



Ca' Foscari
University
of Venice

Master's Degree Programme

in Economics and Administration of Arts
and Culture

(ORDINAMENTO EX. D.M 270/2004)

Final Thesis

Public-Private Partnership in the Cultural Sector

A Comparative Analysis between
Italy and the United States

Supervisor

Ch.Prof. Salvatore Russo

Graduand

Caterina Querci

Matriculation Number 887561

Academic Year

2021 / 2022

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
1. Introduction to Public-Private Partnerships	11
1.1. Defining Public-Private Partnerships	11
1.2. Historical Framework and Characteristics	14
1.3. Benefits and Risks of using PPPs.....	18
1.4. Establishment of a PPP Process	20
1.5. Partner Selection Process	21
1.6. PPPs vs. Privatization.....	23
1.7. From Traditional to New Models of PPPs	25
1.8. Old Public Administration, NPM, and NPG	25
1.9. Collaborative Governance.....	28
1.10. Innovative practices: P4 model and MSPs.....	31
2. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural and Creative Sector	33
2.1. Economic Relevance of Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI)	33
2.2. Global Economic Impact of CCI.....	36
2.3. Funding Mechanisms for the Cultural Sector.....	39
2.4. PPPs for the Cultural Sector.....	42
2.5. Opportunities for PPPs: Cultural Ecosystems.....	43
2.6. PPPs for Cultural Heritage	45
2.7. The Role of PPPs in Preserving Heritage.....	47
2.8. Criticisms.....	49
2.9. Evaluation of Successful Strategies for Cultural Heritage	50
3. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural Sector in Italy	53
3.1. Management of the Cultural Sector and National Heritage in Italy	53
3.2. Public-Private Partnerships in the Italian Cultural Sector.....	56
3.3. Mecenatismo/ Cultural Patronage	57
3.4. Sponsorship	59
3.5. Foundation of Participation	62
3.6. Special Forms of PPPs	64
3.7. Co-design Approaches	66
3.8. Further Forms of PPPs	68
4. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural Sector in the United States	71
4.1. Management of the Cultural Sector and National Heritage in the United States.....	71
4.2. How the United States Funds the Arts	74
4.3. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural Sector in the United States.....	77

4.4.	Public-Private Partnerships for National Parks	78
4.5.	Public-Private Partnerships for the Development of Public Parks	80
4.6.	Public-Private Partnerships for National Landmarks	82
4.7.	Public-Private Partnerships for the Presidential Library System	83
5.	Italian and American Park Experience	87
5.1.	Premise	87
5.2.	Herculaneum Archaeological Site: Historical Framework	88
5.3.	The Herculaneum Conservation Project.....	90
5.4.	Governance and Management Structure	95
5.5.	Local Involvement.....	97
5.6.	Interview with President Michele Barbieri	98
5.7.	Presidio Park: Historical Framework	101
5.8.	Governance and Management Structure	103
5.9.	General Management Plan and Presidio Trust Management Plan	105
5.10.	Local Involvement.....	108
5.11.	Key Aspects.....	109
	Conclusion.....	113
	Acknowledgements	119
	References	121

Introduction

Last year I had the opportunity to spend a semester abroad as an exchange student at Southern Utah University, an American university located in Utah, United States. During this period abroad, I could attend classes of arts marketing, arts management, and cultural policies, with a special emphasis on the American market and the federal government. Thanks to this experience, I acquired further knowledge of the socio- economics conditions of this country, and I could notice relevant differences as concerns the arts and heritage administration between Italy and the United States. Consequently, I decided to conduct a comparative analysis between the above-mentioned countries and focus on the topic of public-private partnerships in the cultural sector in order to underline the main differences and similarities that characterize them. It follows a theoretical examination of the cultural management practices of the two nations.

In this dissertation, the topic of public-private partnership (PPP) for the cultural sector will be faced and discussed. The analysis will be conducted with the aim to provide the reader with further knowledge about this type of agreement, besides the conventional schemes that are used to associating it with the field of infrastructures, healthcare, and public services. The thesis, indeed, will mainly focus on the relationship that public and private partners can establish within the cultural field and how the implementation of an effective PPP can positively contribute to the proliferation of cultural projects and their success. The definition of cultural sector that will be considered for this dissertation extends from artistic disciplines to cultural, national, and historical heritage. In this regard, cultural differentiation represents a core element for this paper, since the analysis of PPP for culture is not limited to a general discussion on the subject, but rather investigates its characteristics in relation to two specific countries, whose legislative and organizational framework totally diverges from each other, namely Italy and the United States. A description of the cultural management and governance system of each country will be reported before dealing with the theme of PPP, its different regulations, fields, and methods of application. The main purpose of this dissertation is, in fact, to underline the differences that occur between two countries, whose history, traditions, and government structure fail to coincide. Several research have already been made about the similarities and dissimilarities that characterize Italy and other

European countries, whose model of management and governance has demonstrated to be quite similar in many cases. A similar comparison between the Italian and a North American model has rarely been made, also due to the high degree of differentiation in terms of public administration and privatization which affects Italy and the United States. The same contrasting picture is reflected in the structure of PPP for the cultural sector and the use that each actor makes of it. Therefore, the aim of this thesis is also to identify potential connections between Italy and the United States that can be found in the implementation of public-private partnerships applied to the cultural field. Accordingly, two examples of PPP for the cultural heritage at Italian and American level will be briefly analyzed. The first case concerns the restoration of the archeological Park of Herculaneum, in the Naples area, while the second case deals with the cultural revitalization of the Presidio Park in San Francisco, California.

The thesis will be divided into two main areas: the first area will explore the topic of public-private partnerships on a general level and the second area will focus on the use made in the selected countries. The first chapter will introduce the topic of PPP at a general level, its characteristics, historical framework, traditional, and innovative models of agreement. This section will deepen the 3 core “R” components of the partnership, namely resources, responsibilities, and risks and will place public-private partnerships within four categories that comprehend PPP as a tool for managing and governing organizations, as an institutional arrangement for financial relationships, as a development strategy, and as a language game. A short overview of the origin of the agreement throughout the centuries will be provided, followed by its implementation in the current times and its different features, typologies, and forms. A description of the two main categories of PPP, namely transactional arrangements and categories by delivery type will be reported, and a section will be dedicated to the benefits and risks which may emerge when individuals aim to implement this partnership. Public-private partnerships are also known for being a complex, long-term agreement, and a lengthy procedure is required before they can be undertaken by the stakeholders involved. A paragraph will be, hence, dedicated to the several stages of applications for the establishment of a PPP process and a further section will introduce the procedure for the selection of the most suitable private actor. Moreover, due to the common misunderstandings which arise when dealing with the meaning and functions of PPP, a paragraph will be dedicated to the main differences that distinguish it from the phenomenon of privatization. A timeline of the administrative shifts that the public sector

had to face, from the phenomenon of Old Public Administration, New Public Management, to New Public Governance, will be, then, provided. New trends developed from the mid-1990s have demonstrated the increasing interest of public bodies towards a more transparent and collaborative approach, whose new participatory culture have been shared by public-private parties as well. In this regard, further space will be given to explain the dynamics of a new model of governance, namely collaborative governance, that is taking hold among multiple state and non-state stakeholders. The trend of new participatory culture will be subsequently analyzed in accordance with the evolution of PPPs from traditional P3 models to inclusive P4 models based on the direct involvement of citizens and the third sector.

In the second chapter, the attention will be shifted from a general analysis of PPP to its specific use for the cultural sector. Firstly, the economic relevance that cultural and creative industries (CCI) have been assuming worldwide will be investigated, and detailed information concerning their history, meaning, level of revenues and employment will be provided. A paragraph will be, then, addressed to the different sources of financing implemented by CCI, which refer to public support, private support, and earned income. The theme of tax incentives and deductions for the arts and culture will be also discussed. The second part, instead, will be mainly centered on the role of public-private partnerships for the cultural sector, with a particular focus on cultural heritage. The chapter continues with the opportunities that PPPs can exploit by developing cultural ecosystems in which the social value of the public and third sector is merged with the economic value of the private sector to determine the valorization of the cultural asset and its cultural shared value. The last part of the chapter will entirely focus on the topic of PPPs addressed to cultural heritage and the role that partners play in its preservation. It will also provide an evaluation of successful and unsuccessful practices that can affect them. The main objectives pursued by private and public actors involved in the partnership, namely digitalization, conservation of immovable heritage, and management of cultural services, will be included. Furthermore, some criticisms from both public and private partners can emerge when dealing with the fear of low profitability, the decline of direct support funds, and the development of regeneration projects. Consequently, a range of solutions, including a fair allocation of risks, the private actors' compliance with the 4 Cs (clarity, certainty, consistency, and consultation), the use of conservation management models, and involvement of third-party organizations, such as a special purpose vehicle (SPVs), will be listed. Finally, a section

addressed to evaluative methods and criteria to determine the achievement of the established results will be added.

The third chapter aims to explain the functions, responsibilities, and typologies of PPPs for the arts and culture in Italy. This country presents the highest number of UNESCO World Heritage Sites and over the 60% of world's cultural heritage. Consequently, the management of the cultural sector and national heritage is determined by an articulated governance structure, which relies on the interrelation between national, regional, and local entities. The first paragraph will provide the reader with an overview of the most relevant legislative provisions and regulatory measures that have influenced the administration of the Italian culture over the years. A section will be dedicated to the current model of cultural governance that have been characterizing the country after the establishment of the Ministry of Culture and peripheral administrative structures, such as the Superintendence. Moreover, the importance of public and State intervention on the protection and safeguard of national heritage should be underlined as well as the development of regulations for the involvement of private and public actors in the process. Tax breaks or reduced taxes, such as the most recent disposition of fiscal aids for private investors, known as Art Bonus, are, indeed, provided to private stakeholders who are willing to financially sustain the arts and culture. Several models of cooperation are, then, regulated by the law, and include *mecenatismo* or cultural patronage, sponsorship contracts, foundations of participation, special forms of PPPs, and new co-design approaches. All these categories will be analyzed and carefully explained according to their regulatory system. The same structure of the third section is reflected in the fourth chapter, although the main linking element is represented by the United States. A comparison between the two countries in terms of management of cultural and national heritage is, hence, intended to be pursued by stressing their differences in institutional, governmental, and regulatory terms. As opposed to the Italian governance system, the American federalism have specific laws which vary from state to state, therefore, a uniform statutory regulation cannot be given. A fractured system of agencies, committees, and independent organisms with their own policies features the country. This system is characterized by a predominance of individual decision making, liberalism, and a long tradition of tax incentives for privates. Moreover, the United States does not have a Ministry of Culture, since their political apparatus is made of departments, which, however, do not include a proper department of culture. The main organism is represented by the independent federal agency NEA (the National Endowment for the Arts), which is the

largest funder of the arts and arts education in the United States. This topic will be, therefore, discussed in depth and followed by an analysis on the use of PPPs for the U.S. cultural heritage. It should be remarked that cultural heritage in the U.S. refers to national parks, monuments, reserves, historic sites, such as national cemeteries and military parks, and other public sites, such as public museums and libraries. Most of these assets are managed through PPPs between governmental and nongovernmental organizations, including federal, state, or local government agencies and private and non-profit partners. The second section of the chapter will, thus, focus on the implementation of PPPs for national parks, public parks, national landmarks, and the Presidential Library System, as presidential papers are formally a part of the national heritage. The examination will consider the absence of codes or legislations that regulate and recognize collaborative agreements for the arts and culture as forms of PPPs.

The last chapter provides the reader with two examples of PPP projects that took place in the above-mentioned countries. The case studies will be analyzed to verify what previously affirmed on a theoretical basis and demonstrate that the implementation of PPPs can bring to the realization of plans for the valorization and enhancement of a national cultural asset. In this section, two direct sources involved in the HCP have been consulted, namely the President of the Fondazione Packard Institute for Cultural Heritage Mr. Michele Barbieri and the former Director of excavation Mrs. Maria Paola Guidobaldi. Moreover, the examples will be compared to analyze how two PPP projects, related to a similar field, have been undertaken by stakeholders from different countries, whose legislative and institutional framework is likewise totally different, and how they managed to achieve results. Also, this comparison is aimed to detect potential similarities which may emerge during the analysis of the two parks. Although for different reasons, the Herculaneum Conservation Project and the Presidio Park have been deemed to be two unique models of partnership projects. Their common feature of uniqueness, combined with the shared interest for the preservation of cultural heritage, have been decisive for the selection of these specific projects. The Italian scenario will address the case of the archeological site of Herculaneum and the Herculaneum Conservation Project. The non-profit foundation Packard Humanities Institute started preservation and maintenance works for this site in 2001, signing a cooperation agreement with the archaeological Superintendence of Naples and Pompeii. During the time frame 2004-2013, a sponsorship agreement between the two parties and a third partner, the British School at Rome, led to a new governance and a new

project-oriented management. As for the Herculaneum archeological site, the Presidio Park represent for the San Francisco community a symbol of the cultural heritage of the city. The Presidio of San Francisco is, in fact, a National Park and a National Historic Landmark District, but it was a U.S. Army Post from 1846 to 1994. Rehabilitation efforts started in 1994 and the project was based on the partnership between The Presidio Trust (a federal agency representing the public side) and multiple private investors. The main aspects of each project, namely the historical framework, the development of the projects throughout the years, their governance and management structure, and the degree of local and civil involvement, will be examined.

1. Introduction to Public-Private Partnerships

1.1. Defining Public-Private Partnerships

Extensive literature has been provided on the issue of public-private partnerships and a substantial debate about its definition has emerged. Different kinds of PPPs, involving diverse activities and features, have led to a broader conceptualization of this form of agreement. Public-private partnerships can be defined as a “relationship in which public and private resources are blended to achieve a goal or set of goals judged to be mutually beneficial both to the private entity and the public” (Witters et al., 2012). Public entities include the central government, local governments, and public estate owners, while the private sector is mainly constituted by businesses, developers, and private owners (Boniotti, 2021). However, PPP is still a contradictory topic and a range of definitions have been formulated by scholars and economists. Variations also depend on the country or institution that have decided to implement this partnership. For instance, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2012: n.d.) defined public-private partnerships as “long term contractual arrangements between the government and a private partner whereby the latter delivers and funds public services using a capital asset, sharing the associated risks”. Instead, for the UK Government a PPP simply joins public and private entities in a long-term partnership of various types for shared benefits. Similarly, the National Council for Public-Private Partnerships of the USA describes a PPP as a “contractual agreement between a public sector agency and a for-profit private sector concern, whereby resources and risks are shared for the purpose of delivering a public service or development of public infrastructure” (Akintoye, Beck, and Kumaraswamy, 2016). A last definition has been provided by The United Nations organization PPPUE, in which PPPs are identified as both informal dialogues between government officials and local community-based organizations and long-term concession agreements with private entities, without including privatization (Akintoye, Beck, and Kumaraswamy, 2016).

What unifies all these assumptions is the mere concept of PPP as a cooperative activity based on three core components (known as the three “R” components) that the two sectors are required to share as part of this agreement, i.e., “resources, responsibilities, and risks” (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). In addition, Akintoye Beck, and Kumaraswamy (2016)

reported in their book *Public Private Partnerships: A Global Review* five general principles which can be found when dealing with PPPs. In the first principle is underlined that, even if private and public subject are the main actors involved in the agreement, the partnership might be extended to non-profit organizations, citizens, and other stakeholders of the third sector. In the second principle it is claimed that each participant is a principal, namely they can conduct negotiations on their own, without seeking help from other sources of authority. The third principle focuses on the establishment of long-term relationships and negotiation of parameters among participants, while the fourth principle states that each actor should bring a set of tangible or intangible resources to provide their own contribution. The last principle is centred on one of the three “R” components, namely the sharing of responsibility for outcomes or activities. In a PPP partnership, in fact, the public sector doesn’t keep full authority after obtaining the support of private organizations, but their relationship is based on a shared responsibility, which includes joint investments, sharing of risks, and mutual benefits. However, all these components are highly context-specific, meaning that they are customized to meet the needs, standards, and results of different partners.

PPPs have been placed within four categories which comprehend: PPP as a tool for managing and governing organizations, PPP as an institutional arrangement for financial relationship, PPP as a development strategy, and PPP as a discursive term or a language game (Khanom, 2010). Similarities and differences of these categories have been discussed among scholars, who have provided a definition for each classification. PPPs are mainly attributed as a tool for governance and management. It is, first, relevant to give a proper definition of governance and management. Governance incorporates the mechanisms, processes, and institutions, which allow citizens and groups to express their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations, and mediate their differences. Management, instead, relates to inexpensive and functional accomplishments in terms of results by personal and manager’s responsibility (Khanom, 2010). Its organizational aspects, emphasized by either inter-organizational and financial arrangements between the public and private sphere, are the focus of this relationship. Inter-organizational arrangements involve three main features which characterize PPPs, namely cooperation, risk sharing, and durability. As previously claimed, PPP is a cooperation between organizations in which risks, but also costs, and resources are shared to bring out the desired public outcome. This collaboration implies a durability which cannot be limited to short-term contracts, but is usually characterized by a longer-term commitment, that might extend

from 10 to 30 years. Also, the conceptualization of PPPs as inter-organizational arrangement is linked to a more recent definition of this partnership, in which PPPs, as perceived in today's economic environment, are regarded as "contractual agreements between a public agency or public-sector authority and a private-sector entity that allow for greater private participation in the delivery of public services, or in developing an environment that improves the quality of life for the general public" (Witters et al., 2012).

Financial arrangements represent both a sub-field of the first category and a separate group. This last mainly relates to the field of infrastructure, where the implementation of private finance could avoid dealing with recurrent constraints and cuts of the government budgets. Not only does this tool imply economic contributions, but also financial assistance for designing, constructing, and maintenance of public infrastructures and facilities by the private sector. Moreover, the involvement of several actors in this form of relationship might also suggest a multiplicity of parties in the financial investment. As suggested by Tillman (1997) and Khanom (2010) more than one agency or organization can be involved in this funding, extending funding partners to international organizations too. PPP has been identified as a tool of development process and a method for promoting development. This definition is featured by common objectives which have been developed according to a process of communication and negotiation. As claimed by Khanom (2010), PPPs are, in fact, mutual activities built on each partner's strengths and weaknesses and based on the sharing of expertise, knowledge, and experiences. Mutual sharing also includes financial, human, technical, and intangible resources, as well as participation in the decision-making process from the public and private sector (including profit and not-for-profit sectors, the government, business, and civic organizations) (World Bank, 1999; Khanom, 2010).

The fourth category faces the issue of PPPs as a language game. This theory is aimed to underline the misunderstandings which might be generated when discussing public services and private involvement. According to this, a public-private partnership is rather an attractive word, implemented by the government or public organizations, to substitute pejorative terms, like privatization and contracting out, but keeping their function. This terminology would, thus, deflect attention from the real strategies and objectives of the partnership, driven by the interests of private providers. However, despite varying in nature, the focus of the four categories of PPPs, is always on the delivery of services and/or the production of goods, because of cooperation, involvement of private actors, and long-term

durations. The only distinctive aspect is the inner purpose of the agreement, which varies according to the field it is addressed to. It should be, hence, underlined that one of the main difficulties in giving a proper definition of PPPs is given by the different fields of application that involve this partnership.

1.2. Historical Framework and Characteristics

Public- Private partnerships are long-lasting agreements, whose origins date to the 16th century. However, the use by governments and public authorities of private allocations for public interest can be traced back to the ancient Greek. In the 4th century BC, wealthy citizens from the city-state of Athens economically contributed to the organization of public and religious events and the construction of public monuments and facilities. The same projects involved, some centuries later, the Romans and their army for the conquer of a large portion of Europe and the Mediterranean region, where noncombatants and the army co-worked for the realization of infrastructures necessary for the exploitation of the conquered lands. This form of agreement reached as far as the New World: in 1742 Benjamin Franklin created the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, to sponsor, in partnership with the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, the University of Pennsylvania, the first medical school in the British colonies (Witters et al., 2012). However, the expression was used for the first time by specialist audiences in the 1970s and the first episode of structured PPPs happened in the early 1980s. (Borin, 2017). Throughout the decades, PPPs extended from a broad concept to a specialized form of agreement addressed to different fields and exploited by a huge number of countries all over the world. They spread over the last 20 years as an instrument for governments to deal with the increasing costs and responsibilities of services or ventures traditionally delivered by the public sphere. PPP arrangements were initially used for infrastructure projects (transit, railways, highways, and bridges) but then, expanded to soft infrastructures (health, education, and emergency services) and service delivery. Over the last three decades, the cultural sector, whose management is often influenced by the public sector, has also been impacted by this form of collaboration (Borin, 2017).

Historically speaking, the first attempt to include private partners in public projects was from the Thatcher Government, in United Kingdom, during 1980s. The government, in fact, aimed to reduce the role of the public sector in economic issues and overcome

expenditure controls. Before 1989, the intervention of privates in the field of public infrastructures had been managed by British governments through the so-called Ryrie Rules. However, these norms were based on a high competition with private stakeholders, consequently, they were repealed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer John Major in 1989. In 1992, the same John Major, who became Prime Minister, decided to create the Private Finance Initiative (PFI), a government procurement policy through which private actors could be involved in the management and implementation of public projects. The PFI, in fact, did not aim to substitute traditional forms of public expenditure, but were committed to increase investments for the country (Antellini Russo, 2011). Between 1999 and 2000, the Executive Government developed the so-called Partnership UK, a public-private structure aimed to improve the planning processes of PPPs and their projects, and the Office of Government Commerce (a public structure committed to public procurement). This institutional system is still in force today. Accordingly, the relevance of PPP and its relationship with the PFI in UK allowed the country to become a reference point for partnership projects at international level. In fact, it has been estimated that between 1990 – 2009, 67% of PPPs for European infrastructure projects were realized in England (amounting to 145 billion euro) (Antellini Russo, 2011).

It has been demonstrated that 1749 PPP projects, for a total value of 336 billion euro, have been implemented in Europe between 1990 and 2016. Before the financial crisis of 2008, a huge number of PPP projects were developed at European level, although, during the crisis, the trend of PPPs went into a steep decline. However, in 2016 the value of PPP operations (which amounted to 64) reached 10,3 billion euro. Most projects (1/3) concerned the field of transportation, followed by health care and education. In general terms, the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Portugal, and Germany were the main countries involved in the market of PPPs at European level within that timeframe (Corte Dei Conti Europea, 2018). As underlined by the EPEC data (2017), between 2009-2018, the market of European PPP underwent a decline both in terms of number of operations and value. In 2018, indeed, 39 operations of PPP reached the financial closing (the lowest number of transactions), for a total amount of 14,6 billion euro. It emerged that UK ruled the European market of PPP both in terms of contracts (1.032) and value (160 billion euro), followed by France (183 contracts and 38,5 billion euro), and Spain (161 contracts and 35,2 billion euro). Italy was the sixth country in terms of contracts (39), and value (14,9 billion euro). The nation that ruled the European market of PPP in 2018 turned out to be Turkey, with an amount of 5,1

billion euro. As concerns the major field of application, transportation reached the highest number of financing contracts, amounting to 7 billion euro in 2018 (DIPE, 2019). In 2019, the number of transactions was lower in comparison with 2018 (38 operations), as well as its value (338 million euro compared to 375 million euro in 2018 and 345 million euro in 2017). The United Kingdom turned out to be ruling country for the PPP market in Europe in 2019, with an amount of 3,3 billion euro invested in transactions, followed by France (1,8 billion euro). As regards PPP sectors, transportation was, again, the field with the highest number of contracts (6 billion euro) and projects (10), followed by the housing sector, social services, and education. If extended to the timeframe 2015-2019, the analysis of data confirmed that Turkey led the European market with a value of 21,85 billion euro, followed by UK (11,63 billion euro), and France (11,56 billion euro). Italy kept its sixth position with 3,31 billion euro, after Germany, Belgium, and Ireland (DIPE, 2020). This decreasing trend of PPP market at European level continued in 2020, with a value of 231 million euro (compared to 284 million euro in 2019). Germany dominated the market with 2,8 billion euro (1,3 billion euro in 2019), while the country with the highest number of contracts was France (12). As concerns the sectors, transportation held the highest value of financing contracts with 4,9 billion euro, followed by telecommunications (1,1 billion euro), and education (846 million euro) (DIPE, 2021). In 2021, the European market of PPP reported a decline of 13% in its value compared to 2020, with an amount of 8 billion euro, as well as for its operations (40). This decrease was mainly due to the negative impact that COVID-19 had in economic terms in all European countries. Nonetheless, France developed the highest number of projects, with a value higher than 20 million euro. Transportation confirmed to be the leading sector for PPP projects in terms of value, with an amount of 6 billion euro for transactions (compared to 5,8 billion euro in 2020), followed by the environmental sector (866 million euro), and telecommunications (427 million euro) (DIPE, 2022). In 2022, after the damages suffered during the Pandemic, the European Union approved an aid plan for the disposition of funds for each State of the European Union, known as Next Generation EU (NGEU). The recovery plan of each country also focused on the development of new PPP projects, which also affected Italy. More specifically, the Italian PNRR (*piano nazionale ripresa e resilienza*) encourages the use of public-private partnerships to foster economic growth of the country. More specifically, financing from PA cannot exceed 49% of the total investment.

Public-private engagement is a broad topic distinguished by several features, typologies, and forms. The most common categories of PPPs are represented by institutionalized PPPs and contractual PPPs, which are two typologies of transactional arrangement. In institutionalized PPPs a special entity is created for the project to include public and private sector partners in its governance and insulate them from risk. This third-party organization is referred as special purpose vehicle (SPV) or special purpose entity (SPE) and is the governing body in charge of delivering a service or good. Also, this entity is usually generated to design, build, preserve, and run a project for a specified length of time (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). In Contractual PPPs, instead, a contract between public and private parties is made for the realization of the project for an extensive period. The private sector usually oversees the design, construction, and management of the facility for the delivery of the public service or good. It is also responsible for the project financing, sometimes supported by government contributions (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Moreover, this arrangement comprehends two subcategories, namely concessions and private financing initiatives (PFIs). Concession contracts are characterized by a “user-pays” system, in which user fees fund the process and administration of the PPPs. More specifically, a private company, contacted by a public entity to work on the development of a public service, pays for the operations and its revenues are derived from the collection of user fees (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Private financing initiatives (PFIs) are agreements in which a public organization arranges with a private entity to provide facility and high-quality services over an extended period for an agreed fee by government. PFIs are commonly used for social infrastructure projects, including hospitals, schools, defense, and public lighting (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014).

PPPs can be also categorized according to the delivery type (UNECE, 2008), which refers to the delivery of the five components (design, construct, operate, maintain, finance) that characterize construction projects. In fact, these forms of agreement are mainly adopted for infrastructure projects, although they can also be implemented for cultural heritage projects. They comprehend buy-build operate (BBO), build-own-operate (BOO), build-own-operate-transfer (BOOT), build-operate-transfer (BOT), build-lease-operate-transfer (BLOT), design-build-finance-operate (DBFO), finance only, operation and maintenance contract (O&M), design-build (DB), and operation license. In buy-build operate (BBO) project models a private or quasi-public entity operates a public asset under a contract for a specific period. In a build-own-operate (BOO) model the private sector finances, builds, owns, and

operates a facility and service indefinitely. In build-own-operate-transfer (BOOT), a private obtains a franchise to finance, design, build, and operate a facility for a specific period. After that, ownership is transferred back to the public sector. Likewise, in build -operate-transfer (BOT) the private entity finances, builds, and operates under a long-term concession contract a facility, but without owning it. On completion of the project, the facility is returned to the public owner. In build-lease-operate-transfer (BLOT), a facility is leased by a private entity, which is entitled to finance, design, build, and operate it for the lease period, without paying the rent. In design-build-finance-operate (DBFO), the private sector designs, constructs, finances, and operates a new facility under a long-term lease, which is transferred back to the public sector at the end of the lease. In the finance only model, a project is directly financed by a private organization. In an operation and maintenance contract (O&M), a private actor manages, under contract, a publicly owned asset for a specific term, even if its ownership remains with the public sector. In a design-build (DB) model, the private entity designs and builds infrastructure to meet the demands of the public entity and the risk of cost overruns is allocated to the private sector. Finally, in operation license models, a private actor obtains a license or rights to operate a public service for a short period.

1.3. Benefits and Risks of using PPPs

PPPs proved to be an efficient tool for the maintenance and development of a wide range of public assets throughout the years. If implemented properly, the adoption of this arrangement can be a perfect alignment of public and private interest for the achievement of the best Value for Money (Allegro and Lupu, 2018). As claimed by Van Boxmeer and Van Beckhoven (2005), PPPs can, indeed, be defined as strong when decision rights, costs and risks are equally shared among all partners, or weak when these aspects are concentrated on one partner. What defines a public-private partnership successful is also its commitment to transparency and supervision, in compliance with a fair allocation of duties in terms of governance, financing, risk, responsibilities, and outcomes. Further criteria which might define the effectiveness of this agreement comprehend a culture of trust and cooperation, leadership, fulfillment of responsibilities by both parties, access to information, finances, and other resources, and compatibleness with the established political and legal framework (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). The merging of interests and the distribution of responsibilities, shared by both public and private parties for the achievement of high-

quality results, represent two fundamental strengths to encourage the implementation of this cooperation. However, several weaknesses, which characterize this partnership, should also be considered when evaluating its effectiveness. Consequently, a description of the potential benefits and risks associate with PPPs for a comprehensive understating of system strengths and weaknesses, is reported.

