

UFZ-Diskussionspapiere

Department of Urban and Environmental Sociology

3/2010

Governance in Santiago de Chile – Stakeholder Prospects for the Future

Corinna Hölzl, Henning Nuissl

April 2010

Governance in Santiago de Chile – Stakeholder Prospects for the Future

Corinna Hölzl and Henning Nuissl

Contact:

Corinna Hölzl
Helmholtz-Zentrum für Umweltforschung – UFZ
Dept. Stadt- und Umweltsoziologie
Permoserstr. 15
04313 Leipzig
Germany
Tel. ++ 49 341 235 2696
E-mail: corinna.hoelzl@ufz.de

Prof. Dr. Henning Nuissl
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Geography Department
Unter den Linden 6
10099 Berlin
Germany
Tel. ++ 49 30 2093 6811
E-mail: henning.nuissl@geo.hu-berlin.de

Acknowledgement:

This research was conducted as part of the Helmholtz-research initiative *Risk Habitat Megacity* and was supported by the Networking and Initiative Fund of the Helmholtz Association. We would like to thank Claudia Rodriguez Seeger for helpful comments and criticism as well as Benjamin Otto and Sunniva Greve for their support in preparing this discussion paper.

Content

Executive Summary	5
1 Introduction.....	6
2 Methodology.....	7
3 Framework conditions and challenges of urban governance in Santiago de Chile	8
3.1 Policy trends and urban development during the last 20 years	9
3.2 Major challenges for urban governance – past, present, future	11
3.3 Important fields of urban development in the future	14
4 Urban governance in Santiago – status quo	14
4.1 Important actors and their influence on urban governance	15
4.2 Planning instruments	18
4.3 Coordination of political decision-making processes	21
4.4 Public private partnerships	25
4.5 Citizen participation	26
5 Santiago in 2030.....	28
5.1 Future influence of different actors on urban development	28
5.2 Public private partnerships as governance arrangements for the future	32
5.3 Decentralization.....	33
5.4 Significant thematic lines for the future.....	37
6 Santiago in 2030 – desires and visions	38
7 Measures.....	39
8 Conclusion.....	42
9 References	43
10 Appendix.....	44

List of figures

Figure 1: Interviewed stakeholders	8
Figure 2 a-f: Impact assessment of policy trends on urban development in Santiago	10
Figure 3: Additional policy trends that have an impact on urban development in Santiago	11
Figure 4: Major challenges for urban governance in Santiago in the past, the present and the future	12
Figure 5: Additional major challenges for urban governance in Santiago	13
Figure 6: Actors with a major influence on urban governance in Santiago	15
Figure 7: “Increase in corporate citizenship in the future”.....	17
Figure 8: “More transparency and opportunities for participation will increase civic participation in urban development”	18
Figure 9: Importance of existing planning instruments in Santiago	19
Figure 10: Evaluation of vertical coordination of public policies in Santiago	21
Figure 11: Evaluation of horizontal coordination of public policies at different state levels in Santiago.....	22
Figure 12: Public private partnerships in different sectors in Santiago.....	25
Figure 13: “More transparency and opportunities for participation will increase citizen participation in urban development”.....	27
Figure 14: Change of influence of different actors on urban governance in Santiago in the next five to ten years	29
Figure 15: “Do you think the state will increase its influence in the future?” (answers per actor group)	30
Figure 16: Sectors where stakeholders in Santiago expect the number of public private partnerships to rise in the future (number of possible future PPPs mentioned in the online survey per sector).....	32
Figure 17: “One day Gran Santiago will have a mayor and a metropolitan government”	34
Figure 18 a-d: Opinions of stakeholders in Santiago on assumptions regarding future municipal governance	36
Figure 19: Visions of stakeholders in Santiago for the future	38

List of tables

Table 1: Urban development fields in Santiago according to the need for action in the future	14
Table 2: Thematic lines for the future of Santiago	37
Table 3: Measures to improve urban governance recommended by stakeholders in Santiago.....	41

List of abbreviations

AMS	Area Metropolitana de Santiago
CCHC	Cámara Chilena de la Construcción
CEPAL	Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean / ECLAC)
CONAMA	Comisión Nacional de Medio Ambiente
COREMA	Comisión Regional de Medio Ambiente
CORE	Consejo Regional
DIPLADE	División de Planificación y Desarrollo Regional
EDR	Estrategia de Desarrollo Regional
GORE	Gobierno Regional
FCM	Fondo Común Municipal
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LGUC	Ley General de Urbanismo y Construcciones
MIDEPLAN	Ministerio de Planificación
MINBienes	Ministerio de Bienes Nacionales
MINVU	Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo
MINTRANS	Ministerio de Transporte
MOP	Ministerio de Obras Públicas
NGO	Non governmental organization
PDUC	Proyectos de Desarrollo Urbano Condicionado
PNUD	Plan Nacional
PLADECO	Plan de Desarrollo Comunal
PPP	Public private partnership
PRC	Plan Regulador Comunal
PRDU	Plan Regional de Desarrollo Urbano
PRMS	Plan Regulador Metropolitano de Santiago
PROT	Plan Regional de Ordenamiento Territorial (PROT)
PTUS	Plan de Transporte Urbano de Santiago
RM	Región Metropolitana
RMS	Región Metropolitana de Santiago
SEREMI	Secretaría Regional Ministerial
WTO	World Trade Organization

Executive Summary

With the objective of promoting sustainable development in Santiago de Chile, this paper explores current challenges and possible future trends of urban governance from a local stakeholder point of view. Its empirical base is an online survey conducted among local stakeholders in spring 2009. It brings together the opinions of nearly fifty stakeholders from different sectors, e.g., political decision-makers, experts from the private sector, NGOs and universities. Data was also gathered in a focus - group discussion realized carried out with selected participants of from the survey. This data enables us to make assumptions about the urban development challenges Santiago is confronted with as well as upcoming governance processes. It furthermore allows us to critically reflect stakeholder perceptions of metropolitan development trends.

Urban governance in Santiago is first of all characterized by the fact that Chile is still a highly centralized country. Accordingly, the stakeholders who took part in our study are particularly concerned with the issue of decentralization and most of them call for a more determined delegation of competencies and tasks away from the national level to regional and local authorities. The development of citizen participation, another vital aspect, appears to be slow in Santiago and will need more encouragement and support if it is to flourish. With respect to more tangible, i.e., material, urban development challenges, the stakeholders we interviewed see the greatest demand for action in the fields of air protection, public transport and the provision of green areas.

Our study reveals that stakeholders in Santiago tend to perceive an overriding influence of the private sector on urban development, which they expect will largely persist in the future. This influence is frequently considered too strong. In addition, national state entities are also deemed singularly influential in the urban governance process, whereas the importance of other actors such as the regional government or civil society seems fairly limited. However, several participants in our study assume that certain public sector actors will gain in significance for urban development in the future, notably the municipalities and, to a lesser extent, GORE and CONAMA. With respect to the role of civil society, opinions are somewhat divided.

In terms of steering urban development processes, the participants in our study consider the way existing policy and planning instruments are used to be the problem rather than their availability or effectiveness. In addition, there are grave concerns about serious coordination deficits between the different authorities with a stake in urban development processes – with vertical coordination assessed as even more unsatisfactory than horizontal coordination. With regard to the interaction between public and private actors, the majority of participants in our study approves the potential role of public private partnerships. Only a few interviewees adopt a more critical attitude towards this governance arrangement and point to possible deficits in terms of transparency, participation, and concern for environmental and social issues.

All in all, our results seem to indicate that numerous stakeholders in Santiago expect state authorities to steer urban development processes more decidedly, to regulate land-use changes, and to open up opportunities for civic participation. Furthermore, many stakeholders are confident that public-private-partnership arrangements are a suitable means for future urban policies – if sufficient attention is paid to the question of how to avoid potential drawbacks, such as lack of transparency. At the same time there is a strong drive for improvement in the situation of regional and local authorities, although opinions differ on how to achieve this appropriately.

In order to generalize the main lines of argument that stakeholders in Santiago expect will shape future discourses on urban governance, we have identified six topics: *Business as usual*, *Urban sprawl*, *Neoliberalism*, *A polarized city*, *More state regulation*, and *Urbanism & Quality of Life*. Complementing these broad areas, the participants in our study explicate long-term visions and hopes for their city, as well as recommendations regarding future urban development strategies and policies. These will be presented at the end of this document.

1 Introduction

Santiago de Chile, as well as many other megacities, faces a wide range of challenges in urban development, such as the provision of housing and infrastructure services or the reduction of social vulnerability, air pollution and urban sprawl. At the same time, governing a metropolitan region like Santiago is a huge challenge, including the development of a common *Leitbild*, the enablement of citizen participation, the provision for transparency of decision-making processes, the equitable distribution of power within and between the state, the private sector and civil society, and the vertical and horizontal coordination of policies, to mention but some of the central aspects. These challenges, together with existing deficits of coordination between governance actors, call for adequate and innovative responses from urban and regional authorities and other stakeholders.

Successful governance of megacities and metropolitan regions is only possible on the basis of

- (a) publicly shared perceptions of current and future challenges,
- (b) realistic assumptions as to the causes, dynamics and trends of these challenges, including different and contradictory interests that often lie behind them,
- (c) knowledge about the scope for policies to intervene in the urban development process, and
- (d) the reflection by decision-makers and relevant actors on their own perspectives and world views (without such reflection incommensurable interpretations of urban development processes and challenges or individual blind spots and idiosyncrasies may impede carefully targeted governance strategies).

It is not possible to ascertain the extent to which these preconditions of successful governance are met in a given case simply by working with secondary literature, i.e., without the involvement of local stakeholders. Therefore, this report paper aims at exploring the current characteristics and future prospects of governance in Santiago de Chile through the eyes of the local stakeholders we interviewed in an online survey and a focused round-table discussion.

By looking at urban development and urban governance issues in Santiago from the point of view of 'typical' stakeholders, our empirical analysis aims to explore the trends and challenges of urban governance in Santiago as well as the typical opinions and expectations held and the conclusions drawn regarding these trends. It should be made very clear, however, that our study neither sought to produce scientific results on the future of Santiago nor to make representative statements on what the majority of stakeholders in Santiago thinks or desires. Yet, it does aim to identify key issues and trends, and the typical patterns of perception and viewpoints of professionals and activists concerned with the development of the Chilean capital.

As there are various notions and meanings of governance, it seems appropriate to start with a clarification of our understanding of the term governance. We adopt the term governance in a broad sense, covering various forms of decision-making on publicly relevant affairs proceeded by the state, the private sector and civil society. Furthermore, governance is understood as a strictly analytical concept without any normative meaning. This understanding of governance, however, interferes with the notion of governance held by many of the stakeholders we interviewed, which includes a mix of normative and descriptive elements. (The authors' notion of governance should not be confused with the governance concept of the interviewed stakeholders.)

The paper is structured in the following way: after a methodological section where we describe the methods used in our empirical study (Section 2), we turn to an analysis of the framework conditions and challenges of urban governance in Santiago de Chile (Section 3). We then present the status quo of governance issues in Santiago as perceived by the stakeholders we interviewed (Section 4). This marks the starting point for a summary of stakeholder opinions on future governance prospects in Santiago (Section 5). These opinions will be contrasted with stakeholder (normative) desires and visions in relation to governance in Santiago (Section 6). The last chapter deals with our empirical findings and provides some insight into the measures proposed by the interviewees regarding the future realization of their visions (Section 7). Finally, we summarize the findings and add our own interpretation of the stakeholders' opinions, thereby coming back to the aforementioned major preconditions for successful urban governance (Section 8).

2 Methodology

This report paper is based on an empirical study on governance issues in the Metropolitan Region of Santiago de Chile and basically employed two methods: an online survey among stakeholders in the field, which was conducted in early 2009; a focused round-table discussion with selected stakeholders in the field, which was likewise conducted in April 2009. The aim of these empirical endeavours was, on the one hand, to further insight into future governance processes and, on the other hand, to shed light on existing actor constellations and how different stakeholders perceive and conceptualize governance issues.

a) The majority of empirical findings presented in this report are based on an online survey that was conducted among local stakeholders in Santiago de Chile between January and March 2009.¹ It compiled the opinions of almost fifty stakeholders from different sectors, e.g., political decision-makers, scholars/scientists, stakeholders from the private sector and NGOs. The questionnaire asked stakeholders about their views on the following topics:

- 1) Major characteristics of urban governance in Santiago
- 2) Development path of urban governance in Santiago in the future
- 3) Challenges the city of Santiago faces in the future
- 4) Potential urban governance amendments in Santiago
- 5) Possible measures in the field of urban governance in Santiago

The questionnaire was designed as a mix of standardized and open questions, giving stakeholders the opportunity to elaborate on their opinions (cf. questionnaire in the Appendix). 170 stakeholders were invited to take part in the online survey via email, 49 of whom responded. This response rate of 28 per cent was far higher than expected initially.² Nevertheless, it should be noted that our results are not representative. The findings presented in the following are to be understood as an indication of the key issues and concerns of and opinions on urban governance in Santiago as derived from the statements of eminent people in the field but cannot be generalized for the entirety of stakeholders in Santiago (whatever the delineation of the entire stakeholder group may be).

