

# **EMPLOYMENT OBJECTIVES OF NATIONAL AND EUROPEAN TERRITORIAL PACTS IN ITALY**

Manuela Galetto – Labour Studies PhD candidate  
University of Milano, Department of Labour and Welfare Studies

## *PhD Project*

### *Abstract*

In 1996, in a period of great concern for the high levels of unemployment and the low levels of activity rate in most member countries, the “Territorial Employment Pacts” (TEPs) program was launched as a pilot measure by the European Commission under the Irish Presidency.

The introduction of TEPs aimed at activating local generated resources and enhancing a bottom-up approach to local development and employment creation. It was conceived as an integrated innovative strategy, based on the principle of social partnership and to be implemented by a wide range of local actors, including the social partners and representatives of the civil society.

Out of the 89 pilot TEPs which have been eventually selected by the Commission, submitted from all over Europe, 10 were located in Italy, with the objective of creating about 10,000 new jobs. As far as this particular instrument of local level concertation and social partnership is concerned, Italy represents indeed an interesting case. When the European sponsored TEPs were launched, Italy had recently introduced a national approach with very similar local economic development objectives and based on the same instrument – the Territorial Pact – in the Southern regions of the country.

Although the two programs – the European and the Italian – were largely similar as far as their general objectives are concerned, they exhibited however a number of differences in terms of procedures, resources and facilities accompanying the overall decision-making process and the implementation of the specific concerted measures. It is commonly argued that such differences may account for the different degree of success that at the end apparently characterised the two programs.

The proposed research will focus on the comparison between the two types of Territorial Pacts implemented in Italy, with special attention to their different capacity in reaching their employment objectives, thus trying to develop a crucial aspect frequently - and rather surprisingly - underestimated by the literature. More generally, aim of the research is to provide the ongoing debate on local development with some data on the employment outcomes of TPs. The purpose is not just to offer quantitative accounts of what happened in terms of job creation, but also to collect qualitative material concerning the types of jobs TPs managed to create. Beside a better understanding of the conditions of success reached at the local level, it will be possible to appreciate the influence of a particular aspect of the European employment strategy on the employment strategy of a member state.

## *Introduction*

Over the past decade, socio-economic studies have been drawing on terms like regulation, governance, co-ordination, decentralization and so on, with reference to European public policies and national welfare adjustments in general, and also to the approach to the problem of unemployment in particular.

*Regulation* can be defined as the product of social exchanges and is, consequently, the result of explicit or implicit social compromises which define not only substantive rules on employment, but also the “rules of the game”, that is, the regulation process itself (Léonard, 2005: 308), while *governance* is “the set of mechanisms, devices and institutional arrangements that co-ordinate the economic actions of actors and organisations, regulate the distribution of resources and structure conflicts” (Burrone, 2004). EU may look like the cradle of new governance methods. Comparative researches across Europe have shown how member states adopted different national strategies (Regini, 2000a), but at the same time we also witness a sort of convergence in the levels and in the models of regulation of labour (Regalia, 2002). At the same time, though, within one Member State we can find policy instruments aiming at the same objectives, but stemming from different sources of directives. The experience of national and European Territorial Pacts in Italy can be inserted in this framework.

It will be interesting to observe how regulation and governance have been working in the two cases. Territorial pacts’ contents are very broad and have been deeply investigated. But though labour policies and, more generally, measures aimed at boosting local labour markets are always indicated in the “package” of initiatives defined by Territorial Pacts, there is very little evidence on how these policies are implemented, and what has really been achieved in terms of jobs created, first of all, but also in terms of more general improvements in the local labour markets.

It is definitely very important to consider both quantitative and qualitative dimensions when observing the results and effects of Territorial Pacts with regard to the local labour markets.

Figures on the jobs created are not easily available. While it is unproblematic to get exact data on the planned expenditure and actual resources delivered, as well as detailed numbers of the funding relative to the different initiatives included in the pacts, the flow of information narrows when talking about the results in terms of created employment. Therefore, the first part of the research is dedicated to a systemization of the available information.

Of course, isolating the variable of the employment outcomes does not imply a sort of re-evaluation of the whole experience of TPs. As it will emerge from the analysis of the literature, the ongoing debate is very intense. While some presented a pessimistic position on the importance of PT (see paragraph on the literature review) or tend to disparage the results achieved, the present research interprets TP and other local development instruments, first of all, as a crucial experience of the Italian economic policy scenario that enabled a significant change in the institutional approach to local development.

One of the key effect observed is the development of partnership between private actors, social partners and local administration. It probably wouldn't have been considered if incentives to companies or to infrastructures were given directly to private or public investors, according to a traditional top-down practice<sup>1</sup>. Not always local partnerships have worked well, but in many cases important positive sum games have been played.

Related to these preliminary observations, there is also another necessary distinction that has to be drawn between economy dynamism and local development. Economic growth can be measured through quantitative variables (gross product, industrial production, inflation rates, investments, employment rates and so on), but improvements on such variables do not necessarily imply a development of the territory or of the country concerned.

Therefore, as well known, promotion of local development is not done with the creation of a certain number of new jobs. Actually a bias may emerge when focussing on the employment dimension only. In fact, there may be TPs that proved successful in terms of employment creation but that did not achieve the purpose of enhancing cooperation and a bottom-up approach among social local partners.

The analysis I would like to present draws on hard data, and in the first phase of investigation it will mainly refer to existing reports. But then, the objective is that of collecting qualitative material too, about the characteristics of the new jobs that TPs managed to trigger. It will then be possible to identify independent variables likely to favour successful employment outcomes of TPs. Integration between the various policies of intervention settled through the TP might represent an hypothesis. But it will also be interesting to see whether, for instance, financing big, rather than small, companies prove more effective, or vice versa.

Subsequently, beside an account of the new jobs created through TPs, an added value to the interpretation will stem from a sociological analysis of the kind of jobs created. This will conduct the analysis close to the labour sociology debate on labour policies. So far

interdisciplinary approaches in the study of local development have proved very useful and worthwhile.

### *Levels of employment policies*

The notion of employment policy covers a variety of measures, like training, a wide range of forms of flexibility (from the type of contracts, to the flexible organisation of work itself), workers mobility, return to work for older workers, integration of other specific categories of workers, adaptability, etc. All these measures surely have an impact on the labour markets they are addressed to, and they generally aim at preserving or increasing employment, but it is also true that each of those measures can produce different effects in terms of employment.

For instance, strongly improving the efficiency of an employment local office might not have significant immediate impact on the number of new jobs, but it may produce considerable effects in terms of an improved matching between jobs searchers and employers.

The interest is addressed on when TP, in general, can be considered an instrument of labour policy, and how, if it did, affected the local labour market.

Considering the different levels of intervention on the issue of unemployment, we can observe a great variety of measures available.

The European Union's concern on employment has been expressed through a number of Directives implemented by MS, but most importantly through the European Employment Strategy. The program was launched in 1997 at a special "Jobs Summit" of EU heads of state and government in Luxemburg, following the Amsterdam Summit earlier that year which included a new Employment Title in the revised Treaty (Watt, 2004: 118). The co-ordination method adopted received the title "open method of co-ordination" at the Lisbon Summit in 2000. The European Employment Strategy include 10 guidelines aimed at introducing:

- active labour policies for the unemployed
- job creation and entrepreneurship
- adaptability and mobility in the labour market
- development of human capital and lifelong learning
- active ageing
- gender equality
- integration and disadvantaged people
- enhance work attractiveness and diminish passive policies

---

<sup>1</sup> Law num. 488 of 1992 for the direct financing of companies' investments.