If the previously mentioned criteria for a successful PPPs were correctly implemented, they would be considered as unfailling strengths of this agreement. A fair allocation of resources and risks between the two partners lead to benefits which include acceleration of infrastructure provision, faster implementation, cost minimization, better incentives to perform, operating flexibility of both the public and private sector, and active involvement of citizens (Borin, 2018). More specifically, PPPs might be able to provide a significant operating flexibility, which is given by the fulfilment of regulations and resources by the public sector together with the different management models, know-how, and technical/technological inputs introduced by the private sector (Allegro and Lupu, 2018). Placing the private sector's resources within the public sphere should bring more efficient forms of good public provision (Kivleniece and Quelin, 2012; Borin, 2017). Governments can, in fact, obtain new skills, technology, knowledge, gaining visibility and access to the market, a higher availability of modern technology, innovative business models, and additional revenues (UNESCO, 2013; Borin, 2017). Active involvement of citizenship, linked to the use of innovative business and financing models, is part of a process of innovation where all actors might benefit from the creation of a shared value and where more traditional fields (such as health, education, infrastructures, etc.) might be hybridized with innovative sectors, like the cultural industry, through innovative sector-specific adjustments (Allegro and Lupu, 2018).

However, potential risks, which might negatively impact this partnership, should be evaluated. Firstly, PPPs should be prevented from opportunistic behaviors as well as from commercial aspects and potential identity or cultural value damages (Borin, 2018). The private sector might, in fact, place their own economic interest before the public interest on which this partnership is grounded upon, undermining the improvement of a public service. Then, information asymmetries, "cherry picking" by private investors, knowledge gaps, underestimation of ROI and cost building projects, and "cold investments" should be considered (Allegro and Lupu, 2018). Information asymmetries refer to substantial

differences in risk sharing among parties, instead, by activating a “cherry picking” selection processes, a project with higher return on investments, whose result might cause a depletion of the public administration financial tensions, might be chosen by the private entity. As concerns knowledge gaps, they might include a programming which does not coincide with the needs of the public authorities and the society, but also a weak governance caused by the administrative inability of the public sector, misalignments in risk sharing, problems in choosing the best projects, and lack of competences and know-how. Further risks might arise from overrating the returns on investments and underrating the related cost building projects. Finally, the use of PPPs, especially if applied to fields of limited profitability like the cultural sector, might generate “cold investments”, unable to ensure sufficient cash flow without a public action. The economic activity of PPP should, in fact, guarantee a profitable management to cover all costs and debts, in compliance with the directives of the private entrepreneurial class, and avoid giving rise to a class of exploiters of public resources.

1.4. Establishment of a PPP Process

Several stages of applications should be undertaken by governments in order to implement a PPP project. The procedure might slightly differ from country to country, consequently, a general view of the process will be provided. In the third version of the *Public-Private Partnership Reference Guide* by the World Bank (2017) is expressed that governments are responsible for defining processes, institutional responsibilities, and key roles for a PPP project. Its development is structured in three stages, namely the establishment of the PPP process, the definition of institutional responsibilities, and the formation of PPP units. In a typical PPP process, the establishment of a project is determined by a previous broader public investment planning and project selection process that mark it as a “priority public investment project” (World Bank, 2017:70). This is followed by three main stages: structure and appraisal of the PPP, design of the PPP contract, and implementation of the PPP transaction.

After the approval of the project, the PPP structure and the key commercial terms need to be established. This determines the establishment of the contract typology, the allocation of risks and liabilities, and payment methods. In this first stage, the appraisal of the suggested PPP structure, as proof of the good project investment, as well as the assessment of the project feasibility, commercial viability, and fiscal responsibilities, should be made through

a business case demonstration. In the second stage, a draft of the PPP contract, in which commercial principles are transformed into contractual terms, is submitted. More specifically, this draft should determine performance requirements, payment methods, adaptation mechanisms, dispute-settlement systems, and deadlines. In the last phase, also known as transaction stage, the government, after conducting a competitive selection process, names the private entity it will collaborate with. This stage can be considered as concluded when a financing agreement has been reached and the PPP project can officially begin. The government is, then, responsible for ensuring that the public asset is managed as established in the contract and economic efficiency is achieved (World Bank, 2017). It should be remarked that the selection of a preferred bidder is part of a competitive, multi-stage process which requires potential candidates to submit several information regarding their competences, technical features, and financial position. Due to the complexity of this procedure, the next paragraph of the dissertation will dwell upon the several steps that compose it.

After establishing how the project will be structured, it is important to confirm the institutional responsibilities and define the roles that each actor will assume during the implementation of the project. This is fundamental to drive forward the PPP process and distribute the daily work. After conducting an accurate review of all the candidates and their documents, the most suitable partner will be selected, and the resulting partnership agreement will allocate the roles and responsibilities of each actor and ensure the beginning of the work. Some governments might also decide to establish PPP units, i.e., team aggregating staff with specific knowledge on PPPs, whose functions vary from policy guidance and capacity building to PPP promotion, technical support, and overseeing.

1.5. Partner Selection Process

An environment that supports both policy and the marketplace is needed in order to establish a successful partnership. With regard to this issue, PPPs necessitate a high level of governance and knowledge of capital markets that, according to the nature of the agreement, require a long period and expertise to flourish. Consequently, only after ensuring that the policy and marketplace climates are efficient to support the partnership and can achieve the set goals, the PPP can initiate. During its development, both the parties discuss their liabilities, as well as risks and benefits. Once identified, the contract can be finally signed

by the parties, and they can start operating (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). A previous step that public parties are required to undertake before the signing of the contract is to ensure that the private actor is the most suitable for the project. As already stated, each PPP is unique and it is important that the private partner owns the required professional abilities for developing and delivering the proposed project. Due to the existence of a wide range of private sectors and subjects (engineering, construction, financial institutions, etc.), the challenge is finding the appropriate partner, and this demands an accurate partner selection process (CDIAC, 2008). The California Debt & Investment Advisory Commission (2008) summarized the procedure and highlighted the main criteria for the selection process. The Commission divided it into four sections: identification of the potential partner, the selection process, partner selection criteria, and review of potential partner submissions. Consequently, a partner should be considered “potential” when a public entity can benefit from the “expertise, knowledge, resources, and experience that the private partner has with project design, finance, management, operations, or other specific project components not usually available to a public agency” (CDIAC, 2008:3).

After identifying a list of potential actors that comply with these requirements, the selection process can begin. Firstly, the public entity should provide the applicants with information about the proposed project, including project parameters, the amount of public contribution, a timeframe, current conditions of the existing facility or suggestions for a new one. Then, a multi-step selection process is adopted, in which the first part consists of a request for quotation (RFQ) to detect a group of bidders, while the second part comprises the partner’s technical proposal, named as request for proposal (RFP). For a better evaluation of each potential partnership, the public entity should also consider the following factors, i.e., project design, project delivery schedule, use of innovation, access to expertise, project financing, and user fee schedule in order to bring the best value to the project. In the submitted documents, the potential partner should also inform the public subject about the history of its business/ organization, the ownership, the organizational structure, and any other relevant data. In the third section, qualification and experience, financial capability, references, risk transference, litigation and controversy, and continued follow-up represent the key criteria for the selection process. Qualifications and experience should indicate the technical expertise of the team members selected for the project and should analyze how they would bring benefits and enhancements (such as accelerated project delivery, access to technology and innovation, transfer of risk, financial tools, and cost-efficiencies) to the

public entity. Professional qualification of a private actor should also reflect previous experiences working with the public sector, as well as include certifications of technical competences, education, and a list of prior project experiences. Financial capability should be, then, evaluated by a public agency to ensure that the private entity has the right number of resources necessary for the implementation of the project. A review of the most recent financial data, statements, and other budget or annual reporting documents (like annual reports and past fiscal performances) should be conducted to verify the financial viability of the potential partner and to confirm the net working capital and net worth of the submission team for the project. An overview of the issues they experienced and solved, should be, then, provided to the public entity. Risk transference is a further criterion that should be considered when dealing with public-private partnerships. One of the advantages of PPPs is that higher risks are attributed to the partner which is better equipped to manage it. Therefore, the public subject should choose the private partner with more experience in reducing risks which could affect the project. A further aspect that should be considered is, then, to make sure that the private partner is not involved in any litigation or material controversy which might negatively influence the project and the reputation of the public entity. A written statement, which proves the private partner to be free from any controversy, is, indeed, required by the public subject to proceed with the collaboration. Finally, it is fundamental that the information submitted by the candidates is updated. By asking for updated material, the public actor can obtain all relevant documents concerning changes, annual information, deletions, or incorporations occurring during the project process and compare them with the documentation previously submitted by the private partner. Furthermore, interviews, as part of the selection process, are scheduled by the public party to get acquainted with potential partners in a direct way and to better evaluate their capabilities. Another key feature of the selection process is that, after reviewing the agreements between the public and the selected private partner, a legal counsel should guarantee the rights and remedies of both the parties, protect them from any possible legal dispute, and include contract clauses.

1.6. PPPs vs. Privatization

A public-private partnership is a topic which has also been misinterpreted several times due to its similarity with privatization, which likewise involves the participation of the private sector and the delivery of public services. Under privatization the accountability for the

delivery of the public service is transferred to the private sector, while under PPPs the ownership of the asset remains unchanged, and the public sector is still responsible for it (UNECE, 2008). However, a definition of privatization, as reported by the California Debt & Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC) in 2007, should be provided for a better comprehension of the issue. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica (2007) and CDIAC (2007:5), privatization is “the economic process of transferring property, such as building, road, or enterprise system that delivers services from public ownership to private ownership”. This phenomenon arises when the government sells a public good or service to a private entity or when it can’t provide a service and transfers the responsibility to the private sector.

The California Debt & Investment Advisory Commission (2007) identified some key operational differences and classified them into three main categories: ownership, structure, and risk. The first difference between PPPs and privatization is the ownership of the asset subjected to the transfer. In P3, the public organization is the direct owner of the good or service and oversees the operations, management, and involvement of the private sector. Instead, when a public asset is made private, its ownership and accountability is completely moved or sold to the private entity. The second difference is the structure of the contract, which indicates the degree of involvement of the two groups. In a PPP the structure of the collaboration is based on a level of flexibility and transparency which allows both parties to determine their amount of participation and maintain the good/service in public ownership. Instead, with privatization, the asset is purchased by the private sector and the public sector is not involved in any managerial or decisional process anymore. The last difference between the two agreements lies in risk sharing. Risk, in fact, relates to the assumption of responsibility for conceptual, operational, and financial threats that might undermine the purposes of privatization or PPPs. According to the principles of equity, in a public-private agreement risk is usually shared by both participants. However, it might also be assigned to the partner that is better capable of preventing a threat from occurring or that could experience significantly less losses related to that risk. It is likely that the private sector will take a risk of commercial nature, while the public sector of residual nature. Nonetheless, due to the changing nature of PPPs, the allocation of risk can vary, and the amount of risk is agreed upon the parties according to the project and the type of contract established. On the contrary, in the privatization process, the private sector, being owner of the asset, is the solely responsible for any risk related to it.

1.7. From Traditional to New Models of PPPs

Traditional PPP models have been progressively replaced by new forms of arrangements which involve multiple stakeholders and incorporate the private entities' managerial skills and knowledges to the social purposes of the public sector. Tracing the history of public administration, new parameters, such as the New Public Management (NPM) and the New Public Governance (NPG), allowed the acquisition of entrepreneurial knowledge and the creation of shared values for efficient public provisions. Trust, networking, and knowledge sharing have, hence, guaranteed a rethinking of governance and managerial cooperation of the public and private sectors, which focuses on more flexible schemes and participatory approaches. A participation that distances itself from vertically integrated models (Borin, 2017) and seeks to overcome recurrent disparities between public and private parties. Moreover, a new tendency, based on a collaborative model, has developed over the past few decades, i.e., collaborative governance. This concept, which likewise belongs to the domain of governance and public administration, has been defined as a policy tool aimed to connect private and public stakeholders with public agencies and act collectively to promote consensus-oriented decision-making methods (Ansell and Gash, 2018). Nonetheless, being PPPs placed in the framework of public administration, a timeline of the administrative shifts in the public sector, from Old Public Administration to New Public Management, and Public Governance, should be added.

1.8. Old Public Administration, NPM, and NPG

The concept of public administration can be traced back to 1887, when the American politician and former President Woodrow Wilson published the founding essay *The Study of Administration*. Different theories concerning this discipline were, then, developed throughout the 20th century, and were mainly influenced by the ideas of the scholars Max Weber, Woodrow Wilson, and Frederick Taylor. The model of Old Public Administration was embedded in political science studies and focused on Max Weber's concept of "Pure Bureaucracy". This model was based on a hierarchical structure, in which public organizations served as the principal actors within society. The legal authority was exercised by an elected official who was responsible for managing the organization, rather than according to the inherited position of an individual (such as a Monarch). It was, then, fundamental that each organization was related to a function, or a location and their

jurisdiction was recognized to ensure a satisfactory level of the public service. Hierarchy was crucial for effective coordination, in fact, a proper level of responsibility was attributed to the leading individual and a fair distribution of services, in compliance with the rules and procedures, was required (Vignieri, 2020). Consequently, the bureaucratic model of Old Public Administration, as based on a “rules-driven rational decision-making process” (Vignieri, 2020:5), was initially able to guarantee efficient and equal services to all people. However, the inner nature of the Weberian model was much more political than administrative, and the role of citizens was essentially limited to mere voters.

By the end of the 1970s, a financial crisis and societal issues like scarcity, pressures of globalization, and governmental corruption, affected the whole globe and the classical model of Old Public Administration was replaced by a new mode with better complied with the needs and demands of that time. This was referred to as New Public Management (NPM) and was adopted from the 1980s to the 2000s as a special measure to redress the balance of the society, restore the confidence of its citizens, and embrace entrepreneurial methods of management (Velotti et al., 2012). Several scholars associated this new phenomenon to the theory of New Institutional Economics, which encouraged the reorganization of the public services and their management process through a market-oriented approach (Vignieri, 2020). The main difference between the old approaches of public administration and this new form of public management lay in the implementation of private sector managerial tools, rather than those of the public sector, to improve the effectiveness of the public services (Osborne, 2006:379; Thatcher, 1993; Vignieri, 2020). Moreover, its main features included hands-on and intra-organizational management, arm’s length organizations and independent contractors, entrepreneurial role of politics, and market usage and classical contracts for the distribution of resources and service delivery (Vignieri, 2020). Another innovation was, then, the integration of the concept of “Value for Money” (VfM) (Borin, 2017:38), which was committed to the promotion of projects or the delivery of public services and complied with the so-called “3 E” requirements: efficiency, effectiveness, and economy. Still today, they correspond to three dimensions, i.e., “spending less” (economy), “spending well” (efficiency) and “spending wisely” (effectiveness) and are guaranteed by the usage of corporate management tools and similar mechanisms (Borin, 2017). It should also be mentioned that New Public Management (NPM) represented one of the parameters, together with the mechanism of New Public Governance (NPG), which allowed the

development of PPPs, and its integration with phenomena, such as privatization and externalization of services (Velotti et al., 2012).

However, some specific limitations, in the use of this management model, emerged. It was, in fact, believed that NPM encouraged decentralization (as cause of policy fragmentation), competition, and incentivization (Vignieri, 2020), and increased the gap between executive and politicians (Christensen et al., 2008; Vignieri, 2020). Consequently, the New Public Management was replaced by a new administrative model of New Public Governance. Although known also as simple governance, public governance, and network governance, its notion is usually associated to the word “new”, and the expression “New Public Governance” is predominantly used (Borin, 2017:39). In general terms, governance is defined as a set of rules, laws, protocols, and administrative procedures, driven by collective decision-making, that ensure access to publicly sustained goods and services (Ansell and Gash, 2007). The concept of NPG evolved by the mid-1990s and was based on the interdependency between multiple actors for the delivery of public services. It relied on people networking, stakeholders’ commitment, and the provision of efficient public services and outcomes for the users and the community (Vignieri, 2020). This model was centered on the idea of collaborative relationships, which diverged from a competition or mere cooperation and corresponded to a wider environment in which people worked together to generate equity. Equity, indeed, determined a democratization of government relationships by giving value to the social counterpart and ensuring the achievement of the common interest and the detachment from the self-interest of several actors involved in the agreement (Velotti et al., 2012). This transparency was due to the collaboration of private and public stakeholders, that acted and interacted together. Also, the use of NPG in the PPP scenario turned into a fundamental constituent for the rethinking process in public management (Velotti et al., 2012). The New Public Governance is, in fact, usually associated with the concept of co-governance, aimed to strengthen the relationship between private and public actors. In this context, co-governance is linked to the concept of co-production, in which managerial tools are exploited by both the parties. Moreover, co-production, whose link with the public sector represents a recent trend in the literature of PPP, considers the active role of people and communities for contributing to generate public value. Consequently, the new culture of PPPs embraces a participatory approach which involve public, private, and local subjects (Fung, 2006; Borin, 2017).

1.9. Collaborative Governance

Ansell and Gash (2007) analyzed the dynamics of this model of governance and discussed the variables that characterize it. Accordingly, their definition identifies it as “a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets” (2007: 544). The term public agency stands for different kinds of public institutions, including bureaucracies, legislatures, and local, state, federal governmental entities. These bodies usually initiate the arrangement procedure and subsequently collaborate with non-state actors, namely citizens and organized groups, that are required for the completion of the process. As the name itself suggest, this type of governance relies on the collaboration between state and non-state stakeholders and is based on their direct engagement in the decision-making process, as intended to reaching unanimity. Collaborative governance features some criteria which differentiate it from more conventional forms of collaborative participation. It is, indeed, defined as a formal collaboration, i.e., it is constituted by an organization and structure and is consensus oriented (Ansell and Gash, 2007). In contrast with other traditional forms of consensus, such as public dispute resolution and mediation, this governance is furtherly centered on public issues (Ansell and Gash, 2007). Moreover, this arrangement should not be confused with other forms of policy making and collaborations, such as adversarialism, managerialism, and public-private partnerships. By adopting an adversarial politics, conflict does not need to be necessarily converted into cooperation, while in managerialism stakeholders are not directly involved in the decision process, but decisions are made individually by public agencies or third parties (Ansell and Gash, 2007). As concerns PPPs, their differences in contrast to collaborative governances should be clarified since the terms are often used interchangeably. Despite collaboration being needed on both sides, PPPs focus on the achievement of coordination between the public and private parties for the provision of goods and services and the proper performance of duties. Collaborative governance, conversely, focuses on the achievement of mutual consensus, defined by the regulation of a collective decision-making process (Ansell and Gash, 2007).

In order to evaluate its efficiency and its process outcomes, a model of collaborative governance has been, then, conceived and has been divided into four variables (starting

conditions, institutional design, leadership, and collaborative process) (Ansell and Gash, 2007). Starting conditions are established in order to facilitate collaboration among different actors and overcome potential divergences or previous discrepancies. Problems, instead, are referred to power and resource imbalances among players involved in the potential agreement and include lack of organizational infrastructure, skill, and technical expertise from weaker stakeholders, which might impact their willingness to take part to the collaboration (Ansell and Gash, 2007). However, despite taking antagonism a negative connotation, a level of conflict could paradoxically contribute to the success of this cooperative agreement. In fact, if the achievement of the same goal is shared among parties and there are not alternative means for its accomplishment, they will be likely to collaborate, regardless of past or current conflicts. Furthermore, according to the variables that feature this model of collaborative governance, leadership might turn out to be an efficient tool to bring participants together and motivate them to harmoniously cooperate. An effective leadership can enhance dialogue, increase trust, and produce mutual benefits (Ansell and Gash, 2007). Successful collaborations also depend on compliance with the rules and protocols that characterize their institutional design, suggest the inclusiveness of all participants for the proper development of the process and prove the exclusion of critical stakeholders to be the main reason for failure (Ansell and Gash, 2007).

The key element of the model is represented by the collaborative process, which is divided into more stages of collaboration. Ansell and Gash (2007:588) have represented it as a “iterative process”, featured by a range of elements to determine its cyclical nature. As a consensus-oriented process, face-to-face dialogue among state and non-state actors is, indeed, the starting point of the collaboration. It requires stakeholders to build foundational trust and transparency and establish a long-term commitment to the process. Commitment also depends on the level of collaboration among stakeholders and their original motivation to take part in the process and is determined by their respect for other points of view and opinions (Ansell and Gash, 2007). Stakeholders are, in fact, expected to achieve a common goal, according to a shared understanding of the strategies and solutions addressed to solve all issues. Also, this process should provide participants with concrete advantages determined by intermediate outcomes and “small wins” from their collaboration (Ansell and Gash, 2007:561). In this way it will be easier for participants to achieve their final expected result. In conclusion, collaborative governance should not be considered the appropriate solution for short-term strategies and plans. Collaborative governance is a time-consuming

process that requires coordination, consensus building, and trust, and cannot be treated rashly and superficially. Through the collaborative process it is possible to build a high level of interdependence among stakeholders which can allow democratic participation, enhancement of public management, and prevent costs of controversial policy making (Ansell and Gash, 2007).

In the last years, collaborative governance has been increasingly associated to proactive policy instruments, i.e., collaborative platforms. They are described as competent organizations or programs for furthering the creation and success of multiple or evolving projects (Ansell and Gash, 2017). They are aimed to mobilize a “multilateral collaborative relationship” (Ansell and Gash, 2018:18) and expand the scope of cooperative governance from a single collaboration to a wider collaborative ecosystem (Ansell and Gash, 2018). The platform, indeed, focuses on the idea of network governance and takes the shape of a network administrative organization that manages a selection of collaborative projects and groups. It embodies the idea of adaptive governance, which works as a strategy to modify and reorganize projects and collaborations as new challenges and opportunities emerge (Ansell and Gash, 2018). Collaborative platforms promote variation by creating a structured space in which many different actors can operate, and proactive and flexible projects develop. They also support integration by incorporating the diverse activities into an interactive system within a structured space (Ansell and Gash, 2018). Additionally, collaborative platforms are known for their role of “strategic intermediaries” (Medd and Marvin, 2007; Ansell and Gash, 2018) between local collaborative projects, national and international resources, and political institutions (Ansell and Gash, 2018). Intermediation should be compensated with a portion of control which, in the framework of collaborative platforms, has been defined as an ecological control. However, an extended control might damage the legitimacy of the collaboration, limit innovation, and synergism. Consequently, it is fundamental for collaborative platforms to develop a good degree of openness, which allows stakeholders to get access to the infrastructures and use their resources.

Despite being openness a key figure for the success of the platforms, excessive openness, if poorly implemented, could have a counter-productive effect and could, in fact, reduce stakeholders’ interest in investing in activities that would not ensure them enough control over the project. Four criteria should be, hence, fulfilled in order to guarantee the success of collaborative platforms and avoid potential risks coming from internal conflicts and

misunderstandings. The first criterion is related to the so-called “attractor effect” (Ansell and Gash, 2018:24), which concerns the establishment of a positive network to stimulate new users to interact with the platform. Platforms, as facilitators of an ever-growing participation, should, in fact, foster collaborations that allow to achieve concrete and flourishing results. The second criterion focuses on the relationship between collaborative governance and learning activities, in which learning represents a tool to ensure the continuity of the collaboration, according to a collaborative knowledge acquisition, developed through interaction (Ansell and Gash, 2018). The third criterion is linked to the achievement of leverage that takes place through the development of shared assets, designs, and standards that can be reached through coordination and governance (Ansell and Gash, 2018). Synergy, as based on interdependent knowledge, expertise, resources, and attitude, is the fourth criterion that can facilitate cooperation among stakeholders (Ansell and Gash, 2018). Finally, all the criteria converge in a singular objective: to lay the foundations upon which a large set of activities may evolve (Ansell and Gash, 2018).

1.10. Innovative practices: P4 model and MSPs

Participatory culture has allowed to shift the focus from the traditional P3 model of public-private agreements to a new, inclusive model where right holders are fully integrated in the implementation process. More specifically, this model, better known as P4 model, stands for “public-private-people partnership”, and provides for the involvement of a further category of stakeholders, i.e., people, including common citizens, the non-profit sector, end-users, and, especially for the cultural sector, philanthropists, donors, volunteers, and crowdfunding. All these actors might be identified as active members of the “third sector”. Also known as voluntary or community sector, it encompasses local inhabitants and consumers, nonprofit organizations, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Several elements distinguish it from the traditional P3 model, starting from the main goal of the partnership that, in contrast with the expectation of ROI from the for-profit sector, is driven by the philanthropic activities, that characterize the no-profit sector, and citizens’ direct engagement.

Recent literature has investigated the different activities carried out by the community in the context of governance models and project planning. Wisa Majamaa (2008), who analyzed this concept in the framework of urban development, defined this model of

agreement as an end-user-oriented method aimed to promote pro-active participation practices for the construction, operation, and management of local, economic, and social infrastructures. Therefore, the whole community's involvement represents one of the prerequisites for a more sustainable attitude towards the disposal and fruition of public goods. Boniotti (2021) underlined that local participation is particularly relevant for the field of urban preservation. Being this environment characterized by a set of socio-economic actors working closely, also simple citizens can become part of this group, serving as co-designers, co-producers, and co-evaluators (Rizzo et al., 2014). This multiplicity of interactions combines with a variety of operational instruments and competences related to different fields (Boniotti, 2021) and highlights the importance of interconnecting people's roles and expertise for the achievement of a shared purpose.

However, the involvement of a third group of actors can also be referred to as a "Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships" (MSPs), which is "a long-term cooperation between public, private, and civic subjects" (Borin, 2018: n.d.). This form of agreement, based on the participatory approach of the P4 model, involves citizens and communities as active actors in the governance and management of public good assets (Borin, 2018). MSPs have been classified as an emerging trend with high potentialities that might be able to ensure the enhancement of the local territory and interests of its community. A growing set of features has emerged to support this partnership, including bottom-up approaches for the management of the territory, shared decision-making process, heightened sense of belonging, production of public resources by civic action, implementation of policy instruments, and mutual funds (Borin, 2018).

2. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural and Creative Sector

2.1. *Economic Relevance of Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI)*

The cultural and creative industry has become of ever-increasing importance in the post-industrial economy and has assumed a key role in the socio-economic development of globalized countries (Malshina and Firsova, 2018). Before dealing with the investment resources and economic factors that contributed to the growth of this sector, an historical overview, and a theoretical framework, aimed to introduce the main features of this sector, should be included. The concept of “cultural industry”, intended as “creation, industrial reproduction, and mass reproduction of cultural works” (Corless, 2012:1) has, in fact, a long history which dates to the 1800s. The phenomenon of industrialization in the 19th century and the shifting from an agrarian to an industrial society led to far-reaching societal and economic changes, which impacted the way of life of people as well as their consumption patterns. This new industrial environment was impacted by several aspects, including urbanization, new affordability, new work force organization principles, liberalization, but also capital concentration, and the power of ideology (Moore, 2014). Moreover, the market forces of innovation and the drive for commercialization led to assess the value of culture in mere economic terms, placing it in the realm of commercial culture and popular culture. This last term, which was originally coined in the 19th century, was later used to define “the ideas, perspectives, attitudes, images and other phenomena within the mainstream of a given culture, especially Western culture, of the early to mid-20th century” (Moore, 2014:742). However, after the end of the World War II, the rise of technological innovations brought the concept of culture closer to mass media and mass distribution, and the term “popular culture” was rapidly substituted with the ones of “mass culture”, “media culture”, “image culture”, and “consumer culture” (Moore, 2014). The issue of culture for mass consumption was faced by several scholars of that period, who presented critical assertions about the new parameters, dictated by mass reproduction and distribution, of culture. It is no coincidence that the first definition of “cultural industry”, as provided by Theodor W. Adorno, one of the most influential members of the Frankfurt School, took a negative connotation. The expression was coined in the early 1940s and was included in the chapter “The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception” of his book, co-written with the sociologist Mark Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, and published in 1944. In this text, the word

“mass culture” was substituted with the term “culture industry” (in a singular form) to indicate that mass culture did not derive from the masses, but it was produced for them. Also, the term was aimed to address the issue of the commodification of culture, as a consequence of the masses’ lack of education. Despite the critical perspective, this notion provided a connection between two fields, culture, and industry, that had always been considered as antithetical until then, and converted artistic practices into a market element of the capitalist production (Moore, 2014).