Figure 1 gives an account of the institutional affiliation of the stakeholders that took part in the online survey (except for the seven respondents who did not reveal their professional context). Respondents come mainly from the public sector and from research and civil society, while stakeholders from the private sector participated to a lesser extent. In addition, stakeholders engaged at local level are somewhat underrepresented in the survey; this applies to the public sphere, with only two representatives of municipalities, as well as to the sphere of civil society, where only a few small NGOs or community organizations are represented. The comparatively low number of 'local' stakeholders and stakeholders from the private sector among the respondents should be taken into account when it comes to interpreting the results.³

Subsequent to the online survey, data was gathered by means of a focus group discussion conducted with selected stakeholders, partly participants in the survey. The composition of the group also covered the abovementioned sectors. Five stakeholders took part in the focus group discussion, two


¹ The online survey was conducted by the Governance working-group of the Risk Habitat Megacity project, a joint Chilean-German research initiative initiated by the Helmholtz Association, in cooperation with the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL) and the Regional Government (GORE) in Santiago de Chile. We express our gratitude to Claudia Rodriguez Seeger for her support and helpful comments throughout the process, Roland Verwiebe for his methodological advice, Anamaria Silva and Leslie Parraguez for reviewing the questionnaire, and Michael Lukas for supporting the focus group discussion.

² The response rate in online surveys usually varies between 5 and 40 per cent, depending on factors such as the topic of the study, the length of the questionnaire, the incentives offered etc. (Dillman 2007). The stakeholders were selected within the frame of comprehensive research (literature, Internet) and in consultation with scientific experts with the aim of covering all institutions and stakeholders relevant to the respective field of study (e.g., ministries, municipalities, regional entities, NGOs, private companies, universities). This may have provoked a somewhat subjective selection. However, bearing the qualitative character of the study in mind, it would have been neither possible nor useful to prepare a completely independent and objective sample.

³ For the quotation of statements made in the online survey, numbers are used to represent the respective interviewee. These are complemented with an indication of the question referred to in the respective statement (e.g., 35/7 stands for participant 35 / question 7).

of whom came from the public sector (the Regional Government – GORE) (A) and (B), two from the private sector (one a planning agency (C) and one from an architectural firm (D)), and one from civil society (representing an NGO / community organization) (E). Two representatives of the Helmholtz research initiative Risk Habitat Megacity moderated the discussion and took the minutes. The intention of the focus group discussion was to reflect and validate the results of the survey, and to further the understanding of particular issues through direct interaction with the stakeholders. The discussion consisted of two phases, firstly a brief input on the results of the survey and secondly a guide-based and moderated discussion on selected aspects.⁴

Figure 1: Interviewed stakeholders



The data gathered by means of the methods described was used in two ways. Firstly, as it mirrors the views of several stakeholders from different fields on likely developments and challenges Santiago faces in the future, this data enabled us to make plausible assumptions about upcoming issues of governance in Santiago. Secondly, we tried to reflect on the stakeholders’ own perception and interpretation of urban development and governance issues since the mindset of those who ‘make’ urban governance are as important a framework condition for future governance processes as are ‘real’ urban structures and development trends. We thus paid particular attention to the characteristics of metropolitan governance and policy-making in Santiago de Chile, the convergence of diverging expectations and interpretations with regard to urban development trends, and to future governance challenges and the remedies that might help to tackle them.

3 Framework conditions and challenges of urban governance in Santiago de Chile

Urban governance and urban policy-making take place within broader societal, economic and political framework conditions that largely define the scope for political action on the local level. Accordingly it is mainly these framework conditions that national urban policy should address in order to support development and governance processes at local level (since direct intervention by the state in local politics would contradict democratic principles, nor would it be feasible). In addition, the perception and evaluation of how these framework conditions impact on urban development by regional and local stakeholders has a strong influence on the respective stakeholders’ activities and policies.

⁴ For the quotation of statements from the focus group discussion, letters are used to represent the respective participant and her or his institutional background.

3.1 Policy trends and urban development during the last 20 years

Respondents were asked in the stakeholder survey to assess whether and, if so, how (i.e., positive or negative) specific policy trends in Chile and worldwide political change had impacted on general urban development in Santiago de Chile (see Figure 2).

Figure 2 conveys an ambiguous picture. The interviewed stakeholders have a variety of opinions on how recent national policy trends have influenced the development of Santiago. While stakeholder views diverge strongly with respect to some national policy fields (privatization of state enterprises; reforms of social security systems) and globalization trends (liberalization of world trade) – possibly the effect of their respective political orientation – their evaluation of other policy fields is less contradictory.

Most respondents judge the recent economic deregulation negatively but a majority sees positive effects for urban development in the pronounced export orientation of the Chilean economy. As both trends are cornerstones of the (neoliberal) national economic policy (whereby the second is more or less the opposite side of the coin of the first), this outcome is surprising. One possible explanation of this somewhat ambiguous result could be that the term “export orientation” elicits positive connotations after the failure of the import substitution policies that almost all Latin American countries had adopted by the mid-twentieth century. However, it would need further inquiry to uncover why deregulation and the export orientation of the economy are assessed differently.

On the subject of decentralization, the result is also fairly clear. A considerable share of respondents welcomes decentralization as a trend with at least moderate positive impacts. However, an even greater number are unable to see any impact of decentralization on urban development. We interpret this as an indication that, on the one hand, there is broad agreement on the desirability of decentralization of state power; on the other hand, however, the degree of decentralization that has been achieved in Chile up to now is deemed insufficient by many. This interpretation will find further support in the following section (3.2) and is also corroborated by some of the comments made on this question, as for instance:

“No ha existido en realidad una descentralización del estado. También hay una tendencia a generar responsabilidades temáticas de los organismos públicos más que territoriales lo que ha generado dificultades en la coordinación de los distintos aspectos que influyen en el desarrollo urbano.” (74/2.1)


In addition to their judgement on the policy trends specified in Figure 2, the respondents identified several other trends and issues as having had a major impact on Santiago’s urban development in the recent past.⁵ It is noteworthy that most of these were aspects they had already judged as negative. Figure 3 presents an evaluation of the additional aspects; the categories named in the first column were created by aggregating the additional policy trends and issues mentioned to (‘meta-’) categories on the basis of qualitative content analysis.

Deregulation of land-use planning and public urban policies – corresponding to economic deregulation – seems to be a major concern among Santiago’s stakeholders. Additionally, a couple of respondents complained about the negative influence of land speculation on urban development. Thus, it is apparent that many perceive the scope for regulative intervention in urban development processes as unsatisfactory. This view is complemented by the fact that there are quite a few stakeholders who criticize the role generally accorded to the private sector in urban development as too significant; who hint at aspects of institutional weakness of the state sector; who disapprove of the (‘insufficient’) level of citizen participation achieved up to now; or who comment on instances of bad performance of spatial planning and environmental policy.


⁵ The questionnaire was designed in such a way that many questions gave the respondents the opportunity to add additional items to a given list of keywords as well as to make a general comment on the issue dealt with in the respective question. In most cases respondents made ample use of these possibilities.

Figure 2 a-f: Impact assessment of policy trends on urban development in Santiago


a) Privatization of state enterprises




b) Economical deregulation




c) Reforms of social security systems




d) Decentralization



e) Liberalization of world trade



f) Export-oriented economy



N = 48


Other issues that elicited – mainly critical – comments by a number of respondents concern current trends in social or urban development, i.e., the outcome of public sector action and governance. These are (national) social housing (the poor quality and spatial distribution of which is under attack although the housing policy has contributed considerably to making squatting and informal housing an aspect of minor importance in Santiago); the proliferation of settlement structures at and beyond the urban fringes; the growing gap between the social strata in Chile as a whole. Many other issues and trends with a potential impact on urban development were mentioned only once or twice in the survey:

- with respect to public sector performance, among other things: the inclination to employ public private partnerships as a major planning tool, and corruption;
- with respect to general development trends: the slowing down of population growth, technological progress, income increases, and the growing traffic volume.

On the whole the picture that emerges from the respondents' answers and statements gives a clear indication that economic policies have shaped Santiago's recent development, whereas activities in

other policy fields were less influential. This is particularly true of the attempts to vest regional and local authorities with more powers.

Figure 3: Additional policy trends that have an impact on urban development in Santiago



3.2 Major challenges for urban governance – past, present, future


The stakeholder survey questionnaire invited respondents to judge the significance of seven major challenges to urban development in the past, the present and in the future. Figure 4 presents the mean values obtained from the answers to the respective questions.

It is remarkable that all governance challenges mentioned in the questionnaire are considered important by the respondents and, indeed, expected to remain so. There are only two exceptions to this observation. Firstly, most respondents anticipate a decline in the importance of privatization policies in the future. This observation probably reflects the fact that privatization of public entities and infrastructure has progressed considerably in Chile. Secondly, corruption appears to have been of only moderate importance in the past; more recently the perception of this issue has apparently changed and corruption is increasingly seen as a burden to public sector performance.

Most salient, however, is the respondents' strong emphasis on decentralization as a major policy task in the future. This is another clear sign that past and present decentralization policies are deemed a failure, making decentralization an even more pressing challenge than before. Correspondingly, the general increase in the influence of state sectors as well as fiscal reforms rank high on the respondents' scale of relevance in terms of the most vital governance tasks. On the whole, these results once more convey the general impression that stakeholders in Santiago perceive the need for more decided reforms of the state sector (also evident from many of the additional comments respondents made in the survey; see Figure 5).

Regarding the challenges of democratization (after the return to democracy in 1990) and participation, the shifts in importance perceived by the respondents are less pronounced. With respect to democratization, however, it is worth noting that it is still considered a relevant issue.

Figure 4: Major challenges for urban governance in Santiago in the past, the present and the future




In addition to their assessment of the relevance of predefined challenges, the respondents mentioned other challenges for urban governance (either explicitly or implicitly via their comments). In Figure 5 we aggregated these additional challenges to a set of “meta-aspects”, i.e., generalized challenges. The most important part of this figure is therefore the centre column, which contains the result of our interpretative (i.e., ‘hermeneutic’) effort to identify the major (additional) governance challenges as perceived by the interviewed stakeholders. The first column indicates the total number of respondents who mentioned the respective aspect. The last column indicates how many respondents conceived of the respective aspect as a past, current, or future challenge (and therefore includes only statements where respondents attributed the aspect concerned to a time horizon). A couple of challenges mentioned in Figure 5 correspond directly to (i.e., deepen) one of the “pre-defined” challenges shown in Figure 4 (as indicated in *italics*).

By and large, the picture conjured up by Figure 5 bolsters the interpretation of Figure 4 as a considerable amount of urban governance challenges mentioned by the respondents concern the layout and functioning of the state sector (Nos. 1 - 5 in Figure 5). There seems to be a strong desire among stakeholders in Santiago for a political system that is both more powerful in implementing public policy goals and more decentralized, without infringing on the achievements of recent democratic developments. One of the comments made in the online survey gives a concise summary of what many stakeholders apparently deem a political priority against this background:

“En el futuro la descentralización efectiva del estado debe traducirse en una real y efectiva distribución de poder hacia los gobierno locales comunales y regionales. Un país que resuelve sus problemas centralmente está destinado a la macrocefalia y anquilozamiento de la gestión pública generando insatisfacción de las necesidades de la ciudadanía. Un gobierno realmente descentralizado se moderniza y construye desde las bases las soluciones que necesita la ciudadnía en forma participativa y transparente y oportuna.” (68/2.5)

The next group of perceived governance challenges (Nos. 6 - 8) concerns the question of how to cope with the private sector and its substantial influence on politics and policy-making. However, while a majority of those who mention this aspect call for the public sector to recapture more weight in public affairs (i.e., a pushing back of the extensive influence of the economy), several voices hint at the importance of safeguarding economic growth as a major goal of governance.

Figure 5: Additional major challenges for urban governance in Santiago



Another set of aspects mentioned in the survey (Nos. 9 - 12) relates to the appropriate mode of governance. While some comments merely contend that more, i.e., more effective, spatial planning is necessary to ensure a balanced and sustainable urban development, there are numerous comments containing 'suitable' strategies and 'effective' instruments of urban policy and planning. In particular, a strong claim is made by some interviewees for a more integrated urban planning and policy-making that would commit itself to a common vision for the future of the city, which – according to the statements of two more respondents – should focus primarily on quality of life for the urban population. One statement argues that urban policy in Santiago should, now that basic services (tenure, access to drinking water etc.) are provided to the vast majority of the urban population, profoundly shift its focus away from 'quantity' towards 'quality issues':

"En muchos ámbitos del desarrollo o de las políticas públicas, se ha optado por privilegiar la cantidad, la cobertura (cobertura de electrificación, cobertura educacional, entre otros). Hoy en día y cada vez más en el futuro, se deberá dar más relevancia a la calidad en la provisión de servicios y en las políticas en general." (27/2.5)














In addition, some statements call for urban governance mechanisms that ensure development externalities are paid for by the developers; others demand a more professional, i.e., scientifically based, form of urban policy and urban planning.

