

Welcome to the NEWGOV Project

Welcome to the Integrated Project (IP) on New Modes of Governance, co-ordinated by the European University Institute and the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.

The pan-European Project is funded by the European Union under the Sixth Framework Programme from 2004 up to 2008. NEWGOV includes 24 projects and 2 transversal task forces and has around 120 participating researchers from some 35 institutions in Western and Eastern Europe.

Aims of the Project

The aim of the NEWGOV IP is to examine the transformation of governance in Europe (and beyond) by mapping, evaluating and analysing the emergence, execution, and evolution of what we refer to as 'New Modes of Governance' (NMG). By new modes of governance we mean the range of innovations and transformations that have been and continue to occur in the instruments, methods, modes and systems of governance in contemporary polities and economies, and especially within the European Union (EU) and its member states.

The objective is to produce a deeper conceptual, empirical and normative understanding

of all aspects of governance within and beyond Europe, giving special attention to the emergence, execution, evaluation and evolution of new and innovative modes of governance. The project integrates the wealth of research ongoing in the field of democracy and multilevel governance undertaken by various research communities from different countries, regions and disciplines. The work aims to provide a synthesis of theories of multilevel governance and their relations with theories of democracy as well as to enhance capacities for comparative analyses for different policy sectors and the articulation of responsibilities in their governance. Such articulation – from local to regional, national, European and global – should take into account the changing roles of public and private sectors and partnerships and address issues of participation, legitimacy and democratic scrutiny. Specific issues addressed include the assessments of 'hard' and 'soft' policy instruments and law (e.g. in areas such as risk regulation, new pillars as compared to traditional Community policies), interpretations of subsidiarity, and checks and balances.

NEWGOV's External Newsletter

This is the first issue of the NEWGOV External Newsletter. The Newsletter will be produced approximately every six months and will provide information concerning work in different parts of the Integrated Project.

The Newsletter is sent to members of the broader academic and policy making communities and to a wider public which wishes to receive regular updates on our activities.

The Newsletter can be downloaded at the project website www.eu-newgov.org and is sent to a special email distribution list. If you wish to subscribe to this Newsletter, please send an email to: NEWGOV@iue.it.

If you receive this Newsletter by email but you wish to be removed from the mailing list, please reply to this email including the word REMOVE in the subject field.

Contact:

Adrienne Héritier
Scientific Director
adrienne.heritier@iue.it

Ingo Linsenmann
Project Manager
Ingo.Linsenmann@iue.it

The Project in Brief

Structure of NEWGOV

The precise scientific objectives of NEWGOV are pursued within four different clusters, each of which contains a set of inter-linked component projects and places a particular emphasis on one or two of the “four E” questions of Emergence, Execution, Evaluation and Evolution. The four clusters are dedicated, respectively, to ‘emergence, evolution and evaluation’, ‘delegation, hierarchy and accountability’, ‘effectiveness, capacity and legitimacy’, and ‘learning, experimental governance, and reform’. Within these clusters there is a total of 24 projects which cover topics such as ‘capacity building and the OMC’ and ‘arguing and persuasion in EU governance’ in cluster 1; ‘regulatory agencies and network governance’, ‘governance and the EU securities sector’ and ‘European public services regulation’ in cluster 2; ‘new forms of governance and eastern enlargement’, ‘the domestic impact of European law’ and ‘new modes of governance in relations with non-member states’ in cluster 3; and ‘varieties of capitalism and economic governance in CE Europe’, ‘new corporate governance regimes’ and ‘distributive politics, learning and reform’ in cluster 4 (see below for the list of projects). At the same time, each cluster has clear links to and overlaps with other clusters, creating an integrated structure across the consortium as a whole. The clusters

and the projects are accompanied by transversal task forces, one on ‘legal issues’, the other on issues of ‘legitimacy and democracy’ which make inputs across the Integrated Project.

The pan-European research consortium engages political scientists, economists, lawyers, sociologists, and practitioners to collect data on and to map and analyse innovations and transformations in the instruments, modes, and systems of governance operating at the multiple levels and arenas of the still evolving and enlarging European polity and economy. Joint activities across the consortium as a whole include workshops, conferences, the mutual exchange of ideas, information, and data, and research training conducted in two summer schools.

