

ALEKSANDER NOWORÓL

Jagiellonian University

TERRITORIAL PARTNERSHIPS AS AN INSTRUMENT OF URBAN POLICY

Abstract: The importance of urban issues to regional development is growing. The basis for this article has been the interpretation of the results of a research project conducted by a team of Jagiellonian University employees under the direction of B. Domański and the Author. The project included the development of the document entitled: *The Urban Policy of Małopolska Voivodeship Until the Year 2020*. This article presents synthetically the mentioned project, and also identifies the role of partnerships as a key tool of urban policy. In the conclusion, the Author suggests specific organizational instruments of this policy, citing the nature and roles of the bodies managing the so-called Integrated Territorial Investments in large urban centres. He also calls for the creation of multi-centre and single-centre urban partnerships, established in order to stimulate the development of networks of smaller cities or towns which are losing their previous functions.

Key words: Regional policy, territorial co-operation, territorial partnerships, urban policy.

Introduction

The importance of urban issues to regional development is growing. Not only is the city increasingly important, but also the urban functional area, in which the city is the core of an urbanized area, covering the territory of metropolitan interactions, including: the agglomeration of satellite centres and the zone of the sub-urbanization processes. The basis for this article has been the interpretation of the results of a research project conducted by a team of Jagiellonian University employees under the direction of B. Domański and myself. The project involved the development, on the basis of an in-depth analysis of the regional studies carried out within the framework of the Małopolska De-

velopment Policy Observatory, a draft document entitled: *The Urban Policy of Małopolska Voivodeship Until the Year 2020* [Noworól et al. 2012].

This article includes a reflection on the organizational aspects of the regional urban policy related to the use of different types of entities to manage the development of urban functional areas. Based on the changes resulting from the current understanding of management processes in the public sphere, and as a result of new European Union regulations, the key importance is being placed on the territorial partnerships, which are discussed in this article.

1. The regional urban policy, using the example of Małopolska Voivodeship

Modern cities – not only in Poland – require the support from regional policy instruments. This is due to the nature of the current development processes that focus on selected cities and their functional areas, and at the same time – through such phenomena as suburbanization or the restructuring of the regional economy – discriminate against some cities. This is especially true for the centres that are away from the main transport hubs and routes. In many cities, whole districts, both located in city centres and on the outskirts, are undergoing a slow process of degradation. The traditional role of small towns, serving as hubs for rural areas, has weakened.

Regional urban policy includes actions of regional governments and the ability of said governments to mobilize the members of the regional community to make a joint effort for the development of cities and urban areas. Urban policy is part of regional policy, which – as Grosse described it – can be understood as „strategic actions initiated by the government in cooperation with local governments and other local government entities, which are aimed at improving the economic competitiveness of all regions, providing equal opportunities for the development of regions, and striving for economic and social cohesion as well as territorial cohesion on the national scale and within individual regions” [Grosse 2009, p. 14]. At the same time, what is also important is the territorial aspect of the cohesion policy. It is worth remembering that, according to Markowski, the concept of „territorial cohesion” is a complex and variously defined spatial and functional category. It may therefore refer to polycentric and endogenous development aimed at the formation of clusters that would be competitive entities on a European scale. From a slightly different perspective, territorial cohesion equals sustainable development – within the meaning of the elimination of socioeconomic disparities and imbalances.

This concept is also connected with the availability of various types of facilities and services regardless of the geographic location. It is also understood as the creation of network structures, with particular emphasis on the physical and interactive relationships between the main transportation centres, and taking into account the relationship of said centres and the surrounding areas [Markowski 2011, p. 76]. The multiplicity of interpretation options does not change the fact that, in the next EU programming period, in the years 2014-2020, the key challenge – in the spirit of the so-called „New Regional Policy” – will be the territorial dimension of cohesion policy. Its essence is to move away from the balancing approach, related to harmonizing the standards of living and improving the quality of public services, in favour of an approach that focuses on increasing the competitive potential in the functional areas on a national and European scale [Barca 2009; Markowski 2011; Szlachta 2011]. Cities and surrounding urban areas are examples of such areas. In order to become an instrument for the establishment of a basis for socio-economic and spatial development of a region, the regional urban policy should take into account the territorial dimension. The territorial approach represents a departure from the perception of areas through the lens of administrative boundaries in favour of defining them based on possible potentials and obstacles to the development of different regions. This applies in particular to urban functional areas, whose typology was laid out in the *National Spatial Development Concept 2030* [KPZK 2030 2011, pp. 187-191]. The territorial dimension is also an important element of the National Strategy of Regional Development 2010-2020 [KSRR 2020, 2010, pp. 76-77]. The regional urban policy needs, based on the analyses and diagnosis of cities and urban areas, to provide: determinants, development goals, policies, and implementation solutions related to the support of urban areas by regional governments.

