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Introduction: some Swiss theses

- Future challenge is not the competition between cantons, cities and municipalities, but the improvement of the Swiss urban and metropolitan regions in the European and global context.

- Switzerland is changing in spatial, economic and societal terms, without having changed its political resp. territorial structures.

- Swiss urban areas are structurally disadvantaged (so-called Ständemehr, i.e. small mountain cantons have more political weight than big cities). However, it is possible to strengthen urban regions, if they cooperate in strong institutions.

- Strong metropolitan regions are no danger for rural regions, but the welfare and innovation engine for all.
Our territorial focus

Median

Switzerland: 850
France: 1500
Italy: 7050
Germany: 7200
USA: 12 500
Danemark: 18 500
Sweden: 29 600
Portugal: 33 300
Overall aim

Cooperative discussion on cooperation
The fact of voluntary cooperation between City of Zurich and municipalities on cooperation-study is a success in itself

New forms of cooperation, based on the existing Swiss federalism
Direct cooperation between 8 cantons and more than 100 cities / municipalities within the Zurich Metropolitan Space Association since July 2009
e.g. Zurich Metropolitan Region

- Excellent competitiveness
- Excellent living quality
- Excellent diversity
Specific objectives

- Analysing, how the City of Zurich cooperates with its hinterland: how does the network work?
- Discussing where cooperation makes sense and where not
- Searching for conclusions and recommendations on regional and metropolitan level
- Building-up of common functional spaces such as identity, culture, mobility, quality of life, education and economy
e.g. Zurich Metropolitan Region

Better cooperation
Better international position
Better national position

Development
Promotion
Lobbying
Target groups (stakeholders)

Metropolitan stakeholders: 8 cantons, 106 cities/municipalities

Regional stakeholders: core city Zurich, municipalities, Canton of Zurich, RZU, GPV…
Planned activities (recommendations)

Regional

- List of possible services of the City of Zurich for surrounding cities / municipalities
- Installation of thematic platforms (first one started: major events)
- Discussions of City Council with groups of municipalities (district level)
- Conventions and treaties
Metropolitan

- **Living space**
  - common development areas
  - common Metro parcs, best practices

- **Traffic and Mobility**
  - core large metropolitan projects / lobbying
  - common urban mobility measures

- **Economy**
  - Green Region (CleanTech, education, etc.)
  - Innovation Area / promotion

- **Society**
  - Open dialog between municipalities
  - “Identity harvesting”, visualisation, metro festival
Methodology on project level

Regional

- organisation by themes (projects)
- optimising of existing and established structures
- no new structures, if already existing and established structures
- efficient cooperation structure: thematic platform
„The role of cities in integrated regional development“

Metropolitan

[Diagram showing the structure of Metropolitan, including roles and responsibilities of Kantone, Städte/Gemeinden, Metropolitankonferenz, Metropolitanrat, Geschäftsstelle, and Arbeitsgruppen such as AG Wirtschaft, AG Verkehr, AG Gesellschaft, AG Lebensraum.]

Stadt Zürich
Stadtentwicklung

Martin Harris/Walter Schenkel, 18 June 2010, Workshop CRN Arezzo

Präsidialdepartement
Complementation with other interventions

From government to multilevel governance… or how to handle the complexity of babushka

Municipalities, districts and canton work increasingly in different networks on different levels in mutual interdependence.

The traditional 3-level federalism turns into a multilevel governance network of networks with specific tasks and interdependencies.
„The role of cities in integrated regional development“

3-stufiger Staatsaufbau
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Regional cooperation with core city

- Traditional cooperation of municipalities: municipalities in same districts (bilateral) (City of Zurich is a one-municipality-district, therefore no natural cooperation partners!

- List of possible services of the City of Zurich for surrounding cities and municipalities (one-way-service)

- Supposed efficient cooperation structure between core city and municipalities: thematic platform (exchange-way)
Financing of project

Regional

- financing **case by case** by budget of cities and municipalities (as for the study)

- principle: **autonomy** of municipalities

- no enforcement, cooperation of the willings
Metropolitan

Association budget per year: ca. 250‘000 Euro

Membership means 1 vote per 4’000 inhabitants plus 1 vote for the first 2000 inhabitants

Membership means 300 Euro per vote

e.g. the City of Zurich: 30’000 Euro per year

Project budget 2010: ca. 450‘000 Euro

Cantons 55%, cities 35%, larger municipalities 10%

Binding key of payment, but “voluntary” payment; budget goal achieved
Innovative character

Optimisation and higher efficiency of cooperation without a general reform of the federalistic structures of agglomeration and metropolitan region of Zurich

Regional

- Fact, that core city and hinterland discuss together voluntarily to learn more about their cooperation
- Voluntary co-financing of study on cooperation
### Metropolitan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Cantons</th>
<th>Membership Municipalities</th>
<th>Votes Municipalities</th>
<th>Votes Cantons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aargau</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zug</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwyz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luzern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffhausen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgau</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gallen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>453</strong></td>
<td><strong>453</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons learnt: general summary I

- Fiscal and financial autonomy of Swiss cities and municipalities seem to be an important competitive advantage in comparison to most of the other European cities, even in the question of cooperation.
- It takes time: political discussion and acceptance needed.
- Take existing cooperation and make it better.
- No new structures without having a content.
- Concrete problems need pragmatic solutions.
- Overcome fear and psychological distance between municipalities and core cities on the one hand, and between cities and cantons on the other.
Lessons learnt: metropolitan summary I

- National *lobbying* and international *promotion* become more important
- Strong *willingness* to reform Swiss federalism without destroying it
- Metropolitan *cooperation* is not yet as established as in other European metropolises (under construction)
Lessons learnt: regional summary I

- General rule: every municipality solves its own problems (Swiss principle of subsidiarity)

- Most of „daily“ cooperation in between the municipalities works primarily within the districts

- „Lonesome giant“: The City of Zurich is the only „one-municipality-district“ in the Canton of Zurich, therefore it has no natural cooperation partners

- Cooperation with the City of Zurich happens particularly in the topics that need a certain quantity or quality and that cannot be solved nor in the own municipality nor in the own district
Lessons learnt: regional summary II

- Existing cooperation **not intense**, but good and of a high mutual benefit
- New forms of cooperation **only if necessary and of high benefit**
- **Not every topic** is suitable for regional cooperation
- **Principles of cooperation**: voluntary basis and municipal autonomy
- **Existing structures** are often sufficient, but can be **optimized**
- **Competition** between cities and municipalities may force to optimize own services and cooperation (to attract families, taxes, public services, etc.)
Thank you for your interest!

Martin Harris, City of Zurich / project manager
Walter Schenkel, synergo / secretary metropolitan conference