



**Policies to deal with the COVID-19 crisis e
implement the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development**

Edited by Vincenzo Pira and Marco Pasquini

N. 5 – May 2020

Introduction

Armadilla is a social cooperative committed, primarily, in the context of international cooperation. (www.armadilla.coop)

It also conducts training and information on the issues of the 2030 agenda proposed by the United Nations, for the defence of human rights and for the achievement of the 17 Goals for sustainable human development: <https://www.unric.org/it/agenda-2030>

In this context, these notebooks want to help to disseminate among students and the public opinion to which Armadilla is addressed, information, critical analysis, possible answers to the priority problems that are addressed. The collection of all the Notebooks from 2015 to the present is located in: <http://armadilla.coop/quaderni/>

In this Notebook we propose a reflection on the impact that the Covid-19 pandemic can have in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals proposed in agenda 2030 and on the international cooperation of Italy and Europe.

We will refer to two important documents that analyse the topic and propose a summary of them, inviting the reading, study and application of them.

The first is from the Italian Alliance for Sustainable Development (ASVIS) entitled "**Policies to deal with the crisis from COVID-19 and implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**". The full text can be read in the following link:

<https://asvis.it/public/asvis2/files/Pubblicazioni/RapportoASviSCovidAgenda2030.pdf>

The second document is from the **Inequality and Diversity Forum**, entitled "During and After the Crisis, for a Different World".

<https://www.forumdisuguaglianzediversita.org/durante-e-dopo-la-crisi-per-un-mondo-diverso/>

The shock produced by the Covid-19 is very violent and a source of "radical uncertainty". **The virus has made egregious frailties and inequalities, in Italy, as in the whole West. The global crisis Covid-19 takes place in a context marked in the West by profound injustices and a weakening of democracy, the result of a long season of erroneous policies, and by the authoritarian dynamic that followed.**

On the one hand, it is the ecological crisis of the planet, the loss of biodiversity, the climate crisis, the consumption of nature, pollution, deforestation, the intrusion of agri-industrial systems: we do not yet know the causes of the onset of this virus, but for previous epidemics it has been ascertained the contribution of genetically homogeneous overpopulations, especially if it is adjacent to wildlife; and the relationship between the effects and lethality of Covid-19 and the spread of chronic respiratory diseases, which are notoriously highly affected by the air pollution that produces hundreds of different types of air pollution worldwide every year, should be analyzed, thousands of premature deaths (over 70,000 in Italy, according to the European Environment Agency).

On the other hand, are the fragility and economic, personal and territorial inequalities, in the access and quality of the fundamental services and recognition that characterized the supposed

pre-Covid-19 "normality", fragility and inequalities that amplified the spread and health, economic and social effects of the virus.

The ASviS document delves into the effect of the crisis on the different dimensions of sustainable development, proposing a series of actions to be taken to take Italy on a path of recovery and development in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This report represents the contribution of the wider network of Italian civil society to the design of future national, regional and local policy interventions with a view to sustainable development, in full accordance with the guidelines expressed by the European authorities, also in view of the use of the huge financial resources that will be made available by the European Union.

The Inequality and Diversity Forum Document seeks to answer the many questions that the pandemic crisis poses: how to stop the impoverishment initiated by the Covid-19 crisis? How can we contain the destruction of production and work capacity? How can the burden of the extraordinary fall in income be redistributed among the entire population? How to build immediately, in social protections and in the criteria of reopening, a more just "after"? How to ensure the necessary "physical distance" without "social distance"? How to avoid downloading every ultimate solution on family and women? How can we reconcile certain national guidelines with the focus on the diversity of territorial contexts? How can we prevent the new-found role of the "public" from degenerating into authoritarian stateism? Or vice versa that under the ambiguous banner of "digital progress" "passes a further concentration of private control of knowledge, and a mortification of democratic choices, civil society and productive entrepreneurship? And that the great talk of "inequalities" is resolved in old-fashioned compensatory measures that cultivate parasitic behaviors and do not increase people's capacity and power? How can we transform the fractures and imbalances that have created itself into a change of course towards social and environmental justice? Which proposals should be prioritised? And, to implement them, how to raise the quality of the "public"? With what alliances and mobilizations to promote vision and proposals? Which political actors will be able to pick up this flag? What can they do to do that?

And finally, how does this affect international cooperation and the need for humanitarian aid from Italy and Europe?

