

Draft version_ to be improved

**DRAFT VERSION_ TO BE IMPROVED
COMPLEXITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP.
CONSIDERATIONS FROM AN ITALIAN CASE STUDY**

Camilla Ariani

Phd candidate, Dept. of Planning, Design, Technology of Architecture
Facoltà di Architettura, Università "La Sapienza" Roma_Sapienza University Rome (Italy)

Keywords: Public Private Partnership, Urban Regeneration, Italy

Since the 90's, urban projects based on partnerships between different kinds of stakeholders, both market or public-oriented, were spreading in the European Countries in order to face EU policies. In the current economic and financial context, these experiences are becoming more relevant than ever with their complexity, fuzziness and multiple-player nature. Therefore it seems now crucial to understand limits and possibilities of PPP's projects (notably about urban regeneration) and the issue of balancing contraction of public finances and private stakeholders' involvement.

In this framework, the paper presents investigations about the nature of each "P" involved in the process by the analysis of a case study in urban regeneration in Italy which has shown negatives features, especially considering the role played by the public administration. Particular attention has been paid to understand how the allocation of risks and responsibilities and the definition of the final purpose affected the final outputs and outcomes. The paper argues that PPPs need to be analysed beyond biased literature and useless generalization, setting up a sort of database of practical experiences, examined and classified also through the point of view of practitioners, in order to relate outcomes with institutional environment, typology of partnership, role of each stakeholder, relationship between public interest and private benefits.

1.What can't be cured must be endured? Observations about Public Private Partnership

Summary of the section

The term Public Private Partnership refers to a general approach to urban transformation, involving several policies, tools and devices. In the current frame defined by social and economic crisis, PPP's gain a less role both in governance mechanism review and in the production of new paradigms and operational tools in order to study, manage and intervene on urban transformations.

The urban transformations' background came under deep change, in the last decades, in Europe as in Italy, considering social, political and economics aspect.

It's possible to number among the expressions of change the spreading of policies and practices of urban regeneration based on a PPP's approach (Sagalyn, 2011, EC 2004). Nowadays more than ever is important to consider the occasion that drove, since the early 90's, the migration and diffusion of PPP's procedure, also linked to European policies aimed to reach stability of states through a limit in use of public assets.

The whole spectrum of PPP's practices is a new market up to, virtually; find a balance between the reduction of public finance, the need to renew collective services and of urban renewal and the incentives to private stakeholders. In a context of scarcity, both in public and private sector, PPP's could be read as a laboratory to investigate and change links and connections among different stakeholder with different interests and aims. In the meantime, there are several cases with negative outputs due to the lack of dialogue between actors or to the unclear purposes. Therefore it's crucial to understand if and how they could be successful and beget urban transformation and regeneration, towards a just city.

PPPs stay as a problematic topic, often analyzed from biased points of view, mostly because economic and financial issue. Is PPP only a way to extract money from the community or is it a way of reallocating risks and responsibilities? (Hildyard, 2014) Discussion on this tools has to be observed by different perspectives: on the one side we have PPP's as symbol of neoliberal city (allocating resources to private actors, privatization, selling-off of public goods), in a sort of ideologization of critical analysis upon an approach strongly interconnected with debate on economic and social aspect of contemporary cities (Le Galès, 1995; Sagalyn, 2011, Swingedow Moulart Rodriguez, 2002, Mirafteb2004). On the other side there are also several studies and handbooks describing PPP's as a

Draft version_ to be improved

miracle cure for infrastructures, services and urban transformations urbane (Hodge, Greve & Boardman 2010.)

PPP can be the place for dialogue as it can be the place of conflict; that's why; biased approach is confusing in the reading of such practices and, thereby, frustrates the improving of best practices in Public Private Partnership.

2. Research questions

Summary of the section

The first question of this research is about who takes the risks and for whose benefit, beyond the ideological position, in order to read the relationship between public and private interest without the lens of a supposed necessary dualism (Alexander 2001).

In a wider point of view, the interaction between public and private actors in urban transformation starts a lively and open debate, since it involve different discipline. The research of a new paradigm in the definition of PPP tools has to be supported by the research on the evolution of economic and politic paradigm, nowadays in the spotlight.

