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4 CONCURRENT WORKSHOPS

1- What is the citizen’s role in creating the metropolitan project?
2- How should the metropolitan area approach its city centre?
3- How to adopt the metropolitan narrative?
4- Which instruments do we need in order to implement the metropolitan project?

DISCUSSION around three metropolitan areas: Amsterdam, Barcelona and Berlin

CONCLUSION
by Claire CHARBIT, liaison officer for local and regional authorities - Public governance and territorial development - OECD
On 23 and 24 May, Paris’ City Hall was the venue for “Greater Paris and metropolitan strategies in Europe”, a conference held as part of the process of reflection undertaken by the City of Paris since 2001 with the aim of integrating the idea of “making a metropolis” into all its policies.

This summary will give readers an idea of the quality of the discussions at the event, of the commitment shown by Anne Hidalgo, mayor of Paris and first vice president of the Grand Paris Metropolitan Authority (MGP), and of her determination to promote a new model for the metropolitan area, forming an inclusive, supportive and sustainable city which plans for the future, experiments, innovates, generates a vital cultural and social life of its own and radiates out as an influence in the wider world.

States are currently struggling to respond to the challenges brought by the 21st century. In parallel to this, metropolitan areas are becoming key players in the globalisation phenomenon as, thanks to their valuable assets and dynamism, their diversity and their influence, they represent interconnected, attractive urban hubs.

The very task of creating a successful metropolitan area is itself a major innovation. The experiences from around Europe presented at this conference shed light on metropolitan areas' triple role, first as a political space characterised by the election of a representative, second as a space for social cohesion based on proximity, and third as the economic cockpit for an entire region tasked with highlighting the territory as an attractive opportunity. Moreover, major infrastructure projects can only allow a metropolitan identity to emerge when they give inhabitants a better quality of life and help to rebalance territorial inequalities.

The European metropolitan areas which INTA mobilised for the event argued for closer ties between economic and political operators. The former are looking for a strong metropolitan area with powerful engines driving development capable of competing globally; the latter wish to limit transfers of skills and resources towards this new metropolitan stratum of society, but also offer occasional support in order to advance projects and cooperative action. If we do not find a way to move on from these oppositional rationales, the metropolitan project risks becoming a collection of individual programmes. Divested of any project or governance and without any involvement from the citizens – all of which are markers of social cohesion and a sense of local ownership – the metropolitan area will hardly be recognised as such by those who experience it on a daily basis.

This is why, now more than ever, European metropolitan areas need to form synergies to link each of them together and to share all their initiatives and experiences.

Like previous conferences, this meeting was one stage in the process to constitute a platform of reference material and space for dialogue. Initially Europe-wide, later international, this platform will federate elected officials, specialists, researchers, and urban and regional planning professionals. The next stage will be to have the metropolitan phenomenon recognised by Europe - the Commission has recently made a commitment in the form of the Pact of Amsterdam - and by the United Nations: this subject will be the matter in hand at Habitat III.
The “Greater Paris and metropolitan strategies in Europe” conference held in May 2016 brought together more than 200 participants from over ten European countries. It allowed researchers, elected representatives and urban practitioners to join the dots between their various outlooks on how inclusive, sustainable metropolitan areas can be developed.

This summary collects and rationalises the thoughts and ideas expressed by participants in both the workshops and the presentations and debates which formed the plenary meetings.

The opinions expressed are not necessarily shared by the City of Paris or INTA and are entirely the participants’ own.

“IT IS IMPORTANT THAT COMPARABLY SIZED EUROPEAN METROPOLITAN AREAS SHARE THEIR ANALYSES AND BEST PRACTICE SO THAT WE CAN ADJUST, VERIFY OR REALIGN OUR POLICIES AS WE GO ALONG.”

Anne Hidalgo
WHAT IS A METROPOLITAN AREA?

Before any other issues can be addressed, the concept of the metropolitan area needs to be interrogated. It cannot solely be defined in terms of the size of an urban area or its population, such as the contrast between Amsterdam’s 800,000 inhabitants and Chinese cities with their 90 million-strong citizenries. Is our subject the biggest cities or cities more generally?

The term metropolitan is too often used to mean a purely economic concept, as such areas are a location for globalised convergences and value creation. Here, a metropolitan area is a city integrated within global competition: it has to hold its own in a new, globalised knowledge economy. It also prioritises a strategy of development, with competitiveness and performance its objectives.