1. ASviS Document: Policies to Address the Crisis from COVID-19 and Implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The ASviS assessed the expected impact of the crisis on the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), analysed the first Decree Law ("Cura Italia") launched by the Government in response to the crisis and proposed, together with the Inequality and Diversity Forum (FDD) two measures (Emergency Income and Emergency Support to the Self-Employed) aimed at protecting the weakest workers in Italian society, according to the motto of the Agenda 2030. This report is published in the aftermath of the start of the so-called "Phase 2", aimed at the gradual reopening of economic and social activities stopped during the *lockdown*. It therefore represents the contribution of the wider network of Italian civil society to the design of future national, regional and local policy interventions with a view to sustainable development, in full accordance with the guidelines expressed by the European authorities, also in view of the use of the huge financial resources that will be made available by the European Union.

As shown by a survey conducted by Eumetra MR, much of the assessments on the urgency of pursuing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda grow significantly between the end of 2019 and mid-April 2020. More than half of the Goals now exceed the "eight" score threshold on a scale of one to ten. **Above all, the ranking of the Objectives changes substantially: if the top two places remain "clean water and health" and "climate actions", the underlying positions are distorted. "No hunger" earns third place, "no poverty" the fourth and "employment and economic growth" the fifth.** This trio of priorities, centred on the basic values aimed at ensuring the dignity of the individual, override some of the priorities related to the environment. The picture that emerges from this survey seems to indicate a relocation of man as an animal species belonging to the environment (such as viruses), whose needs (individual and social) must be read within the larger ones of the conservation of the Planet.

Other findings indicate that the majority of people, while continuing to assess how very relevant the actions necessary for protecting the environment, seem more willing to sacrifice this aspect, at least temporarily, in favour of an economic and employment recovery "as long as it is" considered as vital for all. **The choice for sustainable development, only a few months ago, was seen by scientists, politicians, the world of finance and company leaders as the only possible one.** Just think of the statements and reports published at the World Economic Forum in Davos at the end of January. Now is the time to follow concrete decisions to those declarations and it is very positive that the European Commission, which had adopted sustainable development and agenda 2030 as a policy architect, insists on the priorities set a few months ago (from the Green Deal to digitalisation, from tackling inequalities to innovation to creating more lasting and quality employment). **Similarly, the decision made a few months ago by the European Investment Bank (EIB) to stop funding fossil fuel-based projects** and the work of the European institutions for the "taxonomy" of sustainable economic activities, the revision of the Directive on non-financial statements of companies, and the design of the future Recovery Fund in favour of a sustainable and fair recovery, are particularly valuable.

Italy must also decide in which direction to go: whether to continue in the direction indicated by the Budget Law for 2020, much more focused on sustainability than the previous ones, as recently indicated by the Minister of Economy and Finance, or whether, in the name of GDP growth at all costs, we will be prepared to sacrifice the progress made or planned for the coming years, first of all the process of decarbonization, the safety of workers and fairness.

From this point of view, we point out some cross-cutting actions that would help the country to "bounce forward" towards more sustainable development:

- **Simplifying administrative procedures** to enable rapid activation of public investment, including for early use of future European funds;
- **the rethinking of the role of the state, in the integration and support of private sector action, for the protection of common goods** and the promotion of economic behaviors oriented to the well-being of all. This involves accelerating the transition to the circular economy, increasing protection of health and workers' rights, extending the obligation to report the social and environmental impact of their activities to medium-sized enterprises, and introducing public guarantee funding for sustainable development;
- **the acceleration of the digital transition as a driver for sustainable development**, to be combined with measures for the reconciliation between life and work (with particular attention to the condition of women, which in this situation risks being sacrificed) through corporate welfare and smart *working*, with positive effects on mobility and benefits for climate and air quality;
- **consider central the health of natural capital, the basis of our health, well-being and development model**, and promote an action plan for housing policies, urban regeneration and energy redevelopment of building heritage;
- **safeguarding and strengthening cultural infrastructure**, in every territory and at the national level, fostering an integrated relationship between worlds of culture, education and tourism;
- **meet the challenge of distance learning to improve access to knowledge, the quality of learning, reduce inequalities and offer adults opportunities for lifelong continuous education.**

