



MATRIX FOR IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF TOOLS AND BEST PRACTICES ENHANCING METROPOLITAN COOPERATION

Introduction

In the framework of the international project “**Strengthening metropolitan cooperation and governance in Central Europe**” (**MECOG-CE**), we elaborated the following matrix to identify and analyse **the existing tools and best practices of metropolitan cooperation**. For the purpose of this project, we propose to use the notion of territorial dialogue and cooperation spaces in the metropolitan areas as it applies best for the description of the metropolitan cooperation tools and practices, which are very rich and diverse in form, territorial range, and the level of formalisation and institutionalisation.

Metropolitan dialogue and cooperation space comprises all forms of exchange of information, everyday discussions, commitments, and transactions between actors from the public, private, or civic sectors functioning at different territorial levels, which are triggered by the interdependence of their interests and concerns at the metropolitan level. The notion of metropolitan dialogue can encapsulate every area and problem, i.e. spatial planning, road network, projects, and events, which take place in a supralocal dimension, and their appropriate implementation demands arrangements of actors at the metropolitan level.

The use of the notion of metropolitan dialogue and cooperation spaces reduces the risk of omitting interesting tools and practices of metropolitan cooperation, the so-called **soft planning spaces**, which are less institutionalised, but can be very efficient in enhancing metropolitan cooperation and the emergence of new metropolitan structures in the future.

The metropolitan governance system consists of a set of different interdependent, crosscutting, and overlapping metropolitan cooperation and dialogue spaces. Its characteristics, including the content and field of actions, course of development and participants as well as territorial range, level of formalisation, available resources etc., determine the specificity of governance in a particular metropolitan area.



Please provide contact details of an editing person:

A. National context			Short description / explanation (up to 200 words)
1.	Level of autonomy of municipalities in terms of:	1.1 Budget resources*	* Please indicate shortly what the main sources of municipalities' revenue are. What is the share of transfers from the central budget, and the share of own revenues (what sources and amounts are controlled by local authorities)?
		1.2 Responsibilities / competences*	* Please indicate shortly the scope of competences of municipalities (main areas). Do they have a general competence clause, e.g. they can determine their own tasks (if these have not been reserved for other local government units)?
2.	Strength of local / metropolitan leadership and its influence at the national level	2.1.1 Strength of local leadership*	* Please indicate shortly the position and legitimization of political power of municipal representatives (mayors, presidents etc.) (e.g. direct/indirect elections)?
		2.1.2 Strength of metropolitan leadership*	* If applicable, please indicate shortly
		2.2.1 Presence of official municipal representatives (chancellors, mayors, etc.) in central government bodies*	* If applicable, please indicate shortly
		2.2.2 Presence of official metropolitan representatives in central government bodies*	* If applicable, please indicate shortly
3.	Presence and importance of a metropolitan issue in the national political agenda		* If applicable, please try to specify shortly in what way the metropolitan issue is present in the national political agenda (all kinds of expression of the political will towards the empowerment of the metropolitan level, laws, policies, strategies, programmes, decisions/declarations etc. at the national level)? Please present briefly the organization of metropolitan cooperation and governance in the country. You can indicate the origins / the evolution of metropolitan governance in the national context.

B. Metropolitan cooperation forms, structures and dialogues spaces* as components of a metropolitan governance system

The following table can be replicated depending on the number of metropolitan cooperation and dialogue spaces identified in your MA (structures, institutions, associations etc.). Please provide max. 5 examples and describe each of them separately using the categories below. Please note that not all of the categories listed below necessarily apply to the forms of cooperation you describe. Insert N/A if not applicable.

1.	Form and status of metropolitan cooperation and dialogue spaces	1.1 Official name		
		1.2 Date of creation / start of cooperation		
		1.3 Logo, visual identity		* Please indicate which of these elements is applicable, paste the logo or provide a link to the image.
		1.4 Number of jurisdictions/ municipalities comparing to functional metropolitan area (FMA) (territorial range of cooperation)		
		1.5 Legal status (regular meetings, conference, agreement, association, territorial unit, self-government)		
		1.6 Is it an ITI (integrated territorial investments) managing institution?		* Please indicate: Yes / No.
		1.7 Amalgamation – fusion / inter-communal cooperation*		* Please specify whether the metropolitan structure in its current form results from a merger of municipalities into one city or is an entity based on cooperation between municipalities.
		1.8 Seat (office) / place(s)		
		1.9 Total annual budget in 2022 at disposal of the unit of cooperation and its sources (partner contributions, taxes, subvention from the central level, EU funds) ?		
		1.10 Strategic and/or spatial development and planning instruments of MA*		* Please provide a brief description of the MA approach towards the strategic/spatial planning, information about the strategy of MA, its content, time period, etc.
	Mark “X” in appropriate box and explain your choice, give an example(s)	1.11 “Hard” spaces with political power	“Soft” spaces without political power*	

