

# Introduction to Seminar on Democratic Governance of Metropolitan Areas

## Paper for CDDG

### Reason for seminar

This seminar is held as part of the “European Union – Council of Europe Technical Assistance Project on Institutional Enhancement for Local Governance in Greece” and stems from the invitation expressed by the Greek Minister of Interior Panagiotis Skourletis (in May 2017) to host the European Committee on Democracy and Governance of the Council of Europe (CDDG) Conference on governance of metropolitan areas in Thessaloniki.

Democratic governance of metropolitan areas gives real effect to the values and standards of democracy, human rights and rule of law and is a priority as, increasingly, in the coming decades, more people will come to live in these areas.

“Effective democracy and good governance at all levels are essential for preventing conflicts, promoting stability, facilitating economic and social progress, and hence for creating sustainable communities where people want to live and work, now and in the future”<sup>1</sup>.

The goal of this seminar is to provide the Ministry of Interior and participating CDDG delegations with a comprehensive overview on governance of metropolitan areas, benefitting from experiences and good practices of other CoE member states. To do so, the event brings together representatives of member states and metropolitan areas, with experts, relevant Greek stakeholders and international organisations (i.e. OECD and METREX)

Metropolitan areas could be considered as one of the key issues for the upcoming revision of existing legislation on administrative structures in Greece. The assessment of the existing metropolitan governance arrangements in Athens and Thessaloniki along with the examination of practices in other countries could be an important prerequisite to enrich the direction and context of these reforms.

Finally, sharing such experience allows to identify appropriate lines of action such as the compilation of best practices in the form of guidelines or a “toolkit” for interested authorities in member States.

### The governance of metropolitan areas

A metropolitan area has been defined as a functional urban area usually with at least 500,000 inhabitants. A functional urban area is, in turn, an urban agglomeration with a continuously built-up urban core and surrounding area, where its limits are determined by the share of inhabitants that commute into the urban core.<sup>2 3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Third Summit Heads of State and Government of the member States of the Council of Europe, Warsaw, 2015

<sup>2</sup> Ahrend, R., Gamper, C., and Schuman, A., 2014. *The OECD metropolitan governance survey. A quantitative description of governance structures in large urban agglomerations*. OECD Regional Development Working Papers, 2014/04. Paris: OECD publishing. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jz43zldh08p-en>

Within a metropolitan area, there are many different challenges to be addressed, operating at different spatial levels:

- Meeting the service needs of individuals and communities in neighbourhoods (e.g. personal and operational services) from social care, education to waste disposal;
- Coordinating the strategic development of the whole metropolitan area (e.g. spatial planning, transportation, infrastructure investment, waste management, economic and sustainable development); and
- Supporting national and regional policy aims for promoting economic and sustainable development.

To do this effectively, requires:

- 'Working across boundaries' – to achieve collaboration between neighbouring municipalities and with state and regional institutions;
- 'Working across sectors' – to work effectively across the public, private and 3<sup>rd</sup> sectors; and
- 'Working across communities' – to work inclusively with the communities, neighbourhoods and stakeholders that collectively make up the metropolitan area.

However, to be classified as a metropolitan area governance body, it is suggested that it should meet four criteria:<sup>4</sup>

- It should cover the central city and a large share of the remaining parts of the metropolitan area;
- National and sub-national governments should be important actors within the organisation of metropolitan area governance, or its organisation should have the status of sub-national governance;
- The organisation should primarily focus on the governance of the whole of the metropolitan area e.g. strategic land use planning and transportation; and
- It should have a mandate that enables it to work on more than one issue relating to metropolitan area governance.

In this setting, it is acknowledged that the key challenge for the governance of metropolitan areas is to provide effective strategic coordination to enhance the well-being and sustainable development of the city and its hinterland.<sup>5</sup> Whilst crucial to citizens, businesses and other stakeholders of the metropolitan area, there are also wider implications. The growth of metropolitan areas has been a striking feature of urbanisation in recent decades, with variations in patterns of urbanisation between Eastern/Central and Western Europe.<sup>6</sup> Because metropolitan areas are increasingly

---

<sup>3</sup> Methodology described in: OECD, 2012. *Redefining urban. A new way to measure metropolitan areas*. OECD publishing. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264174108-en>

<sup>4</sup> Ahrend et al. 2014 op cit.