A final consideration should be made on the ability to read the current crisis with a particular focus on its impact on the different stocks of capital (economic, natural, human and social) and not only on flows (GDP). In fact, the well-being of a country and the sustainability of its development depend on the provision and intergenerational transmission of all forms of capital, essential for the functioning of the socio-economic system and the quality of the environment in which it operates, as all are used to generate goods and services (i.e. GDP). **The systematic and persistent depletion of the different forms of capital determines the unsustainability of the whole system.** At the same time, the production of "physical waste" (waste, pollution, etc.) and "human waste" (poor, marginalized, etc.) impacts on the services – apparently free – provided by

the ecosystem (pollination, beauty of a landscape, etc.) and by the socio-system (peace, solidarity, etc.); reducing ecosystem and socio-seismic services impacts individual and social well-being, reducing human and social capital.

The shock from COVID-19 negatively and severely impacts:

- (reduction in production capacity, accelerated by the fall in investment, and therefore capital accumulation; fall in current and prospective wealth; etc.);
- on human capital (unemployment and underemployment reduce the knowledge embedded in individuals; lockdown has a negative impact on training activities towards young people, adults and workers; etc.);
- (reduction of interactions; operational difficulties for the Third Sector; etc.) ...

In March 2020, the ASviS conducted an initial qualitative assessment of the crisis on the predictable performance of the more than 100 elementary indicators used, with reference to Italy, to develop composite indices for the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, published regularly by the Alliance and updated to 2018 last February.

The assessment focused on the short-term effects of the crisis (i.e. during 2020), assuming the removal of the current restrictions on people's mobility and the conduct of economic activities by June.

For Goals 1 (poverty), 3 (health), 4 (education), 8 (economic and employment condition), 9 (innovation) and 10 (inequalities) the expected impact is largely negative, while for Goal 13 (fight against climate change) and 16 (quality of governance, peace, justice and solid institutions) a moderate positive trend can be expected.

For Goal 6 (water and sanitation), 11 (city conditions), 14 (conditions of marine ecosystems) and 17 (international cooperation), in 2020 the impact should be substantially nil, while for the remaining five goals the impact is not assessable (NV): in some cases, in fact, it was not possible to imagine a clear relationship between crisis and indicator.

In particular:

- **Goal 1 (Ending all forms of poverty in the world)** - Despite the government's economic intervention in support of businesses and workers, an increase in poverty in all its dimensions is conceivable. The forced interruption of productive activities (apart from essential ones) and increased uncertainty will lead to the closure of businesses and the loss of jobs, reducing incomes and increasing the level of poverty overall.
- **Goal 2 (Ending hunger, achieving food security, improving nutrition and promoting sustainable agriculture)** - Therefore two elements can be highlighted: agricultural trends and eating behaviours. Indicators for agricultural production could remain largely unchanged. On the other hand, the difficulties related to the mobility of temporary workers and the blockade of catering are putting many productions, including the highest quality ones, typical of our country, in serious difficulties. On the other hand, it is not possible to

predict the trend of indicators closely linked to personal behaviour, excluding good nutrition, which is expected to worsen because, in the face of a growing awareness of the importance of the origin and safety of food, the reduction in economic availability could also be reflected in the quality of the food consumed.

- **Goal 3 (Ensuring health and well-being for all ages)** - A decrease in the mortality and fatalities of road accidents is assumed, due to the drastic reduction in vehicle traffic imposed during the crisis. Nevertheless, the increase in mortality due to the pandemic could lead to a worsening of overall mortality rates. At the moment, however, it is not considered possible to predict the average annual trend of indicators closely linked to personal behaviours relevant to the state of health, such as smoking and alcohol, despite the negative signs on lifestyles that emerge from the surveys conducted during the lockdown.
- **Goal 4 (Ensuring quality, fair and inclusive education, and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all)** - School closures for an extended period and the consequent adoption of distance learning (DAD) should have a negative impact on both teaching/learning processes, inclusion capacity and, consequently, student competence and school dispersion (12.3% of children did not have a PC or tablet at home). In the short term, however, there should be no significant effect on the number of people pursuing a degree and degree, while the effect of blocking and restarting productive activities on the training activities of workers is uncertain.
- **Goal 5 (Achieving gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls)** - In the short term, the health emergency will not have a direct effect on the presence of women in institutions and senior roles in business, while the rate of entrepreneurial feminisation could worsen. Assessments of labour market developments are more difficult. In particular, it is considered that women with preschool children will be more affected by the crisis than those without, due to the more fragile condition in which they are, while it is not possible to assess the overall effect of the crisis on the ratio of female to male employment due to the opposing trends related to the composition of value added by sector, the differential impact of the crisis on dependent and self-employment, etc.
- **Goal 6 (Ensuring the availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation facilities for all)** - Compared to household consumption and behaviours in relation to water resources and water network efficiency, being mainly structural behaviours and assessments, it is estimated that the current situation has no substantial effect on them.
- **Goal 7 (Ensuring everyone has access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy systems)** - It is estimated that the share of renewable energy is increasing on both final consumption and primary energy consumption, due to the decrease in primary and final energy consumption, rather than increased energy production from renewable sources. On the other end, falling fossil fuel prices can boost their consumption and slow down new investments in renewable sources. Finally, energy intensity is expected to deteriorate since the industries that were active during the lockdown are the most energetic.