The project „The Urban Policy of Małopolska Voivodeship Until the Year 2020” includes just such a structure. Making references to a number of studies carried out on behalf of the Małopolska Development Policy Observatory, including the researchers’ own studies [Domański, Noworól 2010], an analysis of the existing statistical data, expert opinions, and information compilations was performed using as subjects the cities in the Małopolska region against the background of the whole of the country. For groups of cities and their functional areas, the data on barriers and potentials have been compiled and juxtaposed, along with suggested courses of action aimed at overcoming the barriers and using the potentials. Also, there has been an analysis performed of the local revitalization programmes for towns with a population of more

than 20 thousand, which in Małopolska were required to delimit the ‘crisis districts’¹. The conclusions of the analysis included a list of conditions defining the challenges for urban revitalization in the Małopolska region and related courses of action in urban policy.

Another area of investigation concerned the analysis of national and EU objectives, guidelines, and instruments in relation to urban policy. The documents included are EU strategies [*Europe 2020* 2010; *Karta Lipska* 2007] and EU regulations [*Wniosek...* 2011; *Zintegrowane Inwestycje Terytorialne* 2011], pertaining to the cohesion policy in the next programming period. The solutions cited include those contained in Polish national documents [*KSRR 2020/NSRD 2020* 2010; *KPZK 2030/NSDC 2030* 2011; *SRK 2020/NDS 2020* 2012], as well as such documents – sometimes working versions – that set out the intentions of the central authorities in relation to the inclusion of the urban dimension of the cohesion policy [*Zasady uwzględniania wymiaru miejskiego polityki spójności UE, w tym realizacja Zintegrowanych Inwestycji Terytorialnych, Projekt z 4 stycznia 2013 r./Principles of taking into account the urban dimension of EU cohesion policy, including the implementation of the Integrated Territorial Investments, Project of 4th January 2013, 2013; KPM/NUP, National Urban Policy, 2012*].

The above-mentioned analyses have helped to formulate the diagnosis of the main determinants and prospects of implementation of the Małopolska Regional Development Strategy for the Period up to 2020 in the scope of urban policy. The diagnosis has encompassed the most important determinants of urban development as well as the most important determinants of urban policy for the region of Małopolska. It has been used as a basis for drawing conclusions and formulating recommendations, including: objectives, principles, and instruments of urban policy for the Voivodeship. That part of the study contains the strategic goal of urban policy, which is: „strengthening the importance of cities and urban areas as a key condition for economic growth, greater social and spatial cohesion of Małopolska, and the improvement of the quality of life of the inhabitants of the region.” That goal is synthetic in character and requires further clarification and provision of details. It has been proposed that the elaboration of the goal should include the following main objectives:

¹ In accordance with the methodology provided in the Małopolska Regional Operational Programme, a town with a population of fewer than 20 thousand people can develop urban revitalization programmes for the entire commune.

1. Supporting the sustainable and intelligent development of the cities of Małopolska as centres for growth and hubs in the network of national and international linkages.
 2. Improving the standard and availability of public services in the cities of the region.
 3. Improving the quality of life of the inhabitants.
 4. Striving for a compact urban structure by supporting the development of urban revitalization processes and exercising control over suburbanization.
 5. Improving energy efficiency and sustainable development of cities.
 6. Efficient management of organisational systems and structures of the regional government for the implementation of the urban policy objectives.
- Other elements of the policy are the rules drafted in accordance with the territorial approach to development policy:

- I. The principle of integrity: the subordination of regional policy to the urban policy of socio-economic development and planning, as laid out in the 2020 Małopolska Regional Development Strategy and the Spatial Development Plan of the Małopolska Region.
- II. The principle of integrated territorial approach, differentiating public intervention in the various sub-regions and functional areas of the region.
- III. The principle of multi-level governance, the essence of which is the interaction of many levels of development management and many sectors (public, economic, and social).
- IV. The principle of conditionality, in which support is dependent upon the effects of the implementation of development policy and upon the fulfilment of certain conditions, usually associated with urban spatial planning.

