



Memòria justificativa de recerca de les beques predoctorals per a la formació de personal investigador (FI)

La memòria justificativa consta de les dues parts que venen a continuació:

- 1.- Dades bàsiques i resums
- 2.- Memòria del treball (informe científic)

Tots els camps són obligatoris

1.- Dades bàsiques i resums

Títol del projecte ha de sintetitzar la temàtica científica del vostre document.
Integración de políticas medio ambientales: Transformaciones institucionales en España

Dades de l'investigador (beneficiari de l'ajut)

Nom	Cognoms
Andrea	Lanaia
Correu electrònic	
Lanaia@gmail.com	

Dades del director del projecte

Nom	Cognoms
Francesc	Morata
Correu electrònic	
Francsc.Morata@uab.cat	

Dades de la universitat / centre al que s'està vinculat

Institut Univesitari d'estudis europeus

Número d'expedient

Paraules clau: cal que esmenteu cinc conceptes que defineixin el contingut de la vostra memòria.
Integración de Política del Medio Ambiente, Cambio Climático, Europeización, Unión Europea, Institucionalización

Data de presentació de la justificació

22-01-2010





Resum en la llengua del projecte (màxim 300 paraules)

La Integración de la Políticas Ambientales (IPA) consiste en la incorporación de los objetivos ambientales en todos los estadios de elaboración e implementación de las políticas no ambientales (o sectoriales), con un reconocimiento específico de dicho objetivo como principio director de la programación y la puesta en práctica. Se complementa con la previsión de las consecuencias ambientales mediante una evaluación de conjunto de la política con objeto de minimizar las contradicciones entre las políticas ambientales y no ambientales dando prioridad a las primeras. La naturaleza transversal de la IPA no se ajusta a la forma tradicional de gobernanza jerárquica basada en la autoridad del Estado, la diferenciación sectorial, y los instrumentos típicos de dirección y control. Por ello, no es extraño que la IPA se encuentre a menudo asociada a los llamados "nuevos modos de gobernanza". Esta tesis propone analizar empíricamente el estado de la cuestión en España con respecto a la Integración de la política ambiental, tanto a nivel estatal como autonómico (Cataluña, País Vasco), yendo más allá de los compromisos políticos a favor de un mayor grado de integración de los factores ambientales en las demás políticas. En particular, los ámbitos de investigación seleccionados para esta finalidad son el de las políticas de mitigación de las causas y los efectos del cambio climático, y las políticas de desarrollo sostenible. En términos de 'variable independiente' La hipótesis que se quiere comprobar es que la acción llevada a cabo por la Unión Europea ha generado profundos cambios en las estructuras de las instituciones mencionadas y en los procesos de elaboración y implementación de determinadas políticas (energía y transporte) así como en las relaciones entre sectores de la administración pública y entre el sector público y el privado.





Resum en anglès(màxim 300 paraules)

Environmental Policy Integration (EPI) consists in the incorporation of environmental objectives into all stages of policy-making in non-environmental policy sectors, with a specific recognition of this goal as a guiding principle for the planning and execution of policy. This objective is complemented by an attempt to evaluate policies in the light of all their possible environmental consequences, as well as a commitment to minimise contradictions between environmental and non-environmental policies and by assigning “principled priority” to the former over the latter. The cross-cutting nature of EPI does not square well with the traditional governance models based on hierarchic, state-cantered authority, sectoral segmentation, and old-fashioned “command and control” instruments. It is no surprise then that EPI is usually related to the ‘New Governance Modes’. This Ph.D. project aims at an analysis of the state of the question in Spain and some of its Regions (notably Catalonia and the Basque Country), to empirically test if the principles of EPI are only confined to political formal statements or if the latter are translated into concrete and observable patterns of action in the policy-making process. More specifically, the selected area of environmental policy expected to be integrated within sectoral policies are climate change adaptation and sustainable development. In terms of ‘independent variable’, my hypothesis suggests that the action taken by the EU in climate change policy has prodded substantial changes in the decision-making and implementation processes of specific policy sectors (e.g.: energy and transport), as well in the relationship between different sectors of public administration and between public and private sectors.



2.- Memòria del treball (informe científic sense limitació de paraules). Pot incloure altres fitxers de qualsevol mena, no més grans de 10 MB cadascun d'ells.

1. Marc teòric i definició dels objectius a analitzar / Marco teórico y definición de los objetivos a analizar

The research effort at the centre of this PhD thesis draws on two different strands of current theoretical research in political science and public policy analysis, namely Europeanization and Environmental Policy Integration (in the following referred to by its acronym, EPI), to assess the impact of EU climate change policy on environmental (climate) policy integration in a multilevel institutional setting, as is the case of Spain. Exploring the concept of 'multilevel governance' implies to move the analytical microscope along two dimensions, both a reflection of the reframing of the traditional notion of modern state. Globalization, the emergence and expansion of competences of supranational organizations as the EU, as well as the sheer, factual complexity of the challenges (and the opportunities) faced by the modern state and contemporaries societies, have all showed the insufficient character of the resources traditionally enjoyed by the latter. There can be few doubts as to the fact that mitigation and adaptation to climate change concerns all levels of government, from local to global and that the interactions between levels are complex and multidirectional. The modern state has inevitably suffered a transformation, stretching and evolving along two lines, as mentioned before. On one hand, it has tapped into the resources that, in various degrees, are found within society at large. On the other hand, traditional state competencies and sovereignty have been shared with supranational organizations and sub-national governments (Morata, 2004). These considerations explain why the notion of government has been eclipsed in favour of that of 'governance': 'a complex network of horizontal and vertical relations, but also a normative concept aimed at improving the inadequate functioning of democracy' (Morata, 2007). Spain is one of the countries that, for historical reasons linked to its variegated landscape of territorial identities, and the challenges mentioned before (climate change and sustainable development-related issues), is going through a complex series of transformations both in its institutional asset and in its policy-making process. More in detail, the research aims to:

- explore the nature of the changes that EU climate change policies have brought to the management of policies in two sectors in particular, energy and transport, where the most part of Greenhouses Gases (GHG) are emitted.
- Shed light on the nature and the causal mechanisms at the root of these changes.