Yet metropolitan areas have other aims and multiple, shifting significations in terms of their perimeters, position within a network and governance. They can be high-performing spaces where growth is redistributed, a mechanism through which manifold centres are federated, a place of regional solidarity and political and social innovation, and much more besides.

It is important to examine what “making a metropolis” means to each of us. The metropolitan area is most often seen as a place where spatial changes and social tensions are expressed, revealed and exacerbated. Viewed this way, freedom – including the freedom to protest – could be what defines the metropolitan space and brings it to life. We must therefore move beyond purely spatial considerations to look at a multitude of factors from investment attractiveness to connections within networks, a sense of kinship to public space, and the common good to an overarching project and, of course, governance.

AN OPENING UP OF POSSIBILITIES AND A PROMISE OF FREEDOM ARE WHAT COULD DEFINE METROPOLITAN SPACE
As societies turn towards the knowledge economy model, the new capital city is first and foremost based on cognition and relationships. Metropolitan areas are one of the nerve centres for an economy globalised through networks.

Since industrial economies began transitioning towards service economies in the 1980s, cities have strengthened their role as drivers of innovation and investment attractiveness in a globalised world. It is within their regional territories that wealth, jobs and networks multiply. Yet paradoxically, investment in cities slowed down after the single market was first created in 1985 and was only picked up again by the European Union in the late 1990s.

The switch from an industrial economy to a service economy comes with a belief in digital technology enabling new forms of cooperation and sharing, and producing numerous new, personalised, geolocated services based in areas such as tourism and mobile capabilities. The skills which dominate in a dematerialised economy are cognitive and cultural: they are more concerned with symbolism than production, and in essence they call on creativity and entrepreneurship.

Thus in the new urban economy, individuals can create their own jobs, and within this context networks gain a crucial importance. The metropolitan area plays an interconnecting role as a platform, a milieu, and a space where synergies and confidence can flourish, reducing incertitude through interaction and a concentrated relationship capital.

So a city’s size is less crucial than its placement within a network. It has been shown that between 1995 and 2009, the biggest cities were not the ones to see the greatest development. The biggest cities did not grow, although they responded more resiliently from the moment financial crisis hit in 2008 to the year 2011.

As a result, we have to view the metropolitan area within its regional context. It would be a mistake to only define a region through a single metropolis without also weighing in its second and third rank urban areas. This is clear when we consider the examples of Milan, Turin and Genoa in the 1960s: before falling victim to inflation, they formed a concentrated collection of all their region’s wealth. Another comparable instance would be Dublin, which was Europe’s second most expensive capital city after London in 2000 until its ability to attract investment went into decline.

Let’s view the metropolitan area in its entirety within a region and in terms of its cooperation with other territories.
...AND GROWING INEQUALITY

From environmental protection to energy transition and from countering peri-urbanisation (or urban sprawl) to creating jobs, metropolitan areas have to face up to more than a few challenges. However, their priority is to win the battle against growing inequality.

New challenges are arising around the environment, rapid urban growth and peri-urbanisation, but the most pressing issues relate to increasing inequality. Inside a metropolitan area, social inequalities become spatial inequalities. This is a pattern repeated globally in rich countries and in poor and across a divided Europe in which change happens at different paces. Global disparities look set to become even more polarised, and inequality is increasing within each individual country and city. This is a dynamic which is only becoming more entrenched, as only 5% of jobs which could be mechanised are being so at the moment.

When crisis hit, the narrowing of inequality gaps between European countries ceased, despite earlier efforts to realign Italy, Spain and Portugal. As a result, the European political model is now in peril. In the United States, the disparity between the average income and the highest doubled between 1980 and 2012. Such inequalities also play out via access to jobs, citizenship, aid and healthcare.

In Baltimore, those living in the richest districts are expected to live 20 years longer than inhabitants of the poorest districts.

When metropolitan areas form, they reveal social changes and tensions through the physical barriers and territorial segregations which they bring. In a globalised economy, value-creating business develops more in the heart of metropolitan spaces than it does in wide-ranging peripheral areas. These peripheries struggle with low-skilled jobs, low-paid workers, unemployment and even delinquency. For inhabitants to feel that they are part of the metropolitan project, jobs have to be created and a sense of dignity has to be restored.