The systematics of urban policy instruments has been adapted to the methodology described in the Polish government's document entitled *The Principles of Poland's Development Management System* [2009]. It distinguishes three subsystems of development management: programming, institutional and implementation ones (including monitoring, evaluation and financing of development policy). It has been assumed that for each of the subsystems mentioned a set of tools of urban policy should be determined, which includes:

- I. Development planning instruments.
- II. Instruments for organizing the development process, the key element of which is the creation of appropriate institutions.
- III. Instruments for policy implementation, taking into account the tools for monitoring, control, and evaluation.

The proposal for concrete, specific urban policy management tools has been presented in accordance with the main objectives cited above. For each of the objectives, planning, organizational, and implementation tools have been proposed, allowing the regional government to positively influence the development of cities and urban areas of Małopolska. The subject of further consideration is limited to the organizational instruments of urban policy, the creation and formation of which is – in the author’s opinion – the most difficult managerial challenge.

2. The essence of territorial co-operation and partnerships

The evolution of management theory and practice in the public sector is moving towards developing concepts based on collaboration, partnership, and the development of multi-sectoral and network relationships. Since the 1990s, in addition to the older concepts of public management, such as the neo-Weberian administration, or the so-called new public management, there have been many concepts existing simultaneously, which were built around concepts such as *governance* (co-management, co-government), networks, partnerships, *joining up*, transparency and trust [Pollitt, Bouchaert 2011, p. 11]. These approaches also refer to new phenomena, which have, at the same time, both the technological and social dimensions.

The nature of these phenomena is studied and described by, among others, (*flow economy*), which, according to Dawson, concerns the reality in which nearly all values are based on the flow of information and ideas. Organizations must continuously examine their position in the context of these flows [Dawson 2008, pp. 123-128]. R. Dawson identifies six elements of flow economy, which are: standards, interfaces, connectivity, relationships, content, and services. In their system, the main interrelation concerns the links between standards and relationships. Relationships are based on trust, which enables organizations and individuals to orient themselves in the tangled web of the Internet. Standards and networks spread, which in turn makes it easier for customers to enter into further relationships. It’s the latter that become the source of value (in economic terms). Control over relationships allows you to control value. This means that the relations between organizations across all sectors: public, private, and non-governmental, as well as between organizations and individual users of the network are critical to economic and social results [*ibidem*, pp. 128-147]. The concept of flow economy, based on the study of the real and current business processes taking place in the free market,

international network environment, strengthens the importance of relations/relationships that are built on trust. In such an environment, the influence of political factors weakens. What increases is the role of social participation as an important element of building competitive advantage, based on the activity towards innovation. Public participation, which is usually associated with the processes of democratization of the public life, and with direct democracy, takes on a pragmatic dimension in flow economy. Participation, which helps to identify hidden, non-obvious phenomena, and to build coalitions to improve its own position in a world of ever-changing conditions, forces the opening up of the development management processes beyond the bodies that have been traditionally and legally responsible for the development and operation of territorial units.

The social dimension of network relationships is the reason why, at present, a citizen sees in the government only one of the many institutions of the free-market society [Stivers 2009, p. 1095]. It is against the background of this new perception of the role of public administration that the concept of good governance/co-governance emerged. Pawłowska determines that manner of the implementation of public objectives and functions as „the involvement of citizens and public administration clients in the decision-making process associated with the formation and implementation of public policy and public services. *Governance* (co-management) departs from the market-oriented new management of public affairs in favour of a socially- and politically-oriented approach” [Pawłowska 2004, pp 126-127]. Pollitt and Bouchaert define *Good Governance* as a process that requires the control of society through networks of partnerships between the public sector, businesses, and civil society associations [Pollitt, Bouchaert 2011, p. 21]. The terms „networks” and „partnerships” are crucial here, but one should also pay attention to a number of specific models of co-management of public affairs, usually referred to in the literature as *Governance*, *Good Governance*, *Public Governance*, and *New Public Governance* [Hausner 2008; Izdebski 2007; Lisiecka *et al.* 2011]. It is worth, at this point, to quote the idea of Rhodes, who states that „governance (co-management) refers to self-organizing inter-organizational networks”, with the following features:

- interdependence between organizations, which translates into the inclusion in the governance process of entities outside the public sector, and lifting the „boundaries” between the public, private, and social spheres;
- continuous interaction between the participants of the network, caused by the need to negotiate goals and exchange resources;

- game-like interactions based on trust and regulated by the rules negotiated and agreed upon by the network participants;
- a significant level of independence from the state, resulting from the fact that the networks are not accountable to the state; the state does not occupy a ruling position in the networks, but can indirectly exercise a degree of control over them [Rhodes 1997, p. 53].

