Metropolitan governance

Jefferey Sellers
Vincent Hoffmann-Martinot


PHILIPS
HITACHI

I. Introduction

Worldwide, metropolitan regions (also referred to as "urban regions" or "city regions") are rapidly becoming the predominant form of human settlement. In 1800 only 2% of the world's population lived in urban areas. Five years from today –most likely when a villager somewhere in Asia or Africa moves to an urban center there– the majority of the world's population will be urban. Thereafter, humankind will be, indisputably, an urban species.

With the industrial revolutions of the 19th and early 20th Centuries, urban regions became the predominant form of settlement throughout most of the global North. This process of urbanization is now increasingly the rule in the global South as well. For example, most of Latin America is now urbanized. The United Nations predicts that from 2005 to 2030, 90% of all global population growth will take place in urban regions of the global South (UNCHS 2005).

The size and form of metropolitan regions differ considerably, both within countries and between global North and global South regions. The size of today's largest urban regions is unprecedented in world history. In 1950 only one city had a population of more than 10 million. By 1975 there were five cities of this size, three of them in the developing world. By 2000 there were 16 cities with populations over 10 million, twelve of them in the developing world. However, such megacities like these present only part of the story. Cities with populations in excess of one million are proliferating worldwide, and the number of cities with more than five million inhabitants is also increasing. As more people are drawn into expanding urban regions (UNCHS 2005), the world's metropolises grow more extensive, more diverse and more fragmented.

Simultaneously, changes in the governance, economics and societies continue to transform the spatial and social structures of urban regions. Diverse service sectors in both the South and the North have grown into dominant components of metropolitan economies. As economic globalization has increasingly linked urban regions to each other, and cities to their peripheries and hinterlands, competition among cities and regions has intensified. At the same time, widespread decentralization has encouraged high-level governments to abandon local governments within metropolitan regions to the myriad consequences of the ongoing demographic, economic and social changes.

Social scientists have for many years linked urbanization with economic development, education and other components of "modernization" (Ingram 1997). Of course, cities are still the centers of economic and social activity worldwide, but in important ways the dynamics of modernization have changed. It is increasingly clear that today's metropolitan regions face unprecedented governance challenges. The size of modern cities, their continued growth, their social and spatial fractures, their distinctive economic characteristics, and their institutional dimensions present hitherto unanticipated dimensions of governance. As expanding metropolitan regions cope with the new facts of governance, governments at higher levels must also acknowledge and address metropolitan issues. Nor is it likely that solutions will be simple. Solutions for one region may not pertain in another. Each metropolitan setting, North and South, is in important respects unique.

The size of today's largest urban regions is unprecedented in world history

II. Conditions of metropolitan governance

Worldwide urbanization has given rise to the global phenomenon of geographically extended metropolitan regions. This chapter focuses on governance of these settings, governance being defined as "actions and institutions within an urban region that regulate or impose conditions for its political economy" (Sellers 2002, p. 9). Despite the many forms that metropolitan governments take, they confront common challenges shaped by parallel shifts in politics, economics and

As markets for residence and employment in metropolitan areas diversify, affluent households seize the opportunity to sort themselves into areas with superior amenities and a better quality of life

society. Still, fundamental differences between Northern and Southern cities make governance a significantly different proposition above and below the equator.

Urban growth means territorial expansion as well as population growth. De facto metropolitan borders push thus farther and farther out into the surrounding rural area. At the same time, improved transportation and communication technologies have greatly increased the mobility of employers and residents. Especially in developed countries, clear dichotomies between city and countryside have given way to dispersed, polycentric patterns of settlement and economic activity. Many developing areas, such as the Pearl River Delta of China, manifest a similar evolution.

The problem of horizontal governance across an extended area confronts all of these urban regions. Settlement and economic activity frequently expand across institutionalized boundaries, and beyond the reach of stable, pre-existing governance arrangements. This phenomenon presents several potential problems:

- **Absence of territorial controls and guidance:** Urban spread can be limited and restricted only by co-operative action among the affected urban areas. Local governments must look beyond their parochial vision and strategy, and make at least a minimal effort to acknowledge and accommodate this crucial spillover dimension;

- **Shortcomings in management capabilities and experience:** Small government units find it difficult to attract and develop the administrative and technical resources required for territorial management. Pooling resources could provide increased efficiency and economies of scale;

- **Lack of structural consultation for solving common problems:** Collective action by local governments is still the exception. Yet when the social and economic structures within a metropolitan region are interconnected, decisions and actions taken by one community can easily affect or even undermine the choices made in a neighboring one. This interconnectedness of metropolitan communities stands at the core of the metropolitan problem.

Partly for these reasons, metropolitan governance requires vertical as well as horizontal relations among governments. The social and economic problems that the higher-level governments of both developed and developing countries confront – from economic development to reducing pollution – are also increasingly the problems of metropolitan regions. Opportunities for governance within these regions are often provided by national policies and institutions. For example, transportation policy determined at a higher level of government can be coordinated with local decisions about economic development. Similarly, implementation of national or regional pollution laws can be facilitated by appropriate local planning; or an overarching social welfare policy can be coordinated with local educational policy.

Other social and economic dynamics in metropolitan areas compound the need for metropolitan governance. Recent research points to growing socio-economic disparities within many contemporary metropolitan regions (e.g., Fainstein 2001; Segbers et al. 2007). As markets for residence and employment in metropolitan areas diversify, affluent households seize the opportunity to sort themselves into areas with superior amenities and a better quality of life. Poor households gravitate toward areas with the lowest housing costs. Especially where the boundaries between affluence and poverty correspond to boundaries between governmental entities, such as villages or towns, heightened differences in the number and quality of public services can reinforce social disparities. Without public measures to equilibrate the fiscal disparities among locales, governance arrangements can reinforce spatial advantages and disadvantages.

Even beyond the boundaries of metropolitan settlement itself, increased mobility and communication have intensified social and economic links between urban centers and outlying areas. Metropolitan regions, like most central cities, function as centers of production and distribution for the surrounding regions. However, they are also centers of consumption for outlying areas, providing a strong cultural economy for intellectual life, education and tourism. Indeed, growth in the metropolis often comes at the expense of rural economies, triggering a population influx from rural areas.

Differences between northern and southern metropolitan regions

Within these broad commonalities, urban regions in the developed North and those in the developing South have distinctive characteristics and face markedly different challenges.

In parts of the South, especially in Asia and Africa, urban regions are growing at unprecedented rates, faster even than cities grew at the onset of urbanization in the North. Flight from the countryside is driven by rural environmental degradation, disappearing job opportunities and poverty. So dire are conditions in many rural areas that growth in southern metropolitan regions is simply explosive. Although current rates of growth among cities in the North vary widely, they are generally lower. In much of Europe, declining birth rates and migration present new problems among declining urban populations.

The populations and forms of peripheral settlement also differ. In most of the North, middle class and affluent residents have led a migration from the central cities (Hoffman-Martinot and Sellers 2005). In most of the South, however, urban regions remain generally more concentrated and dense, and poor residents typically predominate on the urban periphery.

Concentrations of poverty and slums may still be found in major metropolitan areas in the United States and in a number of European countries. In many Southern metropolitan regions, however, poverty predominates. The latest survey data suggest that 25% of the urban population is below the poverty line in India, 15% in Brazil, 30% in Tanzania, 19% in Ghana, 13% in Jamaica, 57% in Sierra Leone and approximately 7% in Vietnam (UNFPA:2006). If poverty in the South were measured by the same standards applied in developed countries, at least half of the urban population in many developing countries would be categorized as poor. In developing nations, the urban figure is usually less than the proportion of households below the relevant poverty line in the rural areas (UNFPA: 2007).

Concentrations of poverty and slums may still be found in major metropolitan areas in the United States and in a number of European countries

The most recent UN figures also suggest that one third of the world's urban population – 90% of city dwellers in the developing world – live in slums, defined as areas with inadequate provision of infrastructure such as sewers, running water and electricity (UNFPA: 2007).

For urban residents in the South, a notable measure of informality characterizes employment and housing (cf. Gilbert 1998; Segbers et al. 2007). While their legal status varies with local circumstance, these settlements by definition lie outside the formal planning and legal system, and are usually built on land that the inhabitants do not own. Such residential areas come in many forms and sizes, and most attain de facto acceptance by local authorities. Local municipal politicians often use their residents as sources of patronage and electoral support. One result of this acknowledged but unofficial status has been the appearance of a full-fledged underground housing market with properties (usually shacks) being unofficially bought and sold. Because most settlement residents can not afford to "own" property, even under such quasi-legal conditions, there is also a strong rental market.

