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Abstract: Cities around the globe always play vital roles in both local and global levels. Starting at the local level, cities provide their residents with a set of services and products that they need while maintaining an acceptable quality of life and developing local economies. While on the global scale, cities are considered sources of economic growth and the nations’ driving forces towards development in cultural, social, political and economic life. These roles face restraints as cities expand neglecting their administrative boundaries while experiencing a shortage in either financial or jurisdic- tional capacity. Such expansion and shortage need coordination among local governments through introducing different models of governance targeting successful coordination among local governments. These models of coordination range from voluntary actions among local governments, to the establishment of larger entities at Metropolitan scale. Thus, this paper firstly identifies the evolution of the term Metropolitan and its relation to the City. Besides, the relations between city, metropolitan areas, governance, and performance are described. Thirdly, different models of metropolitan governance will be explored. This paper presents a comparison between different models of metropolitan governance showing that there nothing as best model. It is concluded that enhancement of metropolitan areas governance is directly linked to five main pillars. These main pillars of governance depend more on providing appropriate fiscal powers to achieve effectiveness rather than the selection of the right model of governance (model of coordination).
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1. Introduction

According to the UN habitat [1], the phenomenon of Urbanization takes place when urban areas extends and grows towards outside their borders. In other words, when cities border physically gradually disappears and nothing becomes separating them from their surroundings (i.e. Rural land) [1]. Consequently, these growing urban areas faces challenges as shortage in their financial and/or jurisdic- tional capacity. Such state of complexity lately is named “Metropolitanization”. Clark and Moonen [2] referred to such term as the way urban areas deal with population and economic growth under the pressure of urbanization phenomena while aiming for more effective and efficient management of their growing urban areas.

During the 11th Metropolis World Congress [3], the growing urban areas transformation to a larger complex urban agglomerations/urban region is considered as the predominant form of human settlement named metropolitan areas (MAs). Such complexity raised the necessity of joint solutions for regional issues and problems that increased due to Urbanization and Metropolitanization on urban areas. In the early beginning was in the United States in early 1950. According to Wikstrom [4], the first attempt took place when Local leaders call for regional conferences which were later called Councils of Government (COGs). Such councils are a voluntarily actions where certain regional policies, bodies of regulations, and guidelines and rules at metropolitan scale are established.

2. Phases and Evolution of Metropolitan Governmental Arrangement

There were three main phases since the evolution of metropolitan governance concept in 1950 in the United States. (See Fig 1.1). Regionalism was the first attempts ever to discuss or try to formulate any institutional arrangements to govern at metropolitan scale. Public Choice reaction took place during the mid-20th century which encourages the local control. Finally, New Regionalism, in 1980s, which appeared mostly in Global North. These three phases influenced the formulation of metropolitan governance models [5].

Figure 1: Phases of Governmental Arrangements for MAs

3. Evolution of Governance

From administration point of view, governance is the fourth phase of public administration where all the actors share same targets for public participation promotion. This phase is where civil society, private sector and the state indicate clearly their interests, mediate differences and share powers, legal rights and obligations to promote people-centered development through sets of rules, institutions and practices that set limits and provide motivations for individuals, organizations and firms [6], [7], [8], [9].

Furthermore, Neo and Siong stresses that governance is always in a dynamic state of change and customization as leaders and decision makers are seeking to overcome the day-by-day problems facing their Metropolitan areas [10].

The question is: when is governance called bad or good? According to Weiss [24] governance is said to be good if it can achieve: equity, justice and protection of individual life and property, preservation of rule of law, enhancing popular participation, and improvement of the living condition of the
geared. While, bad governance is when it fails to achieve such aims.

4. Governance and Performance

There is a question which remains unanswered: Why leaders seek the perfect model of governance and how is governance related to performance?

Performance is one of the main principles of good governance where poor MAs governance, sometimes called bad governance, is consequently mean poor MAs performance [11], [12], [13]. Based on GIZ model “capacity WORKs”, it was found that the five success factors of this model can work as 5 main pillars of metropolitan governance. Throughout these five pillars sets of indicators might lead MA leaders to highlight where the reformation/development process should take place and/or identify the problem within a functioning MG. These five main pillars are: Strategy, Capacities, Cooperation, Processes and Steering Structure.

5. Models of Metropolitan Governance

Quang yen and Yezhuang stress that steering structure, also named organizational structure, is a framework used to outline any organization usually encompasses policies, rules and responsibilities for everyone in this organization. MG is more than a jurisdictional structure [14].

According to Gaetano and Strom, metropolitan governance is more about what are a metropolitan area governing institution relation? (i.e. how do governments, business and civil society interact to make decisions?); what is the governing logic? (essentially the principles under which decisions are made); who, in practice, are the key decision makers? (is power diffused or concentrated; and if concentrated, what are the political objectives that drive the system of governance? And how is it financed? [15].