Finally, the respondents allude to a multitude of specific urban policy goals to be achieved in particular policy fields (e.g., the provision of social housing, urban green space, a clean environment or affordable public transport). While these concrete goals are not precisely the kind of governance challenges we had in mind when drawing up the questionnaire, their mention here is nevertheless instructive as it clearly reflects what appear to be pressing issues from the stakeholders' perspective.⁶

3.3 Important fields of urban development in the future

The participants in the stakeholder survey were asked to judge the urgency of action in a number of urban development fields. Their priorities concerning this issue are reflected in Table 1.

Table 1: Urban development fields in Santiago according to the need for action in the future

Ranking	Urban development field *	Share of respondents who perceive a "high need for action" in the respective field**	Mean: 1 - 4
1	Air protection		94% 3,96
2	Provision of public transports		87% 3,89
3	Provision of green areas		83% 3,83
4	Waste management		70% 3,70
5	Construction of social housing		67% 3,64
6	Energy supply		66% 3,58
7	Promotion of renewable energies		63% 3,58
8	Management of informal settlements		60% 3,40
9	Urban security / Crime reduction		50% 3,33
10	Wastewater treatment		44% 3,28
11	Water provision		53% 3,21
12	Development of land for urbanization		46% 3,04
13	Road construction		17% 2,58

* Closed question. ** Response categories: 1 = "no need for action", 2 = "some need for action", 3 = "need for action", 4 = "high need for action". N = 46

According to the respondents of the online survey, air protection, public transport and the provision of green areas are the three urban development fields with the highest need for action. These issues were ranked top priority by between 83 % and 94 % of the interviewees (see Table 1). Additional comments by participants in the survey revealed that with regard to public transport the pricing system and structure of the network were seen as major problems. There are also fields of urban development where respondents do not perceive an increased need for action. This is especially the case with road construction. Only 17 % of respondents deem it particularly important to invest in the building of more roads. Likewise, investment in the development of land for urbanization, water provision or wastewater treatment also seems less urgent and can be interpreted as a reflection of the progress in the fields in question in Santiago.

Besides, the stakeholders also named other fields that required action. These include (1) governance related issues, particularly citizen participation, democratization and decentralization; (2) education and jobs; (3) social integration; (4) public space (key aspects: parks, security, revalorization).

4 Urban governance in Santiago – status quo

After the preceding overview of framework conditions and governance challenges we will now discuss the status quo of urban governance in Santiago in more detail. Resting on the information and data we gathered from our respondents and interview partners, we highlight the role of key actors, the most salient planning instruments, the problem of horizontal and vertical coordination in decision-making processes, the issue of public private partnerships (PPP), and the opportunities for citizen participation in Santiago.

⁶ In the online questionnaire another question was dedicated to the concrete issues and challenges of urban development, the answers to which will be interpreted in the next section.

4.1 Important actors and their influence on urban governance


Figure 6 contains the actors or actor groups that respondents of our online survey say have the strongest influence on urban governance in Santiago. The figure is based on an open question which invited the interviewees to name and rank the three actors they deem most influential with regard to urban governance. A simple weighted additive index was generated by assigning an actor a value of 3 if he or she was mentioned as the most important actor, a value of 2 if he or she was mentioned as the second most important actor and a value of 1 if he or she was ranked third.

First of all, it is striking that the interviewees' assessment of the importance of various actors in the governance process largely converges. Then, although a direct comparison of the influence the interviewees accord different actor groups is not possible because some of the categories chosen are more comprehensive than others, there are clearly a few actors, i.e., actor groups, that are deemed particularly important. These are in particular the real estate developers and the private sector in general. The relevance of certain individual actors is emphasized:

"Pienso que la Cámara Chilena de la Construcción ha tenido un peso excesivo en la toma de decisiones de Gestión urbana y en las políticas del MOP y MINVU." (20/3.2)

The influence of public sector actors, such as the Ministry of Housing and Urbanism (MINVU), the municipalities of the Metropolitan Area of Santiago and the Central State, is assessed as being somewhat weaker. Noticeably and in contrast to our own expectations the influence of the MINVU is not only very high but also preponderates that of the Ministry of Public Works (MOP). However, the focus group discussion showed that the influence of the MOP might be equally strong but seems to be less visible, since this ministry's influence is apparently based on strong links to the private sector.

Figure 6: Actors with a major influence on urban governance in Santiago



N = 50 (weighted additive index)

Apart from these two ministries, the Ministry of Transport and Telecommunication (MINTRANS), the Ministry of National Goods (MINBienes) and the future Ministry of Energy, the introduction of which is currently being planned, were also mentioned explicitly. Together with the Regional Secretaries of the different Ministries (SEREMIs), they were summarized in the category "Other Ministries and Regional Secretaries". By and large, data from the online survey conveys the impression that these institutions have little influence on urban governance in Santiago. One interviewee pointed out that ministerial capacities are highly dependent on the policies of the respective government. Thus, although the power of certain ministries is quite appreciable at the moment from this interviewee's point of view,

changing governments render the future unforeseeable. In this vein several stakeholders criticized that the topic of transport does not gain the attention it deserves:

“No se está tomando en cuenta el transporte, que es un actor central, pues se ve influido por las malas políticas de gestión urbana, y con ello genera externalidades negativas fuertes, tales como congestión y contaminación.” (55/3.2)

The influence of the Regional Government (GORE) is considered low. Both in the online survey and in the focus group, stakeholders agreed for the most part that at present GORE plays only a minor role in urban governance. One participant of the focus group claimed, for instance, that in spite of the fact that GORE strives for greater influence and presence in the realization of several revitalization projects in cooperation with the SEREMI MINVU in the *barrios* Mapocho and Quinta Normal, it failed to increase its visibility to any significant degree:

“Yo creo que lo que le falta al gobierno regional, es un plan de comunicación, (...) estamos trabajando de manera conjunta con la SEREMI MINVU en 3 proyectos de recuperación, (...) uno es el sector del barrio Mapocho, otro es Quinta Normal y también hay un plan de recuperación más micro (...).” (B)

GORE has recently become responsible for the development of the *Plan Regional de Ordenamiento Territorial* (PROT), which is not a binding planning instrument but, as an indicative planning tool, could stimulate spatial development processes in the Metropolitan Region. Although its responsibility for PROT has not yet been finally settled, the GORE representatives who took part in the online survey saw this as a first step towards increasing the importance of government at the regional level – as can be seen from the following quotation:

“Pero de alguna forma, nosotros tenemos que hacernos cargo de un plan que siendo indicativo, también genere los procesos, también desencadene cosas por ejemplo como los malls, que uno orienta la inversión para allá y genera dinámicas de procesos del territorio que están más definidos, que puedan generar presiones para que las zonas industriales que están más deprimidas a lo mejor puedan cambiarlas y podamos aprovecharlas.” (A)

The attitude of the respondents towards GORE is divided. On the one hand, we found stakeholders who voiced strong criticism of the institution and, on the other hand, vigorously demanded democratization at the regional level. One stakeholder questions GORE's competencies by calling it „una entidad bastante frívola” (62/5.1); another cannot see the use of GORE, while two other stakeholders admit to not knowing GORE at all, let alone its agenda.

“Todo lo que hemos visto en gestion urbana no tiene que ver con administracion regional, calidad de vida, descentralizacion, mejoramiento de las condiciones sociales y/o ambientales. Lo que vemos es una gestion basada en la inmediatez para solucionar los problemas de un gobierno central y mantener el poder” (75/5.1)

This quotation leads to another issue. There seems to be a degree of concern about the somewhat ambiguous role of the head of the regional government, the *Intendente*, who is appointed by the central government. Hence it is never quite clear to the stakeholders in Santiago whether they should perceive of the *Intendente* as a representative of the central or the regional government. Accordingly, some stakeholders advocate for the democratization of GORE and a mayor for the Metropolitan Region, with both institutions directly elected by the citizens. However, although democratization and greater decentralization seem to be important goals for a considerable number of the stakeholders we interviewed, only very few made a statement as to how this could be realized in practice.⁷

With regard to the local level, it is noteworthy that many respondents of the online survey perceive the municipalities as having a sizable influence. This contradicts both the point of view of a number of other respondents as well as parts of the academic literature on urban development in Santiago, which claims that the municipal scope for action is heavily restricted by Chilean's “light decentralization” (cf. Siavelis et al. 2002).

⁷ There is a new law for the direct election of „consejeros regionales” (Ley 20.390, 28/10/2009).


Finally, the interviewees in the online survey see only a limited importance of civil society, universities and, surprisingly, even politicians in the process of urban governance. However, it is possible that the latter were rarely mentioned as influential players because they exert their influence through other public sector actors such as the ministries, i.e., the executive. Concerning the role of civil society, i.e., the citizens, in urban governance in Santiago, one stakeholder expresses a rather pessimistic view:

“Creo que la ciudadanía es el actor ausente y no escuchado por las autoridades que las ONGs pierden fuerza y que el sector académico cada vez está mas cooptado por el sector empresarial.” (75/3.2)

To conclude, stakeholders in Santiago tend to perceive private sector actors as the most influential group in urban governance. Therefore, in the following we present the data we obtained in the online survey from a few more detailed questions dealing with the particular role of the private sector in the governance of Santiago. Among others we asked the participants in the survey for a normative statement on the influence of the private sector on urban development on a four-level scale from “1 = too little” to “4 = too high”. The result is strikingly unambiguous: at 33 out of 46 stakeholders who answered the question, the majority of respondents (~72 %) considers private sector influence too strong (level 4). A further 11 stakeholders share this opinion but choose level 3, to be understood as “the private sector influence is a bit too high”. Only two interviewees wanted to see a more powerful private sector.

As Chile’s largely neoliberal policies of the recent decades entail few instruments of redistribution, we were also interested in whether and to what degree the private sector takes social responsibility. Figure 7 presents the results of the respective question. It indicates that the stakeholders have divergent opinions regarding the corporate citizenships of private firms in the future. While almost half of the respondents agree with the assumption of increasing corporate citizenship, the other half does not believe that the social responsibility of private companies will rise. Hence, it remains an open question whether or not an increase in social entrepreneurs can be expected in the future.


Figure 7: “Increase in corporate citizenship in the future”



N = 45

We also wanted to know what the stakeholders expect to be the reaction of the – apparently paramount – influence of the private sector (see Figure 8). More than half of them agreed with the assumption that a strong opposition to the influence of the private sector on urban development will develop in the future.

Figure 8: “More transparency and opportunities for participation will increase civic participation in urban development”



Summing up, the respondents of the online survey have surprisingly converging views on who the most influential urban governance actors are in Santiago. They stated the strong influence of the private sector and, along with this, especially the national state entities in the public sector. In addition to this general assessment, numerous respondents named specific public and private actors whom they regarded as exceptionally influential, in particular two ministries, the MOP and the MINVU, on the one hand, and real estate developers, the CCHC or infrastructure firms, on the other. The results also show that the majority of interviewed stakeholders criticizes the influence of private actors on urban governance as too high. The importance of other actors in governance processes seems fairly limited. Regarding the regional government (GORE) and civil society actors, however, at least some interviewees expect these actors to increase their influence in the future.


4.2 Planning instruments

Figure 9 provides an overview on how the respondents to the online survey estimated the importance of a set of central urban planning and policy-making instruments in Santiago. The different instruments were arranged according to how relevant they appear to the interviewed stakeholders.

In addition to their judgement on these predefined planning instruments, respondents of the online survey added further planning tools/aspects that they consider crucial to shaping the future of Santiago.⁸

⁸ In addition to the plans in Figure 9, the respondents mentioned the following plans and programmes: (i) Planes de desarrollo estratégico espacio público; (ii) Planes de desarrollo estratégico patrimonial; (iii) Planes de desarrollo estratégico medio ambiental; (iv) Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental; (v) Plan de Prevención y Descontaminación Atmosférica (PPDA) (3); (vi) Plan Maestro de Disposición de Residuos; (vii) Plan Maestro de Aguas Lluvias Metropolitano (2); (viii) Plan Maestro de Ciclovías; (ix) Plan de manejo de quebradas precordilleranas; (x) Planificación de áreas verdes; (xi) Protección de cuencas; (xii) Anteproyecto Regional de Inversiones (ARI); (xiii) Programa Público de Inversión Regional (PROPIR); (xiv) Políticas Públicas Regionales; (xv) Corporaciones municipales; (xvi) Chile Emprende (<http://www.chilemprende.cl/index.jsp?txtipo=1>); (xvii) Digitalización de los procesos.