In many developed countries, local governments, planning regimes, property laws and welfare states institutionalized at the natio-

The growth patterns of metropolitan regions are most usefully viewed as products of both government and private-sector policies

nal level have provided powerful instruments to steer metropolitan settlement and address resource inequalities. In the South, however, even where comparable mechanisms exist, they are apt to be less extensive and less effective.

In confronting rapid urbanization and the challenges of metropolitan governance in the 21st Century, Southern metropolitan areas can find guidance in the growing number and range of global institutional models. These models incorporate international expertise about policy in specific sectors, and accumulated lessons about metropolitan management garnered from previous experience with urbanization. But the sheer size and extent of the largest urban regions, as well as the growing influence of outside forces and metropolitan interconnectedness, frequently give rise to unforeseen circumstances and daunting complexities.

The growth patterns of metropolitan regions are most usefully viewed as products of both government and private-sector policies. Intentionally or not, even the most diverse and expansive metropolitan areas achieved certain aspects of their present form partly as a result of governmental choices. Such governmental efforts include extending transportation systems, such as motorways, trains and other forms of mass transport, designating locations for businesses and residents, providing incentives through tax abatements and other subsidies, and planning suburban habitats. At the same time, individual businesses and consumer housing preferences exert powerful, ongoing influences on growth patterns.

III. Key challenges of governing metropolitan areas

The governance of metropolitan areas is particularly difficult for a number of reasons. Whatever the institutional arrangements or the peculiarities of the surrounding region, metropolitan governance must address increasingly extended, diverse, and divided spaces. Many metropolitan areas must deal with continued demographic expansion. Many others must also overcome institutional fragmentation due to the lack of a central, encompassing regulatory authority. Most, to some degree, also have to cope with new and sometimes intense local conflicts.

III.1. Social and territorial diversity

The shape of metropolitan regions today marks a clear departure from the traditional form of cities. Especially in Europe, urban settlement has long been understood to follow an agglomerative concentric model. Within fortifications, behind gates and along great boulevards, the European city developed a distinct economy and way of life. Beyond the city walls lay the economically and administratively separate sphere of rural settlement. Modern metropolitan regions, however, have far more complex patterns of territorial diversity that often blend urban and rural elements. Such new patterns are reinforced by social diversity that frequently outstrips that of urban regions in centuries past.

Though it may seem counterintuitive, today the fastest growth often occurs in the rural communities on the fringes of urban areas. In the developed countries of the North, this growth is fed by young families looking for homes with more space. Many of these "new rural dwellers" left denser urban neighborhoods or even established suburbs to live in outlying villages. Though they move farther from the center of the city, these families typically remain dependent on the city for employment and public amenities.

In the developing countries of the South, especially in Brasilia and Mexico City, middle class and affluent households are also moving away from the center of metropolitan regions. However, an even larger number of new arrivals are poor residents of rural areas and poor urban dwellers seeking affordable housing.

As the urban fabric spreads and stretches, the notion of 'conurbation' – a continuous net-

work of built-up urban areas – has increasingly failed to capture the fluid and ambiguous nature of peri-urban regions. It has given way to measures of commuting intensity or patterns of migration toward a central city. Significantly, geographers and urban planners have even invented special terms to describe the new entities that are taking shape around large cities: City-archipelago, emerging town, megalopolis, metapolis and metropolitan area are a few examples of recent additions to the urban-studies lexicon (Ascher 1996; Gottman 1961; Mongin 1998; Veltz 1995).

Growing social diversity in many urban regions has contributed to the increase in ground-level territorial diversity. The largest urban regions in developed countries generally feature higher levels of social and economic segregation by residence. In Europe and North America, many such regions have also absorbed the largest proportions of new immigrants, including those from developing countries. Growing economic and social diversity has often compounded metropolitan segregation. Although middle class areas predominate in the largest metropolitan regions of the developed world, it is usually possible to find both exclusive affluent localities or neighborhoods and concentrations of poverty and social disadvantage. Overall levels of territorial segregation vary widely among metropolitan regions, but range higher in the United States than in most of Western Europe or Japan.

In most southern cities, the incidence of poverty is determined primarily by the local labor market. The income, security, and benefits linked to employment remain the primary means by which households can avoid impoverishment. Industrial firms are the major employers in the urban centers of the South, though in some places the service sector has been replacing them. Street trading and the informal job sector have become a major source of employment for those not in the formal sector. The proportion of jobs in this sector varies between cities but often accounts for upwards of 20% of those in employment.

III.2. Governmental fragmentation

Another challenge for governance stems from the organizational fragmentation of local governments in extended metropolitan regions. Much of this fragmentation is geopolitical. As more people move into an increasing number of communities surrounding central cities, more local governments are drawn into problems that beset the entire metropolitan region.

The largest urban regions in developed countries generally feature higher levels of social and economic segregation by residence

Data from the 476 metropolitan regions in the International Metropolitan Observatory (Hoffmann-Martinot and Sellers 2005) offer the most systematic current overview of governmental fragmentation in OECD countries; data for several additional cases are provided as well. Measured by the proportion of the central city population in areas of more than 200,000 inhabitants, Israel is one of the most fragmented countries from a geopolitical point of view, along with Switzerland (30%), Germany (31%), the United States (34%) and France (36%). In the Netherlands, about half the population lives in central city neighborhoods, but in the other countries studied, the bulk of the population continues to reside in central towns rather than traditional suburbs.

The number of communities with approximately 100,000 inhabitants is a second widely accepted measure of this kind of political-institutional fragmentation (e.g., Brunn and Ziegler 1980) in metropolitan areas. The higher this indicator is for a metropolitan area, the greater the fragmentation. In a majority of the countries in the International Metropolitan Observatory (IMO) project, this measure of institutional fragmentation is low, having a value lower than five. Such a low score invariably indicates that municipalities in the region have been merged, as they were recently in Canada (1). Sweden and the Netherlands (2), Poland and Israel (3), and Norway (4), also merged their metropolitan municipalities comparatively recently. In Spain, the exurban parts of metropolitan areas have only developed in recent years, accounting for that country's low level of ins-

As measured by this index, France appears as the most territorially fragmented country in Europe

titutional fragmentation (3). The highest values appear in countries where pre-industrial municipal boundaries largely survive, such as France (32), the Czech Republic and Switzerland (21), Germany (18), the United States (15) and Hungary (12). It may seem surprising that these values are much higher in Hungary and in the Czech Republic, former communist countries, than in Poland (3) or in other post-communist countries such as Slovak Republic. This higher level of fragmentation is a result of planned programs for municipal disaggregation carried out by the Czech and Hungarian national governments.

A geopolitical fragmentation index developed by Brunn and Zeigler (1980) combines the two previous indicators into a single measurement. This enables a summary comparison among the IMO countries.

As measured by this index, France appears as the most territorially fragmented country in Europe with a value of 11. This indicates considerably more fragmentation than the average for the United States (7), which is more or less the level for Switzerland. International comparison of the Zeigler and Brunn scale shows that there is no uniform North American model: Canadian metropolitan areas are institutionally very different from those in the United States, and recent consolidation reforms have placed Canada closer to the Northern European model. Similarly, it is not possible to put all countries in Eastern Europe in the same bracket. While they were all subject to waves of mergers during the communist period, the fragmentation of the post-communist Czech Republic (3) presents a completely different profile from Hungary (1.7) or Poland (0.6). Because of a recent, less-pronounced metropolitanization process, Spain (0.5) appears to be closer to the Netherlands (0.5), Sweden (0.3) and Norway (0.8) than to neighboring France. Germany (6) is highly fragmented, and has higher levels in eastern metropolitan areas, as well as some western metropolitan areas, including Koblenz.

Overall, the IMO data show geopolitical fragmentation to be highest in those developed countries where metropolitanization has proceeded amid continued legacies of older town and village settlement and administration (France, Germany, Switzerland, the eastern portions of the United States). Fragmentation is also progressing rapidly in a number of other countries where metropolitanization is relatively new, such as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Spain and Israel. By contrast, far-reaching reforms have succeeded spectacularly in reducing fragmentation in Scandinavia, Canada, and the United Kingdom.

Other than South Africa, which is included in the IMO project, no comparable data are as yet available to measure geopolitical fragmentation in the developing and transitional countries of the South. However, South Africa provides a dramatic example of governmental restructuring in the South. Post-apartheid reforms in South Africa effectively eliminated geopolitical fragmentation by reconfiguring municipal boundaries to correspond with the economic and social outline of the major metropolitan areas.

Similar moves toward metropolitan consolidation took place earlier in other developing countries during the period when governmental consolidation was fashionable in Northern Europe. In 1973, the Brazilian military regime created nine metropolitan regions that are still functioning today. In Republic of Korea, the regime instituted metropolitan regional governments for Seoul and several other cities. Many Southern countries also established some form of metropolitan territorial authority for their capital city regions.