Against the backdrop of traditional environmental policy, usually dealing with one single issue, one source of pollution and one industry at a time, some of today's most pressing environmental concerns defy this simplistic model of cause and effect and impose an overhaul of outmoded styles of environmental policy-making. The interdependent nature of sectoral decisions and activities and its cumulative effect of overloading the carrying capacity of ecosystems are now widely accepted. And there is a creeping worry that we might have already activated an irreversible process of ecosystem change. Climate change is by its own nature an environmental problem linked to punctual and diffused GHG emission sources, human and biophysical, and it obviously requires an integrated policy approach in various policy domains. It is a complex issue, falling under the category of 'unstructured' policy problems, featuring a high degree of disagreement among stakeholders regarding the status



of climate science, the underlying normative basis, the validity and opportunity of policy interventions, and the distribution of the economic burdens of mitigation and adaptation measures (Albrecht and Arts, 2005: 885). It is finally emerging the idea, in political and academic circles alike, that only an integrated approach to policy-making that bypasses the artificial boundaries of policy and political competences, within and across national governments' sphere of competences, can constitute an adequate response to environmental problems of such nature. Global impacts ask for global answers, as well as coordinated action of different sectors of society and economy.

The concept of EPI

Environmental policy integration is thus promoted as a policy coordination process intended to stimulate change in the way environmental concerns are taken into account when formulating, adopting and implementing policies in non- environmental sectors. This challenge cannot be won by devising ad-hoc solutions, limited to a reduced number of sectors or emission sources. It requires instead the adoption of an integrated, holistic approach in which environmental values and variables all become part of the decision-making process in every policy sector and of the choices of consumption and production of all economic and societal actors. The concept of EPI as a principle of environmental policy stems from the wider and fuzzier notion of sustainable development. As stated in the Brundtland report (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987: 313), "[T]he ability to choose policy paths that are sustainable requires that the ecological dimension of policy be considered at the same time as the economic, trade, energy agricultural, industrial and other dimensions on the same agenda and in the same national and international institutions". EPI can thus be considered as an amendment to the fragmentation or compartmentalisation of public policy according to sectoral lines, which is the direct consequence of the increasing specialization and sophistication of policy- making.

But if this general understanding of EPI is quite immediate, its conceptual definition is not as straightforward and uncontroversial as one might think. Among academics and policy-makers, sometimes EPI is considered as a guiding principle whose implications in terms of concrete administrative and institutional arrangements are controversial, unclear or overly ambitious to be fully and effectively implemented. There are two fundamental ways of looking at EPI that reflect different ontological interpretations: one based on rationality and effectiveness of policy making and the other based on normative and principled assumptions. To begin with, EPI can be considered as a special case within the more general framework of research in public policy and public administration interested in policy integration. But when one puts environment into the picture, the account of the strategies suggested or prescribed in order to make coordination and integration real, becomes more controversial and debated. The disputed reading of the practical consequences of attaining a higher degree of EPI is not at all surprising if one goes back to the idea that EPI is a conceptual offshoot of the overarching 'mother principle' of sustainable development and it is commonly understood that the latter cannot be pinned down only by using rational arguments uninfluenced by normative choices of some kind. As such, the weakness inherently associated with the concept of sustainable development is passed on its ancillary concept, in particular when the 'weighting issue' among its three founding pillars (economic, social and environmental) is considered. The relation among the three dimensions of sustainable development is not always 'win-win' in nature but, more often than not, entails 'trade-offs' and thus complex, delicate and even subjective political decisions. Lenschow (2002: 226-227) argues





that there are intrinsic weaknesses and ambiguities inherent to politically and socially constructed ideas such as sustainable development and EPI. Another interesting view of the trade-offs inherent in the idea of sustainable development is gained by adopting the notion of policy frames. Talking about the evolution of policy frames guiding environmental policy in the EU, Lenschow and Zito (1998: 416-418) distinguish three different stages. At its origin, environmental policy was framed as 'conditional', another form of regulation serving as a tool to create equal market conditions. It then evolved to a 'classic' policy frame, where environment was seen as a way of reducing negative externalities emerging from market interactions. Finally a 'sustainability' frame has taken root, based on the assumption of mutual interdependence between economic development and environmental protection.

Drawing on different contributions (Lafferty and Hovden, 2003; Nilsson and Persson, 2003: 334-335; Persson, 2004: 22-23; Jordan and Lenschow, 2007: 11) it is now possible to organize the debate around the conceptualization of EPI according to three broad categories. The more abstract conceptualization is directly connected to the ontological issue of the weighting among the different pillars of sustainable development, and considers EPI as a normative principle with political substance. The other conceptualizations are more pragmatic, and focus on EPI as a governing process (organization and procedures), as an output (policy instruments) or an outcome (measurable impacts on the target).

Looking at the issue from a different perspective, it is possible to distinguish a vertical and a horizontal dimensions of EPI (Lafferty and Hovden, 2004: 12-15), each dimension ripping a line through a different axis of governmental architecture. The vertical dimension then refers to the 'greening' of sectoral policies and governance, i.e. how and how much an established level of environmental protection is reflected within sectoral policy-making. It does not have to be mistaken for the issue of the distribution of competences among different territorial levels of policy-making, as in the case of multilevel governance. The horizontal dimension refers instead to the question of the saliency of environmental concerns in the overall process of policy making, or, the problem of 'who gets what, where, when and how' (ibidem, 15). This calls into question the role of a central authority developing and monitoring comprehensive cross-sectoral strategies for EPI. Studying EPI as a governing process means identifying the quantity and the quality of actors' interactions necessary to obtain substantive results in everyday policy-making (Jordan and Lenschow, 2007: 14). Both in vertical as well horizontal terms, this means 'the process through which 'non-'environmental sectors consider the overall environmental consequences of their policies, and the active and early steps taken to incorporate them into policy making at all the relevant levels of governance (Jordan and Schout, 2006: 66). EPI then becomes an 'ongoing process' rather than an end-of-state outcome, whose results in terms of changed administrative practices and cultures must nonetheless be institutionalized in order to protect them from the menace of being reversed by countervailing forces originating in the external environment (EEA, 2005: 9). Once EPI is conceptualized as a process, different perspectives can be followed in order to explore the mechanisms, variables and contextual factors relevant to its practical configuration. Following Jordan and Lenschow (2006: 14) it is possible to utterly study the process of EPI as an organizational (or administrative), a political or a cognitive phenomenon. When considering the organizational aspect of EPI, one can think of a wide category of factors such as government architecture, interaction of actors within and outside government, power structure, resource allocation, budgeting and capacity (Persson, 2005: 29). The main obstacles to overcome are sectoral compartmentalisation and the power struggle among competing interests, views and paradigms. Sub-optimal results as departments develop 'turf mentality' and engage in a competitive





struggle to defend their interests, satisfy their 'clients', and increment or just defend their resource base. This 'pulling and hauling' of departments and levels of governments can be seen as a matter of bureaucratic politics (Jordan and Schout, 2006: 5), and contradicts the fact that cross-sectoral learning ultimately is an automatic mechanism for achieving change. Environmental quality, moreover, has the characteristic of a public good and no actor as such has a sufficient incentive to take it into account in its decisions of 'production and consumption' (Schout and Jordan, 2006: 6).