- **Goal 8 (Incentivizing lasting, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all)** - On the issues of decent work and economic growth, the effects of the health emergency should have a particularly negative impact overall and on all individual indicators. The prolonged freeze on most economic activity will lead to a fall in GDP, employment and a simultaneous increase in unemployment, the share of involuntary part-time work and people not engaged in study, labour or training (NEET). The productivity of work is also expected to decrease, which is more pronounced when calculated compared to those employed than that of actual working hours.
- **Goal 9 (Building a resilient infrastructure and promoting innovation and fair, responsible and sustainable industrialisation)** - For businesses, innovations and infrastructure, in the face of an overall decrease in value added caused by the halting of economic activity, the share of the value added of manufacturing industry on the total economy is expected to increase, since the sector seems to be, relatively, one of the least affected by the blockade of economic activity (compared to, for example, to businesses).

There is a decrease in the use of public transport, both because of the restrictions on traffic and because in the next phase of return to normal it is possible that you will prefer to travel by own means out of prudence/fear. Finally, the emissive intensity of value-added is expected to deteriorate, due to the fact that the industries they will continue to produce are the most energetic and with a higher emissive quotient. Compared to the research sector, it is not considered possible to estimate an effect in 2020, except for the share of researchers, which will increase due to the dismissal of other professionals. However, spending on innovation and R&D in the private sector is expected to fall in the economic phase, as a sign of greater uncertainty about future developments. One consequence of the restrictions introduced should be an increase in the demand for broadband connections and the use of the Internet, due to the increased focus on the issue of access to the network by both individuals and businesses.

- **Goal 10 (Reducing inequality within and between nations)** - Even on the issue of inequalities, an overall deterioration is estimated, which will particularly affect the weakest sections of the population, those in need not affected by welfare benefits, including foreigners. High personal inequalities, concentrated in some territories, have amplified the asymmetric impact of COVID-19 and are likely to be further exacerbated by the economic crisis, as happened during the previous crisis, starting in 2008.
- **Goal 11 (Making the city and human settlements inclusive, safe, durable and sustainable)** - The decrease in urban pollution due to the blockade of economic activities and restrictions on the movement of people, albeit in a limited time frame, is expected to lead to a decrease in the average 2020 figures. On the other hand, there are no substantial changes to structural indicators such as building abuse, the availability of urban greenery and the parking spaces offered by local public transport (although the use of own means to reduce the chances of contagion could adversely affect the actual use of public transport).

Finally, the effects on waste collection and landfill waste due to the difficulty in defining, formerly, the different impact of the various components involved in measuring these indicators are not considered to be assessable.