In the South, these consolidation efforts have generally failed to eliminate the problem of geopolitical fragmentation. There as in the North, the problem remains especially evident in the largest urban regions. Laqian, in a recent survey of governance in Asian metropoles, calls political and administrative fragmentation "[t]he most serious problem that many of them face" (2007, p. 145). In some

former colonies, structures of colonial administration still define local district boundaries outside central cities. Elsewhere, as with the Indian panchayat or the Philippine barangay, indigenous settlements shape municipal jurisdictions. Where metropolitan governments are in place, spatial expansion often continues beyond the formal administrative boundaries into surrounding localities. Metropolitan governments now administer 50% of the metropolitan population in Mexico City, 71% in Sao Paulo, 45% in Seoul and 38% in Johannesburg.

Even where the jurisdiction of metropolitan governmental authority extends over the entire metropolitan area, other forms of fragmentation can frustrate effective governance. In Bangkok, Manila, and Mumbai, for instance, metropolitan authorities have secured extensive geopolitical jurisdiction, yet effectiveness is often limited by political and administrative interference. To some extent local or high-level governments can formally restrict the power of metropolitan institutions. A further dilution of metropolitan authority occurs where agencies or offices charged with different sectoral tasks, such as roads, housing, and transit, resist directives from the metropolitan government.

III.3. Economic globalization and competitiveness

Increasingly, in both the North and the South, metropolitan regions have been recognized as key nodes for national economic strategies. They are also regarded as vital hubs for mobilization for rapid economic development. Alongside the globalization of trade and production networks, the shift to service and high-technology business has reinforced this transformation of metropolitan commerce.

Most literature on "global cities" initially centered on the largest cities of the North, and sought to analyze urban regions according to global hierarchies based on their position in international finance, corporate governance, elite travel, and communication (e.g., Sassen 1991; Taylor 2003). Other work on "global city regions" points instead to the role of regional economic clusters in the high-technology and advanced service components of modern industrial economies (e.g., Scott 2001). In developed countries, a range of smaller and mid-size urban regions have also managed to stimulate growth by attracting high technology, corporate branch offices, and educational or administrative services (Markusen, Lee and DiGiovanna 1999). This new round of economic competitiveness has not pushed growth in just one direction. Increasingly, metropolitan centers find that there is considerable commercial allure in a vibrant urban environment and the cultural amenities found there (Glaeser, Kolko and Saiz 2000). Such new regional economic dynamics further reinforce demands for more regional collective action.

In the South, development has been comparatively uneven. Despite greater pressures there to pursue economic prosperity, governance of metropolitan regions in the South presents challenges that are similar to those in the North. For the first half of the 20th Century, cities in Asia and Latin America focused almost exclusively on industrial development and modernization. In much of Latin America, as well as in the Asian countries of Thailand and Republic of Korea, cities absorbed much of this industrialization and commanded correspondingly large proportions of national resources. Aggravated by conditions of authoritarian rule in many of these countries, urban primacy had the demonstrated effect of reducing the potential for overall national development (Ades and Glaeser 1994).

Since the 1970s, however, much of the new manufacturing capacity in the developing world has been built outside urban centers, usually in surrounding towns. New industrial parks and high-technology centers have also been situated on the periphery of major urban centers, such as Campinas in the Sao Paulo region (Markusen, Lee and DiGiovanna) and the HITEC Center outside of Hyderabad (Kennedy 2007). In the face of the underdevelopment and declining fortunes of

Since the 1970s, however, much of the new manufacturing capacity in the developing world has been built outside urban centers, usually in surrounding towns

Services, high technology activities and commercial development have increasingly replaced traditional manufacturing as the objects of metropolitan economic recruitment

the countryside, new centers of development in the South continue to rely on the infrastructure, capital, and other advantages conferred by proximity to the largest urban concentrations. This stands in contrast with the North where more disparate, smaller urban regions, including Austin, Montpellier, Raleigh-Durham and Toulouse, have seen significant growth in high technology and service development (Sellers 2002).

A corresponding consequence of global economic shifts has been a general increase in inequality. According to Sassen (1991), the increase in disparities between the elite in service businesses and the underpaid, immigrant work force employed by those businesses, results in an increase in social and spatial polarization. Regional strategies associated with globalization are often geared more toward attracting economic development than to addressing these new disparities. In more dynamic regions, public expenditure tends to support physical infrastructure that facilitates growth and new economic activities. Especially when accompanied by the fragmentation of many metropolitan regions, such strategies can compound disparities in the provision of local public services.

III.4. Socio-political conflicts

The emergence of metropolitan regions has some of its most far-reaching implications for territorial conflicts. Especially in much of the North, as the monopolistic position of central cities has declined, increasingly fierce economic and political competition pits urban centers against surrounding municipalities that refuse to be relegated to suburbs or satellites. Experiments in inter-local redistribution of resources in Europe and North America have largely arisen out of intensified arguments over fiscal exploitation between ex-urban communities and cities.

As the localities within metropolitan regions have coalesced into distinctive demographic and income clusters, tensions over the territorial distribution of resources and responsibilities have increased. Conflicts now focus routinely on the financing of collective goods and services, from public transportation to cultural facilities to sewage treatment. Even within a consolidated jurisdiction, territorial polarization between neighborhoods or other parts of cities can generate growing conflicts. In the wake of decentralization and democratization in Southern cities, metropolitan leaders in such diverse settings as Brazil, South Africa and India have all had to address tensions of this kind.

The socio-economic dimension of conflict can transcend territorial bases. A classic example is the perennial clash between the interests of capital and those of the workforce and local residents. Conflicts of this type hark back to the mercantile origins of cities, yet they still drive debates over metropolitan governance institutions. Proponents of metropolitan governance, regardless of whether they are themselves local chambers of commerce or business representatives, often portray economic development as a primary objective. But in the South as well as the North, the arguments about this objective have shifted. Services, high technology activities and commercial development have increasingly replaced traditional manufacturing as the objects of metropolitan economic recruitment. In the North, local businesses now mobilize regularly alongside governments around local initiatives to bring these activities (Sellers 2002; Jouve and Lefèvre 2002). In much of the North partisans of growth limits or growth management also regularly contest the untrammeled pursuit of regional growth (Clark and Goetz 1994). In the South, environmental groups usually exercise less influence, but are becoming more active.

Ethnicity and religion present another source of conflict that can cross territorial boundaries in metropolitan regions. In both the North and South, ethnic, racial and religious divisions often reinforce existing barriers between the haves and have-nots. Where minorities, especially immigrants, move into areas dominated by residents with a dif-

ferent ethnicity or race, the integration of the newcomers can give rise to conflicts with a national majority, as well as between the new minority and the resident majority. Immigration and citizenship issues have thus provoked both populist backlashes and resurgences in minority-rights movements in the cities of Europe, Japan and the United States. In the growing number of large cities with pervasive ethnic or racial divisions, such as Mumbai or Los Angeles, group identity regularly furnishes flashpoints for social tensions, political clashes and inter-group violence.

A fourth element of the new urban strife is partisan conflict over ideologies, programs and strategies. The influence of distinct parties and coalitions differs considerably, depending on location and context. Reflecting, at least in part, trends in other dimensions of conflict, political parties have also developed new forms. In many countries the number of parties and political groups represented in local assemblies has grown substantially. In Europe new ecological and populist parties have appeared. In the South decentralization and the establishment of local democracy has helped foster new interest groups in the local partisan landscape. Partisan organizations traditionally have exerted only limited control over local politics in many Southern cities. Now upstart religious and ethnic parties compete openly and with some success with the established parties. As in Europe, these new groups threaten traditional single – or two-party domination, and further complicate the already fragmented local party system.

IV. Institutional alternatives for governance within metropolitan areas

In early 20th Century North America, widespread suburbanization created some of the most extensive and dispersed urban regions ever seen. Under conditions of high geopolitical fragmentation, a debate emerged that to this day continues to shape choices about institutional designs for metropolitan governance. At the beginning of the 1940s, one of the leading representatives of the Chicago School of urban studies, Louis Wirth (1942), called for formal institutional consolidation: "We live in an era which dissolves boundaries, but the inertia of antiquarian lawyers and lawmakers, the predatory interests of local politicians, real estate men, and industrialists, the parochialism of suburbanites, and the myopic vision of planners have prevented us from a full recognition of the inescapable need for a new planning unit in the metropolitan region."