Policy coordination is often acknowledged as a determinant organizational variable to achieve improvements in EPI. The analysis of coordination has resented from the shift in the conceptual understanding of policy making, away from a hierarchical system toward a horizontal system of interdependent actors and interlocking interests. In the context of a more opened form of governance, the issue of coordination has been absorbed within the scope of theories concerned with the formation and functioning of networks.

In relation to procedural factors conducive to EPI, these include measures for designing and implementing EPI arrangements (such as sector strategies and action plans) as well as measure intended to support the more routinely tasks of policy making such as ex ante impact assessment. Great importance is understandably attached to the decision making rules and styles defining the position of environmental concerns in the policy process. EPI can also be understood as a learning process, in which case the heuristic toolbox must be enriched of cognitive and knowledge- related factors., as the concept of policy learning, referring to changes in the belief system (Sabatier, 1998) and paradigm (Hall, 1993), both intended as world views based on values and norms. Nilsson (2003, 2005) has proposed the adoption of the more general concept of policy frame to design the cognitive and epistemological domain within which actors' rationality moves, how they organize the hierarchy of issues as well as the 'stories' they employ to diagnose policy problems and to link the associated causal understanding to particular proposals of action. According to actor-centred institutionalism, institutions are intermediate variables that shape but do not determine the choices of policy actors, and constitute the arena where policy frames 'emerge, become rooted and may be replaced' (Lenschow and Zito, 1998: 419). It follows from these premises that the type of policy learning conducive to 'reframing', i.e. policy frame shift, will be something more than technical or simple learning which is limited to the search of new policy instruments without redefinition of objectives and strategies. Reframing can only be achieved through more complex and indeed far-reaching processes of learning, close to the concept of double-loop or conceptual learning (Fiorino, 2001:324), involving an overhauling of problem definitions and strategies, eventually leading to a process of institutionalization of the newly emerged paradigm or frame.

From an analytical perspective, approaching EPI as an output it is a thorny issue. It does not seem to be appropriate to identify output with policy instruments. Policy instruments and their settings are ways of obtaining a policy goal (Hall, 1993) and, because of the way in which EPI has been defined, it does not necessarily exist a specific relation between the goal of integration and the use of a specific policy instruments. In any case, the choice and the nature of specific policy instruments is not made only on the basis of concerns of efficiency and effectiveness, but may have something to do with contextual factors such as political history, economic conditions and pressures, as well as the nature and the composition of the target groups. There are then good reasons to believe that the choice of policy instruments has more to do with EPI than the simple relation with its implementation, in that it reveals more of the general policy approach and opportunities for EPI (Herodes et al., 2006: 9), but it cannot be identified as integration in its own terms. This perspective, on the other hand, links





indissolubly policy instruments to modes of governance intended as 'policy steering' (Jordan et al., 2005: 481; Treib et al., 2005: 5-6) and, in turn, the underlying problem-solving approach, models of state-society relations, policy process, implementation and evaluation mechanisms. (See table below)

	Regulator specifies the goal to be achieved	Regulator does not specify the goal to be achieved
Regulator specifies how the goal to be achieved	Command and control (Regulation); fiscal incentives	Technology-based regulatory standards (BAT)
Non-state actors specify how the goal is to be achieved	Most negotiated Vas; some MBIs (Tradable permits); some regulation (environmental quality objectives)	Most MBIs; some Vas; eco-labels; informational devices; Environmental management systems

Source: Jordan et al. (2005: 483)

EPI as governance

EPI can be conceptualized in a more holistic framework based on the notion of governance. Governance is used here in its broad formulation of 'mode of political steering involving public and private actors, including the traditional model of government and different types of steering from hierarchical imposition to sheer information measures' (Héritier, 2002: 185). This governance perspective focused on coordination is all the more appropriate if one thinks of the far-reaching consequences and the growing pressure that the consistent shift of environmental responsibilities to the EU level has put on domestic policy making.

In the literature three archetypal modes of governance have been identified, namely hierarchy, market and networks (Knill and Lenschow, 2005; Lenschow, 2007). More relevant to this work is the network-type governance. Network theory focuses on interdependence, cooperation, exchange and, indeed, coordination (Scharpf, 1993; Nilsson, 2005: 339; Schout and Jordan, 2002: 7-13; Börzel: 1997; Rhodes, 1997 29-43). This conceptualization has been applied in an attempt to capture the essence of the prevailing pattern of governance within the EU. Network governance stands somewhat in contrast to the concept of governing. That is, while governing is about the formal process whereby authority is exerted on a specific political constituency, governance is the structured (but not always 'codified') process of mediating among different constellation of interests and transforming heterogeneity into collective choices, coordination and compliance. On these premises, legitimacy of the decision-making authorities does not rest on the traditional notions of representative democracy and delegation of power but on its effectiveness in problem-solving efforts and accountability to citizens. According to the notion of network governance, the old hierarchical, 'command-and-control', bureaucratic style of policy-making





is not suited for fulfilling the goals of modern and complex societies, where no single actor, including government, has all the knowledge, the information, the tools, or power to either dominate or to make policy work. The hierarchical government model, statism, is therefore supplanted by self-organizing and interorganizational networks (Rhodes, 1996: 658), which also stand in contrast to corporatism and pluralism. The thesis will try to make clear the existence, in the Spanish institutional context, of the conditions under which a network can turn into an effective self-organizing system of multilevel governance, i.e. exploring the set of specific arrangements governing the dynamic of administrative policy coordination a decentralized territorial model in relation to the managing of climate change issues.

Europeanization

The analytical challenge of this thesis is to place the turns in governance conducing to environmental policy integration in the context of the consistent body of studies commonly referred to as Europeanization. The definition adopted in this research program will be the one provided by Radaelli (2003: 30). Europeanization is thus defined as a 'process of (a) construction, (b) diffusion, and (c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms styles, 'ways of doing things', and shared beliefs and norms which are first consolidated in the making of EU public policy and politics and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies'.