The implementation of the large number of projects in this consortium over its entire period cannot be conveyed or unified in a short piece of text. Each sub-project has its own implementation plan and pursues its own methodological path and research objectives within the overall research agenda elaborated by the Consortium and cluster leaders. While project leaders are responsible for the implementation of their individual projects, this progress is at the same time monitored and evaluated at the Consortium Level by the cluster leaders, the Scientific Director and the Steering Committee. This ensures the effective implementation of the projects, develops and sustains coordination and coherence of the research efforts, and reinforces linkages and synergies between the projects and task



The NEWGOV Steering Committee

From left to right: Martin Rhodes, Bruno de Witte, Lena Kolarska-Bobinska, Loukas Tsoukalis, Ingo Linsenmann, Wolfgang Wessels, Jorge Vasconcelos, Jelle Visser, Tanja A. Börzel, Adrienne Héritier, Helen Wallace.

forces. Several 'collective goods' instruments managed at the Consortium level, in particular the project website, workshops, consortium conferences, and practitioner fora, are applied to fulfil these aims.

Scientific Director

Since January 2006, the Scientific Director of NEWGOV has been Professor Adrienne Héritier, EUI, who took over from the first Scientific Director Professor Martin Rhodes. She is responsible for scientific issues and associated organisational and management tasks related to the entire Consortium. She works closely with the Steering Committee to ensure the effective management of the project.

Progress so far

The first twelve months of the NEWGOV project have been dedicated to putting research designs in place at the consortium, cluster and project levels and implementing their first phases. The first six months or so saw an intense process of activity, as the overall design of the IP was refined: in an organisational innovation with scientific implications, new partners were brought in via our legal and democratic legitimacy task forces (a process which filled gaps in our subject coverage, but which also put in place the beginnings of a transversal structure linking our four clusters), while scientifically we also worked at all levels of the consortium to focus our collective attention on a specific set of theoretical and empirical concerns. This latter

process culminated with the consortium meeting in May. The latter consisted of cluster meetings and an overall consortium assembly with the agenda of reflecting on the overall scientific goals of the consortium and on the ways that they are being pursued at the project and cluster levels. The overall IP scientific document was revised for that consortium conference and has subsequently been revised in light of the comments received from our project partners.

The most important achievements have obviously been made at the level of our individual projects, since that is the level at which most of the hard research is being conducted. Although many of our projects have spent their first twelve months perfecting research designs and carrying out the preliminary phases of their investigations, many have equally managed to produce preliminary presentations of their results. Around 70 project deliverables have been produced during the first year, ranging from project workshops and meetings, websites, technical deliverables such as glossaries, indicators, scientific guidelines, refinements of research approaches, and interviews digests, to reports on empirical research, working papers, journal articles, book chapters, and an already-published edited volume.

The second and/or third project years (depending on the duration of each individual project) will be dedicated to primary research (surveys, interviews, etc.), the analysis

of results and theoretical consolidation of the analytical frameworks, as well as for the production and dissemination of research findings. During the second part of year three and year four, the IP and its projects will primarily focus on the (normative) evaluation of the findings, the formulation of policy recommendations as well as on dissemination activities.

In these final stages of the project, the Consortium, through the Steering Committee, will take stock of the scientific achievements of the project: research results; analytical innovations; empirical mapping; data-sets; and the development of scientific capacity in partner institutions and the wider circle of loosely affiliated institutions. This stock-taking will be used to produce a synthetic summary of achievements (and of any scientific problems encountered) by the Consortium. In addition the Consortium, working with its external Monitoring Group, will agree on a set of actions to transmit the results of the research to those institutions, funding agencies, and professional associations (both national and European) which are engaged in activities relevant to the subject matter covered by the Consortium.

Dissemination

The research results of the consortium are being disseminated through numerous forms of publication and means of dissemination, including professional journals, articles in edited volumes, publicity at international con-

ferences, and the creation of 'extra-consortium' linkages with other European and international institutions. Of particular importance in this regard are the peer-reviewed EUROGOV joint working paper series with the Network of Excellence CONNEX, which is diffused in virtual copy, to a large number of institutions and libraries, as well as the project website www.eu-newgov.org, which is the primary tool for disseminating the results of the research conducted by the Consortium and for diffusing them to all relevant scientific and practitioner communities. In addition, relaying the results of

the research to relevant practitioner communities is mainly implemented by a series of forums organised at the Consortium level (complemented by many similar activities by individual projects), bringing together a mixed group of academics and practitioners from different sources. Practitioners and other academic are also the main target groups of an Issues and Briefing Papers Series and of a research results-oriented external project newsletter.