In many countries the number of parties and political groups represented in local assemblies has grown substantially

Up to the 1970s academic opinion throughout the global North reflected this view. The wave of reorganization of local government in the 1960s and 1970s in Europe, North America and parts of the South drew on these critiques. Two arguments were essential to the case against fragmentation. First, the essential tasks and responsibilities of governance – from infrastructure to social equity – spilled over fragmented jurisdictional boundaries in ways that demanded consolidated institutions. The second, opposing, concept posits that larger governmental units could take advantage of economies of scale, providing public services at lower cost than smaller governments.

Applied to vastly different regional, national and socio-political contexts, a decades-old argument has coalesced around two general strategies: supra-community reformation and territorial polycentrism.

IV.1. Supra-community reform

To those in favor of creating overarching metropolitan governments to replace a multitude of existing local authorities, a salient failing of the multi-government model is its weak performance as a democratic institution. This is evidenced by a decline in local political and electoral participation in many countries. In addition, many local governments are perceived as inefficient and disconnected from the expectations of their citizens.

There is a perceptible lack of collective will among those who might effect broad changes in metropolitan boundaries

The weakness of a multitude of local governments preoccupied with only local concerns is a perceived unwillingness to act on issues that affect the entire region. This was the argument advanced, for example, by the Quebec government in their White Book on municipal reorganization (2000:20): "The limited size of the municipalities is sometimes presented as an advantage in terms of the exercising of democracy because it allows for an administration that is more attuned to residents' needs. However, insofar as the fragmentation of the municipalities limits their ability to deal with the often important issues that transcend their territories, e.g. land use planning, the environment, public transportation, and economic development, there is instead a risk that residents will be less interested in participating in municipal life."

The significance of these arguments needs to be understood in light of the highly decentralized states where they were put forth. In North America, the fragmentation of local authorities, including municipalities and districts established for education and other services, contributes to great disparities in the services different communities receive. In some cases these differences are caused by variations in local skills and in the professionalism of municipal bureaucracies. In the United States and Canada, those in favor of integrated forms of metropolitan government have generally stressed the need to reduce intra-metropolitan area socio-economic disparities in such services as education and security (Dreier, Mollenkopf and Swanstrom 2004). Reform was also held out as a better way to address problems that require coordinated collective action throughout a metropolitan area, in such sectors as water supply, waste management and air pollution.

IV.2. Territorial polycentrism

It was ultimately in more centralized Northern European countries, for example the United Kingdom, where successive waves of communal consolidation came closest to realizing the goals of supra-community reform nationwid.. In the United States, a countermovement emerged to defend decentralized metropolitan arrangements. To counter the arguments of reformers, those against the formation of metropolitan governments criticized their red tape, their high operating costs and their remoteness from their citizens.

The supporters of the political-economic approach known as Public Choice have provided the main inspiration for arguments in favor of small local units as the main units for governance in metropolitan areas (Ostrom, Bish and Ostrom 1988). This approach analogizes local governments competing for residents to privately owned companies competing for the production or sale of goods. Proponents argue that it is more efficient and democratic for the localities within a metropolitan area to compete among themselves for the production or sale of public services than to leave those services to one monolithic government entity. They argue further that the coexistence of different government units with different combinations of services and taxes offers inhabitants a wider choice of residential areas. Residents can thus select the community within the metropolitan area that best corresponds to the level of public service they seek. Resources needed by the separate metropolitan towns can be shared through agreements about specific functional sectors, such as transportation, education and health (Marks and Hooghe 2003).

Beyond such operational concerns, there is a perceptible lack of collective will among those who might effect broad changes in metropolitan boundaries. Middle classes in many countries have shown little desire to contribute financially to the reduction of intra-metropolitan wealth disparities, and to the quest for fiscal equity. There has thus been only limited middle-class support for a key principle underlying the push for metropolitan integration.

IV.3. The "New Regionalism"

Given the imposing realities of life in large metropolitan areas, a practical compromise

may be found in a flexible solution with a variable scale of inter-municipal cooperation. In this case results can be manifested in different ways. The advantages of such quasi-formal cooperation have been emphasized in many empirical studies.

By the end of the 1970s, disenchantment with conurbation institutions became apparent in many countries. In Great Britain the suppression of urban counties and the Greater London Council took place in 1986; the same year saw the dissolution in the Netherlands of the Rotterdam and Eindhoven conurbation bodies. At about the same time, Australian authorities acknowledged the failure of repeated federal and state attempts to consolidate local authorities, and in Spain metropolitan governments in Valencia and Barcelona were dismantled. The French called an early halt to an urban communities' institutionalization process, the Italian effort to create metropolitan areas failed to get off the ground and in Germany consolidation experiments such as the Umland Verband Frankfurt and the Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet proved disappointing.

However, the concept of metropolitan area government itself has substantially changed in the past 20 years. Most of the models envisaged or experimented with in the 1980s are now seen from the perspective of governance, rather than government. Moreover, governance is no longer confined to the built-up areas of distinct urban conurbations; it now extends to vast multi-polar urban regions that continue to expand and change.

This new trend toward a more flexible, polycentric form of governance, described in North America as new regionalism, is firstly associated with the global decentralization process. This approach seeks to strengthen local authorities at the expense of large, supra-municipal organizations, especially in areas of the world that are on the path to democracy. At the same time, the form, pace and scale of contemporary metropolitan transformations has made traditional forms of metropolitan government seem increasingly inadequate.

It is therefore not appropriate to speak of simple replacement or of the substitution of one model by another over time. Rather it is more useful to envision increased differentiation among a variety of mixed systems of government. This movement can be observed in most countries, both in the North and in the South.

How can these new forms of metropolitan governance be characterized? Analysis of recent institutional experience reveals five particularly significant aspects:

- Pragmatic responsiveness in execution. State governments tend not to impose their ideas any more; instead they take great care to consult, listen, put into perspective, harmonize and reconcile. Rather than propose a single institutional model for all urban areas, they work carefully on a "made-to-measure" solution. Decisions to undertake reform respond to specific challenges related to the management of urban growth (Downs 1994).

  This view makes it easier to understand the changes in governance of the Tokyo region. The Tokyo Metropolitan Government (TMG), became one of many players – prefectures, regional ministerial offices, Japan Railway, private companies – involved in regional governance. In a similar fashion, the recently created Greater London Assembly appears to be a relatively superficial mechanism. It cannot exercise any real influence except in strict collaboration with the boroughs, privately owned public service companies (special purpose agencies), two regional development agencies, and several central government departments. Canada, throughout the second half of the 20th Century a leader in integration of metropolitan governments, has now turned toward a polycentric neo-regionalism. This shift comes in the wake of spectacular de-fusion measures following referenda among municipalities

Governance is no longer confined to the built-up areas of distinct urban conurbations; it now extends to vast multi-polar urban regions that continue to expand and change

grouped within metropolitan areas. The development of "lighter" governance structures built around regional districts and metropolitan municipalities has followed.

- The adaptation of existing territorial units and governments above the municipal level to manage emerging challenges of metropolitan regions. For large urban regions, such as Tokyo, Paris and Sao Paulo, a regional or federal unit of government provides administration at a scale beyond the local government itself. Similarly, in the United States county governments, which are a higher level than local municipalities, often provide a more encompassing administrative framework for carrying out planning or providing social services across municipal boundaries. American advocates of metropolitan governance increasingly look to coalitions among representatives of cities and suburbs in the legislative and policymaking arenas of state and federal governments as a source of metropolitan policy (Dreier, Mollenkopf and Swanstrom 2004).

- Strengthening democratic legitimacy. For the supporters of new forms of metropolitan governance, direct popular election of legislators and government executives has a double purpose: enhancing local autonomy and strengthening the link between citizens and their political representatives (responsiveness). The direct election of the leadership for Metro Toronto began in 1988. In Stuttgart, when the political parties offered lists of candidates for election to the Stuttgart Regional Community (Verband Region Stuttgart) founded in 1994, party leaders took care to include the smallest possible number of local representatives. This tactic limited political ties to parties in existing local governments, further empowering the regional assembly. Since 2000, the Greater London Assembly and the mayor are elected directly by the people. Unlike the former Greater London Council, the GLA has adopted a strategy to encourage competition and social cohesion rather than simply to supply services directly (Harloe 2003).

- The primacy of mission over management. The metropolitan administration is committed above all to planning, coordinating and integrating policies set by metropolitan area local authorities. True management tasks remain limited. As a consequence, expert and scientific analysis of the metropolitan problem is more nuanced and pluralistic than it was 20 years ago. Rather than agencies of strategic direction, the new structures of metropolitan governance are necessarily lighter: The Greater London Authority has little more than 600 employees.

- Close association with the private sector. At all stages in the process of institutional maturity, the strong influence of private sector leaders and organizations can be seen. In Europe as well as the United States, chambers of commerce and associations of enterprises are particularly prevalent. In some countries, the role of the private sector is determined by legislation.

