

# ASSESSMENT OF THE COOPERATION CAPACITY AMONG THE STAKEHOLDERS OF THE TORINO METROPOLITAN AREA, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO URBAN PLANNING AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT POLICIES

## Summary

Torino Internazionale / Strategica | 30.06.2013



Torino Internazionale



TORINO  
STRATEGICA

## Imprint

Responsible: **Associazione Torino Internazionale / Strategica**  
Paolo Mascia, [mascia.cityregions@gmail.com](mailto:mascia.cityregions@gmail.com)

Elaborated by: **IRES**  
**IRES Piemonte - Istituto di Ricerche Economico Sociali del Piemonte**  
Via Nizza 18, 10125 Torino



Output number: 3.3.3 – Stakeholder Capacity Assessment

## Information about the CENTRAL EUROPE programme

CENTRAL EUROPE is a European Union programme that encourages cooperation among the countries of Central Europe to improve innovation, accessibility and the environment and to enhance the competitiveness and attractiveness of their cities and regions.

CENTRAL EUROPE invests 231 million EUR to provide funding to transnational cooperation projects involving public and private organisations from Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia.

The programme is financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and it runs from 2007 to 2013. Interested partnerships were invited to propose their projects following public calls for proposals, which were widely publicised.

## **Introduction**

Metropolitan areas have a tendency to generate problems which span individual institutions' administrative boundaries. To address such issues there are a number of solutions. They range between two ideal models: a structural and a functional one. The first one establishes a new agency or a new metropolitan body (directly elected, with a general or multipurpose responsibility); the second one is problem oriented and focuses on the setting up of ad-hoc agencies (of managerial nature and with a limited-purpose range).

In recent years a new solution focuses on multi-actor governance tools (strategic planning). As far as the metropolitan area of Torino is concerned (but one may refer to Italy as well) attempts at setting up metropolitan agencies have so far failed. At the same time a wide range of inter-municipal cooperative efforts have sprung up to address individual policy issues thus giving birth to a sort of implicit functional metropolitan model (metropolitan governance without metropolitan government). Such experiences have developed independently from any apparent and coherent vision in so far as each one has grown out of all logic or criteria or timing.

Besides investigating the reason why a functioning metropolitan government has come to naught, this paper maps inter-municipal cooperation projects, with special emphasis on recent and successful ones.

### **Institutional cooperation between Communes belonging to the Torino metropolitan area: profiles and dimensions**

Within Torino metropolitan area inter-municipal cooperation has always been very lively. Each and every institution shares at least one service. Such cooperation adapts to different tasks, number of participating institution, preferred solutions. Cooperation spans from public works, to public services, to strategic planning and economic development. To classify such a varied panorama different criteria and measuring tools have been made use of.

The foremost criteria have been the functional scope (i.e. object) breaking down the individual examples into three broad categories:

- a) communal and individual services;
- b) planning activities: environment, public works, local development;
- c) administration.

Further, cooperative efforts have been classified following nature of activity:

- 1) planning,
- 2) implementation,
- 3) management,
- 4) development,
- 5) control.

A final classification criteria refers to:

- i) limited partnerships,
- ii) multi-level partnerships,
- iii) bottom-up partnerships.

**Limited partnerships** owe their development mainly to the privileges of the Regione (Regional administration) normative powers, and, more recently, of the Provincia. To this set belong inter-municipal cooperation for basic wide area services (such as: public waste, water, transportation, public parks) as well as the territorial agencies as set out by the Piano Territoriale Regionale (Regional Planning Master Plan). **Multi-level partnerships** see a more balanced participation by local bodies even though the Regione and the Provincia may play a bigger role in the planning and in the executive phase. The most successful example is the Agenzia per la Mobilità Metropolitana (Local Public Transportation Agency). **Bottom-up cooperation** has two main characteristics: they are the product of the Communes and they are on a voluntary basis. They tend to be more successful when dealing with specific issues or services. In this lot, successful examples deal with social services and City unions.

The three models (limited partnership, multi-level partnership, bottom-up cooperation) have no straight boundaries, nor are their salient characteristics exclusive, so much that a specific example may belong to more than one category.

### Structure of the research

The paper consists of three distinct parts. An overview on the composition of the paper can help outline further the methodology adopted.

