The label of metropolitan region in Germany and France

All over Europe, metropolitan regions have emerged as a new category in the system of urban agglomerations, both as analytical concept capturing specific functions in a globalized world and as an institutionalized form of intercommunal cooperation. Metropolitan governance has developed over several decades, both bottom up and with national incentives. Size and competences are in the general tendency increasing towards larger and more integrated forms, but differ a lot when looking at different countries. In the last two decades, a labeling as metropolitan region in national documents and laws has taken place highlighting the metropolitan regions as engines of economic growth. There are significant differences between the entities politically and analytically defined as metropolitan regions, both concerning their number and their dimension. Concerning the number of metropolitan regions, there tends to be an inflation, whereas the size of the cooperation areas often is much smaller than the functional area or sometimes also bigger, expanding into the rural hinterland. The area definition is influenced by the boundaries of higher territorial entities, either not crossing their border or extending to their complete size. The emergence of institutionalized metropolitan regions raises questions about the distribution of competences and power between different territorial levels of administration and has in many countries led to reforms.

The paper describes the process of labeling city regions as metropolitan in France and Germany, explores their position in the multilevel system and compares them in terms of number, territory, institutional form and interrelation with other layers in the multilevel system. What are the criteria and aspirations behind labelling an urban agglomeration as metropolitan? Have they become a full-fledged problem solving level in the multilevel system of the state?

1. The label of metropolitan region

Metropolitan regions are a new category in the system of urban agglomerations that is used all over Europe by scientists, politicians and in the media. Despite this mainstreaming, it is not self-evident how many metropolitan regions a country has and which municipalities belong to these metropolitan regions. There is not an unique answer to the question which territories are "metropolitan" as the term metropolitan region is used in different ways with quite different meanings and can be normative or analytical (Fricke 2016). It is questionable as well, if hard spaces with fix borders or rather soft spaces with a changing shape depending on the issue at hand are suitable.

The term Metropolis has a symbolic dimension associated with urbanity, innovation and diversity, evoking images and desires and attracting tourists, investors and migrants (Volgmann 2013, 13). Large cities label themselves as metropolis as part of their self-image and for city marketing purposes to stress their radiance and position as most central places in the urban system. From an analytical perspective, metropolitan regions are defined by their functions as nodes in a global network economy and describe a cluster of metropolitan functions regardless of administrative boundaries (Blotevogel, Danielzyk 2009: 23) From another perspective the metropolitan region is described as a new layer of governance, linked to the debate which would be the suitable scale for policy and planning in city regions (Münter, Wiechmann, Danielzyk 2016: 15). The metropolitan regions do not correspond to the existing boundaries and layers in the system of territorial government and have led to forms of intermunicipal cooperation as the city development and public services cannot be tackled anymore on municipal scales as the spaces of everyday life have become larger than that. The emergence of institutionalized metropolitan regions raises questions about the distribution of competences and power between different territorial levels of administration and has recently led to reforms in many European countries.

This paper takes the institutional perspective looking at national metropolitan policy in the two countries Germany and France. Metropolitan regions are an issue at the national level in both, but only in France recent reforms of the territorial entities of the state have taken place. The paper describes the process of labeling city regions as metropolitan in France and Germany, explores their position in the multilevel system and compares them in terms of number, territory, institutional form and interrelation with other layers in the multilevel system. The aim is a juxtaposition of the kind of city regions has become "metropolitan" in a politico-administrative perspective, the processes and institutional forms. Section 2 deals with the question which city region have been labeled as metropolitan in Germany and France, section 3 is about the outline of these metropolitan regions and their role in the multilayer system.

The question about what is a metropolitan region and who belongs to it is in this context answered by the institutional form: in France legal status as "métropole", in Germany the "European metropolitan regions".

2. National determination of metropolitan regions

In the last two decades, a labeling of metropolitan regions in national documents has taken place in many countries, highlighting the metropolitan regions as engines of economic growth. This has also been the case in Germany and France. Adopting the concept of metropolitan regions as national strategy for economic growth has not led to a concentration of public investment to a few cities that would be competitive on a European or even global scale. In Germany it is rather symbolic policy not involving additional investment from the state and in France the circle of cities included has been much enlarged.