Figure 9: Importance of existing planning instruments in Santiago
Instruments



N = 43

The *Plan Regulador Metropolitano de Santiago* (PRMS), which is the principal normative planning instrument that regulates the physical development of urban and rural areas in the Metropolitan Region, is regarded as the most important plan by the interviewees. More than 30 of them awarded this plan "high importance". The *Plan de Transporte Urbano de Santiago* (PTUS) and the *Plan Regulador Comunal* (PRC) are the normative planning instruments at local level. They were also evaluated as very important. Indicative instruments at national, regional and local levels were

mentioned by the interviewees, too (*Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano, PROT, EDR, Política Nacional de Desarrollo Regional, PLADECO, Plan Seccional, Límite Urbano, Quiero mi Barrio and Santiago Amable*), but considered less relevant than the “hard plans” that include binding guidelines.⁹

Both in the online survey and in the focus group discussion, the effectiveness of existing planning instruments was criticized. Many stakeholders mentioned that these instruments are rarely used and that some are even unusable. In this sense, one respondent stated:

“Estas herramientas de ordenamiento han demostrado existir sólo en el papel y de ahí que no las considere importantes. La ciudad evoluciona en torno a iniciativas puntuales de algunos políticos bien posicionados y de empresas. Los planes no son reales ni pretenden ser respetados.” (61/8)

By and large, the respondents did not consider the content of the various instruments a problem but rather the way these instruments come into being. In particular they often miss an adequate degree of citizen participation in the course of developing plans and programmes – as reflected in the following statement on the typical method of elaborating municipal land-use plans:

“Así ha sido con los planes reguladores, donde en algunas comunas hubo una participación muy significativa, pero sin embargo, el MINVU comenzó a utilizar el mecanismo de los conjuntos (des)armónicos para burlarse de las normas y limitaciones logrados por los ciudadanos en los procesos participativos de los planes reguladores. Todo para que las empresas inmobiliarias puedan sacar todo lo que quieran de la ciudad, dejando una tremenda destrucción de tejidos urbanos y sociales.” (34/8)

Regarding the implementation of plans, there seems to be a lack of rules to be observed in the execution of planning regulations at the local level in general and for certain issues such as green areas or the street network in particular. Some respondents complained that planning instruments are not respected in Chile. In the focus group discussion, several stakeholders even argued that governance – in the sense of political and institutional guidance – is non-existent in Chile:

“En Chile la gestión urbana no existe, hay una confianza en los instrumentos, creen que a través de instrumentos se va a llegar a la calidad urbana, y la calidad urbana no es planificable, se gestiona, administra y diseña, entiende, por eso te digo que la palabra gestión es una palabra bastante importante, y que por lo tanto yo bajo esa perspectiva en mi opinión es que no hay.” (D)

Some of the stakeholders who took part in the online survey or the focus group discussion demanded the implementation of a test system that allows for evaluation of the social, technical and economic impacts of investments. According to one of the stakeholders, however, such a test system could only work if the state provided a sound prognosis of future urban developments.

Coordination is another crucial aspect participants in our empirical studies emphasized. The malfunctioning of sectoral policies within the framework of the *Quiero mi Barrio* programme is one example they gave for the lack of coordination in planning and urban policy-making. This programme began with the best intentions and included a number of promising planning instruments. Currently it is likely to fail, however, because the individual means and instruments to be implemented in the course of *Quiero mi Barrio* have not been sufficiently adapted to each other. As a result of experiences like these some stakeholders claim they are contemplating the development of integrated regional and municipal plans in the near future:

“La idea de contar con un PROT es fundamental pero más fundamental es tener ese concepto desarrollado a escala intercomunal y por tanto mejorar el PRMS y tener el PROT a nivel comunal, sino no se logran los cambios a nivel de proyectos. El ejemplo del OTAS [Programa de Ordenamiento Territorial/UCHILE] logró metodológicamente mostrar lo importante de una visión regional de los usos del territorio y las recomendaciones desde el punto de vista de la sustentabilidad del sistema pero se requiere desarrollar ahora el PROT a todas las escalas no sólo a escala regional.” (108/8)

⁹ Given the comparatively low number of respondents from civil society, however, “soft programmes” like *Quiero mi Barrio* would probably have been ranked more important if the composition of interviewees had been different.


The answers and statements made by private sector stakeholders in the online survey and the focus group discussion differ to some extent from those of the other stakeholders as they rarely articulate critique and see less need for action. They reject reproaches of being complicit in undemocratic planning and unsustainable development, and do not seem to feel responsible for what goes wrong in urban development. The following statement of a private sector stakeholder is typical:

“Por encima - verdaderamente – de intereses particulares creo firmemente que los constructores lo que hacen es suplir la demanda y lo hacen donde las regulaciones se lo permite. Considerar que son los vulneradores es un error profundo.” (41/8)

4.3 Coordination of political decision-making processes

Countless studies have made it clear that both vertical and horizontal coordination (i.e., the coordination and collaboration of actors representing different policy-making sectors as well as actors from different policy-making levels) is crucial to the success of urban governance. In order to establish the attitudes of stakeholders in Santiago towards the issue of coordination, interviewees in the online survey were asked to evaluate vertical and horizontal coordination in Santiago on a scale from “very bad” to “very good” (Figures 10 and 11) and to give their general opinion on the challenges of coordination.

Figure 10: Evaluation of vertical coordination of public policies in Santiago




All in all, coordination issues at all levels are evaluated negatively by most of the participants in our study, with vertical coordination considered even worse than horizontal coordination:

“Ante el desafío de lograr una gestión integrada, es vital que esta coordinación vertical y horizontal se manifieste realmente y no quede en meras declaraciones de intención.” (50/7)

In particular stakeholders criticized the processes of coordination and/or gave recommendations on how to improve the current situation. The following paragraphs highlight the coordination problems and possible solutions from the point of view of the stakeholders.

Figure 11: Evaluation of horizontal coordination of public policies at different state levels in Santiago



The role of the state and the quest for more decentralization

The following citation circumstantiates this critique, emphasizing the fact that too many decision-makers want to maintain their power:

“Un problema principal es la descoordinación del aparato público. Un monstruo de muchas cabezas y celosos de sus prerrogativas. El caso de lo medio ambiental y vial es patético.” (62/3.2)

Some stakeholders stress the need for state reform as a precondition for successful coordination and even more demand a common *Leitbild* for the Metropolitan Area. In their view, this joint vision calls for mid- or even long-term guidelines, as well as explicit goal settings that emphasize quality of life and welfare issues rather than political rationale.

“El mayor desafío es lograr acciones con visión de territorio, evitando la “sobre-intervención” descoordinada. La operación de mucho programas y proyectos no se vincula con la intencionalidad política en lo vertical y en lo horizontal no se dialoga con quienes trabajan en el mismo territorio.” (20/7)

With regard to horizontal coordination many of the online survey participants demand mutual adaptation of partial interests (e.g., in terms of land-use) and an integrated treatment of challenges, such as segregation and poverty, thereby calling for intersectoral coordination. In this context, a number of stakeholders see an urgent need not only for citizen participation but also that of the private sector. The following quotation illustrates that Chile’s pronounced centralization is considered a key reason for the lack of horizontal cooperation at the regional level:

“En términos horizontales, existe poco interés y compromiso de trabajo intersectorial, básicamente porque los SEREMI sienten mayor compromiso con la autoridad ministerial que con las autoridades regionales.” (35/7)

Concerning the vertical level of coordination, some participants complained of insufficient decentralization throughout Chile, thereby partly referring to the military dictatorship:

“[Hay que] abandonar las estructuras verticales autoritarias del periodo de la dictadura.” (92/7)

By and large, our results indicate a strong quest for a more determined delegation of competencies and tasks from the national level to the regions and municipalities, and thus a general strengthening of sub-national levels of public authority. In more detail, the participants in our study suggest meeting the challenges of (a) improving coordination between ministries and regional secretaries, (b)

generally reducing bureaucracy, (c) vesting the metropolitan authority with adequate autonomy and decision-making power, and (d) strengthening policy-making at local level by introducing a series of measures that include the transfer of greater competencies and budgetary resources to the municipalities, the provision of local authorities with the information they need to raise their voices on metropolitan development issues, the capacity-building of local authorities through staff education programmes. In this context several stakeholders suggest the introduction of regulations to facilitate the engagement of local authorities in urban development issues on a regional scale. These should clearly define the discretionary powers of the municipalities, provide for fair negotiations between the various authorities and support intermunicipal cooperation.

One stakeholder suggests boosting the horizontal coordination of public authorities by introducing some kind of mediation process in order to overcome established negotiation practices and deadlocks. Yet another stakeholder proposes intensifying cooperation between the municipalities by focusing on a number of selected topics. As examples, he mentions possible joint activities between GORE and the Metropolitan Regions' municipalities on the mitigation of air pollution or on disaster protection as well as the synergetic potential of intermunicipal cooperation in implementing revitalization programmes. This cooperation should be organized as an association of communes. The focus group discussion showed that progress with the described cooperation forms has already been made.

On the whole our results clearly reveal a distinct lack of stakeholder trust in the state. For the most part stakeholders criticize the (ongoing) predominance of political interests as against directing policies towards practical issues and thematic goals. It is also indicative that all of the interviewed – from private to political and scientific stakeholders – excoriate this topic. Of course, Santiago de Chile is not the only city that faces inadequate vertical and horizontal coordination of public policies. Other megacities or vast agglomerations are characterized by extensive shortcomings in this respect as well (see, for instance, Siemens AG 2008).

The role of the regional government – opportunities and limits

In many of their statements the participants in our study reflect that the regional government, GORE, plays a crucial role in enhancing the level of coordination between public authorities (as well as with the private sector and civil society) in the region. However, opinions are mixed on how GORE could be enabled to promote coordination. For instance, one stakeholder makes very clear that only the national state is in a position to enforce genuine coordination and cooperation between authorities. Another emphasizes that GORE's influence would first have to increase before it embarked on a path of enhancing cooperation in and democratization of the public sector. This point was also reflected in the focus group discussion:

“Lo que nosotros percibimos desde afuera es la ausencia de una instancia que gobierna el gobierno regional (...) lo que se ha ido consolidando de a poco en la intendencia y el gobierno regional es justamente esa capacidad que nosotros lo estimamos que es un esfuerzo muy importante que (...)lo antes posible hay que democratizarlo, pero significa que va a haber (...)una capacidad ya desarrollada, ya instalada en ustedes. Y creo que el futuro de Santiago depende mucho de quienes van a ganar en esta pelea y ahí van a tener mucho que decir los ciudadanos.” (E)

Complementing this quotation, the focus group discussion also stressed that strengthening the role of GORE would necessarily involve its visibility *vis à vis* the citizens, which, in turn, could lead to a vast increase in civil society support for decentralization policies. The following quotation from a statement by a GORE representative who took part in the focus group discussion demonstrates that GORE is making efforts to pick up on these ideas:

“Pero poco a poco nosotros vamos empujando esa maquinaria tan pesada y por eso (...) nacen los gobiernos regionales en la década del 90', 93-94 el primer poder metropolitano y de ahí vienen todos los demás, en un proceso de intentar democratizar e intentar descentralizar las decisiones (...) Que tarea tan inmensa, más que las otras regiones es ser gobierno regional en la Región Metropolitana. Entonces desde ahí viene la segunda fase, que una vez instalado los gobiernos regionales, incorporarlos a las competencias, o sea al principio de los gobiernos regionales.” (A)

In summary, GORE might support the establishment of a stronger, democratically legitimized regional authority by taking an active role in metropolitan affairs and showing as much commitment as possible, e.g., in the process of drawing up the PROT, thereby asserting itself as an institution to be reckoned with in urban development. This strategy has in fact already been adopted by GORE and its successful pursuit can also be seen as a prerequisite for increased confidence of the central government in GORE's capacities. Nonetheless, the central level seems to be the key issue here, since GORE will ultimately gain significance only if the national state is prepared to waive some of its competencies. This, in turn, will not occur until such time as civil society, i.e., the voter, makes a strong plea for this course.