Cooperation

The 'sister' project of NEWGOV is the Network of Excellence CONNEX ("Connecting

Excellence on European Governance"), coordinated by the MZES (Mannheim Centre for European Social Research). CONNEX is dedicated to the analysis of efficient and democratic multilevel governance in Europe and runs until June 2008. While CONNEX is responsible for the organisation and management of the joint EUROGOV Papers and the Living Reviews in European Governance (see below), NEWGOV organises two joint Summer Schools open for younger researchers from both consortia and partner institutions. The CONNEX Website: <http://www.connex-network.org/>

NEWGOV Clusters and Projects

Cluster 1: Emergence, Evolution and Evaluation

Wolfgang Wessels, Cologne University

1. The Evolution and Impact of Governing Modes
2. The Open Method of Co-ordination
3. Arguing and Persuasion in EU Governance
4. Legal Perspectives on Democracy and New Modes of Governance

Cluster 2: Delegation, Hierarchy and Accountability

Adrienne Héritier, EUI

5. New Modes of Governance in the Shadow of Hierarchy
6. After Delegation: Regulatory Agencies & Network Governance
7. Governance and the EU Securities Sector
8. European Public Services Regulation
9. Choice and Combination of Policy Instruments
10. Private Dispute Resolution: Legitimate & Accountable?
11. The Role of Civil Society in Democratizing European & Global Governance

Cluster 3: Effectiveness, Capacity and Legitimacy

Tanja Börzel, Berlin Free University

12. Coping with Accession: New Forms of Governance and European Enlargement
13. The Domestic Impact of European Law
14. Smoothing Eastern Enlargement: Independent Regulatory Agencies and Non-Hierarchical Steering
15. Evolving Regional Governance Regimes: Challenges for Institution Building in the CEE Countries
16. Inside-Out: New Modes of Governance in Relations with Non-Member States

17. Democratisation, Capture of the State and New Forms of Governance in CEE countries

Cluster 4: Learning, Experimental Governance and Participation

Martin Rhodes, EUI/Denver University; Jelle Visser, Amsterdam University

- 18a. Distributive Politics, Learning and Reform: Emergence and Evolution of National Social Pacts
- 18b. Distributive Politics, Learning and Reform: Emergence and Evolution of Administrative Partnerships
- 19a. New Approaches to Economic Governance in the EU
- 19b. New Approaches to Economic Governance in the EU: The Politics of Central Bank Accountability in the Age of Globalisation
20. 'Varieties of Capitalism' and Economic Governance in CE Europe
21. Towards New Corporate Governance Regimes in Europe
22. Changing Governance Architecture of International Taxation – TAXGOV
23. Learning and Local Innovation System
24. Democratisation/Participation of Civil Society in New Modes of Governance

Task Forces

- Democracy Task Force
- Legal Task Forces
 - New Modes of Governance and the relevance for EU law
 - Which governance structures for European private law?
 - Litigating EU Law

NEWGOV Cluster 2

New modes of governance and the shadow of hierarchy

General questions

New modes of governance have increased in importance in public policy-making in Europe and beyond. Cluster 2 focuses on new modes of sectoral governance and the shadow of hierarchy, as an element of government. Two related questions are discussed: Firstly, do new modes of sectoral governance as such contribute to the efficacy of policy-making, or do they rather need the shadow of hierarchy, i.e. legislative and executive decisions and court rulings, in order to effectively deal with the problems they are supposed to solve?

Secondly, what is the institutional nature of the link between sectoral governance and hierarchy as territorially bound democratic government and how do different links contribute to the efficacy of policy-making? How do these links change over time? Do they indicate a retreat of government from policy-making and a corresponding increase of sectoral governance or just the opposite: the extension of governmental activities into new areas and a demise of sectoral governance?

By distinguishing sectoral governance from territorially bound, democratic government and focusing on the nature of the link between the two, we expect to gain new insights into the dynamics of policy-making and structural change. Rather than throwing the two ideal types together and linking them as the policy networks, policy subsystems and policy communities and hybridization literature does, we acknowledge that the two, sectoral governance and democratic government, are in practice intertwined, but argue that their analytical distinction, and the system-

atic study of the nature of the link between the two offer new insights. In order to make this argument plausible, we first define the concepts and outline important dimensions of sectoral governance and territorially bound, democratic government that may be of relevance for explaining policy outcomes. We then propose hypotheses derived from principal-agent theory accounting for the efficacy of sectoral modes of governance and their changing link to hierarchy.