<u>Germany</u>

Metropolitan regions are defined in national spatial planning documents adopted by the Federal Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung, MKRO) from Bund and Länder and prepared by the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung, BBSR) (Fricke 2016). The so called

„European metropolitan regions" were first included as spatial category in the action framework (Raumordnungspolitischer Handlungsrahmen) enacted by the MKRO in 1995 (MKRO 1995:27). Their number increased from six in 1995 (Berlin/Brandenburg, Hamburg, München, Rhein-Main, Rhein-Ruhr, Stuttgart) to seven in 1997 (including Halle/Leipzig-Sachsendreieck) and eleven since 2005 (including Hannover-Braunschweig-Göttingen, Nürnberg, Rhein-Neckar and Bremen-Oldenburg) (Blotevogel 2005: 642). They are included in the national spatial vision 2006, updated in 2016, on the map about economic growth and innovation, following the idea that they are main drivers for national growth. This has triggered massive resistance against the concept form the Associations of German Counties and Municipalities (Kawka, Staats 2016: 535), fearing a redistribution of subsidies toward metropolitan regions at the dispense of rural spaces. Extensive debates have taken place whether or not the spatial vision could be interpreted as a change of the paradigm of equal living conditions that had in the past let to a support of peripheral and economically underdeveloped regions. In fact, the vision acknowledged the enhanced role of metropolitan regions, but there was a reluctance to actively push them.

The area of those metropolitan regions has deliberately been left open, using a symbolic representation in the maps to leave the decision of the appropriate cooperation space to the local actors (Kawka, Staats 2016: 537). The number of metropolitan regions has not changed since 2005 and is not likely to grow any further, though the Rhein-Ruhr Region is de facto split up in two cooperation spaces (Zimmermann 2017). This nomination as European metropolitan region by the MKRO does not include any determination of the institutional form of those metropolitan regions and does not lead to state subsidies either, unlike in France. It is more an affirmation of the function of a city region relevant in terms of location marketing and a question of being on the map. The activities of the ministry and its agency are limited to including the metropolitan regions as new spatial category in spatial strategies and territorial observation as well as encouraging cooperation in form of calls for model projects. The call for supraregional partnerships issued by the BBSR (2007-2017) was not addressing the institutional organization of metropolitan cores, but instead dealing with the cooperation with their hinterland and urban-rural-partnerships. The cooperation areas have been even larger than the metropolitan regions, corresponding to the idea of communities of responsibility (Verantwortungsgemeinschaften), attributing all areas to a metropolitan influence area. The spatial development report (Raumordnungsbericht) 2005 included a chapter on metropolitan regions in Germany as part of a chapter on spaces with particular need for action, analyzing their metropolitan functions and making a proposal of recommended competences, that those metropolitan regions should have, though without any binding impact (BBSR 2005: 189). The next and most recent spatial development report (BBSR 2011) does use the term of metropolitan region, but far less prominent. Their importance for growth and innovation is confirmed without addressing their internal organization. The networking in the metropolitan regions has been encouraged as well, leading to the foundation of the Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen IKM in 2001, an organisation pursuing the interests of metropolitan regions similar to Metrex on the European level.

It can be said that metropolitan regions are today well established in the thinking, but not much has happened on the national level since. The only more recent dynamic concerns cross-border regions with metropolitan functions. They have been targeted by two calls for model projects[1], encouraged to build their own network IMEG (Initiativkreis metropolitane Grenzregionen) founded in 2011 and are included in the revised spatial vision from March 2016 (Hager 2016, 559ff).

France

The notion of métropole was first introduced in the 1960ies by the national programme «Métropoles d'équilibre » (1963-74). The policy consisted of structural investment into infrastructure in the fields of

---

[1] MORO "Überregionale Partnerschaften in grenzüberschreitende Verflechtungsräumen"2008- and MORO IMeG 2011-2013 with four project areas

transportation, higher education, health, e.g. regional airports in order to enhance the central functions of the cities and masterplans for the regional development elaborated by organizations founded for that purpose (Organismes Régionaux d'Etudes et d'Aménagement d'aire métropolitaine OREAM). It was a turn in the French policy of regional development, because it focused for the first time on the larger cities instead of small urban centers and economically weaker regions. But already one decade later, at the beginning of the 1970ies the national subsidies were again concentrated on medium sized and later on small cities (Burgel 2009: 79). The OREAM were abolished in 1983 and the cooperation areas that had been fixed by the state could not impose themselves against historic rivalries between neighbouring cities, but the notion métropole remained present in debates (Geppert 2009: 255f).