On the theoretical foundations of co-governing, concepts of *Multilevel Governance* are developing. They are related to the belief that governance – although it is a domain of the state – should exceed and transcend it, taking into account the private and social sectors. „All three sectors are crucial for the continued and sustainable development. The government constitutes a leading political and legal environment. The private sector generates jobs and income. Lastly, civil society organizations facilitate political and social interactions, mobilizing community groups to participate in the economic, social, and political initiatives” [UNDP 1997]. The concept of multilevel management „describes the changing relationships between the actors operating within the framework of a particular political system, situated on different levels and in different sectors” [Szczerki 2005, p. 11]. The multilevel aspect concerns the empowerment of not only the public authorities of different levels, but also other related parties, with interpenetrating networks in the processes of governance. According to Agh [2010, pp. 19-21] the essence of multilevel governance is that public administration and public agencies engage in active cooperation with local social, economic, and civic actors that remain outside the public sphere. „The implementation and dissemination of multilevel governance structures results in a participatory revolution”.

Multilevel governance reveals the growing importance of territorial cooperation and of partnerships that are created to manage territories or spatial and functional areas. Analyzing public policies involving the transfer of public functions to private and social parties, Elander [2002, pp. 192-193]. points to cross-sectoral partnerships of various types of organizations as an increasingly more popular (since the 1990s) form of task performance, especially in the field of regeneration and mobilization of development potentials. Elander stresses the importance of cross-sectoral partnerships in the creation of public policies, raising six arguments:

1. Partnership can create synergy effects for its participants.
2. partnership spreads the risks associated with the implementation of a project over a number of actors.

3. Partnership can help one of the partners affect the outlook and behaviour of the other participants.
4. Partnership can be an instrument to raise additional funds for the remaining participants.
5. Partnership can be a means of reducing open conflict and creating a climate conducive to compromise.
6. Partnership can reduce the excessive demands directed at the (self-) government and create a broader, more distributed basis for the implementation of tasks [*ibidem* 2002, p. 198].

An in-depth study of the functioning of partnerships between territories was carried out by Luo and Shen (China), and by Haseki (Turkey). They distinguished the following partnership types:

- **pro-development**₂, created by the local authorities, the private sector, and the academic elites for the joint development for mutual benefit on the basis of a partnership agreement (for example: cooperation in tourism);
- **promotional**₂, pursuing a common territorial marketing, carried out mainly by the local and regional-level authorities, and focusing on the development of common strategies and programmes, as well as promotional brochures, and meetings (such as promotion of investment opportunities and/or tourism);
- **co-ordination**₂, which aims to improve the availability and level of public services at the local and regional level, with the involvement of regional and local authorities, and NGOs, on the basis of a partnership agreement to co-ordinate the design, creation, and operation of the infrastructure, and the improvement of public policies (such as cooperation in the sphere of transport, especially public transport);
- **resource-based**₂, where public authorities seek to manage (share) human and natural resources on the basis of a partnership agreement (*e.g.* education, maritime economy);
- **strategic**₂, controlled by public authorities and aimed at strengthening the overall competitiveness and weakening competition between cities through the creation of common strategies and programmes (such as the single market, the standardization of investment policies) [Luo, Shen 2009, p. 60; Haseki 2011, pp. 103, 106].

These theoretical concepts raise the importance of the partnership approach, which is becoming more and more influential to the shaping of the regional policy. This applies in particular to urban policy. A number of questions are raised at the same time about how to organize the support by the regional

administration of the development processes carried out on a sub-regional level, *i.e.* in the functional areas of cities. Two challenges in particular should be recognized as especially difficult. The first concerns the organization of development processes on the territorial scale that is not identical with the boundaries of administrative units. The second difficulty involves the necessity of creation of multilevel governance mechanisms in the conditions of mutual political independence of the regional, county, and municipal government. Problems of this type can be overcome precisely thanks to organizing development management of urban areas with the use of partnership structures in which a common direction of policy on the sub-regional scale is conditioned by obtaining a high level of consent among the interested parties. These issues constitute the main theme of the following portion of this article.