2.	Emergence of spaces forming a metropolitan cooperation and dialogue	Mark "X" in appropriate box and explain your choice, give an example(s)			Short description / explanation (up to 200 words)
		2.1 Evolutionary		Revolutionary*	* Slow progress of reaching a dialogue / the emergence of decisions that quickly and radically change the rules of communication and relations between communes
		2.2 Supported		Hampered*	* Cooperation can be facilitated or impeded by financial aid and policy preferences of state authorities (i.e. metropolitan law coming from the central government)
		2.3 Monocentric		Polycentric*	* Activities can be undertaken as a result of initiatives of the leader city of the metropolitan area, which directs the cooperation relationship, or they can result from bottom-up integration projects proposed by medium-sized or smaller cities
3.	Actors of metropolitan cooperation and dialogue space and its governance bodies	Mark "X" in appropriate box and explain your choice, give an example(s)			Short description / explanation (up to 200 words)
		3.1 Political actors		Technical-administrative*	* The category refers to the diversity of actors involved, which may be limited to the political dimension or may also include technical-administrative staff guaranteeing the stability of the dialogue over time and more significant agency potential
		3.2 Composition of the governance body and functions of its organs			
		3.3 Number of representatives/actors/institutions in governance body and outside them			
		3.4 Number of administrative staff working for the cooperation institution (if relevant) *			* Please specify the number of full time and part time employees
		3.5 Non-statutory advisory bodies (e.g. council of development, council of youth, advisory committee) or/and other forms of involvement of external actors (entrepreneurs, NGOs, inhabitants/citizens, etc.)*			* If the external actors are engaged in the dialogue, please describe their roles and give at least one example of their participation
		3.6 All other forms of social/civic participation (e.g. participation of MA inhabitants in the activities of the metropolitan structure)*			* Please describe the forms of such participation and actors involved, give at least one example

4.	Subject of metropolitan cooperation and dialogue	<p>Mark “X” if applicable, describe the action range in the field and provide examples of tools and best practices. If needed, please add additional areas of intervention at the end of the table as a separate row.</p>			
		4.1 Domains / areas of intervention	Range of action/competence within the domain (short description up to 200 words)	Tools and good practices (short description up to 300 words) <small>* Please describe briefly projects/policies/tool types</small>	General strategy including a given domain or sectorial strategic document <small>*Please specify a type of document, provide the link.</small>
		4.1.1 Spatial Planning			
		4.1.2 Regional Development (growth, innovation, R&D, etc.)			
		4.1.3 Housing			
		4.1.4 Waste management			
		4.1.5 Water Management			
		4.1.6 Energy			
		4.1.7 Education			
		4.1.8 Tourism & Leisure			
		4.1.9 Social policy / inclusion			
		4.1.10 Culture & Heritage, Metropolitan Identity			
		4.1.11 Promotion & Territorial marketing			

		4.1.12 Sewage Management				
		4.1.13 Transport				
		4.1.14 Healthcare				
		4.1.15 International cooperation				
		4.1.16 Other domains and subjects of cooperation and dialogue				
		<i>Please add additional lines below if needed.</i>				
		(...)				

4.	4.2 Focus of the cooperation and dialogue	4.2.1 Repairment	Development*	(up to 200 words)
				* Cooperation and dialogue can focus on problems and conflict resolution or on laying the foundations of residents' welfare and further territorial development
	Mark "X" and explain your choice, give an example(s)	4.2.2 Present	Future*	(up to 200 words)
				* Cooperation and dialogue can be focused on the present and its problems or on anticipating the challenges of the future within the framework of the prospective sustainable development strategy
	4.3 The character of dialogue/decision-making mechanism	4.3.1 Conflictual	Consensual relations	(up to 200 words)
		4.3.2 Bilateralism or limited coalitions of municipalities	Multilateralism*	(up to 200 words)
				* The decision-making mechanism / dialogue can take the form either of the dominance of bilateral relations (or coalitions) between municipalities in conflict or those with common problems, or of the broader cooperation involving all or majority of municipalities of MA necessary to think about common challenges in the future
		4.3.3 Transactionality	Shared metropolitan interest*	(up to 200 words)
				* Please specify whether a given form of dialogue / decision-making mechanism relies on internal competition and transactions exchange or it focuses on building external advantages and thinking in terms of shared metropolitan interest
		4.3.4 Direct/personal communication between actors	Indirect communication between actors	(up to 200 words)

5.	Cooperation and dialogue results and empowerment	5.1 Character of results	5.1.1 Visionary		Operability*	(up to 200 words)	
		Mark "X" and explain your choice, give an example(s)	5.1.2 Institutionalization		Project-based nature*	(up to 200 words)	
6.	Best practices (flagship projects / activities) potentially transferable to other MA in CE Based on point 4.1, please describe up to 5 examples of flagship projects / activities resulting from the metropolitan cooperation and dialogue with no more than 500 words per example. <i>Add additional lines below if needed.</i>	6.1 Name of project /policy /tool etc.	6.2 Main goals, organisation, functioning	6.3 Metropolitan impact and results	6.4 Innovative aspect	6.5 Involvement of stakeholders	6.6 Potential of transferability
				*Please include the type of results: short-term / long-term; direct / indirect (new forms of cooperation, shared knowledge...)			*Please specify if the potential is low or high and give a justification for your choice
		1.					
		2.					
		3.					
		4.					
		5.					

C.	<p>Metropolitan governance system* – structure and interactions</p> <p>The metropolitan governance system consists of a set of interdependent cooperation and dialogue spaces presented through max. 5 examples in part B of the matrix. Please explain in no more than 400 words the relations between these metropolitan cooperation and dialogue spaces that you identified in your MA and presented in part B of the matrix.</p>

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR MAs in case of questions concerning the matrix content:

NAME AND SURNAME	E-MAIL ADDRESS	PARTNER METROPOLITAN AREA IN QUESTION
dr hab. Robert Pyka, prof. UŚ	robert.pyka@us.edu.pl	STUTTGART GZM
dr hab. Krzysztof Bierwiazzonek, prof. UŚ	krzysztof.bierwiazzonek@us.edu.pl	BRNO MILAN
dr hab. Małgorzata Suchacka, prof. UŚ	malgorzata.suchacka@us.edu.pl	OSTRAVA WARSZAWA
dr Zuzanna Neuve-Église	zuzanna.neuve-eglise@us.edu.pl	BERLIN BRANDENBURG TORINO