It was introduced again in 2004 by a national call for metropolitan cooperation, encouraging the creation of city networks (Motte 2007). It followed the establishment as an institutional form of intercommunal cooperation by the law RCT (réforme des collectivités territoriales) 2010 and law MAPTAM in 2014. Two different forms were offered to the cities, the pôles métropolitain and the métropole. Whereas the métropoles have directly elected councils, a wide range of competences especially concerning public services and planning and non-intersecting memberships, the pôles metropolitains are a softer, more flexible form of cooperation on a larger spatial scale formed of municipal grouping and do not have predefined competences. The definition of the métropoles is a mixture of bottom-up initiative and national control: created after a request of the municipal groupings, but with the ultimate decision on the national level. Additionally the creation of métropoles has been enforced in 2014 by the law MAPTAM for the largest municipal groupings with 400 000 inhabitants and a functional urban area of 650 000 or more. The status of métropole is linked to a specific institutional form including predefined minimum competences and governance structures and releases state subsidies. The delimitation in terms of member municipalities is decided by the municipalities and was mostly based on existing municipal groupings, but is in a sense part of the national decision whether a city region can adopt the legal status of metropole because a minimum size in terms of inhabitants is required. These minimum criteria in the law have been lowered several times though, and added by tailor-made additional criteria to allow smaller city regions campaigning for it to get the legal status as well. The initial threshold (law RCT 2010) was 500.000 inhabitants, lowered to municipal groupings with 400.000 inhabitants, having a functional urban area of 650 000 or including a regional capital and in 2017[2] to municipal groupings with 250.000 inhabitants or including a regional capital with an employment zone of 400.000 habitants (of 500.000 habitants for former regional capitals). The city region of Nice was the forerunner in January 2012, being the only one intrigued by the possibility given in the law RCT and becoming a métropole before the law MAPTAM. The city regions Bordeaux, Nantes, Toulouse, Grenoble Lille, Montpellier, Rennes, Rouen, Strasbourg, Brest and Lyon all gained the status as métropole in January 2015 and Aix-Marseille, Grand Paris and Nancy were added in July 2016. These fifteen metropoles will be added by seven more until 1.1.2018: Tours Val de Loire, St Etienne, Clermont-Ferrand, Metz, Dijon, Orléans and Toulon.

3. Size and position in the multilevel system

Whereas the previous section outlined the way metropolitan regions where selected in the two states, this section addresses the characteristics. The politico-administrative cooperation areas of *European metropolitan regions* in Germany and the municipal groupings *métropole* in France will be contrasted with each other. The emergence of institutions at the metropolitan level has an impact on the multilevel governance system and the repartition of competences, resources and democratic legitimacy. However, neither in Germany nor in France, the metropolitan level has been established as a fully-fledged new level of territorial administration, though in France it has been discussed to abolish the *départements*.

Germany

---

[2] Loi n° 2017-257 du 28 février 2017 relative au statut de Paris et à l'aménagement métropolitain

In Germany, the nomination of Metropolitan regions in political documents was not linked to a clear definition of the area. This was possible because the institutional form was left entirely open, up to local actors to decide. For the networking on the national level, only a representative was needed. Indeed, the outline of the cooperation area remained fuzzy and the question was in some region first raised when initiating a regional monitoring in 2005 (Pütz 2016: 545). The area that should be used for the monitoring has been defined by the metropolitan regions themselves for this purpose has in some cases changed considerably between 2006 and 2015, e.g. Mitteldeutschland, Hamburg and Munich.

The data in table 1 refers to those areas. Anyhow, the areas should be interpreted as common reference frame for projects and positioning, underlying frequent redefinition, not as fix borders. At the same time, variable geometries exist depending on issues and topics (BBSR, IKM 2012: 6).