The power of each actor and stakeholder involved in Public Private Partnership is a crucial guideline to investigate how the process develops in planning and design phases in order to build different kinds of approach and definitions of public interest (which is supposed to be, anyway, the final aim of PPP's introduction)

In the current times, PPP tools, mainly in Italy, are in crisis, both considering the number and the value, because of the credit crunch after 2008 crisis, bad communication with local communities, and fuzzy definition of the final aims.

This work is part of a bigger research aimed to understand whether PPP could be a real opportunity for cooperation to create a synergy and more inclusive processes for urban regeneration, to be an exchange between different stakeholder, or, on the other side, if it's only a financial device to sell commons and public goods to private developers and investors.

3. European institutional environment and PPP regulations

Summary of the section:

Before taking into consideration concrete experiences that can put in evidence possible virtuous uses of the PPP, it is essential to consider either the directives and the community recommendation that favored the diffusion of the collaboration between public and private subjects from countries where that approach was already strengthened (such as United Kingdom and France) towards the other countries of EU.

In the past 25 years we observe a trend of reorganization of the public sector in various parts of the world. This phenomenon affects particularly the european countries, where, starting from Maastricht, the use of private and financial resources to optimize the realization or the management of infrastructure and supply of services have been made necessary.

Since the green book of PPP until the newer European directives, the European Union, supported the diffusion of subsidiarity in urban transformation. But at the same time, the isn't an unique definition and procedure for the Public Private Partnership in all the European countries; the role of the public stakeholder and the kind of private stakeholders differs from a country to another. So it's important to describe the institutional environment in which the investigated PPP take place.

Description of laws and procedure of PPP in Italy and comparison with other countries' laws and institutions which regulate and improve partnership between different actors

4. Urban transformation in Naples, an attempt of urban renaissance

Summary of the section

Short description of urban policies, urban marketing and urban transformation of Naples, related to the change in institutional framing (new role of the major and of local administration in Italy in the early 90's). Good and bad experiences

Large urban regeneration, new public transport and the network of intervention in the east of the city (Naplest).

5. The case of the “Centro direzionale” completion

Draft version_ to be improved

Summary of the section.

Centro Direzionale is a district in Naples mainly devoted to business and services, planned at first in 1964 and designed by the Japanese architect Kenzo Tange in the early 80'. The construction of the huge district, with some of the tallest building in the south of Italy, was interrupted half way. While a part of the project is completed and working, there is an empty or under-used area at the east, in a marginal and peripheric area of the urban conglomeration.

Description of the Project Financing proposed to fill the empty area, with a new project and new function (streets, park, schools, social and private housing, leisure and tourism infrastructures).

History of the project, since the early public proposals in 1999 until the starting of Project Finance initiative in 2004, which lasted until the final approval of project in 2011. At the end of this process, also due to long and difficult procedures (not fully regulated by the Italian Law at the time) and to critical partnership between public and private stakeholder, the construction of the new urban development haven't yet started, even if it's not officially abandoned.

In this part, the evolution of the agreements between public and private promoter of the whole operation is described also following the evolution of the urban design and of the actual project.

6.From synergy to compromise

Summary of the section

The development of the project financing, which was carried out during more than a decade, perverted and twisted the procedure of the public private partnerships. The core of the proposal had some point of interests : the private developer wanted to build private residential building to payback the costs of public works in the same area, so there was a gain in both part from the achievement of public interests (even for the economic purposes of the private stakeholder)

In this section we describe the causes of the deep changes in the project, connected to the weak leading role of the public administration (which changed during the year) and the role of the private stakeholder who was no more interested in creating a real reallocation of responsibilities and risk, but looked for the most convenient way to finalize the works.

7.Consideration about the role of public administration in PPP

Summary of the section

The output and outcomes of PPP operations, mainly in the urban regeneration program such as the one we are talking about, depend on the cooperation and togetherness of all the actors involved. While the role played by the private developer is to pursue its own interests (except for the third sector actor, whose role in PPP will be briefly investigated), it's up to the public administration and to the institutional stakeholder to coordinate the sum of the private interests and drive them through urban transformation. It's up to the public actors to go beyond the dichotomy between public and private. That's why it's important to investigate the role of public entities in the building of PPP in different countries, and short comparison between other experience of PPP in Italy (Civic Center of Scandicci, Florence, designed by Sir Richard Rogers) in France (Caserne de Bonne, Grenoble) and in Spain (Renewal project Ciutat Vella district), with a special focus on the role of public actors in the good quality of the physical outcome.