THE CONFERENCE ADOPTED A MAXIM FIRST USED AT THE INTERNATIONAL ARCHITECTURE BIENNALE ROTTERDAM (IABR): “WE KNOW HOW CITIES SHOULD BE EVEN IF WE DON’T KNOW WHAT THEY WILL BE”

METROPOLITAN AREAS MUST BE PRODUCTIVE, GREEN AND INCLUSIVE

In OECD countries, the average difference between the incomes enjoyed in metropolitan areas and those outside of such cities is 17%, with marked disparities between, for instance, Mexico and countries where wealth is redistributed such as the Scandinavian nations and France. Yet there is one factor which never varies: in every country, university graduates gravitate en masse into metropolitan areas. This means that from Paris to London, those regions surrounding the metropolis remain hooked into a significant dependency on city centre jobs.

More than 50% of people who are in London every day live outside of Greater London.
Moving past the Centre/Periphery Dichotomy

Constructing a metropolitan space means imagining a newly formed, non-uniform city that integrates natural and industrial spaces while juggling with peri-urbanisation. Metropolitan areas tend to shift shape, but acknowledging peripheral zones is still a central issue.

Peri-urbanisation is a lesser phenomenon when a metropolitan authority is in place. To preserve natural areas and prevent earth from being concreted over, we need to integrate policies on an appropriate scale, without ever forgetting to connect the ambit of housing with the ambit of transport. The off-putting high prices of homes with good transport links is the primary reason for urban sprawl, and this relegates disadvantaged groups of people to the edge of the city. A metropolis without limits in which no one is on the edge or in the centre is what needs to be designed.

German and French cities have done a lot for their peripheries. Strides have been made in Lyon’s impoverished suburbs of Vaulx-en-Velin and Vénissieux, for example. Yet inequality persists: despite Milan’s new building programme which ran from 2001 to 2011, new inhabitants unfailingly set up home at the city’s periphery even though new jobs tended to be located in the historic city centre.

The profound shockwaves which rocked historically polycentric Berlin in the 20th century, not least the destruction of 70% of the city in 1945, have influenced how city life is practised there. The metropolitan area is not dense. Instead, it is broken up by woodland and farmland, with large agglomerations to the east and a heritage of extraterritoriality in the west allowing for an alternative cultural and artistic scene to thrive. While multicultural participation and policies flourished, so did temporary usage of liminal urban spaces and cooperative housing projects. Yet housing started to become more pressurised from the year 2010, and we have seen the artistic scene migrate towards Leipzig.

Rome’s Corviale district is a single peripheral building stretching over a length of one kilometre and home to 6,000 residents. Despite its geographical proximity to the centre, it remained socially and culturally remote. The adoption of a multi-disciplinary strategy touching on social, cultural, environmental and infrastructural issues gave rise to the Piers Project, a triple-pronged strategy to connect Corviale to central Rome which looked, first, at transport link infrastructure (including classic modes of transport as well as more environmentally friendly ones); second, at landscaped green spaces designed to be used in innovative ways; and, third, at socio-cultural dialogue.
Greater Berlin: past and future
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Areas which suffered serious damage during WWII bombing
Inclusive development is becoming a priority. Programmes such as Urban Initiatives in 1990s southern Italy proved their worth, demonstrating themselves to be effective ways of fighting crime and the mafia. This was the impetus behind the Europe 2020 programme for an “intelligent, sustainable and inclusive” economy. The UN's 2014 World Urban Forum in Medellin (2014) also supported the idea that social mobility and creativity could be developed through the formation of public spaces in which everyone can work together. Moreover, micro-loans helped to propel small local businesses, as did SARDEX, Sardinia's local currency for use between businesses, which in 2014 required at least 50% of all surpluses from central zones be redistributed.

The question of migrants and refugees is a crucial one for European metropolitan areas, and the goal is now to move beyond a dialectic which opposes vitality to fragility. From Amsterdam to Berlin, the vast majority of residents are not native to the metropolis, and the global city of London trumpets...
its ability to attract talent from Europe, Asia and the world over. Every mayor from the Barcelona Metropolitan Area voted in favour of welcoming Syrian refugees and accommodation was arranged yet, due to the city lacking expertise in migration, the envisioned results have not come to pass.

Gentrification follows when a traditionally working class area becomes increasingly attractive to investors. An overheated housing market means that historic centres cease to engender social cohesion. Public action around housing designed to counter segregation varies greatly from one country to the next: while France and Spain are largely nations of property-owners, 70-80% of Germans are renters.

The City of Amsterdam owns 80% of local property and has wide-reaching regulatory powers. 60% of homes are social housing, and 25% are under “right to buy” schemes. As influxes of tourists have doubled over the space of a decade, there has been increasing concern that the historic centre will be gentrified or even turned into a living museum in the Venice model. Dissuasive taxes around tourism have been implemented to reinforce peripheral zones’ image as attractive investment opportunities. Zoning has also been launched so as to draw multinationals’ headquarters towards peripheral areas.