Definition

We use definitions of sectoral governance and territorially bound democratic government (hereafter democratic government) which are derived from empirical observations. These empirical concepts represent ideal types of sectoral governance and democratic government which describe the most important features of the two types. As ideal types they are not meant to exhaustively describe all elements of concrete empirical cases of sectoral governance or democratic government and, rather, serve a heuristic purpose of providing analytical points of reference. We define sectoral governance as policy-making and decision-making by private and/or public actors in clearly delimited sectoral areas which occur outside the main political legislative avenue of decision-making. The decision-making refers to policy formulation (as opposed to routine implementation decisions in which private actors are frequently involved when putting into practice legislation, i.e. governmental decisions) in particular sectoral areas.

From sectoral governance we distinguish *territorially bound,*

democratic government. It is based on legislative decision-making and immediately derived executive decisions, and judicial decisions by public actors exclusively. The scope and focus of governmental decision-making may be changed by public actors of the political centre, potentially across all areas of the territory of a polity and is not limited to particular sectors. In contrast, governance actors (private and public actors) in developing regulatory measures are limited to their particular sectors and sub-sectors and cannot deliberately choose to link activities across all sectors or selected sectors. Again our attention focuses on governmental decisions in the shaping of policies, not the implementation of existing policy decisions in a large number of individual cases of application. 'Hierarchy' in the form of legislative decisions, executive decisions and judicial decisions constitutes an aspect of territorially bound, democratically legitimated government at the national and European level.

Dimensions of territorially bound, democratic government and sectoral governance

In analyzing the particular link between governance and government as defined above we distinguish several analytical dimensions which help to point out the different qualities of the link between governance and government.

In analyzing the link between democratic government and sectoral governance we focus on the *level* dimension: does the link extend across different *levels* (supranational, national) or does it operate at the same level?

Thus, sectoral governance may be applied at a supranational level and be linked to supranational forms of government. Or supranational governmental decisions may cast a shadow of hierarchy over national functional modes of governance. Different combinations of the dimensions of levels on the one hand and governance/government on the other are conceivable, each linked with different dynamics in policy performance.

Another important dimension concerns the *actor-structure* (number of actors involved) of democratic government and functional governance. Are multiple governmental actors interacting with one actor of functional governance? Or multiple actors of sectoral governance interacting with one governmental actor? If there are multiple actors of functional governance, do they coordinate themselves well vis-à-vis the governmental actor(s), and vice versa and what are the implications for policy efficacy?

What is the *quality of the interaction* or *typical instrumental relation* characterizing the link between democratic government and functional governance? An entire continuum of attributes is conceivable in the nature of this interaction. It may reach from facilitating, approving, lending authority, incentivisation, prescribing procedural rules and structure of actors to be involved, monitoring, to imposition plus sanctions on the part of government vis-à-vis functional governance. To give just a few examples, government may facilitate sectoral governance by lending support in terms of infrastructure, by publicly approving the results of sectoral governance and lending them public authority. Or it may threaten ineffective sectoral governance by threatening to act itself and proceed to legislate and, by so doing, transform the existing form of regulation. A

final important aspect relates to the question whether governmental actors have both the willingness and capacity to exert positive or negative sanctions, e.g. to monitor compliance or to enforce infractions.

Finally, the point in time of government intervention in sectoral governance may be imagined along a *time dimension*: Government may initiate, accompany, participate in sectoral governance (co-regulation) or figure only at the end as a fallback position in case that sectoral governance fails.

Empirically, there is a wide variety of such sectoral modes of governance linked to government, such as self-regulation, defined as policy-making by non-legislative public and private actors independently from political actors' intervention (e.g. voluntary agreements – possibly with private third-party certification); regulated self-regulation defined as policy-making by private actors in a regulatory framework set by legislation (e.g. voluntary agreements acknowledged by public authorities); or co-regulation, defined as joint policy- and rule-making by public and private actors.

Specification of research questions

The *policy performance question* discussed in the NEWGOV Cluster 2 raises the question whether a shadow of hierarchy is needed to guarantee the efficacy of policy-making under functional governance. Which typical link between government and governance along the specified dimensions ensures a high policy performance as measured by policy output? It has been argued that the new modes of sectoral governance, i.e. particular tasks of public policy-making have been delegated to non-legislative and private actors because the latter have more expertise and are

more flexible and speedy in adjusting to new and complex environmental challenges. Moreover, sectoral governance by being cut off from the mainstream of legislative political decision-making is supposed to guarantee credibility and stability of public policy making in the light of changing political preferences of governments. Finally, because the rest of the responsibility (residual risk) remains with the governmental political decision-makers, the delegation of a task may be revised. To what extent does the performance of the different types and forms of sectoral governance



NEWGOV Scientific Director
Adrienne Héritier

bear out this expectation empirically?