The role of local authorities – opportunities and limits

In numerous comments the participants in our study highlighted the difficult role of municipalities in the Metropolitan Area. One major problem to emerge is the lack of common objectives, i.e., the lack of ability of local elites to pursue – or at least to perceive – the existing mutual interests of municipalities in the region. This, amongst others, is said to result in growing disparities within and between the municipalities (see, for example, Orellana 2009):

“Los Municipios manifiestan en su territorio las disparidades que son en su gestión.” (47/6)

The stakeholders, however, not only complain about the unwillingness of communes to coordinate their activities but give several reasons for this. First of all, there seems to be a lack of instruments to support forms of intermunicipal cooperation, such as common investments or joint development projects:

“No existen mecanismos ni instrumentos adecuados para lograr que los municipios se embarquen en iniciativas de inversión conjunta, muchas veces a pesar que enfrenta desafíos comunes.” (35/6)

Then, it seems crucial that municipalities do not dispose of the necessary human and financial resources to engage in mutually beneficial cooperation. Criticism was levelled in particular at inadequate equipment, the unsatisfactory level of professionalization and knowledge of the municipal staff (i.e., the fact that there are not enough qualified employees to handle municipal tasks), the limited budgets and the ineffective redistribution of municipal income between municipalities.

“Los municipios en general han debido asumir responsabilidades para las que no se encuentran preparados ni cuentan con recursos humanos y financieros para hacerlas, el incremento de las autonomías podría aumentar los desequilibrios y la descoordinación en intervenciones territoriales de nivel intercomunal o metropolitano.” (30/6)

The lack of resources from which most municipalities suffer is at the same time a major incentive to compete for private investments rather than to cooperate with each other. This is aggravated by another aspect hinted at by some stakeholders: the negative consequences of municipal decisions are often not (immediately) apparent where the decisions were made. By and large, the strong disincentives for municipalities to engage in mutual cooperation are probably the biggest obstacle to achieving more cooperation at local level.

Against the background of numerous impediments to a successful and professional handling of urban development challenges and coordination requirements at the municipal level, a number of stakeholders seem hesitant about a swift transfer of responsibilities to the local level. The following citation from the focus group discussion illustrates this view:

“La Municipalidad, si tú le das la autoridad del 100% a la gente, el alcalde de San Bernardo, el hace crecer su límite, y lo transforma en un 100% en urbano (...)Y cuál es su preocupación? Que tienen algunas de las industrias más emblemáticas que bajo recomendación se compraron mucho suelo para que los echaran tenían grandes inversiones, como son Carozzi (...). Es lógico con las industrias y esas cosas, ese terreno no se va a desarrollar, porque ellos saben que la presión de los residentes los va a echar.” (D)

Taking the example of road planning and transportation, the following statement, which also stems from the focus group discussion, shows how the municipalities' hands are tied as a result of their

severely limited scope for autonomous decision-making; however, it also contains some idea of how municipalities might arrive at least at minimal compromises:


“Hay niveles muy altos, muy máximos como el MINVU, el MOP que están viendo temas muy micro muy locales. Y ese es un gran problema. (...) Las municipalidades no tienen la tutela sobre sus calles como la municipalidad de Santiago. Entonces se producen muchas barbaridades por ejemplo se creó todo este sistema de ciclo vías recreativas que se ponen en la vereda que es lo peor que tú puedes hacer técnicamente.(...)Muchas de las herramientas de la sustentabilidad en el transporte, para el control del aire y para otras cosas no están en manos de los que están viviéndolo y administrándolo a esa escala.Entonces hay un desajuste entre la escala de la gobernanza y la escala del espacio crítico.” (E)

To conclude, local governments are obviously confronted with vast challenges. The state is thus requested to intervene, in particular by improving the human and financial resources of the municipalities. In addition, solving problems at local level seems difficult without a parallel strengthening of the regional government, as the latter could facilitate both the transfer of competencies to the communes as well as intermunicipal cooperation.

4.4 Public private partnerships

In order to understand the direction of governance processes we asked the interviewees in the online survey to name positive and/or negative examples of public private partnerships (PPP) in Santiago. These market-based instruments appear to be the most recognized model for governance arrangements between the public and the private sector. Forty interviewees gave at least one example of PPP and altogether more than 100 PPP were mentioned in the survey. The public and private actors involved in these PPP mainly come from the national ministries (MINVU, MOP), the municipal level, infrastructure companies (energy, water, road construction and transport) and the real estate sector. Figure 12 shows the distribution of the above-mentioned examples in the various fields of infrastructure and public services.

Figure 12: Public private partnerships in different sectors in Santiago



Approximately 60 per cent of the PPP mentioned are related to technical infrastructure (cf. Figure 12). Twenty examples alone concern road construction and maintenance. Another 17 responses are associated with public transport. This makes transportation the policy field where public-private coalitions are most salient in Santiago. However, while PPP for road construction and maintenance are largely evaluated positively, those in the field of public transport are subjected to a more critical assessment. Further statements on PPP deal with the water and energy sectors or, more generally, technical or social infrastructure as a whole.

Besides public private interplays for infrastructure provision and development, construction and land-use planning are two other fields mentioned by interviewees in terms of PPP projects. These were judged negatively in most instances. Finally, the interviewees mentioned several PPP projects that concern the provision of public space, environmental protection and *barrio*-redevelopment issues.

On the whole, a positive perception of PPP projects prevails, with 60 per cent of all PPP assessed as encouraging. This would, of course, call for a more detailed analysis due to the broad variation of individual PPP projects in terms of size, actors involved, institutional arrangements and legal precautions made (see Appendix, Table 4 for evaluation of categories). This type of analysis would also be necessary for a more precise interpretation of interviewee statements on the topic of PPP but unfortunately exceed the limited scope of our study. Nevertheless, some preliminary conjectures on the issue of PPP in Santiago can be made.

First of all, it is obvious from our results that PPP is a highly contested issue. The proponents (the majority) of public-private partnerships pointed to their potential to function as facilitators with respect to public goals and public goods, e.g., the maintenance of public parks. The stakeholders in our study who were largely critical of PPP, on the other hand, raised a number of points to substantiate their position. One major critique was that the private partner has far more from this kind of cooperation as a rule than the public side. The *Proyectos de Desarrollo Urbano Condicionado* (PDUC)¹⁰ were mentioned as an example. A second critical aspect referred to concerns the perceived lack of transparency and, more generally, of democratic legitimacy, which many see as a key feature of the very idea of PPP. In particular, there was some concern about accountability when PPP projects go wrong. Thirdly, the suspicion was raised that PPP projects tend to neglect environmental matters, e.g., with respect to the ecological effects of road construction. In this context, CONAMA, the National Commission for Environment, was criticized in the survey for not performing its control function. In a similar line of argument, fourthly, some stakeholders showed concern about the social dimension of PPP projects. The issue of water services can be taken as an example here: while water quality seems to be guaranteed, there is almost no mechanism in place to provide for the social adequacy of water prices and water fees.

4.5 Citizen participation


The role of civil society and the opportunities for participation are another vital aspect of governance addressed in our study. A couple of interviewees emphasize the paramount importance of participation in bringing about change in urban development trends. Others support this view by calling the state to account, demanding an effective monitoring and regulation of the private sector, and the support of civil society in the interests of a balance of power. Due to the diverging interests of different actor groups, state intervention is seen as indispensable. However, if the state is to provide for 'more' participation and a more equal balance of interests in the governance process, a change in institutional framework conditions seems necessary, as there are very few norms in place to counterbalance the vast influence of a small number of powerful actors. One stakeholder in the focus group discussion argued as follows:

"Yo creo que se han normado muchas cosas, pero no se han normado muchos procesos (...). Entonces estamos todos luchando para aprovechar en una jungla que no tiene reglas claras, (...) tiene que haber reglas en este juego, porque es un tema de poder, no puede ser siempre la ciudadanía (David) contra el empresario (Goleat) y estamos siempre en desventaja sin ninguna regla del juego. Tiene que ir institucionalizando procesos." (E)

Figure 13 demonstrates that the majority of stakeholders who took part in our study assume that citizen participation would increase if supported by institutional framework conditions that provide for the transparency of decision-making processes and opportunities for participation.

¹⁰ PDUC is a new instrument of spatial planning in Chile, which links new urban development to compensation measures (e.g., provision of infrastructure) that private investors who benefit from the permission to develop greenfield land have to provide for.

Figure 13: “More transparency and opportunities for participation will increase citizen participation in urban development”



In the online survey as well as in the focus group discussion, many stakeholders mentioned the progress made in different fields of urban development as a consequence of democratization at local level and a growing civil society engagement. They corroborated this view by several examples. Among others, they pointed to the movement against the construction of the urban motorway *Costanera Norte*. As a result of these protests the urban motorway was constructed underground. Another example is the civic engagement for the *barrio* of Yungay, which was declared a conservation area, a so-called *zona típica*, after a long struggle by the local population (see also Ducci 2000). Referring to these examples, one stakeholder maintained that the organizational capacity of civil society has improved while another advanced the opinion that small organizations, e.g., neighbourhood associations (*Juntas de Vecinos*), have far more influence today than in the past. Current attempts to turn Santiago into a bike friendly city were mentioned as an illustration of successful participative planning efforts. In the opinion of one participant in the focus group discussion, these attempts demonstrate the evolution of a process or even a culture of communication:

“Diseñamos una mesa ciudadana de gobierno de decenio de una política de una bicicultura para Chile, con 4 comisiones, uno es un Plan estratégico para la región metropolitana para la bicicleta, uno es un plan nacional de fomento de la bicicleta que es de educación y comunicación y cultura, el tercer elemento es la ley de la bicicleta, y hace una propuesta de ley que cuenta con el apoyo presidencial, y el cuarto es la creación de la economía de la bicicleta, (...)” (E)

On the other hand, a critical attitude still prevails among stakeholders towards the quest for (more) participation. One interviewee, for instance, complains about the apathy of citizens who show an interest only when they are affected by certain decisions or measures. Likewise, another shrugs off the participatory efforts of civil society movements as „NIMBY“ motivated (i.e., as not-in-my-back-yard strategies). In the focus group discussion one participant even expressed the provocative view that participation is of no consequence whatsoever.

In order to illustrate the “NIMBY” character of many instances of public participation in the urban governance of Santiago, the neighbourhood association “*Salvemos Vitacura*” was brought up in the focus group discussion. This initiative instigated a referendum on the land-use plan of Vitacura with the aim of preventing the commune from erecting a group of high-rise buildings in this upper-class area. However, while one participant, who interestingly came from the private sector, advanced the opinion that this was a typical NIMBY activity against social housing, another discussant declared that it merely reflected justified opposition to an absurd and solely profit-oriented project. The different

attitudes stakeholders adopt with regard to the “NIMBY argument” indicate that private sector interviewees sometimes use it to question the relevance and legitimacy of participatory practices.

Our study not only gives an impression of how stakeholders in Santiago assess civil society participation in urban development; it also reveals that when assessing the current level of participation, stakeholders tend to take into account a set of framework conditions that are detrimental rather than conducive to participation. One representative of civil society, for instance, notes that the media generally concentrates too much on urban issues and conflicts with which the upper classes are preoccupied, whereas most of the 54 urban conflicts recently identified in a study by the SUR NGO attract only minor attention (cf., SUR 2009). The same stakeholder therefore contends that current forms of citizen participation largely reflect a form of “democracy light”.

In addition to biased media, it should be noted that from the point of view of this stakeholder a young democracy like Chile does not dispose of the same institutional resources as countries in North America or Europe. Hence recent achievements in terms of participation allow for a somewhat optimistic evaluation of the role of civil society in Santiago. In this vein, the history of the NGO *Ciudad Viva* was cited to corroborate the argument:

“Ciudad Viva estaba en una pelea pero feroz con el MOP, con las máximas autoridades de este país, con el sector de construcción, con la concesionaria, o sea con medio mundo. Y hoy día llevamos dos años trabajando asesorando y capacitando a la misma gente del transporte del MOP (...). Es decir, a mi gusto eso dice mucho de la capacidad de los chilenos de dar una pelea feroz.” (E)

We can now summarize that the majority of stakeholders perceives some progress with regard to the participation of civil society in urban development. As a result of growing confidence in the competencies and know-how of civil society actors, a certain culture of participation seems to be emerging. The opportunity to take part in the process of ‘city making’, however, remains largely dependent on socio-economic status. Moreover, it appears that decisions still seem to be made from case to case. Thus, to achieve genuine progress in citizen participation would mean introducing a comprehensive body of formal rules and regulations. In view of the rising cost to public authorities of the now substantial number of urban conflicts issuing from projects delays and the modification of plans and projects, this may well gain increasing public support (cf. Poduje 2008).

5 Santiago in 2030

After the presentation of our results on how stakeholders in Santiago perceive and evaluate major features of urban governance in their city, we will now highlight their expectations regarding future governance issues before we turn to their visions for the future in the following chapter.

5.1 Future influence of different actors on urban development


Overview of actor groups

In the online survey, we not only asked respondents who they currently consider to be the most important actors in the governance process in Santiago de Chile (cf. Figure 6); in addition, we wanted to know whether, i.e., to what extent, the interviewees expect the influence of the respective actors to change in the future. We asked them to assess – with the help of a five-level scale – whether the influence of a particular actor or actor group will increase, remain constant or decrease in the future. The list of actors was defined in advance but the respondents had the opportunity to add other actors. Figure 14 contains the results we obtained from this question.