Cultural industries extended to more sophisticated production and large-scale distribution processes throughout the decades. This global expansion was due to increasing need of including creativity in the socio-economic processes and organization of labor of contemporary societies and determined a variety of new terms, i.e., “creative sector”, “copyright industries”, “content industries”, “experience economy”, “creative business sector”, “art centric business”, “cultural and communication industries”, “media industries”, and “knowledge economies” (Moore, 2014:739) in order to strengthen the economic capability of cultural and artistic assets. It assumed a particular importance for the development of the so-called “creative economy”, a concept that empathizes creativity and introduces it as a tool for technological innovation and business development (Corless, 2012). This connotation contributed to the creation of the term “creative industry”, which laid the groundwork for differentiations between the cultural and creative sector. The expression was used for the first time Australia in 1994, when a new cultural policy, called “Creative Nation” was issued by the government in order to help the Country encompasses new IT and digital media opportunities addressed to the cultural field. The convergence of cultural policy into economic policy also underlined the importance of culture for the national identity and the benefits it could bring in terms of social and financial wellness, innovation, marketing, and design (Corless, 2012). The second country that made use of the term was the UK, after that the New Labor, under Prime Minister Tony Blair, took charge in 1997. The labor government implemented a policy theme which included proposals concerning the creative industries. They also acknowledged that public policies were necessary to connect ICT with creativity for the promotion of businesses, the encouragement of IT training, and the strengthen of intellectual property rights, without which an increasement of the product value and its distribution would have proven impossible (Corless, 2012). In line with the political economy of the Labor Party, the UK Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (2001) defined the creative industries as

“those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for job and wealth creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (Corless, 2012).

Throughout the years, new approaches towards creativity and culture, as well as a range of new definitions and concepts, like content industries and copyright industries, emerged. Despite the differences in defining this industry, which can vary according to the needs and purposes of a nation and its local policies, what these notions have in common is their link with the cultural assets produced by human creativity, whose value chain ensured goods and services to reach people and the market (Corless, 2012). What unifies cultural and creative industries is, then, the main goal of producing, reproducing, promoting, distributing, and commercializing goods, services, and activities of cultural, artistic, and heritage nature (UNESCO, 2009; Corless, 2012). However, there is still some debates concerning cultural and creative industries. In particular, many people are still reluctant to associate creative industries with activities of artistic value. They were, indeed, associated with sectors of separate domain, such as design and advertising. According to today’s definitions, cultural industries are, instead, a part of the cultural sector, which also includes visual arts, performing arts, and cultural heritage (Borin, 2018). Visual arts consist of forms of art whose nature appeals to the sense of sight, such as fine arts (paintings, drawings, and sculpture), crafts, and photography. Performing arts feature the execution of an action of various artistic nature like theater, dance, music (from opera to live music) and cultural events. Cultural heritage, also associated with natural heritage, comprises museums, archeological and historical places, cultural landscapes, and natural heritage. Artifacts, monuments, buildings, and site of historical, artistic, and symbolic significance are, then, part of the cultural heritage, while natural and geological areas, important for the conservation and preservation of natural beauty (natural parks, reserves, zoos, aquaria, botanical gardens) are associated with natural heritage (UNESCO, 2009). Furthermore, cultural industries are centered on creative content-producing industries, that distribute copyrighted materials through mass production, including the categories of audio-visual and interactive media, books, and press. Their cultural asset consists of films and tv programs, broadcasting, record companies, book and magazine publishers, computer games, and leisure software (Artscape DIY, 2020). On the contrary, the creative sector is related to the production of non-cultural goods, such as design, architecture, and advertising (Borin, 2018). What differentiates them from a cultural asset is that the final product is realized

through a creative activity, but its result is not always necessarily a product of cultural nature (UNESCO, 2009). These categories of activities and goods are placed within the framework of creative services and derive from the architecture of buildings and the aesthetic design of objects. Finally, design consultancies, advertising agencies, architecture practices, and digital media firms are the professional fields that constitute the creative industries (Artscape DIY, 2020).

2.2. Global Economic Impact of CCI

As mentioned in previous section, the cultural and creative sector, with one of the highest growing rates in terms of industry and employment, has made a suggestive impact on the global economy. The culture industry, by ensuring social stability and integrity and developing human capital, has become a constituent of economic development and a real form of investment. As stated by Malshina and Firsova (2018), thanks to the rapid development of the cultural industries in the '80s and '90s, new investment strategies were elaborated by industrialized countries. Large businesses and firms from North America and Europe started investing in the cultural sector and its asset, making it a prominent form of profit-making. Accordingly, an empirical analysis of the profitability of the cultural and creative industries should be provided. The World Bank Group (2017) estimated that the creative economy contributed to the 7% of the global GDP and was expected to grow by 10% a year. Clearly, this prediction could not consider the drastic impact that the global pandemic and the Covid-19 had on this sector in 2020 and 2021. Furthermore, despite having CCI a profound social and economic impact on global markets, a lack of comparable and updated statistics at international level underlines how much this sector is still undervalued by policy makers. Nonetheless, Ernst & Young (EY) (2015) conducted one of the most important studies to evaluate the impact of CCI on the global economy, by analyzing the level of revenues and employment of the five continents in 2013. The most relevant search results are, thus, reported in this dissertation, in which a further comparison with more recent data submitted by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2021 is provided.

An amount of US \$ 2,250 billions were globally generated by CCI and 29 million cultural employees (corresponding to 1% of the world's active population) were hired in 2013. It emerged that, within the cultural sector, visual arts and television were the most profitable

fields, generating more than a third of the economic value of the CCI (39% of sales and 35% of jobs). Instead, music, movies, performing arts, and books turned out to be the sector with the highest rate of placement (46%), even if with a low percentage of entries (only 17%). Turnover also changed according to the geographical area, consequently to the different markets, consumer's preferences, and working opportunities. According to the research, the Asia-Pacific region was the world's biggest CCI market, holding a 33% of the global CCI sales (US\$ 743b of revenues) and a 44% of CCI jobs (12.7 million job positions). This might be justified by the fact that APAC still has the largest consumer-based market of the world, with a particular focus on newspapers and videogames. Due to the history and prestige that Europe boasts, it classified as the second region with the largest CCI market, with revenues of US\$ 709b, corresponding to the 32% of the total, and 7.7 million jobs (26% of jobs worldwide). Finally, the third largest CCI market corresponded to North America, whose revenues accounted for a 28% of the global total (US\$ 620b) and whose rate of employment amounted to 16% (4.7 million jobs). Entertainment is the lead-player of the American CCI market, with revenues of US\$ 182b from TV, US\$ 28b from movies, and US\$ 21b from the radio. However, further attention should be paid to the digital realm, having this continent the highest number of consumers of digital cultural content and the highest percentage (47%) of digital distribution and incomes. Moreover, further attention was given to the increasing role that cultural tourism, as a cultural resource and subcategory of the creative economy, were assuming. Ernst & Young (2015) reported that, according to the United Nations, that city centers were inhabited by a 54% of the global population and an increase of 60% was foreseen by 2050. This changing tendency is mainly due to people's interest and ambitions to live a richer cultural life, surrounded by events, activities, and opportunities that a developed city can offer. Furthermore, 1.8 billion of people were between 10 and 24 years old in 2014, laying the foundation for the development of a young society of middle-class consumers, increasingly oriented towards culture. The rise of a new economic class also encouraged the creation of a subclass of creative professionals, better known as the "creative class". This group, developed by the urban studies theorist Richard Florida (Ernst & Young, 2015), indicates all the creative stakeholders (artists, designers, novelists, but also "super-creative" scientists and engineers) who may contribute, according to their means, to the growth of an urban area. Moreover, citizens' request for culture and entertainment operated as an urban growth accelerator, bringing firms, companies, and businesses of various kind to invest in construction and real estate for urban renewal and preservation of cultural and natural heritage. Also, cultural infrastructures and urban

development allowed the advancement of a new city brand that builds on CCI, flagship projects for tourists' attraction, and highly skilled professionals.

Previous data should be integrated with most recent statistics provided by the OECD (2021) in their report on the “economic and social impact of cultural and creative sectors”. Growth models for cultural recovery, as a consequence of the effects that the COVID-19 pandemic had on CCI, have been provided to ensure the survival of this sector worldwide. Pre-pandemic, the EU-27, for instance, had an increase of 11% in employment between 2011 and 2019 (Eurostat, 2021; OECD, 2021). There was also an increase of 20% in the amount of household consumption of culture by inhabitants of G20 countries in the same years. With the arrival of COVID-19 and the beginning of restrictions, cultural and creative sectors and institutions of the EU-27 and the United Kingdom had an earnings collapse of over 30% (around EUR 200 billion) between 2019 and 2020. Economic failures gave rise to mass job losses and intensified pre-existing issues in the field, including lack of employment security and income instability resulting from casual labor. As confirmed by the Eurostat (2021) and OECD (2021), whose data reported that a 32% of the European workforce were self-employed in 2019, a high rate of cultural stakeholders works, in fact, as freelancer or for small or medium-sized firms. COVID-19 also resulted in other detrimental after-effects, such as the post-recession of the sector. It was, indeed, demonstrated by the ICOM survey on museums and museum professionals (2020) that over one-quarter of freelance museum workers were evaluating to permanently change their profession. Alternative solutions have been provided for a cultural recovery, as well as innovative ideas to increase cultural participation and education. After the arrival of COVID-19, employees, organizations, and the public had to seek new ways of cultural engagement, in compliance with social distancing rules and lockdowns imposed by governments. This led to an increasing request for online contents, which largely benefited CCI and their services, from music, cinema, and television to digitalized accesses to museums and theatres. Digitalization in the era of pandemic also generated new opportunities for both the economic and territorial growth of diversified areas. New models of creative tourism, focused on cultural-led local developments, indeed, emerged. Digital attractiveness translated the interest of people from a virtual to a physical tourism demand, stimulating public and private entities to implement strategic plans to revive cities, towns, and neighborhoods through culture, after the long period of Covid lockdown. In this perspective, recovery and public investment funds allowed the experimentation of new local development projects to cope with new challenges

and opportunities. Nonetheless, technological progress and the growth of demand for cultural products and experiences require funding and investments for their development. Potential, innovative cultural projects need, thus, to be incorporated to national and local development policies to obtain credit and venture capital. Measures of tax exceptions or incentives by private subjects for cultural heritage conservation and production of cultural assets represent further typologies of economic support. The role of the private sector in financing innovative projects for the cultural sector turned out to be particularly effective throughout the years, which is why many public entities has decided to adopt collaborative mechanisms, such as public-private partnerships, for the sphere of culture.

2.3. Funding Mechanisms for the Cultural Sector

Different models of financing, from public funds and tax reliefs to direct and indirect private investments, can be applied to cultural and creative industries and classified into three sources: public support, private support, and earned income. A definition for each category was provided by the directorate general for internal policies (Čopič et al., 2011). Public support was divided into two main sub-fields, i.e., public direct and public indirect support for culture. The first subset includes any form of financial aid, such as grants, subsidies, and awards, provided by the government or other public entities. The second subset refers to any method, implemented by a public body through legal means, in which money are not transferred from the public institution to the cultural organization. More specifically, they are represented by vouchers, matching grants, other banking and financial plans, and lottery funds. As regards private support, it was defined as any form of “investing in, giving to or spending on culture done by individuals, businesses or non-public organizations” (Čopič et al., 2011:9). It was split into three subgroups, i.e., business support, individual giving, and foundations/trusts. The first subset refers to direct investments for monetary return and includes public-private partnerships, sponsorships, investments in arts collections, corporate giving. The second subset includes all donations and contributions by individual actors. The third subgroup, instead, encompasses support from grant-giving organizations, sustained by private actors, such as foundations and trusts. Finally, the last group, earned incomes, represents any expenditure on culture made by people, such as registration fees to cultural institutions, the purchase of artworks and cultural objects, entrance ticket, etc.

It should be reminded that the cultural field has always been influenced by the presence of the public sector, including government, state, agencies, and other public entities. This, however, differs from country to country; consequently, as reported by Malshina and Firsova (2018), different models of financing culture can be implemented. More specifically, in the European model a meaningful portion of public funds and tax incentives are addressed to culture in order to facilitate private investments. In developed European countries, state subsidies for culture vary from 75 to 100 % and many European nations make use of financial tools like patronage, sponsorship, and fundraising to encourage further funds. A different approach is adopted by North America, where private entities and individuals have a predominant role and just few public funds are reserved for culture. A minimum contribution is given to culture by the government in the US, while other forms of financial support, like sponsorship and fundraising, are mainly used to attract capital. On the contrary, Great Britain, also due to the importance that the cultural industry assumes for the economic welfare of the country (5.4% of the UK economy and 6.2 % of the GDP in 2018), makes use of a huge amount of private capital for the development of culture and tourism. The mechanism of “private finance initiative” (in which private financings for national cultural organizations related to the UK government are to be guaranteed) is predominantly used.

Furthemore, a general view of the different measures of state support for the development of CCI have been provided by Malshina and Firsova (2018). They correspond to financial support (such as public-private partnerships, tax incentives, guarantee schemes, budget subsidies, financial and credit mechanisms, seed and venture capital), production support (including mass participation in the chain of production of creative goods and services, creation of specialized creative clusters and service centers), market support (marketing support, proximity to the consumer, copyright and related rights), educational support (programs for the development of creativity through the system of education), and strategic management and policy support (mobility of creative workers, flexible labor markets, creative start-ups, strategic documents, and road maps for the advancement of creative industries).

The key role of the private actors in collaborating with public bodies is one of the main topics discussed in this dissertation. The benefits obtained through the establishment of long-lasting agreements, such as public-private partnerships, is the result of an efficient

strategy aimed to strengthen the organization, management, and governance of a cultural asset. Consequently, a deeper analysis of the different typologies of private investment in the cultural sector should be conducted. As reported by Čopič et al. (2011), private investments can be placed within four subcategories, i.e., direct/ capital investments, sponsorship, donations/ patronage, and earned income. The main goal of the first group is the achievement of profit, the second group, instead, aims to obtain brand recognition for the business, as well as benefits for the cultural organization. The third group is primarily committed with the spreading of social, symbolic, and similar non-economic values that might benefit culture in all its forms. Finally, the last group, as previously exemplified, might be also classified as an independent mechanism of cultural financing. In this framework, several mechanisms for the deployment of private capital have been established. They are opposed to public subsidies and grants and are defined as forms of indirect public support of culture, which, as already underlined in the previous paragraph, represent one of the main three sources for financing culture. As illustrated by Čopič et al (2011), they include tax incentives for donors, consumers and sponsors, stimulations for fundraising through matching grants, public-private partnerships, intermediary mechanisms, publicly funded vouchers, and banking schemes for loans. It follows an explanation of each of these measures.

Tax incentives are measures of taxation applied to any kind of cultural consumption. The most common example is VAT reduction, which is addressed to cultural goods, services, and objects. Another widely used tax incentive is the percentage legislation, in which a part of the income tax is allocated by taxpayers to a cultural organization. Sponsorship is also known as “support with returns” (Čopič et al., 2011:42) since the sponsor’s main purpose is to achieve a direct or indirect return, including benefits for its business and brand reputation. As the main topic of this dissertation, it is fundamental that PPPs are mentioned again, also in this context. They are referred to as an agreement between the public and private sector for the delivery of a public service and are based on managerial duties and risk sharing. Another form of private investment is, then, represented by donations, which can be individual or corporate. Individual donations can be in-cash or in-kind and are not driven by quest for profit. They are usually motivated by social and sustainable values, although some countries have offered them deductions for increasing benefactors’ contribution. Corporate donations are, rather, in-cash or in-kind gifts that cultural organizations and artists receive from firms and other legal bodies. Another source is

represented by lottery funds, through which private money are raised and allocated to organizations for cultural aims, in compliance with a legal obligation. Private investment in culture can be also encouraged using vouchers, which are monetary credits for a particular purpose. On the contrary, through the budgeting practices of earmarked taxes, all the incomes are addressed to a specific group or program. Then, banking schemes are means of direct support from the banks to the cultural field, which include loan schemes, interest rates, and so forth. There also institutional bodies, like foundations, arts, and business organizations, that are aimed to support culture. Foundations are a form of non-profit organization that provide cultural organizations with in-cash and in-kind donations, as well as other sources of funding for charitable purposes. On the other hand, arts and business organizations are specialized agencies that strengthen the relationship between business companies and the art field by delivering services, like training and awareness training activities. Another form of financial contribution addressed to culture that is becoming increasingly popular among investors, is the venture philanthropy (VP), whose aim is to increment the social impact of a cultural organization by applying principles and techniques of venture capital management and investment, such as long-term investments and assistance in capacity-building. Finally, other emerging mechanisms which are increasingly being used among arts supporters are systems of crowdfunding and online fundraising, which allow to easily collect money raised by individuals and entities of various kind.

2.4. PPPs for the Cultural Sector

The nature of public-private partnerships, as a financing mechanism addressed to the development of a public service, is perfectly suited to the artistic and cultural context of today's societies. As claimed by Borin (2017), the development of PPPs in the cultural sector was fundamental for a reshaping of the public administration and a rethinking of the cultural management. The principle of application remains unchanged and the public good is temporarily allocated to a private body which assumes the liability risks of this partnership (Malshina and Firsova, 2018). However, a substantial difference among "traditional" PPPs and PPPs for culture exists and concerns the function of interest for the good of the community. As previously underlined, different scenarios may occur, from charity and patronage, whereby altruistic interests have a higher value than potential image returns, to sponsorship, that, instead, focuses on the return that investors can deduct. This last phenomenon should be, in fact, considered as a real brand-directed activity, focused on

marketing mix processes and commercial operations (Russo, 2009). As concerns cultural industries, PPPs are perceived as a managerial, contractual, economic model, in the form of official document, of cultural and financial interest, aimed to obtain mutual benefits. However, this agreement can be also extended to other fields of the arts and culture, including museums or institutions dealing with educational, social, historical, and leisure projects. A public-private partnership for CCI represents, then, a joint investment of resources for the creation of socio-cultural projects that require a stimulus of innovation (Malshina and Firsova, 2018). On this last issue, Malshina and Firsova (2018) affirmed that one of the principles of PPPs for financing cultural services is innovation. It was stated that scientific and technical novelties, as well as new financial and informational technologies, could guarantee a consolidation between the different layers of formation, promotion, and execution of cultural and creative services, in addition to good business processes, an excellent management of material flow and capital movement, and a quality of services in line with the global market demand.

According to the previously mentioned functions of interest, which distinguish “traditional” forms of PPPs from PPPs addressed to the cultural field, also specific typologies suited for cultural purposes, exist. Life Cycle Contracts (LCC) turned out to be an effective tool for the innovation of cultural venues, like galleries and museums, and the launch of new cultural objects (Malshina and Firsova, 2018). The LCC is a contract form of PPP that belongs to the Design – Build – Finance – Maintain (DBFM) model, a project delivery method similar to the Design – Build – Finance – Operate (DBFO), which was formulated on the basis of the “Private Finance Initiative” model (Malshina and Firsova, 2018). In a LCC, indeed, a public entity signs an agreement with a private actor for designing, building, and managing a facility. After the project is commissioned, a public institution pays for it, instead, the cultural asset is maintained by the private sector for its entire life cycle (which might last more than 40 years). More specifically, a private financier oversees the construction or reconstruction of an asset for public usage, while a public entity pays for the services to ensure their use. This fair distribution of tasks and risks should, then, ensure a reduction of costs and a general optimization of the operational processes for its realization and development (Malshina and Firsova, 2018).

2.5. Opportunities for PPPs: Cultural Ecosystems

The benefits that the cultural sector might bring to the territory and its local reality should be referred to an emerging framework of “ecological interrelationships” that is at the root of “cultural ecosystems”. This new tendency is also known as “ecology of culture”, which stands for “the complex interdependencies that shape the demand for and production of arts and cultural offerings” (Borin, 2018, n.d.). As sustained by Holden (2015), culture is a sort of “regenerative life cycle” of three interactive spheres, namely publicly funded culture, homemade culture, and commercial culture (Borin, 2018) and should be perceived as an ecology, rather than an economy. Cultural ecologies are, thus, an elaborate system of research that make use of “cultural shared values” to furtherly validate the cultural sector and ensure the exploitation of its potential. The concept of “cultural shared value” places, in fact, itself as the key element of a hybrid approach in which the social impact of the public and third sector merges with the incentives of the private entities (Allegro and Lupu, 2018). Moreover, the creation of value is a topic of relevance in the field of cultural heritage, due to its identification as common and public good. This is the result of a convergence between the public value, i.e., social well-being, and the private value, represented by the economic value, which gives rise to the creation of a socially and economically driven cultural value. In this scenario, the implementation of PPPs should guarantee a market-driven process capable of combining the economic and financial with the socio-cultural objectives of this partnership. As explained by Allegro and Lupu (2018), in the view of PPPs, the cultural shared value could represent a reliable means for the valorization of the cultural asset and the management strategies of private entities could be framed within the perspective of “social impact investments”, which might also be integrated with the contributions from citizens and civilians as representative of an innovative hybrid approach, rather than a mere act of philanthropy. In this view, the public administration assumes a relevant position in shifting the mission and vision of private firms from a “profit per se to a shared value for all” and acting as a stimulus for the “production and distribution of the best cultural shared value for money” (Allegro and Lupu, 2018:3-4).

According to the cultural identity of a territory, the implementation of effective cultural ecosystems, allows, then, the creation of sustainable environments, as provided by the collaboration of a group of actors with the shared interest of supporting this field. These ecosystems should be identified as a sort of virtual cycle made of public authorities/ public cultural institutions, cultural and creative industries, other stakeholders (such as associations and citizens), and other sectors of the territory (Borin, 2018). Also, cultural ecosystems

represent a new managerial phenomenon that is detached from the traditional micro-approaches and oriented towards meso level perspectives featuring new governance and management models. Indeed, they better comply with cultural policies and can also implement micro-level strategies, impact tourism, and foster culture for the local growth (Borin, 2018). This perspective also opens to a further trend of research, in which PPPs and MSPs are utilized for the strengthening of cultural ecosystems. A more flexible interpretation of PPPs and their functions, in which public-private collaborations are fully integrated in the ecosystems at a meso territorial level, is, indeed, provided (Borin, 2018). In this context, the governance structure of PPPs is characterized by rules, procedures, and guidelines based on “trans-sectoral research perspectives” (Borin, 2017:51). The latter are related to analogous fields of research, such as tourism, which share the same purposes of reshaping and redeveloping the territory. According to a multi-stakeholder partnership model and governance mechanism, PPPs can, thus, implement highly detailed urban/regional development plans by relying on a wide range subject (public bodies, private entities, people, and communities) on multiple levels.

2.6. PPPs for Cultural Heritage

The preservation of heritage and urban revitalization have turned out to be the major fields of application of PPPs in the cultural realm. It has been demonstrated that PPPs have been mainly used in this field for purposes of “digitalization, online access and digital preservation, conservation of immovable heritage, and managing of cultural services” (RICHEs, 2016:5). A further field of application has, then, recently emerged, which includes digital technologies for the creation of artworks, events, and artistic expressions. This also refers to activities, such as virtual performances, streaming performances, and augmented reality, which might encourage the development of new partnerships between the public and private sphere (RICHEs, 2016). RICHEs (2016), which stands for “renewal, innovation, and change: heritage and European society”, carefully discussed these four categories, whose descriptions are integrated in this dissertation.

Digitalization, online accessibility, and digital preservation, as the first goal pursued by the European Commission and their Member States, was included in order to preserve the memory, identity and cohesiveness of the European community, as well as a way to address direct funds for financing national digital conservation. Examples of this activity might be

referred to online portals and digital archives dedicated to works and artifacts of various kind. Furtherly, the implementation of PPPs for digitalization projects might be a good opportunity to unify the experience of public institution in archiving with the knowledge, software, and proficiency of the private sector in digitalization processes (RICHERS, 2016). The RICHERS analysis also considered the impact of the virtual realm on traditional cultural heritage, emphasizing the several changes made by digital practices, including “transformations of physical spaces, places and territories, and digitization on performance-based cultural heritage” (RICHERS, 2016:14).

As concerns the second purpose, the conservation of immovable heritage (intended as a cultural site or the renovation of an old, historic building) is a complex topic which requires PPP insiders a great effort in setting up restoration processes and ensuring the preservation of the cultural asset in the long-term. A multiplicity of professionals from different working fields, a multifaced approach, and an integration of conservation practices with financial, societal, and sustainable strategies is needed. In the framework of PPP recovery projects, historic buildings can be also converted into new venues for commercial and accommodation purposes. This typology of project can, in fact, benefit both the site, by preserving the original location, and private actors, by making it a huge estate investment with high returns on investments. Nevertheless, if the new destination or use of the public building is not well received by the community, their opposition could even block the beginning or execution of the works. Consequently, it is important to consider citizens’ opinion and integrate it in the process through a participative approach. Moreover, another form of PPP for cultural heritage, that relates to the management of a cultural site, is the so-called “Concession Contract” (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014; RICHERS, 2016). In this form of agreement, a government signs with a private company, that is responsible for paying the whole operations in exchange of a profit from the sale of tickets.

The third purpose, which corresponds to the management of cultural services, includes different forms of movable heritage. Assets like arts collections can be supervised both by the public and private sector individually; however, an agreement between the two parties could guarantee a better exhibition activity and museum administration. What should be mentioned, as underlined in the report by RICHERS (2016), are also new potential areas, such as the un-displayed collections, in which the use of PPPs could prove to be extremely useful. Indeed, by collaborating with private actors, public museums and galleries could

foster travelling exhibitions of their un-displayed works, by lending pieces of art to other public or private institutions. This might be an opportunity for both cultural venues and private collectors to show their assets to a larger and diversified audience. Another field of application for PPPs might be, then, art storage, whereby the modern, structured, and sophisticated facilities of the private sector might be unified with the expertise of the public sphere in packaging, cataloguing, and inventory management practices. For instance, some museums established a rental agreement or service contract with private bodies or private sectors made use of public collection management tools and curatorial practices for their spaces. As for educational purposes, partnering with a private entity (in this case a private technology and service supplier) might be a valid strategy for museums to create new experiences, through the adoption of digital media, technologies, and multimedia tools, and unlock opportunities for visitors and new generations. Similarly, partnerships between the public sector and private technology developers could lead to the implementation of digital technologies, such as virtual and augmented reality applications, for the creation of innovative cultural expressions, including virtual and streaming performances, and could contribute to an artistic renewal to be integrated with previous traditional spaces and artifacts.

2.7. The Role of PPPs in Preserving Heritage

The first aim of a conservation project is to support the cultural relevance attributed to the corresponding building, venue, or site. This objective, however, needs to combine with the expectations of the private sector to gain revenues from its services and activities. Despite their divergent goals, if the two partners are willing to cooperate, they can easily reach their expected results in terms of socio-cultural sustainability (for the public sphere) and profits and financial sustainability (for the private sphere). Moreover, PPPs focused on heritage assets are to be associated with market-based development projects, rather than rehabilitation projects (whose sole objective is the conservation of the asset). This partnership demands, in fact, high levels of government supervision, a wide comprehension of the real estate market, and specialized know-how due to its value and identity (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). On the other hand, these operations take place in degraded places or buildings that require specific intervention. Consequently, they can represent an incentive for both private and public parties to revitalize the venue and its surrounding area, with a view of developing a conservation plan (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). This integrates the

market-based perspective with regeneration practices, aimed to show all the benefits the project can provide to the place itself, its community, and its benefactors.

PPPs can, thus, allow the revitalization of historical city centers and the re-evaluation of publicly owned historical venues or industrial heritage buildings, such as former factories, stations, etc. They are rented by private real estate firms that, stimulated by revenues opportunities, convert them into new venues of a commercial nature (from art venues, restaurants to private residences) (Borin, 2017). This function of PPP can be referred to the traditional trend of research which places this partnership at a micro level, namely focusing on the management and governance of single, established PPP projects. In relation to this approach, different policies, according to the country, can be implemented for the management of cultural heritage. However, each nation makes use of a centralized model in which activities are handled by private companies, but supervised by public cultural institutions, in compliance with a project-based public-private partnership model where managerial practices are implemented and skills and resources distributed (Schuster, 1998; Borin, 2017). Part of this first trend of research, is also the contracting out of enhancement-related activities, which is the most widespread model of PPP in heritage administration (Stewart and Walsh, 1994; Borin, 2017). These are, in fact, performed by the private sector, while conservation-related responsibilities are addressed to public bodies. However, it should be clarified that, when dealing with traditional models of PPPs for heritage conservation projects, the adoption of different typologies of institutionalized and contractual PPPs could slightly diverge from the ones of infrastructure partnerships as conventionally intended (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Indeed, as illustrated in the first chapter, several PPP subcategories, typical of nonheritage projects, exist. Some of them have been deemed fit for preservation purposes and have been converted into specific PPP types for heritage conservation (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). They include buy - conserve - operate (BCO), (from buy – build – operate model, BBO), in which the heritage asset is purchased by a private or third sector while its safeguard is ensured by the government. In build- conserve-operate-transfer (BCOT) and build- conserve-operate-transfer (BCLOT), (from buy - own - operate -transfer, BOOT, and buy - lease - operate - transfer, BLOT), the conservation of a historic building is established through a long-term lease agreement and the ownership of the structure is returned to the public sector just after the fulfillment of the terms of the lease. Finally, in conserve – build – finance – operate (CBFO) (resulting from design - build – finance – operate, DBFO), the private sector is

responsible for funding the construction and preservation of heritage assets of large-scale projects (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014).