- regularization of undeclared work (though without explicit quantitative targets)
- tackling regional disparities in the countries where it is particularly stressed (like for instance in Italy).

These guidelines were divided into four pillars (employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability and gender quality), chosen to reflect the four main perceived weaknesses of European labour markets (Watt, 2004). Such guidelines are to be implemented and reported by Member States when drawing up their National Action Plan (NAP), where recent and present policies and measures are reported and then assessed by the Commission, which may suggest changing for the following year<sup>2</sup>.

At the national level we find mainly laws but in many countries tripartite bargaining has taken place for the conclusion of social pacts (Pochet and Fajertag, 1997).

A cross country common objective in national social pacts is that of tackling unemployment. The growing importance of the local socio-economic systems transformed the local level into the most appropriate field of intervention in the unemployment levels, beside a number of other welfare policies. Some scholars reported the possibility of introducing new forms of negotiated regulation for the local labour markets through instruments of decentralised negotiation, according to the changes taking place in the industrial relations systems too. Today, Territorial Employment Pacts or similar approaches based on multi-stakeholder partnerships at local level form part of the standard policy portfolio in many European nations.

There is not much literature available, though, on the relationship between the different levels. The current debate tends to focus either on each of them individually or to implicitly assume that the basic features of concertation remain substantially the similar between one level and another (Regalia, 2006).

#### *Territorial Pacts and Territorial Employment Pacts: definition and categories*

National Territorial Pacts (TPs) and European Territorial Employment Pacts (TEPs), then, can be looked at as particularly interesting instruments of concertation taking place at the local level, with the supervision of the national and European level.

As noticed in Cortese (2005: 115), they gather a set of elements representing a great potential as an instrument to tackle the urgent problem of European unemployment:

- integration of labour policies within the other local development actions and initiatives
- the redistribution of the responsibility of territorial competition and social cohesion among a wide range of social partners
- the vertical and horizontal co-ordination of governance actions

There are various definitions of TP.

Combining the elements emerged from the different experiences, Territorial Pacts can be described as a policy of stimulation of an endogenous development, addressed to a particular delimited territory including self-associated areas. The national or the European decision maker provides resources to finance a local coalition among the various actors of the civil society (social partners, local administration, non profit organisations, etc.), who are then in charge of stabilising such coalition and improve the local economy and society (Bottazzi, 2005).

There is also a number of categories of TP. With reference to the Italian case, for instance, we find a distinction among pacts according to the varying degree of integration, experimentation or innovation that the programmes implement (Viscomi, 2001).

Another milestone definition of the territorial pacts is the one that distinguishes between *distributive* Pacts and *integrative* ones (Barbera, 2001). The former definition is addressed to those experiences where local actors do manage to have access to resources and distribute them over the territory, but they do not necessarily improve their mutual relationship; the latter are those pacts where concertation procedure produces a strong improvement on, or it generates from scratch, stable cooperative and trustworthy coalition between local actors. At the same time, Cersosimo and Wolleb (2001) set up *collusive* pacts against the integrative ones to describe situations that they have observed where local actors form opportunist coalition only aiming to obtain financial resources. Freschi, on the base of study cases, then, adds another category, the so called *managerial* pacts (*patti dirigisti*), referring to those cases where local administrators play the main role and concertation seems weak because of the asymmetry between local political administrators and private actors. The evidence analysed by Freschi shows that in these cases there is a lack of a real project connected to the territorial pact, and the main objective seems that of getting resources.

---

<sup>2</sup> The literature offers a variety of points of view on NAPs as a tool for national employment policies, and critics and doubts have recently emerged. See De la Porte and Pochet (2004), but also the European Industrial Relations

From a more “technical” point of view, the definition of Territorial Pact given by the Italian law introducing it (Law n. 341, 1995) as one of the instruments of the “negotiated budget planning” (*programmazione negoziata* – Law n. 662 of 1996, where a bottom-up approach is introduced and local administrations are invested with major role and power of initiatives) says it is “the agreement between public and private actors aimed at identifying, and finally implementing in a coordinated way, different kinds of policies to enhance local development in the economically depressed areas of the national territory, according to the guidelines and the objectives of the QCS<sup>3</sup> [...]”. This is what would have laid the foundations of different forms of “social partnership”.

Since 1997, TP can be agreed all over Italy<sup>4</sup>. In 2003 it has been established<sup>5</sup> that Regions would have played a growing role in the definition and implementation of the territorial pacts. Regionalisation will represent a major concern as with reference to the coming 2007-2013 Community funds. The present research actually refers mainly to TPs agreed in the 1996-2001 period.

Numerous changes in the laws regulating Territorial Pacts and, more in general, local concerted actions, have produced a stratification of rules actors had to refer to, generating sometimes confusion and a more uncertain approach.

Today, in Italy, we can distinguish among three different kinds of Territorial Pacts:

- Territorial Pacts for agriculture (91)
- first generation Territorial Pacts (12)
- second generation Territorial Pacts (106)

See table 1 for details.

As for the Territorial Employment Pacts<sup>6</sup>, in Italy they (10) have been included in a specific Multi-Regional Operative Programme (POM), where 139 million Euro had been allocated by

---

Observatory documents on NAPs.

<sup>3</sup> Quadro Comunitario di Sostegno – Community Support Framework

<sup>4</sup> A distinction remains, though. TP, in general, can be assigned both national and European Funds. The former are given to European Territorial Employment Pacts (signed in different areas of Italy) and to national pacts regarding areas included in the Objective 1 regions, Objective 2 and 5b. National funding is addressed only to the just mentioned areas.

<sup>5</sup> Resolution signed on July, 25<sup>th</sup>, by CIPE – Committee for Economic planning constituted by several ministries (*Delibera del CIPE del 25 Luglio 2005*)

<sup>6</sup> The Territorial Employment Pact programme was formally launched in Dublin in December 1996, under the Irish presidency. The promoting Directorate was DG Regional Policy (taking the responsibility for Pacts in Objective 1 areas) with the DG for Employment (Objective 3) and Agriculture (Objective 5) sharing the Pacts and taking some under their administrative umbrellas. EU Commission provided the TEPs with technical assistance – up to a maximum of 300,000 Euro. Additional resources would have come from the EU Structural Funds, beside private funding according to each individual Pact. 89 TEPs have been selected across all Member States and the population covered by the Pacts amounts to 36 million people.

the national government (under the law 183/1987, known as “*Fondo di rotazione*”), beside a Community funding of 140 million Euro, under the Structural Fund Programme addressed to the South of Italy.