Table 1 Metropolitan regions in Germany

Metropolitan region	Size (km²)	Inhabitants (million, 2014)
Rhein-Ruhr	11.742	11.4
thereof Ruhr	*4.437*	*5.1*
thereof Köln/Bonn	*4.416*	*3.6*
Berlin-Brandenburg	30.546	6.0
München	25.548	5.9
Frankfurt Rhein-Main	14.755	5.6
Stuttgart	15.427	5.2
thereof City region	*3.654*	*2.7*
Hamburg	28.338	5.1
Hannover Braunschweig Göttingen Wolfsburg	18.579	3.8
Nürnberg	21.783	3.5
Nordwesten	13.750	2.7
Mitteldeutschland	9.108	2.5
Rhein-Neckar	5.637	2.4

Source: Monitoring IKM

As the size indicates, metropolitan regions are a large scale layer in Germany that is explicitly supposed to include suburban and rural areas and deal with urban-rural partnerships. A core issue of the metropolitan regions is to develop partnerships that overcome administrative borders that do not correspond to the functional reality of the city regions (Kawka, Staats 2016: 538). This does not only address municipal borders but also the Länder and administrative districts (Regierungsbezirke). This is particularly true for the three city states Berlin, Hamburg and Bremen, but also for the Ruhr Region being split up in the middle by three administrative districts all having their administrative center outside the metropolitan region. Seven out of eleven metropolitan regions areas cross the borders of the Länder and three of the remaining ones cross borders of administrative districts[3]. At the same time, the metropolitan cooperation spaces partially overlap, meaning that some municipalities are partners in two metropolitan regions. This means that metropolitan regions cannot be ranged "russian-doll like" (Faludi 2012: 203) in the hierarchical order of territorial authorities. Concerning the coverage of the territory, the metropolitan regions themselves are only covering selected areas, although in the spatial representation of the vision the peripheral spaces have been matched with metropolitan areas as well, dividing the whole country into influence areas of metropolitan regions.

This means that the label of "European Metropolitan region" is linked to an additional cooperation space across existing borders, but It is not defined how this new layer should be integrated in the multilevel

---

[3] The metropolitan region Hannover Braunschweig Göttingen Wolfsburg is the only one for which this does not apply anymore, because the administrative districts have been abolished in Lower Saxony in 2004. This administrative subdivision of a large Land exists nowadays in North Rhine-Westphalia, Bavaria, Hesse and Baden-Wuerttemberg.

governance system. Given the enormous variety of institutional form of German metropolitan regions, the entities they are composed of vary as well. It can be a cooperation on one territorial level like in France, in this case mostly between counties and county-exempt cities (Nürnberg, Rhein-Neckar, Ruhr, Köln-Bonn, Mitteldeutschland) or municipalities (both county-exempt cities and municipalities with county, Frankfurt). The metropolitan region Berlin-Brandenburg is a particular case, because it is a cooperation of two Länder, not of municipalities. The treaty was concluded in 1996 and led to the foundation of a Joint Spatial Planning Department (Gemeinsame Landesplanungsabteilung) and a transport association for the whole area. Besides those cooperations on the same layer, there are also vertical arrangements involving several territorial layers. In the case of Hamburg, all layers beneath the federal level are involved: Länder representatives, counties and county exempt cities, municipalities belonging to a county as well as the city districts of the city state Hamburg, in Hannover-Braunschweig-Göttingen-Wolfsburg as well apart from city districts, in Bremen (Nordwesten) Länder representatives, counties and county exempt cities and in München, counties and county exempt cities and municipalities belonging to a county. Additionally, almost all metropolitan regions prominently include private actors from the economy, in many cases represented in the board with an equal share like the political side.

In terms of competences, there is no substantial shift from other territorial levels to the metropolitan region. Instead, it is rather a soft space taking on additional tasks of coordination of development strategies, joint marketing and in the case of Hamburg financing projects out of a joint fund. German municipalities experienced several phases of incorporation of municipalities into bigger core cities despite local protests and issues of local identity. Additionally the counties constitute a second tier of local government and are service providers for smaller municipalities (Germany has about 300 counties), whereas the bigger cities (so called Kreisfreie Stadt or county exempt cities, about 100 cities) have the competences of a county and a municipality. Against this background, the purpose of metropolitan cooperation was from the beginning of the 1990s onwards accomplishing a more coherent spatial development and, later on, having the critical mass for marketing at a supraregional level (as business location, but also for culture, tourism and, more recently, science) whereas the competences for technical services have mostly remained at the level of cities and counties.