- **Goal 12 (Ensuring sustainable production and consumption patterns)** - For responsible consumption and production behaviors, it is particularly difficult to make assumptions, given the different components that determine them. An overall reduction in resource consumption due to the decline in production activities and an increase in the consumption of matter relative to GDP is estimated, according to the hypothesis, already stated (Goal 9), that industries with the widest rate of material consumption remained active. It is not considered to be any hypothesis about the effects of the emergency on waste collection and landfill waste, because of the difficulty of defining the impact of the various components that determine them.
- **Goal 13 (Take urgent measures to combat climate change and its consequences)** - The government's disruption of production activities to address the health emergency will lead to a general improvement in all indicators related to climate change. There will be a sharp reduction in CO2 emissions.
- **Goal 14 (Preserving and permanently utilizing the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development)** - **The crisis is not expected** to have a significant impact on this issue, as fishing activities are considered essential and should not change significantly. The same can be said for marine protected areas, unless the incorrect disposal of individual devices (masks, gloves, etc.) causes them to pour into the sea, with disastrous effects on ecosystems.
- **Goal 15 (Protecting, restoring and promoting sustainable use of the earth's ecosystem, sustainably managing forests, combating desertification, stopping and demoting land degradation, and stopping loss of biological diversity)** - Blocking circulation and productive activities could have beneficial effects on biodiversity in 2020, while no impact is expected on structural indicators such as soil coverage and fragmentation.
- **Goal 16 (Promoting peaceful and more inclusive societies for sustainable development, offering access to justice for all and creating efficient, responsible and inclusive bodies at all levels)** - **An improvement in indicators of the number of crimes due to restrictions on freedom of movement is expected by 2020**, although, in the previous period of crisis, the increase in poverty has been associated with the increase in criminal behaviour. Measures to contain contagion, slowing down the work of the courts, should lead to an extension of the judicial time of civil and criminal proceedings. Finally, there already seems to be an increase in public confidence in law enforcement.
- **Goal 17 (Strengthening the Global Partnership and Implementation Means for Sustainable Development)** - No immediate effect of the crisis on the financial dimension of international cooperation is expected, as public development aid funds for 2020 have already been allocated. However, the capacity to spend and implement the cooperation programmes already financed may be significantly delayed. The main indicator for Goal 17 is Public Development Assistance (APS) as a share of gross national income (GNI). This

indicator in the coming year should not be considered significant, because it could be misleading for trend valuation. In fact, **Italy's APS for 2020 has been allocated and allocated with the Budget Law passed before the crisis, while the GNI will be defined post-crisis and will be in sharp decline.** So the APS/RNL ratio is likely to show a sharp increase, signalling a positive trend, but only because the denominator will be lower. However, it must also be considered that the 2020 APS will be accounted for and known in mid-2021, in Italy's report to the OECD DAC. Only then will it be possible to know whether Italy has actually spent what it had allocated with the Budget Law. **It may be, in fact, that, because of the crisis, not only in Italy but also in the countries receiving the ODA, some of the allocated funds are not spent. In this case, the numerator of the APS/RNL ratio will also be lower than expected.** Moreover, for construction, this indicator does not account for the resources dedicated to supporting development activities directly related to the private sector, which could also (and perhaps to a greater extent) contract in response to the negative shock of both supply and demand.

This scenario would be extremely bad for sustainable development, because it would mean that, despite the severe global crisis, and therefore the need for partner countries to have more aid, the rigidities of the ODA delivery system prevented support for partners. For this reason, it is necessary that the funds allocated to APS should not be cut during this year.

These considerations should lead to reflection on the need for "transformative resilience" in Italy's international partnership and development cooperation. **Current APS funding procedures are showing a number of rigidity elements that prevent a response to the crisis and to new needs to support different beneficiaries and partners.** The instrument of international cooperation, it should be remembered, was born after the Second World War with the aim of reducing the North-South divide, promoting processes of accelerated industrialization, agricultural mechanization, the spread of public works such as roads, dams, bridges, reclamation.

Of course, the priorities of appropriations have changed over time depending on the historical contexts and the criticalities to be overcome.

In view of the disastrous impact that COVID-19 is also having in developing countries and to prevent the risk of new pandemics occurring in the near future, jeopardising the survival of humanity itself, a debate on the aims of Italian cooperation and the volume of appropriations in relation to the planning of the coming years should be initiated. It will be appropriate to set more objectives to support the priorities of agenda 2030 and investments in support of projects aimed at promoting access, especially by the poorest populations, to the fundamental goods to which the basic universal human rights, that is linked to the dignity of human life, are associated, and to promote a peaceful and secure coexistence of all living beings.

Since Goal 17 is based on the partnership between actors, institutional and non-profit and non-profit, reflection on the new perspectives of cooperation must be carried out with all relevant

stakeholders, also taking into account the initiatives initiated by philanthropy, business and the Third Sector to deal with the health and social emergency. For this reason, **the National Council for Development Cooperation must be convened as soon as possible, including in telematics mode, in order to draw up concrete proposals to be submitted to the Interministerial Committee for Development Cooperation.** Finally, the so-called "Third Sector Code", whose operation has been blocked for more than two years due to the lack of implementing decrees, must be completed as soon as possible, in order to enable the institutions affected by the measure to deploy all their potential even in the current crisis, taking into account the strategic role of care giver organisations and support for Third Sector bodies in the enhancement of essential services to the person.