The process by which the Territorial Employment Pacts Programme *per se* emerged from the complex and fast-moving background of the ‘90s to become adopted as a mainstream Commission initiative is subject of some debate. Nevertheless, the insertion of the word “employment” into the title of the Pacts programme shows how Pacts were positioned against the problem of the day in Europe: persistent and long term unemployment. Listing their main features can easily draw a definition of TEPs:

- bottom-up approach: the idea was to encourage initiatives and schemes to address unemployment that originated at a “grass-roots” level;
- formal and broad based partnership: the partnership would be expected to bring together all actors with the potential to make an impact on the labour market in the area – and in the most innovative pacts this would include some unexpected or unusual organisations;
- coordination and integration: one of the main requirements was the integrated strategy, both with existing programs, and integration among different policies, not only labour policies, but also, for instance, with other inclusive social policies;
- innovation: the requirement for a pact to be innovative suggests that it must carry out actions and initiatives that are in some way different to mainstream provision or that clearly offer an added value;
- appropriate spatial scales: the original requirement for the TEPs was that they should be set up at a level “above the municipality and below the region”, which was quite difficult to figure out in some cases and Member States eventually ignored this instruction. Studies show that the scale Pacts were developed at, often has to do with the existing governance structure and practical considerations prevailed (Ecotec, 2002).

#### *Literature and expectations on Territorial Pacts*

Literature on Territorial Pacts is quite broad, particularly with reference to the Italian case. There have been more than 200 TPs (all categories considered) with a big amount of resources invested, more than 2,000 towns and villages involved, covering 40% of the territory. Giuseppe De Rita named Italy as “the Pacts’ people”. These figures alone motivate a

serious analysis of the phenomena. The first main studies originated from the end of the “Cassa per il Mezzogiorno” (a program of assistance policies for the South of Italy) started in 1992 with the law num. 488.

Policies aimed at enhancing economy in the southern regions of Italy during the ‘70s and the ‘80s were mainly consisting of incentives for the re-organization or re-location of major companies. Production local systems, here, were either characterised by informal economies and local traditions of professional skills, or on big companies (both local and non) driving local economies (Burrioni, 2005).

From 1992 on, the southern regions of Italy were still entitled to receive aids for their development, but the mentioned law represented a first attempt to change the approach to achieve the objective. Bottom-up participation was encouraged instead of a top-down management of funds and initiatives. A stricter control on the implementation of the resources was applied, and this represented the base of the so called decentralised negotiation.

With reference to the described frame, Territorial Pacts represented a new model of economic policy, oriented to the decentralisation of intervention. This is based on two main assumptions. First of all, the idea of the “local” dimension as the unit to refer to, as the starting point from which it will be possible to achieve a more general socio-economic development. Secondly, it is assumed that in order to generate development, local actors and territory’s representatives have to be involved through a mechanism of sharing the policy design, fostering social cohesion (Riccone, 2002).

The analysis of the effects of the shift from top-down regulation to a bottom-up approach has been the main focus of an extensive amount of the literature (De Rita and Bonomi, 1998; Trigilia, 2001; Deidda, 2002; Meldolesi, 2001; Viesti, 2002), which led to a re-interpretation of the political exchange originally identified in the national social pacts (Regini and Sabel, 1998) and now applied to the decentralised negotiation. According to the different typologies of pacts, the political exchange involving actions to tackle the problem of unemployment can be implicit (as it was the case of the policies for the Mezzogiorno areas – funds were given to industrial development projects, which would have indirectly affected employment levels), explicit (as it is in the definition of the Territorial Employment Pacts), or integrative (as it was the case of the Pact for Milan, which represented a complementary action to other policies of the territory).

Expectations on the new local development instrument greatly varied, and the debate between those who supported territorial pacts and those who considered this way to development too slow is still very lively.

Various scholars have been analysing the importance of the change in the traditional approach to political economics planning of the Southern regions of Italy. Trigilia (2001), one of the most authoritative in the field, found that the introduction of the new instruments for local development has been crucial, the *ratio* of territorial pacts, as well as of other typologies of bottom-up policies, is that the actors involved are asked to re-define their identities, and subsequently, their interests in order to commit themselves in more risky, innovative and long term initiatives.

Bagnasco (1999), too, tends to express an enthusiastic view of the local development policies, arguing that they can have a twofold role, favouring local economic potentialities and promoting social cohesion through the valorisation of local resources, not yet completely exploited. Viesti (2000), on the other hand, while wondering whether it is possible to create *ex novo* the conditions for the regions to grow, asserts that territorial policies are crucial to competitiveness. In Italy, particularly, competition has to be enhanced by correct macroeconomic policies and, over all, by generating new external economies for medium-sized firms. Some external economies depend on national policies while others depend on territorial ones; consequently, good territorial development policies are essential for Italy's competitiveness raising.

Their and other authors' analyses bring about with great strength the complexity of the concept of "local" as a key preliminary assumption in this field of study, clearly emerging from interregional comparison studies (Regalia et al., 2001).

It seems like there is now a second phase in the debate concentrating rather on the performance of local systems and on the results obtained in terms of institutional innovation, and though there has been signal of some discontent and frustration, most authors share the opinion that local dimension remains the privileged ground of intervention (Pichierri, 2006). Researches showed that some procedures could be adjusted, or at least updated for resources to be delivered faster. Recent proposals seem to aim at the introduction of a major regionalisation of such intervention. However there is also a strongly negative opinion on the Italian experience of Territorial Pacts. Rossi (2005), for instance, has been arguing that local development instruments have not represented any "evolution" of the former Cassa per il Mezzogiorno, and that, actually, a huge amount of resources has been wasted without

triggering a proportionate level of outcome in terms of performance, economic growth and real development in the southern regions of Italy.

Beside Territorial Pacts local development policies include area agreements (*contratti d'area*), integrated territorial pacts (*Piani Integrati Territoriali*), integrated urban plans applied by various major cities in Italy (*piani strategici*). A quite common feature of such literature is case-study methodology (Pichierri, 2002: 71), being the focus on the connection between successful implementation of the programs and the local socio-economic context they developed in (among others, Freschi, 2001; Burrioni, 2001; Cerase, 2005; Giaccone, 2002; Mirabelli, 2001; Tonarelli, 2000; and Regalia et al., 2001 also at an international level of comparison). Recently there has been a growing interest on the local and regional models of capitalisms (Crouch, 2005). This shows the great importance of the local institutional arrangements, due, on the one hand, to the effects of globalization, strongly tying companies to local contexts, and, on the other, to the institutional re-organisation processes that strengthen lower level of regulation (fostering the so called “territorial regime competition”, Burrioni, 2005).

Another important focus of concern of the literature has been the role of actors and the analysis of networks of the Territorial Pacts, as well as a dynamic perspective on the emerging and evolving of the experiences of negotiation (among others Delai, 2004; Avdagic, Rhodes and Visser, 2005).

Decentralisation of development policies gave birth to public-private partnerships, which also caught the interest of academic research. Local administration revealed of crucial importance in the successful implementation of the initiatives foreseen by local pacts, and a new branch of literature develops along technical issues (like the financing, project evaluation criteria, monitoring and so on).

#### *Sources and data collection*

Phase “one” of the research conducted me through the wide literature whose main contributions I tried and outline above.

It has also been important to carefully get into the technical details of the phases of implementation of the pacts in order to find out that, although the two programs – the European and the Italian one – were largely similar as far as their general objectives are concerned, they exhibited a number of differences in terms of procedures, resources and

facilities accompanying the overall decision-making process and the implementation of the specific concerted measures.