As Radaelli puts it, Europeanization it is not a solution, but rather a problem, is not a self-sufficient explanatory framework, but rather a framework for analysis of difference and variation in adaptation process where other explanatory elements will have to be identified. There is no previous assumption with respect to the relations between structure and agency: institutions, organizations and individuals can all be potential explanatory variables. In other words, Europeanization is an explanandum (Gualini, 2003: 24) and, finally, is not an end of state but rather a process. As for the source of impact, the "EU policy process" does not necessarily equate to the adoption of policies or legislation (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007: 37), but it can comprise different moments of the policy cycle, such as policy formulation (construction), policy implementation (institutionalization), as well as the more fluid dynamics of diffusion of policy and modes of governance within the EU. The potential recipients of the impact are equally largely defined, ranging from formal features of the political structure and policy process to the less tangible instances of governance and the cognitive dimension of politics. Mutual influences are also possible. The policy dimension is where the 'direct' effects of Europeanization are more distinguishable and likely to happen, while institutional changes, when they occur, are more the result of 'indirect' effects of Europeanization and usually happen over a much larger time span (Hix and Goetz, 2001: 15). The relationship between politics and policy, mediated by institutions, is explained though the use of sociological and historical institutionalism accounts. Thus, even if most changes affect policies (Radaelli, 2000: 23), these changes can overflow onto the political-institutional system, a phenomenon that can be captured under the label of 'policy-driven institutionalization process'. Learning process and cognitive shifts are easier to materialize at policy level. They can nevertheless lead to the generation of new paradigms that might in turn trigger transformative trends at the institutional level (Gualini, 2003. 26). An exogenous process turns into an endogenous pattern of change, encompassing institutions, interests, and the more diffused symbolic-cognitive dimension of politics comprising ideas, argumentative framing, discourse and paradigm (Bache, 2003: 6).





Even if a research design on Europeanization is not amenable to a clear-cut use of independent and dependent variables, it does not mean that it is not possible to do so, but it warrants a degree of caution and 'open mindedness' when trying to operationalize them. Therefore, the first questions to be asked are: what is Europeanized? What is the 'focus of analysis (Héritier et al., 2001: 3)? By answering this question, it is possible to trace the imaginary boundary of the 'domain of impact', i.e. the dependent variable. It is possible to distinguish, for analytical purposes, three categories: macrodomestic structures, public policy and cognitive and normative structures. Macrodomestic structures can be further divided into the subcategories of 'political structures', comprising mainly the institutional-administrative settings and the legal framework, and of 'structure or representation and cleavages', reflecting the political domain of a domestic constituency.

As already said, public policy is the domain where more changes can be expected and counts with a great deal of analytical and empirical studies. According to Liefferink and Jordan (2004: 36-43) public policy analysis can be conducted on three different levels: policy content (setting and typology of the instruments, and the hierarchy of goals guiding policy, see also Hall, 1993: 278-279), policy structures (formal, bureaucratic organization, structures, norms and rules governing decision making, conflict resolution and inter- and intra- departmental coordination) and policy style (including the 'soft, cultural side of a policy system' such as problem solving approach -reactive or anticipatory- and the relationship with other actors in the decision-making and implementation process – consensual or adversarial).

Finally, to complete the picture of the transformative effects of Europeanization, the dimension of values, ideas, norms and discourse must be put under close scrutiny. Cognitive and normative frames do not only serve as an abstract or remote point of reference for actors, but, by defining the values, the objectives and 'the choice of instruments to implement a particular strategy', they have a profound impact on the spheres of politics and policy. In the case of climate change policy is utterly important because it involves questions of social and ecological justice, distributive and intergenerational equity, and the very basis on which our entire socio-economic system is founded.

It has already been said that Europeanization is not itself a theory or an explanation per se, but rather a 'problem' that needs to be explored and solved by deploying and adapting theoretical approaches already existing in social science (Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003: 33; Bulmer, 2007: 47). In most literature on Europeanization the theoretical underpinning of the mechanisms of change is based on the so called 'new institutionalism', which is not a 'unified body of thought' but comprises three main variants, namely rational choice, sociological and historical institutionalism (Hall and Taylor, 1996, Schneider and Aspinwall, 2001). They propose different understanding about the influence of institution on social action and offer competing models of explanation drawing on sociology and economics. But, as this research intends to show, it is not common to find explanatory models of Europeanization of a 'pure' form of new institutionalism but rather, 'hybrid' forms combining elements of the different approaches. Relying on such cross-cutting models, the shortcomings of each variant in making sense of complex realities can be overcome. The most fruitful way to approach the question of which mechanisms are relevant in process of Europeanization and how they work, at least in relation to the object of this thesis, it is to use governance as an organizing concept to distinguish among different forms of policy making in the EU (Kohler-Koch, 1999: 15; Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002: 257; Bulmer and Padgett, 2005: 107; Bulmer and Radaelli, 2005: 346; Knill and Lenschow, 2005, for environmental policy). Each mode of governance comprises specific types of policy, a distinct 'analytical core' and is eventually associated to a specific mechanism of Europeanization.





Different types of governance are characterized by a unique set of macro and micro institutional variables, such as the scope of the powers allocated to the supranational levels, the decision rules and the density of the exchange networks where national actors participate. Each set of variables shape in turn s the outcome of the Europeanization process. It is possible to talk of horizontal mechanisms when the EU does not prescribe legally binding obligation but rather functions as a 'massive transfer platform from dominant countries or winning advocacy coalition to other coalitions' (Radaelli, 1999: 28), or as a market-driven process where regulatory competition or competition among socio-economic actors is at the base of change (negative integration). Horizontal mechanisms also apply when the EU agrees policy or political action based on declarations, 'soft law' (e.g. minimal directives, no legally binding and/or symbolic rules of conduct) or, finally, where the EU arena simply serves as a forum where domestic actors share good practices and ideas and learn policy (as in the Open Method of Coordination). Climate change policies, at least at the implementation stage, can be classified under this category. It must be remarked that the scope of the thesis does not extend to the process of policy formation at EU or the international level; at least not insofar these processes have a direct and relevant effect on the implementation process, as the case of the ETS (European Trading Scheme) will show. It is also true that climate change negotiations, at the international level, are opening up new spaces and opportunities for different actors, e.g. private and sub national, to interact, create new networks, and acquire resources that can be used to change the domestic balance, and so on. These developments, unless otherwise stated, will be mostly considered as external given rather than independent variables.