2. DURING AND AFTER THE CRISIS: FOR A DIFFERENT WORLD

The Inequality and Diversity Forum (DD Forum) in the Document entitled "During and after the crisis, for a different world" (the full text of which can be read on the Forum's website: <https://www.forumdisuguaglianzediversita.org/durante-e-dopo-la-crisi-per-un-mondo-diverso/>) proposes some evaluations in a conceptual scheme that makes synthesis.

"Uncertainty is still great and radical, but it is our duty to risk a reading of the facts and offer a vision and a principle of order. To do so, **we start by identifying the major inequalities and weaknesses made egregious by the crisis and the main trends and bifurcations it has generated, and we set out three possible scenarios.**

To move towards the scenario we want, a "new world" that has social and environmental justice at its centre, we propose seven things to do immediately and five strategic objectives, made of concrete proposals. They are within our reach, if we can accompany the mobilization to the vision and proposals. We have not started all over again, because the Covid-19 crisis confirms our diagnosis of the serious inequalities that have arisen over the last forty years and the urgency of the 15 proposals drawn up in 2018-19, on technological change, dignity and strategic participation of work and generational crisis, as well as the new project to combat educational poverty.

These proposals are radically affecting the processes of wealth formation. The very serious crisis, the destruction of production capacity, the supposed changes in preferences, the fractures in international value chains now give these pre-distributive proposals a new and stronger meaning. **The massive use of the "public" reminds us of its fundamental role, but it urges the changes of method proposed by us in public administrations, in the governance of fundamental services, in the direction of the still robust public enterprises, in development policies. But we need more. The increase in expenditure and public debt, the reduction of GDP, the asymmetry with which social groups and territories are affected, also require rethinking the arrangements of tax and social redistribution.**

In the face of the violent shock of the Covid-19 and the systemic uncertainty that entailed it, nothing is written. As with and more than in previous crises, the seriousness of the situation makes possible social, institutional and technological changes that in ordinary times would be impossible or much slower. But the ultimate outcome of these changes is indeterminate. Our future, the fortunes of society and democracy, its degree of social and environmental justice, still depend

our choices. It is the teaching that comes from previous crises, beginning with that of 1929, which in the United States led to the New Deal, in Germany to Nazism. It's up to us to choose. To do this the comparison must be turned on and informed.

There are three possible options to follow:

First option, take the road by correcting the "imperfections": the goal is to return to the pre-Covid-19 "normal" by better compensating for inequalities, but relying on the same principles and devices that produced them, presenting "digitization" as a unique process of progress, promising "simplifications" and inhibiting the exercise of discretion by public administrators in making decisions, favoring renters over entrepreneurs, mortifying strategic participation of work and civil society, and dumping on the latter and the family any role of mediation Social.

Second option, accelerate the authoritarian dynamic that was in place before the crisis : the further impoverishment, anger and anxiety about tomorrow are alleviated by offering barriers that promise a reassuring "identity purity", enemies to be defeated (migrants, foreigners, different, experts), a centralized and centralizing state ready to make quick decisions and to sanction deviant behaviors, without the pretense of a public confrontation.

Third option, to change course towards a future of social emancipation: the balance of Power and the devices that reproduce inequalities are modified, guiding digital technological change, offering a heated and informed space for discussion to the world of work, civil society and every person living on our land, tying welfare and economic development and achieving a leap in the quality of public administrations.

In each of the three scenarios, the renewed use of the "public" undergoes a different evolution.

In the first case, the "public" is relegated to a passive role, first of saving from emergency conditions, then as a dispenser and breeder of uniform standards and procedural rules that follow strategies decided by management groups and technocracies closed in themselves. **In the second case, the "public" degenerates into a centralizing state**, invasive and authoritarian, eroding our formal and substantive freedoms. **In the third case, the "public" is renewed and reinvigorated with resources, missions and methods and evolves into a democratic platform** where citizens' preferences and knowledge can manifest and find an intersection, in order to arrive at shared decisions. The design of the DD Forum's proposals is aimed at setting the conditions for this third scenario. And to build, based on the best experiences already realized, the modalities of public action that under Articles 3 and 118 of our Constitution recognizes and promotes the participation of "workers" and "individual and associate citizens".