<sup>5</sup> OECD, 2015. *Governing the city*. Paris: OECD publishing. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/publications/governing-the-city-9789264226500-en.htm>

<sup>6</sup> Dijkstra, L., Garcilazo, E. and McCann, P., 2013. The economic performance of European cities and city regions: Myths and realities. *European Planning Studies*, 21(3), pp.334-354.

recognised by national states and regional governments as key sites for national economic growth, sustainable development, good governance and service delivery, structures for metropolitan governance are increasingly common across European nations, sometimes within a regional government framework.

### Seminar agenda

In this context, this seminar builds on the work on principles of democratic governance of metropolitan areas in Europe initiated in 2015 by the European Committee on Democracy and Governance (CDDG). It also considers:

- Recommendations by the Parliamentary Assembly (recommendation 1964 (2013)) and the Congress of local and regional authorities of the Council of Europe (recommendation 392 (2016) on 'good governance of large metropolises'.

In bringing forward the work of the CDDG, this European seminar explores and shares experience and knowledge about the good governance of metropolitan areas by:

- Enabling member states and metropolitan areas that are seeking to develop new mechanisms for their governance to learn from an exchange with more experienced metropolitan areas (and their states).
- Providing illustrations of good practice, both for formal structures and informal processes of metropolitan governance, consistent with the Council of Europe's 12 principles of good governance.
- Informing good practice recommendations and practical guidance for member states engaged in revising their practical guidance or in implementing new rules on the governance of metropolitan areas.

The seminar will address two interrelated dimensions of metropolitan governance, along with approaches for identifying governance structures best suited for different urban areas. These dimensions are:

- *Governance structures of metropolitan areas* – To consider different approaches to address the challenge of metropolitan governance in providing effective and strategic coordination across municipal bodies to improve the well-being and development of the city. Different national and metropolitan area illustrations will compare multi-level governance structures and divisions of competences across metropolitan areas and the circumstances in which they apply. This will include arrangements for capital cities. Different metropolitan case studies have been requested and these have been asked to address a common set of questions about metropolitan governance, to enable cross-comparison.
- *Participatory democracy in metropolitan areas* - illustrations of approaches being taken towards metropolitan governance to engage residents and other stakeholders and/or to encourage their participation in consultation/decision-making processes. Also, implementing policies for increased inclusiveness and improved integration of communities. This is

because: 'It is widely recognised, as set out by European standards, that good urban governance should involve mechanisms for citizen participation. In this respect, large metropolises are 'light houses' of local democracy where both innovative approaches and challenges become more visible than elsewhere, not least because of the particularly complex urban and social situations that they face.'<sup>7</sup>

## Governance structures for metropolitan areas

In 2014, the OECD reported a survey conducted across 263 metropolitan areas in 21 countries of at least 500,000 inhabitants (with an average below 2 million and median slightly above 1 million).<sup>8</sup> It was found that more than two-thirds of OECD metropolitan areas have established a body to coordinate responsibilities across the municipalities that form the metropolitan area. Within these, four broad categories of metropolitan governance bodies exist and, in practice, the larger the metropolitan areas, the more likely the arrangements are to be more formal in their structure. The four categories were described by the OECD as:<sup>9</sup>

- a) *Informal/self-coordination* – Informal collaborative arrangements are established only to provide consultation and share information across municipalities across the metropolitan area. They usually lack means for enforcement and provide no direct relations with citizens or with other levels of government. Thus, they are unlikely to be involved in direct service delivery. Legally, they are only subject to local agreement between participating municipalities and other local partners. Thus, they are relatively straightforward to set up and undo. This was the most common form of arrangement and encountered in 52 per cent of cases.
- b) *Inter-municipal authorities* – These may be set up to coordinate a single issue (e.g. spatial planning, transportation) or to provide broader coordination across the metropolitan area. The most common responsibilities include economic development, land-use planning, waste management and transportation. They are likely to have some formal basis, provided by central government, possibly by statute. responsibilities and costs across the participating municipalities are shared through institutional agreements. These arrangements may involve other tiers of government and other sectoral organisations (e.g. business organisations). There will be a joint body to manage cooperation and share decision making and responsibilities. Accountability is to member authorities. This form of arrangement was found in 24 per cent of cases.
- c) *Supra-municipal authorities* – They are found where an additional layer of government is introduced above existing municipalities across the metropolitan area giving the metropolitan body defined powers and responsibilities, usually of a strategic nature (e.g. strategic planning, transportation, economic development and waste management). This may include a directly elected Mayor and assembly, or a non-elected metropolitan tier. This is established by central government statute. Collaboration is reinforced by way of legally defined different roles and responsibilities for upper tier and lower tier authorities. This form of arrangement was found in 16 per cent of cases.