3. Urban partnerships as an organizational instrument of urban policy

The assumption of a key role of partnerships in supporting the development of urban areas has been reflected in creating a project of urban policy for Małopolska Voivodeship. Also, the new and future EU regulations on cohesion policy for the period of 2014-2020 show the importance of partnerships and multilevel governance. The draft regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council provides common principles for all structural instruments relating to the general principles of support [Wniosek... 2011]. Mentioned among these principles are precisely the partnership and multilevel governance. The draft includes the requirement to establish the key areas of support and territorial challenges that need to be addressed. Special emphasis, in the context of the subject matter of this publication, must be placed upon the following:

- taking into account the role of cities and their functional areas as key elements for building cohesion;
- mobilizing potential at the local level by strengthening and facilitating community-led local development (CLLD), and by the transfer of responsibility for the implementation of local development strategies to local action groups;
- the introduction of an instrument called integrated territorial investment (ITI) in cases where the strategy of territorial development or the urban development strategy require an integrated approach, involving investments in more than one priority axis of one or more operational programmes [ibidem 2011, pp 14-26].

Essential to urban policy are integrated territorial investments, which constitute an essential tool for the integration of different types of interventions within urban areas in the national solution projects [*KPM* 2012; *Zintegrowane Inwestycje...* 2011; *Zasady...* 2013].

These solutions, in addition to the trends towards the socialization of public policies outlined above, have become the determinants of the proposals put forward in the draft Urban Policy of Małopolska Voivodeship. Within the framework of the implementation of the proposed policy objectives, organizational tools have been proposed, including those propounding the creation of appropriate partnerships.

Recommended organizational instruments of Objective 6 – The Efficient Management of the Organizational Systems and Structures of the Regional Government for the Implementation of Urban Policy Objectives mainly include organizational support for the establishment of entities managing functional areas, such as ITI (the so-called ITI Associations), as well as the so-called multi-centre and single-centre urban partnerships – in all cases in the form of appropriate partnerships. This support should include legal assistance and mediation carried out in relation to the constitution and determination of the scope and principles of inter-sectoral cooperation, whereas:

- a) ITI implementation is provided in the functional areas of: Cracow (mandatory in the Cracow Metropolitan Area), Tarnow, and Nowy Sącz, which will require the creation of ITI Associations with institutional capacity for managing a part of the operational programme, and for co-financing of projects; at the same time, it is postulated that the ITI Associations had the status of multi-sector LGU associations, as well as the status of economic and social entities.
- b) The self-organization of the collaboration of urban centres within other functional and/or territorial areas, *e.g.* the major cities of Western Małopolska (Olkusz, Chrzanów, and Oświęcim), or other multi-centre systems (*e.g.* Andrychów – Kęty) could take the form of the so-called multi-centric urban partnerships, established in order to:
 - monitor the effects of urban policy in relation to its objectives,
 - develop integrated investment and tourism offers,
 - create effective public services systems,
 - define joint actions with regard to target territorial marketing groups.
- c) The establishment of local single-centre urban partnerships, built around the principles similar to the so-called Local Action Groups, which is ap-

appropriate in the case of the functional areas of cities losing their previous socio-economic functions.

The regional urban policy should include measures to promote active participation in ITI Associations and urban partnerships of influential representatives of the urban economic sector (representatives of major companies operating in the relevant functional area), without the participation of whom it will not be possible to mobilize the pro-competitive local potentials.

The draft urban policy of Małopolska Voivodeship suggests the continuation of the regional government's actions aimed at the animation of co-operation within the macro-regional functional area based on the complementary and joint potentials of the Cracow and Katowice Metropolitan Areas. The creation of an organizational cell within the structures of the Office of the Marshal of Małopolska Voivodeship has been proposed, which would manage (co-ordinate) urban policy; conversely, the Małopolska Regional Development Agency could be granted the powers required for that purpose. The urban policy of the Voivodeship should cover the animation of the establishment of sub-regional forums², as well as the participation in the new EU instrument to support the development of cities, known as the „innovative actions in the field of sustainable urban development”.

These organizational tools related to Objective 6 (which concerns development management) are of the horizontal type, and relate to other regional urban policy objectives. Instruments based on the ideas of partnerships have also been proposed for the implementation of other policy objectives.