<u>France</u>
The french métropoles are hard spaces that are composed of municipalities. They correspond to the logic of nested spaces within a system-wide architecture with none-intersecting membership (Well, Schmitt 2016: 9) and can be ranged between municipalities and départements with few exceptions. The two largest métropoles Grand Paris and Aix-Marseille are crossing the borders of départements, whereas all others are smaller. The abolishment of the départements as territorial level has been discussed but could not be pushed through in parliament. Only in two exceptional cases the department has been merged: in Lyon with the métropole and in the city of Paris with the municipality. The institutional form of métropole is the most integrated one out of four types of metropolitan groupings with own taxation (EPCI établissement public de coopération intercommunale[4]).This means that a comparable institutional form is open to all municipalities and has been considerably pushed by this state, leading to larger, more integrated groupings covering more and more of the territory. In January 2017, there have only been four municipalities with in total about 6.000 inhabitants left, that do not belong to any municipal grouping. The adjacent municipal groupings are players in a certain rivalry with the metropoles. The creation of a layer above the municipality is an answer to the small size and therefore lack of capacity of many French municipalities. The main issue of metropolitan regions is therefore joint service provision within the continuously built-up core area. A large part of municipal competences are transferred to the metropolitan level, combined with some competences from the department and the region.

---

[4] the other types are communautés urbaines, communautés d'agglomération and communautés de communes

Table 2 Métropoles in France (1.1.2017)

Metropolitan region	Size (km²)	Inhabitants (million)	Number of municipalities (1.1.2017)
Grand Paris	814	7.0	131
Aix-Marseille	3.150	1.9	92
Lyon	538	1.3	59
Lille	612	1.2	90
Bordeaux	570	0.8	28
Toulouse	459	0.7	37
Nantes	523	0.6	24
Nice	1.400	0.5	49
Rouen	664	0.5	71
Strasbourg	314	0.5	33
Grenoble	550	0.5	49
Montpellier	434	0.4	31
Rennes	711	0,4	43
Nancy	143	0,3	20
Brest	220	0,2	8

Source: DGCL

Whereas the *métropoles d'équilibre* from the 1960ies/70ies, the cooperation area of the call from 2004 and the *pôles métropolitains* introduced in 2010 had rather large polycentric areas, the *métropoles* are with the exception of Aix-Marseille monocentric areas, covering one larger city and its surrounding municipalities. In the Case of Lyon, St Etienne and Grenoble, the three centers where supposed to form one *métropole d'équilibre* in the past, but have today each become a metropole of its own. Some of the métropoles are not even entirely covering the urban agglomeration ("unité urbaine"), meaning the build-up area without interruptions of more than 200 meters, e.g. Bordeaux, Toulouse and Grenoble (INSEE).

In addition larger, soft cooperation spaces exist with the instrument of pôles métropolitains introduced in 2010. Its interpretation in the regions differs considerably despite being based on a national law. The innovation is that they do not need to cover a continuous territory and that they are not exclusive, meaning that one EPCI (be it a métropole, CU, CA or CC) can be part of several pôles. They should formulate a common metropolitan interest with related action fields like economic development, innovation, research, culture, transport or spatial planning, but do not have competences predefined by law unlike the métropole (Louargant 2013, 48f). Additionally since 2014 other partners can be included like the regions and départements as well as universities, port authorities, tourism agencies, economic development agencies, commerce chambers and the like (Aucame 2011: 2; Béhar et al. 2011: 1). In terms of layers, that can either be seen as an alternative to the métropole for city networks of smaller cities or urban agglomerations whishing a softer cooperation form or as an additional, larger layer of cooperation. Nantes, Rennes, Brest, Strasbourg, Rouen, Lyon, Nancy and Toulouse are cities belonging both to an EPCI transformed into a métropole and to a larger pôle metropolitain composed of several EPCI, in the case of Nantes and Brest even to two overlapping pôles metropolitains as they are part of the large cooperation area Espace Métropolitain Loire Bretagne. Almost all of them have chosen to organize the pôle as polycentric networks of cities with a certain distance in between instead of continuous spaces. A counterexample is Rouen being part of the pôle CREA Seine Eure together with only one other municipal grouping. In those cases, the softer pôles were founded first, in 2011-2012 whereas the functionally more consolidated métropoles with a smaller perimeter were constituted in 2015-2016. The reason is that most city regions opted for the creation of a pôle when both instruments were introduced by the law RCT in

2010, whereas the law MAPTAM (2014) enforced the creation of a métropole for all the bigger ones having a functional urban area of at least 650 000 inhabitants.