Mechanisms of Europeanization

One important strand of the Europeanization literature is based on the concept of 'goodness of fit' implying that domestic change prompted by Europeanization can only happen under the condition of a 'misfit', 'inconvenience' or 'incompatibility' between 'European-level processes, policies and institutions on one hand and domestic-level processes, policies and institutions on the other', at the moment of 'downloading' (implement) from the level above (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 58). Misfit can affect either policies or institutions or both and will in turn generate 'adaptational pressure' bearing on domestic level actors and institutions, pushing them toward reaction. As a rule of thumb, the lower the level of compatibility, the higher the adaptational pressure. Critic to this approach points out that the goodness of fit argument has not general validity but is rather a special case whose explanatory power is limited to vertical mechanism of Europeanization and the existence of a specific template. In other instances of governance modes, i.e. 'horizontal', this argument is much less convincing. The fact is that the goodness of fit argument can be 'excessively structural without enough room for agency' (Radaelli, 2004: 23) and it is strictly focused on macro-level institutional factors.

My research work will be based on a rather different, even though not entirely, approach. Knill and Lehmkuhl (2002: 258) and Knill (2001: 30-31), refer to Europeanization by institutionalization, when EU policies requires the adoption of specific institutional models, devising a two step approach based on different levels of abstraction and combining an institutional-based and an agency-centred explanatory toolkit. The first, more abstract, step looks at macro-institutional structures and makes predictions based on historical institutionalism as preliminary tools to determine whether change is likely or not. Historical institutionalism (Hall and Rosemary, 1996: 5-10, Pierson, 1996, 2000, 2000a; Bulmer and Burch, 2001: 81) highlights the 'stickiness' of institutional and policy arrangements





as well as the incremental nature of change. Moving then to the second step of the explanatory framework, the structural factors lose part of their constraining effect, making room for more agency. To determine whether there is sufficient support and empowerment for those actors pushing for change, one has to look at the existing interest constellation and the institutional opportunity structure. This approach does not question the fact that adaptational pressure is a necessary condition for change, but opens up the analytical space, pointing out at cases in which the magnitude of the requirements needed to meet adaptational pressure rules out change altogether.

2. Estat de la qüestió i evidència empírica disponible / Estado de la cuestión y evidencia empírica disponible.

Under the Kyoto Protocol, the EU-15 has agreed to curb its cumulative greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the period 2008-2012 by 8% compared to their level in 1990. This collective commitment has been internally modified through a 'burden sharing agreement' (June 1998) that assigned different emission targets to each country according to a set of criteria such as reduction capacities, historical cumulative emission and relative economic welfare (Barker et al, 2001)¹. Climate change policy is a multi-level, multi-actor governance system. It is negotiated, agreed, implemented and enforced at very different levels of institutions and society, spanning from the very global to the very local, and involving almost all actors thereof (Addink et al., 2003: 82-83)

The EU has developed over the time substantial competences in relevant areas for the preparation and implementation of a robust, comprehensive and coherent climate change policy. It has acquired competences over trade, tax and foreign policy, and it can legislate and harmonize laws in environment, energy, transport and agriculture sectors, all of them extremely important for designing and managing climate policies. The programme to help the EU and its member states meet their emission targets under the Kyoto Protocol is called the European Climate Change Programme (ECCP). Managed by the European Commission, the ECCP has led so far to the development of a wide set of European-level policies and measures to reduce GHG. These complement the actions being taken by individual EU countries at home.

In broad terms, climate change policies in the European Union have been 'split' in two areas characterized by a different approach based on different premises and, as the research is intended to show, a different model of governance. On the one hand, policy action in the energy sector, which accounts for about 60% of GHG emissions in the atmosphere, has been framed within a system of governance centred on market-based mechanisms. Launched in January 2005, the EU ETS², is the first large-scale trading system in the field of environment. It is considered as the corner-stone of the ECCP, an ambitious experiment in environmental policy instruments, and 'a fundamental system change in environmental governance' (CEPS, 2002). In order to give full and effective implementation to the ETS, an articulated and complex system of administrative arrangements, comprising all levels of government within the EU, as well as the passive and active collaboration of the individual installations subjected to the system (11.500 across the EU-27). Its actual coverage extends to six industries belonging to the heat and power generation and energy-intensive sectors (that will be referred to as the 'trading sectors', as

¹ Spain has been assigned a target of 15% increase on 1990 levels.

² Consolidated version of Directive 2003/87/EC, amended by the following directives: 2004/101, 2008/101, 2009/29 and Regulation No. 219/2009



opposed to the 'non-trading sectors' comprising all the other sectors not covered by the scheme), with an in-built potential to be further extended, such as it has been the case of aviation dating from the beginning of 2012 (Directive 2008/101). What is more important, under the ETS carbon emissions are traded and decisions are taken according to the price set by the market. This represents a fundamental shift from precedent regulatory approaches, as well as a clever way to circumvent the extremely difficult task to introduce a uniform tax regime in the EU.

On the contrary, the sectors defined as 'non-trading' (and among the transport) are not submitted to a comprehensive system of European legislation specifically dealing with environmental and climate goals, and member states have more room, as well as the formal obligation, to devise national strategies and policies to reduce emissions to respect their reduction commitments. Member states have the obligation to draw up national reduction strategies that must be included in their National Allocation Plans, a key document linked to the implementation of the ETS which is submitted for each compliance period of the ETS to the approval of the Commission. One obvious consequence of this formal requirement has been the redaction of national Climate Strategies that come to define the overall set of policies, policy instruments and the projected reductions to be achieved in the non- trading sectors.

If we apply the typology of Europeanization mechanisms exposed in the previous section to the different patterns of policy and governance that have been developed in relation to the trading and the non trading sectors, it is immediately evident that we have to recur to different explanatory mechanisms, and even to more than one for each of the cases considered. In the case of ETS, it is of immediate appreciation the vertical character of the directive, imposing a specific template of obligatory and strict implementation. But, under the surface of this hierarchical mode of governance, the ETS is a decentralized scheme with different responsibilities assigned to different levels of government and to private actors, according to the principle of subsidiarity that lies at the base of any EU policy. Its implementation and its correct functioning require continuous interactions between all the actors involved, from the Commission down to the private sectors, in which case it is not inappropriate nor paradoxical to talk of a special kind of network governance structured around a hierarchical axis (as supported by the fact that installations that overshoot their limits of emissions without compensatory purchase on the allowance market are liable to pecuniary sanctions). The ETS, because of its novelty and originality, has also been subjected to continuous reviews and changes, which will probably continue for a long time to come, especially if and when a new international agreement on GHG reductions will be signed, opening up and linking the ETS to a global market of allowances. The Commission has heavily drawn on the experience and on the advice of the other members of the (network carbon) governance system to effect the necessary changes, allowing the claim that mutual learning is another central feature of this special case of vertical Europeanization.