It is conspicuous that more than half of the stakeholders who took part in the online survey believe in an increase in the influence of the municipalities (see Figure 14). This is particularly striking as the municipalities have been attributed major influence on urban governance in the Metropolitan Region. In other words they will increase their already considerable standing. Some of the other actors expected to gain influence in the eyes of the interviewed stakeholders come from the private sector: real estate developers, infrastructure companies and federations of enterprises. Similar to the

municipalities, these actors have already been ranked as highly influential in the status quo analysis (cf. Figure 6).

Figure 14: Change of influence of different actors on urban governance in Santiago in the next five to ten years



N=44

The converging estimates on the future relevance of municipalities and real estate developers probably reflect the assumption that the complementary interests of both actors will become prevalent. Both can benefit from urbanization projects, which lead, on the one hand, to profits for real estate developers and generate municipal income, on the other, by increasing the respective municipality tax base. Hence preparing the required local land-use plans or investing in real estate are strong incentives for both actors to push new urban developments, making them the major players in urban governance in the process. It is undeniable, however, that huge differences between

the 37 municipalities of the Metropolitan Region will emerge in terms of their potential to attract large new urban developments. Thus, not all municipalities will benefit from the expected increase in municipal power.

It is particularly noteworthy that more than 60 per cent of the respondents in the online survey expect the influence of NGOs to increase, at least moderately. Likewise, stakeholders seem confident about the future of GORE, CONAMA, SEREMI CONAMA RM, and also, as elements of civil society, federations, political foundations and think tanks. These results are somewhat surprising since all of these actors tend to be seen as less influential at present. This raises the question of whether the results presented in Figure 14 reflect a certain realism or rather mirror a situation the interviewees would like to see.


While the respondents anticipate several actors, such as MOP or MINVU, to more or less maintain their current level of influence, they are sceptical about a number of other actors: churches, trade unions, MIDEPLAN, CEPAL, small and medium-sized enterprises, political parties, and the international organizations of the World Bank and the IMF. With regard to the actors added to the existing list by the respondents, the expectation of some stakeholders that the citizens as such and the Ministry of Transport (MINTRANS) will gain influence in the future seems worth mentioning.

The participants in the online survey also had the opportunity to complete the picture of governance actors in Santiago by adding personal comments about the present importance of particular actors and their anticipated importance in the future. Drawing on these comments – and, occasionally, also on other statements from the survey that refer to this topic – we will now discuss the future of public, private and civil society actors in more detail.

Future importance of the state sector

More than 60 per cent of the respondents to the online survey are convinced that state influence will increase in the future, while the remaining 40 per cent do not expect this to happen. When differentiating these estimations according to the institutional belonging of the respondents, stakeholders from the public sector (mainly from the National Government and GORE) appear to be more optimistic regarding the future role of the state than others (see Figure 15).

Figure 15: “Do you think the state will increase its influence in the future?” (answers per actor group)



N = 46

Following the general question on the future role of the state, participants in the online survey were also asked to name the policy fields in which the state will be able to increase its influence.¹¹ The stakeholders who assume increasing influence of the state in Santiago expect it to become visible above all in the field of regional and urban planning. Furthermore, several statements indicated a growing role of the state in transport policy and planning as well as in land-use regulation. With respect to changes in land-use legislation, new instruments are considered probable and stronger control of plans and project implementation is deemed likely. Although precise forecasting is, of course, impossible on the basis of our results, the large number of statements that hint at planning issues allows us to identify land-use policy and planning as one of the major governance challenges in Santiago in the future. In addition, the growing relevance of local governments, as mentioned in the last section, will contribute further to the future eminence of planning issues.

Future importance of the private sector

Throughout the online survey numerous respondents added comments on the future significance of urban actors, in particular actors from the private sector. These comments indicate that there is a strong expectation among stakeholders in the field that the private sector will retain its current (overly strong) influence or even increase it in the wake of liberal policies. One interviewee points to the primacy of economic groups linked to political actors:

“En general, los grupos económicos asociados con la clase política mantendrán su nivel de influencia sobre la estructura gubernamental, en términos de decisiones de inversión, normas de control, etc.” (30/3.2)

As a result of these suppositions, various stakeholders anticipate a continuation of uncontrolled urban growth and purely market-based action leading to negative impacts on public welfare and the quality of life. Likewise, they see it as realistic that major conflicts on urban development issues and policies will evolve:

En los próximos años, podría ponerse en cuestión el crecimiento descontrolado de la ciudad producido por el mercado y con esto en duda las actividades puramente mercantiles de las empresas, ya sea desde el Estado o la Sociedad Civil. (42/3.2) (...) se incrementará la articulación social, lo que pudiere ocasionar conflictos medianamente significativos en la disputa por las cuotas de poder (42/4).

Besides, several interviewees pointed to the future relevance of infrastructure enterprises, claiming the need for control of this potentially powerful group of private actors.

Future importance of civil society and future opportunities for participation

The comments participants in the online survey made on the future significance of civil society in the urban development of Santiago reveals the existence of contrasting views. While some interviewees expect the influence of civil society to grow (in particular due to growing evidence of the detrimental effects of a largely private form of ‘city building’), others anticipate at best its stagnation; yet others criticize citizens for their passivity or doubt if public participation can contribute to a more sustainable development at all. Those who imagine a civil society of growing importance count on an increase in active citizenship, the improved organizational capacity of civil society and, generally, the latter’s ability to establish new patterns of bargaining with public and private sector actors. One stakeholder points to the role NIMBY groups could play in this regard. In contrast, other respondents take a somewhat resigned position regarding future opportunities of civil society to influence urban development because in their view, those in power can have little interest in a more forceful involvement of citizens:

“Si bien estos grupos tienen capacidades, no existe desde el estado ningún interés en esta participación y mucho menos en el sector empresarial, por tanto creo que seguirán marginados.” (75/4)

¹¹ Many of the statements we received on policy fields where state influence might increase are likely to reflect the desire of the interviewees rather than their view as experts. Hence the interpretation of these statements forms part of Section 0 of this report, which deals with recommended measures.


To sum up, the participants in the online survey are convinced that the enormous influence and power of the private sector with respect to the city's spatial, functional and socio-economic development will continue in the future. As to the public sector, they consider first and foremost the municipalities and, to a lesser extent, GORE and CONAMA capable of somehow increasing their influence. Positions are divided on the future capacity of civil society to make a difference in urban development. All in all, however, the majority of interviewees seem to expect the state to steer urban development more decidedly, regulate land-use change and open up opportunities for civic participation.

5.2 Public private partnerships as governance arrangements for the future

Against the background of the growing popularity of economic principles in the organization of society, cooperation between public authorities and the private sector in so-called public private partnership projects (PPP) has been a proven instrument of urban development in the western world for many years now. In a country like Chile, where public policies are characterized by a pronounced neoliberal orientation, this instrument can be assumed to be particularly eminent. In our study we therefore aimed at gathering the opinions of stakeholders about whether and, if so, in what areas PPP will be significant in Santiago in the future.

In their answers to our question on the future significance of PPP, 37 participants in the online survey state that the importance of PPP will increase within the next five to ten years, whereas only 8 respondents disagree with this opinion. Figure 16 shows the areas, i.e., associated with which tasks, these 37 interviewees expect the number of PPP to grow in the coming years.

Figure 16: Sectors where stakeholders in Santiago expect the number of public private partnerships to rise in the future (number of possible future PPPs mentioned in the online survey per sector)



Both the transport sector and megaproject-driven development are mentioned most in the online survey as areas of urban development where PPP will be (even) more important in the future. This may come as a surprise since PPP is already the dominant public policy instrument in these two areas; hence the result probably reflects the stakeholders' automatic association of these areas for the most part with PPP. However, the 'classical' infrastructure and services sectors, such as waste management, energy supplies and water services, as well as the prevention of air pollution are also mentioned frequently. Another group of urban development areas – social housing, security, education, city marketing – is also assumed to experience a rise in the number of PPP. In addition to the topics represented in Figure 16, which were predefined in the online questionnaire, the interviewees mentioned other areas of urban development where they expect the PPP instrument to

thrive in the future, i.e., health care, sports and public green space, telecommunication, health care for the elderly, sustainable development, energy efficiency, cultural heritage and protection of monuments.

Overall we could summarize that many stakeholders are confident PPP will be a major urban policy instrument in Santiago in the time to come. This is particularly true of those policy fields where PPP are already frequently used (see Table in the Appendix). This, however, would call for a review of how the deficiencies that characterize many PPP – such as lack of transparency and accountability – can be avoided. Furthermore it seems worthwhile to reflect on the (infrastructure) areas that are suitable for PPP (and those that may not be) and how PPP can be clearly distinguished from a mere policy of privatization. This also implies the careful consideration of alternative – perhaps less integrated – ways to organize the collaboration of the public and the private sector.

5.3 Decentralization

Since Chile is still a highly centralized country (despite long-lasting initiatives to promote decentralization) it appears useful to consider the opinion of the stakeholders in Santiago on the fate of the regional and local tiers of administration in the near future.

Possibilities for the political representation of the Santiago metropolitan area in future

In Santiago, as in many other metropolitan areas in the world, the lack of the appropriate political representation and power is a major problem of regional (i.e., metropolitan) administration. Accordingly, we asked the participants in the online survey to give their opinion on the future role of the regional government (GORE) in the Metropolitan Region.¹² Stakeholder opinions on this issue are diverse. While some stakeholders expect the influence of GORE to increase, others firmly oppose this view. Those who are optimistic about the future role of GORE in particular emphasize the expertise of GORE and its role as a politically independent consultancy:


“Estimo que hay una oportunidad para el GORE de asumir la conducción de la gestión urbana a nivel región, siempre que cuente con cuadros técnicos experimentados y consejeros más independientes políticamente.” (39/5.1)

Those who see GORE's future role with scepticism are doubtful about GORE's ability to acquire discretionary powers in the face of strong opposition from established state entities. Some participants criticize lack of commitment by GORE. Overall, these results bolster the weakness of the regional governance level, something of a commonplace among stakeholders in Santiago. We therefore included a further question on the issue of regional governance in the online survey and asked the interviewees whether they expect the Santiago agglomeration to have a single major, an *Alcalde mayor*, and a city-wide government some time in the future. Figure 17 shows the results we obtained from this question.

Ten respondents see the existence of a mayor and a city-wide metropolitan government as a reality by 2020; another eleven interviewees could imagine this happening by 2030. This implies that almost half of the participants in the online survey expect the Santiago agglomeration to become a political and administrative entity (which it is not at the moment). On the other hand, it is striking that the other half of the participants does not expect the Santiago agglomeration to be politically represented in the future, let alone independent, which in terms of decentralization and democratization is quite a gloomy prospect.

¹² There are two levels of metropolitan governance in Santiago. The first is the metropolitan region (Region Metropolitana), one of the 15 regions into which Chile is divided for administrative purposes. The metropolitan region, however, covers a territory of around 15.000 sq.m. and thus exceeds by far the scope of the urban agglomeration. The second level is the metropolitan area (Area Metropolitana), which includes the agglomeration of Gran Santiago. This, however, was delineated for statistical and planning purposes only and lacks any kind of political representation.

Figure 17: “One day Gran Santiago will have a mayor and a metropolitan government”



By commenting on the statement regarding the future political representation of *Gran Santiago*, the online survey interviewees clarify two basic assumptions that were also corroborated in the round table discussion. Firstly, Santiago’s stakeholders broadly agree about the urgency of improving the coordination of urban development and urban policy processes. Secondly, none of the participants in our study opposed the view that a direct election of metropolitan, i.e., regional, representatives was necessary to strengthen democracy in Santiago (indeed, a decision that there will be a ballot on the next regional council has been taken in the meantime).

Beyond these two widely acknowledged assumptions, however, there are diverging views on the likelihood and desirability of establishing political representatives at the metropolitan, i.e., city-regional, level. Note that we could not detect any sign that there might be a correlation between a stakeholder’s affiliation and his or her preferences regarding political representation of the metropolitan area.

(i) A first group of stakeholders makes a strong claim for the introduction of a directly elected metropolitan mayor. In their opinion, this key official would facilitate democratic practices and integrated urban development at the city-regional level, as well as an efficient planning system. Likewise, he or she is expected to help overcome social and spatial disparities:

“Es una urgencia contar con una mirada integral de la ciudad como única vía de resolver los desbalances” (20/5.1)

One stakeholder even suggests having both a metropolitan mayor and the regional *Intendente* elected by popular vote.

(ii) A second group of stakeholders primarily focuses on the problems that arise from the high number of local authorities that together form *Gran Santiago*. In their view, the principal argument in favour of a metropolitan mayor is the expectation that this figure could enhance the steering capacity of the public sector immensely by initiating and managing decision-making processes that involve several local mayors. The general belief is that unified leadership eases coordination between various actors and potentially mitigates conflicts between the different sectors of urban development.