And so, for Objective 1 – Supporting the Lasting and Intelligent Development of the Cities of Małopolska as Centres of Growth and Nodes in the Networks of National and International Relationships, the establishment, at the request of and in agreement with local city authorities, of entities (development institutions) involving Voivodeship funding has been proposed in order to support the development of cities as centres for growth, which involves:

- a) enterprise support institutions,
- b) public-public and public-private partnerships in the area of public infrastructure,
- c) institutions managing the development of Functional Areas and/or areas of strategic intervention in the economic sphere.

² In accordance with Annex 2 to Resolution of the Government of Małopolska Voivodeship No. 1077/12 dated August 31st, 2012.

Another postulated tool to achieve Objective 1 is animating cross-sector co-operation in the sphere of inter-networking of the region's economy by:

- a) promotion of the cities of Małopolska and lobbying on their behalf at the national and European institutions,
- b) creating territorial partnerships operating on the Central and Eastern European scale in the field of technical infrastructure and transport infrastructure, tourism, as well as scientific and research co-operation,
- c) organizational support, at the request of and in agreement with local city authorities, of clusters created from the bottom up.

The participation of the regional government in cluster initiatives in the form of the so-called „triple helix” is also recommended; the „triple helix” involves the co-participation – in the conditions of *e.g.* a regional innovation system – of three main partners from the areas of:

- a) enterprise,
- b) research and education,
- c) government and politics.

Among the organizational instruments of Objective 2 – Improving the Standard and Availability of Public Services in the Cities of the Region, the regional urban policy should take into account the establishment of entities (development institutions) involving Voivodeship funding, in order to improve the accessibility of transport and electronic communication within cities, which should relate to:

- a) participation in the relevant public-public and public-private partnerships in towns of the Tarnów and Podhale sub-regions with average transport and communication accessibility, as well as in the towns of the Nowy Sącz sub-region with poor or very poor transport and communication accessibility;
- b) participation in the relevant public-private partnerships related to ICT development in other urban centres of the region.

For Objective 3 – Improving the Quality of Life of Residents, and for Objective 5 – Improving Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Development of Cities, organizational tools have been proposed including the collaboration of the regional government and sub-regional forums with local governments in order to define the problem areas that require collaboration of and co-funding by all the levels of government, particularly in the form of the so-called territorial contracts.

On the other hand, the organizational instruments of Objective 4 – Striving for a Compact Urban Structure by Supporting the Development of Urban Revitalization Processes and Exercising Control over Suburbaniza-

tion, should include – apart from the organizational tools of Objective 3 – the formulation of guidelines or incentives for the co-operation of local administrative units in land use planning for border regions. Also, the appointment of a regional urban revitalization operator for degraded areas has been proposed, where the complicated ownership structure, size, and degree of contamination of the environment is a challenge beyond the capacities of the local government.

Conclusions

According to current trends, as well as the principles and rules of the EU and Polish policies, the importance of the solutions based on various types of partnerships and cooperation has been increased in the proposed organizational tools for the implementation of the regional urban of Małopolska Voivodeship. Organizational solutions based on partnership are situated within the mainstream of the evolution of public management, constituting an element of agency in the public sphere that goes beyond the legal framework. This applies to the growing importance of the operation of territorial units within a network environment in which the public administration „regains the ability to govern” rather than „rules” in the ordinary sense of the term.

- 1) The new regional policy and the associated public intervention territorialisation gravitate towards the control over development within the so-called functional areas, which do not necessarily coincide with the administrative boundaries of the territorial units. Key importance is being assigned to partner negotiation – that is, one that is based on voluntary co-operation – of different types of solutions. Building competitive territorial advantages forces partnerships with local economic and social circles.
- 2) Large cities and surrounding urban areas are the main drivers of modern regional development. This awareness exists at the EU, national, and regional levels. Therefore, regulations and policies are created, aimed at strengthening cities and urban areas. The territorial approach to these policies, and the need for interventions transcending administrative boundaries, encourage the use the tools of partnership and co-operation in the multilevel governance, *i.e.* one with multiple levels of governance (the European Union, the state, the region, the city), and many sectors: the public, economic, and social ones.
- 3) Delimitation of the urban functional areas, which often do not overlap with the administrative boundaries of counties, forces local governments to take