In the non trading sectors, in the absence of specific templates³ or specific policy instruments imposed by the EU, change is revealing more difficult, slow and incremental. Policy changes are therefore occurring in all sectors involved, but, as historical institutionalism predicts, institutions limit the range and the scope of options available to actors (institutional 'lock-in') in the absence of any direct and inescapable legal constraints. They do this by ruling

³ To a certain extent, there is not always a clear-cut division running between trading sectors and non trading sectors, as the case of aviation shows. Moreover, certain aspects related to transport are indirectly covered by the ETS, e.g. the electricity produced to power rail travel and fuel production in refineries.





out those options that suppose a costly divergence from the actual configuration or that are difficult to obtain because of the institutional distribution of power. In other instances, previous institutional choices preclude new venues to be explored (policy legacies) or is the 'time inconsistency' between institutional choices carrying long-run benefits (and possibly short-run costs) and the short time-horizon of elected officials that prevents changes.

Spain has approved its first two NAP (for the two compliance periods 2005- 2007 and 2008- 2012 respectively) which included two different versions of the National Climate Change Strategy. The strategy consist of a detailed description of the main lines of action to be taken to curb emission also in sectors outside the ETS, and call for an integrated and concerted action among the different strands of the central administration, i.e. the ministries, as well as between central and regional administration. To manage these policy changes, several and profound novelties have been introduces in the institutional structure, to reflect the need of incremented and enhanced coordination, coherence and integration.

The origin of the institutional (re)organization of Spain to deal specifically with climate change dates back to 1992, whit the institution of the National Climate Commission, even predating the institution of a specific ministry of environment. The first National Climate Program dates of 1995, but it was not until 1998, after the Kyoto Protocol was finally signed, that the urgency was felt to adopt concrete measures and actions. In the same year the National Climate Council sees the light, charged, among other things, with drafting the Spanish Climate Change Strategy. In 2001 the composition of the National Climate Council was enlarged to make sure the participation of all branches of public administration (included the regions) as well as that of socioeconomic stakeholders. In the same year 2001, another institution is put in place, the Climate Change Bureau, depending of the ministry of environment and entrusted with coordinating climate change policy implementation. The Commission on Coordination of Climate Change Policies and the Interministerial Group on Climate Change are political structures that should ensure coherence and create consensus among different ministries. Within the Ministry of Environment a specific State Secretary of Climate Change has been established, in a move that resemble similar initiatives taken in most Members States. These are all instances of new and ad-hoc institutions created for the purpose of streamlining climate policies, showing its profound implications as well as its 'unstructured' policy issue qualities.

But climate change is only one of the drivers, arguably the more pressing and politically salient, of the more general push toward sustainability. Even formally, the Climate Change Strategy is part of the Sustainable Development Strategy finally approved by the Spanish government in 2008. The 'greening' of sectoral policies is taking place via the application of instruments such as the Environmental Impact Assessment at all the stage of policy- making, from general plans through to projects of a smaller scale. In this respect, it becomes clear that an assessment of the impact of the EU on the transformation occurring in the integration of environmental consideration within sectoral policies must take into account a whole set of instruments that predate climate change action and that where conceived for different purposes.

In the context of multilevel governance, in Spain as elsewhere, regional and local governments are in the frontline of climate change mitigation and adaptation. The evidence in the Spanish case is abundant and a new chapter is being added to the story of the evolution of the 'State of Autonomies', as the type of federalism in force in Spain is generally referred to. The wide devolution of competences to regional governments in Spain would not fit well with a centralized and uniform policy template. Not to mention the fact that climate change polices call for a bottom up





approach, in so far their effectiveness depends to a great extent on factors such as geography, population, density and local availability of resources.

In line with other instances of the Spanish institutional configuration, the pattern of dynamism showed by different regions in embracing their responsibilities is not homogeneous. The result is an asymmetrical system of governance where some regions, as the case of Catalonia shows, have set up a self-sufficient and coherent institutional structure, delivering meaningful and proactive policies and pushing them to question their restricted space of manoeuvre within the domestic arena, which they try to bypass by linking up directly with the supranational level. This seems to confirm the claim made by Europeanization that one of the consequences of the EU on member states is a redistribution of resources available to national actors (in the case in point, to different levels of government) via the provision of incentives and opportunities. One of the analytical questions that this thesis wants to answer is which conditions, in a contested multilevel political setting, are supportive to the enhancing of Environmental policy integration and which ones, in turn, can lead to a suboptimal result.

3. Metodologia i principals dificultats de l'anàlisi / Metodología y principales dificultades del análisis.

The thesis is based on the premises that climate change policies developed at the EU level have direct, discernable and measurable impacts, through the different mechanisms contemplated by the Europeanization literature, on the degree and the quality of environmental (climate) policy integration in Spain. The intended structure of this research, save for minor adjustment that might be deemed necessary during the course of the empirical fieldwork, is centred on the drafting of 7 chapters. The first chapter aims at giving an historical outlook of climate change policies in the EU, trying to stress the different institutional and policy context that have emerged, after the introduction of the ETS between sectors subjected to directive 2003/87 (trading sectors) and sectors that stand outside the scope of the directive. Moreover, of the two branches of which climate change policy is constituted, mitigation (reduction) and adaptation, the scope of the thesis is limited to the former.

Chapter 2 and 3 are concerned with the description of the theoretical framework underlying the research task, i.e. Europeanization and EPI. Europeanization is used here as the explanatory framework to make senses of the changes that have happened in the consecution of a higher degree of EPI. Starting with EPI, Chapter 2 will therefore engage in a comprehensive review of the literature, highlighting, among the different interpretation surrounding the concept, those that will be operationalized in this thesis. One of the key choices to be made at this stage in the arrangement of the research design is to descend from a generic notion of EPI to a well-defined, operational variable, amenable to some kind of qualitative measurement. To this end, the notion of 'mode of governance' will be privileged above the others on the ground of its flexibility and its capacity to encompass a wide range of phenomenon, from specific institutional solutions, policy-making styles, policy instruments, through to engagement with the private sector and society at large.