To draw this third way, you need two preliminary steps. First, we must move from the inequalities and fragility of the situation on which we were the day Covid-19 appeared, and that aggravated its effects.

Then, despite the great uncertainty, we must get a picture of the trends and forkions to which the crisis is giving rise.

It is important to note that international political cooperation and the European Union has stalled.

The neoliberal culture of the last forty years has not only weakened the role of politics at national level, crushing the parties and intermediate bodies on the state, denying the existence of alternatives, reducing decisions to a confrontation of techniques, taking a voice away from workers and workers, citizens and citizens, but has also eroded the political role of the bodies of international cooperation, their ability to operate as places of confrontation and then compromise between different political **options. In the face of the crisis in the Covid-19, the absence of consultation and even a claim for consultation by the world's political leaders was striking. It affects the lack of role of the global agencies of the "UN system", as if their considerable skills gained in serious calamities in the "poor countries" did not also serve industrial countries.** There is no political or military alliance, or a place of international cooperation that has been the catalyst for confrontation. Nor have political internationalist alliances of any kind, on the left or on the right, been at work. Each country showed up alone at the appointment. It is reasonable for the cultures of each country and community to emerge at these times, and we also hope that the interests of power will emerge: that is not the point. The places of composition that are also conflicting of these cultures and interests have been absolutely lacking. The European Union also missed yet another chance. The resounding initial delay was met with an awareness when the crisis affected the countries of Northern Europe and economic interests, but the intergovernmental logic, moreover badly implemented, still slows down any operational decision on a dedicated European Fund. Once again, even after hesitation and serious words, only the European Central Bank has been up to the task of the situation: it is no coincidence that it interprets a federal logic, and is pushed back to the limits of its own scope of legitimacy by the absence of a federal economic and fiscal policy authority. They are, all of these, distressing signs for the citizens.

With regard to the health sector, in Italy, the frailties already identified by the Global Health Security Index of the John Hopkins Center for Health Security (which in 2019 illustrated our delays, especially in the speed of response to an epidemic and in the protection of health workers) were created by the systematic reduction of public health spending, the failure to renew medical staff and the dominance of the hospital paradigm, with the penalty of local principals that combine health and social services.

The decentralization of the powers of government achieved by the reform of Title V of the Constitution has shown all its weaknesses: regardless of the judgment on the regulatory system, it was the flaws in the implementation that emerged.

The repeated tensions between the State and the Regions are, in fact, largely related to the absence of an adequate institutional place for technical and political recomposition of disagreements: it is a sign of the state of abandonment of the State-Regions Conference, which the Constitutional Court (sentence 33/2011) identifies as a place of "understanding" in the subjects relevant to the Covid-19 crisis (health protection, occupational safety and research). The

relationship of the State and the Regions with the municipalities was clearly inadequate: the latter, often governed by the most innovative part of the country's ruling class and who bear ultimate responsibility for the provision of basic services, were generally not given the opportunity to influence the design and manner of implementation of the interventions. As regards the action of "citizens, individuals and associates, for the conduct of activities of general interest, on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity" (Cost. art. 118), which also manifested itself strongly during the crisis, it found very little correspondence in public action, not equipped to govern participatory processes and not convinced of their essential cognitive contribution.

The Italian welfare system is strongly anchored at work and neglects, quantitatively and qualitatively, all forms of welfare not related to work; but at the same time it actually excludes a significant part of the work, as was manifested with the crisis. These deficiencies find compensation in an often-ancillary role of civil society that instead of integrating public action ends up replacing it, even accepting undignified working conditions.

Let us return to the conclusion: what is now dashed is not the DD Forum Work Programme. It is a conceptual scheme of strategic objectives and tools for changing course, not exhaustive, but consistent and supported by a diagnosis and evaluation of the trends in place following the Covid-19 crisis. It's the backbone of a possible strategy. In order not to be bottled in a single mechanism, that everything changes so as not to change anything. Not to fall into a dark and desperate authoritarian dynamic. In order not to succumb to the dangerous encounter of these two projects. Let us discuss this in a heated, open, informed and reasonable public debate. In such a serious crisis, the parameters of the possible are no longer the same. Italy has the human resources, skills, practices, social and civil passion to take over change. A brighter future is possible.