



## CITYLAB ON METROPOLITAN GOVERNANCE 12<sup>th</sup> February 2010

### Notes on Workshop 2: Economic Development and Labour Markets across Boundaries

We are confronted by a 21<sup>st</sup> Century economy, with 20<sup>th</sup> Century governance and 19<sup>th</sup> century boundaries. In this context, how can we effectively govern the modern metropolitan region to improve economic efficiency and inclusivity? It seems that while economic development and labour markets are increasingly shaped by global forces, cities still have considerable margin for manoeuvre to influence both the overall competitiveness of urban areas and the distribution of economic activity with them. From this complex problem for the workshop key questions were as follows.

1 How do cities deal with the complexity of managing both the morphological and functional city regions which are cleaved by national, regional and local administrative boundaries?

2 What types of innovative arrangements do they develop in order to overcome the resulting political, financial and/or administrative divisions?

3 How does the citizen remain engaged and the system maintain legitimacy in increasingly complex governance arrangements?

Moderator: Paul Soto, URBACT Thematic Pole Manager

Rapporteur: Thierry Baert, Communauté urbaine de Lille, Lead Partner Joining Forces

<b>Time</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Speakers</b>
11.00-13.00	<b><u>Workshop 2a</u></b> <b>Economic development and labour markets across boundaries</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ab Oosting and Harm Martens, City of Eindhoven / Samenwerkingsverband Regio Eindhoven (NL) - Brainport project, Joining Forces partner</li> <li>• Istvan Ferencsik, Ister-Granum/ Esztergom (SK-HU) - Solidarity fund, EGTC partner</li> <li>• Joan Miquel Pique, LocalRet, Barcelona (SP)</li> </ul>
14.00-15.30	<b><u>Workshop 2b</u></b> <b>Economic development and labour markets across boundaries</b>	<p>Follow-up from morning session – Statements from URBACT projects, discussion and conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tobias Chilla, University of Luxemburg, Espon Metroborder project</li> <li>• Yves Dhau-Dacuyper on Lille Metropolitan Area, Director of Mission Bassin Minier (FR)</li> <li>• Thierry Bart as representative of Joining Forces project</li> </ul>

**Morning workshop 2a  
Case Studies**

Ab Oosting	Brainport	Eindhoven	NL	Joining Forces	<a href="mailto:a.oosting@sre.nl">a.oosting@sre.nl</a> :
Istvan Ferencsik	Solidarity Fund	Ister - Granum / Esztergom	HU / SK	EGTC	<a href="mailto:ferencsik.istvan@istergranum.hu">ferencsik.istvan@istergranum.hu</a>
Joan-Miquel Piqué	Localret	Barcelona	SP	(Nodus)	<a href="mailto:jmpique@localret.cat">jmpique@localret.cat</a>

Three URBACT groups are represented: Joining Forces, EGTC, linking to Nodus

i) Presentation of *Harm Martens* was about the case of Eindhoven (Netherlands), where Philips bankrupted in its traditional structures in early 90ies. The company concentrated in the area very much from decades. A new vision and ambition aimed a new type of economic and urban pole, like as Brainport Project. *Ab Oosting* (SRE) presented the concept of the project that is based on the strategic spatial planning of the country. It is based on three successful poles as seats of winning companies as SEAPORT (Rotterdam and its area) – AIRPORT (Amsterdam city-region) – BRAINPORT (Eindhoven urban area). Main pillars of Brainport are the innovative ecosystem (esp. High Tech Campus and its area), Triple Helix: cooperation between business, academia and government, Brainport Navigator (monitoring: ranking and scoring) as also a common programme. Importance of governance is emphasized. It is a bottom up process based on high trust. Spatial poles are also expanded by ELAt – Eindhoven, Leuven, Aachen triangle (also cross-border).

**Discussion** was on closed versus open innovative ecosystem: importance of 'doing together' and open is emphasized, even these formats are open physically, as well. Role of public sector must not be neglected in the whole process. Local government and forms of governance are moderators or facilitators of big company and industry revitalization programmes. Private sector is also represented in Brainport esp. in its steering committee. An interesting question is raised about relationship between ELAt and EGTC as formats.

ii) The second presentation is from the ISTER GRANUM development agency (Euroregion Hungary–Slovakia, also EGTC) on the Solidarity Fund. *István Ferencsik* described basics and operation of the Fund in which the Hungarian town, Esztergom plays a crucial role. Big companies, first of all Suzuki, are seated in the city, while employees are from the surrounding cross-border area. Particular proportion of the local industrial tax income is distributed back to the residential area of employees, which is in 60 % from Slovakia.

**Discussion** was on motivation of the city. What is its interest in solidarity? A cultural and ethnic reason is highlighted, namely Hungarian speaking area is influenced in this way. Nevertheless the present as initial development is characterized with quantities. No huge European projects are going on. Calls of the agency are on very limited sources.

iii) The next presentation is made by *Joan-Miquel Piqué*, Catalonia, City of Barcelona about *Localret* ([www.localret.cat](http://www.localret.cat)). Localret is a consortium of 818 municipalities. The initial cooperation is based as intended answer on the economic crises and mainly increasing

unemployment rate. A common reconstruction strategy was initiated by Barcelona city council and Katalonia regional government supporting municipalities in applying new technologies like telecommunication of government offices including information technology (high speed connection). In the meantime organizational initiatives were enhanced, like lobbying for general Municipalities Meeting Plan; establishment of boards for small municipalities as partners of big cities. Cooperation also focuses on strengthening linkages between companies and municipalities.