Once settled the nature and the scope of the dependent variable in terms of EPI, Chapter 3 will give a systematic account of the Europeanization literature, and, in the same fashion of Chapter 2, starting from the general picture, the focus will be narrowed down to the specific strand of the literature and the analytical toolbox fitting with the dependent variable. But the choice of Europeanization as the main explanatory factor, must warn against the danger of committing a series of too common mistakes related to its handling. Research designs that are not





complex enough to control for other variables and rival hypothesis can easily fall prey of the common error of prejudging the domestic impact of EU policies and to ascribe any change at home to similar development at EU level (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007: 40). Goetz refers to this class of mistakes when he defines Europeanization 'a cause in search of an effect', (Goetz, 2001) warning against the use of European integration as a straightforward independent variable bound to effect some change somewhere in the domestic context. In other words, 'the establishment of EU policies is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for Europeanization' (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007: 41).

To achieve a satisfying level of certainty about the 'net impact' of Europeanization in a dynamic of domestic change, it is necessary to devise a research design that controls for the rival hypothesis of change, in particular globalization and domestic-driven change. Besides the counterfactual, which implies a strong dose of hypothetical reasoning and imagination, a decisive variable in the organization of research strategies on Europeanization is the time dimension. As argued by Goetz (2001: 223) changes induced by Europeanization are 'gradual and cumulative rather than sudden and dichotomous', an observation that prompts for sensitivity to the time factor. Radaelli (2003: 48), referring to the same concepts, invites to direct our attention to the strategic use of the time dimension made by policy makers, whereby decisions are taken (or not taken) and the pace of Europeanization controlled according to domestic expediency. Europeanization can also matter as a reference point to channel the (sometimes) independent effects of other variables (Cowles and Risse, 2001: 221). To this respect, it can be claimed that international climate change politics may have a direct impact on the domestic scene. This claim cannot be easily dismissed as irrelevant and, on the contrary, it is partially true. Most of the drivers behind the way climate change policy is being developed in the EU must be accounted for in the context of international agreement and negotiations. The hypothesis adopted in this thesis is to consider that the impact of climate change policies decided in the EU on member state does not depends on the international context. Or, to say otherwise, the EU 'digest' the influences of the international context and the result of its metabolism (international agreements, policy instruments, etc...) can be taken as a given for member states. Chapter 2 and 3 will build on the experience and the content of the memory of research presented by the candidate on September 2007, duly refined and revised. The lessons learned in the process of submission of the memory of research have exposed the need of explicating more clearly the scope and the nature of the dependent and independent variable.

Chapter 4 and 5 will be redacted on the base of the stock of information that will be collected via the empirical work. The latter would consist of document analysis and a large enough number of interviews with officials (from the three institutional levels involves, European, national and regional), practitioners and private sectors representatives. Chapter 4 will deal with the energy sector while chapter 5 will focus on the transport sector and contiguous activities (such as land use planning) necessary to have the complete picture of the activities involved in managing the adaptation of infrastructures and transport patterns to climate change reduction strategies. The research will cover a time-span of 20 years, which seems reasonable long to trace the changes that can be attributed to climate change policies since their appearance. Both chapters will be try to follow a logic thread based on the chronological comparison between governance systems and their potential to achieve environmental policy integration in sectoral polices before and after the changes following the introduction of climate change policies and legislation. Chapter 6 will apply the same comparative logic in a cross-sectoral manner, with the aim of exposing the main differences, and eventually the similarities, in the parallel processes of Europeanization of the sectors under scrutiny. Finally, chapter 7 will draw the main conclusions out of the empirical evidence, with the





specific target of singling out the factors that have hindered or enhanced EPI in the context of climate change policy.

4. Referències bibliogràfiques i calendari previst / *Referencias bibliográficas y calendario previsto.*

Albrecht J., and Arts, B. (2005) 'Climate policy convergence in Europe: an assessment based on National Communication to the UNFCCC', *Journal of European Public Policy* 12(5), 885-902

Addink, H., B. Arts and A.Mol (2003), 'Climate change policy in changing context: globalization, political modernization and legal innovation' in van Ierland, E.C., J. Gupta, M.T.J. Kok (Eds.) 'Issues in International Climate Policy. Theory and Policy. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar 75-96

Bache, I. (2003) *Europeanization: A Governance Approach*. In University of Sheffield, Department of Politics. ESRC/UACES Series of Seminars on EBPP, 2002-11-29 Sheffield, UK.

Barker, T.; Kram, T. ; Oberthür, S. and Voogt, M. (2005) *The Role of EU Internal Policies in Implementing Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Options to Achieve Kyoto Targets*, *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics* 1: 243–26

Börzel, T. (1997) 'What's So Special About Policy Networks? – An Exploration of the Concept and Its Usefulness in Studying European Governance' *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* Vol. 1 (1997) N° 16;

- (1999), 'Towards Convergence in Europe? Institutional Adaptation to Europeanization in Germany and Spain', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37(4), 573-596

Börzel, T. and T. Risse (2003) 'Conceptualising the Domestic Impact of Europe', in K. Featherstone and C. M. Radaelli, *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 57-80

Bulmer, S. (2007) 'Theorizing Europeanization' in P. Graziano and M.P. Vink (Eds.) *Europeanization. New Research Agendas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan p. 46-58

Bulmer, S. and Burch M. (2001), 'The Europeanization of Central Government: The UK and Germany in Historical Institutional Perspective' in G. Schneider and M. Aspinwall (eds), *The Rules of Integration: Institutionalist Approaches to the Study of Europe*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 73-96

Bulmer, S. and Padgett, S. (2005), *Policy Transfer in the European Union: An Institutionalist Perspective*, *British Journal of Political Science*, 35(1): 103-126

Bulmer, S. and C. Radaelli (2005) 'The Europeanization of National Policy?', in S. Bulmer and C. Lequesne (Eds.) *The Member States of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press p. 338- 359

Cowles, M.J., J. Caporaso and T. Risse (2001) (eds.) *Transforming Europe*. Ithaca London: Cornell University Press

CEPS (2002) *Greenhouse gas emission trading in Europe: Conditions for environmental credibility and economic efficiency*. Task Force Report no 43. Brussels: CEPS