Metropolitan governments can usefully be classified by the amount of territory where they have jurisdiction, their institutional depth, and their democratic intensity

V. Panorama of existing metropolitan governance arrangements

Worldwide there is great variety in metropolitan governance. As illustrated in Table 1, metropolitan governments can usefully be classified by the amount of territory where they have jurisdiction, their institutional depth, and their democratic intensity. The position of metropolitan regional governments in the overall governmental hierarchy, including national and other systems, also influences the effectiveness and significance of metropolitan governance. Additionally, the specific governmental functions assumed by the institutions of metropolitan governance reveal global similarities and contrasts, as do any trans-national arrangements that address the challenges of de facto international metropolitan governance.

Table 1 Dimensions of governance institutions in metropolitan areas

	Lower	Moderate	Higher
INTERNAL			
Spatial coverage	Fraction of the metropolitan area	Majority of the metropolitan area	The entire metropolitan area
Institutional thickness	Inter-community co-operation	Authority for metropolitan development or specific sector	Metropolitan town
Democratic intensity	Local democracy only	Multi-level democracy	Compound metropolitan democracy
EXTERNAL			
Centrality to higher level policymaking	Intra-metropolitan divisions Inter-metropolitan divisions Limited representation for metropolitan interests	Regional capital National alliance of urban regions Sector-specific integration	Prime urban region National capital

V.1. Spatial coverage

Existing institutions may cover all of a metropolitan territory, or only part of it. Consequently, their ability to regulate, manage and affect residents necessarily varies. Especially under conditions of rapid growth, the fluid functional and demographic boundaries of metropolitan regions make spatial coverage a constant challenge.

Most metropolitan governments have to make adjustments to accommodate changes in their official territory. In some cases, the metropolitan government at its inception did not encompass its entire modern region; others have seen their region grown well beyond their official boundaries. For example, Metro Toronto was created in 1953, but by 1991 still covered only 54% of the Toronto metropolitan area. Similarly, the Greater Bombay Municipal Corporation (GBMC) covers only 67% of the population in the Mumbai metropolitan region, even though it serves 12 million of the region's 18 million inhabitants. More recently, the reform that created metropolitan governments for South African urban regions succeeded in bringing only 38% of the total population in the Johannesburg metropolitan region under the single central metropolitan government there.

Many metropolitan governance arrangements are confined to limited, often socially and spatially distinct portions of metropolitan areas. In Argentina, the Northern Metropolitan Region, a consortium created in 2000, encompasses just a portion of the mainly affluent municipalities in the Buenos Aires metropolitan area (San Fernando, Vicente Lopez, San Isidro, Tigre). In the same manner, the minimal coordination of public policy among 39 different towns in the Sao Paulo metropolitan area appears to affect just seven of them. All seven, Diadema, Sao Caetano do Sul, Sao Bernardo do Campo, Santo Andre, Maua, Ribeirao Pires and Rio Grande da Serra, operate within the Camara Regional do Grande APC. It is symptomatic that the central town, Sao Paulo, is not a member of this consortium.

V.2. Institutional thickness

The governance of metropolitan areas can be more or less institutionally concentrated and integrated, both territorially and functionally.

a) New town or metropolitan town

It is relatively rare for a single authority to exercise general and multifunctional authority over an entire metropolitan territory. It occurs where a merger of all component communities has taken place.

When this happens, the metropolitan area is likely to be structured around the metropolitan town that provides most services. The Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA), for example, was created by merging Bangkok and Thonburi. Similar absorption of at least some functions and responsibilities of lesser towns has occurred in Seoul, Kuala Lumpur, Surabaya and Jakarta. The Seoul Metropolitan Government is run by a mayor and an assembly that is more or less elected directly by the people, and encompasses 25 districts called Gu. The Chinese government created metropolitan towns directed by powerful mayors who are appointed by the state in Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Chongqing and Tianjin. On the infra-metropolitan level, districts still exist, but with reduced authority and budgets. This sometimes leads to friction between the metropolitan level and the affected areas.

The metropolitan level of governance can take any one of several forms: a metropolitan development council, a metropolitan development authority, or a fully empowered metropolitan government

A series of mergers between communities belonging to two-level metropolitan systems has taken place at the instigation of Canadian provinces. In 1970, the New Democratic Party, having a majority in the Manitoba provincial parliament, decided to combine the Corporation of Greater Winnipeg and its districts into a single town, Winnipeg. The hope was that the merger would alleviate socio-economic and financial difficulties in the central town by including its wealthier suburbs in the region's resource pool. The Ontario government in 1998 employed a similar merger strategy to forge the new Town of Toronto. Two years after that, the province of Quebec created the new, enlarged municipal areas of Montreal and Quebec.

One of the world's most striking recent experiments with metropolitan governance is taking place in South Africa. By its nature, the old apartheid regime with its institutionalized segregation prevented any type of metropolitan organization. The abolition of apartheid in the 1990s led in a very short time to the appearance of metropolitan towns. Pressure for this change came primarily from the dominant party, the ANC, which saw in metropolitan government the most effective vehicle for territorial reform and for reduction of socio-economic inequities. In December 1998, the Local Government Municipal Structures Act officially recognized the formation of metropolitan towns, whose boundaries would be defined by a commission called the Municipal Demarcation Board before the 2000 local elections. There are now six such towns: Cape Town, Ethekwini, Johannesburg, Ekurhuleni, Tshwane, and Nelson Mandela (Cameron and Alvarez 2005). It is still too early to draw firm conclusions from this unique effort. So far, however, the creation of metropolitan towns appears to have improved the lives of residents in some places but had mixed or even disappointing results in others.

b) Co-existence of local governments with metropolitan structures

This formula combines proximity between local authorities and their citizens with transfers of responsibility for metropolitan issues to a specific supra-community entity. In principle, the federal logic underlying such an arrangement precludes any hierarchical or subordinate relationship between the two territorial levels. The Canadian provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Quebec and British Columbia created such structures for all of their metropolitan areas in the 1950s and 1960s; for a long time Metro Toronto (1953-1997) was the government prototype. Similar metropolitan governance structures also play a role in Metro Manila, Sao Paulo, Lima, Rio de Janeiro, Bombay and Calcutta.

The metropolitan level of governance can take any one of several forms: a metropolitan development council, a metropolitan development authority, or a fully empowered metropolitan government.

The metropolitan development council guarantees the retention of power by component local governments. Members of the local government designate their mayor, or some other local official, as their council member. These council members in turn select a council executive from among their

number. Advisory councils with this type of structure can be found in most metropolitan areas in the United States, For example, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (WASHCOG), was created in 1957 for the Washington metropolitan area. The same structure is also found in El Salvador in the Council of Mayors for the Metropolitan Area of San Salvador (COAMSS: Consejo de Alcaldes del Área Metropolitana de San Salvador).

The Metro Manila Development Authority (MMDA) was created by Filipino legislation in 1995. The council is made up of state representatives and 17 mayors (seven towns with extended powers, and 10 municipalities). It replaced the Manila Metropolitan Authority, which in 1990 had in turn replaced the Metropolitan Manila Commission, which was set up in 1975 with relatively important powers. The MMDA is not a territorial collective. It is a specific public body placed under the direct control of the President of the Philippines. The MMDA is responsible for planning, monitoring and co-ordination tasks, but its budgetary resources remain limited. It is considered not well suited to regulating the policies of its component parts because of the weakness of its integration instruments. The MMDA appears to be caught between the power of the state authorities and the desire of the 17 municipal authorities to escape from any direction or restriction imposed by higher authorities. (Laquian 2001).

Compared with a metropolitan development council, a metropolitan development authority concentrates more on technocratic functions than on political methods of governance. This model has been adopted by many Indian metropolitan areas, including New Delhi, Bombay, Karachi and Colombo.

The model of a metropolitan government superimposed on local authorities provides more functional integration, and its leadership is often elected directly by the people. This is the case in Tokyo and in Toronto.

Tokyo's TMG was created in 1943 by a merger of the City of Tokyo and the Prefecture of Tokyo. Today, it is a metropolitan prefecture consisting not only of the central town and its districts, but also the Tama area, which includes 39 municipalities, 26 towns, 5 localities and 8 villages. It appears that the TMG gives priority to running the services and development of 23 districts of the City of Tokyo guided by a system of financial equalization, while running the western part of its territory (Tama) in a more detached manner (Vogel 2001).

The degree of institutional thickness depends on a metropolitan structure's financial autonomy. The Chinese central government has given metropolitan areas significant scope in taxation and the management of their own resources, including buying and selling of land, tariffs and license fees and securing loans in China and abroad. In France, the communautés urbains are responsible for large budgets that correspond to their expanded areas of authority. The Communauté Urbaine de Bordeaux (CUB) budget is twice the size of the budget of the City of Bordeaux, in part because the CUB carries both compulsory and optional missions associated with the production of large facilities, the modernization of urban services and the development of the local economy.