---

<sup>7</sup> Parliamentary Assembly, 2013. *Good governance of large metropolises*. Report to Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development, 4 November 2013. Doc: 13350:1.

<sup>8</sup> Ahrend et al., 2014 op cit.

<sup>9</sup> OECD, 2015 op cit.

- d) *Special status 'metropolitan cities'* – This is where a city within a wider metropolitan area is upgraded and given a 'special status' of being put on a higher footing by the government in relation to other municipalities in the metropolitan area. This form of arrangement was found in 8 per cent of cases. However, no examples were found in Europe.

## Metropolitan governance illustrations

This seminar brings together representatives from member states and metropolitan areas from across Europe and will illustrate the diversity of approaches towards metropolitan governance reflecting distinctive geographical, historical and civic evolutions of different metropolitan areas and their national settings. They will include both illustrations of formal government frameworks and mechanisms for participatory democracy.

Speakers from the OECD and METREX will provide an overview of frameworks and approaches towards metropolitan governance in Europe. At a national level, it will include presentations from Greece, Ireland, France, Germany and the UK on metropolitan governance arrangements in their own countries. In terms of the discussion on capital and metropolitan cities, it will include Athens and Thessaloniki (Greece), Brussels (Belgium), Riga (Latvia), Reykjavik (Iceland), Stuttgart (Germany) and Zaragoza (Spain).

As indicated above, contributors representing national states or metropolitan areas provided input about their metropolitan area based on a series of background questions. These centre around the form of governance structure, reflecting the OECD framework set out above. Accordingly, types of governance can be summarised as:<sup>10</sup>

- a) Soft – Informal collaborative arrangements subject to local agreement between participating municipalities (and other local partners).
- b) Intermediate – An inter-municipal authority/body or committee(s) established to manage inter-municipal cooperation and decision making across a single or range of responsibilities e.g. transportation, spatial planning.
- c) Strong – Supra-municipal authority established as an additional layer of government created above existing municipalities, likely to be directly or indirectly elected (mayor and/or political body).

Contributors were asked : when metropolitan governance arrangements were established; what the reasons were for establishing metropolitan arrangements; what the population of metropolitan areas is; the number of municipalities within the area; whether a regional tier exists between the metropolitan area and national government and whether the governance arrangements are established by national statute or through local or regional action and what functions are carried out at metropolitan level? In each case, contributors also indicated whether their case study most closely resembled a sprawl, monocentric, polycentric or multipolar structure. In addition to a focus on formal governance, respondents were asked about bottom-up approaches in citizen and other

---

<sup>10</sup> Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, 2016. *Good governance in metropolitan areas*. Governance Committee, CG31(2016)17. 21 October 2016.

stakeholder engagement in consultation and decision-making processes. Finally, contributors were asked to indicate what has worked and what challenges and problems have had to be overcome .

The final report will draw on all the seminar contributions. Contributions received prior to the seminar have been compiled in a series of short case studies.