EEA (European Environmental Agency) (2005) 'Environmental Policy Integration in Europe: Administrative culture and Practices', *Technical Report No 5/2005*, Copenhagen: European Environmental Agency

Fiorino, D.J (2001) 'Environmental Policy As Learning: A New View of an Old Landscape', *Public Administration Review*, 61(3), 322-333





Goetz, K.H. (2001) 'European Integration and National Executives: A Cause in Search of an Effect?' in Hix.S and Goetz K. (Eds.) *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems*. Frank Cass

Gualini, E. (2003) *Multi-Level Governance and Institutional change. The Europeanization of regional Policy in Italy*. Aldershot: Ashgate

Hall, P.A. (1993) 'Policy Paradigms, Social Learning and the State: The Case of Economic Policy Making in Britain', *Comparative Politics*, 52(3), 275-296

Hall, P.A., and R.C.R. Taylor (1996) 'Political Science and the Three New institutionalisms', MPIFG Discussion Paper 96/6

Héritier, A and C. Knill (2001), 'Differential Responses to European Policies: A Comparison', in Héritier et al., *Differential Europe: The European Union Impact on National Policy Making*, Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: pp. 257-294

Héritier, A. (2002) 'New Modes of Governance in Europe: Policy-Making without Legislating?' in A. Héritier (Ed.) *'Common Goods. Reinventing European and International Governance'* Boulder: Rowman& Littlefield Publishers. 185-206

Hix, S. and Goetz K. (2001) 'Introduction: European Integration and national Political System' in Hix.S and Goetz K. (Eds.) *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National*

Jordan, A., R. Wurzel, A. Zito (2005), 'Has Governance Eclipsed Government? Patterns of Environmental Instrument Selection in Eight States and the EU', *Political Studies*, 53, 477-496.

Jordan, A. and A. Lenschow (2006) 'Integrating the Environment for Sustainable development: an Introduction', Paper presented at the International Research Workshop, 'Innovation in environmental Policy? Integrating the Environment for Sustainability', 6/7 December 2006, Stockholm environment Institute, Stockholm.

Jordan, A. and D. Liefferink (2004) *Environmental Policy in Europe. The Europeanization of national environmental policy*. Abingdon: Routledge

Jordan A. and A. Schout (2006) 'Environmental policy integration at European Union level: a catalogue of coordinating capacities' in A. Jordan and A. Schout, *The Coordination of the European Union: exploring the capacities of networked governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kohler-Koch, B. (1999), 'The Evolution and Transformation of European Governance' in B. Kohler-Koch and R. Eising (Eds.), *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*, London: Routledge, 14-35

Knill, C. and Lenschow, A. (2005) 'Compliance, Communication and Competition: Patterns of EU Environmental Policy Making and Their Impact on Policy Convergence', *European Environment*, 15(2) 114-128

Knill, C. and D. Lehmkuhl (2002) 'The national impact of European Union regulatory policy: Three Europeanization mechanisms', *European Journal of Political Research* 41: 255-280

Lafferty, W.M. and Hovden E. (2003) 'Environmental Policy Integration: Towards an Analytical Framework', *Environmental Politics*, 12(3): 1-22

Lenschow, A. (2002) *Greening the European union: an Introduction*, in A. Lenschow (ed.) *Environmental Policy Integration. Greening Sectoral Polices in Europe*. London: Earthscan.





- (2007) 'The Modes of EPI in Theory and Practice'. Draft Paper presented at the EPIGOV conference 'Environmental Policy Integration and Modes of Governance', 16 February 2007, Brussels

Lenschow, A. and A.R. Zito (1998) 'Blurring or Shift of Policy Frames?: Institutionalization of the Economic-Environmental Policy Linkage in the European Community', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 11(4): 415-441

Morata, Francesc (2004) "Regiones y Gobernanza Multinivel en la Unión Europea", en *Gobernanza Multinivel en la Unión Europea*, ed. Morata, F., Valencia, Tirant le Blanch, 19-50.

Morata, Francesc (2007) "Introducción: el proceso de europeización y España". en *España en Europa, Europa en España [1986-2006]*, eds. Morata, F. & Gemma Mateo, Fundación CIDOB, Barcelona.

Nilsson, M. A. and Persson, A. (2003), 'Framework for Analysing Environmental Policy integration', *Journal of environmental Policy and Planning*, 5(4): 333-359

Nilsson, M.A. (2005) 'Learning, frames, and environmental policy integration: the case of Swedish energy policy', *Environmental and Planning C: Government and Policy*, vol. 23 207-226

Peters, B. G. (1998), 'Managing Horizontal government: The politics of coordination', Research Paper, Canadian Centre of Management Development, Ottawa.

- (1998b) 'Managing Horizontal government: The politics of coordination', *Public Administration*, 76, 295-311

Pierson, P. (1996) 'The Path to European Integration', *Comparative Political Studies* 29(2): 123-163

Radaelli, C.M. (2000) 'Policy Transfer in the European Union: Institutional Isomorphism as a Source of Legitimacy', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 13(1), 25-43

(2003) 'The Europeanization of public policy' in Featherstone, K. and C. M. Radaelli, (eds.) *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

- (2004) "Europeanisation: Solution or a problem?", *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 8(16). Available at: <http://www.eiop.or.at/eiop/pdf/2004-016.pdf>

Radaelli, C.M. and Pasquier, R. (2007) 'Conceptual issues' in P. Graziano and M.P. Vink (Eds.) *Europeanization. New Research Agendas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan p. 35- 46

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1996) "The New Governance: Governing without Government", *Political Studies*, XLIV: 652-667

- (1997) *Understanding Governance. Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*. Maidenhead: Open University Press

Sabatier, P.A. (1998) 'An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy-oriented learning therein', *Policy Science* 21: 129-168

Scharpf, F.W. (1997), *Games Real Actors Play. Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Schout, A. and Jordan, A. (2002), 'Coordinated European Governance: self Organising or Centrally Steered', CSERGE Working Paper EDM 03-14

Schneider, G. and M. Aspinwall (2001) *The Rules of Integration: Institutional approaches to the study of Europe*, Manchester University Press





**Agència
de Gestió d'Ajuts
Universitaris
i de Recerca**



**UNIÓ EUROPEA
Fons Social Europeu**

Treib, O.; O. Bähr and G. Falkner (2005) 'Modes of Governance: A Note Towards Conceptual Clarification'.
European Governance Papers. No-05-02



Generalitat de Catalunya
**Departament d'Innovació,
Universitats i Empresa**