THE ISSUE OF MIGRANTS AND REFUGEES MUST BE URGENTLY PRIORITISED

1.1 million dwellings | 2.4 million inhabitants | 247,000 businesses | 1.3 million jobs | 11.2 million visits to recreation areas | 16.8 million hotel overnight stays

The Amsterdam metropolitan area in figures © Ville d’Amsterdam
Transition and Time

Transition is an essential theme for cities’ progress towards becoming metropolitan areas. Transitional periods make experimentation possible, but they also bring incertitude and tensions, pushing the crucial question of collective life and cooperation to the fore.

Unquestionably, change is a constant, including in the role cities play in forming civic space. Time is an indispensable asset in resolving the conflicts which come with transition. These might arise between the vision of the city as a place of continual flux and a traditional, unchanging image of a city managing a stock of assets, or they can be clashes between openness to and shrinking from the wider world, attractive investment opportunities and solidarity, or citizenship and non-resident status.

Transition is often painful because it involves incertitude, presupposes a period of confusion and requires leadership which gets the motors behind change running, accelerates the transition process and gives people hope. Parallels can be drawn between cities’ transitions and the construction of nations and of Europe, both long collective learning processes. This is why the Atelier International du Grand Paris (or International Greater Paris Workshop) has been designed with a limited lifespan: it has been supporting the gradual rollout of the Grand Paris Metropolitan Authority (MGP) since 2007, and the organisation’s institutions are to be bedded down between the 2014 and 2020 municipal elections. Metropolitan planning has taken time in Stockholm too, and it was only adopted as a policy after a decade-long process.

Bologna’s metropolitan strategy has been officially in place since 1 January 2015, but its cooperative standpoint was first taken up in 1994. As of the year 1998, more than 1,000 associations have helped to define a project which counted among its key objectives an aim to overcome the rivalry between the lowlands and the highlands. This was a long process which also forged links with businesses (most notably Lamborghini), but it resulted in 500 projects being proposed, with 67 making the final selection.

Time is an Indispensable Asset
In Resolving the Conflicts
Which Come with Transition
REPRESENTATIONS AND NARRATIVES

To become a metropolitan area, a conscious decision has to be taken to make a metropolitan area. The narrative around what links and binds the city emerges through a shared language which all stakeholders and citizens – resident or non-resident – use together.

To become a metropolitan area, a conscious decision has to be taken to make a metropolitan area. The narrative around what links and binds the city emerges through a shared language which all stakeholders and citizens – resident or non-resident – use together.

Watch the promotional videos from global smart cities and you will be struck and baffled by their uniformity. City branding exemplified by slogans such as “OnlyLyon” and “I Amsterdam” appear primarily as means of communicating to the outside world. But new communications technologies can be used to encourage participation and therefore develop a shared vision of the metropolitan area. This technology lets us showcase and cultivate local differences and singularities, as identity rests on a diverse pool of experiences and affinities.

Considering the difficulty of combining promises with incertitude, but also of urban life’s fragility for inhabitants, businesses and administrative departments, for the process to make sense it has to rest on participation. Seen from this perspective, the metropolitan narrative is not an image but a promise: the promise of a shared destiny. This explains why the fixity of citizenship assigned through residence falls short of the more mobile reality of life in the metropolis and throws the very idea of local citizenship into question.

Public space is a city’s primary shared property. One key way of encouraging the appropriation of the metropolitan area as shared property would be to offer such space up as a way of easing transport links and promoting sustainable development and a circular economy. History and heritage are also ways of constructing a narrative.

IDENTITY RESTS ON A DIVERSE POOL OF EXPERIENCES AND AFFINITIES: METROPOLITAN AREAS HAVE PLURAL NARRATIVES

The Hague is the capital city of peace and international justice, and it has chosen to develop an initiative around safety for both property and people. The project emerged out of dialogue with the 40,000-strong student community. A serious game was also developed to raise residents’ awareness of what the project could provide.

So who has to adopt the metropolitan narrative, and to and for whom should they do so? In France this discussion revolves around popular education and civil society, whereas the terminology used in wider Europe is one of trust and stakeholders where a hierarchised outlook is positively de-stratified, thereby questioning the position that politics occupies in city life.