2.8. Criticisms

Despite the relevance that the cultural market has been gradually assuming at global level, some criticisms from private entities on the supposed lower profitability of this sector, as compared to other professional fields, still exist. At European level, for instance, the largest funds for PPP projects are allocated to the transport sector, while sectors like education and culture, are considered fields of non-utilitarian value (as opposed to PPP projects involving medicine, transportation, waste management, and water supply) (Malshina and Firsova, 2018). The same skepticism is shared by a part of the public sector itself, that, sometimes, decline direct support funds to institutes for the conservation of cultural heritage or diminish its available resources, regardless of their recognized social value and economic potential (RICHERS, 2016). This apparent lack of interest from both parties might be, in part, motivated by the fact that developing projects for new buildings is much easier than working on conservation projects of cultural and historical value, as the level of risks and responsibilities is significantly higher. One of the key challenges for conservation projects involving PPPs is, thus, the allocation of risks. As it happens in other working fields, it is unlikely that the private sector will accept a high risk without any guarantee of economic return or concession from the public sector. On the other hand, intricate governmental regulations might decelerate the project and negatively affect the work and contribution of the private sector. The public bodies should, consequently, ensure an appropriate regulatory framework to overcome the bureaucratic obstacles of the government. It is, hence, fundamental for private entities to comply with four key factors, known as the “4 Cs”, through which the reduction of risks can guarantee the redevelopment of historical areas, buildings, and sites. They include clarity about the elements that require conservation and renovation, certainty about the regulatory environment, consistency in the execution of regulations, and consultation and communication between the two parties (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014).

As reported by Macdonald and Cheong (2014) another challenge of PPP conservation projects concerns the so-called “unifying features”, such as street views, archeological sites, and historical elements that contribute to its value. The solution, that the authors suggested,

is exemplified by the implementation of Conservation Management Plans (CMPs), a model, mainly used in UK and Australia, through which conservation projects are managed by a skillful team of conservation specialists, with the contribution of the site owner. This approach might be associated to the traditional “master plan”, a large-scale comprehensive planning tool for the growth and development of the urban environment and its surrounding areas, building, and neighborhoods. This model can easily attract potential investors by guaranteeing proper solutions to benefit their financial interests and community needs. Furthermore, further solutions can be implemented in order to mitigate risks, as for the use of SPVs. As underlined in the previous chapter, a special purpose vehicle refers to a third-party organization, created specifically for institutionalized PPPs, in charge of running a project. The creation of this separate legal entity, constituted by members of the public, private, and non-profit sectors, would represent a proper solution for PPP heritage and conservation projects, whose risks, in comparison with the private sector solely performing the same duties, would be significantly reduced (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Finally, Macdonald and Cheong (2014) provided a further option for addressing risks, which concerns stakeholder engagement for the redevelopment of government-owned assets in historical city areas. Through stakeholder consultations, PPP proposals would, in fact, fulfill with the expectations of the community, whose collaboration in the PPP project would also reduce potential controversies and delays and secure public support to initiate the process.

2.9. Evaluation of Successful Strategies for Cultural Heritage

Especially for the cultural heritage, the establishment of a successful PPP strategy might turn out to be a challenging task. There is, in fact, a lack of reliable indicators capable of monitoring the development of a conservation project and assess its value. Furtherly a successful partnership is supposed to bring environment benefits to improve the public space, its habitat, and eco-sustainability and to appropriately value the area for a positive perception of the surrounding heritage (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). A solution was found by the Heritage Dividend Methodology, through the creation of an evaluative methodology that proved to be a valid source for assessing the success of PPPs for heritage projects. This approach is based on the English Heritage evaluation method, which was conceived to measure the impact of grants that English Heritage had on urban regeneration project. Accordingly, the success of the evaluative method was determined by physical, economic, and social outputs, such as the amount of buildings improved, the creation of

employment and new collaborations, increase in tourism, profit generation, safety and urban revaluation, community participation, and the rising quality of local activities. If fully respected, this method should guarantee the success of the project and the achievement of its goals, if they comply with the collaborative requirements proper to this partnership. As part of a collaborative relationship, four criteria should be adopted to properly evaluate the achievements of PPP objectives for cultural heritage: trust building, participation, training, and simplification. Trust building is based on a bi-directional conversation that ought to allow individuals to communicate with both the public and private entities and express their own ideas. Considering that the public body consists of both the public administration and citizens, people's participation should be, then, ensured. Lastly, a personnel training to fill the gaps of both the parties, together with a simplification of administrative procedures that might slow down conservation and urban regeneration processes, should be guaranteed (RICHES, 2016).

3. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural Sector in Italy

3.1. Management of the Cultural Sector and National Heritage in Italy

Due to its priceless artifacts, monuments, and buildings, Italy has been defined as an open-air museum with the highest number of UNESCO World Heritage Sites (Borin, 2017). In 2017, it was estimated that 4889 cultural assets, including museums, monuments, and archaeological sites could be found (Beretta et al., 2019). The extension and diversification of the Italian cultural heritage demands an articulated system of governance, in which its management and preservation are assigned to public authorities, and the power is centralized at the state level (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Article 9 of the Italian Constitution, in fact, declares that "the Republic shall promote the development of culture and scientific research; it shall care for the nation's historical and artistic heritage." This statement underlines that Italian heritage is property of the nation, which is intended as a sort of community where preservation duties are distributed among State and local governments (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Consequently, the management of culture is determined by an articulated governance structure, based on the interrelation between national, regional, and local bodies. This system is the result of an evolution process that have established a series of legislative provisions and administrative measures addressed to culture over the years. However, from 1980s, more flexible systems of protection and promotion were integrated to the traditional state-controlled systems on culture. A timeline of the most relevant regulatory measures, aimed to finance cultural initiatives and organizations, as well as to support the economy and employment within this field, should be mentioned. As stated by Landriani and Pozzoli (2014), the real turning point occurred during the 1990s, a period which saw the introduction of new sectorial guidelines and rules for the public administration and brought important changes to cultural organizations and the heritage sector. The reform of local authorities and self-government (Law 142/1990) extends, in fact, the management of public services to autonomous special agencies, which might also include the participation of private firms in the process. Subsequently, the introduction of the "Ronchey's Law" (Law no. 2/93) has brought about a revolutionary change in the relationship between the public and private sector, by allowing private actors and providers to manage additional services in state museums (such as cafeterias, bookshops, and merchandise). In 1998, a special decree (112/1998) was, then, issued in

order to provide a proper classification of cultural heritage related activities (namely preservation, restoration, management, enhancement, and promotion) and distinguish the function of conservation, entrusted to the State, from the one of management, commissioned to the Regions.

New institutions, which laid the foundation for the current model of governance, were established between the end of 20th century and the beginning of 21st century. The new Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, whose competences were extended to recreation and sport activities, was created in 1998 through the legislative decree 368/1998. Despite the excessive bureaucracy still characterizing the Italian cultural system, the introduction of a government body which involved not only cultural heritage, but also tourism and entertainment contributed to acquire an extended vision of the value of each cultural asset. Another important innovation related to this field was the Constitutional law 3/2001, which reformed the Title V of the Constitution by increasing the power of Regions for the valorization of the territory and its cultural goods. Subsequently, the national financial law for 2002 year (act 448/2001) allowed the State (art. 33) and local authorities (art. 35) to subcontract both accessory and cultural heritage services to private firms (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). In 2004, the legislative decree no. 42/2004 promulgated a new Code of cultural heritage and landscape in order to substitute obsoleted regulations and establish a stronger relationship with private entities (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Moreover, as a result of this legislation, the administration of cultural heritage can be traced to two main groups of activities: preservation tasks, linked to national authorities, and enhancement tasks, carried out by both central public figures and private entities.

The Ministry of Culture (MiC) is the central authority in charge of safeguarding and protecting cultural heritage at the present time. It consists of a variety of internal divisions, which include Central Offices, General Directorates, Central Institutes, and associated organs. This segmentation allows central authorities and directorates to support the general objectives of the national cultural policy, by focusing on the promotion and valorization of different sub-sectors of culture (cultural heritage, fine arts, national archives, libraries, museums, cinematography, performing arts, tourism). It should be also underlined that this administrative body was subject to structural changes over the years and saw the development of new organizations, regulations, and an alternation of designations which included and excluded tourism from the ministerial body. However, regions play an

important role in the definition of conservation, cataloging, and restoration of heritage. This is due to the establishment of peripheral administrative structures, known as superintendencies, that collaborate with local entities for the promotion and development of cultural and landscape heritage, museums and archives, tourism, and urban planning at regional level. In addition, some superintendencies, known as Special Superintendencies, have been empowered with a special authority to safeguard five exceptional sites of historical value, e.g., Rome, Florence, Venice, and Naples, and to give their museums greater autonomy in terms of management and governance (Borin, 2017).

According to the statistics provided by Mic in 2014, the 63.8 % of cultural institutions and assets were public, while 36.2 % were privately owned. Among them, 41.6 % was municipal, 10% ecclesiastical, and 9% were property of the Ministry (Borin, 2017). The Italian legislation on cultural heritage establishes that its protection must be under the supervision of the State and national authorities. However, as previously underlined, protection related activities can be undertaken by both public and private parties, whose contribution is fundamental for the enhancement of the cultural venue or asset. Moreover, although Italy, due to its immense and invaluable heritage, is mainly focused on preservation activities, is also aimed to foster its cultural identity through a range of activities which include the promotion of reading, urban development, performing and visual arts, cinema, research and innovation, and the spread of Italian cultural traditions abroad (Čopič et al., 2011). In this respect, public authorities are mainly involved in activities concerning cultural heritage, museums, archives, and, to a certain degree, performing arts, instead, private actors are used to providing more support to cultural industries through means of advertising or access to the market (Čopič et al., 2011).

Nonetheless, as demonstrated by Eurostat data (2011), the public expenditure for cultural services fluctuated between 5 and 7 billion euros per year, with an incidence of 0.3-0.4 % on the national GDP. Although in Germany, UK, Spain, and France, the percentage was equivalent, the link between public support and culture was not proportionate to the amount of goods spread all over the Italian territory. It should be, in fact, declared that, if compared with the previously mentioned countries, the contribution of public expenditure was below average in Italy (Beretta et al., 2019). The limited funds that Italy yearly allocates to culture are mainly due to the misconception that cultural assets should not be used to obtain an economic return and that the apparent commodification of the arts would jeopardize their

status symbol. Furthermore, the excessive bureaucracy that characterizes the administration of this country, make the Italian system inflexible and extremely protective in the cultural field. This rigid approach is the result of an overproduction of norms and excessive legislation (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014), which adversely affect internal decisions and the hierarchy of the system of governance. Indeed, there is a lack of managerial approaches and a shared and transparent administration that allow to focus on appropriate accounting techniques and create external reports (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Finally, as previously claimed, the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage fall within the competency of the State and its units. This idea of focusing greater attention on the first phases of the cultural chain (safeguard and preservation), rather than the subsequent steps (management, enhancement, and enjoyment), and on the inviolable value of the cultural asset, rather than potential economic advantages resulting from its promotion, limits the intervention of private partners (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Also, without the involvement of private actors, the adoption of corporate tools and instruments by public bodies is often denied or implemented with difficulties.

3.2. Public-Private Partnerships in the Italian Cultural Sector

Potential legislative restrictions, additional costs and issues concerning the intended use of certain spaces and venues, have surely discouraged private parties from participating in initiatives and projects of cultural interest. However, the large number of cultural assets located in Italy and the increasing tax benefits granted by the State to potential financiers have stimulated the development of further collaborations among different stakeholders. Furthermore, private involvement in the cultural sector is facilitated by the new Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape which, according to the previously mentioned Legislative Decree 42/2004 and Law 137/2000, allows private organization, namely “institutions, foundations, associations, consortia, companies, or other subjects, constituted or participated” (Trupiano, 2005:339), to carry out indirect administrative activities for a fair exploitation of cultural resources. Activities also include services of hospitality and cultural assistance to be assigned to third parties involved in the concession agreement (Trupiano, 2005).

In Italy, PPP is regulated by the Public Contract Code and defined by the article 180 of the Legislative Decree n. 50/2016 as a contract for pecuniary interest through which administrations allow one or more economic operators to realize, transform, preserve, and

manage a specific work in exchange for its economic exploitation or provision of a related service for a specific period. The implementation of public-private partnerships in the field of cultural heritage valorization represents an alternative management tool which has been producing significative results. According to the previously mentioned Italian Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape and the related Ministerial Decrees, it might, thus, affirmed that the main functions of PPPs are primarily related to the safeguarding (Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape, articles 18-19), protection, (article 30, M.D. of 10 May 2001), conservation (Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape, article 29, M.D. of 10 May 2001) research (Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape, article 118, M.D. of 10 May 2001), cultural management (M.D. of 10 May 2001), support (Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape, articles 110-120, M.D. of 10 May 2001) local economic development (M.D. of 10 May 2001), fruition and valorization (Fondazione ANCI and Federculture, 2013). The commitment of the involved parties in the achievement of shared purposes allows, then, to overcome the abovementioned limits and improve the efficiency of the partnership (Pignatti, 2022). PPPs have demonstrated to be effective instruments of cultural policy, since the direct involvement of private actors in preservation-related projects has never affected the principle of unitary heritage preservation which the Italian Constitution establishes (Dubini et al., 2012). In their relationship with public entities, private actors are usually involved in additional activities and external processes through means of outsourcing and contracting out (Trupiano, 2005). The wide number of legislative provisions and the different cultural institutions to which they can be applied have led to the implementation of several models of cooperation, that could be easily exploited by the Italian public administration for protection and improvement purposes. These models are mainly referred to by experts as cultural patronage (*mecenatismo* in Italian), sponsorship, foundations of participation, and special forms of PPP. Moreover, additional models of PPPs, which are still under development, but that are proving to be innovative tools for the engagement of local and regional stakeholders, deserve to be mentioned. They revolve around the concept of co-design, addressed to cultural and social development, and include laboratories, cultural marathons, and local networks. Finally, a set of sub-categories of PPP, which investigate legislative and contractual aspects of this agreement, has been included.

3.3. *Mecenatismo/ Cultural Patronage*

In Italy, different models of PPPs can be applied to several fields of the cultural sphere. *Mecenatismo* or cultural patronage is a donation system, mainly encouraged by the

government, aimed to attract private investors and support conservation plans. The entry into force of the Legislative Decree 42/2004 established this model as an alternative solution for the funding or liberal donation of restoration projects (Ventura et al., 2016). *Mecenatismo* or cultural patronage represents a form of support to culture and the arts, which is based on deductibility instruments and tax breaks addressed to private parties, to encourage them in financing restoration projects or other related activities for the enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage. According to this system of funding, not profit-seeking financiers are committed to satisfy the social and public interest through a system of donations. The most recent disposition, aimed to create greater incentives for this phenomenon, is the Legislative Decree n. 83/2014, then modified with n. 106, bearing “Urgent provisions for the protection of cultural heritage, cultural development, and the revival of tourism” (Muggianu, 2018). Accordingly, the so-called “Art Bonus”, introduced by article 1, consists of a tax credit to be committed in three years (65% the first two, 50% the third), in order to attract freely given aids and contributions, intended for maintenance, protection, and restoration of publicly owned cultural heritage. This tax credit is applicable to physical individuals up to 15% of their taxable income, to subjects holding business income up to 5% of their annual revenue, and it is also guaranteed to concessionaries and contractors of the asset in question (Muggianu, 2018). The data provided by MiC proved this provision to be a successful tool for the Italian cultural field, in fact, it was reported that this process accumulated funds amounting to more than 200 million euros at the end of 2017 (Beretta et al., 2019). However, forms of financing from private subjects or enterprises are not to be considered as a real partnership. Despite the relationship between different parties, there is not a sharing of resources and competences allocated for the realization of a project. Moreover, there is no economic compensation for the actor in charge of the donation, since the potential financial benefit, resulted from a positive return in terms of image, does not take the form of compensation and, consequently, does not allow the operation to be part of a bilateral contract (as opposed to the sponsorship contracts that will be subsequently analyzed) (Muggianu, 2018).

Cultural Patronage has demonstrated to be an effective tool to increase supports for the development of the cultural sector. Beside traditional forms of *mecenatismo*, other forms of financing, such as fundraising and crowdfunding, have been implemented on the Italian ground as well. The first one consists of an alternative form of financing for projects which relies on the use of specific web platforms to collect financial sources. They are basically

campaigns addressed to the public (the “crowd”) that allow everyone (individuals, firms, public bodies, non-profit organizations, etc.) to become financiers of the project. They can, in turn, receive a consideration or their purpose can be simply based on altruistic, social, and human values (Muggianu, 2018). Similarly, crowdfunding focuses on the cooperation among three parties, namely the promoter of the project, its supporters, who are willing to finance it, and a digital platform of crowdfunding, dedicated to the intermediation between the two groups. In Italy, this technique has been assuming relevance within the cultural sector. Initially, it was mainly used by private entities and individuals, that, as emerging artists, or creative professionals, struggled to find the necessary resources for their productions, such as music albums, film productions, or publications of books (Muggianu, 2018). It was, then, realized that this phenomenon could turn out to be an effective tool to raise further funds for the preservation and valorization of the cultural asset and, in particular, for the restoration of famous monuments or the acquisition of works of great value (Muggianu, 2018).

Nonetheless, likewise *Mecenatismo* or cultural patronage, this model of financing cannot be considered as a category of public-private partnership since the financiers’ role does not involve their participation in the planning stage and does not have any decision-making power regarding the proposal. In relation to this last aspect, it might be relevant to add that, although the Italian cultural heritage is primarily rooted in issues of public nature, the contribution of private donations and donators is proving to be extremely beneficial to the country. In this regard, firms and private individuals co-operate and co-participate in funding cultural facilities through money donations, their technologies, and other management and business tools (Trupiano, 2005). Banks especially, play a leading role in financing culture, both as active and passive participants. Mere financial support is, indeed, combined with the establishment of banking foundations, which assign more than 30% of their funds to the cultural field, for an estimated 250.000 million euro, yearly (Trupiano, 2005).

3.4. Sponsorship

As concerns the models of PPPs, sponsorships represent a service contract of commercial nature through which the private entity economically contributes to cultural initiatives in exchange of visibility, given by a return of image through means of culture. In the framework of privatization, the sponsorship contract is atypical, consensual, subject to

payment, and synallagmatic (i.e., with corresponding obligations). It, indeed, establishes a service in return for payment, since the image of the sponsee is constrained to the one of the sponsor, in return for their contribution (Fidone, 2012). Cultural sponsorship in Italy is regulated by article 120 of Legislative Decree 24/2004 and its contract, indeed, provides private entities with the possibility to make use of the image or name of a cultural asset to promote their own brand, activities, or products (Ventura et al., 2016; Pignatti, 2022). On the contrary, the aim of the public bodies is to give the right visibility to the cultural asset and increase its popularity through an effective promotional activity, ensured by the name and reputation of the sponsor. Both the parties involved in the agreement must fulfill the two core obligations of the contract, namely the provision of financial support and its intended use from the sponsor and the site license for advertising purposes from the sponsee (Pignatti, 2022). The model of sponsorship is to be placed within the framework of partnership contracts, since the private party directly intervenes in the different steps of the process (planification, financing, implementation, and management). Accordingly, two typologies of sponsorship exist, which can be referred to as “technical sponsorship” and “pure sponsorship”. In the first partnership, the sponsor is obliged to define and realize a part or the whole project, and their intervention can also concern the provision of services and supplies; instead, in the second partnership, the sponsor is limited to financial intervention. Furthermore, a third category, known as “mixed sponsorship”, based on the merge of the previously mentioned categories, exist (Muggianu, 2018). What motivates the State to make use of this contract partnership is its need to rely upon alternative sources of founding and technologies in order to ensure the promotion, preservation, and valorization of the cultural asset. Instead, private firms and companies, stimulated by significant tax relief, are mainly interested in obtaining economic benefits and further notoriety through advertising (Muggianu, 2018). In this regard, sponsorship represents an alternative means to communicate with clients and ensure higher visibility and prestige to a firm, without resorting to intrusive ads or mere means of communication. Social appeal and mass audience are what motivate companies to sponsor cultural heritage and increase their reputation profile. Building a high reputation is, therefore, the main reason why entities decide to sponsor a cultural good (Muggianu, 2018). Moreover, sponsorships are perceived by many businesses and multinationals as development opportunities in terms of marketing strategies and investments. Due to its commercial nature, this typology of partnership has been subject to the criticism of many opponents, that have identified it as a mere “sale” of the Italian cultural heritage. However, this typology of partnership, which might apparently

go against the principles of restoration and conservation of the State and exploit cultural assets to pursue mere individual objectives, is, instead, fully consistent with the legislations on the protection of the cultural heritage. According to art. 120, sponsorship complies with the protection of property since the contract is to be subject to a careful evaluation before its signing. The final decision is, in fact, taken after performing a “compatibility test”, as expressed in the article (Ventura et al., 2016). In the framework of cultural properties, a form of property “use” likewise exists and needs to be regulated and authorized by the superintendencies (Ventura et al., 2016). Also, many supporters sustain that it can foster successful collaborations between private enterprises and public authorities, that are dealing with financial difficulties, boost the economy of the Country at a national and international level and, in the meantime, protect and enhance cultural assets (Veronelli, 2015).

From a legislative point of view, this phenomenon had only been regularized at a general level, without taking into consideration the specific field of culture and its need. The first legislation (article 43 of the law number 449/1997), in fact, allowed the implementation of sponsorship contracts and cooperative agreements with public and private bodies which were only addressed to nonessential public services and used as incentive systems to increase productivity (Muggianu, 2018). Subsequently, as enshrined in Article 119 of the Legislative Decree n. 267/2000, this rule was extended to local bodies and entities, in order to allow them to cooperate with private parties, improve the quality of services, and reduce public costs (Muggianu, 2018; Trupiano 2015). The Legislative Decree 24/2004 was implemented to recognize the sponsorship contract as valid specifically for the cultural heritage sector (Muggianu, 2018). Its initial formulation (article 120 of Legislative Decree 24/2004, Title II) only recognized the role of *sponsor* to private entities, and the one of *sponsee* to the Ministry, Regions, and local entities (Muggianu, 2018). It was subsequently substituted by the corrective decree, still in force, n. 62/2008, which allows the use of the “active sponsorship” (namely a form of passive contract through which the role of sponsor is attributed to public subjects as well), legitimizes the financial sponsorship, and extends the sponsor’s contribution to the provision of goods and services (Muggianu, 2018). Also, this sponsorship must be instrumental to cultural initiatives addressed to the valorization of the cultural heritage and must not conflict with its historical and artistic value, appearance and, cultural identity (paragraph 2 of article 120) (Muggianu 2018).

As concerns the selection of potential sponsors for the cultural sectors, the article 199-bis of the Legislative Decree n. 163/2006 (repealed from April 19, 2016 and substituted with

the Legislative Decree n. 50/2016 of the Italian Public Contract Code) was inserted into the Italian Public Contract Code to safeguard the market from arbitrary laws and avoid causing damages to the public interest from the collaboration with private economic players (Muggianu, 2018). However, this last disposition was over-regulated, and every process was procedurally aggravated or almost impossible to implement. Due to the operational issues of this procedure, a new law, established by the Reform of the Procurement Code, was introduced on January 28, 2016, to modify the regulation of contracts related to cultural heritage and identify new benchmarks based on simplification, innovation, and peculiarity. The article 1, paragraph 1, letter 0) of the Legislative Decree 50/2016, indeed, has established the simplification of the former legislation on contracts related to cultural heritage, including sponsorship, and has provided new procurement procedures for works, services, supplies, and concession of services, in compliance with protection provisions contained in the Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape (Legislative Decree 42/2004) (Muggianu, 2018). Therefore, the article 151 of the Legislative Decree 50/2016, specifically addressed to cultural heritage, unlike the former article 199 bis of the Legislative Decree 163/2006, addressed to cultural heritage, and the article 26-27 addressed to sponsorship at a general level, does not represent a specialized norm, which differs according to the field of application, anymore. On the contrary, it introduces a unified legislation that regulates the implementation of sponsorship at a general level and integrates and applies it to cultural sponsorship contracts (Muggianu, 2018).

3.5. *Foundation of Participation*

In the 1990s, new forms of organizations, based on the hybridization of different models of institution and association, were introduced. A particular attention should be given to the so-called foundation of participation (*fondazione di partecipazione* in Italian), which represents a further category of institutionalized public-private partnership for the Italian cultural sector. Its legal status originates from the model of foundation, which is used as a tool of private nature, from which it borrows the management of a legacy or patrimony, (*elemento patrimoniale* in Italian), that is merged with the typical characteristics of the association, i.e., plurality of its members (*elemento personale* in Italian) (Borin, 2017). This mixed approach satisfies the idea of corporate community involvement and corporate philanthropy, as based on the importance of social responsibility, that is increasingly common among medium and large-scale enterprises (Russo, 2009). Private actors are allowed to be part of the governance boards of cultural foundations (Borgonovi and Rondo

1994; Borin, 2017) and collaborate with institutional subjects to perform cultural activities for non-profit purposes. Its participatory culture allows the identification of two main groups, namely founding members and participating members, that take part in the development processes of the foundation. The first group forms the core of the institution and has a greater control over it, while the second group consists of public and private actors that give their own financial contribution for its improvement (Russo, 2009). It emerges from this description that the first group acts as a guarantor with a political-institutional role, while the private element of the second group supports strategic decisions and determines the use and destination of the resources (Russo, 2009). A further element that distinguishes the foundation of participation is its relationship with the territory. More specifically, its operational range is extended to any intervention of socio-cultural nature within a specified area (Russo, 2009). Consequently, it can be only implemented in a territory in which the public body has a key role or in which its presence is relevant. Furthermore, in order to be considered as a form of institutional cooperation, a cultural foundation should own all the features typical of a PPPs, which include a long-lasting durability of the partnership, involvement of private parties in the realization, financing of a project, and transfer of risk from the public to the private partner. Consequently, not only is the contribution of the private sector limited to the financial sphere but is extended to co-management of events and facilities (Muggianu, 2018). The foundation of participation should be, thus, considered by the public body as a tool to establish a relationship with a private party, but also outsource a service, using a service contract, and make the foundation an autonomous body (Russo, 2009). In historical terms, the first foundations of participations were created for opera houses and theatres, but they were subsequently implemented by other cultural venues, such as museums and archeological sites, both nationally and locally (Borin, 2017). A relevant number of cultural foundations can be found in the Piedmont area (Fondazione Musei Torino, Fondazione Antichità Egizie di Torino, Fondazione Venaria Reale, Fondazione di San Paolo, Fondazione CRT - Cassa di Risparmio di Torino). All these institutions are economically supported by banking and financial companies and sustained by local organizations, third sector associations, and citizens (Pignatti, 2022). The final goal of the foundation of participation for the cultural sector should be, hence, to promote a network of local systems that work as incubators of initiatives addressed to the valorization and administration of the cultural assets and activities (Russo, 2009).

3.6. *Special Forms of PPPs*

The State and local territorial entities can also activate special forms of PPPs to restore, recover, maintain, manage, and valorize cultural heritage. These activities represent an alternative way to “ensure the fruition of the cultural heritage of the nation” and “promote scientific research on preservation” (Pignatti, 2022:107). This typology of partnership, established by the article 151, paragraph 3 of the Legislative Decree 50/2016, as part of the Italian Public Contract Code, is specifically addressed to the valorization of immovable cultural monuments and can be implemented by public entities and private subjects. Accordingly, paragraph 3 explicitly states that “to ensure the enjoyment of Italy’s cultural heritage and to promote scientific research as applied to protection, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Tourism can implement special forms of partnership with public entities and bodies and with private parties, aimed at allowing the recovery, restoration, scheduled maintenance, management, openness to public enjoyment and the enhancement of immovable cultural property, through simplified procedures to identify similar or additional private partners with respect to those provided for in paragraph”. It has also assumed the acronym of “PSPP”, which in Italian stands for *Partenariati Speciali Pubblico-Privati* (Sciullo, 2021:154). However, this form of partnership has been strongly questioned by experts due to its ambiguity and limitations. Firstly, it might appear that only the MiC can activate special forms of partnership, without including public bodies, regions, local entities, regardless of the control that they can have on cultural sites and heritage. On this last point, it should be, then, noticed that the article 89, paragraph 17, of the Legislative Decree n. 117/2017 of the Code of the Third Sector establishes that also regions, local and public entities can activate special forms of partnership with third sector organizations that work in the field of culture, through simplified procedures, as established by the article 151, addressed to the valorization of publicly owned immovable cultural property (Federculture, 2019). Secondly, the provision limits itself to immovable cultural property, without referring to tangible and intangible assets. Thirdly, it only mentions the promotion of scientific research applied to the protection of cultural heritage, without referring to a more extended field of research and innovation, which would better valorize it (Federculture, 2019). Moreover, according to this provision, “simplified procedures” for the identification of private partners are supposed to be activated with public bodies, although they are neither mentioned nor indicated. On the contrary, this hypothetical simplified procedure is

obstructed by a mismatch between the intent of the disposition and the intent of the potential partnerships.