The first set illustrate non-capital city metropolitan area governance arrangements - Amsterdam Metropolitan Area and Metropolitan Area Rotterdam and The Hague (The Netherlands), Stuttgart Region (Germany), and Messina (Sicily, Italy) – as well as one potential metropolitan area case study – Zaragoza (Spain). A second set illustrates urban/metropolitan arrangements in capital cities: - Brussels-Capital Region (Belgium), Ljubljana Urban Region (Slovenia) and Riga (Latvia).

a) *Illustrations of metropolitan area governance*

Amsterdam Metropolitan Area (AMA)

| Summary of information                   |   |
|--|---|
| When set up?                             | Been an informal network for 10 years. The Amsterdam Metropolitan Area covenant signed January 2017.  |
| By national or local or regional action? | The transport authority (part of the AMA area) by statute. The AMA by local/regional action.  |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | 2.3 million.  |
| Number of municipalities                 | 33.   |
| Is there regional government?            | Two provinces involved in constructing and participating in the network.  |
| Responsible functions>                   | Economic development; transportation; land-use planning; tourism; housing (policy) – but adopted and acted upon by member authorities and other metropolitan parties. |
| Urban structure?                         | Polycentric.  |

The AMA is an example of the soft or informal model. Different partners work collaboratively to agree on policies for the metropolitan area that are then adopted and implemented by different members and other partners. By doing so, it provides a broad and strategic approach to addressing important issues at the metropolitan scale, supported by a small but effective executive office that is funded by network participants. It also cooperates along eight logical and pre-existing sub-regions. However, there are challenges in building a network that has access to financial and executive resources to address significant issues such as energy transition, as well as ensuring effective engagement of municipal and provincial representatives in consultation processes. Resident engagement is carried out through the participant municipalities.

Messina

| Summary of information                   |  |
|--|--|
| When set up?                             | 2015.  |
| By national or local or regional action? | National law.  |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | 635,199.   |
| Number of municipalities?                | 108.   |
| Is there regional government?            | Yes, Sicily.   |
| Responsible functions?                   | Part responsibility for transportation, tourism, emergency services and education. |
| Urban structure?                         | Polycentric.   |

Messina, Sicily is described as a strong model, with a supra-municipality model. In Italy, metropolitan cities replaced the former 'province' of the 14 most major cities. They are governed by a metropolitan mayor (mayor to the principal municipality) and a metropolitan council. However, the governance system in Sicily is slightly different, due to its relative autonomy. At present, a commissioner undertakes the executive functions of the Council. The governance of the metropolitan area is in a process of change and it is likely that in future metropolitan mayors in Sicily will be directly elected.

#### Metropolitan Area Rotterdam and The Hague (MRDH)

| Summary of information                   |   |
|--|---|
| When set up?                             | Effective from 2015   |
| By national or local or regional action? | The MRDH was set up by local/regional action.   |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | 2.3 million.  |
| Number of municipalities                 | 23.   |
| Is there regional government?            | Yes, the province of South-Holland. The province and the MRDH must work together effectively to coordinate economic, transport and spatial planning.  |
| Responsible functions>                   | Economic development and transportation.  |
| Urban structure?                         | A dense, polycentric spatial structure. The MRDH area is formed by the two similarly sized cities of Rotterdam and The Hague and 21 medium and smaller-sized municipalities, which are connected by transport infrastructure but not by a contiguous built-up urban area. This reflects the polycentric spatial structure of the Netherlands at a more localised scale. |

The MRDH is an example of the intermediate model, with a metropolitan scale body created in 2015 to manage responsibilities for transport and economic development in the area. The general management is composed of the 23 mayors of the municipalities in the region. Member authorities are also represented by their aldermen in two committees; transport and economic development as well as in two advisory committees made up of two councilors per municipality. The mayors of Rotterdam and The Hague serve as chair and vice-chair of the MRDH. The responsibilities for transportation are transferred responsibilities from central government. The responsibilities for economic development are based on (voluntary) co-operation and do not include any enforcement mechanisms. Its legal competencies and financial resources in this domain are therefore relatively limited. As an 'institution' the MRDH is relatively unknown to residents of the metropolitan area, which is not unusual with this kind of extended municipal governance. As communication with residents about MRDH falls to the municipalities. The different stakeholders such as the province, municipalities, universities and other parties are involved decision making processes in diverse ways. As an example, in 2016 the 23 municipalities worked together with the province of South-Holland with the neighbouring regions of Drechsteden and Holland-Rijnland to establish a regional investment programme consisting of 150 projects in response to an urgent recommendation following OECD territorial review in 2015 to establish an investment strategy to strengthen the economy with investments in connectivity, economic development, energy transition and city environment. There remain challenges to secure the full agglomeration benefits for the region.