The degree of institutional thickness depends on a metropolitan structure's financial autonomy

c) Intercommunity co-operation

Governing metropolitan areas can also be carried out by means of agreements between and among municipalities. Legislation can prescribe or simplify such arrangements in designated sectors or services. An intermunicipal agreement, which is the most popular arrangement worldwide, can operate even in the absence of a specific metropolitan institution. Such cooperative agreements have been established in quasi-official form within the metropolitan areas of Sydney (Kübler 2005), Australia, and also in Lima-Callao, Santiago du Chile, and Santa Fe de Bogota in South America. They also foster mutual support between large Russian towns and their surrounding oblasts (regions) and among

Flexible structures to coordinate local participation around targeted initiatives are common, and have become more so over the past few years

many municipalities and counties in United States metropolitan regions.

Under these types of agreements, territorial fragmentation persists, but specific sector-based integration overcomes it in the performance of specific, sometimes narrowly defined sectors, such as water and sanitation, electricity, transportation and waste processing. The resulting arrangements are expected to realize economies of scale for the management of capital-intensive services.

The two main agencies of Metro Manila are the Metropolitan Waterworks and Sewerage System, and the Light-Rail Transit Authority. The Karachi Metropolitan Corporation specializes in economic development projects in the largest of Pakistan's cities, the Karachi Development Authority manages property and infrastructure and the Karachi Water Supply and Sewerage Boards preside over their respective tasks. Another example of inter-community cooperation is seen in the Dhaka metropolitan area of Bangladesh. There specialized agencies operate in parallel both in the City of Dhaka, and with a set of municipalities (pourashavas) and 42 state services. Among these, the most important are RAJUK (Capital Development Authority), the Dhaka City Corporation and the partly state-controlled Dhaka Water and Sewerage Authority. Similar arrangements may be found in other major metropolitan regions from Los Angeles to Sao Paulo (see Appendix).

Flexible structures to coordinate local participation around targeted initiatives are common, and have become more so over the past few years. The State of Sao Paulo, for instance, has initiated a number of these arrangements since the 1990s. In conjunction with an NGO, the Metropolitan Forum for Public Safety created the institute "Sao Paulo Contra a Violência." The state also established a system of governance for river watersheds, incorporating a variety of local stakeholders (Abers and Keck 2006).

Especially in the South, many metropolitan areas have weak intra-metropolitan coordination: in some cities there, none at all. Lack of sufficient local autonomy or capability often contributes to this problem. In Nigeria, Ethiopia and Tanzania, the urban authorities have rarely experienced a level of autonomy that would allow them to manage their own policies, much less forge cooperative agreements with neighboring local governments. In Nigeria, disputes over the proper application of existing governmental and professional skills have impeded intra-city cooperation. It was only in 2003 that the decentralization begun by Ethiopian state authorities gave Addis-Ababa a new charter with the express aim of ending a century of centralized development. In Tanzania, decentralization in the 1970s was simply a de-concentration exercise. Dar el-Salaam's new municipal structure, operational since February, 2000, followed a long period of technocratic and centralized management of the town. In all three of these African metropolitan towns, territorial parceling through the creation of new administrative units contrasts with the unification process seen in South Africa.

Intervention by higher level governments can also supplant metropolitan cooperation. In Israel, for instance, despite the high proportion of its population living in the four metropolitan areas of Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa and Beer Sheva, there are very few metropolitan governance mechanisms. In the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area most inter-community efforts are organizationally weak. At least in part, this is because central authorities maintain strict control over territorial development, transport and regional infrastructures (Razin and Hazan 2005).

V.3. Democratic depth

The citizens' role in the appointment and control of metropolitan authorities varies widely. Although electoral institutions alone are rarely sufficient to ensure responsiveness or democracy, recent local electoral reforms in many countries have been intended to extend opportunities for electoral participation. The growing size, complexity and territorial connectedness of metropolitan

regions increasingly poses what Devas (2005) calls a tradeoff between "scale" and "voice" in governance. The larger the scale of governance, the more difficult it is to provide effectively for the participation of local units, neighborhoods, civil societies or individual citizens.

Indeed, integrated metropolitan structures have frequently been imposed by authoritarian central governments. Alongside technocratic efficiency in urban management, non-democratic governments have used metropolitan administration to control politically "sensitive" urban regions; that is, those suspected of having potential to breed opposition. For example, in 1973 it was the Brazilian military regime that created the nine metropolitan regions of Belém, Fortaleza, Recife, Salvador, Belo Horizonte, Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, Curitiba and Porto Alegre. Though initially supported and tightly controlled by the government, only vestiges of this system remained at the start of the 1990s. By then, a new democratization and decentralization process was well underway. Similarly, the Metropolitan Manila Commission was created by the Marcos dictatorship in 1975, its leadership entrusted to Imelda Marcos.

Association with authoritarian regimes may explain why metropolitan governance has to a certain extent been neglected in some countries. In metropolitan governance systems that are based on the functions of specialized agencies, management is mainly carried out by technicians or bureaucrats. This necessarily reduces democratic control, and with it, legitimacy. Appointed by the President of the Philippines, the MMDA executive is often politically impotent in the presence of the 17 directly elected mayors of the towns in the metropolitan area. These mayors provide financial contributions to the metropolitan authority's budget.

Direct election of a metropolitan executive, as in Tokyo, Bangkok and Jakarta Raya, can enhance the legitimacy of metropolitan political institutions. South African metropolitan towns are run either by mayors (Johannesburg, Ekurhuleni, Tshwane, and Nelson Mandela) or by executive colleges (Cape Town and Ethekwini). Although the latter are not directly elected by the people, they are appointed by the parties according to their electoral score. In some cases, only some of the representatives are elected by the people. The council of Bombay's GBMC, for instance, is elected, but its executive is appointed by the state of Maharashtra.

Democracy can be organized on an infra-metropolitan scale. Sub-municipal elected governments play an especially important role when the municipal government is large. Thus, South African legislation allows provincial authorities to create either sub-councils or ward committees. The sub-councils, made up of municipal councilors and councilors from adjacent wards, perform a consultative role for the municipal council, which can delegate specific powers to them. Ward committees, made up of the ward municipal councilor and representatives of the people, function as instruments of participative democracy. Sixteen, then 20 sub-councils have been created in Cape Town. Ward committees have been set up in Johannesburg, Ekurhuleni, Tshwane and Nelson Mandela. As in many such instances of sub-municipal participation, municipal authorities have generally been hesitant to transfer power to these bodies. Initial assessments of their operation show only modest participation by local people (Cameron 2005).

In the case of the Tokyo TMG, arrangements for sub-metropolitan democracy have recently provided greater democratic depth. The mayors of the TMG districts have since 1974 been elected directly by the people. Since then, the districts have been transformed from administrative entities into special urban governments that carry out a portion of metropolitan government services. A reform to devolve financial functions and skills to the districts was adopted in 1998 and took effect in 2000. The metropolitan authority remains responsible for fire-fighting services as well as water and sanitation.

Electoral institutions alone are rarely sufficient to ensure responsiveness or democracy, recent local electoral reforms in many countries have been intended to extend opportunities for electoral participation

The depth of democracy refers to an aspiration that may never be entirely met. Nonetheless, governance structures that come closest are those that go beyond multi-level participation procedures and provide real empowerment to make participation meaningful at each level, from neighborhoods to metropolitan councils. Mechanisms that allow public participation in routine governmental planning and budgeting can also deepen democracy. Since the emergence of metropolitan areas as a widespread form of settlement, democratic theorists have advocated compound democratic forms of this nature (Dahl 1969).

Since the emergence of metropolitan areas as a widespread form of settlement, democratic theorists have advocated compound democratic forms of this nature

V.4. Relations with higher-level governments

The politics of metropolitan governance plays out at higher levels of government, as well as within metropolitan regions themselves. From the perspective of leaders in metropolitan regions, effective governance often depends upon bringing wider regional and national organizations and resources to bear. As urban regions have become increasingly extended and connections with the hinterlands have grown, a better understanding is needed of the changing dynamics of intergovernmental relations between large cities and other surrounding regions.

It can not be surprising that relations between metropolitan regions and higher levels of government vary widely. At one end of the spectrum are urban regions that have secured a central position in the national political process. Such cities contain the bulk of a nation's urban population, economic activity and cultural production. The metropolitan region of Seoul, for instance, contains 47% of the Republic of Korean population; metropolitan Lima contains 32% of the population of Peru; metropolitan Buenos Aires has 32% of the Argentine population. The demographic weight of such cities often goes along with economic, political and cultural centrality. In the smaller countries of the North, the growth of cities into inter-connected regions has sometimes created metropolitan regions with a similar kind of primacy. In the Netherlands, for instance, the national economy revolves around the Randstad region that encompasses Amsterdam, Rotterdam and the Hague. Even with a smaller proportion of the national population, status as a national capital can enhance the position of an urban region in the national economy and in the shaping of national policy.