Because of the difficulties inherent to asking an individual with little proximity to the city’s amenities to help form that city’s narrative, the right conditions for creating a narrative can only come into being when an inclusive, socially cohesive policy is in place.
ENCOURAGING ALLIANCES

Metropolitan areas can establish collaborative processes which promote the empowerment of each and every individual. Here, best practice is to form alliances and trusting relationships with all stakeholders.

A metropolitan authority only exists in Chicago after major local businesses, tired of having to deal with three different bodies, called for one. Fragmented administrative departments of the type common to the Czech Republic and France do not appear to perform well. To give a further example, when negotiating water concessions, small local authorities always come out worst. Alliances between local authorities are essential, to the extent that we could envisage a future where there are no longer local mandates but mandates for inter-related areas.

The European Union has encouraged cooperation between cities in the Czech Republic for two key areas: socio-economic development and environmental protection. In Brno, the biggest driver in drawing up a development strategy was the organisation of an ecosystem of stakeholders starting in 2014.

DEVELOPING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS AND PROMOTING EMPOWERMENT

Alliances have to be formed between the public and private sectors too, with a cooperative outlook that also allows civil society to have its say. Universities, research organisations and property developers must have their place in this collective, multi-disciplinary framework which includes businesses and citizens. Ultimately, the aim is to turn away from rivalry towards cooperation.

The Barcelona Metropolitan Area (AMB) is made up of 36 local authorities. It has created a “transparency agency” which had the notable effect of establishing a new model for public-private partnerships. This model built in public surveillance of private businesses providing services related to the general public interest such as transport, energy and telecoms. The private sector accepted this transparency pact because it was presented as a way of preventing the risk of penalties.
BUILDING NEW STRUCTURES OF GOVERNANCE

Making a metropolis is first and foremost a political project, but it must not be petrified in the same way that cities have been. It must be a shared project by nature, allowing us to build a shared destiny.

New governmental structures have been created in Europe, with Lyon’s urban communities in the 1960s followed by London’s more institutional changes and then developments in Germany, Spain and Italy. Modes of governance vary from one metropolitan area to another and each one uses various systems, responses and organisations.

Two different frameworks, integrated and polycentric, went head to head in the Grand Paris Metropolitan Authority (MGP). The mode of governance at this stage was an unusual one, as it was shared across local authorities and every political force in the area. The City of Paris argued in favour of a rationally, reasonably integrated metropolitan area made up of the MGP’s 131 local authorities and has welcomed the process of transforming a debating chamber to a decision-making chamber.

Amsterdam has opted for voluntary collaboration which is more based in practicalities than institutions. Elected officials from 32 local authorities, two provinces and one region meet in congress every two years with an agenda and a programme of work. This form of governance which prizes compromise over consensus is the culmination of a long history of voluntary cooperation: in a country where 60% of the population lives below sea level, there is a tradition of working to counter flood risks dating back as far as the Middle Ages.

While local circumstances and mode of governance come in all different stripes, every metropolitan area faces the same issues, including pressurised housing provision, infloresces of people and mobility, globalised markets and concentrated pockets of wealth. The challenge is knowing how to live together in a metropolitan area, and responses have converged towards urban governance which gives politicians the power to act and defers to each and every stakeholder’s contribution. To all intents and purposes, Europe has entered into the metropolitan era, yet the political space that metropolitan areas have at their disposal is not yet great enough for them to be able to rise to the occasion.

EUROPE HAS ENTERED THE METROPOLITAN ERA AND METROPOLITAN SPACE IS A NEW POLITICAL CHALLENGE
“As the Grand Paris Metropolitan Authority (MGP) comes into being, I wanted us to reflect together on how to govern our major European metropolitan areas, which are currently facing a number of shared challenges.

This is why I have chosen to organise a conference on 23 and 24 May.

At this meeting, we will be able to discuss our experiences and practice and to help cultivate each other’s projects for our metropolitan areas.”
**SCHEDULE**

**MONDAY MAY 23RD 2016**

**PARIS CITY HALL**

1.30 pm  
**WELCOME AND REGISTRATION**

2 pm - 2.15 pm  
**OPENING**

Mr. Patrick Klugman, deputy mayor in charge of international relations and francophonie

2.15 pm - 2.45 pm  
**KEYNOTE**

**METROPOLITAN AREAS’ FUTURE STRATEGIES AND CHALLENGES**

Mr. Roberto Camagni, professor urban economics, University Politecnico di Milano, Italy