on a partnership approach. The urban dimension of the cohesion policy for these areas includes a management tool called the Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI), which the Ministry of Regional Development applies to the cities which are capitals of voivodeships, as well as to regional and sub-regional centres. Taking into consideration the government's proposals to manage ITIs through the so-called ITI Associations, it should be considered it expedient to constitute such Associations in the form of multi-sectoral associations of local governments and economic and social actors. This solution consists in the partial entrustment of the ITI management to authorities that would be representatives of the urban areas, as well as other partners. The partnership tasks would, in that case, include: the preparation of an ITI action programme, development of the criteria for the selection of projects, the assessment of formal and substantive aspects of the proposals, preparation of ranking lists, and selection of the projects. Alternative models either marginalize the role of ITI Associations, limiting their role to the selection of projects, and leaving a prominent role to regional governments, or fully entrust the ITI management to municipal local government units from the given functional area. The latter solution has at least two defects. Firstly – it diminishes the role of social and economic partners in favour of public partners, and secondly – it will be difficult to accept by voivodeship governments, which have been accustomed to performing the managerial role within the scope of the implementation of the cohesion policy at the regional level.

- 4) In the draft regional urban policy, one should also take into account partnerships, referred to in the draft for Małopolska Voivodeship as multi-centre and single-centre urban partnerships. This applies to centres with lower positions in the urban hierarchy of the region³. Multi-centre partnerships could be established to monitor the effects of urban policy in relation to its objectives, to develop integrated investment and tourism offers, to create effective public service systems, or to determine joint actions in relation to territorial marketing target groups. The establishment of single-centre of local urban partnerships, according to the rules similar to the so-called Local Action Groups, would be advisable for the urban functional areas of cities losing their current socio-economic functions.

In summary, the institutional infrastructure of urban development management is changing, and the importance of a multi-sector partnership approach is

³ With respect to cities that are voivodeship capitals, regional and sub-regional centres.

increasing. The desire to take advantage of the benefits of cohesion policy is going to force local authorities to adopt an open attitude towards their neighbours (even if it was hardly ever displayed in the past) and to co-operate with different environments.

References

- Agh A., 2010, *Europeanization and Democratization in ECE: Towards Multi-Level and Multi-Actor Governance*. „The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy” (Vol. III, No. 1), pp. 9–32.
- Barca F., 2009, *Towards a Territorial Social Agenda for the European Union. Report Working Paper* http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/policy/future/pdf/10_barca_final_formatted.pdf
- Dawson R., 2008, *Living Networks: Leading Your Company, Customers, and Partners in the Hyper-Connected Economy*. Lulu Press Inc.
- Domański B., Noworól A., (Eds.), 2010, *Małopolskie miasta – funkcje, potencjały i trendy rozwojowe*. Małopolskie Obserwatorium Polityki Rozwoju, Cracow.
- Elander I., 2002, *Partnerships and Urban Governance*, UNESCO 2002, Blackwell Publishers (http://www.sociologia.unimib.it/DATA/Insegnamenti/4_3037/materiale/elandar.pdf).
- EUROPA 2020, *Strategia na rzecz inteligentnego i zrównoważonego rozwoju sprzyjającego włączeniu społecznemu*, 2010, Komisja Europejska, Bruksela.
- Grosse T., 2009, *Cele i zasady polityki regionalnej państwa. Ekspertyza dla Ministerstwa Rozwoju Regionalnego na temat Krajowej Strategii Rozwoju Regionalnego*. MRR, Warsaw, http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/poziom_regionalny/ekspertyzy/Documents/Grosse_ekspertyza_Cele%20i_zasady_MRR_02042009_1.pdf.
- Haseki M., 2011, *Regional Development with Cooperative Marketing Strategy: A Case of Cukurova Region, Turkey*. „International Journal of Business and Management”, Vol. 6, No. 6, pp. 98-107.
- Hausner J., 2008, *Zarządzanie publiczne*. Wyd. Naukowe Scholar, Warsaw.
- Izdebski H., 2007, *Od administracji publicznej do public governance*. „Zarządzanie Publiczne. Kwartalnik UEK w Krakowie” (1/2007), pp. 7-20.
- Karta Lipska na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju miast europejskich*, przyjęta z okazji spotkania ministrów w sprawie rozwoju miast i spójności terytorialnej w Lipsku, 24-25 maja 2007 r. (2007). http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/poziom_miedzynarodowy/polityka_przestrzenna_ue/rozwoj_miast/Documents/Karta-%20Lipska_PL_tlumaczenie%20Komitetu%20Regionow_1.pdf.

- Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030. Uchwała nr 239/2011 Rady Ministrów z 13.12.2011 r.*, 2011, MRR, Warsaw.
- Koźuch B., 2010, *Innowacyjność w zarządzaniu publicznym*, [in:] *Nowe zarządzanie publiczne i public governance w Polsce i w Europie*, A. Bosiacki, H. Izdebski, A. Nelicki, I. Zachariasz LIBER, Warsaw, pp. 31-45.
- Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego 2010-2020: Regiony, Miasta, Obszary wiejskie*, 2010, MRR, Warsaw.
- Lisiecka K., Papaj T., Czyż-Gwiazda E., 2011, *Public Governance koncepcją zarządzania w administracji publicznej*. UE, Katowice.
- Luo X., Shen J., 2009, *A Study on Inter-city Co-operation in the Yangtze River Delta Region, China*. „Habitat International” (33), pp. 52–62.
- Markowski T., 2011, *Dylematy terytorialnego wymiaru w krajowych i regionalnych dokumentach strategicznych*, [in:] *Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego do roku 2020 a strategie rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego województw*, J. Szlachta, J. Woźniak (Eds.). Studia KPZK PAN, Vol. CXXXVII, Warsaw, pp. 75-96.
- Noworól A., Domański B., Dej M., Działek J. i Hałat P., 2012, *Polityka miejska województwa małopolskiego do 2020 roku*. Małopolskie Obserwatorium Polityki Rozwoju, Cracow.
- Pawłowska A., 2004, *Informatyzacja w administracji publicznej. Od wirtualnej biurokracji do elektronicznych rządów*. „Służba Cywilna” (jesień – zima 2003/2004).
- Pollitt C., Bouchaert G., 2011, *Public Management Reform* (third edition). Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Rhodes R., 1997, *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*. Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Stivers C., 2009, *The Ontology of Public Space: Grounding Governance in Social Reality*. „American Behavioural Scientist”, (52 (7)), pp. 1095-1108.
- Strategia Rozwoju Kraju 2020. Aktywne Społeczeństwo, Konkurencyjna Gospodarka, Sprawne Państwo*, 2012, MRR, Warsaw.
- Szczerski K., 2005, *Administracja publiczna w modelu zarządzania wielopasmowego. Wyzwania dla rozszerzonej Unii Europejskiej – przypadek Polski*. Centrum Europejskie Natolin, Warsaw.
- Szlachta J., 2011, *Strategiczne programowanie rozwoju regionalnego, w kierunku krajowego systemu myśli strategicznej w sferze polityki regionalnej*, [in:] *Nowy paradygmat rozwoju – najnowsze trendy i perspektywy polityki regionalnej*, M. Kolczyński, P. Żuber (Eds.). MRR, Warsaw, pp. 27-37, http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/Polityka_regionalna/KSRR_2010_2020/Dokumenty/Documents/6_Nowy_paradygmat_robotcza.pdf.

UNDP, 1997, *UNDP Policy Document on Governance for Sustainable Human Development*. United Nations Development Programme, <http://mirror.undp.org/magnet/policy/>.

Wniosek, Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady, ustanawiające wspólne przepisy dotyczące EFRR, EFS, FS, EFRROW oraz EFMR, 2011, Komisja Europejska, 6.10.2011 (KOM (2011) 615 wersja ostateczna), Bruksela.

Założenia Krajowej Polityki Miejskiej do roku 2020, 2012, MRR, Warsaw.

Założenia systemu zarządzania rozwojem Polski. Dokument przyjęty na posiedzeniu Rady Ministrów 27 kwietnia 2009 r., 2009, MRR, Warsaw http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/Polityka_rozwoju/System_zarzadzania_rozwojem/Documents/Zalozenia_SZR_wersja_przyjeta_przez_RM_270409.pdf.

Zasady uwzględniania wymiaru miejskiego polityki spójności UE, w tym realizacja Zintegrowanych Inwestycji Terytorialnych, Projekt z 4 stycznia 2013 r., 2013, MRR, Warsaw.

Zintegrowane Inwestycje Terytorialne. Polityka Spójności na lata 2014-2020, 2011, Komisja Europejska, Bruksela.