There has been a phase “two” of the research preliminary studying, considering the different sources referred to. While scientific and academic literature has proved extremely important and particularly useful when applying an interdisciplinary approach, “grey” material and evaluation reports and the hard data available are essential to have a more quantitative general overview of what is at stake when we talk about Territorial Pacts. Therefore I will draw on official European sources, beside national reports drafted by social actors, national reports addressed to the General Directorate for Employment and Social Affairs, and comparative reports edited by the European Foundation.

The following paragraph reports a selection of the most meaningful data collected through reports and detailed evaluation accounts, in order to start presenting the kind of data available when considering the employment objectives of Pacts.

#### *Evidence from the experience of the national and European Territorial Pacts*

What we have when examining the programme agreed on by Territorial Pacts is exact references and numbers also with reference to the jobs that will be created, but then it is hard to collect systematic account of how the partners involved are going to fulfil, or have fulfilled, their intents.

As I first approached the issue of the employment objectives in Territorial Pacts, I analysed documents of Pacts agreements belonging to the Italian group. Most of them reported precise numbers when referring to the number of jobs they planned to create through the initiatives of the TP. For instance, the TP of the Province of Lecce belongs to the so called first generation of national pacts and the available data on employment objectives refer to 1998. According to those data, the jobs triggered by the initiatives planned by the pact, amounted to some 1,700 new posts. The area the Pact was addressed to is economically based mainly on small companies of the shoe and textile industry (see also Viesti, 2000: 247). As we see from table 3, each of the towns involved is supposed to have a precise number of new jobs. But then it has been virtually impossible to get evidence relative to the characteristics of the mentioned new jobs (whether the contracts are most temporary or open ended, whether women or long unemployed benefited from such intervention, or whether the jobs are simply a regularization of former informal work contracts, for instance). The same is true with reference to the amount of employment actually realized.

Decentralisation of labour policies has been fulfilled through a wide range of instruments, where Territorial Employment Pacts represent one of them.

The initiatives observed comprehend (Regalia, 2003: p. 163):

- regional/territorial pacts, or concerted multilevel initiatives;
- bilateral agreements/contracts between local institutions and agencies providing services (temporary labour, job placement, training and business services);
- agreements among firms and employers;
- forms of self organisation by workers;
- collective agreements signed by organisations representing non-standard employees;
- company level/informal agreements

Territorial Pacts offer a privileged ground of intervention towards the local labour markets, as the “package” of initiatives usually comprehends a wide set of projects in order to boost local economies and to promote employment, directly and indirectly. Sometimes the initiatives are mainly built on the financing of big companies or on the infrastructures provision for the local firms. In turn, companies raise their production and are supposed to employ new labour force. As outlined by a research on 19 well settled Pacts in Italy (La lezione dei patti, 2003), both national and European pacts, the employment objectives would have been achieved according to different variables. One of the key factors identified in the research is the type of pact we refer to. In particular, the authors distinguish between manufacturing pacts, mixed pacts and agriculture and tourism pacts, on the basis of the industry where the Pact’s initiatives are most concentrated. The first typology registers the highest index of job creation according to the resources that is 2.4, where the index shows the number of new employed every 100,000 euro of public financing. In the other two cases the index is 1.9 and 1.2 respectively. It has to be underlined that these facts refer to the 19 pacts considered in the research that are, as underlined, well working pacts.

Having an idea of the resources at stake when talking about Territorial Pacts will help to better interpret the importance of deepening the study on employment objectives. The just mentioned research provides some figures on the amount of money mobilized around the 19 pacts considered (including both national and European pacts). Some 780 millions of Euro is the amount of national and European resources delivered, while 920 millions Euro represent the additional resources coming from private and local partners. The 19 pacts considered include some 18,000 projects, and the estimated new employment amounts to 15,000. The expenditure per new employed is calculated as 52,000 Euro, and the average number of new

jobs is about 789 (though, it should be noticed, the average figures are lower when considering a greater sample of Pacts).

As mentioned, TPs and TEPs show some differences. With reference to 12 of the analysed pacts, the same report underlines that 40% of the employment objectives included in the national TP were reached, while those employment objectives declared by TEPs had a “fulfilment rate” of 60%. This has been interpreted as depending on the stricter control procedure on the implementation and outcomes of European Pacts, compared with the national ones.

As outlined in a report evaluating TEP as a policy instrument and written by Ecotec (2002) for the DG Regional Policies, “pacts were inserted into a variety of contexts. The TEP territories covered populations from 16,000 to over three million, and varied in size from Pacts covering single municipalities to whole regions. The number of partners ranged from five to 105” and the labour markets TEPs were addressed to greatly varied as well. This is due, of course, to the fact that they are embedded, as said above, in a variety of different contexts across member states and within regions according to the prevailing circumstances.

The position expressed in the Ecotec report is close to the main argument usually considered when drawing a general evaluation of Territorial Pacts. Though the results in terms of employment haven't been fully achieved, and though sometimes there have been problems in the use of the resources, it seems comforting to concentrate on the fact that a true development in the bottom-up approach to local governance has taken place. Of course this is of great importance, as expressed in the introduction. As said above, this article is not a counter argument to the optimistic interpretation of territorial pacts. It is rather an attempt to use a different point of view in observing Tps as instruments of local labour policies.

Of course, when drawing the evaluation in the report there is a great variety in the achievements and results that emanate from the pacts. The Ecotec authors have considered, for instance, the creation and nurturing of partnerships and associated co-operative activities and the leverage of other funding streams, but they also stressed that evidence of their influence on the local labour market is scarce due to the indirect nature of much of their work. As reported: “when examining labour market achievement in general, 45% of TEPs demonstrated full achievement of their objectives in relation to the programmes' employment related purpose, whilst only 39% partially demonstrated this, and 16% did not achieve their objectives. ... Direct creation of employment has taken place in some Pacts but as a whole is of relatively little importance as an achievement of the programme. Where it has taken place

it offers some models of collaborative approaches to new project development and operation, but in these cases the main benefit comes from the process of stimulating the idea and putting it into practice in the first place, rather than the job creation figures themselves”.

One of the few studies focussing on the employment outcomes of TEPs in Italy is the one of Cortese (2005). In her research, she analysed two TEPs agreed on Sicily, the case of Catania Sud and the one of Calatino Sud Simeto. Measures for employment relative to the two cases haven't proved much effective. Their weakness is mainly due to vagueness and, according to the evidence collected by the author, to the poor differentiation between employment objectives and economic growth objectives. Incentives and financing towards the latter prevailed over attention for active labour policies. Due to peculiar negative interactions of risk, of loose binding rules and of the contingent political situation (delegitimation of trade unions, strong pressure on political actors, etc.), the choice about labour market initiatives has been oriented toward the promotion of “any job”. The role of trade unions has proved crucial (pg. 136): in the Catania-Sud Pact, trade unions took part to the negotiation of it, but they pretended to be representative of general interests, rather than of workers' interests simply. In practical terms the companies involved in the Calatino Sud Simeto TEP have been described as stronger and more dynamic than those taking part to the initiatives of the Catania Sud TEP. The Ecotec evaluation report gave some figures of the same Catania Sud TEP that sounded more positive. At December 2001 the monitoring data relating to 93 projects completed indicated that more than 66% of the firms that received the funds started to employ personnel. In particular, 291 new jobs were created, out of which 87 women were employed. The number represents 35,4% of the 882 new jobs foreseen. New recruitment should have taken place (152 employees) within 2002 and (206 employees) 2003. It is quite interesting to notice that more than 82% of the now jobs started with an open ended form of contract, while the remaining job contracts were mostly apprenticeship contracts or training contracts. This raises a question on whether the experience has represented a chance of regularization of former undeclared employees or it is brand new jobs that we are talking of? Both the scenarios are important of course, but it would have different implications on the same evaluation of the TEP. In the case of regularization the outcome is not less important than the creation of new jobs, but it has a different value in terms of resources and expenditure, it would be cheaper in the first case, and effects on local development would probably be less disruptive.