Consequently, many experts have tried to interpret the meaning of the term “special”, which is still being debated. The first group identifies the issue of “specialty” as regulated by the Code. The article 3, paragraph 1, letter eee), of the Italian Contract Code, provides, in fact, a definition of PPP, focusing on the “genus”, “category”, or “archetype” (Sciullo, 2021:155) of its contract. Its distinguishing features are determined by article 180, paragraph 8, of the Code, affirming that “the type of contract set forth in paragraph 1 shall include project financing, building and operating concessions, the concession of services, the financial leasing of public works, availability contracts and any other procedure to realize as a partnership works or services having the characteristics set forth in the above paragraphs”. This last sentence might, therefore, imply that any atypical or special form of partnership is likewise attributable to the “genus” of PPP and subject to the general rule of this partnership (Sciullo, 2021). On the contrary, a further group identifies the issue of “specialty” as not regulated by the Code. More specifically, the typology partnership described in the article 151, par. 3 of the Code would differ from the typologies of contracts regulated by the article 180 of the Code due to its peculiarity in terms of purposes (better fruition of cultural assets and promotion of scientific research) and discipline (“recovery, restoration, maintenance, management, openness to public enjoyment and the enhancement of immovable cultural property”). From a structural point of view, they might be referred to as a sort of “container” in which different types of contracts combine (Sciullo, 2021). Accordingly, special forms of partnership are not attributable to typical contracts, since they are characterized by entrepreneurship, managerial activities, and risk allocations, (according to the article 3, paragraph 1, letter eee), the article 180, and the article 165, paragraphs 3-5) and, consequently, feature the “genus” of the PPP, as established by the Code (Sciullo, 2021). Special forms of partnership are to be referred to any collaboration in which the economic-financial nature is not the key element of the relationship between public and private actors (Sciullo, 2021). Moreover, special forms of partnership are characterized by cooperation, which is the most important aspect of this agreement. Cooperation, in fact, is aimed to pursue the public interest, and characterizes the functionalization of the agreement, but also the interest of the different parties, and the structure of the agreement (Sciullo, 2021). It might be, thus, said that special forms of partnership are related to a logic of cooperation, which differs from the logic of exchange on which ordinary partnerships are based. In

ordinary PPPs, in fact, a collaborative element, linked to its finalistic order, can be found, but its interests respond to a logic of exchange.

3.7. Co-design Approaches

The vastness of the Italian cultural heritage extends throughout the territory, and it is, therefore, fundamental to develop management policies which are aimed to increase its utilization and productivity. State and non-State assets, which consist of museums and cultural institutions, represent a strategic, large-scale tool for the national territory. Indeed, statistically, more than one Italian municipality out of four is provided at least with a museum or cultural venue (Mariotti, 2012). This regionalism has allowed the implementation of cultural competences and creative approaches that can only be expressed through local systems of medium and small scale. The production and communication of the cultural asset is, thus, increasingly oriented towards the participation and involvement of the local community and visitors. This new vision of cultural economy interpretes cultural heritage as an economic resource for the local development, as well as a relational resource within a cultural ecosystem (Mariotti, 2012). The topic of culture has been, in fact, developed according to different territorial contexts and the interrelation of local systems. This conjunction is determined by the union of private and public parties, whose collaboration contributes to the valorization of cultural and local resources and facilitates the operation of long and short networks in order to increase the efficiency of enterprises and organizations located in the territories (Mariotti, 2012). In this framework, new strategies, addressed to territorial competitiveness, the recovery of cultural identities, and the welfare of citizens, have been carried out, and geography has assumed a primary role in the creation of territorial microsystems. This approach can be easily applied to small and medium-sized urban centers within the logic of short networks (Mariotti, 2012). Consequently, all these facets of territoriality bring to new approaches of cooperation, which are to be referred to as different models of cultural co-design.

This phenomenon involves a wide range of different subjects and concerns two phases of development, namely network activation, formation, data collection, and, lastly, implementation. Co-design is, therefore, constitutive of social development and infrastructures, and its quality, sustainability, and impact are merely due to the implementation of a structured and integrated territorial network (Elevati, 2021). Regardless of its typology, the process of co-design needs to be planned in time, as well as it needs

economic support, right competences, people (facilitators, partners, stakeholders), and resources. As summarized by Elevati (2021), clear and transparent rules of engagement, participation, and governance are required and are to be transcribed by proper legal representatives. Co-design is, then, a form of collaboration based on the relationship between private and public bodies. Consequently, financiers, such as banking and corporate foundations, are in charge of contributing economically to the process, being able to make the most of their funds. However, public administration is the solely responsible for the implementation of a regulatory ecosystem, necessary to convert practices into policies. Also, processes only work if technicians, executives, and functionaries of local administrations are involved. Moreover, as previously mentioned, the local element and territoriality are essential components of this model of participatory governance. Consequently, all the entities involved must have strong territorial roots to be part of the process. Co-design represents, hence, the new frontier for cultural interconnections, as based on a single system of monitoring and evaluation which relies on a constant exchange of ideas, opinions, and capitalization of knowledge. It is, thus, fundamental to promote a cultural change and evolution which involve not only benefactors and beneficiaries, but also all the citizens, with a particular focus on young generations. Cultural co-design is, indeed, an innovative instrument to involve the public in initiatives promoted by cultural institutions. It is based on the sharing of decision-making power and can renew the institutions which choose to implement it. The first model is the so-called laboratory (*laboratorio* in Italian), which encourages cultural professionals, entrepreneurs, and local actors to share their ideas, knowledge, and skills, with the aim of reaching a common goal. Specific days are, in fact, dedicated to the drafting of proposals, focused on sustainable and practical projects, by experienced facilitators. The second model relates to the commonly named cultural marathons (*maratone culturali* in Italian) and represent a sort of game in which participants (professionals, students, and creatives of all kinds), divided into groups, come together for the creation of a functioning prototype, aimed to valorize culture and museums. Finally, there are places that are subject to complex challenges, in terms of cultural renewal. Local network (*rete locale* in Italian) takes place within the network of a specific town or neighborhood.

3.8. *Further Forms of PPPs*

According to scholars and experts, sponsorships, cultural patronage, foundations of participations and special forms of PPPs are to be considered the main models of collaboration between public and private actors within the Italian field. However, other typologies of contracts and agreements might be classified as alternative forms of public-private partnerships, also considering that specific information concerning their legislation can be found. According to Fondazione ANCI and Federculture (2013), in fact, further forms of PPPs include service concessions, public works concessions, enhancement grants, availability contracts, project financing, joint ventures, and the consortium. More specifically, service concession is one of the most important forms of management of public services, which allows the implementation of a public service without adding further costs in terms of administration. Since additional services represent an essential constituent of cultural heritage, this form of PPP is of particular importance for its administration and promotion. In legal terms, a public entity is owner of a specific asset and directly responsible of the service and its management must be entrusted to a private subject that, as a licensee, also bears the economic risk. Due the public nature of the Italian cultural asset, public works concession might also be considered as a typology of PPP. Through this partnership, indeed, an entrepreneur and a contracting authority sign a contract concerning the definitive planning and execution of public works and works of public utility, as well as their functional and economic management. Enhancement grant is, instead, another form of concession which allows private operators to make use of public real estate assets and work on their redevelopment, valorization, and maintenance for economic purposes, within a period. As regards the availability contract, it allows the public administration to benefit from a privately-owned asset, which enters the public domain, without however losing its private nature. In fact, its ownership, planning, as well as all related risks are in the hands of the private actors. By moving to project financing, it would be more appropriate to describe this category of PPP as a form of financing addressed to specific projects which features a complex structure. Its main guarantee, in fact, is given by the cash flows that the project itself can generate, without the need for any financial charge for the public administration. Also, not only can this form of financing be implemented for public works, but also for services of public interest. Finally, one of the most common forms of PPP at Italian level is the mixed society. It is based on the presence of social capital, comprising both public and private subjects, and provides the public administration with business

notions in terms of management of public services, professional and managerial skills. To conclude, the consortium for cultural valorization is a legal institution which has been created to manage cultural activities and services, with the aim to enhance cultural heritage. Being the consortium a sort of association, entrepreneurial activities cannot be performed, and profits cannot be allocated. The mere aim of this institution is, hence, to develop a cultural program capable of ensuring the conservation and valorization of the cultural assets.

4. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural Sector in the United States

4.1. *Management of the Cultural Sector and National Heritage in the United States*

The formation of a cultural and artistic heritage in the United States has recent origins, if compared to the history and traditions of the European continent. The concept of culture itself is, in fact, wider and less defined, and the interest for the conservation of historical heritage is more moderate than the European average. As concerns the Italian case, the legal framework and cultural policies strongly contrast with the ones of the United States, as the American system is mainly influenced by private actors and the private market and is tendentially detached from public institutions (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). The main actors and entities involved in cultural and artistic initiatives are, in fact, private companies and non-profit organizations (NPOs), e.g., associations and foundations (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). The aim of this dissertation is to provide the reader with a comparative analysis between the Italian and the American cultural system. It follows that the main difference lies in institutional model and constitutional principles of the two nations. The following statements are intended to properly examine the theoretical side of the American organizational, financial, and legislative approach to culture, as well as its own conception of the arts and heritage in order to underline these differences.

It should be specified that, despite the reduced number of cultural heritage assets, this country, being constituted of different states with their own culture, landscape, and values, relates to a liberal approach and different governance models, with different final goals. Having federalism specific laws which vary from state to state, a uniform statutory regulation is rarely found. It should be also declared that the complexity and variety of this country did not contribute to the spread of knowledge in cultural and artistic terms, and the scarcity of literature on this topic justifies its undervaluation (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). The model of state intervention which characterizes Italy, based on the hegemony of public organizations, is opposed to the liberal approach of America, in which the state intervention is restricted, and the main players are private stakeholders that are allowed to make and follow their own rules. (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Legislative and institutional matters

concerning culture are handled both by federal, state, and local stakeholders, that feature a certain degree of autonomy, and private actors, that hold a prominent position in the decision-making process (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Furthermore, this conception of non-invasive policy, based on the decentralization of the government, is shared, and supported by American citizens as well, who are used to identifying culture as an open topic connected to personal freedom.

However, although cultural organizations are primarily financed by private actors, the federal government is also responsible for supporting a portion of cultural institutions which, otherwise, would not be able to find sponsors or investors, necessary for their survival. NPOs exempted from taxes, in fact, account for approximately 40% of the field, with approximately 19,000 philanthropic foundations (Cofrancesco 2012; Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). From an institutional point of view, the United States does not have a federal or state cultural heritage ministry, but there is only a federal “cultural heritage” section whose main responsibility is to find possible resolutions to address potential legal controversies on this matter. Nonetheless, individual government of each state have specific units that are involved in the protection of cultural and historic traditions (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014), although they are much more aligned with valorization tasks, rather than the safeguard of cultural assets. A portion of regulative rules can be found in some states of the country, but, at a general level, the United States has approved a very small number of UNESCO conventions related to this subject (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). At the federal level, the arts are perceived as a flourishing form of investment; in fact, 11 departments and 38 commissions have been dedicated to them (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). In this regard, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) needs to be mentioned. The NEA was conceived in 1965 and, today, is the most important independent federal agency aimed to fund, support, and strengthen the arts, creative jobs, and cultural organizations. The NEA consists of several funding programs, from which American institutions and professionals can benefit, such as program funds, that cover approximately 50% of organizational and personnel costs, treasury funds, which include private funds, and challenge grants to invest in the medium long term (Cofrancesco, 2012; in Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014).

As concerns historical heritage, all the departments and units at federal, state, and local level, which deal with its administration differ from the ones involving other cultural forms, i.e., visual arts, music, theatre, dance, cinema, and so on. As illustrated by Landriani and

Pozzoli (2014), an overview of the significant milestones in the history of American cultural policy should be reported, thus facilitating the comparison with the Italian case. Cultural heritage in the U.S., more appropriately defined as historical and natural heritage, has, in fact, origins dating back to 1862, when the Congress, under the oversight of the Ministry of War, created some laws to preserve and protect historic sites, such as battlegrounds, national cemeteries, and military parks. The establishment of Yellowstone National Park strengthened the implementation of a national cultural policy ten years later. Legislative attempts resulted in The Antiquities Act of 1906, which is still in force and gives the president the power to create national monuments in order to safeguard the cultural interest and natural and scientific resources. However, the most important regulation, in terms of cultural heritage preservation, was the creation of the National Park Service in 1916. This agency of the federal government is still the main responsible for the administration and preservation of parks, reserves, and national monuments and sites. Then, the National Trust of Historic Preservation, a public-private partnership organization aimed to preserve the historic buildings and heritage of the United States, was founded in 1949.

Since the latter half of the 20th century, several policies concerning the natural, urban, and cultural environment have been implemented. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of October 1966 should be mentioned in this regard. It recognized the key role of the government in promoting activities and collecting private founding for historic properties (such as archeological sites and buildings), while the responsibility for implementing the National Program of Historic Conservation is given to the single states (Raffo, 2012; Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). One of the most important processes of project approval, known as “Section 106 review”, which requires federal agencies to assess the impact of federally financed projects on the historic property is, then, carried out by the NHPA. Moreover, a new body, known as the Advisor Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) was created by the NHPA in the same year. This independent federal agency is responsible for coordinating all the different stakeholders that deals with cultural heritage. The Council consists of ministers with previous experience on these matters and directors of the National Trust and National Park (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Due to its link with the NHPA, the ACHP is required to oversee the preservation review process, as coiceived by Section 106. The participation in the realization of projects has been extended to state and local authorities since 1996 (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). These historic events, therefore, confirm that, despite being private entities the most involved in cultural matters,

the contribution of state and federal bodies is likewise important to properly manage and preserve cultural heritage.

4.2. *How the United States Funds the Arts*

Due its administrative pluralism, the United States has its own peculiar model of cultural policy. As previously mentioned in the first paragraph, there is not a Ministry of Culture that deals with cultural and artistic matters, but the federal cultural program consists of a fractured system in which various agencies and their committees develop their own policies in support of different segments of the arts. (Mulcahy, 1999). It emerges that American artists and arts organizations can be financially supported by several independent organisms. The first form of economic support for the arts is represented by direct public funds provided by the NEA and different state, regional, and local arts agencies across the country. The second form of financial support, is provided by federal departments and agencies, excluding the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), while the last form, which seems to be the most popular, corresponds to donations from the private sector and its stakeholders (NEA, 2012). Therefore, the America's cultural funding system consists of a wide number of public and private bodies, taxations, contributions, allocations, limited grants, educational obligations, and social programs which makes it tortuous and misunderstandable. Government agencies and their inner structures, made of state, regional, federal, country, and city levels, can create likewise confusion (NEA, 2012).

The NEA, which stands for the National Endowment for the Arts is the governmental organization designed to ensure the development and safeguard of traditional, visual, media, performative arts, and their related institutions, including museums. Its annual funding is established by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and grants are, then, allocated through a detailed peer review system. An amount of \$146 million corresponded to the number of appropriations for the year 2012, whose 80% was allocated through a grant-making approach (NEA, 2012). Also, grants can be awarded by arts organizations through arts projects programs, whose main categories include the Art Works and Challenge America Fast-Track (NEA, 2012). Furthermore, regional and state arts agencies partner with the NEA in financing the arts, and state arts agencies can exploit the link between state-appropriated funds and the NEA's Partnership Agreement Funds to finance specific activities, promoted at local level. The New York State Arts Council (NYSAC), whose

appropriations for the fiscal year 2012, corresponded to \$36,2 million is today the most relevant state agency in the country (NEA, 2012). An affluence of local arts agencies can be also found in the United States, which corresponds to about 5000 agencies scattered around cities, towns, regions, and countries. They assume the role of commissions, councils, or city departments, and are financed by the NEA itself, but also by state arts agencies, municipal budgets, and private contributions (NEA, 2012)

However, other federal departments and agencies which promote the arts exist, apart from the NEA. Some of them are responsible for financing artists or organizations, others oversee the production, archives, or exhibitions of artworks and events for the public's interest, while further agencies implement strategic plans and programs for cultural purposes. Relevant examples of direct funding sources are the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), a federal agency that economically supports public programs in the humanities and scholarly research, and the Institute of Museums and Library Services (IMLS), another independent federal agency committed to the preservation of museums. Additional arts agencies and institutions, including public libraries, museums, and performing arts venues, that have a direct relationship with the federal government, can be found in the United States as well. The Smithsonian, composed of a diversified number of museums, research, and education centres, is undoubtedly the most remarkable example of independent institution developed by the government. Moreover, it should be noticed how the arts have been used by several departments as a tool to foster their missions and accomplish their goals. More specifically the development of arts-related programs has involved federal departments, agencies, and bureaus, including the U.S. Geological Survey, the Department of Defense, the Department of State/Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the General Service Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the National Forest Service, and the National Park Service (NEA, 2012).

In the previous chapter about Italy and Italian partnerships, it has been discussed how the concept of the arts relates both to the field of the arts and cultural heritage, without making any distinction in legislative and institutional terms. Public-private partnerships for the arts and cultural heritage are, in fact, regulated by the Italian Public Contract Code, which legitimizes sponsorships and special forms of partnership as typologies of PPPs. Moreover, the Italian government recognizes cultural patronage and foundations of participation as two models of agreement to be placed within the framework of PPPs. The United States are

totally opposed to the Italian legislations, in fact, there is no code or legislation that regulates collaborative agreements for the arts and culture and recognizes them as forms of PPPs. It should be also underlined that PPPs for the cultural sector are solely addressed to cultural, historical, and natural heritage, and, according to the sources, there is no mention of public-private partnerships for visual or performative arts. This justifies the choice to mainly focus on cultural agreements between private and public entities, officially recognized by the State, which involve cultural preservation and development, namely national parks, monuments, landmarks, presidential libraries, and fields related to cultural and natural development, such as public parks. However, although cultural patronage is not defined by American legislators as a form of PPPs, the different donation models and donors that features the American system make it one of the most reliable means to support and finance the development of culture. As already affirmed, private donations are essential to fund the American arts. They can take the form of corporate or individual contributions and are stimulated by several tax incentives and benefits. Corporate tendency to support culture have been shifted from general charitable donations to a more sponsorship-based and marketing oriented-approach (Čopič et al., 2011). Public policy has influenced corporations, that have been receiving tax breaks for funding the arts since 1936 (NEA, 2012). Similarly, individual giving corresponds to three-quarters of all charitable donations and all tax-paying individuals that finance non-profit organizations have been subject to deductions since 1917 (NEA, 2012).

A further category of institution, that annularly contributes to the financial wealth of arts and cultural organizations, is given by foundations, whose dimension and jurisdiction is particularly relevant in the United States. Their asset, in fact, is about \$583 billion, whose 48% comes from large-scale institutions, such as the Ford Foundations (NEA, 2012). Nonetheless, the contribution of small and medium-sized private foundations to the arts should not be undervalued. Other “donor models” can be also applied to foundations, e.g., legacy foundations and family foundations. A last important difference between the US and Italy is the professionalization of fundraising and crowdfunding, considered as alternative forms of cultural patronage. In the United States, good fundraising practices have been developed by partners over the years and fundraising is today recognized as a real profession (Čopič et al., 2011). The same procedure applies to crowdfunding, a practice of funding which, as already explained in the previous chapter about Italian PPPs, is based on the collection of capital donated by individuals (“the crowd”), through an online platform

(Farajian et al., 2015). The use of crowdfunding for project financing was formally regulated by the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act in 2012 (Farajian et al., 2015), which made crowding a flexible mechanism for PPP project as well. PPP partners can, in fact, engage with institutional and independent investors as direct equity investors (Farajian et al., 2015) in their project. As regards the arts and culture, two major categories of crowdfunding exist, namely crowdfunding as philanthropy and crowd investing. This is mainly due to the artists and entrepreneurs' difficulties in accessing financial resources from traditional forms of financing, such as bank loans (Farajian et al., 2015). Indeed, it is widely common, when funding the arts through this mechanism, that donors support an entrepreneur's idea or new company through monetary means. An example of this innovative funding mechanism is ArtistShare, the first commercial crowdfunding platform, developed in 2012, to directly fund musicians and their recording projects.

4.3. Public-Private Partnerships for the Cultural Sector in the United States

The US National Council for Public-Private Partnerships (NCP3P) (2014) has defined PPP in the United States as a contractual agreement between a public agency (federal, state, or local) and a private sector identity. It has been already underlined that a universal definition of PPPs does not exist. Consequently, each country has developed their own rules and dispositions concerning the implementation of this partnership and its different fields of application. The idea of PPPs for the cultural sector and heritage as conceived in the United States is, indeed, totally different from the one which can be found in Italy. What firstly emerges is that, as opposed to the Italian cultural field, mainly supervised by public bodies and in which partnerships take place between public companies and private firms, usually through forms of contracting out or privatization, the American cultural sector is characterized by a wide number of non-profit organizations, such as associations and foundations, whose establishment of a collaboration meets the interest of the enterprises (Russo, 2009). Secondly, as previously explained, the American legislation on cultural issues differentiate the field of visual and performative arts from the ones of cultural, national, and natural heritage. Thus, if the administration of the arts and culture in Italy is normally handled by the Ministry of Culture, in the United States different departments, which are not related to each other, are concerned with their management. Moreover, nongovernmental organizations are fundamental for preserving and maintaining cultural

and historic sites (Boden, 2013) and, in fact, private actors has assumed a significant role in the promotion of national history and maintenance of collective memory (Boden, 2013). However, government institution also contributes to the formation of collective memory, and, in fact, many sites are provided with the support of both public and private organizations (Boden, 2013). Most of them are, managed by private nongovernmental organizations (Boden, 2013). Non-profit organizations are particularly involved in the administration and conservation of these sites, providing them with economic and cultural facilities (Boden, 2013). It should also be reminded that cultural heritage in the US is to be referred to national parks, monuments, reserves, and historic sites, such as national cemeteries and military parks. Therefore, the first section of the paragraph will be dedicated to the analysis of the different partnerships between private and public actors concerning the field of heritage. However, there are also other public sites, such as public museums and libraries, whose mission is related to the creation and preservation of collective memory and whose administration relies on public-private partnerships. (Boden, 2013). This also concerns museums, monuments, or memorials that have been dedicated to former presidents of the United States. Most of these assets are operated by nongovernmental organizations, others by federal, state, or local government agencies, and a part of them is managed through PPPs between governmental and nongovernmental organizations (Boden, 2013). Finally, the involvement of federal agencies, such as the National Park Service (NPS) and the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), in the creation and conservation of site of collective memory have increased over the years, and their actions have been supported by private non-profit partners, through the implementation of established PPPs.

4.4. *Public-Private Partnerships for National Parks*

National parks represent some of America's greatest cultural landmarks. As once stated by President Theodore Roosevelt "there is nothing so American as our national parks" (Baker, 2017, n.d.). As previously mentioned, national parks are managed by the National Park Service (NPS), a government-funded agency aimed to "preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources (...) for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this – and future generations" (Baker, 2017, n.d.). The NPS is a bureau of the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) and is headed by a director, appointed by the president, and approved by the U.S. Senate (Baker, 2017, n.d.). A huge number of organizations annually partner with the NPS; from national non-profit organizations, such as the National Park Foundation, to small

community-based groups and cooperatives (Baker, 2017). As claimed by the DOI, in fact, when a federal or non-federal body cooperate with the department, this collaboration is to be considered as an effective partnership (Vaughn and Cortner; Baker, 2017). The number of partnerships with NPS for the management of the park facilities and units has increased over the decades. These units correspond to 423 Parks across the country and are split into several categories, including national battlefields, national battlefield parks and sites, national military parks, national historical parks, national historic sites, international historic sites, national lakeshores, national memorials, national monuments, national parks, national parkways, national preserve, national reserves, national recreation areas, national rivers, national scenic trails, and national seashores (National Park Service, 2022). In order to strengthen the units of the National Park System, it has become common to establish relationships with federal, state, local, tribal, and private actors. It is also believed by the National Park Advisory Board that these partnerships represent a new way of thinking about park areas as collaborative spaces in which the NPS develops relationship with other public, private, non-profit stakeholders for preservation purposes. The Board has also defined partnership management as an innovative solution to meet massive landscape challenges and guarantee the economic sustainability of the local communities (Congressional Research Service, 2016).

Public-Private partnerships are a useful tool for the administration of parks, also due to the cost savings that the Congress can achieve through them. Its interest in parks partnerships is, in fact, mainly justified by the role that they assume in exploiting external funding for park management (Congressional Research Service, 2016). One example might be the provision of site-specific staff, transferred from cultural preservation organizations to the park, in order to save labour costs. Also, another reason why the Congress strongly supports PPPs is due to the controversial federal management that takes place over a land (Congressional Research Service, 2016). Moreover, parks are often located in urban and suburban areas and are close to other public and private lands. In this case, specific agreements and partnerships are necessary for both practical and ethical matters. The Congress can, thus, establish a legislation providing a cooperative management among several public-private authorities and landholders (Congressional Research Service, 2016).

Due to the wide range of parks and the different administrative apparatus that characterizes them, units have their own property arrangements and management agreements.

Partnerships are aimed to increase the benefits of preservation and outdoor activities, whose achievement is possible due to government funding and donations. More than 400,000 volunteers and thousands of associated organizations, indeed, collect money for the NPS projects and activities yearly (Baker, 2017). Consequently, philanthropy has been fundamental to the enhancement of the National Park System. Private donations still contribute to its improvement, in terms of maintenance and land acquisition, as well as to its management, in terms of park planning, development, and educational programs (Baker, 2017). Contributions can also come from individual philanthropists, families, and foundations. One example of supporting foundation which deals with the collection of economic resources for the National Park System is the National Park Foundation, an official non-profit partner and charity aimed to provide private support and establish partnerships for the preservation and improvement of the American national parks and public interest.

Therefore, partnerships have turned out to be a reliable asset for the National Park System. Public-private partnerships cannot and should not be a substitute for the federal government and their funding, but they can represent an innovative tool to help fix internal inconsistencies and the lack of federal funds (Argust, 2017). Consequently, the main four models of PPPs should be further analyzed. The first model consists of a partnership between national parks and railroad companies, philanthropists, and non-profit partners. The second model is based on the collaboration with individuals and citizens, including students, volunteers, and veterans. The third group is made of for-profit companies that provide parks with in-kind donations, expertise, and technical equipment for their upgrading (Argust, 2017). Examples of past collaborations have involved lighting firms, automotive manufacturers, and agricultural machinery manufacturers. The last category focuses on private donations from private philanthropies and philanthropists.

4.5. Public-Private Partnerships for the Development of Public Parks

In the United States, the concept of parks and “parks partnerships” can assume different meanings. Their function of preservation has been just analyzed; therefore, it would be appropriate to mention the further role that they have in terms of urban regeneration and revitalization. As discussed in the previous chapters, public-private partnerships can be also implemented for urban renewal, which may be considered as a practice in between the

preservation and innovation of historic areas. In this framework, PPPs have succeeded in combining the resources of both the public and private sector to generate new parks, green areas, trails, and other community services, and overcoming municipal budget cuts (Walker, 1999). The partnerships between public parks agencies and local non-profits are strictly common in the United States; in fact, park agencies can better support the development of parks if they collaborate with a nonprofit organization that shares the same goals.

A conceptual framework, for a short examination of this typology of partnership, should be hence provided. The first element is linked to the partnership structure: partners can be, in fact, “general” or limited”, according to the rate of investment and risk. General partners involved in the agreement oversee business processes and assume the highest risk of the operations, while limited partners are less involved in organizational and investment activities (Walker, 1999). In previous initiatives, core partners were found to be municipal parks agencies, non-profit park support teams, and Trusts (Walker, 1999), while limited partners usually refer to neighborhood and regional associations (Walker, 1999). Moreover, most of the time, regardless of its general or limited nature, individuals involved in the partnerships have a particular interest for natural history, environmental issues, recreational facilities, conservation, and societal development (Walker, 1999). Partners are, then, differently involved in administrative and decision-making tasks. This aspect is related to the second phase of the partnership process, namely control. General partners are, indeed, the main responsible for the success of the collaboration and their control is widely extended (Walker, 1999). Instead, limited partners restrict the risk according to the volume of their contribution (Walker, 1999). The participation of core partners in the decision-making process, that deals with issues of governance, programming, implementation, and management, can specifically involve advisory bodies and governing councils. Limited partners can eventually give their own contribution by participating indirectly to the process as members of the nonprofit general partner’s board of directors (Walker, 1999). As concerns partnership risks, the Urban Parks Initiative, which was implemented by the Wallace Foundation at the end of the 20th century, identified five specific challenges, namely the willingness to fulfil promises, carry out them, implement a strategy to meet partnership goals, obtain a ROI, and solve miscommunication (Walker, 1999). Risks are, thus, the consequence of series of commitments that parks parties are required to comply with in order to achieve the desired results. The first commitment refers to a clear distribution of roles and responsibilities in order to ensure the long-term success of the

initiative, the second commitment focuses on the equality between partners in order not to lose their interest in participating in the agreement, the third commitment aims to protect the interest of the partnership by increasing the number of involved partners, the fourth commitment focuses on increasing community involvement and engagement, and the last commitment aims to demonstrate transparency (Walker, 1999). Moreover, as for any kind of PPP, each actor is required to bring their knowledge and assets, namely organization, reputation, and benefits, to the collaboration, as well as to minimize the weakness through the implementation of an efficient collaboration.