**Part 1** is the general part, where the “Metropolitan issue” is reviewed on the local Torinese and on the National level. This comprises, in turn, 6 paragraphs.

Paragraph 1 shows how one can use different concepts of metropolitan area as regards the morphological or functional features of an urban area. Paragraph 2 gives an overview on the models of governance of a metropolitan area that can be observed in practice and in literature, and compares these models with the current Italian situation in the field of metropolitan governance. National laws have addressed the issue under different perspectives, as explained in paragraph 3; much of a change is expected with the new law that should enter into force as of 2014 and create the new metropolitan provinces in 10 major Italian urban areas. Paragraph 4 observes the Torinese experience in the field of metropolitan strategic processes: the International city as of the late 90s, the city of knowledge as of 2006 and finally the ongoing strategic planning process triggered in 2013.

Paragraph 5 describes the forms of inter-municipal forms of cooperation detected in the metropolitan area. The cooperations have been classified according to several criteria:

- Is the cooperation voluntary or obligatory (meaning, by regulatory intervention of the Regional or Provincial Authority; is it bottom-up or multi-level)
- Is the cooperation focused on a specialization of practices / functions (services rendered to citizens, promotion of territorial development, administrative functions)
- The kind of activity developed by means of the cooperation (planning and investigation purposes, planning of measures enhancing development, management of public utilities / services, promotional scopes, control / observatories / monitoring units)

Finally, paragraph 6 summarizes the lessons learnt and the possible scenarios: Italy is lagging behind in terms of legal framework of metropolitan areas, in comparison to other European countries; the strategy that is gradually being adopted resembles very much the strategic lines that marked the

evolution of “Communautés urbaines” in France. Other focal points are flexibility vs. strong institutional structure, heterogeneous composition of the metropolitan areas in Italy, differentiated evolution of strategic planning, pros and cons arising from the observation of forms of metropolitan cooperation in the Torinese Metro area.

**Part 2** of the work lists the forms of cooperation detected in the metropolitan area. There are 62 fiches, each corresponding to a cooperation model. The list is grouped in three main categories: A) Public bodies and Institutional multimunicipal working tables; B) Programmes, MoU’s, promotional initiatives for local development; C) PPP’s, consortia for the management / provision of services.

Finally, as a complement and to provide further hints for the discussion, **part 3** of the work comprises an overview on the “metropolitan experience” of five major European urban areas: Lyon for its affinity with Turin, Paris and Manchester as significant practices, Barcelona as a good practice, eventually Milan as another Italian example.

### **Concluding remarks**

In the last fifteen years Communal cooperation in the metropolitan area has blossomed in specific functional areas and particularly in the non-personal services (transportation, sanitation, water, etc.). At the same time various kinds of multi-purpose cooperation (political) have prospered at sub-metropolitan level very seldom including the central city.

#### *Territorial services*

Fifteen years ago municipal cooperation in the metropolitan area had a predominantly technical and managerial profile and was based on the utilities and the companies which were responsible for them. These have increasingly expanded their activities (see: water management, power, and public transportation). Today the situation is consolidating and a good example is local transportation where a specific metropolitan body has been set up (MTM). Completion of the metropolitan railway network is an important objective of the metropolitan area.

#### *Negotiated planning and local pacts*

Since the beginning of the nineties, following the development of negotiated planning, a number of complex projects have followed up. In the Turin area diverse partnerships have sprung up and died away. Starting with the territorial pacts most of the City councils have become partners of one or another project: not all of them have included the central city. Various co-operations have involved different institutions in different shapes: an example is the “Sportelli unici associati” (SUAP: Associated One-Stop Shops). However, each cooperation/association involves a limited geographical area without a recognized central managing body. Some development coalitions have set up shop as independent bureaus or special-purpose agencies, which in turn have developed the range of services and upgraded the managing body: among them, some City councils unions.

#### *General- and special-purpose cooperation*

Some initiatives show a more evident political or strategic profile focusing on broad consultation and wide area planning, others are more limited-purpose. The first model is more powerful and flexible, and has often morphed into more broadly-based bodies. The opposite is true for the limited-purpose model which has not been able to branch out in new areas. On the other hand these latter have been more stable throughout whereas the others have showed a more unstable nature: sometimes consolidating, sometimes dissolving or being superseded by other bodies.