In the South, the political dominance of major cities in the middle of the 20th Century provoked criticism that "urban bias" in policymaking had rewarded the urban elite at the expense of citizens living in smaller settlements and in rural areas (Lipton 1977; Bates 1983). Although cities, especially the largest, remain more prosperous than rural areas, recent analyses have rejected such a broad conclusion. The increasing prosperity of cities small and large, the growth of poverty within cities, the democratization of national and local governments, and the growing interdependency of city and countryside have fundamentally altered underlying assumptions of that early analysis (Corbridge and Jones 2005). Moreover, accumulating evidence shows that policy intervention can alter economic and social disparities between cities, as well as between cities and the countryside (Overman and Venables 2005). National development in much of the South now hinges on the exploitation of joint advantages in cities, in the countryside and in the rapidly growing zones in between.

By comparison with other metropolitan regions, those with a favored position in national politics can benefit from advantages in policymaking as well as in economic and cultural life. Paris, for instance, has been a repeated site of major planning initiatives since the 19th Century. Similar initiatives in many smaller French cities began only in the 1970s. Latin American capital cities such as Bogota and Santiago, as well as Bangkok, Manila and Seoul in Asia, have been leaders in efforts to build metropolitan governmental institutions.

However, some metropolitan regions, especially in the largest nations, lack a notable

degree of socio-economic and political centrality. Under these conditions, metropolitan regions can still find a voice at higher levels of government, and secure crucial support for governance at the metropolitan level. In federal countries, metropolitan dominance within one of the federal states can secure similar resources. The Sao Paulo region in Brazil, for instance, dominates the larger state of Sao Paulo; the Mumbai region is the metropole for the Maharashtra state in India. Officials and activists from the Sao Paulo region helped secure state-level legislation for water basin governance that created new possibilities at the metropolitan level (Abers and Keck 2006). Similarly, public companies and officials from Maharashtra state have played an important role in the development plans of localities in metropolitan Mumbai.

In specific sectors of policy-making, state ministries or other specific organizations representing higher-level governments may contribute to metropolitan governance in ways that need not implicate those governments as a whole. National and state environmental agencies, for instance, often play active roles in antipollution initiatives. Organizations such as the Metropolitan Region Development Authorities in Karachi and Mumbai can mobilize higher-level government resources and authority on behalf of local development. (See Appendix.)

At the national level, disparate metropolitan regions can form alliances to represent collective interests. Politically influential organizations of urban representatives, such as the German Staedtetag or the Nordic local government associations, provide examples of this potential (Sellers and Lidström 2007). In other countries such as the United States, urban representatives have faced growing marginalization in national political processes (Dreier, Mollenkopf and Swanstrom 2005).

The increasingly dispersed, fragmented and divided nature of metropolitan regions in many developed countries poses new problems for effective political and intergovernmental representation of this sort. At the same time, political and economic divergences between metropolitan regions can frustrate alliances in pursuit of common metropolitan interests. Intra-metropolitan and inter-metropolitan political divisions are now a recurrent feature of governance in the United States, and recently have begun to emerge in such countries as Canada, France, Switzerland and the United Kingdom (Hoffmann-Martinot and Sellers 2005).

V.5. Sectoral diversity and limited convergence

As Hooghe and Marks (2003) have observed, governance arrangements for local cooperation in specific policy sectors – roads, education, and pollution regulation – departs from the traditional hierarchical model of relations between higher-level and local governments. By and large, such arrangements for governing metropolitan regions reflect a global convergence around this more sector-specific, flexible approach, which is consistent with the "new regionalism." To a degree not seen in the earlier U.S. debates over polycentric and supra-communal arrangements, higher-level governments have played decisive roles in many sectors. But the main international commonalities in organizational practices correspond to differences between distinct sectoral domains.

A look at the main organizations involved in metropolitan governance in six major metropolitan regions provides illustrative examples of several distinctive patterns. (See Appendix.) The two examples from the developed world present both centralized and decentralized models. Los Angeles has relatively decentralized governing arrangements under a federal state, whereas Paris relies on a more centralized pattern under a unitary state. The remaining cases include Seoul, which has experienced recent transitions resulting from industrialization and democratization, and the Southern metropolises of Johannesburg, Mumbai and Sao Paulo. These six examples include two national capitals (Paris and Seoul), two capitals of federal states (Mumbai and Sao Paulo), and two metropo-

The increasingly dispersed, fragmented and divided nature of metropolitan regions in many developed countries poses new problems for effective political and intergovernmental representation

lises that are neither state nor national capitals (Johannesburg and Los Angeles). The comparative table of the Appendix focuses on the main organizations charged with carrying out policy implementation in nine sectoral domains, including the distribution of public and private responsibilities.

Regional geopolitical fragmentation by itself imposes similar problems for all of these different governmental structures. As is typical of other metropolises, the central city in these cases contains between 19% and 67% of the metropolitan population. In every case – even Johannesburg in the wake of the recent metropolitan reforms– the local governments across the metropolitan area divide into multiple units. If we include the infra-local district governance in Johannesburg, then every configuration of general-purpose governments includes both some local units and a second layer of units that takes the obligations of the entire metropolitan area into account. In each case, under both unitary and federal states, an intermediate unit of government at the regional level stands between the national level and these local arrangements.

The metropolitan regions of Los Angeles and Paris contrast with their counterparts in the South in their reliance on stronger local institutions, particularly those commanding the greater resources available to towns outside the urban centers

Even more striking similarities among metropolitan institutions emerge from the breakdown of specific sectors of policy. For example, a similar configuration of agencies and firms addressing needs at national, metropolitan and local levels carries out transit services. Roads administration is also divided among national agencies responsible for big state and national roads, local governments charged with maintaining local roads and other governments for the roads in between. Municipal and inter-local arrangements manage most trash collection and land use planning sectors. Against a backdrop of national legislation in all six countries, local or metropolitan governments are often given the job of implementing environmental policies. These common trends reflect a transnational understanding of best practices, as well as common influences at work within each sector.

Of course, there are significant contrasts. In Seoul and in the Southern metropolitan areas, the examples demonstrate how public corporations tied to national or other higher-level governments play a more pervasive role in many areas. National public companies in all of these countries exercise exclusive control over all airports. National or state-held development companies play a leading role in land-use planning and roads. National or provincial governments carry out secondary and – except in Mumbai – primary education. Even where local governments bear much of the responsibility, there is less evidence of active inter-local arrangements or local initiatives in French and U.S. metropolitan areas. Especially in the rapidly developing areas outside the main urban centers, local government capacities remain weak.

The metropolitan regions of Los Angeles and Paris contrast with their counterparts in the South in their reliance on stronger local institutions, particularly those commanding the greater resources available to towns outside the urban centers. Yet Los Angeles and Paris differ significantly in their patterns of organizational fragmentation. To a far greater degree than that seen in Los Angeles, the 1584 communal governments of metropolitan Paris exemplify a polycentric model espoused by Public Choice proponents of territorial fragmentation. In trash collection, water or sewage and land-use planning, inter-governmental arrangements in Paris have proliferated more or less in ways that Public Choice theory would prescribe. Even in these domains, however, multiple municipalities often depend on unified centralized agencies or companies. Before the decentralization of the 1980s in France, even land use and planning were carried out by national field offices.

By comparison, the 180 municipalities and five counties of greater Los Angeles present a less fragmented organizational landscape of general purpose local governments. However, numerous sectors that are centralized in France are decentrali-

zed and fragmented here. Primary and secondary schools present perhaps the biggest contrast. Unlike any other metropolitan region, in the Los Angeles area a patchwork of local districts operating almost independently share the primary responsibility for this area. Ownership of the area's airports similarly belongs to four different local governments, although the central city owns the largest airport, Los Angeles International, and one other. Land-use planning lacks the coordinating intervention that has typified planning at the regional level in Paris and in other metropolitan regions. Even pollution regulation is the responsibility of metropolitan-level district organizations created by the state government, rather than being subject to direct intervention by higher-level governments. The result is an organizational landscape that is in important respects more fragmented than metropolitan Paris. Private contracting, a widespread practice in greater Los Angeles for trash collection, adds to the organizational fragmentation of local service delivery.