It has been discussed how parks partnerships for regeneration plans tend to rely on the collaboration between public agencies and nonprofit entities. Public-sector agencies for parks, mainly financed through intergovernmental aids and revenue resources, have established funds to support parks departments and their facilities (Walker, 1999). They are also responsible for planning, developing, and administering large-scale projects, by implementing different resources (planning and budgeting tools) and competencies (a skilled workforce) (Walker, 1999). Nonprofit agencies, instead, can provide additional economic resources, such as individual, corporate, and private donations, that can be used to improve and innovate the programs of a park. Nonprofit agencies are also known for being more flexible than public agencies in terms of organization, although this flexibility makes it difficult for them to have and manage a stable staff. Lastly, both public agencies and non-profits share a common asset, which lies in constituencies. Constituencies, such as environmentalists and bicycling groups, can be potential allies for parks partnerships and their allocation of funds (Walker, 1999). Natural constituencies, like neighborhood groups or community development practitioners, are, in fact, used to supporting the activities of park agencies, while nonprofits have a central role in attracting the political and financial support of both environmental groups and cultural and scientific institutions, such as museums and universities (Walker, 1999).

4.6. *Public-Private Partnerships for National Landmarks*

A total of 129 national monuments can be currently found on the American ground. They are administered by the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior in most (85 out of 129), however, also other departments, including the United States Forest Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National

Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the War Department, are involved in their management (National Park Service, 2022). The difference between a National Park and a National Monument lies in its preservation purposes, in fact, the first category is based on scenic, educational, and recreational principles, while the second category contains elements of historical, cultural, and scientific value. As for the national parks, public-private partnerships have played a fundamental role for the development and restoration of national monuments. Again, there is not a unitary norm on PPPs as for the Italian case and the financial support from private actors is the main connection tool between public and private parties. As reported by Lefrak (2019), in the article “how public-private partnerships fund national landmarks”, most monuments and memorials have been built with private resources. Lefrak (2019) provides the example of the National Mall, which is probably the most important landmark in America from an historic point of view, being it located in Washington D.C., the capital city of the United States. This landscape park and its national monuments, such as the Capitol, the White House, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Jefferson Memorial, have been largely funded by private citizens, rather than the federal government. The President and CEO of the Trust for the National Mall, Catherine Townsend, who is in charge of raising money in support of the Mall heritage, has claimed that the collection process follows three main steps. Firstly, the Congress gives the authorization for a memorial, secondly, private individuals collect money for its edification, and thirdly, once erected, the Park Service takes measures for its maintenance. The Washington Monument, due to the substantial economic support that the billionaire philanthropist David Rubenstein has provided for it (\$3 million for the repair of its elevator), have been subject to what might be defined as a “patriotic philanthropy”. Rubenstein had already financed the structure in the past, after that an earthquake struck it in 2011. However, this episode also reveals the difficulties of the government in finding a substantial number of external philanthropists willing to finance their national buildings. This is supported by the fact that the National Park Service paid \$ 7 extra million for the renovation of the remaining installations of the Washington Monument.

4.7. Public-Private Partnerships for the Presidential Library System

The Presidential Library system (PLS) consists of 15 Presidential Libraries located in different States of America. They are managed by the Office of Presidential Libraries, that

is a constituent of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). Presidential Libraries are made of archives and museums that are exposed to the public and contain the official papers and records of each president issued during his term (National Archives, 2021). Its history dates to 1939, when President Franklin Roosevelt's personal and presidential documents were donated by Roosevelt himself to the federal government. A part of his estate at Hyde Park was likewise donated to the government to preserve all his material. Roosevelt was firmly convinced that presidential papers had to be a part of national heritage, as well as of public domain, therefore, he asked the NARA to take care of his work and to manage the library and museum building (National Archives, 2021). A system of privately constructed and federally preserved libraries was officially established by the Congress through the Presidential Libraries Act in 1955. Following the enactment of the Act, many presidents decided to donate their papers and material to the government and further libraries were established. The erection of libraries was financed through private and nonfederal public resources, and, after their edification, private organizations inserted them into the National Archives and Records Administration. In 1978, the Presidential Records Act was issued to declare the government property of all presidential records, while in 1986, the Presidential Library Act was established to cover the maintenance costs of the libraries by allowing the use of private donations (National Archives, 2021).

The Presidential Library System is, therefore, a further example of an effective public-private partnership concerning national heritage, that links the National Archives to presidential support foundations. All the presidential libraries are, in fact, managed by the NARA in partnership with a private support foundation or institute (that due to their status of charitable foundations are exempted from taxes). The partnership between the National Archives and their presidential foundation associates is one of the oldest models of PPP implemented by the government of the United States (Boden, 2013). It also allows to better understand the relationship between a federal agency and its private partners (Boden, 2013). The case of the George W. Bush Library and Museum should be mentioned in order to provide an example of PPPs related to this field. The edification of this library and its administration was, indeed, possible due to the non-federal money provided to the government by NARA (Boden, 2013). More recently, NARA has allowed individual foundations to support the development of public programs, including educational programs, conventions, and museum exhibitions (Boden, 2013).

PPPs have assumed a precise function in the preservation of collective memory, and the main characteristics that contradistinguish them should be mentioned to provide a full description of this agreement in the PLS. Firstly, their nature is informal and nonpartisan, and their procedure is undefined. Congress provides some instructions for the establishment of the partnership, but there is not a precise structure that is to be followed by the parties (Boden, 2013). There is, in fact, a lack of statutes and agency policies related to PPPs in the Presidential Library System, and this status gives the opportunity to presidents and their foundations to customize them at their convenience. In general, the responsibility of shaping the relationship between NARA and the library foundation partners is given to the foundations, rather than the federal agency. Also, the law does not necessarily require former presidents to erect libraries in order to store their material, but if a former president asks for them, the NARA must collaborate with him and his team to guarantee that the construction complies with all the obligations, in terms of design and architecture (Boden, 2013).

Legitimacy is another feature that distinguishes PPPs in the PLS. The partnership, in fact, recognizes the presence of a public entity in a field where nongovernmental institutions are usually identified as the main providers of facilities (Boden, 2013). In the United States, many individuals consider private entities, rather than the government, to be the main responsible for the preservation of historical sites, however, presidential libraries are a clear example of a “privately built, publicly maintained” space (Cochrane, 2002:60, Boden, 2013:154), balanced by a proper concertation of public-private intervention. Moreover, it should be underlined that due to the informal nature of this partnership, the obligations to the public and liabilities that private organizations have differ from each other (Boden, 2013).

On the other hand, there are some scholars that criticizes NARA and its dependence on private resources to administrate public facilities. Furthermore, it is believed that there is too much control from former presidents and their presidential foundations over public museums and their exhibitions (Boden, 2013). This different conception leads to an unbalanced vision of public-private partnerships within the framework of national heritage. Finally, another aspect of this partnership that has been criticized by scholars relates to foundations. If compared with older foundations that financed libraries in the past, foundations working on new edifications, are allowed to get access to greater political and economic resources nowadays. This situation has generated a phenomenon, known as

cooptation, that arises when individual library directors become too dependent on individual foundations and too compliant with their former presidents (each employee of the presidential libraries is, in fact, allowed to interact and communicate with former presidents) (Boden, 2013).

5. Italian and American Park Experience

5.1. *Premise*

This section aims to provide information on the methodology and methodological approaches which have been implemented in order to discuss the main aspects of the PPP projects that characterized the Herculaneum Archaeological Site and the Presidio Park. As underlined in the introduction, two examples of PPP projects have been considered to verify what previously affirmed and demonstrate that the implementation of PPPs can bring to the realization of plans for the valorization and enhancement of a national cultural asset. With all the limits of the case, the contents have been analyzed in accordance with an extended research based on bibliographic sources, which have been consulted and reworked in line with the purposes of the dissertation. As concerns the bibliographical approach of this section, it has been made use of books and articles written by researchers, experts, and professionals directly involved in the two projects. Sources have been compared, analyzed to provide the reader with the author's elaboration. Furthermore, the free access to online data provided by governmental sources and park reports has been fundamental for the collection of analytics and numerical information. However, the approach to the writing process has also been influenced by the witnesses and opinion of individuals. More specifically, as concerns the archeological site of Herculaneum, the contribution of Mr. Michele Barbieri, prominent lawyer, and President of the Fondazione Packard Institute for Cultural Heritage has been fundamental to provide the dissertation with a further practical approach. The institution is the Italian head office of the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI), through which the American philanthropists David Woodley Packard financially supports the Herculaneum Park. Mr. Barbieri is of the closest collaborators of Mr. Packard, as well as an old friend. I conducted an interview by phone and had a long conversation with Mr. Barbieri. His words turned out to be precious in providing me with an insider perspective on the project and in confirming what has been detected through the bibliographic sources. He explained me what the PHI did and currently does to sustain the park, providing insights on the roles, responsibilities, and duties of both private and public parties. Furthermore, Maria Guidobaldi's witness was crucial to define the HCP as a case of successful PPP partnership for the cultural sector. As concerns the Presidio Park, it should be underlined that the United States has a different policy in terms of transparency, compared to Italy. This allowed me to have access to data directly provided by the Presidio Trust itself, which

include documentation of plans, budgets, and projects. As a public entity supported by private donations, the Presidio must include all official documents that deal with budgets and finance, institutional agreements, projects, and planning. Moreover, a further methodological approach, based on my personal experience as an exchange student in the United States, has been used. In the United States, I could attend different classes, including cultural management and arts advocacy & cultural policy. Classes were mainly focused on the role and degree of involvement that the federal government has in administering the arts and culture in the United States. I noticed that the higher number of students agreed that the federal government should not have direct control over cultural assets, an aspect which totally differs from the conception of cultural administration in Italy. Also, I did not have the opportunity to work on a national park, but I had the opportunity to give a personal contribution to an American no-profit organization, through the development of arts projects, which also involved the issue of private and public actors and attend classes which focused on the topic of public-private partnerships for cultural assets. I could notice that the degree of involvement of private actors was much higher than the one of public entities. Therefore, by analyzing the case of American cultural landmark, I could demonstrate what I learned from my experience in the United States and compare it with an Italian example.

5.2. Herculaneum Archaeological Site: Historical Framework

Ercolano is a city located in the Bay of Naples, in Italy, whose ancient city, Herculaneum, was buried and dismantled after the eruption of the Mount Vesuvius in AD 79 (Borin, 2017; Thompson, 2007). A peculiarity of this site, which was brought to light at the beginning of the 18th century, lies in its location, which is exactly at the foot of the volcano and next to the modern Ercolano. (Thompson, 2007). Herculaneum was rediscovered during the era of the Bourbons, one of the dynastic rules of the Kingdom of Naples, and the works were conducted on behalf of the family itself. Nobody was aware of the existence of the site before the ancient Roman theatre was accidentally discovered by a farmer who was digging a well (Camardo, 2006). The excavation started in 1738, but it was limited to an open-air excavation campaign and did not include conservation and restoration works that were, instead, carried out by the archeologist Amedeo Maiuri from the 20th century onwards (Camardo, 2006). However, despite the use of primitive techniques, the Bourbon campaign succeeded in collecting a number of artifacts and historic assets which are today exposed in the major cultural centres of Naples and in renowned international museums. Moreover, the discovery of the site contributed to the proliferation of cultural tourism, attracting a huge

number of Grand Tour travellers and collectors from all over the world (Thompson, 2007). Moreover, the ancient town, whose heritage was still owned by the ruling family, gained for the first time the title of “collective propriety of humankind” (Thompson, 2007:3).

The second fundamental step in the excavation process was undertaken by the archaeologist Amedeo Maiuri, that took place from 1927 to 1961. He directed an open-air excavation campaign, launched during the fascist regime at the beginning of the 1900s. The ancient city was previously hidden by a thickness of 12-20 m of volcanic remains, which were removed during the excavation, although it is believed that a huge part of it is still beneath the modern town. Its excavation project, mainly focused on the restoration and conservation of the site, achieved great results and led to the opening of the buildings to the public (Thompson, 2007). Its success was also due to a group of excavators (about 20 individuals) selected from the staff of the heritage authority that cooperated with a team of boys in charge of dragging boxes of mud to small railway carriages (Camardo, 2006). The collaboration with bricklayers, joiners, and restorers, who were responsible for supporting the structures in danger of collapsing and preserving decorations (Camardo, 2006), was likewise fundamental for the success of the project. The formation of a collaborative and competent team allowed Maiuri to properly oversee each phase of the process and transform the site into a sort of museum (Camardo, 2006). As concerns the success of the campaign, it should be reminded that the excavation works took place during fascism, a national political movement whose main purpose was to celebrate the powerfulness of Italy and bring it back to the greatness of the Roman empire. Consequently, the symbolic and historic meaning of Herculaneum ensured Maiuri an on-going access to funds for the excavation (Camardo, 2006). The exceptional preservation of the buildings allowed Maiuri to create a real open-air museum, where tourists could visit perfectly conserved, ancient Roman houses and see original items and ordinary furniture, surpassing even the popular touristic site of Pompeii (Camardo, 2006). The case of Herculaneum has gained a special importance not only for its cultural and historical value, but also for its pioneering role in the field of modern archeology, being the site considered as the birthplace of the discipline itself (Camardo, 2006; Thompson, 2007).

Soon after Maiuri’s interventions, the maintenance program of the site experienced a steep decline. Starting from the 1990s, atmospheric agents, bad outsourcing of services, an improper maintenance, and vandalism led to a gradual collapse of houses and structures

(Camardo, 2006; Thompson 2007). The venue was defined by the UNESCO (2013) as “the only site in such serious state of decay that has no civil war to justify its condition” (Ferri and Zan, 2017). After Maiuri’s campaign, the Ministry did not manage to secure sufficient funds for the maintenance of the structures. Also, additional funds were used to finance further excavations between 1989 and 1997, increasing the general need of maintenance of the area (Ferri and Zan, 2017). Furthermore, the outsourcing of functions and services by external companies did not ensure high quality at lower costs, but rather their inefficiency in carrying out the works was intensified by the lack of skilled staff from the Superintendence (Ferri and Zan, 2017). The implementation of the 1997 law, which gave experimental autonomy to the heritage authorities of the city of Rome and Pompei, allowed the Superintendence of Pompei to obtain financial support for the archaeological sites. However, the real problem lied in the lack of operational capacity to spend these resources in the most proper way (Thompson 2007). Consequently, a new form of collaboration, based on the know-how and capabilities of several experts, was needed to restore the project. This scenario contributed to the creation of a new campaign, known as the Herculaneum Conservation Project, whose operational capacity has been extremely effective and whose efficiency has made Herculaneum one of the most important examples of conservation and proliferation of a cultural heritage asset.

5.3. The Herculaneum Conservation Project

The Herculaneum Conservation Project (HCP) can be defined as a broad, long-term program implemented by the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI), an American non-profit foundation, in 2001. It was developed in cooperation with the archaeological Superintendence of Naples and Pompeii and was aimed to “safeguard, conserve, enhance, and advance the knowledge, understanding and public appreciation of the ancient site of Herculaneum and its artifacts” (Dubini et al., 2012:65). The project, which represents an example of effective public-private partnership initiative for the heritage sector, can be split into three phases: phase one, from 2001 to 2004, phase two, from 2004 to 2009, and phase three, from 2009 to 2013 (Ferri and Zan, 2017). They can be summarized in three main steps: the first one, whose private partner’s involvement was limited to refund the works planned and implemented by the Superintendence, the second one, in which responsibilities for planning and implementing the works was given to a private partner, and the third one, in which the maintenance works were gradually transferred from the private to the public

partner (Ferri and Zan, 2017). This initiative has been internationally recognized as successful example of PPP in the cultural heritage field (Borin, 2017). This huge success has been also conformed by the words of Dr. Maria Paola Guidobaldi, with whom I had the opportunity to communicate by email.

Dr. Guidobaldi's comment on the strengths of this multiple partnership:

“I had been working as Director of Excavations for the Herculaneum site for 15 years, from 2000 to 2015. I managed and coordinated, on behalf of the Archaeological Superintendence of Pompeii, i.e., the public actor, this important public-private partnership that allowed the Site, that was in disastrous conditions, to revive. This partnership represents the only case of PPP in Italy featured by a comprehensive vision of shared strategies, long duration, and pure patronage so far. As representative of the public partner, I collaborated with the BSR (until 2013) for the development of this partnership and the contract of sponsorship. Also, the involvement of the PHI, followed by the creation of the “Istituto Packard per i Beni Culturali” with headquarters in Italy strengthened the public management system with professional, organizational, and financial resources. The provision of these resources was the real strength”.

Dr. Guidobaldi's answer to a potential model of HCP for other archeological sites:

“The model of the HCP has been emulated by many other archeological sites with particular reference to the development of a safety plan for endangered archeological heritage, improvement of accessibility, drainage of water, the optimization of financial and professional resources, conservation of previous restorations, and scheduled maintenance for the site. They are just some examples of the important field results that we obtained through the implementation of this partnership”.

Dr. Guidobaldi's academic commitment:

“I have personally organized meetings, seminars, and conferences to explain the evolution and impressive results of this PPP in several academic and cultural institutions in Italy and abroad, whose contents have been highly appreciated and published on national and international media”.

The collaboration has also been identified as an exceptional case of innovative management for the cultural heritage, as well as a mix of skills provided by public, private, and multiple

parties (Ferri and Zan, 2017; Borin, 2017). By participating in the project, the private foundation, aimed to preserve and valorize the archaeological site, provided the local authority with its technical and managerial tools (Borin, 2017). As concerns the main actors involved in the project, they were to be referred to as public heritage entities, the Superintendence, and two non-profit actors, i.e., the Packard Humanities Foundation and the British School of Rome (Borin, 2017).

However, there is a last, important phase which should be added to the process and which, today, characterizes the organizational and administrative structure of the site. Following the Franceschini reform of 2014 and the new organization of museums, the archaeological park has been recognized today as an autonomous museum with its own scientific, accounting, and financial autonomy. Firstly, this structural change led to the detachment from the administration of Pompeii in 2014 and the Superintendence, which was shared by the two sites, was converted into two separate institutions, namely the Special Superintendence of Naples and Pompeii and the Special Superintendence of Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Stabia. In 2017, the Superintendence of Pompeii was adapted to the international standards for cultural organizations and sites and was named Archaeological Park of Pompeii (Archaeological Park of Pompeii, 2022). The same concept was applied to Archaeological Park of Herculaneum. The Herculaneum Park was officially made autonomous in 2016. This change has led to positive results in terms of autonomous accountability, streamlining of decision-making processes, promptness of preservation activities, conservation and research, communication strategies (Milanesi, 2021). However, despite their greater autonomy, autonomous museums must always comply with the directives of the Ministry and are subject to supervision of the Directorate-General of Museums, that approve budgets (Fiè *et al.*, 2018). Moreover, the transformation of the park into an autonomous museum did not affect the partnership with the PHI, which it has been collaborating with since 2001. Today, the Park receives 1 million euro from the PHI annually. The amount of grants from the State varies annually. Thanks to the funds provided by the PNRR, the parks will receive 2 million euro from the plan of “improvement of energy, efficiency of cinemas, theatres, and museums” by September 2023, and 9.750.000 euro from the “CIS Vesuvio-Pompei-Napoli” contract promoted by MIC (approved on May 17, 2022) (Italia Domani Gov., 2022.; MiC., 2022). As concerns other private donations, thanks to the Art Bonus, the park obtained 59.485 euro for maintenance,

protection, and restoration of The Custodian's Room of The Collegium Augustales, to be added to 120.562,66 euro in public funds disbursed in 2021 (Art Bonus Gov., 2022).

Phase one began with the sign of a Memorandum of Understanding by the above-mentioned Institute and the archaeological Superintendence of Pompeii, which consisted of an agreement to establish the financial and methodological support of the operation (Thompson, 2007). According to the Memorandum, the PHI was asked to refund several conservations works and specifically focus on an urban space of the ancient town, named the Insula Orientalis I (Ferri and Zan, 2017). A special scientific committee was then developed during this first phase and a further group of specialists supervised by a project manager, namely an architect, a restorer, an archaeologist was involved to focus on the Insula Orientalis project (Ferri and Zan, 2017). Nonetheless, this agreement was limited and did not foster the implementation of an effective conservation plan. The PHI only provided the public entity with a refund of the expenses (around 725000 €), and research projects about the site and its maintenance needs (amounting to 865000 €) were only partially conducted (Borin, 2017). Problems emerged also due to the long execution times and subsequent delays in preparing and carrying out the works, as well as a further lack of operational facility in implementing funds (Ferri and Zan, 2017). This required the adoption of new legal models (Thompson, 2007), leading to the involvement of further partners in the development of a more effective preservation projects.

The second phase was launched by the new law 42/2004 which, as already mentioned in the chapter concerning Italian PPPs, promoted the use of sponsorship for cultural assets. This law also encouraged several non-profit partners in participating in projects concerning the preservation of historic heritage and allowed them to undertake and manage the works at their own cost, without the need to rely on the public works law (Ferri and Zan, 2017). Accordingly, a new sponsorship agreement, involving a further non-profit private partner and research institution in the HCP, namely the British School of Rome (BSR), was implemented. Thanks to the PHI grants, a five-year contract with the Superintendence was signed by the BSR in order to schedule plans and engage contractors in on-site work activities (Ferri and Zan, 2017). The development of this innovative model of partnership was due to the awareness that the real problems of the project lied in a lack of managerial competences and knowhow, rather than a scarcity of funds (Borin, 2017). The BSR was directly responsible for carrying out all conservation works on the site, including

restoration, maintenance, and research (Borin, 2017). It was the first time in the Italian history that a private partner was allowed to intervene directly on an archaeological site for conservation purposes at its own management, expense, and in a more flexible and rapid way (Thompson, 2007). Moreover, this interdisciplinary team, which involved participants from the first phase, namely an architect, a restorer, an archaeologist, and a project manager, was extended to the inclusion of structural engineer, an engineer specialized in water-related issues, a conservation scientist, and an IT specialist (Ferri and Zan, 2017). As stated by both the project manager and the director of the site, the collaboration between HCP specialists and the authorities of the Superintendence was fundamental to achieve the desired results of this phase (Ferri and Zan, 2017). This new model of mixed partnership, whose operations lasted five years, succeeded in restoring the environment and consolidating the buildings, structures, and decorations of the site for its gradual reopening to visitors (Thompson, 2007). Moreover, this new approach was totally different from the previous models implemented by the Superintendence, since its conservation aims were focused on problems, rather than on single buildings. More specifically, general problems, involving for instance roofs, walls, and the water management systems, were arranged according to hierarchical priorities, but restoration efforts were addressed to the whole site.

The third phase faced the renewal of the sponsorship agreement for five more years and dealt with the implementation of joint programming initiatives and the completion of the restoration works. This new agreement provided that, in addition to the projects planned, contracted out, and paid by private partners, other projects had to be financed and contracted out by the Superintendence. According to this joint programming initiative (*Programmazione Congiunta HCP* in Italian), the Superintendence were committed to invest one million euro in the project in 2009, and almost two million in the projects planned by both the HCP specialists and the Superintendence itself in 2010 and 2011 (Ferri and Zan, 2017). This phase was known as the “exit-strategy”, which gradually allowed the public entities to become highly responsible for the archaeological site and strengthen their relationship with local, social, and economic actors (Borin, 2017). A program of conservation works, and research plans was, then, implemented and provided to scholars and the academic community.

Additional activities were addressed to further stakeholders, including citizens and tourists (Borin, 2017). The project was extended up to the modern part of the city, which was

similarly in a state of advanced decay and degradation and relied on the collaboration between HCP specialists and the Municipality of Ercolano (Ferri and Zan, 2017). This last phase also redefined the governance and management structure of the project by strengthening the relationship between different partners involved in the agreement (Borin, 2017). The governance structure of the PPP project included stakeholders from the already mentioned scientific committee and from a new executive committee. This collaboration led to an innovative ecosystem, based on a new project management approach, “mixed governance bodies and a mixed project staff” (Borin, 2017:154). In this last phase core processes were implemented unanimously by this mixed team, the project management capacity of the public authority was increased, and further external collaborators (such as the Getty Conservation Institute, Italian and International institutions) were involved in preservation and conservation activities of the site (Borin, 2017).

5.4. Governance and Management Structure

One of the main elements of this partnership is the continuous process of transformation of the conservation project. Different phases and agreements have led to a wide range of collaborations, transformations, financial implications, and control mechanisms. The agreement typology of phase one was characterized by a traditional sponsorship scheme (namely the refund of several Superintendence’s projects) and sponsorship in kind (research on the Insula Orientalis I). The agreement typology of phase two, instead, reflected a design-build-finance approach, better known as conserve-build-finance in restoration terms (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014), through which it was possible for the BSR to hire heritage professionals able to implement conservation campaigns and outsource their realization to specialized work companies, supervised by the Superintendence (Ferri and Zan, 2017). Finally, the agreement typology of phase three was characterized both by a sponsorship in kind and design-build-finance model. Indeed, thanks to PHI grants, heritage professionals were hired by the BSR to arrange conservation campaigns (later outsourced and paid by the Superintendence). A design-build-finance approach was implemented by the non-profit actors for a few projects (Ferri and Zan, 2017). If compared with traditional models of Italian partnerships in public infrastructure projects, this example has been made unique by the non-profit element of private partners. Firstly, it was the first time that a non-profit partner was involved to repay funds; secondly, due its nature, the length of agreement was established over time (4+5+5), in compliance with the need of intervention and the

availability of the partners; thirdly, the amount of public grants was in line with the ones of private funding (11.4 million euro investments by the Superintendence between 2001 – 2008, and around 1 million euro yearly for the joint programming from 2009); fourthly, the partnership was not affected by any exploitation-conservation conflict typical of projects which deal with the recovery of historical buildings (Ferri and Zan, 2017).

As for the governance and control systems, different actors were involved in the partnership. In the first phase, the PHI had control over each project, its time of execution, expenditures, and the Superintendence. The scientific committee of this first phase included the President of the PHI, the Director of the BSR (director of the partnership), the Superintendent, the Campania Regional Director for the archaeological heritage, the Director of the International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), and three researchers in the field of Vesuvian archaeology (Ferri and Zan, 2017). The second phase was characterized by an extended governance (a new PHI elected member was, in fact included in the committee) and a more articulated reporting system. In this phase the Superintendence, instead of being controlled, monitored HCP actors through the committee and its team. HCP specialists were, in fact, required to provide public reports on a six-monthly basis to the Superintendence. However, the third phase saw the biggest changes in terms of governance, with the inclusion of an executive committee aimed to ratify programs of annual interventions and midterm changes. While the scientific committee preserving its advisory role, the executive committee was made of a new group of two actors for each main institution involved (PHI, BSR, and the Superintendence), and their decision were approved collectively (Ferri and Zan, 2017). The scientific committee was extended to two more representatives of the PHI, two members of the BSR, and experts from academic and cultural heritage institutions (Borin, 2017).

It should be relevant to underline that a project management approach has been necessary to face the huge number of initiatives correlated to the HCP. As previously mentioned, the HCP involved several consultants (amounting to 15) to directly collaborate with public actors from the Superintendence, including a project director, a project manager, a research coordinator, and professionals from the heritage field (Dubini et al., 2012). The project manager has assumed, in fact, a central role from the very first stage of the operations. The management team dealt with project management tasks and administrative duties and was responsible for developing, coordinating, and overseeing the general conservation program

(Dubini et al., 2012). In the last phase, the management team of the PPP project was reinforced by the supervision of a project director (the same president of the scientific committee), who strictly collaborated with the project manager and with a team of professionals from the local heritage authority, other local public entities, independent counsels, private firms, and freelancers in the heritage field (Borin, 2017). Finally, as underlined in the first paragraph of the chapter, the HCP underwent a further evolution with the implementation of the museum reform of 2014, which later turned it into a state museum equipped with special autonomy. This change also affected its administrative structure, which according to the ministerial decree of January 23, 2016, had to be composed of a director, an administrative council, a scientific committee, and a board of auditors. In compliance with the law, the current governance system of the Archaeological Park of Herculaneum places the director at the top of the organization, followed by the administrative council and the scientific committee, and lastly by the director's office. The office, in turn, is divided into three main areas, e.g., accessibility, technical-scientific area, and general affairs (Parco Archeologico di Ercolano, 2022).

5.5. *Local Involvement*

The Herculaneum Conservation Project supported the development of the International Center for the Study of Herculaneum. It was founded with the aim of bringing together core public partners, private, and institutional participants under the same building and creating a space of dialogue for the community. It was launched in 2006 through a state-funded three-year program and included a partnership with the local, non-profit Herculaneum Association. This partnership was established by the Municipality of Ercolano, the archaeological Superintendence of Naples and Pompeii, and the British School of Rome. The International Center for the Study of Herculaneum was the second initiative carried out by the HCP actors aimed to involve residents in the activities of the ancient and new Ercolano. The first project was the Urban Herculaneum Project, which was launched in 2003 to cope with the socio-economic problems of the area. The project was developed in order to regenerate the modern city in parallel with the ancient Herculaneum and create a social and cultural image through heritage (Borin, 2018). Moreover, the project aimed to promote a more sustainable tourism by connecting the site with other natural heritage venues, such as the Amalfi Coast and villas of the 1700s – 1800s (Borin, 2018).

