Appendix A: Annex: A Guide for Drafting Case Study Papers

The goal of this collection of papers is to describe and analyse the emergence and roles of implementation and delivery units in the UK, Australia and Europe, to understand how they differ from each other, and how they evolved and fared. Their arrival undoubtedly reflected broader developments in the management and evolution of central institutions in each jurisdiction, so some background on this would be useful.

I hope each of the case study papers might address the points identified below, but let me hasten to add that each author or team of authors should feel free to develop their analysis and narrative in the way that makes most sense to them – in other words, do not let the checklist get in the way of a good story! Here are the areas that would be useful to cover:

• What was the rationale for establishing these units? Did they reflect the specific interests of first ministers or other leaders? Did particular failures or scandals lead to their creation, or was there a more general critique in the air? Was their emergence partially as a critique of the inability of other central agencies to make these kinds of assessments?
• What is the location of implementation and delivery units in the immediate organisational ecology of the core executive? Did this evolve over time? Why?
• What kind of leaders and staff were chosen to fill these units? What was the size of these units? Did the type of leader change over time?
• What is the specific role of the units in policy development, agenda management, and oversight processes by first ministers and their governments? Does the label ‘implementation unit’ really reflect their role? Are they working the upstream of developing policy initiatives, or do they operated more fully in the downstream with the actual implementation of initiatives, or both? Or are they monitoring the progress of other entities – such as departments, ministries or agencies – as they seek to implement a policy initiative? Are they reserved for only dealing with certain kinds of policy initiatives?
• How do these units carry out their mandates in complicated, shifting institutional environments with a multitude of delivery agents but also a good number of other core executive agencies and units? Can you point to instances where these units successfully carried out their roles? Are there instances where they were marginal or ineffective? Has their effectiveness evolved over time?
• Are there functional equivalents or competitors to implementation units, such as central processes or other units and central agencies that provide
implementation thinking in the upstream of policy development and then monitor progress?

• Has ‘lesson-drawing’ taken place across jurisdictions (Rose, 1993), when the units were created or as they took up their mandates?

• What does the future appear to hold in store for these units? Is the existence of these units precarious, at the whim of first ministers and certain governments? Or do they appear have promise of becoming institutionalised? If so, where?
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