4. Conclusion

Although the idea of metropolitan regions is about city regions with functions and competitiveness beyond the national territory, metropolitan policies are done at the national level and contingent on the urban system, the structure of territorial authorities and traditions of spatial development policies. It is remarkable that despite the frequent use of the term metropolitan region, their number and size is not self-evident to denominate. In Germany, the number is more or less settled, but the outline is much less so. In France, on the opposite, there are current debates on the number of metropolitan regions, whereas they have a clear border, at least when talking about the municipal grouping *métropole.* Both in Germany and in France national initiatives introducing metropolitan regions where motivated by growth strategies, seeing them like main drivers of national economic growth. In both states the national activity included spatial analysis assessing their role, model projects to explore possibilities of metropolitan cooperation and trigger new forms. An initially smaller number of metropolitan regions or cities has been enlarged after lobbying of the next bigger cities. But whereas in the federal state Germany, the internal organization was entirely left to the local actors, the more centralized French state intervened directly by offering a legal form with defined competences, financial incentives and in some cases the forced creation of a metropolitan region by law. Whereas the process of institution building has been very dynamic in France since 2010, in Germany not much has been happening in the last ten years.

The definition of metropolitan regions and their cooperation area takes place in an interplay between the national and the local level. Who gets to be labeled as metropolitan region is negotiated at the national level, whereas construction of a metropolitan cooperation area is left to define to the local actors, mostly to the municipalities. Bluntly said the concrete area of a metropolitan region does not matter when zooming out to the national or even European scale, not even if there is a clearly defined boundary of the metropolitan area. From the large scale perspective, metropolitan cities are dots on the map and the issue is about being on the map, marketing and competitiveness. The attraction of investors, highly qualified workers and tourists depends on symbols, the image created and on the critical mass of population, research facilities, cultural institutions etc. This logic corresponds to creating large, soft areas, including as many facilities as possible. From the state perspective a metropolitan region is one actor and a representative is needed, in the German Case e.g. as partner in the network of metropolitan regions Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen IKM and in the French Case e.g. to negotiate the contract about metropolitan projects Pacte État-métropoles. When zooming in, the potential metropolitan region is constituted out of a multitude of actors and the appropriate size of cooperation areas is not necessarily the same depending on the issue. Cooperation is partially about the efficiency of service provision, especially in France with its small municipalities. We can observe a tendency towards larger spaces, but at the same time the proximity to the citizens matters, with the effect of emerging sublevels e.g. in the largest French métropoles Aix-Marseille Provence and Grand Paris.

There is no one-fits-all solution for the construction of a metropolitan cooperation area, not in terms of size and nor in terms of institutions and layers. It cannot be identical as it has to be adapted at the local conditions. Because the power is mostly transferred from the municipal level up to the metropolitan, it is a bottom-up process following the logic and restrictions of each individual area. On the European scale this is obvious when looking at the clear contrast in size and competences between Germany and France. But even inside both countries, one metropolitan region is not alike the others and both countries display a wide range of historical pathways to metropolitan cooperation. In Germany the wide range of institutional forms is caused by the lack of national intervention. But despite the legal definition, French metropoles are far from homogeneous as well.

Nevertheless unlike words like municipal grouping, *Metropolregion* or *métropole* has a strong associative dimension, connected with urbanity, innovation and diversity. This can be leading to a mismatch between the imagination and the object, if the area is so huge that it covers large rural areas with low functional connections or if the core cities are not "metropolitan" enough. In Germany the existing administrative borders of the Länder, the aspiration not to leave rural territories behind and combine the concept of metropolitan regions with the prevailing principle of equal living conditions has in some cases led to oversized metropolitan areas. In France there is a kind of inflation taking place concerning the number of metropoles. It is difficult to come to an end in the subsequent process of denomination, because there is not such a clear cut to the next category of agglomerations justifying to deny the status to new applicants. From the point of view of the city regions in question it makes sense to adopt this more integrated legal form coming along with increased resources. But looking at the urban system as the whole from an outside perspective the name metropole becomes misleading as most of the 22 city regions do not correspond to what would be a metropolitan region from a European perspective.