Under which conditions can we observe that the threat of governmental intervention increases or decreases policy-making efficacy? According to the dimensions outlined above, i.e. level, actor structure, quality of interaction, and time, this link may take on a wide variety of features and lends itself to the generation of multiple hypotheses. To give just a few examples: the threat of legislation in a policy area can induce private actors to engage in effective self-regulation. It also may motivate private actors to sustained efforts in self-regulation in order to avoid legislation. Regular executive monitoring of

sectoral self-regulation prevents the externalisation of costs of self-regulation to the rest of society; executive monitoring of sectoral self-regulation supported by boards of stakeholders will reduce the externalisation of costs of sectoral self-regulation even more; imposing of standards plus sanctions will be more effective in inducing effective sectoral governance than mere public recognition.

The second question focuses on the change occurring in the particular nature of the link between government and governance over time and its effect on policy outputs, i.e. a more structural question as to the long-term change of the relationship between governance and government? Two broad contrasting patterns of a changing link are conceivable: Under the first pattern which may be labelled “sectoral governance to roll back the frontiers of government” there is a stepping-back of governmental intervention and a concomitant shift of these tasks to non-legislative and private actors’ policy-making bodies. This may occur at the vertical or horizontal level. National governmental tasks may give way to supranational or national functional forms of governance. If national governments see a need to perform a particular policy task at the supranational level, a

sectoral mode of governance not based on legislation may be preferable because it does not imply the yielding of formal competences at the national level. But how can national governmental actors secure the effectiveness of policy/rule making after the delegation European functional governance? The opposite pattern, “sectoral governance to prepare the way for government”, identifies a shift from functional modes of governance to governmental action. The resulting research question would be: Was a lack of policy performance at the roots of this shift? In-between the two extreme shift patterns a variety of gradual changes are conceivable which can be mapped along the level, actor structure, quality of interaction, and time dimensions.

Theoretical background

We argue that answers to many of the questions raised above, from the policy performance and institutional shift perspectives, may most plausibly be derived as hypotheses from principal-agent theory and submitted to empirical scrutiny. The emergence of sectoral governance may be interpreted as an act of delegation in a principal-agent relationship. Assuming bounded rationality of actors and information asymmetry between principal and agent, we argue that the principal, a public actor, because of lack of expertise and in order to secure policy credibility over time, delegates a task, i.e. the formulation of public policies, to private actors or other public actors outside the political/legislative stream. This may occur in an exclusive form (self-regulation), as regulated self-regulation or in a partial form, i.e. joint decision-making with public actors (co-regulation). In so doing, the principal runs two risks, the risk of adverse selection and the risk of moral hazard, i.e. the occurrence of agency loss. In order to mini-

mize this risk principal and agent conclude a contract specifying important conditions of the delegation such as the conditions governing the control over contract compliance. This contract then defines the particular nature of the link between democratic government and sectoral governance. The principal-agent literature spells out a variety of instruments the principal may apply in order to reduce the two risks, such as the mechanisms of policy patrol, firebell ringing, multiple agent-structure, budgeting, monitoring, new legislation.

For our first question addressing the policy efficacy of a particular link between democratic government and sectoral governance, i.e. of whether a looming shadow of hierarchy is conducive to a better policy performance principal-agent theory offers a number of hypothetical answers.

Our second question addressing the question of why and how the link between democratic government (principal) and sectoral governance (agent) changes over time, may produce further preliminary working hypotheses. Assuming that a change of the link between democratic government and sectoral governance is sought under conditions of agency shirking or discontent on the part of the agents, we contend that the outcome of the changed relationship will depend upon a bargaining process between the principal(s) and the agent(s) regarding the terms of a new contract defining their relationship.

In sum, preliminary hypothetical answers to the question of whether hierarchy is necessary to render sectoral governance effective and why the relationship between democratic government and sectoral governance changes, would be “it depends”.

Adrienne Héritier and
Dirk Lehmkuhl

The Project Website www.eu-newgov.org

Turn to our website which offers topical information concerning the project, in particular publications, reports, articles and working papers of the Research Consortium for download, links to other information sources relating to the project’s research fields, as well as regularly updated information on events organised in the framework of NEWGOV.