The implementation of the centre was an effective example of how a private investment succeeded in attracting further public funds for heritage-related activities of the venue (Dubini et al., 2012; Borin, 2017). The center also supported the inclusion of residents in its activities, with the aim to give a cultural and civic value to an urban space which, at that time, was dealing with a series of social and economic problems. The centre developed several activities which directly involved communities, locals, and inhabitants (Borin, 2017), making them active stakeholders engaged in ensuring that the archaeological site did not return to its previous condition of degradation (Dubini et al., 2012). Teaching programs and research internships were developed to investigate the relationship between the locals and cultural heritage and teachers from the school of Ercolano were provided with teaching materials and asked to participate as spokespeople in international workshops and study days (Dubini et al., 2012; Borin, 2017). It should be reminded that, besides the Herculaneum Association's partners, further collaborations were likewise implemented to achieve the same purposes, including the ones with International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), national and international universities, schools, and cultural associations (Dubini et al., 2012). This framework contributed to the establishment of long-term sustainable PPP models increasingly open to citizens, communities, local and cultural organizations.

5.6. Interview with President Michele Barbieri

How is the relationship between the Packard Humanities Institute and the Park? Do you think that the autonomy that the Park has gained and the detachment from the Superintendence of Pompeii have contributed to an improvement in the administration of the park?

“The partnership has been and is still today highly productive. Of course, it did. The higher rate of autonomy of the park allows it to mainly focus on their own activities and projects, rather than on the initiatives of the site of Pompeii. Before being autonomous, in fact, the site of Herculaneum was, due to the dimensions and relevance of the Park of Pompeii, relegated to secondary status. Today, PHI can make donations directly addressed to the Herculaneum Park and can better manage the money that come from the United States.”

Who has higher decision-making power in this partnership?

“The public sector, as owner of the park, has the decision-making power. As a foundation, we are not allowed to do anything without permission of the public bodies of the park (90% of the cases indicates that the final decision resides with the park). We must follow the directives of the park in any case. However, we always try to combine common ideas and there is not a supremacy. The objective is to find a meeting point”.

If the primary aim of PHI is always philanthropy, how is the situation managed in fiscal terms? How are grants managed?

“The issue of philanthropy is totally true, the grants provided are from the American foundation, which is non-profit. Clearly, donations are tax-deductible. However, being it a form of economic support, but also a partnership which involves multiple actors, the tasks to be performed by both parties are mutually agreed in advance. Grants are sent from the main venue of the Packard Institute, located in the U.S., to the Italian subsidiary - the Packard Institute for Cultural Heritage, directed by lawyer Barbieri -. The Italian foundation obtains grants, which are then used to finance activities of conservation of relics, excavation plans, and programs for the allocation of funds. We don't carry out excavation work. The park cannot, in fact, manage its activities on its own, due to the lack of appropriate means, resources, and personnel. Clearly, all initiatives must be previously agreed with the administrators of the park”.

Is Packard involved in activities which differ from archeology?

“As concerns further activities, the foundation not only deals with archeology, but also with movies, music, the restoration of U.S. sites (such as the library of the U.S. Congress) and so on”.

How did the Foundation get interested in the park of Herculaneum?

“It was around 2001 and David Packard, who is really passionate about arts and archeology, was visiting *Villa dei Papiri* in Ercolano. However, he noticed that there was a damp patch, and after 4-5 months, when he was visiting the park again, he found out that it was still there. This problem was due to the fact that the park was a public entity and had to wait for funds and comply with a long tendering procedure. Consequently, David provided the park with an equip of professionals that helped both Herculaneum and Pompeii in carrying out the interventions necessary to the parks, without waiting for the long and complex procedures of public procurement - (*tempi biblici*, as affirmed by Barbieri) -. The foundation

is, indeed, made of several professionals, including archeologists, geologists, architects, etc.”

Since you mentioned the long-lasting procedures of the public sector in Italy, do you think that the same can be applied to the United States, when dealing with relationships between public and private partners?

“Public administration in the U.S. is much easier than the Italian one. Clearly, this is not my field of study, thus, I don’t have an extended knowledge of the topic, but David confirmed me that Italy is far more complicated. This does not mean that there are not rules that need to be followed in the U.S. For instance, when David was restoring the Library of the U.S. Congress, its foundation had to comply with rules and norms. However, it might be confirmed that the system is less intricate”.

Being Herculaneum a case of PPP which has involved multiple actors from both the public and private sector, including the British School of Rome, how was the cooperation?

“Generally, pretty good. There has only been a period when the PHI wanted to make some interventions that the British Institute could not support for institutional reasons and, thus, there were some problems in the distribution of funds from the PHI for these interventions, since money were given, but the British Institute could not make use of them. Therefore, to avoid potential disputes, we - Barbieri refers to himself and David Packard - decided to create the Fondazione Packard Institute for Cultural Heritage, with headquarters in Pisa. However, the relationships with other stakeholders have always been good, and this also concerns the relationship with the park itself. Of course, it is not easy to combine different ideas, David is American, the Park is Italian, therefore, they need to find common ground. Nonetheless, when there is a common purpose, things work efficiently. Also, David annually gives to the park 1 million euro”.

What about Fondazione Packard Institute for Cultural Heritage?

“It is in Pisa, since David owns a house in the city, and we are really good friends - Michele Barbieri has his law office in Pisa as well -. Thus, I told David that I could directly manage the foundation here. The foundation is owned by David”.

Upcoming projects?

“The park got money from the European PNRR and we are deciding which is the better way to spend them. Together with the money provided by the American Foundation, we aim to create something that can last over time. Thus, we are working on this new construction project, and we hope it can be concluded soon”.

5.7. *Presidio Park: Historical Framework*

The Presidio is a National Park and a National Historic Landmark District located in San Francisco, California. Its site encompasses 603 hectares around the northern peninsula of the city and reaches the Golden Gate Bridge. Its landmark district is comprised of 470 historic buildings, together with gardens, streetscapes, and historic gates (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Moreover, more than 350 historic buildings have been restored and added to the territory in 2012. One of the most important landmarks of the Presidio is its forest, that was erected by the Army at the end of the 1800s and that today reaches about 120 hectares (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). However, its history dates to 1776, when the site was one of the four royal forts (alias *presidios*) of Spain, before passing into the hands of the US Army from 1886 to 1994 and making it one of the most important examples of American military architecture. The Presidio area originally consisted of sand dunes, grasslands, oak woods, and marshes and was inhabited by the Ohlone Indians, namely a native American tribe of the northern California coast. They lived in the region for almost 10000 years, where they had established seasonal camps and villages, until the arrival of the Europeans (Holloran, 1996; Presidio Trust, 2022).

The Presidio was a military outpost of the Spanish empire from 1776 to 1821 and hosted more than 200 soldiers with their families from northern Mexico. Despite its already extensive dimension, the area was doubled after that an earthquake hit the place in 1812 (Presidio Trust, 2022). In 1821, Mexico gained independence from the Spanish kingdom, however, there were no shift in the administration and workforce of the outpost. The big change occurred after the Mexican American war, when the American army assumed control of the site in 1848. The battle took place after a border conflict in Texas, which led to the occupation of the Presidio from the New York Volunteer Regiment in 1847. From that moment, the area became the most important military reservation of the Pacific Coast and developed into a large coastal defence system that reached the peninsula of the Marin Headlands and the former defensive outpost of Fort Funston, including Alcatraz and Angel Island (all these former military places are today part of the Golden Gate National

Recreation Area). From 1847 to 1890 the Presidio protected the area of San Francisco, and its military force took part in several battles such as the American Indian Wars. The site was also central to the protection of the American military forces that were in the Pacific area and Asian region during the conquest of the Philippines and the Vietnam War. At end of the 19th century, the Army developed a forestation program to enhance and embellish the whole area and, in 1874, the site was transformed into an open-access space for citizens (Presidio Trust, 2022). Regardless of its military status, the natural beauty and vegetation of the place made it a California Historical Landmark in 1933. The urban regeneration and heritage renewal of the venue led to its official inclusion in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in 1972, 10 years after being recognized as a National Historic Landmark. However, its conversion from military post to national park occurred on October 1, 1994, making the Presidio and its collection of fortifications, structures, properties, and cultural assets one of the symbols of the American military and national history (Presidio Trust, 2022).

Today, the Presidio is a popular destination for local, national, international visitants, hosts residents, communities, and organizations (Presidio Trust, 2022). The national park is characterized by hiking and biking trails, beautiful viewpoints, and top attractions. The area is divided into four main regions: the Main Post, the Crissy Field, the Golden Gate, and Southern Wilds. According to the Presidio official website, the Main Post is the core of the Presidio and is constituted of several green spaces and cultural recreations. As for the northern coast, i.e., Crissy Field, glimpses of the Bay, hiking trails, birdwatching, indoor and outdoor activities can be found. Similar activities are provided in the Golden Gate area, where people can also experience a walk near the homonymous bridge. Finally, outdoor recreation and a rural landscape characterize the Southern Wilds region. The park is characterized by special destinations, which have been classified as top attractions of feature the territory. They include the Presidio Visitor Center, the Presidio Officers' Club, the Presidio Tunnel Tops, the Battery Bluff, the Main Parade Lawn, the Walt Disney Family Museum and Café, and the Korean War Memorial in the main region; the Crissy Marsh, and the Warming Hut Park Store in the Crissy Field zone; the Golden Gate Bridge, the Baker Beach, the Fort Point National Historic Site, and the Marshall's Beach in the Gold Gate area; Andy Goldsworthy's Spire, El Polín Spring, Mountain Lake, and San Francisco National Cemetery in the region of Southern Wilds (Presidio Trust, 2022). It should be added that the Presidio is not a simple national park with recreational areas, but its activities

extend from volunteering and educational programs, sport, art exhibitions and installations, to leasing opportunities for both individuals and businesses.

5.8. Governance and Management Structure

The turning point of the Presidio Park project took place in 1996, when the Congress approved the Presidio Trust Act and established the Presidio Trust, an innovative independent federal agency responsible for preserving and improving the Presidio and overseeing its evolutionary process from military site to National Park (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). In legal terms, the Presidio Trust is defined as a wholly owned government corporation, e.g., a body established by the Congress, whose capital is property of the government (Sorensen, 2002). The Board of the Presidio Trust consists of seven directors, six of them are selected by the president of the United States and at least three of them must be based in the San Francisco Bay Area (Sorensen, 2002), while the last one is the secretary of the interior or their designee (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Still today, the Trust administers the park in collaboration with the National Park Service and with the sustain of the non-profit Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy (GGNPC). The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy is community-supported non-profit cooperating association that works on the preservation and development of parks within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (Presidio Trust, 2022). The Trust, the NPS, and the GGNPC are constituent of what is known as “the Partnership for the Presidio”, a cooperation of actors in charge of supporting the natural heritage and traditions of the park, fostering new experiences, and raising funds to secure its future (Presidio Trust, 2022). Furthermore, it should be underlined that the park receives funds from the GGNPC yearly. The GGNPC is responsible for financing park services, restoration, stewardship, community programs, and general activities of improvement of the national landmarks located the San Francisco area. The total support for the fiscal year 2021 (equally split among eight landmarks) amounted to \$62,577,260 (20% for visitor services, 74% for park enhancements, 6% for local programs) (GGNPC, 2022). The Presidio Trust was created with the aim to make the site financially independent over time. Two sources of funding characterized the project, namely an annual federal grant, which was due to end in 2013, and earnings from the leasing of buildings, for business and personal use, within the site. In the balance sheet of the park for the fiscal years 2020 and 2021 is reported that asset and liabilities amounted to \$776,409,282 in 2021 and \$689,548,834 in 2020. Net cost of the operations amounted to \$8,422,757 in 2021 and \$2,171,553 in 2020. As for funds, they amounted to \$441,363,927 in 2021 and

\$403,302,416 in 2020, including non-federal non-exchange revenues, donations, and ends from dedicated collections (Presidio Trust, 2021). In financial terms, the Trust focuses on the recovery and rebuilding of historic properties through a partnership with private entities for the redevelopment of the buildings. All earnings are held by the Trust and reinvested for capital improvement and maintenance of the place, its green areas, infrastructures, and internal programs (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). This governance and management structure makes the Presidio a unique case of administration of National Park (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014).

The project was aimed to protect the Presidio, make use of its historic properties, regenerate its historic landmarks, and recover its natural spaces. Their achievement was possible only through advanced land management tools, since traditional park management approaches were not enough to recover disused and deteriorated buildings, uncultivated forests, and a compromised environment of 603-hectare military land (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). The rehabilitation of the whole site was too articulated and economically challenging to be financed only by the Presidio. Similarly, a sole private actor could not afford to manage such a large project autonomously. (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Consequently, a collaboration between multiple entities was necessary to include private capital in a multimillion-dollar rehabilitation project. Multiple partners were involved in this public-private partnership, namely the Presidio Trust, as concerns the public side, and several private financiers, e.g., Equity Community Builders, Forest City Enterprises, Future without Violence, House of Air, La Petite Baleen Swim School, Letterman Digital Arts, Planet Granite, Presidio Social Club, University of San Francisco, Walt Disney Family Foundation. The agreement typology of this PPP was characterized by a buy-build-operate approach, which applied to the conservation field is transformed into a buy-serve-operate model (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014).

As reported by Macdonald and Cheong (2014), partners covered different positions and responsibilities, starting with the Trust's role of owner and planning authority of the project and the role of developers and tenants held by the private actors. The public body oversaw the creation and development of rules and objectives for each PPP project, supervised design and development plans, allowed the access to public properties, negotiated the terms of a lease, and inspected the site yearly. On the other hand, private partners were responsible for the development of the project proposal, its process, and its costs. They were required to contribute to the maintenance of the park and the public safety through payment of a fee

and to preserve the buildings in compliance with the guidelines established by the Trust. Both private and public actors had to undertake several challenges in order to ensure the restoration, regeneration, and recovery of the Presidio site. In the end, the Trust succeeded in readapting more than 350 historic properties and recovering 40 percent of the landscape. The project of rehabilitation required an expenditure amounting to \$ 1.6 billion in a period ranging from 1998 to 2012, although the Trust was made financially independent from federal funds in 2004 (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). Today, more than 800 individuals live or work at the Presidio, preserving its historicity and community status. The Trust also managed to overcome one of the biggest challenges of the project, namely the recovery of the Public Health Service District, which was converted from a hospital into a modern complex of apartments (the Presidio Landmark apartments). The result is a blend of housing units, workspaces, a preschool, and a printing office surrounded by 10 hectares of natural space (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). The Presidio Landmark apartments have been provided as an example to demonstrate the efficiency of this public-private partnership, which would have not been possible without the collaboration between the Trust and the real estate investment firm Forest City Enterprises (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014).

5.9. General Management Plan and Presidio Trust Management Plan

The Development of an initial plan for the Presidio of San Francisco occurred between 1990 and 1994, when the National Park Service implemented a public planning process for the realization of a General Management Plan addressed to the new functions of the Presidio as a National Park. The General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA), which was established in 1994, provided that the Presidio was structured into 13 sections, or districts, with their own projects and objectives (Sorensen, 2002). Due to the limited experience and knowhow of the NPS, the GMPA asked for the establishment of a public/private partner that was able to administer and rehabilitate the site. This requirement represented the first attempt to the creation of independent body whose sole aim was the management of a National Park (Sorensen, 2002) (the entity is, still today, the only one to fill this role on the whole American territory). However, the original purpose of the plan was the realization of a global center that dealt with the critical environmental, social, and cultural issues that had been afflicting the planet (Sorensen, 2002). The plan was articulated into different areas, in line with the four targets of the programs (namely sustainability, community involvement, international cooperation, health and scientific research), and concerned the renovation of the 13 districts (Golden Gate National Recreation Area California [GGNRA], 1994). The

GMPA also included the realization of a transportation plan and housing lots for park employees. As underlined in the first stage of the public planning process, the GMPA required the creation of a “federally chartered management partner with skills and authorities” (GGNRA, 1994:112; Sorensen, 2002:76) that could support the NPS in obtaining capital investments, philanthropic aids, leasing possibilities, and incomes from the park tenants. Therefore, the GMPA would rely on the collaboration between the partnering institution and the NPS, whose primary role was still to oversee the plan and its changes and provide guidelines and technical assistance. A section of the GMPA was, then, dedicated to costs and financing: the estimated costs amounted to \$612 million, given by the contribution of both private and public funding (a mix of facility rental fees, NPS appropriations, private philanthropy, federal government tax credits, other federal agencies).

Citizens and the community appeared to be enthusiastic about the program, however, the same feelings were not shared by many Congressional authorities, that did not approve the position of a National Park within a city (Sorensen, 2002). According to the GMPA, Congressional appropriations was supposed to amount to about \$24 million for 15 years and \$16 million after 2010 (Sorensen, 2002), a high price that the federal government seemed unwilling to support. This discrepancy brought to several congressional battles, led by the Congresswoman of California Nancy Pelosi, between 1993 and 1995. The first achievement was the establishment of the “Presidio Corporation”, a federal government corporation aimed to sustain the NPS in administering the venue. This public corporation, which was a first manifestation of what would have known as the Presidio Trust, originally relied on a public-private structure, being an institution established within the Department of the Interior (Sorensen, 2002). This first phase also anticipated the role of the Secretary of the Interior and their importance in managing the Presidio and its facilities.

In 1995, the Pelosi’s Bill for the creation of the Presidio Trust was passed by the House, although with the inclusion of a clause of self-sufficiency. The property, indeed, would have been returned to the Department of Defense and dismantled if the Trust would not have achieved sufficient financial independence. Consequently, the appropriations from the government would have decreased to \$0 by 2013, allowing the Trust to become economically self-reliant within 15 years. All this procedure was part of a legislative package, approved by the Senate, and named the Presidio Trust Act (Sorensen, 2002). It was finalized in 1996 and outlined the financial and managerial responsibilities of the Presidio Trust, which was defined as a public/private partner able to limit costs to the U.S.

Treasury and take advantages of private resources (Sorensen, 2002; U.S. House, 1996). The Presidio Trust was committed to protect the natural environment, as well as to improve the historic asset and develop cultural and educational programs with the support of the NPS and other stakeholders (Sorensen, 2002). The Trust exerted control over the 80% of the park (Area B), while the seaward site, or Area A, (corresponding to 20% of the site) was managed by the NPS. It was also responsible for creating a Financial Management Plan, officially signed in 1998, to become economically independent within 15 fiscal years. According to the plan, the Trust was allowed to make financial agreements with other federal agencies, state or local authorities, private and non-profit actors and receive further economic support through tax benefits (Sorensen, 2002). A list of policies (general, non-residential leasing, residential leasing, and open space policies) for the recovery and leasing of the venue and its properties contributed to the achievement of the expected results. The financial models and allocations established through the plan would have led to the realization and approval of the Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP) in 2002, which would have replaced the 1994 GMPA (Sorensen, 2002).

The PTMP developed a more realistic vision of the park, focused on the cultural, natural, and recreational benefits that the site could provide to the Americans, rather than to the globe (Sorensen, 2002). However, the same purpose of self-sufficiency of the GMPA was shared by the new plan, which developed 7 planning alternatives to determine the financial feasibility of the projects and estimate potential revenues from each scenario (Sorensen, 2002). Their analysis determined the implementation of a Final Plan Alternative, whose basic principles were included in the Final Presidio Trust Management Plan. They were focused on the increase of open spaces, the reduction of buildings, a fair use of building spaces (1/3 for residents, 1/3 for work, 1/3 for public use), sustainable practices for the infrastructure system, and public involvement (Presidio Trust, 2002; Sorensen, 2002). The New Plan was also aimed to revitalize seven specific districts of the Area B. The Final Presidio Trust Management Plan was officially adopted in July 2002 and was considered as the primary planning document for the Presidio (Sorensen, 2002). Several plans for future implementation have been developed through the Trust Plan, allowing its evolution throughout the years. Despite the inevitable changes of time, it has succeeded in developing guidelines, park policies, and mechanisms that have guaranteed the survival of the site (Presidio Trust, 2002).

5.10. Local Involvement

Contrary to the beliefs of the Congress, the transformation of the Presidio from a military base to a National Park and its related recreational and environmental activities have been welcomed by citizens and local community. Local involvement in cultural, educational, and social activities of the Presidio is still today a fundamental component of the park identity, and several programs have been customized for both visitors and San Franciscans. In the previous section of the chapter, a theoretical analysis of an Italian archaeological site has been provided to proceed with the comparison between Italy and the United States. Although the Presidio Park is not a mere archaeological site, its heritage has made it a benchmark of the American history and its colonial past. Archaeology research is, indeed, a current activity at the park and a dig site can be found close to the Presidio Officers' Club. This body, which was remodelled by the Presidio Trust in 2014, is today a public museum and cultural destination hosting a number of activities and facilities of different kind, such as the archaeology lab and research programs (Presidio Trust, 2022).

The Presidio is defined as one of the only national park sites in the U.S. equipped with an active archaeological dig site and one of the biggest public archaeology projects. The Presidio Trust has control over 30 archaeological spaces within the Presidio National Historic Landmark District (NHLHD), whose history covers an extended period that goes from the Native Ohlone establishment to the arrival of the American Army (Presidio Trust, 2022). The Presidio Archaeology Lab's primary interest is the Pershing Square in the Main Post district, where archaeologists have been working on its excavation since 2014 and have been adopting a so-called open-site approach, namely involving visitors and volunteers to take part in the process as witnesses or collaborators. One of the goals of the archaeology research is to make people feel part of the history of the Presidio, connect individuals with this large heritage, and establish relationships with different communities (Jones, 2019). Several attempts have been made to meet these purposes and, in this regard, particular importance should be given to the Presidio Heritage Program. Several projects have been implemented to make communities more engaged in cultural practices and conceive archaeology as an opportunity to discuss the future without forgetting the past.

The Presidio Heritage Program was created by the Presidio Trust in 2013 and its mission was to share the history of the Presidio with groups of active participants and communities. A heritage museum, a class for youngsters in the Officers' Club, the Archaeology Lab, and

a public archology project were developed, supported by an equip of professionals, such as archaeologists, curators, historians, and educators (Jones, 2019). The Presidio Museum hosts exhibitions concerning the history of the Presidio and usually involves community partners, such as *Los Californianos* (whose ancestors are the original Spanish colonists) to contribute to the show with their stories and personal objects (Jones, 2019). Formal and informal youth programs have also been provided by the Presidio authorities since the late '90s. Additionally, further public programs, which include not only heritage themes, but also music, theatre, poetry, and dance performances, are offered to families and adults (Jones, 2019). One example of recurring program aimed to celebrate the history of the Presidio, its indigenous and colonial past, as well as to involve communities and attract visitors is the *Pasados del Presidio*. During this annual commemoration, several activities are provided by Spanish, Mexican, and Indigenous cultural organizations and more than 600 children and families are invited to participate (Jones, 2019). Moreover, a range of public archaeology projects have been developed through the years and have been addressed to volunteers, park staff, interns, and students interested in archaeological practices or in preserving the communitarian and cultural value of the site. As for the current Pershing Square site project, other programs have been created to transform archaeology research from a passive to an active process that directly involves the public in activities of excavation (Jones, 2019). It might be concluded that the Presidio Trust has converted archaeology, its practices, and the park heritage into a collaborative model where partners, locals, volunteers, docents, and students can contribute with their personal stories and knowledge to make the Presidio a more inclusive space and benchmark for different communities.

5.11. Key Aspects

The Italian case of the Herculaneum Conservation Project was featured by a series of partnership agreements among different stakeholders and its flexibility in planning, programming, and controlling, as well as the high level of trust between actors, highly contributed to the success of the project (Ferri and Zan, 2017). According to the sources, a few debates, in fact, took place during the development of the project, while a high level of consensus between partners on the general aims of the program emerged (Ferri and Zan, 2017). The implementation of an ecosystem approach, in which the traditional schemes of PPPs were surpassed by a holistic framework of public, private, and local actors, contributed

to the creation of a new model of partnership that turned out to be beneficial for the cultural and historic heritage of the nation. The high level of interdependence between the three main stakeholders and professionals of the territory was crucial to foster the social, cultural, and economic development of the city. A long-term strategy placed community participation at the core of the partnership, assigning to culture a role of community builder and “local regenerator”. Although the case of the Presidio Park does not mainly concern archaeological practices but relates to the issue of conservation in wider terms, the ecosystem approach that characterized the Italian case can be similarly found in the American model. Indeed, the cooperation between public, private, and local stakeholders contributed to make the Presidio project a further example of a cultural ecosystem where multiple actors interact for the benefit of the place and its community.

The success of the HCP was also due to the flexibility of its governance and management structures, which made it a unique case of partnership project in the Italian cultural heritage sector. This element reflects many aspects of the HCP, which should be reported to further underline the uniqueness of this project. The first aspect complies with the philanthropic aim of the partnership, the second aspect deals with the overcoming of the traditional scheme of sponsorship, the third aspect concerns the increased importance of the private partner in the agreement, the fourth aspect focused on the transition from contractual to institutionalized PPP, the fifth aspect relates to the wide multi-stakeholder involvement, made of two committees for the project governance and a HCP team and external professionals for the project management, and the last aspect integrates capacity building with autonomous preservation and enhancement of the archeological area (Borin, 2018). Five years after the development of the last agreement, a “continuous care” maintenance program, to which the Superintendence could apply autonomously, was developed, followed by a transition phase in which the HPC team was required to gradually reduce its contribution and assume an advisory and supervisory role, so that the Superintendence could directly handle the preservation works (Dubini *et al.*, 2012).

The issue of uniqueness for a PPP in the cultural heritage is somehow shared by the American case of the Presidio. Although the previous chapters have demonstrated that there are a few similarities between the Italian and American legislative and administrative system, the governance and management of the Presidio Park, characterized by multiple public-private partners and financial self-sufficiency, is equally considered a unique case of

PPP within the whole U.S. soil. A good park's maintenance was given by the implementation of a BCO partnership and the establishment of a long-term process of privatization through an institutionalized model of PPP and Special Purpose Vehicle that, despite being classified as a federal agency, works as an independent owner, manager, and financier of the site and its historic buildings (Macdonald, 2011). Lastly, this self-sufficiency could be traced to the new model of autonomous museum which have been characterizing the Italian park and which relates both cases to an increasingly international model of cultural self-administration, equipped with greater organizational and managerial capacity.

Conclusion

In this dissertation, the topic of public-private partnerships for the cultural sector has been faced and a comparative analysis about its development and use in Italy and the United States has been conducted. Indeed, this thesis has been pursued in order to identify the differences and similarities which characterize the governance structure and legislative system of the above-mentioned countries, including the dissimilarities that have affected the institutional framework of PPPs. This paper was also aimed to establish the degree of interest and involvement of different stakeholders from the public and private sphere and the rate of influence that they had on the development of PPP projects, according to the system of management and governance of the two countries. In this regard, two examples of PPP projects that occurred in Italy and the United States have been mentioned to explain how similar projects have been managed by different countries and verify that they complied with the theoretical concepts discussed in the previous chapters. Moreover, the two examples have been provided to show how a correct development of PPPs can succeed in valorizing the cultural asset of a country and how their further use for cultural projects could contribute to a general enhancement in the preservation of national heritage.

From this analysis, it has firstly emerged that, regardless of the differences that characterize the ministerial and federal structure of Italy and the U.S. and the discrepancies at public and private level, the main field of application for PPPs in the cultural sector is the one of national heritage. According to the sources, in fact, no mention of public-private partnerships for visual or performative arts has been found in the two countries. Nonetheless, this similarity does not coincide with the conception that the two nations have of cultural heritage. This element clearly reflects the historical past of the two countries since the amount of cultural assets in the United States cannot be compared to the history and traditions of the Italian continent. This justifies the reason why PPPs in the United States have been split into “cultural categories” rather than forms of agreement. It has been, indeed, interesting to notice how the relationships between public and private parties in the U.S. directly concern national and public parks, national landmarks, and the Presidential Library system, rather than regulative frameworks such as foundations of participation, sponsorship contracts and special forms of PPP, as developed in Italy. Accordingly, it has emerged that one of the main differences between Italy and the U.S. is that there is no code or legislation that recognize collaborations and agreements for the cultural sector as forms of public-

private partnerships in the United States. However, it has been reported how the American system is mainly influenced by private actors and the private market. Both the arts and cultural heritage, indeed, rely on private donations and donors, including philanthropists, foundations, non-profit organization, and individual and corporate contributions for their subsistence. It has been investigated that the cultural funding system of the United States is characterized by a huge number of tax incentives, benefits, and deductions for different contributors. Also, it has been found that this feature is partially shared by the Italian legislative system which regulates cultural patronage or *mecenatismo* as a form of donation to finance restoration projects or other cultural-related activities. This model, which has been frequently conceived as a category of PPP, has been subject to incentives to attract aids and contributions from privates. Although never identified as a form of PPP by American regulations, it can be stated that cultural patronage or *mecenatismo* is surely a form of cultural support shared by both countries. Rather, its implementation is much more widespread in the United States, this being a precursor of this system, than in Italy. In this regard, the United States have fostered the implementation of alternative forms of financing, e.g., fundraising and crowdfunding, whose use is gradually taking over in Italy. If the systems of private donations, the link between culture and the private market, and cultural commodification have demonstrated to be a strength of the U.S., the country is still very distant from the regimentation of culture, as developed in Italy. The vastness and diversification of the Italian heritage and its movable and immovable assets have determined the need for an efficient and regularized administration for its cultural scenario. Instead, in the United States, its “poorly monumental and highly centred” cultural heritage (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014:18) does not allow a structured federal intervention. Rather, the lack of a ministerial body or department for culture would assume that the portion of interest for the subject, compared to Italy, is relatively small.