This leads us to a key consideration. As said above, though direct creation of jobs has taken place in some Pacts, as a whole it is of relatively little importance as an achievement of the

programme (Ecotec, 2002), “TP cannot be evaluated only on the basis of their economic and job-related performance. One of the main purposes was rather to bring about a change in the approach to local development initiatives according to a bottom-up approach”.

It is reasonable to believe TP as a potentially important tool to tackle unemployment, for it is designed and implemented considering all the initiatives as part of a wider development project. But this kind of investigation requires a deeper analysis on the types of jobs created, a stricter collection and systematization of data. Afterwards, a sociological analysis on whether employment objectives were consistent with the action realised, will bring an added value to a mere quantitative reconstruction. It will also help investigating whether there have been integrated approaches among the different levels of planning: the definition of the Pact, the labour policies thought of and their integration with the local companies and institutions (like for instance employment offices, or regional Directorate for Employment, and so on).

Such approach, as outlined in the introduction, aims at identifying possible independent variables affecting the employment outcomes of TPs and possibly contributing the field of research on local development. Therefore, qualitative interviews could help understanding the wideness of employment objectives, or on their articulation.

## BIBLIOGRAFIA

- Aydalot, P. (1984), *Crise et space*, Paris, Economica
- Avdagic, S., Rhodes, M. and Visser, J. (2005), *The Emergence and Evolution of Social Pacts: A provisional Framework for Comparative Analysis*, Draft – 21 March 2005, European University Institute
- Bagnasco, A. (1977), *Tre Italie. La problematica territoriale dello sviluppo italiano*. Bologna, Il Mulino
- Bagnasco, A. (1999), *Tracce di comunità. Temi derivati da un concetto ingombrante*, Bologna, Il Mulino
- Barbera, F. (2001), *Le politiche della fiducia. Incentivi e risorse sociali nei Patti territoriali*, in Stato e Mercato, num. 63
- Barbera, F., Di Monaco, R., Roccati, D. (200?), *I dilemmi delle politiche locali per il lavoro. Una ricerca comparata in aree urbano-industriali*, in ....
- Beccattini, G. (1989), *Modelli locali di sviluppo*, Bologna, Il Mulino
- Beccattini, G. (2000) *Il bruco e la farfalla. Prato: una storia esemplare dell'Italia dei distretti*, Firenze, Le Monnier
- Biagioli M., Reyneri E. e Seravalli G. (2004), *Flessibilità del mercato del lavoro e coesione sociale*, in Stato e Mercato, num. 71
- Bonomi, A. (2005), *Lo sviluppo del Sud che fa da sé*, 24 luglio, Il Sole24Ore
- Borzaga, C. e Brunello, G. (1997), *L'impatto delle politiche attive del lavoro in Italia*, Ed. Scieintifiche Italiane
- Bottazzi, G. (2005), *Ripensando lo sviluppo locale. Considerazioni sulla programmazione negoziata*, in Cerase, F. P. (a cura di) 2005, *Lo sviluppo possibile. Esiti e prospettive dei Patti Territoriali in quattro regioni meridionali*, Milano, Franco Angeli
- Brughitta, A. (2000), *Integrazione delle politiche pubbliche e politiche per il lavoro*, Centro Studi di Relazioni industriali, Rapporto di ricerca
- Burroni, L. (2001), *Allontanarsi crescendo*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier
- Burroni, L., Trigilia, C. (2001), *Italy: Economic Development through Local Economies*, in C. Crouch, P. Le Galès, C. Trigilia e H. Voelzkow (2001), *Local Production Systems in Europe: Rise or Demise?*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 46-78.
- Burroni, L. (2004), *Governance and European Goods in European cities*,
- Burroni, L. (2005), *Governance territoriale dell'economia in Francia, Regno Unito e Italia*, in Stato e Mercato, num. 73, aprile
- Caruso, B. (2002), *Decentralised social pacts, trade unions and collective bargaining*, Working Paper n. 2, Centro Studi "M. D'Antona"

- Caruso, B (2000), *Alla ricerca della flessibilità "mite": il terzo pilastro delle politiche del lavoro comunitarie*, in *Diritto delle Relazioni industriali*, 2000
- Cerese, F. P. (a cura di) 2005, *Lo sviluppo possibile. Esiti e prospettive dei Patti Territoriali in quattro regioni meridionali*, Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Cersosimo, D., Donzelli, C. (2000) – *Mezzogiorno*, Roma, Donzelli
- Cersosimo D. and Wolleb G. (2001), *Politiche pubbliche e contesti istituzionali. Una ricerca sui Patti Territoriali*, Stato e Mercato, num. 63
- Checchi D., Perulli P., Regalia I., Regini M. and Reyneri E. (a cura di), 2002, *Lavoro e sindacato in Lombardia. Contributi per interpretare il cambiamento*, Milano, Franco Angeli
- Cortese, A. (2005), *Programmazione negoziata e occupazione: vincoli e risorse per la regolazione concertata dei mercati del lavoro locali*, pagg. 111 – 139 in Cerese (a cura di) 2005, *Lo sviluppo possibile. Esiti e prospettive dei Patti Territoriali in quattro regioni meridionali*, Milano, Franco Angeli
- Crouch, C. (2005), *Capitalist Diversity and Change. Recombinant Governance and Institutional Entrepreneurs*, Oxford University Press
- Crouch, C., Le Galès, P., Trigilia, C. and Voelzkow, H. (2001) *Local Production systems in Europe: Rise or Demise?*, Oxford, Oxford UP
- Cuffaro, M. (2003), *Disparità territoriali e convergenza: un punto di vista differente*, in *Rivista Economica del Mezzogiorno*, anno XVII, n. 1-2
- De la Porte, C. and Pochet, P. (2004), *The European Employment Strategy: Existing Research and Remaining Questions*, *Journal of European Social Policy*, 14(1)
- Deidda, D. (2002), *Nord Est e Mezzogiorno*, Donzelli – Formez
- Delai, N. (2004) *La relazionalità come strategia di sviluppo territoriale*, , Franco Angeli, 2004;
- DPS - Dipartimento di Politiche di Sviluppo e Coesione (2003), *La lezione dei patti territoriali per la progettazione integrata territoriale nel Mezzogiorno*,
- De Rita G., Bonomi A., (1998), *Manifesto per lo sviluppo locale: dall'azione di comunità ai patti territoriali*, Torino, Bollati Boringhieri
- De Vivo, P. (2005), *Relazione per il Convegno su "Il pendolo meridionale. Bilanci e prospettive delle politiche per lo sviluppo locale"*, Bari 15-16 aprile
- Ecosfera S.p.A., *Patto territoriale della Provincia di Lecce. Relazione sulle attività svolte - Roma, 4 gennaio 1997*, dattiloscritto
- ECOTEC Research and Consulting (2002), *Thematic Evaluation of the Territorial Employment Pacts*, [www.ecotec.com](http://www.ecotec.com)
- Esping-Andersen, G. (a cura di), 1996, *Welfare States in Transition. National Adaptations in Global Economies*, London, Sage
- Ferrera, M. and Hemerijck, A. (2003), *Recalibrating Europe's Welfare Regimes*, in J. Zeitlin and D.