Moreover, there are different dimensions to analyze any model of metropolitan governance [16] as: a) Institutional framework of the MG; b) spread of function delegated whether constitutional, legislative from higher levels of government, contingent on circumstances or advisory only; c) type of democracy; d) legislative and executive structure of the metropolitan authority; e) Fiscal and financial powers; f) presence of political parties and consonance with local, provincial or national politics; g) extent and character of sub-metropolitan structures for decision-making or electoral representation; h) level of citizen engagement in decision-making.

Consequently, there are several attempts to identify typologies of MG models [2], [17], [18], [19]. Some of the most common and recent examples for these typologies are: a) Mats Andersson attempt through collaboration study with GIZ and UN-Habitat in 2015, b) OECD report in 2015, c) Robert D. Yaro and L. Nicolas Ronderos work in 2011, d) Aprodicio A. Laquian work concerning MG reform in Asia (2005), and e) Christian Lefevre typology in 1998.

a) OECD Typology

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development report “Governing the city” (2015) focuses on describing various arrangement for Metropolitan Governance. Such study is based on two main approaches, one is quantitative based on a survey and analyses for 263 OECD metropolitan areas while the other is qualitative based on a field case studies of selected 6 OECD metropolitan areas (Aix-Marseille, France; Athens-Attica, Greece; Chicago, United States; Daejeon, Korea; Frankfurt, Germany; and Puebla-Tlaxcala, Mexico) [20].

The previously stated report also introduced four broad typologies of metropolitan governance models: a) Informal/soft co-ordination, b) Inter-municipal authorities, c) Supra-municipal authorities, and d) Special status of “metropolitan cities”. Although, it is considered as a basic and broad typology rather than a specific and rigid typology since two or more of these typologies could coexist within the same metropolitan area [20].

b) Yaro and Ronderos Typology

According to the World bank (2011), Robert Yaro and Nicolas Ronderos carried out a study developed to provide a typology of international metropolitan governance. Throughout such study some examples for international best practices were analysed. One of the study outcomes was a typology developed based on the three phases and the history of metropolitan governance (i.e. regionalism, public choice and new regionalism) [5].

The need for metropolitan governance led to different solutions giving a spectrum of alternatives for MG models, based on the phases previously discussed, as following: a) Metropolitan government: Unitary institution with complete regional authority; b) Metropolitan council: Umbrella organization of local units that promotes shared objectives; c) Territorial polycentrism: Political fragmentation and local self-government; d) Single purpose district: Seeks service consolidation through inter-jurisdictional coverage; and e) Inter-local cooperation: Regional pragmatism and multi-actor inclusion [5].

c) Laquian Typology

Throughout Laquian typology in 2005, based on the study of a set of Asian metropolitan areas, he witnessed that most of the structural reforms of metropolitan governments have taken either one of two forms: a) unified metropolitan government or b) tiered metropolitan structures. According to Laquian, based on these two forms of structures, metropolitan governance models can be divided into four typologies: a) One-tier autonomous local government, b) Multi-tier confederated regional governance, c) Mixed or voluntary system of metropolitan governance, and d) Special or single-purpose districts [21].

d) Lefevre Typology

LeFevre in 1998 attempts to classify different models of metropolitan governance ended up dividing these models into two major types: Institutional governance and non-institutional one. The institutional governance encompasses three main types: a) one-level governments, b) two-levels
government, and c) Assembly of Municipal authorities (CAM). Whereas, the non-institutional governance is divided into: a) coordination of existing structures, and b) Formal agreement [22].

e) Andersson Typology

According to Andersson, there are four main types of MG models: a) Fragmented Governance which refers to some inter-municipal coordination (horizontal cooperation among local governments), b) Metropolitan / Regional Authority (i.e. metropolitan council, regional planning authority, regional service delivery authority, or regional planning & service delivery authority), c) Metropolitan or regional government (i.e. Metropolitan-level local government or regional government established by the national government), and d) Consolidated Local Government (i.e. Territorial annexation or amalgamation of local governments) [17].

6. Models of Metropolitan Governance: Review and Assessment

Based on the above exploration of different attempts to classify different models of metropolitan governance, it is concluded that there are four common types that represent the common institutional type-governance models of MAs as shown in figure 1-2. Nevertheless, there are some cases of metropolitan governance that are considered as an exception. It has to be stressed that no model of the above could be considered as the perfect model of MA governance where contexts (e.g. culture, economic, social, urban, etc.) varies considerably. Additionally, each model of the above has considerable advantages as well as disadvantages as shown in table 1-1 [5], [17], [23].