Metropolitan challenges and strategies in the years to come

3 pm - 6.15 pm  
**PARALLEL WORKSHOPS**

3 pm - 4.30 pm  
**WORKSHOP 1**

**HOW ARE CITIZEN ENGAGED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE METROPOLITAN PROJECT?**

**MODERATOR:** Emmanuel ARLOT, in charge of communication, City of Paris

**REPORTER:** Martin VANIER, professor, Alpine Geography Institut, University Joseph Fourier Grenoble-1, Consultant at Acadie, France

- Alessandro DELPIANO, urban planning director, Province and Metropolitan City of Bologna, Italy
- Lawrence BARTH, professor Architectural Association Housing and Urbanism Graduate School, London, United Kingdom
- Julien NEIERTZ, president of Association Metropop’, Paris, France

**WORKSHOP 2**

**WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE METROPOLIS AND ITS MAIN CITY?**

**MODERATOR:** Jaap MODDER, urban planner, CEO Brainville, Wageningen, The Netherlands

**REPORTER:** Philippe ESTÈBE, director of IHEDATE, consultant at Acadie, Paris, France

- Alfredo FIORITTO, professor at University of Pise, Italy
- Lucina CARAVAGGI, professor at Faculty of Architecture, La Sapienza University of Rome, Italy
- Pierre MANSAT, officer of the Grand Paris Metropolitan Authority (MGP) for the City of Paris, France
SCHEDULE

MONDAY MAY 23RD 2016
PARIS CITY HALL

4.45pm - 6.15pm  WORKSHOP 3  HOW TO EMBRACE THE METROPOLITAN NARRATIVE?

MODERATOR: Emmanuel ARLOT, in charge of communication, City of Paris, France
REPORTER: Martin VANIÉR, professor, Alpine Geography Institute University Joseph Fournier Grenoble-1, Consultant at Acadie, France
• Erik PASVEER, head of Urban Planning and Design, The Hague, The Netherlands
• Francesco MAGRINYA, director of Strategic Planning, Metropolitan Area of Barcelona (AMB), Spain
• Thomas HANTZ, head of information and relationships with businesses, Société du Grand Paris, France

WORKSHOP 4  WHICH INSTRUMENTS TO IMPLEMENT THE METROPOLITAN PROJECT?

MODERATOR: Jaap MODDER, urban planner, CEO Brainville, Wageningen, The Netherlands
REPORTER: Philippe ESTÈBE, director of IHEDATE, consultant at Acadie, Paris, France
• Michael ERMAN, Regional Growth and Planning Administration, Stockholm County Council, Sweden
• Marie ZEZULKOVA, head of City Strategy Office, City of Brno, Czech Republic
• Mireille FERRI, director, Atelier International du Grand Paris, France
• Anthony CRENN, deputy director of the Greater Paris metropolitan taskforce for the General Secretary’s office at the City of Paris, France
SCHEDULE

TUESDAY MAY 24TH 2016
PARIS CITY HALL

8.30 am - 9.30 am
WELCOME COFFEE

9.30 am - 10.00 am
OPENING
Ms Anne Hidalgo, mayor of Paris, first vice president of the Grand Paris Metropolitan Authority (MGP)

10.00 am - 12.30 pm
DISCUSSIONS AROUND THREE METROPOLITAN AREAS
MODERATOR: Marie DEKETELAERE-HANNA, Greater Paris director for the Valophis Group
REPORTER: Daniel BÉHAR, professor at the École d’Urbanisme de Paris - Université Paris-Est Créteil Val-de-Marne and consultant at the Coopérative Acadie
• Pieter KLOMP, deputy director, department for sustainable urban facilities, Amsterdam, Netherlands
• Gemma CALVET, former member of the Catalonian Parliament & director of the Transparency Agency for the Barcelona Metropolitan Area, Spain
• Finn GEIPEL, architect, LIN Architekten Urbanisten, professor at TU Berlin, Berlin, Germany

2.30 pm - 4.45 pm
GOVERNANCE, CITIZENSHIP AND THE METROPOLITAN PROJECT
RECOMMENCEMENT OF WORKSHOPS AND MORNING PROCEEDINGS, THEN A DEBATE AROUND THE ROOM
WITH: Emmanuel ARLOT, Philippe ESTÈBE, Jaap MODDER, Martin VANIER, Marie DEKETELAERE-HANNA, Daniel BÉHAR
MODERATOR: Michel SUDARSKIS, secretary general, INTA

4.45 pm - 5.00 pm
CONCLUSION
Ms Claire Charbit, liaison manager for local and regional authorities - Public governance and territorial development - OECD
Go to the event’s website to see our participants’ names, profiles, and presentations: http://paris-metroeurope2016.inta-aivn.org/en