In this regard, a solution for the United States might be to improve the regulatory environment by developing a portion of general rules and decrees for state heritage, without losing sight of the liberal dictates of the Constitution and the individual power of independent agencies. In turn, private institutions and private donors seem to represent the most valuable asset for the preservation and maintenance of culture, and this system greatly simplifies the administrative procedures and reduces the distribution of high allocations to culture from the government. Also, they would be supportive of all the Italian local authorities whose frequent lack of resources and skills negatively affect their activities and

actions. Consequently, this higher involvement of private actors in cultural issues might be partially adopted by the Italian authorities to facilitate the intricate bureaucracy that features the Italian system, even when dealing with arts and culture. This whole concept would be, then, reflected in the use of public-private partnerships, which relies on the involvement of private actors in the agreement, but whose presence of the public sector is sometimes redundant and confusing, as in the case of special forms of PPPs.

However, the high rate of freedom in the American administration does not imply that the arts, culture, and their resources are better managed. On the contrary, the dissertation has proven PPPs for the cultural sector in the U.S. to be a poorly developed topic, especially if compared to Italy. An absence of regulations consequently leads to a categorization in which the topic is analyzed according to the “typology” of cultural asset or, very often, according to the specific case. This tendency should undergo a change, also due to the high-cost savings that the Congress would achieve through the implementation of PPPs and their use in the management of national landmarks. Therefore, more public-private partnerships should be adopted to preserve and safeguard the American cultural heritage, since it has been demonstrated that, when implemented, they positively contribute to its valorization. The case of the Presidio Park is a proof of what have just been declared.

The selection of an American example for this dissertation has been harder than the choice of an Italian case, due to the restricted number of cases and the different social, political, and cultural contexts of the two countries. Therefore, the Presidio Park should be taken as a model to stimulate further initiatives of this kind, given the relationships that federal agencies, such as the NPS and NARA, have with private actors. A further aim of this dissertation was to analyze two examples of PPPs in the two countries and verify that the theory of the previous chapters combined with the practice of the examples. Also, the purpose of this comparison was to demonstrate how a correct implementation of PPPs can maintain and enhance a national cultural asset. It has been possible, then, to identify potential similarities and show that, despite the different cultural mindset, there can be common elements. Firstly, it might be concluded that both the projects comply with what known as ecology of culture and cultural ecosystems. Accordingly, it has been discussed how the relationship between public value, namely social well-being, and private value, i.e., the economic value, can contribute to the creation of a socially and economically driven cultural value. The implementation of cultural ecosystems allows the development of

sustainable environments, where people can identify themselves with the territory. Both the Presidio case and the Herculaneum case have demonstrated how the social impact of the public and third sector and the incentives of private entities have led to the creation of cultural shared values. This corresponds to the involvement of local actors in the governance and management system of the Herculaneum project and the creation of special venues to connect the city with its inhabitants, but also to the community-based restoration and local involvement in current activities and archeological practices of the Presidio Park. Secondly, it has been discussed how traditional PPPs (mainly associated with professional fields such as the infrastructures, healthcare, and public services) differ from PPPs for the cultural sector in many ways, which include the primary function of interest for the good of communities, the recurrent stimulus of innovation (being PPPs related to a creative field), specific typologies of agreement addressed to culture, and the compliance with the “cultural heritage purposes”. All these elements can be found in both the projects mentioned. More specifically, the function of public interest and the stimulus of innovation can be reflected in the revitalization of the ancient and modern city of Ercolano and the recreational and environmental activities for citizens and locals in the Presidio. Similarly, the PPP second goal of “conservation of immovable heritage” (intended as a cultural site or historic building), which requires great skills in the restoration process and in ensuring a long-term preservation, have been achieved by both Italian and American stakeholders involved in the two projects. The fact that the Herculaneum site is today considered as one of the best examples of good preservation practices at international level and that the Presidio Park has been transformed from a military venue to an historical park, visited by millions of tourists and locals yearly, confirm this theory. Finally, two PPP typologies have been converted from traditional categories “by delivery type” to sub-categories for conservation. A conserve-build-finance model (CBF) (resulting from a design-build-finance), in fact, was partially used for the Herculaneum Conservation Project and a buy-serve-operate (BCO) (resulting from a buy-build-operate) was applied to the American case.

Moreover, the use of a special purpose vehicle (SPV) has been identified as a further element shared by both parties. It has been analyzed how SPVs can represent a proper solution for PPP heritage and conservation projects in order to mitigate risks, which, in this way, are fairly distributed among public and private stakeholders. The creation of the Presidio Trust, as the special entity in charge of managing the Presidio Park, is a clear example of how higher involvement and contributions from the Government have not been

necessary for the success of the project. Although differently, the archeological site of Herculaneum has seen the implementation of a SPVs through its transaction from contractual to institutionalized PPP in the last phase of the process. This might be reflected in its conversion into an autonomous museum, with its own scientific, accounting, and financial autonomy. In this dissertation, some evaluative methodologies to establish the effectiveness of a PPP partnership have been reported as well, with a particular focus on the Heritage Dividend Methodology. This methodology, which has proven to be a valid source for assessing the success of PPPs for heritage projects, if applied to the two examples, can confirm, again, the positive results achieved through these partnerships. Both projects, indeed, comply with the creation of employment and new collaborations, increment of tourism, generation of revenues, safety and urban revaluation, community participation, and quality of local activities. Another feature which should be mentioned in the conclusion section is the private actors' compliance with the "4 Cs", namely clarity about conservation and renovation, certainty about the regulatory environment, consistency in the execution of regulations, and consultation between the two parties (Macdonald and Cheong, 2014). As for the requirements and characteristics listed so far, it is likewise important to underline that the private actors of both the Herculaneum and Presidio project complied with the 4 key factors required for cultural PPP projects. Therefore, it might be concluded that, both cases have demonstrated their consistency with the criteria, characteristics, and elements which have been analyzed throughout the dissertation; in particular, in the sections related to the public-private partnerships for the cultural sector and heritage.

Finally, the last chapter has dealt with a theoretical and, in part, practical analysis of the two parks, to give the reader the opportunity to apply the theory acquired from the previous chapters. It has been underlined how the Herculaneum Project and the Presidio Park have complied with the requirements for PPP projects at a general level. It should be, thus, relevant to draw the necessary conclusions from the similarities and differences of their internal structures. As previously stated, the selection of an Italian and American cultural site, which were, to a certain extent, similar, has been hard to make. However, after their selection, it has been, hence, possible to verify and analyze their similar objectives, as well as their management and governance system. In this regard, it has emerged that they, firstly, share a long-lasting historic tradition, which connects them to their ancient past. Secondly, both the projects have been split into several phases, which have involved different authorities and entities from the private and public sphere. This last characteristic should be

also related to the sections dedicated to the governance of Italy and the United States, in which the main state, local, and private stakeholders, involved in the preservation and valorization of heritage assets, reflect the ones that affected the development of the projects and that, today, are part of the administrative body of the sites. Thirdly, the governance and management structure of the Herculaneum Conservation Project have demonstrated that the typologies of PPP regularized by the Italian law, such as the contract of sponsorship, have been part of the process. The same rule applies to the case of the Presidio, which has proven the importance of the federal agency for the management of national parks. Finally, the involvement of locals and citizens in site-related activities has represented the linking element of two community-based approaches, in which the public interest have been placed in the foreground.

In conclusion, it should be remarked how this work has tried to conduct a comparative analysis on the cultural management practices that characterize Italy and the United States, with a particular focus on the examination of public-private partnerships in the cultural and heritage field. This dissertation has been elaborated for the additional purpose of fostering academic research and debates on cultural and economic subjects involving the comparison between Italy and countries located outside Europe.

Acknowledgements

I thankfully acknowledge the help that I received from my supervisor Professor Russo while writing my dissertation and during this last phase of my academic path.

The completion of my studies could not have been possible without the support of my mother, who have always encouraged me in pursuing my studies and my passions, without ever stopping to believe in me, my ideals, and my dreams.

A debt of gratitude is also owed to my grandparents Alvaro and Anna that have been like additional parents to me and have always loved me unconditionally in the good and difficult moments.

Last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to a really special person, Lorenzo, for the huge patience that he always had with me over the years. I would like to thank him for always being next to me and never complaining about the long days that we spent home due to my study sessions. Also, I would like to thank him for never obstructing my choices and understanding my life decisions.

References

- AKINTOYE, A., BECK, M., KUMARASWAMY, M. (2016), *Public Private Partnerships: A Global Review*. Abingdon, OX: Routledge.
- ALLEGRO, I., ALIONA, L. (2018), Models of Public Private Partnership and financial tools for the cultural heritage valorisation. *URBANISTICA INFORMAZIONI, Special issue*, 0-0.
- ANSELL, C., GASH, A. (2018), Collaborative Platforms as a Governance Strategy. *Journal of Public Administration Research And Theory*, 16–32.
- ANSELL, C., GASH, A. (2007, November 13), Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Inc.*, 543–571.
- ARCHAEOLOGICAL PARK OF POMPEII. (2022), *Archaeological Park of Pompeii - About Us*. Retrieved from <http://pompeisites.org/en/archaeological-park-of-pompeii/about-us/>
- ARGUST, M. (2017, August 10), *Innovative Public-Private Partnerships Can Help Fix Our Parks*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewtrusts.org/fr/research-and-analysis/articles/2017/08/10/innovative-public-private-partnerships-can-help-fix-our-parks>
- ART BONUS GOV. (2022). *Parco Archeologico Ercolano*. Art Bonus - Parco Archeologico Ercolano. Retrieved from <https://artbonus.gov.it/2836-parco-archeologico-ercolano.html>
- ARTSCAPE DIY. (2020, November 29), *Defining the Creative and Cultural Sector*. Retrieved from <https://www.artscapediy.org/defining-the-creative-and-cultural-sector/>
- BAKER, A. (2017), *National Parks in the United States: A Public-Private Partnership*. Retrieved from <https://www.learningtogive.org/resources/national-parks-united-states-public-private-partnership>
- BAM! STRATEGIE CULTURALI. (2019, November 7), *Co-progettazione per le istituzioni culturali. Tre modi per farla, testati da BAM!* Retrieved from <https://www.bamstrategieculturali.com/2019/11/07/3-modi-di-fare-co-progettazione-culturale/>
- BERETTA, E., FIRPO, GIOVANNA, M. A., SCALISE, D. (2019), *La valorizzazione del patrimonio artistico e culturale in Italia: confronti internazionali, divari territoriali, problemi e prospettive*. Divisione Editoria e stampa della Banca d'Italia.
- BODEN, P. D. (2013), *Public-Private Partnerships in the Presidential Library System*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.
- BONIOTTI, C. (2021), The public–private–people partnership (P4) for cultural heritage management purposes. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*.
- BORGONOVİ, E., RONDO, B. P. (1994), Management challenges and markets. *The International journal of health planning and management*, 9(1), 25-38.

BORIN, E. (2018, APRIL 19-20), Cooperation and ecosystem thinking in the arts and cultural sector. *Seminar*. Macerata: University of Macerata.

BORIN, E. (2017), *Public-Private Partnership in the Cultural Sector: A Comparative Analysis of European Models*. Bruxelles: P.I.E. PETER LANG.

CALIFORNIA DEBT & INVESTMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (CDIAC). (2008), *Public-Private Partnerships: A Guide to Selecting a Private Partner*. Partner Report, Sacramento, CA.

CALIFORNIA DEBT & INVESTMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (CDIAC). (2007), *Privatization vs. Public-Private Partnerships: A Comparative Analysis*. Issue Brief, Sacramento, CA.

CAMARDO, D. (2006), Archaeology and conservation at Herculaneum: from the Maiuri campaign to the Herculaneum Conservation Project. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 8(4), 205-214.

CHRISTENSEN, T., LIE, A., LÆGREID, P. (2008), Beyond new public management: agencification and regulatory reform in Norway. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 24(1), 15–30.

COCHRANE, L. S. (2002), Presidential libraries: Presidential, yes; libraries, not really. *American Libraries*, 33(5), 58.

COFRANCESCO, G. (2012), *Tutela e promozione dei beni culturali negli Stati Uniti*. (C. G. internazionale, Ed.) Genova: ed. ECIG.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE. (2016), *National Park System: Units Managed Through Partnerships*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

ČOPIČ, V., UZELAC, A., PRIMORAC, J., JELINČIĆ, D. A., SRAKAR, A., ŽUVELA, A. (2011), *Encouraging Private Investment in the Cultural Sector*. Brussels: European Parliament.

CORLESS, J. (2012), *What do we Mean by the Cultural and Creative Industries?* Retrieved from UNESCO Digital Library:
<https://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/digital-library/What%20Do%20We%20Mean%20by%20CCI.PDF>

CORTE DEI CONTI EUROPEA, (2018), *Partenariati pubblico-privato nell'UE: carenze diffuse e benefici limitati*.

DEPARTMENT FOR DIGITAL, CULTURE, MEDIA & SPORT (DCMS). (2001), *Creative Industries Mapping Document*. GOV.UK Publications, London.

DIPARTIMENTO PER LA PROGRAMMAZIONE E IL COORDINAMENTO DELLA POLITICA ECONOMICA (DIPE). (2022). (rep.). *Partenariato Pubblico Privato E Finanza Di Progetto Relazione Sull'attività Svolta Dal Dipe Nell' Anno 2021* (pp. 3–83). Rome

DIPARTIMENTO PER LA PROGRAMMAZIONE E IL COORDINAMENTO DELLA POLITICA ECONOMICA (DIPE). (2021). (rep.). *Partenariato Pubblico Privato E Finanza Di Progetto Relazione Sull'attività Svolta Dal Dipe Nell' Anno 2020* (pp. 5–51). Rome

DIPARTIMENTO PER LA PROGRAMMAZIONE E IL COORDINAMENTO DELLA POLITICA ECONOMICA (DIPE). (2020). (rep.). *Partenariato Pubblico Privato E Finanza Di Progetto Relazione Sull'attività Svolta Dal Dipe Nell' Anno 2019* (pp. 4–36). Rome

DIPARTIMENTO PER LA PROGRAMMAZIONE E IL COORDINAMENTO DELLA POLITICA ECONOMICA (DIPE). (2019). (rep.). *Partenariato Pubblico Privato E Finanza Di Progetto Relazione Sull'attività Svolta Dal Dipe Negli Anni 2017-2018* (pp. 3–49). Rome.

DUBINI, P., LEONE, L., FORTI, L. (2012), Role Distribution in Public- Private Partnerships, *International Studies of Management & Organization. International Studies of Management & Organization*, 42(2), 57-75.

ELEVATI, C. (2021, September 22), *Co-progettazione e infrastrutturazione sociale: un legame indissolubile* . Retrieved from <https://www.reattiva.org/news/co-progettazione-e-infrastrutturazione-sociale-un-legame-indissolubile-11>

ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA. (2007, June 6), Privatization. *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*.

ERNST & YOUNG. (2015), *Cultural times: The first global map of cultural and creative industries*. Survey.

EPEC, Market Update. (2017), Review of the European PPP Market in 2017. Retrieved from www.eib.org/epec.

EUROSTAT. (2021), Employment and activity by sex and age – annual data. *Eurostat Data Browser (database)*.

EUROSTAT. (2021), Cultural employment by sex. *Eurostat Data Browser (database)*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/cult_emp_sex/default/table?lang=en

EUROSTAT. (2011), *Manual on sources and methods for the compilation of COFOG Statistics. Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG)*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

FARAJIAN, M., LAUZON, A. J., CUI, Q. (2015), Introduction to a Crowdfunded Public–Private Partnership Model in the United States. *Transportation Research Record: SAGE Journals*, 2530(1), 36-43.

FEDERCULTURE. (2019), *Gruppo Di Studio E Di Ricerca Sulla Disciplina Dei Rapporti Tra “Pubblico E Privato” Nel Settore Dei Beni Culturali*. Research group .

FERRI, P., ZAN, L. (2017), Partnerships for heritage conservation: evidence from the archeological site of Herculaneum. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 1-25.

FIDONE, G. (2012), Il ruolo dei privati nella valorizzazione dei beni culturali: dalle sponsorizzazioni alle forme di gestione. *Aedon, Rivista di arti e diritto on line*(1-2), 0-0.

FIÈ, A., GASPARRONI, M. V., PALMAROLI, A., TORTONI, I. (2018), *Riforma dei Musei - La riorganizzazione museale e il nuovo ruolo dei direttori*. Retrieved from Portale Docenti Università di Macerata

FONDAZIONE ANCI & FEDERCULTURE. (2013), *Le forme di PPP e il fondo per la progettualità in campo culturale*. Research.

FUNG, A. (2006), Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 66-75.

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVANCY. (2022). *2021 Annual report: Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy*. Retrieved from https://annualreport.parksconservancy.org/2021/?_ga=2.169943780.510054425.1664715179-2025882768.1661850859#welcome

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA CALIFORNIA (GGNRA). (1994), *d*

HOLDEN, J. (2015), *The Ecology of Culture. Report commissioned by the Arts and Humanities Research Council's Cultural Value Project, Art's & Humanities Research Council*.

HOLLORAN, P. (1996), The Greening of the Golden Gate: Community-Based Restoration at the Presidio of San Francisco. *University of Wisconsin Press Journals Division*, 14(2), 112-123.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF MUSEUMS (ICOM). (2020), *Museums, museum professionals and COVID-19*. Survey results, Paris.

ITALIA DOMANI GOV. (2022). *Home - Italia domani - portale PNRR*. Home - Italia Domani - Portale PNRR. Retrieved from <https://italiadomani.gov.it/it/home.html>

ITALIAN PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE. (2016), *Italian Public Contract Code*. Retrieved from LEGISLATIVE DECREE 50/2016, as modified by legislative decree n. 57/2017: [https://www.anticorruzione.it/portal/rest/jcr/repository/collaboration/Digital%20Assets/ancdocs/MenuServizio/English%20section/ITALIAN_PUBLIC_CONTRACT_CODE%2015%20giugno%202018_sito%20\(2\).pdf](https://www.anticorruzione.it/portal/rest/jcr/repository/collaboration/Digital%20Assets/ancdocs/MenuServizio/English%20section/ITALIAN_PUBLIC_CONTRACT_CODE%2015%20giugno%202018_sito%20(2).pdf)

JONES, K. (2019), From Performance to Participation: Fostering a Sense of Shared Heritage Through Archaeology at the Presidio of San Francisco. In J. H. Jameson, & S. Musteata, *Transforming Heritage Practice in the 21st Century*. Springer.

KHANOM, N. A. (2010), Conceptual Issues in Defining Public Private Partnerships (PPPs). *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 6(2), 150 -163.

KIVLENIECE, I., QUELIN, B. V. (2012), Creating and Capturing Value in Public-Private Ties: A Private Actor's Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2), 272-99.

LANDRIANI, L., POZZOLI, M. (2014), *Management and Valuation of Heritage Assets: A Comparative Analysis Between Italy and USA*. Springer.

LEFRAK, M. (2019, October 3), *How public-private partnerships fund national landmarks*. Retrieved from <https://www.marketplace.org/2019/10/03/how-public-private-partnerships-fund-national-landmarks/>

MACDONALD, S. (2011), *Leveraging heritage: Public-private, and third-sector partnerships for the conservation of the historic urban environment*. *Conference/ Workshop*. Paris: ICOMOS 17th General Assembly.

MACDONALD, S., CHEONG, C. (2014), *The Role of Public-Private Partnerships and the Third Sector in Conserving Heritage Buildings, Sites, and Historic Urban Areas*. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Conservation Institute.

MAJAMAA, W. (2008), *The 4th P - People - in Urban Development Based on Public-Private-People Partnership*. Helsinki: Helsinki University of Technology Espoo.

MALSHINA, N., FIRSOVA, A. (2018), *Mechanisms of Innovative Projects Financing in the Culture Industry on the Basis of Public-private Partnership*. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 100-105.

MARIOTTI, A. (2012), *Local System, Networks and International Competitiveness: from Cultural Heritage to Cultural Routes*. *Almatourism Journal of Tourism Culture and Territorial Development*, 3(5), 81-95.

MEDD, W., MARVIN, S. (2007), *Strategic intermediation: Between regional strategy and local practice*. *Sustainable Development*. *Sustainable Development*, 318–327.

MIC. (2022). *Franceschini: Firmato Cis "Vesuvio-pompei-napoli", un Grande Passo per il rilancio di siti culturali*. Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali e per il Turismo. Retrieved from <https://cultura.gov.it/comunicato/23305>

MILANESI, F. (2021, February 25), *La rinascita del Parco archeologico di Ercolano: l'intervista al direttore Francesco Sirano*. Retrieved from <https://www.touringclub.it/notizie-di-viaggio/la-rinascita-del-parco-archeologico-di-ercolano-lintervista-al-direttore/immagine/8/parco-archeologico-di-ercolano-tutti-i-diritti-riservati>

MOORE, I. (2014), *Cultural and Creative Industries concept – a historical perspective*. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 738-746.

MUGGIANU, A. (2018), *Il Partenariato Pubblico-Privato*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Sassari, Sassari.

MULCAHY, K. V. (1999), *Cultural Patronage in the United States*. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 2(1), 53-58.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES. (2021), *Presidential Libraries and Museums*. Retrieved from <https://www.archives.gov/presidential-libraries/about>

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. (2022), *National Park System*. Retrieved from <https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/national-park-system.htm>

NEA'S OFFICE OF RESEARCH & ANALYSIS. (2012), *How the United States Funds the Arts*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress.

OECD. (2021), *Economic and social impact of cultural and creative sectors*. Note for Italy G20 Presidency Culture Working Group.

OECD. (2012), *Principles of Public Governance of Public-Private Partnerships*.

Osborne, S. P. (2006). The new public governance? *Public Management Review*, 8(3), 377–387.

PARCO ARCHEOLOGICO DI ERCOLANO. (2022), *Parco Archeologico di Ercolano - Organizzazione*. Retrieved from <https://ercolano.beniculturali.it/organizzazione/>

PIGNATTI, M. (2022, April), I modelli di Partenariato Pubblico-Privato nella gestione e valorizzazione dei beni culturali come strumento per la creazione di ecosistemi innovativi e di sviluppo economico e sociale. *DPCE Online*, [S.l.], 51(1), 91-119.

PRESIDIO TRUST. (2022), *Presidio Trust*. Retrieved from <https://www.presidio.gov/presidio-trust>

PRESIDIO TRUST. (2022), *History of the Presidio*. Retrieved from <https://www.presidio.gov/visit/history-of-the-presidio>

PRESIDIO TRUST. (2002, August), *Summary of the Final Presidio Trust Management Plan*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidiotrust.org/ptip/publicparticipation.asp>

PRESIDIO TRUST. (2021). *2021 Performance and Accountability Report*. Presidio Gov. Retrieved from <https://www.presidio.gov/presidio-trust/planning>

RAFFO, S. (2012), Politiche di conservazione dei beni culturali. L'esperienza statunitense. . In G. Cofrancesco, *Cofrancesco G (a cura di), I beni culturali. Profili di diritto comparato ed internazionale*. Genova: ed. ECIG.

RICHES PROJECT. (2016, May), *Public-Private-Partnership Guidelines for CH*. Retrieved from RICHES Resources: <https://resources.riches-project.eu/d7-3-public-private-partnership-guidelines-for-ch/>

RICHES PROJECT. (2016, April 19), *Public-Private Partnerships for Cultural Heritage: Opportunities, Challenges, Future Steps*. Retrieved from RICHES resources: <https://resources.riches-project.eu/riches-think-paper-07-public-private-partnerships-for-cultural-heritage-opportunities-challenges-future-steps/>

RICHES PROJECT. (2015, November 6), *Transformantion, change and best practice for CH processes*. Retrieved from RICHES Resources: <https://www.open-heritage.eu/riches-d3-1-transformantion-change-and-best-practice-for-ch-processes/>

RIZZO, F., CONCILIO, G., MOLINARI, F. (2014, September 3), *My Neighbourhood: un progetto di vicinato intelligente Forum Pubblica Amministrazione*. Retrieved from FORUM PA: <https://www.forumpa.it/open-government/partecipazione-trasparenza/my-neighbourhood->

- RUSSO ANTELLINI, F. (2011), *Il Partenariato Pubblico Privato in Italia tra efficienza e vincoli di finanza pubblica*. Ph.D. Dissertation, LUISS Guido Carli, Rome.
- RUSSO, S. (2009), Economia e management delle aziende di produzione culturale. In M. Rispoli, G. Brunetti. *Il Mulino*.
- SCHUSTER, J. M. (1998), Neither public nor private: the hybridization of museums. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 22(2-3), 127-150.
- SCIULLO, G. (2021), Il partenariato pubblico-privato in tema di patrimonio culturale dopo il Codice dei contratti. *Il Mulino - Rivisteweb*, 154-161.
- SORENSEN, M. L. (2022), *A Comparative Analysis of Two Urban Historic Military Base Redevelopment Projects: The Presidio of San Francisco and Boston's Charlestown Navy Yard*. Masters Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- STEWART, J., KIERON, W. (1994), Performance measurement: when performance can never be finally defined. *Public Money & Management*, 14(2), 45-49.
- THATCHER, M. (1993), *The Downing Street years*. HarperCollins.
- THOMPSON, J. (2007), Engagement in public-private partnership in cultural heritage: the case of Herculaneum, Italy. *ICCROM (ed.)*, 120-134.
- TILLMAN, R. (1997), Shadow Tolls and Public Private Partnerships for Transportation Projects. *Journal of Projects*, 3(2), 30-37.
- TRUPIANO, G. (2015), LA FINANZA DELLA CULTURA: La Spesa, il Finanziamento e la Tassazione. *Atti di convegno, 24 novembre 2014* (pp. 5-188). Roma: Roma Tre-Press.
- TRUPIANO, G. (2005), Financing the culture in Italy. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 337-343.
- U.S. HOUSE. (1996, November 12), Presidio Trust Act of 1996. *104 Congress, Title I of H.R. 4236, P.L. 104-333, Stat. 4097*.
- UNESCO. (2013), *Unesco Background Note on Public Private Partnerships in the Cultural Sector*.
- UNESCO. (2009), *The 2009 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics (FCS)*. Montreal, Quebec: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (UNECE). (2008), *Guidebook on Promoting Good Governance in Public-Private Partnerships*. Geneva: United Nations Publications.
- US NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS (NCPPP). (2014), *US National Council for Public-Private Partnerships*. Retrieved from

<https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/funding-finance-resources/private-sector-participation/national-council-public-private>

VAN BOXMEER, B., VAN BECKHOVEN, E. (2005, April), Public–Private Partnership in Urban Regeneration: A Comparison of Dutch and Spanish PPPs. *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 5(1), 1-16.

VAUGHN, J., CORTNER, H. J. (1987), *Philanthropy and the National Park Service*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

VELOTTI, L., BOTTI, A., VESCI, M. (2012), Public-Private Partnerships and Network Governance. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 36(2), 340-365.

VENTURA, C., CASSALIA, G., DELLA SPINA, L. (2016), New models of Public-Private Partnership in cultural heritage sector: Sponsorships between models and traps. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 257-264.

VERONELLI, M. (2015), Le sponsorizzazioni culturali come forma di partenariato pubblico/privato. *Roma Tre-Press*, 57-71.

VIGNIERI, V. (2020, May 11), *Changes and current challenges in Public Administration*. Retrieved from Vincenzo Vignieri: <https://www.vincenzovignieri.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Changes-and-current-challenges-in-Public-Administration-.pdf>

WALKER, C. (1999), *Partnerships For Parks: Lessons from the Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Urban Parks Program*. The Urban Institute.

WITTERS, L., MAROM, R., STEINERT, K., ALCATEL-LUCENT. (2012), The Role of Public-Private Partnerships in Driving Innovation. In S. Dutta, *The Global Innovation Index 2012: Stronger Innovation Linkages for Global Growth* (pp. 81-87). NSEAD and WIPO.

WORLD BANK. (2017), *Public-Private Partnerships Reference Guide*. Washington, D.C. : World Bank Publications.

WORLD BANK. (1999), *Working Together for a Change: Government, Business and Civil Partnerships for Poverty Reduction in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Publications.