![Figure 2: The models of institutional type-governance at metropolitan level](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Comparison between different models of metropolitan governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forms Formulation/Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Unitary Government (sometimes called Single-tier Authority Framework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Metropolitan Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Special status of “metropolitan cities” or sometimes called “Territorial annexation” or “Consolidated local government”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The existence of a fragmented authorities (localities) in a medium range areas and population within large number of governments compared to other models

- This model is usually sector based but local or state in implementation i.e. local functions and administration rely upon a fragmented organization and implementation structure for policies and plans and localized decision-making and engagement.
- Low Vertical or Horizontal relations (with a structure concerning about management factor)
- Increase in participation of society in decision making cycle together with multi-actor involvement comparing with Umbrella Structure model
- Tendency towards more localized decision-making and engagement

| (a) Vertical Authority | Independent legal entity and sometimes is a voluntary association created by local governments to make better use of their public resources. This model exists in a small area and small population metropolitan with large number of governments, compared to other models.
- This model overcomes the challenges for the provision of services due to large number of local governments within metropolitan area.
- It relies on horizontal intergovernmental relations where all localities participate equally where decisions are made at high level and implementation and engagement tends to be locally.
- It is usually financed by intra-local transfers or user fees or other charges where national government is responsible of the both monitoring and supervision.
- Flexible, if allowing members to join/exit at any time or participate on some subjects only.
- Useful to achieve efficiencies for certain service(s).
- A helpful form of governance that addresses common/ regional interests while maintaining local authority and identity.
- Local governments engaged as active owners - It helps in analyzing spillovers, and inequalities.
- Effectiveness tends to depend on the level of member commitment.
- Sometimes it suffers from limited impact (i.e. advisory only).
- Effectiveness depends on financial authority especially service delivery.
- It is in most cases suffers from limitation in scope.
- Access by residents to a service provider may be prohibited legally.
- Accountability may be weakened or unclear.
- Sometimes it requires monitoring for service quality and coverage provided.
- Sometimes such model witnesses lack of commitment and inventiveness from the member local governments.

(b) Inter-local Cooperation

- Sometimes named “Special” or “Single” Purpose. It takes many forms as Council of Governments and/or Planning Authority and/or Service Delivery Authority.
- It mostly related to benefits, the more the benefits, the more incentive the local governments to join forces.
- It is considered as the most Flexible approach.
- It can be an initial phase to build trust for further cooperation
- It is useful when one local government cannot carry out a whole project in terms of Finance or capacity or on the contrary one government can specialize in a service, for the benefit of others in the area.
- It can work without the need for formal agreement from higher or national level government (if formal arrangements are constrained by politics or prohibited legally).

(c) One/Multi-Function Cooperation

- It is a model where several municipalities (localities) join together to provide a public service.
- This model offers incentives for coordination among the constituting local jurisdictions that require pragmatic and civic led governance.
- Joining efforts might be led by one of the following, according to the forms of this model respectively: When joint action leads to a stronger position in bulk purchasing, contracting, firefighting, road maintenance, tourism promotion or to attract firms, events, or tourists; for the delivery of a service; for consultation and advisory.
- It mostly related to benefits, the more the benefits, the more incentive the local governments to join forces.
- It is in most cases suffers from limitation in scope.
- Access by residents to a service provider may be prohibited legally.
- Accountability may be weakened or unclear.
- Sometimes it requires monitoring for service quality and coverage provided.
- Sometimes such model witnesses lack of commitment and inventiveness from the member local governments.

| (d) Various Actors Cooperation Activity. |

- Such model can take many forms as: joint initiatives, contracting among local governments, and consultation and partnership. Such model usually found in metropolitan areas with large areas and low population within many governments compared to other models.
- It is considered as the most Flexible approach.
- It can be an initial phase to build trust for further cooperation
- It is useful when one local government cannot carry out a whole project in terms of Finance or capacity or on the contrary one government can specialize in a service, for the benefit of others in the area.
- It can work without the need for formal agreement from higher or national level government (if formal arrangements are constrained by politics or prohibited legally).
- It is in most cases suffers from limitation in scope.
- Access by residents to a service provider may be prohibited legally.
- Accountability may be weakened or unclear.
- Sometimes it requires monitoring for service quality and coverage provided.
- Sometimes such model witnesses lack of commitment and inventiveness from the member local governments.

| Mexico City, Mexico |

| Regional Plan Association for New York metro area |

| Sydney, New South Wales (NSW), Australia |

7. Results and Discussion

It is argued that the transformation from one model of governance to other results in an increase in local level functionalism and administration involvement with respect to the spatial coverage context. In addition, the horizontal level coordination among local governments in public policies or problem-solving also increases. Furthermore, there is always a noticeable increase in participation of society in the decision-making cycle together with multi-actor involvement resulting in the enhancement of democratic engagement.

Finally, the national or the central government main role among all models is to monitor or supervise the participation or collaboration of the localities. On one hand, all four models are self-financed except for the inter-local cooperation model which depends on localities or other actors. On the other hand, service delivery and development...
planning are at the core responsibilities of all the four models to execute.
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