- Trubek, (a cura di), *Governing Work and Welfare in a New Economy: European and American Experiments*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Ferraro, G. (2001), *Sviluppo e Occupazione tra europeismo e localismi*, paper available at the web site of Catania University, [www.unict.it](http://www.unict.it)
- Franchi M., Palumbo, M. (a cura di) (2000), *La valutazione delle politiche del lavoro e della formazione*, in *Sociologia del Lavoro*, n. 77
- Franco, S. (2004) 'Il territorio nella concertazione locale. Una ricerca su 82 patti in Italia', *Quaderni di rassegna sindacale - Lavori*, 5
- Freschi, A. C. (2001), Capitale sociale, politica e sviluppo locale. L'esperienza dei patti in Toscana, in *Stato e Mercato*, num. 63, Dicembre 2001
- Giaccone, M. (2000), Contrattazione territoriale come infrastruttura dello sviluppo locale, *Quaderni di rassegna sindacale – Lavori*, 3
- Giaccone, M. (2002), *Un modello di concertazione pluralista? Il caso veneto*, paper dell'Ires Veneto, Venezia – Mestre
- Hall P. and Soskice D. (a cura di) *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford, Oxford UP
- Léonard E. (2005), Governance and Concerted Regulation of Employment in Europe, in *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 11, num. 3, pp. 307 - 326
- Lunghini, G., Silva, F., e Targetti Lenti, R. a cura di, (1996), *Politiche pubbliche per il lavoro*, Bologna, IL Mulino
- Meldolesi, L. (2001), *Sud: liberare lo sviluppo*, Carocci – Formez
- Messina, P. (2001) *Regolazione politica dello sviluppo locale*, Torino: UTET.
- Mirabelli, M. (2001), L'istituzionalismo amorale. L'esperienza dei patti territoriali in una regione del Mezzogiorno, Soneria Mannelli, Rubbettino
- Negri, N., Saraceno, C. (1996), *Le politiche attive contro la povertà in Italia. I problemi, le aree, i soggetti a rischio: un'analisi attenta delle misure volte a contrastare l'esclusione sociale nel nostro paese*, Bologna, Il Mulino
- Pasqui, G. (2001), *Il territorio delle politiche. Innovazione sociale e pratiche di pianificazione*, Franco Angeli, Milano
- Pedersini, R. (2002), *Social concertation and labour policies in Lombardy*, Eironline,
- Perulli, P. (2004), *Patti senza spada: le nuove politiche pubbliche*, *Quaderni di rassegna sindacale-Lavori*
- Pichierri, A. (2002) *La regolazione dei sistemi locali. Attori, strategie, strutture*, Bologna: Il Mulino
- Pochet, P e Fajertag, G. (eds) 1997, *Social Pacts in Europe*, Brussels, ETUI/OSE
- Regalia, I. (a cura di) (1997), *Regioni e relazioni industriali in Europa, Potenzialità e limiti di un livello intermedio di regolazione sociale*, Milano, Franco Angeli

- Regalia, I. (1998), *Industrial Relations at regional Level in Europe: Strengths and Weaknesses of an Intermediate Level of Social Regulation*, European Journal of Industrial Relations, 4/2
- Regalia, I. et al. (2001), LocLevCon (Local Level Concertation), *New forms of Employment and Work*, rapporti di ricerca disponibili su [www.ireslombradia.it](http://www.ireslombradia.it)
- Regalia, I. (2002), *Politiche di protezione del lavoro. Esperienze a livello territoriale in Europa*, in Stato e Mercato, n. 65, Agosto
- Regalia, I. (2003), *Decentralising Employment Protection in Europe: Territorial Pacts and Beyond*, in J. Zeitlin and D. Trubek, (a cura di), *Governing Work and Welfare in a New Economy: European and American Experiments*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Regalia, I. (2006), *Territorial Pacts: Which Kind of Concertation*, Paper in progress
- Regini M., Sabel, C. a cura di (1989), *Strategie di riaggiustamento industriale*, Bologna, Il Mulino
- Regini, M. (2000) *Between De-Regulation and Social Pacts. The Responses of European Economies to Globalization*, Politics & Society, 28
- Regini, M. (2000a) *Modelli di capitalismo. Le risposte europee alle sfide della globalizzazione*, Rome-Bari, Laterza
- Regini, M. (2003), *Tripartite concertation and varieties of capitalism*, in European Journal of Industrial Relations, num. 9 (3), pagg. 251-263
- Riccone, P. (2002), *Programmazione negoziata e sviluppo locale: tre patti territoriali a confronto*, in Rivista Italiana di Politiche Pubbliche, n. 2, pgg. 89-128
- Rossi, N. (2005), *Mediterraneo del Nord. Un'altra idea del Mezzogiorno*, Laterza, Bari
- Santandrea, R. e Giorgio, R. (2004), *Programmi integrati territoriali tra competitività e coesione sociale: il caso della Puglia*, in Rivista Economica del Mezzogiorno, anno XVIII, n. 3-4
- Schmid, G. (1995), *Is full employment still possible? Transitional Labour Markets as a new strategy of Labour Market Policy*, Economic and Industrial Democracy, 16
- Schmid, G. (2000), 'Transitional Labour Markets. A New European Employment Strategy', in B. Martin, D. Beulders and D. J. Snower (eds) *Innovative Employment Initiatives*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Sestito Paolo (2001), *Le politiche del lavoro*, in Brucchi Luchino (2001), *Manuale di economia del lavoro*, Bologna, Il Mulino
- Tonarelli, A. (2000), *Industrial decline and local development policies in the steel area of Piombino*, Mimeo
- Trigilia, C. (1992), *Sviluppo senza autonomia*, Bologna, Il Mulino
- Trigilia, C. (2001), *Patti per lo sviluppo locale: un esperimento da valutare con cura*, in Stato e Mercato, n. 63
- Trigilia, C. (2005), *Sviluppo Locale: un progetto per l'Italia*, Bari, Laterza

- Viesti, G. (2000), *Perché le regioni crescono? Sviluppo locale e distretti industriali nel Mezzogiorno*, in Stato e Mercato, n. 59
- Viesti, G. (2002), *Il Sud che attrae. Gli investimenti esterni nel Mezzogiorno 1996-2001*, Donzelli
- Viesti, G. (2006), *La politiche di sviluppo locale come politiche per la competitività*, in Sociologia del Lavoro, num. 101
- Viscomi, A. (2001), *Modelli normativi e prassi contrattuali nei mercati del lavoro locali*, in Diritto del mercato del lavoro, n. 2
- Watt, A. (2004), Reform of the European Employment Strategy after Five Years: A Change of Course or Merely of Presentation?, in *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 10, num. 2, p. 117-137
- Zeitlin J. and Trubek D. M. (a cura di) *Governing Work and Welfare in a New Economy. European and American Experiments*, Oxford, Oxford UP
- Zenezini, M. (2000), *Le politiche attive del lavoro. Un bilancio deludente*, La Rivista del Manifesto, n. 11