(iii) Another group of stakeholders stresses the need to solve existing coordination problems but does not suggest how to achieve this task. Thus, they deem the potential introduction of the post of a *Gran Santiago* mayor one of several options, such as legal measures.

(iv) Yet another group of stakeholders deems the introduction of a mayor for the entire agglomeration highly unlikely due to the given institutional framework conditions. In their view, the fragmented system of independent local authorities with strong mayors, who often act like local “nobles”, and the general political culture are both major impediments to this idea:

“Se ha fortalecido una estructura fragmentada de gobernanza urbana, donde los alcaldes tienden a actuar como señores feudales, poco interesados en cualquier amenaza a su dominio feudal, por lo que cada vez es menos viable políticamente concretar cualquier iniciativa que signifique restringir su poder político.” (81/5.1)

Furthermore it is not unlikely that the idea of introducing the powerful position of a metropolitan mayor will evoke strong objections on the part of the central government, as this would imply a transformation of the power structure, not only within the metropolitan region but in the entire country;

“(…) el peso de un Alcalde del AMS compite con el del Presidente, por tanto es políticamente inviable tener una figura de tanto poder en un Estado unitario como el chileno.” (72/5.2).

(v) A final group of stakeholders explicitly disapproves of the establishment of a metropolitan mayor, pleading solely for the direct election of the regional government, the regional council, the *Intendente* or another „*Autoridad Metropolitana*“:

“Lo peor que le puede pasar a Santiago es que tenga un Alcalde Mayor.” (67/5.2)

This sceptical attitude towards the notion of an *Alcalde Mayor* mostly reflects the heavy doubts of several stakeholders that a single mayor could adequately represent the often diverging interests of the different communes and develop an integrated vision for the entire metropolitan area.

As an alternative to the establishment of a metropolitan mayor, several interviewees propose alternative models, for instance the inauguration not only of one but of up to ten mayors to represent the 34 municipalities in the metropolitan area.

Other suggestions include the inauguration of either a coordinator for urban transport issues or a “*macro-coordinador*” for social policies and programmes with metropolitan-wide responsibility, or a presidential mayor whose primary function is to bestow the Santiago agglomeration with a strong united identity. These suggestions reflect some hesitance in endorsing the idea of concentrating the responsibility for urban development in the hands of one person. Irrespective of the actual judgement of stakeholders on the likelihood and suitability of a metropolitan mayor, there is wide consent that the establishment of any kind of political representative at the level of the agglomeration would require considerable effort for political reform and the overcoming of long-established traditions in the political system:

“Es sólo decisión política y eliminar fantasmas de pérdida de poder de otros actores.” (108/5.2)

Interestingly, there is a good chance at the moment that these endeavours could be crowned with success:


“Observo que el sistema de partidos políticos chileno está en período de ajustes, lo que pudiese significar mayor democratización de diversas instancias (por la búsqueda de espacios de desarrollo político).” (42/5.2)

The municipalities in the Metropolitan Region – future role and interrelations


In order to find out what stakeholders in Santiago think about the future of the local level of governance, in the online questionnaire we used a set of assumptions about developments that might influence the position of and interrelation between the municipalities. Figure 18 represents the stakeholders' opinions of these assumptions.

Figure 18 a-d: Opinions of stakeholders in Santiago on assumptions regarding future municipal governance


a) "Municipal autonomy as to decision-making power and functions will increase."




b) "Bureaucracy of the Common Municipal Funds (FCM) will be strongly reduced."



c) "Municipalities in the Metropolitan Region will increasingly engage in mutual cooperation (e.g. for infrastructure development)."



d) "Intermunicipal competition for inhabitants and industry will intensify."



N = 44

Figure 18 draws a heterogeneous picture as to what stakeholders in Santiago think about local governance. It is worth noting first of all that the vast majority of participants in the online survey anticipates a growing autonomy of the municipalities (Figure 18a). However, it is not clear how this autonomy is to be used. While almost all of the respondents consider an increase in intermunicipal cooperation probable in the Metropolitan Region (Figure 18c), the same number anticipates growing intermunicipal competition for inhabitants and industry (Figure 18d). This ambiguity is also reflected in results obtained on the statement with regard to the existing fund for municipal compensation (*Fondo Comunal Municipal*, FCM) as opinions seem mixed on this issue (Figure 18b).

The online survey comments on the future role of local authorities provide further insights but are often contradictory. On the one hand, there are several complaints about the municipalities' lack of decision-making competency on crucial topics but, on the other hand, many stakeholders state that municipalities have the potential to become leading actors in the political process, provided their financial base improves. However, complaints about excessive bureaucracy and the unwillingness of many local mayors to share their exclusive budgetary and administrative powers makes it difficult to introduce a more integrative way of thinking about local issues. Against this background, one respondent recommends forcing municipalities and their representatives to adopt a more integrative policy approach:

“(...) requiere definirse su ámbito de poder a temas intercomunales y bienes públicos estructuradores y dotarle de herramientas compensatorias en lo territorial y regulatorias del accionar público y privado local” (96/5.2)

Having had a brief look at how stakeholders assess regional and local levels of governance, we can now conclude that there is an intense awareness in Santiago that the situation of regional and local authorities must be improved – which is tantamount to acknowledging the need for (further) decentralization in Chile. On the question of an appropriate reaction to this challenge, however, stakeholder opinions tend to diverge; there is almost no agreement about the next steps to successful decentralization.

5.4 Significant thematic lines for the future

Towards the end of the online questionnaire participants in the survey were asked to give their opinion on Santiago's development up until 2030. The statements and comments yielded from this question give a rough idea of the most important and most pressing issues of urban development in the years to come.

Overall, we identified six thematic lines along which the interviewed stakeholders commented on the future of their city – four of which are described with a largely negative bias, while the other two have a more positive connotation (cf. Table 2). (The topics of “Neoliberalism” and “Polarized City” are closely related; however, comments attributed to the former focus on politics, those applied to the latter emphasize the social impact of neoliberal politics.) Not only were more ‘negative’ than ‘positive’ issues mentioned by the interviewees, but those who, in the sum of their comments, painted a somewhat pessimistic picture of Santiago's future were generally in the overwhelming majority.

Table 2: Thematic lines for the future of Santiago

	THEMATIC LINES (number of comments on the respective issue in the online survey)	Keywords	Illustrative quotations (selection)
described in a more negative tone	BUSINESS AS USUAL (10)	growth, air pollution, international competitiveness, segregation, more cars, continuing consumption of water, non-renewable energies and land	<i>„...no habrán cambios significativos...” (40/9.1) „...lo probable es que no ocurra nada y por tanto Santiago continúe rumbo a transformarse en una ciudad inhabitable...” (75/9.1)</i>
	URBAN SPRAWL (8)	comparable to Los Angeles, competing municipalities, no common <i>Leitbild</i>	<i>“...a lo estilo Houston...” (71/9.1) “...parecido a Los Angeles...” (61/9.1)</i>
	NEOLIBERALISM (5)	subsidiary role of state (to equalizes inequalities)	<i>“...el Estado asumirá un rol subsidiario para equilibrar las desigualdades...” (24/9.1)</i>
	A POLARIZED CITY (3)	first and third world conditions in one place, exclusion, criminality, power of privates	<i>“...coexistirá una modernización urbana de primer mundo ... con espacios que serán incapaces de ofrecer alternativas de trabajo y vivienda con calidad (3er mundo)” (27/9.1)</i>
described in a more positive tone	MORE STATE REGULATION (5)	participation / democracy, ecological sustainability	<i>“...hacia futuro ... la región tenderá hacia una mayor regulación...” (42/9.1)</i>
	URBANISM & QUALITY OF LIFE (5)	better planning, intact neighbourhoods, compact city , green spaces, public transport	<i>“construcción en altura ...; áreas verdes ...; se potenciará el Transantiago ... con el aumento y extensión de las líneas del Metro” (36/9.1)</i>

All things considered, Table 2 provides a clue to the major concerns of urban governance in Santiago in the coming years. It also hints at how stakeholders tend to judge these issues. Both the assessment of what issues will be important in the future and the evaluation of these issues are, of course, a matter of personal reflection. Since the interviewees in our study are representatives of actor groups who will shape the future of Santiago, however, their personal views are nevertheless instructive as to what the future lines of discussion will be ‘objectively’. Additional empirical effort would be required for a more detailed insight into the on-site evaluation of these crucial matters.

6 Santiago in 2030 – desires and visions

To contrast the expectations for the future discussed in the previous section, the participants in the online survey were asked about their desires and visions for the future.¹³ Most of them developed extensive ideas on the future of Santiago, usually addressing several topics. We identified eight different themes or areas, i.e., visions, in which stakeholders made comments on their version of what the future might look like in Santiago. These visions give us an idea about the different topics currently under discussion in Santiago and the stakeholders’ general ability to elaborate on future prospects (Figure 19).

Figure 19: Visions of stakeholders in Santiago for the future



The vision entitled „Improved air quality and transport“ summarizes the respondents’ desire for a public transport system that serves everybody, for an increased appreciation of bicycle and foot traffic, and a reduction of car traffic – since this would improve air quality and make mobility more just. “Attractive public space” is another major issue for stakeholders in Santiago, since many interviewees focused their vision of the urban future on green areas and natural resources, secure spaces and less noise. The third vision, “Effective planning and regulation” describes a future with stronger regulatory capacities of state authorities. Some stakeholders underline their desire for “Urbanism, identity, quality of life and less stress” in the Santiago of the future, taking the model of the ‘European city’ as

¹³ In some cases asking for desires and forecasts provoked difficulties or uncertainties on the part of the respondents as it is rather challenging to differentiate between what one expects, on the one hand, and what one wants to happen in the future, on the other hand – which is especially true when it comes to reflecting about the contested space of the city, as one participant underlined.

an example. The latter includes physical attributes such as urban morphology or residential density, and normative assumptions about urban life such as public activities, patrimony and cultural events. Complementing these visionary statements on urbanism, the vision of *“Inclusive neighbourhoods”* concentrates on the importance of the local level with its particular assets in terms of identity, patrimony and opportunities for participation in the democratic process. Here, the concept of the ‘barrio’, the neighbourhood, takes the place of the idealized ‘European city’. Other stakeholders again outline a vision that could be called *“Equity and social integration”*. According to this vision Santiago should be a life-enhancing city that provides equal opportunities (particularly in terms of education and jobs) for all its inhabitants. The second last vision is entitled *“Participation and democracy”*. It is largely concerned with politics and includes the idea of increased awareness and responsibility for ecological sustainability. *“Competitiveness”* is the last of the six visions and reflects the desire to transform Santiago into a genuinely global city on a par with competitors like New York City or Tokyo.

It is striking that ‘soft’ aspirations such as “urban culture”, “less stress”, “thriving public life” play an important part in these visions and are frequently linked to the notion of the “European city” (*„una ciudad como Barcelona o Berlin”, 61/9.2*). It is furthermore remarkable that, compared to the expectations and forecasts of interviewees presented in Section 6, the visions are usually clear-cut and straightforward, and provide inspiration for a Santiago *Leitbild*.

7 Measures

Having discussed both probable and desirable futures for Santiago from the stakeholder point of view, we will now highlight some of the recommendations the stakeholders who took part in our analysis made on future urban development strategies. Here we can draw on the abundant responses and remarks provided by these stakeholders, which can be condensed into three general categories or challenges to be considered in the different fields of urban policy (see Table 3 for an overview):

- Coordination of urban development and decentralization
- Improvement of state regulation
- Increase in citizen participation

All things considered, the large number of fundamental comments relating to issues such as the transparency of the political process, the participation of civil society and the quality of democracy is significant. Accordingly, many stakeholders deem a change in political culture indispensable (*„cambio cultural de conciencia tanto en los ámbitos públicos como privados”, 30/9.1*). A reflecting on and rethinking of their role by the decision-making elite is a prerequisite for such change and eventually lead to reliable and accountable political leaders (*“líderes con compromiso real”, 45/9.2*).

Coordination of urban development and decentralization

In light of the negative evaluation of decentralization efforts and the coordination of urban development processes in Santiago highlighted earlier in this study, it is hardly surprising that many of these recommendations refer to these issues. Due to the interdependency of these two issues, recommendations referring to deficits in either coordination or decentralization are treated as one. Unless the challenges of coordination and decentralization are tackled successfully, it is unlikely that an integrated urban development strategy will be implemented, although a strategy of this kind seems urgently required, not least because of the large number of local authorities:

“Considero que mientras no exista una gestión efectivamente integrada en la región metropolitana, mientras no se considere a la ciudadanía y se distingan sus problemáticas, no mejorará la gestión municipal individual, ni la cooperación entre municipios como una forma de hacer política pública.”
(75/6)

As regards the horizontal and vertical coordination of political decision-making and governmental activities, the interviewed stakeholders had different proposals on how existing problems could be solved successfully. One interviewee, for instance, emphasized the urgency of leadership (*„alguien que dirija el tránsito”, 41/3.2*), whereas others focused on facilitation of communication and

collaboration processes. Yet other stakeholders stressed the potential inherent in their view in public private partnerships.