#### Stuttgart Region

| Summary of information                   |   |
|--|---|
| When set up?                             | 1995  |
| By national or local or regional action? | By law of Federal State of Baden-Württemberg, upheld by regional chambers of commerce.  |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | 2.7 million.  |
| Number of municipalities                 | 179.  |
| Is there regional government?            | Yes. Federal State of Baden-Württemberg.  |
| Responsible functions?                   | Economic development; transportation; land-use planning through mandatory regional framework; housing policy (on regional scale); power supply, planning of sites within regional plan. |
| Urban structure?                         | Polycentric.  |

The Stuttgart region comes between medium to strong structures. Although it is not formerly a supra-municipal authority, it does have a directly elected regional assembly. This in turn creates a strong political impact in placing regional issues high on the political agenda, leading to all political parties featuring clear programmes goals in aspects of regional development. Stuttgart Region has a long-standing tradition of public outreach and participation in planning procedures. Recent examples include: sites for wind turbines, large scale commercial sites and the regional



transportation plan. Whilst there was opposition to the region in the early stages, recognition of the value of regional cooperation and the consequences of failing to do so have become increasingly recognised. It came into being out of an economic crisis and a huge majority of support from the Federal State Parliament.

#### Metropolitan (sub-region) Unit of Thessaloniki of the Region of Central Macedonia

| When set up?                             | 2010-Metropolitan (sub-region) Unit: L.3852/2010 (Kallikratis Reform)   |
|--|---|
| By national or local or regional action? | National government level   |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | Metropolitan (sub-region) Unit: 1.110.000(2011)   |
| Number of municipalities?                | Metropolitan (sub-region) Unit: 14 municipalities   |
| Is there regional government?            | Yes, Region of Central Macedonia  |
| Responsible functions?                   | Metropolitan (sub-region) Unit: environment and quality of life; spatial planning and urban regeneration; transport and communications; civil protection and security |
| Urban structures                         | Likely Monocentric, with urban sprawl trends  |

The “Metropolitan committee” of Thessaloniki is also part of the implementation of metropolitan governance in the Region of Central Macedonia. Metropolitan competences have been explicitly arranged for four strategic sectors: transport and networks, environment and the quality of life, civil protection and security, spatial planning and urban regeneration.

Existing metropolitan institutions include: (1) the Organisation for the Planning and Environmental Protection of Thessaloniki (ORTHE) which was set up in 1985 and absorbed into the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change in 2014 (2) Thessaloniki Urban Transport Organisation (OASTH) that was set up in 1957 and transformed many times (1979, 2010, and 2017) but still in operation.

#### Zaragoza (potential metropolitan area)

| When set up?                             | Whilst there is progress in consultations between municipalities, there is no metropolitan governance arrangement in place at present. |
|--|--|
| By national or local or regional action? | Would involve decision making at Regional (Aragón) and national government levels.   |

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Population of metropolitan area? | City of Zaragoza – 700,000; potential metropolitan area – 800,000,  |
| Number of municipalities?        | Potentially 15-21.  |
| Is there regional government?    | Yes, Aragón.  |
| Responsible functions?           | Unclear at present. Likely to reflect a usual range of strategic functions e.g. strategic planning, transportation, economic development etc. |
| Urban structures                 | Polycentric.  |

Zaragoza is a potential rather than actual metropolitan area governance case study. Structures under consideration are likely to put it somewhere between the soft and medium model. The metropolitan governance outcome would represent a further evolution reflecting the strategic development of the metropolitan area surrounding Zaragoza e.g., the Ebro-Association created in 1994, developing a strategic plan for the city and its surrounding area, which is now being worked on in its third evolution.

*b) Capital city examples*

Metropolitan region of Attica

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
| When set up?                             | 2010-Metropolitan region: L.3852/2010 (Kallikratis Reform)   |
| By national or local or regional action? | National government level  |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | Region of Attica 3.830.000 (2011)  |
| Number of municipalities?                | Metropolitan region: 66 municipalities   |
| Is there regional government?            | Yes, Metropolitan region of Attica – Region of Attica  |
| Responsible functions?                   | Metropolitan region: environment and quality of life; spatial planning and urban regeneration; transport and communications; civil protection and security |
| Urban structures                         | Likely multi-polar, with a sprawling development pattern (2 main poles, Athens and Piraeus and -at least- 10 medium sized inter-municipal centers)         |

Metropolitan regions were set up by Kallikratis Law 3852/2018. According to this Law metropolitan competences have been explicitly arranged for four strategic sectors: transport and networks, environment and the quality of life, civil protection and security, spatial planning and urban regeneration. The four sectoral “metropolitan committees” that operate in the Region of Attica are part of the implementation of metropolitan governance structures.