Recent Publications

- Bellamy, Richard (2006), 'Between Past and Future: The Democratic Limits of the EU', in Richard Bellamy, David Castiglione and Jo Shaw (eds), *Making European Citizens: Strategies of Civic Inclusion in Pan-European Civil Society*, Palgrave.
- Börzel, Tanja (2006), 'Conceptualizing New Modes of Governance in EU Enlargement'; in Gunnar Folke Schuppert (ed), *Europeanization of Governance – The Challenge of Accession*, Nomos-Verlag: Baden-Baden.
- Búrca, Gráinne de, and Joanne Scott (2006), *Law and New Governance in the EU and the US*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Burroni, Luigi, Crouch, Colin, and Maarten Keune (2005), 'Governance caleidoscopica, debolezza istituzionale e sviluppo locale', *Stato e Mercato*, 3: December, pp. 423-453.
- Cafaggi, Fabrizio (2006), *The Institutional Framework of European Private Law*, Oxford: OUP.
- Coen, David, and Adrienne Héritier (eds) (2005), *Redefining Regulatory Regimes: Utilities in Europe*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hayes-Renshaw, Fiona, and Helen Wallace (eds) (2006), *The Council of Ministers*, European Union Series, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koutalakis, Charalampos, and Heiko Prange (2006), "'Smoothing' Eastern Enlargement through New Modes of Governance?" in Gunnar Folke Schuppert (ed), *Europeanization of Governance - The Challenge of Accession*, Nomos-Verlag: Baden-Baden.
- Lavenex, Sandra (2006), 'Shifting up and out: The foreign policy of European immigration control', *West European Politics*, 29:2, March, pp. 329-50.
- Lehmkuhl, Dirk (2005), 'Resolving Transnational Disputes: Commercial Arbitration and the Multiple Providers of Governance Services', in Mathias König-Archibugi und Michael Zürn (eds), *New Modes of Governance in the Global System*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Obradovic, Daniela (2006), 'Civil and the Social Dialogue in European Governance', in Piet Eeckhout and Takis Tridimas (eds), *Yearbook of European Law 2005*, Oxford: OUP, pp.261-329.
- Pleines, Heinko (ed.) (2006), *Participation of Civil Society in New Modes of Governance: The Case of the New Member States: Questions of Accountability*, Forschungsstelle Osteuropa Bremen Arbeitspapiere und Materialien, No. 74.
- Radaelli, Claudio (2006), 'Europeanization: Solution or problem', in Michelle Cini and Angela Bourne (eds), *Palgrave Advances in EU Studies*, Palgrave.
- Smismans, Stijn (ed) (2006), *Civil Society and Legitimate European Governance*, Edward Elgar.
- Wessels, Wolfgang (2006), 'Cleavages, Controversies and Convergence in European Union Studies', in Michelle Cini and Angela Bourne (eds), *Palgrave Advances in EU Studies*, Palgrave, pp. 233-246.

EUROGOV Working Papers



The peer-reviewed working paper series EUROGOV is the joint series of the CONNEX and NEWGOV networks in the interdisciplinary field of 'European governance' research. Scholarly contributions from all relevant disciplines involved in the two networks are welcome. Papers are published and distributed online. The EUROGOV-Website is: <http://www.connex-network.org/eurogov>.

Recently, EUROGOV was accepted by the European Research Papers Archive (ERPA), the common access point for 10 online series in the field of European integration research. Since its start in early 2005, ten working papers have been published. The three NEWGOV contributions are:

'The Emergence and Evolution of Social Pacts: A Provisional Framework for Comparative Analysis' written by Sabina Avdagic, Martin Rhodes and Jelle Visser. This paper provides the scientific framework for the NEWGOV project Distributive Politics, Learning and Reform (EUROGOV No. N-05-01).

'Modes of Governance: A Note Towards Conceptual Clarification' written by Oliver Treib, Holger Bähr and Gerda Falkner. The aim of this paper is to clarify the basic concepts that are at the heart of the 'governance' debate, notably 'governance' and 'modes of governance'. (EUROGOV No. N-05-02)

'New Modes of Governance and the Participatory Myth' written by Stijn Smismans. This Eurogov Working Paper is also a deliverable from project 11, 'The Role of Civil Society in Democratizing European and Global Governance' (EUROGOV No. N-06-01)