A full comparison of metropolitan governance would include other elements that would be difficult to categorize without more detailed comparative case analysis. These include legal norms, fiscal relations between different levels of government, the role of private factors, and the dynamics of leadership. Organizational comparison nonetheless demonstrates both broad global similarities in the practical form that governance takes and strong contrasts that stand out boldly only when differences between sectors of governance and policy are taken into account.

VI. Conclusion: the emerging metropolitan agenda

To a significant degree, the governance of 21st-Century metropolitan regions poses similar questions both for the established metropolis of the North and for the emerging ones of the South. The extension and increasing diversity of metropolitan settlement has imposed new conditions for governance in the metropolitan areas of both regions. In both, arrangements for governance present parallel dilemmas of fragmentation and coordination. North and South, the formal institutional alternatives for metropolitan governance share similar dimensions. Metropolitan governance presents common problems of accommodating an array of diverse, conflicting interests and influences. In both the North and the South, growing mobility and the influence of trans-local and trans-national connections are reshaping the possibilities as well as the imperatives for metropolitan governance.

In important respects, however, the problems of metropolitan governance in Southern urban regions still differ from those in Northern ones. The growth of Southern metropolitan regions has created the largest metropolitan areas in the world. More compact, denser and less geographically fragmented, Southern metropolises are more likely to be driven by security concerns born of great disparities between affluent and poor neighborhoods. Southern metropolitan areas also have fewer economic and administrative resources to bring to bear on far more pressing and massive problems.

VI.1. Multi-level governance

As urban regions have become increasingly extended, and connections with their hinterlands have proliferated, a better understanding is needed of the changing dynamics of inter-governmen-

tal relations between cities and their surrounding regions. Metropolitan regions in both the South and the North are not only crucial to the realization of national policy in numerous domains, but can take an active role in influencing policies at higher levels.

VI.2. Participation in metropolitan governance

Participation in metropolitan governance presents important issues for the realization of democracy as well as for effective decision-making processes. Whatever institutional form it takes, governance at the metropolitan level confronts the problem of incorporating the participation of a growing number of increasingly diverse interests. Understanding the informal as well as the formal dimensions of participation is crucial. The challenges surrounding participation are particularly acute for marginalized groups, such as the urban poor and ethnic and racial minorities.

VI.3. Ecological sustainability

Environmental policy in many domains depends on effective implementation at the local level, and in turn on the efficacy of metropolitan governance. The provision of adequate water resources and water quality, especially in the South, presents some of the most far-reaching challenges. Global and national efforts to assure air quality and carbon conservation depend on sustainable transportation as well as solid regulatory and energy policies at the local level. Metropolitan initiatives are critical to these efforts.

VI.4. Social and spatial inequalities

Addressing the legal informality and poverty of Southern cities is one of the highest priorities for metropolitan governance. Concentrations of the disadvantaged often require more intervention and public expenditure to combat related problems, such as crime, inadequate education and health needs (Pack 1993; Chernick and Reschovsky 1995). In diverse, segregated metropolitan regions, fragmented governance can exacerbate the disadvantages of the poor in obtaining public services (Alesina, Baqir and Easterly 1997). Similarly, extended, diverse metropolitan regions can offer affluent communities opportunities and incentives to segregate themselves from the rest of society. This process can also undermine collective efforts to provide goods to the entire metropolis.

Metropolitan governance presents common problems of accommodating an array of diverse, conflicting interests and influences

Annex 1 Examples of metropolitan organization, by tasks

Metropolitan Area	Los Angeles	Paris	Seoul	Sao Paulo	Mumbai	Johannesburg
Population (per km²)	196 per km²	927 per km²	1929 per km²	2.314 per km²	4.089 per km²	1.692 per km²
Percent in central city	22.29%	19.00%	44.94%	57.32%	66.90%	38.23%
Sub-national governments	State (1), counties (5), municipalities (180), regional councils of governments (11) (advisory)	Regions (1), departements (7), communes (1.584) City of Paris	Province (1), metropolitan local governments (2), other municipalities (20)	State (1), Metropolitan Regions (3), municipalities (139)	State (1), municipal corporations (7), municipal councils (13), state districts (4), villages (900)	Metropolitan or district municipalities (3)
Transit	Amtrak (national rail company), Metrolink (joint authority of transit agencies), separate county transit authorities (5), interlocal authorities (6), municipal systems (39), private lines	SNCF (national railway), RATP (public company with metro, bus, regional rail), OPTILE (network of 39 public, private lines), STIVO (network of public and private lines)	Korail (national railway), Seoul Metropolitan government, Seoul Metro Subway Corporation and Seoul Metro Rapid Transit Corporation (city-owned companies), provincial transit authorities, municipal systems and private lines, national ministries	State Secretariat for Metropolitan Transports, Sao Paulo Transporte, SA, (private company), Companhia do Metropolitano de Sao Paulo Metro, Companhia Paulista de Trens Metropolitanos, and Empresa Metropolitana de Transportes Urbanos (state companies), numerous private firms by concession	Indian Railways (national public company), State Road Transport Corporation, Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority (state agency with participation by central city), other state agencies, interlocal and municipal bus services	Spoornet (national railway), Metrobus (central city-owned company); municipal governments; provincial Department of Public Transport, Roads, and Works
Roads	Federal Highway Administration (national roads), State Transportation Department, Regional Council of Governments (advisory), counties, municipalities (local roads	Infrastructure ministry field offices (region, department); departments, municipalities (local roads)	Ministry of Construction and Transportation, Special Metropolitan City Government, Provincial/City/County/District Government, public corporations (Korea Construction Management Corporation, Korea Expressway Corporation)	Federal Transportation Ministry (federal roads), State Department of Roads, municipalities (local roads), private companies by concession	National Highways Authority, Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority (state agency), City Industrial Development Co. (state company), municipal governments	National Roads Agency (national roads), Johannesburg Roads (central city-owned company), municipal governments
Trash collection	Private contracting (42), municipal governments (13), some interlocal cooperation	Municipal and a limited number of intercommunal agencies: 65+ (collection), 30+ (treatment)	Municipal governments and private contracting. Some interlocal cooperation	Municipal governments (mostly), limited use of private contracting, municipal firms	Municipal governments, limited private contracting	Pikitup (central city-owned company), other municipal governments
Water/sewage	Numerous county, municipal and interlocal utilities or agencies, private contractors	Municipal and a limited number of intercommunal agencies, private contractors	Municipal governments, national public corporations (Environment Management Cooperation (EMC), ENVICO(Korea Environment & Resources Corporation)) and interlocal cooperation directed by Ministry of Environment	Basic Sanitation Company of the State of Sao Paulo (SABESP) (state-owned company), state government, basin committees of local officials and others	Municipal governments, City Industrial Development Co. and Maharashtra Industrial Development Co. (state companies)	Johannesburg Water (city-owned company), other municipal governments, private contractors

Annex 1 Examples of Metropolitan Organization, by Tasks (Cont.)

Metropolitan Area	Los Angeles	Paris	Seoul	Sao Paulo	Mumbai	Johannesburg
Airports	Five (two owned by central city, others by separate municipal or county governments)	Two (owned by Paris Airports (national public company))	Two (owned by Korea Airport Corporation (national public company))	Three (owned by INFRAERO (National public company))	Two (both under Airport authority of India, one managed by private firm)	Five (owned by Airports Company South Africa (national public corporation))
Land use planning	Municipal governments, counties, advisory council of governments	Municipal governments, interlocal cooperation, private contracting	Municipal governments advised by Korea Land Corporation (national public company) and Ministry of Construction and Transportation , Seoul Metropolitan Development Corporation (city owned company)	Municipal governments, private contracting, Empresa Municipal de Urbanizacao company)	Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority (state agency with central city participation), City Industrial Development Co. (state company), other state agencies, municipal governments	Municipal governments, advised by provincial government
Air pollution	Air quality districts established by state (2), governed by boards of local officials	National government agency field offices	Municipal governments and interlocal cooperation led by Ministry of Environment	State Environment Ministry, State Environment Agency (CETESB)	State pollution control board, municipal governments	Municipal governments
Water pollution	Water quality districts established by state (3), governed by boards of local officials	National government agency field offices	Metro government and municipal agencies and public corporations, Ministry of Construction and Transportation, K-Water (Korean Water Resources Corporation (national public company), nationally designated water test centers (usually public institutions)	State Environment Ministry, State Environment Agency (CETESB), basin committees of local officials and others	State pollution control board, municipal governments	Municipal governments
Primary and secondary education	Local school districts (172)	National ministry of education	National ministry of Education	State Secretary of Education (elementary and secondary), municipalities (elementary)	State government (secondary), local governments (primary), private schools	Provincial government Department of Education

Sources: *Abers and Keck 2006; Metropolis 2007; Segbers et al. 2007; and governmental and organizational websites.*