References

Aucame (Hg.) (2011): LES PÔLES MÉTROPOLITAINS. NOUVEL OUTIL POUR L'INTER-TERRITORIALITÉ. Caen (Qu'en Savons-Nous ?, 36).

BBSR (2005): Raumordnungsbericht 2005 (Berichte, 21). Bonn.

BBSR (2012): Raumordnugnsbericht 2011. Bonn.

BBSR; IKM (2012): Regionales Monitoring 2012. Daten und Karten zu den Europäischen Metropolregionen in Deutschland. Bonn.

Béhar, Daniel; Estèbe, Philippe; Vanier, Martin (2011): Pôles métropolitains : du « faire territoire » au « faire politique », ou la nouvelle bataille de l'interterritorialité. In: métropolitiques.

Blotevogel, Hans Heinrich (2005) Metropolregionen. In: ARL (Ed.): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung. 4., neu bearbeitete Auflage. Hannover: Verlag der ARL, 642-647

Blotevogel, Hans Heinrich; Danielzyk, Rainer (2009): Leistungen und Funktionen von Metropolregionen. In: Jörg Knieling (Hg.): Metropolregionen. Innovation, Wettbewerb, Handlungsfähigkeit. Hannover: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Forschungs- und Sitzungsberichte / Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung, Bd. 231), 22–29.

Burgel, G. (2009): Métropole D'équilibre. In: Rob Kitchin (Hg.): International encyclopedia of human geography. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 76–81.

Faludi, Andreas (2012): Multi-Level (Territorial) Governance: Three Criticisms. In: Planning Theory & Practice 13 (2), S. 197–211.

Fricke, Carola (2016): Metropolitan Regions as a Changing Policy Concept in a Comparative Perspective. In: RuR (Online First), S. 1–15.

Geppert, A (2009): Polycentricity: can we make it happen? From a concept to its implementation, in: Urban Research & Practice, Vol. 2, No. 3, 251-268.

Hager, Gerd: Metropolitane Grenzregionen in Aktion: der IMeG. In: IzR (5), S. 559–564.

Kawka, Rupert; Staats, Jens-Uwe (2016): Metropolregionen und Bundesraumordnung. In: IzR (5), S. 535–541.MKRO – Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung (1995): Raumordnungspolitischer Handlungsrahmen: Beschluß der Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung. Bonn.

Louargant, Sophie (Hg.) (2013): Grenoble. Axe thematique regulations territoriales et metropoitaines. Rapport final (POPSU 2).

MKRO (1995): Raumordnungspolitischer Handlungsrahmen. Beschluß der Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung in Düsseldorf am 8. März 1995. Bonn.

Motte, Alain (Hg.) (2007): Les agglomérations françaises face aux défis métropolitains. Paris: Economica; Anthropos (Collection Villes).

Münter, Angelika; Wiechmann, Thorsten; Danielzyk, Rainer (2016): Polyzentrale Metropolregionen - Zur Einführung. In: Rainer Danielzyk, Angelika Münter und Thorsten Wiechmann (Hg.): Polyzentrale Metropolregionen. [1. Auflage]. Lemgo: Rohn (Planungswissenschaftliche Studien zu Raumordnung und Regionalentwicklung, 5), S. 10–44.

Pütz, Thomas (2016): Empirische Zusammenschau der europäischen Metropolregionen in Deutschland. In: IzR (5), S. 543–553.

Schmitt, Peter; van Well, Lisa (Hg.) (2016): Territorial governance across Europe. Pathways, practices and prospects. London, New York: Routledge (Routledge research in planning and urban design).

Volgmann, Kati (2013): Metropole. Bedeutung des Metropolenbegriffs und Messung von Metropolität im deutschen Städtesystem. Detmold: Rohn (Reihe Metropolis und Region des Stadt- und regionalwissenschaftlichen Forschungsnetzwerks Ruhr (SURF)).

Zimmermann, Karsten (2017): Re-Scaling of Metropolitan Governance in Germany. In: RuR (Online First), S. 1–11.