8.Conclusions

Summary of the section

The accountability and the strength of public administration is the key to read the urban transformation through Public Private Partnership. This section is going to explain how a weak institutional environment, also on the side of the law and of regulation, affect the output (or the lack of implementation) of PPP project. The lack of vision and of legal device to coordinate complex programs between the main reason why the public stakeholders lose the opportunity to create an innovative urban transformation.

9.References

- Alexander, E. R. (2001). Why planning vs. markets is an oxymoron: Asking the right question. *Planning and Markets*, 4(1), 1-8.

Draft version_ to be improved

- Codecasa, G. (a cura di). Governare il partenariato pubblico e privato nei progetti urbani. Maggioli Editore, 2010.
- Forester, J. (1999). The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes. Mit Press. Cambridge, MA
- Forester, J. (1999). The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes. Mit Press
- Hildyard N. Public-Private Partnerships, Financial Extraction and the Growing Wealth Gap. Presentazione al Manchester Business School, Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC) www.cresc.ac.uk 31 Luglio 2014
- Hodge, G. A., Greve, C., & Boardman, A. E. (Eds.). (2010). International Handbook on Public-Private Partnership. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Le Galès, P. (1995). Aspects idéologiques et politiques du partenariat public-privé. *Revue d'économie financière*, 51-63.
- Leone, V. (2012) Un cambio di passo necessario in Dedalo rivista bimestrale di assimpredil Ance, numero 31 maggio-giugno 2012, 18-21, http://portale.assimpredilance.it/files/dedalo/dedalo_31.pdf
- Mirafteb, F. (2004). Public-Private Partnerships The Trojan Horse of Neoliberal Development?. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(1), 89-101.
- Moroni, S. Andersson, D.E. (2015) Cities and private planning. Edward Elgar Publishing
- Palermo P.C. (2002), Apprendere da Urban: effetti immediati e incerti sviluppi di un'esperienza innovativa, in *Urbanistica*, n. 119.
- Partners4action network and Liverpool city council, Public Private Partnership in urban regeneration. A guide to opportunities and practice, 2006, retrieved on March 5th 2015 in <http://www.mdl.ro/urbactII/urbact/projects/partner4action/P4A-final.pdf>
- Perulli, P. (2012). Il dio Contratto: origine e istituzione della società contemporanea. Piccola biblioteca Einaudi.
- Pizzo, B (2013), Property rights and property wrongs. Il patrimonio pubblico e collettivo tra privatizzazione e riappropriazione. Riflessioni intorno ad alcune ipotesi di trasformazione di aree pubbliche o collettive a Roma, Atti della XVI Conferenza della SIU. PLANUM
- Pizzorno A. et al (2013) Competenza e rappresentanza, Donzelli editore, Roma
- Sagalyn, L. B. (2011). Public-Private Partnerships and Urban Governance: Coordinates and Policy issues. *Global Urbanization*, 191.
- Sagalyn, L. B. (2012). Public-private engagement: Promise and practice. *Planning Ideas That Matter: Livability, Territoriality, Governance, and Reflective Practice*
- Schultze, C. L. (1977). Public Use of Private Interest, *The. Regulation*, 1, 10.
- Summit Consulting Group, IISD report: Harnessing the power of Public-Private Partnership: the role of hybrid financing strategies in sustainable development, February 2012, retrieved on March 5th 2015 in http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2012/harnessing_ppp.pdf
- Swyngedouw, E., Moulaert, F., & Rodriguez, A. (2002). Neoliberal urbanization in Europe: large-scale urban development projects and the new urban policy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 542-577.
- Unioncamere- “Il partenariato Pubblico Privato e l’edilizia sostenibile in Italia nel 2013” , <http://www.infopieffe.it>
- Urbani P. (2007), Territorio e poteri emergenti. La politica di sviluppo tra urbanistica e mercato, Giappichelli, Torino

2 Conclusions

- International Transport Forum, 2010. Transport Outlook 2010: The potential for innovation. [online] Available at: <http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/Pub/pdf/10Outlook.pdf> [Accessed 2 September 2011].