Existing metropolitan institutions include: (1) the Organisation for the Planning and Environmental Protection of Athens (ORSA) which was set up in 1985 and absorbed into the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change in 2014 (2) the Athens Urban Transportation Organization (OASA) which covers 52 Municipalities (3) the Regional Union of Municipalities of Attica (PEDA) which covers all 66 Municipalities of the Region of Attica.

### Brussels-Capital Region

|  |   |
|--|---|
| When set up?                             | 1989, but with much earlier history of intra-municipal collaboration, going back as far as the late 19 <sup>th</sup> century.   |
| By national or local or regional action? | National.   |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | Brussels-Capital Region – 1.2 million.<br>(Metropolitan area of Brussels – potentially 1.8-2.6 million).  |
| Number of municipalities?                | Brussels-Capital Region – 19<br>(Metropolitan area of Brussels – potentially up to 35 municipalities).  |
| Is there regional government?            | Is a region of Belgium, alongside Flanders and Wallonia.  |
| Responsible functions?                   | Includes: spatial planning; economic development; housing policy; tourism; emergency services. However, responsibilities area also shared with the 19 municipalities. |
| Urban structures                         | Monocentric.  |

The Brussels-Capital region fits in the strong model. It has its own Parliament of 89 members and constitutes one of the three federated Regions of Belgium. However, some of the subsidiary arrangements present a closer fit with medium- or softer-arrangements such as the Brussels association of municipalities and services, which is active in the distribution of water, gas and electricity and the more historical Brussels Agglomeration (see below). Prior to the creation of the Brussels-Capital region, regional competences for the 19 municipalities were the responsibility of the Brussels Agglomeration, established in 1971 and which retains some competences today. Since 2011, legislation provides for the possibility of a wider metropolitan area for Brussels that would encompass a population of between 1.8 to 2.6 million and up to 35 municipalities. A number of issues however remain unresolved. A future RER zone – the future express railway that connect the Brussels region – is also being considered, encompassing 135 municipalities with over 3 million inhabitants.

## Ljubljana Urban Region

| Summary of information                   |   |
|--|---|
| When set up?                             | 2006.   |
| By national or local or regional action? | National Law, with legal decision signed by all 26 Mayors.    |
| Population of metropolitan area?         | 537,893   |
| Number of municipalities?                | 26.   |
| Is there regional government?            | No.   |
| Responsible functions?                   | Transportation; Tourism; Emergency services and power supply. |
| Urban structure?                         | Multi-polar.  |

Ljubljana Urban Region illustrates the intermediate model. Its most important members are the 26 municipalities that form the LUR. Their inter-cooperation is important in the preparation of regional development plans and their implementation. This is organised through the Office of the Ljubljana Urban Region. It is important to stress that Ljubljana has status and responsibilities as the capital city of Slovenia, for example in spatial planning and development. The present arrangements were established as part of an ambition for Ljubljana to reinforce its situation as a European metropolis by 2020.

## Riga

|  |  |
|--|--|
| When set up?                             | Long municipal history, but single-level local government for Riga, enshrined in law in 1994. Status of Riga as the capital city recognised by Parliament in 2005. |
| By national or local or regional action? | National.  |
| Population of capital city?              | 701,977  |
| Number of municipalities?                | One.   |
| Is there regional government?            | No.  |
| Responsible functions?                   | Full range of municipal responsibilities, in line with other cities in Latvia, together with recognition of capital city functions.                                |
| Urban structures                         | Possibly monocentric.  |

Riga is differentiated from the other case studies as a city rather than metropolitan area case study and for being governed by a single municipality. In 2003, Riga City Council prepared a draft law 'Law

on Riga as the Capital City', proposing to differentiate its role and legal status as the capital city. Whilst these proposals were not at that stage supported by Parliament, particular recognition was given to Riga's special position in 2005 in the 'Law on local governments'. Significance was given to the city's diplomatic, international, historical and communications functions within the national state.