Table 1 – Territorial Pacts in Italy. Breakdown on regional basis

<i>Region</i>	<b>Type of Territorial Pact</b>	<b>Name of the Territorial Pact</b>
<b>Abruzzo</b>	II generation	TERAMO
	II generation	MARSICA
	II generation	COMUNITA' MONTANA PELIGNA
	II generation	COMPRESORIO TRIGNO SINELLO
<b>Basilicata</b>	Rural Areas TP	SAPORI LUCANI DELLA PROVINCIA DI POTENZA
	II generation	MATERA
	II generation	CORSETTERIA
	II generation	BASILICATA NORD OCCIDENTALE
<b>Calabria</b>	II generation	AREA SUD BASILICATA
	Rural Areas TP	PROVINCIA DI VIBO VALENTIA
	Rural Areas TP	PROTEKOS-EUSIBARYS
	Rural Areas TP	AGROLAMETINO
	I generation	VIBO VALENTIA(1)
	II generation	VIBO VALENTIA SPEC. TURISMO
	II generation	SVIL. VERSANTE IONICO SERRE E SOVER.
	II generation	SILANO
	II generation	LOCRIDE
	II generation	LIT. TIRRENO COS. E VALLE DELL'ESARO
	II generation	LAMETINO
	II generation	COSENTINO
	II generation	CATANZARO
	II generation	AREA DELLO STRETTO
II generation	AREA BOSCHIVA DELLE SERRE CALABRE	
<b>Campania</b>	II generation	ALTO TIRRENO COSENTINO
	Rural Areas TP	VERDE MONTI LATTARI
	Rural Areas TP	VALLO DI DIANO
	Rural Areas TP	SELE TANAGRO
	Rural Areas TP	SELE PICENTINO
	Rural Areas TP	NAPOLI (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	MONTI PICENTINI E VALLI LIMITROFE
	Rural Areas TP	ESPERIA FELIX
	Rural Areas TP	DEL CILENTO
	Rural Areas TP	COMUNI VESUVIANI
	Rural Areas TP	CASERTA (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	BENEVENTO (Provincia di)
	Rural Areas TP	BARONIA
	Rural Areas TP	ANTICHE TERRE DEL BUSSENTO
	Rural Areas TP	ALBURNI CALORE SALERNITANO
	Rural Areas TP	AGROIRPINIA
	Rural Areas TP	AGRO NOCERINO SARNESE
	I generation	BENEVENTO(1)
	I generation	CASERTA
	I generation	MIGLIO D'ORO
	II generation	VALLE DELL'IRNO E DEI PICENTINI
	II generation	SVILUPPO 2000 VALLE DEL SABATO
	II generation	SELE TANAGRO

	II generation	SELE PICENTINO
	II generation	DEL PARTENIO
	II generation	COSTA AMALFI AGEROLA CAVA TIRRENI
	II generation	BUSSENTO-VALLO DI DIANO
	II generation	BARONIA SPECIALIZZATO PER IL TURISMO
	II generation	BARONIA PROT. AGG.
	II generation	BARONIA
	II generation	AVELLINO
<b>Emilia Romagna</b>	Rural Areas TP	APPENNINO MODENESE
	II generation	FERRARA
	II generation	APPENNINO PARMENSE
	II generation	APPENNINO MODENESE
<b>Friuli</b>	II generation	BASSA FRIULANA
<b>Lazio</b>	II generation	RIETI
	II generation	POMEZIA
	II generation	FROSINONE
	II generation	AREA SUD PONTINA
	II generation	AREA NORD PONTINA
<b>Liguria</b>	Rural Areas TP	LA SPEZIA (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	IMPERIA (PROVINCIA DI)
	II generation	TIGULLIO FONTANABUONA
	II generation	SAVONA
	II generation	IMPERIESE
	II generation	GENOVA E VALLI DEL GENOVESATO
<b>Lombardia</b>	II generation	OGMA
<b>Marche</b>	Rural Areas TP	ASCOLI PICENO
	Rural Areas TP	ANCONA (Agricoltura di qualità Provincia di)
	II generation	MACERATA
	II generation	ASCOLI PICENO
<b>Molise</b>	Rural Areas TP	ISERNIA (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	DEL MATESE
<b>Piemonte</b>	Rural Areas TP	VALLI DI SUSÀ
	Rural Areas TP	VAL BORMIDA - ALTA LANGA
	Rural Areas TP	TORINO ZONA OVEST
	Rural Areas TP	SUD EST ALESSANDRINO
	Rural Areas TP	CANAVESE
	Rural Areas TP	ALPI DEL MARE II
	II generation	ZONA OVEST TORINO
	II generation	VERBANO CUSIO OSSOLA
	II generation	STURA
	II generation	SANGONE
	II generation	PINEROLESE
	II generation	CUNEO
	II generation	CANAVESE
	II generation	ALESSANDRIA
	II generation	ALPI DEL MARE
	II generation	ALTA LANGA VALLE BORMIDA
II generation	AREA TORINO SUD	
<b>Puglia</b>	Rural Areas TP	SUD EST POLIS
	Rural Areas TP	SISTEMA MURGIANO

	Rural Areas TP	NORD BARESE OFANTINO
	Rural Areas TP	LECCE (PROVINCIA DI) PROTOCOLLO AGGIUNTIVO
	Rural Areas TP	FOGGIA (PROVINCIA DI) SPEC. PESCA E ECONOMIA ITTICA
	Rural Areas TP	FOGGIA (PROVINCIA DI) AGRICOLO
	Rural Areas TP	FASCIA ORIENTALE DELLA PROVINCIA DI TARANTO
	Rural Areas TP	FASCIA MURGIANA DELLA PROVINCIA DI TARANTO
	Rural Areas TP	CONCA BARESE
	Rural Areas TP	BRINDISI (Provincia di)
	Rural Areas TP	AREA METROPOLITANA DI BARI
	I generation	BRINDISI(1)
	I generation	LECCE(1)
	II generation	TARANTO
	II generation	SUD EST BARESE
	II generation	SISTEMA MURGIANO PROT. AGG.
	II generation	SISTEMA MURGIANO
	II generation	PROSPETTIVA SUBAPPENNINO
	II generation	POLIS TRULLI GROTTI MARE SPEC. TUR.
	II generation	FOGGIA
	II generation	DEL FORTORE
	II generation	CONCA BARESE
	II generation	AREA METR. BARI SPEC. TURISMO
	II generation	CASTELLANETA MARTINA FRANCA
	II generation	BARI
	II generation	ASCOLI S.-CANDELA-S. AGATA DI P.
<b>Sardegna</b>	Rural Areas TP	THARROS 2000 – AGRICOLTURA E PESCA
	Rural Areas TP	SARCIDANO VERDE
	Rural Areas TP	RIVIERA DI GALLURA
	Rural Areas TP	MEDIO CAMPIDANO
	Rural Areas TP	DELLE BARONIE
	Rural Areas TP	BASSO SULCIS
	Rural Areas TP	AREA DELL'IGLESIENTE
	Rural Areas TP	AREA DEL GOCEANO E MONTEACUTO
	Rural Areas TP	ANGLONA VERDE
	I generation	NUORO
	II generation	SARRABUS - GERREI
	II generation	MARMILLA-TREXENTA-MEDIO CAMPIDANO
	II generation	GUSPINESE - ARBURESE - VILLACIDRESE
	II generation	BASSA GALLURA
II generation	AREA VASTA DI CAGLIARI	
<b>Sicilia</b>	Rural Areas TP	VITTORIA
	Rural Areas TP	VALLE DEL BELICE
	Rural Areas TP	VAL D'ANAPO
	Rural Areas TP	TRAPANI (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	TINDARI NEBRODI
	Rural Areas TP	TERRE SICANE
	Rural Areas TP	TERRE DELLA CONTEA
	Rural Areas TP	SIMETO ETNA
	Rural Areas TP	SETTE TERRE - SICILIA CENTRO MERIDIONALE
Rural Areas TP	PALERMO (PROVINCIA DI)	