**Discussion** was going on the type of the urban area, comparing Katalonia as administrative area because it is also a rural area involved in the network, as well. How urban effects are relevant in such a situation? A common perspective was underlined, i. e. to equalize infrastructure in general, esp. roads regarding on the crossing mountain area in the region.

### Afternoon Workshop 2b Case Studies

Yves D'hau-Dacuyper on Lille Metropolitan Area,	Director of Mission Bassin Minier		FR	Mission Bassin Minier	
Tobias Chilla	Espon Metroborder	Luxemburg	LU	ESPON	<a href="mailto:tobias.chilla@uni.lu">tobias.chilla@uni.lu</a>
Thierry Bart	Joining Forces as Working Group of URBACT II	Lille	FR	Joining Forces	<a href="mailto:tbaert@lille-metropole-2015.org">tbaert@lille-metropole-2015.org</a>

iv) In the afternoon session the following, fourth presentation was made by *Yves Dhau-Dacuyer* on Lille Metropolitan Area. It consists of the Lille urban area (in narrower sense), the Belgian part and the Southern arc from France. 3-4 million inhabitants are involved as a total in this polycentric metropolitan area with a common old industrial tradition. However constraints are also typical esp. in cultural heritage. Nevertheless the whole area is motivated to overcome the handicap from the old coal-mining area. There are different instruments for generating policies to strengthen competitive clusters in the region in some of the relevant industrial sectors here. These are for instance EGTC, development councils, Chamber of Commerce and other corporate formats, Metropolitan Area Association, logistics (train, motorways), research centres, universities etc.

**Discussion** was on functional urban area, meaning of which covers this wide territorial unit involving linkages among different poles. It is closely connected to the labour market as a whole (it might be the same). The association in the French side is quite recent, it is formulated in 2007. EGTC is an alternative solution, chosen by the involved Belgian authorities.

The 5th presentation is on the ESPON programme, made by *Tobias Chilla* (Univ. of Luxemburg). The project *Metroborder* is introduced as an applied research focusing on cross-border polycentric metropolitan regions. Labour market is one of the most relevant indicators in these spatial relations. Through Delphi Study method ranking priorities are defined. Among them governance is discussed.

The final presentation was made by *Thierry Bart* on 'Joining Forces' working group of the URBACT II programme. Partner cities and city-regions are typified. Issues of governance are scrutinized through different sector-oriented investigations. Preliminary conclusions can be drawn in this phase. It seems to focus on collecting of different actors from the public sector, collecting actors from other sectors (private, NGO) and flexible processes.

**Discussion** at this point was spread to the theme of the whole workshop. According to Christian Vandermotten relevance to labour market should define more precisely. Peter Ramdsen raised a question, what variables are on effects of the labour market from spatial aspect. He cited Elena Ostrom's work as assessment of trust in government/ governance. Paul Soto emphasized importance of positioning cities in the global economy. Issues solved levels of cooperation, basis of which voluntary and statutory, positioning of the European level in this system.

**Summary** is made by *Thierry Bart*, as the rapporteur of the workshop on linkages between morphological and functional urban area from the side of options on their governing contents.

A/ Issues raised by the case studies:

- On going cultural mutation: we are moving from a closed to an open world – this is also true for LAs
- Involvement of the private sector is required in the economic strategy making at city-region level
- Common mismatch between the scale/ place where taxes are collected and the ones where services are required.
- Crucial role of trust to build up metropolitan co-operations /governance arrangements – solidarity is needed
- Is metropolisation a phenomenon limited to big cities or is all the European territory involved in this process (i.e. is there still true rural areas or just lower density areas)?
- Respective role of the Regional authorities / responsibility of the central cities
- Acting in common is the right way of developing cooperation: project comes first and then structure can be created when required
- How to define the common interest vs. specific ones?

B/ Main issues debated in the workshop:

- City region is a common expression for various realities: there are at least two main, quite different, levels: morphological areas (the more or less densely built-up area) and functional areas corresponding to (the economic system/labour market). They do not necessarily need the same type of governance arrangements.
- Considering the difference between mono-centric and poly-centric city-regions is also essential, as the specificities of cross border metropolitan areas. Specific situations are leading to ad hoc solutions.
- There are different scales according to issues to be dealt with and/or to projects to be developed (the same scale is not relevant for instance for water supply and the labour market)
- The scale of FUAs is quickly evolving (i.e. increasing), especially in cross border ones
- Is a top down definition of metropolitan limits and related government (by national government) required or can informal cooperation be enough/ more effective? – opinions diverge in the workshop (probably a mix?)
- In any case everyone agrees on the fact that incentives from upper levels could help
- The existence of formal agreements at metropolitan level, especially for project development, could be a condition for the allocation of EU funding.
- Time and continuity are required: the cooperation process should not be a matter for politics but the actions to develop in priority.
- What role for citizens/workers in the process? Their residential choices are creating the FUAs !