Overall, these case studies illustrate a diversity of approach taken in different national and regional settings. In each example, there is a critical story about multi-level governance collaboration in design and implementation of metropolitan governance arrangements. They also illustrate the evolutionary processes involved; history is a significant factor in the emergence and nature of the governance of the metropolitan area.

### Success factors for metropolitan governance

This seminar provides an opportunity to reflect on success factors for metropolitan governance, drawing on the variety of contributions. Any practical outcomes will be seen in the light of OECD research reported in *governing the city*.<sup>11</sup> This recognises that there is no simple or off-the-shelf solution to the design of effective metropolitan governance. Any approach ought to be designed in geographical, historical and civic context, to ensure its legitimacy, appropriateness and ownership, considering three key factors:

- The nature of the challenge of coordinating policies horizontally - between municipalities and across policy areas, and vertically - with the state and regional institutions.
- Whether a stronger or softer institutional framework is required in terms of powers, financing structure, budgets and staff.
- The importance of being perceived as legitimate and to generate trust among citizens and non-governmental organisations, the private sector and other tiers of government.

Practical advice will take account of and reflect on existing evidence for likely success factors:<sup>12</sup>

- *Motivate collaboration through concrete metropolitan projects* – Better to build agreement around an identified need and an opportunity related to the economic, social and political context of the area. This may be progressed through tangible projects and initiatives to rally support and establish a 'bigger picture' for the area.
- *Build metropolitan ownership among key stakeholders* – Metropolitan governance reforms need strong advocates and leadership. This is both politically within the metropolitan area and from other stakeholders such as the private sector, NGOs, universities and central government. Ownership needs to be built both top-down and bottom-up.
- *Tailor reliable sources of metropolitan financing* – Consideration is needed of how metropolitan governance arrangements will be funded. Any structures and responsibilities need to be appropriate to the funding and staffing resources likely to be available.

---

<sup>11</sup> OECD, 2015 op cit.

<sup>12</sup> OECD, 2015 op cit.

- *Design incentives and compensations for metropolitan compromise – Working across boundaries is challenging. Co-operation between municipalities and other stakeholders operates best on a voluntary basis where there is local commitment to succeed combined with encouragement incentives from the state. There also needs to be consideration of how best to encourage those who might feel threatened to engage in any reform.*
- *Implement a long-term process of metropolitan monitoring and evaluation – Building effective metropolitan governance, even when it is informal and voluntary, takes a long-time. It is helpful to underpin the progress with appropriate independent research to provide monitoring, evaluation and a supporting evidence base.*
- *Any initiative towards metropolitan governance needs to be addressed as part of a wider multi-level-governance approach towards reform – The national state is a critical partner in the evolution of metropolitan governance. Reform is stronger where it is part of a national approach towards building better institutions and a stronger and more sustainable economy.*

## Seminar Outcomes

Building on the earlier work of the CDDG outlined above and the preparation for this seminar, the intended outcomes are:

- An opportunity for shared learning of experience and knowledge about different approaches of good practice in metropolitan governance across different metropolitan areas and national settings. These will be set within an overall framework of different models of metropolitan governance.
- A conference report that will identify key issues raised by contributors, both in presentations and in discussion. This analysis will make use of the cross-comparison framework as set out in the questionnaire for presenters of metropolitan case studies. It will identify good practice and lessons to be learnt.
- The provision of practical guidance assistance for Member States in developing multilevel governance structures and policies for metropolitan areas and guidelines for the cohesive development of their hinterlands
- The development of tools such as guidelines, functional checklists or benchmarks in relation to the creation and management of governance structures of metropolitan areas, giving practical follow-up to Recommendation 392 (2016) on “Good governance in large metropolitan areas” of the Congress and.

The seminar may also give practical effect to recommendations such as:

- Recommendation Rec(2003)2 by the Committee of Ministers on neighbourhood services in disadvantaged urban areas, or
- Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation 1964 (2013) on good governance of large metropolises.