	Rural Areas TP	NEBRODI ORIENTALI
	Rural Areas TP	MESSINA VERDE MARE
	Rural Areas TP	MAGAZZOLO PLATANI
	Rural Areas TP	LEONTINOI - MEGARA
	Rural Areas TP	JONICO ETNEO
	Rural Areas TP	ISOLE EOLIE
	Rural Areas TP	ENNA (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	ELORO -VENDICARI
	Rural Areas TP	DELLE MADONIE
	Rural Areas TP	DELLE ACI
	Rural Areas TP	CALTANISSETTA (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	CALATINO SUD SIMETO
	Rural Areas TP	ALTO BELICE, CORLEONESE, VALLE DEL TORTO
	Rural Areas TP	ALCANTARA E RIVIERA JONICA
	Rural Areas TP	AGRIGENTO (Provincia di)
	I generation	CALTANISSETTA
	I generation	ENNA(1)
	I generation	MADONIE
	I generation	PALERMO(1)
	I generation	SIRACUSA(1)
	II generation	AREA DEL GOLFO DI CASTELLAMMARE
	II generation	VALLE DEL TORTO E DEI FEUDI
	II generation	TRAPANI SUD
	II generation	TRAPANI NORD
	II generation	TERRE SICANE
	II generation	SIMETO ETNA
	II generation	SICILIA CENTRO MERIDIONALE
	II generation	RAGUSA
	II generation	PANTELLERIA E ISOLE DEL MEDITERRANEO
	II generation	MESSINA
	II generation	MAGAZZOLO PLATANI
	II generation	JONICO ETNEO
	II generation	ISOLE EOLIE
	II generation	GOLFO
	II generation	EMPEDOCLE
<b>Toscana</b>	Rural Areas TP	VATO VERDE
	Rural Areas TP	VALLE DEL PESCIA FLOROVIVAISMO
	Rural Areas TP	SIENA VERDE
	Rural Areas TP	LUCCA (Agricoltura montana Provincia di)
	Rural Areas TP	GROSSETO (PROVINCIA DI)
	Rural Areas TP	APPENNINO CENTRALE
	II generation	VALDICHIANA
	II generation	PISA
	II generation	PIOMBINO VAL DI CORNIA
	II generation	MASSA CARRARA
	II generation	MAREMMA GROSSETANA
	II generation	LUCCA
II generation	LIVORNO	
<b>Umbria</b>	Rural Areas TP	TERNANO- NARNESE- AMERINO
	Rural Areas TP	MEDIA VALLE DEL TEVERE

<b>Veneto</b>	Rural Areas TP	VENEZIA (Area Centro-Sud Provincia di)
	Rural Areas TP	ROVIGO
	Rural Areas TP	MONTAGNA VERONESE
	Rural Areas TP	BASSO VERONESE E COLOGNESE
	Rural Areas TP	BASSA PADOVANA
	II generation	VENEZIA ORIENTALE
	II generation	ROVIGO
	II generation	MONTAGNA VERONESE
	II generation	FELTRINO (COMPRESORIO)
	II generation	CHIOGGIA, CAVARZERE E CONA
	II generation	CADORE CENTRALE
	II generation	BASSO VERONESE E COLOGNESE
	II generation	AGNO-CHIAMPO
	II generation	BASSA PADOVANA
<b>Total</b>	<b>209</b>	

Source: Department of the Development and Cohesion policy –Ministry of Economics

**Table 2. European Territorial Employment Pacts**

<b>Region</b>	<b>TEP</b>
Abruzzo	Sangro Aventino
Molise	Matese
Campania	Agro Nocerino Sarnese Area Nord Est di Napoli
Puglia	Nord Barese Ofantino Alto Belice Corleonese
Sicilia	Calatino Sud Simeto Catania Sud
Sardegna	Oristano
Multiregional	Appennino Centrale
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

Source: Department of the Development and Cohesion Policy, Ministry of Economics

Table 3 - *Lecce Province Territorial Pact – Investments and new jobs*

Place of investment	Amount of investment in Italian Lire	Number of new jobs
Collepasso	16.335	542
Casarano	8.277	239
Miggiano	7.653	45
Lecce	6.640	39
Poggiardo	5.259	13
Campi S.	4.290	27
Nardo'	4.201	66
Surbo	3.881	32
Gagliano del C.	3.673	137
Acquarica del C.	3.336	32
Alessano	3.243	46
Ugento	2.975	26
Melpignano	2.650	33
Castrignano de' G.	2.588	14
Matino	2.500	25
Surano	2.417	7
Specchia	2.399	20
Racale	2.371	26
Maglie	2.260	24
Zollino	2.160	19
Presicce	2.063	29
San Cassiano	2.049	56
Melissano	1.852	51
Arnesano	1.814	4
Corigliano	1.600	9
Galatina	1.353	25
Secli	1.200	6
Parabita	1.197	10
Cavallino	1.119	6

Porto Cesareo	1.088	78
Sogliano	1.080	6
San Cesario	942	5
Tiggiano	887	32
Copertino	831	8
Corsano	820	14
Ruffano	609	6
Galatone	500	5
Leverano	160	2
Total	110.272	1.764

*Source:* Puglia Region's Economic Committee, 1998; Lecce Province, 1998; Ecosfera S.p.A., Territorial Pact of Lecce Province.

Table 4 – *Examples of intervention of TP (1 and 2 generation) and TEP concerning the employment issue*

<b>Name of the pact</b>	<b>Initiatives concerning employment</b>
Canavese (PT 2)	Protocol on training
Maremma Grossetana (PT 2)	Protocol on labour
Napoli Nord Est (TEP)	Employment and sel-employment services; Protocol on I.R.; Protocol to tackle informal economy
Nord Barese (TEP)	Protocol on labour
Rovigo (PT 2)	R.M.I.
Sangro Aventino (TEP)	Commitments on banking, labour market and outsourcing actors
Simeto Etna (TP 2)	Training courses; Protocol on HR
Teramo (TP 2)	Protocol on labour
Valdichiana (TP 2)	Training initiatives
Vibo Valentia (TP 1)	Protocol on labour