Several interviewees pointed to the challenge of accounting for different spatial scales, i.e., vertical coordination. They called for the inclusion of authorities at all spatial scales concerned with a particular project or planning effort. This essentially means systematic inclusion of regional and local authorities in planning decisions. The stakeholders also support the idea of developing a common *Leitbild* for the Metropolitan Area (*“una visión de territorio”, 20/7*), which would undoubtedly contribute to achieving more coordination between urban development actors. They expect this normative idea or model to act as an incentive for actors and stakeholders to pull together. In their statements the participants in our study named several catchwords that indicate, in their view, the direction this model should take (*“lineamiento ciudad”, “políticas de ciudad”, “patrimonio”, “medioambiente”, “infraestructura”, “espacio público”, “transversalidad de decisiones”*).

With reference to decentralization, a substantial number of stakeholder recommendations focused on strengthening the regional state level. In particular, stakeholders from the regional government and academic stakeholders call for the establishment of a government for the Santiago agglomeration (cf., Section 6). In addition, several stakeholders suggest additionally supporting the local level by increasing municipal budgets and improving equalization transfers, i.e., Fondo Comunal Municipal, in order to provide poor communities with the necessary resources to pursue their policies:

“El gobierno tiene que esforzarse para que todos los municipios de la Región tengan las mismas asignaciones presupuestarias de acuerdo al número de habitantes, con el fin de evitar que haya municipios ricos y municipios pobres.” (67/6)

With respect to both regional and local authorities, several stakeholders recommend greater capacity-building of public officials, a more decided leadership in the political process and a strengthening of spatial planning.

Improvement of state regulation

Almost half of the recommendations made by the participants in our study concentrate on the issue of state power. Strengthening public control of urban development processes seems indispensable to most interviewees if more sustainable urban development in Santiago is to be achieved. This challenge refers in particular to the following policy fields: spatial planning and land-use policy, transport, energy, water, social policy, green and recreation areas, education, and environmental protection. Measures proposed by the stakeholders to increase the regulative power of public authorities include such fundamental activities as the reform of existing and establishment of new laws, e.g., taxation, but also the more resolute implementation of norms, planning instruments and control mechanisms already in place. In this sense, regaining some control over private infrastructure companies is undoubtedly a major concern:

“Será fundamental perfeccionar el marco regulatorio para estas empresas de modo de posibilitar su actuación, pero asegurando el bien común y el bienestar para todos. Hoy se cuestiona el abuso de las concesionarias de autopistas, o el monopolio de las empresas ligadas al agua. Mucha gente está disconforme con el servicio entregado, con el traspaso de todos los costos a los usuarios, con los cobros desmedidos, entre otros.” (27/3.2)

Regarding the improvement and reform of existing planning instruments, compensation measures in land-use planning (*planificación condicionada*) are apparently the subject of heated debate. Unless they receive more support, local authorities will not be in a position to claim their right to compensation for developments that take place on their territory.

Recommendations were also made in relation to particular shortcomings in planning practices. Among other things, stakeholders point out the significance of the different time horizons in planning, of covering environmental aspects in all plans, and of accounting for neighbourhood scales in land-use plans. Likewise they mention the use or improvement of evaluation systems and the establishment of expert committees for urban and regional planning.

Table 3: Measures to improve urban governance recommended by stakeholders in Santiago

Coordination of urban development and decentralization	Improvement of state regulation	Increase in citizen participation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Defining precisely the tasks of national, regional and local state entities - Strengthening of existing and/or creation of new authorities or institutions with responsibility for urban development - Balancing of interests between the different state tiers - Providing for integrated urban development - Developing a common <i>Leitbild</i> for the Metropolitan Area - Bundling of interests, resources and discretionary powers for urban development by means of clear rules and joint projects - Providing for the involvement of all authorities concerned in the planning process - Identifying unambiguously the authority with prior responsibility for urban development - Introducing new models of cooperation in urban planning and project implementation (e.g., public-private coalitions, concessions, alliances) - Reduction of bureaucracy <p><i>Supporting the regional state level/</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing the autonomy and providing for democratic legitimization of the regional state level - Transferring responsibilities and decision-making competencies for land-use planning to the regional state level - Strengthening the regional and local state levels in terms of resources and opportunities for strategic planning - Enhancing the regulatory powers of regional planning instruments <p><i>Supporting the local state level/</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing local budgets by reforming the tax system and improving the system of equalization transfers (→ FCM) - Providing for capacity building at the local level - Supporting intermunicipal cooperation by new instruments - Elaborating detailed planning regulations at the local level (working out the PROT at the local level) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intensifying efforts to improve state regulation in particular in the following fields of action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - spatial planning and land-use policy - transport - electricity (supply and renewable energies) - water - green and recreation areas - education (containing the influence of local authorities) - environmental protection - Introducing expert boards which provide advice to the authorities on urban development issues (e.g., social housing) - Retaining existing norms and planning instruments; implementing these norms and instruments more decidedly so as to keep control over new developments - Increasing the amount of subsidies - Augmenting state influence on infrastructure companies (e.g., to avoid a shift of costs to the consumers) <p><i>Improving planning instruments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarifying and concretizing public requirements for the implementation of new developments - Introducing novel compensation measures for environmental and other infringements that come along with new developments - Extending the regulative competences of land-use planning beyond the urbanized areas - Amending existing and introducing new (planning) laws <p><i>Improving the planning practice</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retaining existing planning instruments and implementing them more decidedly so as to keep control over new developments - Introducing short-, middle- and long-term planning horizons - Elaborating thematic strategic plans (complementing the PRMS) - Elaborating problem specific plans (e.g. on air quality) - Including environmental aspects in all plans - Accounting for the neighbourhood level in spatial planning - Evaluating thoroughly the effectiveness of land-use plans - Inaugurating expert commissions for spatial urban and regional planning - Improving the education of urban planners - Compensating unwelcome urbanizations via financial rewards or social programmes for the local communes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhancing the opportunities for citizen participation in planning processes (and elsewhere) – including opportunities to participate in the problem diagnosis and the making of plans - Bringing together the most important actors in urban development by establishing a (transparent) platform for the exchange of information and the preparation of decision - Creating a 'round table' where all actors with relevance for (and interest in) urban development (can) meet - Increasing the efficiency and the democratic character of municipal land-use planning by involving neighbourhood associations (<i>Juntas de Vecinos</i>) - Electing the metropolitan government directly - Introducing the instrument of citizens' budgets at the regional level

Increase in citizen participation

Participation of civil society in spatial planning (and other fields in public policy sectors) is a third topic on which a considerable number of stakeholder recommendations focus. However, they tend to be rather general, with few concrete ideas on what should be done in practice to increase participation. With regard to land-use planning, a number of stakeholders point out that citizen participation should not merely be confined to official measures to inform and involve the local people. Instead they should call for an early and extended involvement of citizens in processes of problem diagnosis and the making of plans. In addition, there is a suggestion to bring the key actors in urban development together, including representatives of civil society such as community organizations and NGOs. One method would be to introduce a round table. As a matter of course, the establishment of a metropolitan government and the direct election of a mayor would also imply a strengthening of citizen participation in the form of elections.

8 Conclusion

The present study offers an insight into discourses on urban governance in Santiago and highlights the view of stakeholders on current challenges, future expectations, and recommendable measures, as well as their personal hopes for their city. It is essentially based on an online survey of almost 50 local stakeholders and a corresponding focus group discussion with selected participants on site where selected issues were discussed in more detail. The analysis of the answers and statements provided by the stakeholders who took part in our study reveals interesting details on governance issues. However, it should be taken into account that the methodological design of the study does not allow for representative results or highly differentiated viewpoints of the various stakeholder groups – the number of stakeholders involved was simply too small.

At the end of our analysis we now turn to the question of whether stakeholders in Santiago can generally provide support and stimulate urban development. In order to obtain an answer to this question we take a look at our empirical results ‘beyond’ the specific governance issues highlighted in the previous sections, and interpret them along four categories that cover the knowledge and capabilities of the stakeholders as such. These categories are regarded as decisive for the pursuit of an integrated strategy for sustainable urban development in the metropolitan region:

- Coherence of stakeholder perceptions
- Scope of stakeholder knowledge
- Ability of stakeholders to formulate visions of the future
- Common stakeholder strategies

With respect to the coherence of stakeholder perceptions of urban governance issues, the conclusion we draw goes in the direction of optimism. In terms of fundamental issues – such as power distribution, horizontal and vertical coordination of decision-making, decentralization, planning challenges, need for regulation, citizen participation or transport problems – the diagnoses of most stakeholders are by and large convergent. Broad support can be expected among the stakeholders for certain governance challenges considered to be the most pressing. This is particularly true of the call for more, i.e., more effective, regulation of urban development by public authorities. However, the stakeholders’ opinions on other issues, such as the efficacy of planning instruments or the desirable amount of civic participation in the planning process, are more diverse.

With respect to the stakeholders’ general scope of knowledge on urban development and governance issues, our results indicate that stakeholders are well acquainted with their city and its characteristics and have an intimate knowledge of urban development and governance issues, which is frequently work-related. However, there are issues about which the stakeholders lack more profound knowledge, e.g., the environmental impact of certain developments or instruments and the long-term prospects of public private partnerships.

With respect to the ability of stakeholders to formulate visions, the participants in our study showed an impressive amount of imagination in expressing their ideas. Nevertheless, it became evident that

many of the stakeholders have a rather pessimistic expectation of the future, which could be characterized as the anticipation of *“business as usual”*. On the other hand, a range of optimistic prospects were also presented, as seen in the numerous suggestions of the interviewees on how development in Santiago could be made more sustainable. One of them, for example, concerned the development of a common *Leitbild* for Santiago.

With respect to whether the stakeholders have common strategies in mind, our results show no indication of such a joint approach. This comes as no surprise since the stakeholders represent a number of different actor groups and networks, all of which pursue a particular agenda. This applies, for instance, to the decentralization issue in general and the future of the regional state level in particular – stakeholders from the public sector have views on these matters that largely depend on their professional roles.

We would like to conclude our study with a brief reflection on the usefulness of stakeholder interviews. We hope that the empirical insights presented in this paper help to make realistic assumptions on

- a) future trends of urban development,
- b) major challenges of urban governance,
- c) the perspective from which stakeholders in the field perceive and assess these trends, and
- d) the extent to which specific policy instruments and development strategies will be accepted.

Moreover, the involvement of stakeholders in the debate on urban governance can be seen as a value in itself as permanent exchange processes between different interest groups are certainly needed. We therefore hope that this empirical study can make a contribution towards sustainable urban development in Santiago.

9 References

- Dillman, D. A. (2007): Mail and Internet Surveys. The tailored design method. Second ed. Hoboken, NJ.
- Ducci, M. E. (2000): Governance, Urban Environment, and the Growing Role of Civil Society. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Orellana, A. (2009): La gobernabilidad metropolitana de Santiago: La dispar relación de poder los municipios. In: EURE, 35 (104): 101-120.
- Poduje, I. (2008): Participación ciudadana en proyectos de infraestructura y planes reguladores. In: Temas de la agenda pública 3 (22): 1-16.
- Siavelis, P. M., Valenzuela Van Treek E., Martelli, G. (2002): Santiago: Municipal Decentralization in a Centralized Political System. In: Myers, D. J., Dietz, T. A. (Ed.): Capital City Politics in Latin America. Democratization and Empowerment. Boulder, CO & London: 265-295.
- Siemens AG (2007): Megacity Challenges. A stakeholder perspective.
(http://w1.siemens.com/entry/cc/features/urbanization_development/all/en/pdf/study_megacities_en.pdf, 15/1/2010)
- SUR – CORPORACIÓN DE ESTUDIOS SOCIALES Y EDUCACIÓN (2009): Conflictos urbanos en Santiago de Chile. Mapa de conflictos urbanos. In: Notas Digitales, 1: 1-6.

10 Appendix

Table A: Evaluation of mentioned examples of public private partnerships

Category	Named examples	Evaluation (number of respondents)		
		++	--	0
Road construction and maintenance (concessions)	Urban freeways / Road concessions	14	5	1
	Road security policy	1		
Public transports / non-motorized transport	<i>Transantiago</i> and public transport	2	12	1
	Bycycle transportation (e.g. GORE, Ciudad Viva, y I-CE Holanda)	1		
Water	<i>Aguas Andinas</i>		1	
	Concessions for water services	1		
	Treatment of wastewater	3		
Energy	Initiatives for energy efficiency	2		
	Energy	1		
Technical infrastructure	Water, Transport		1	
	Provision and infrastructure	2		
	Other concessions	4		
Mainly social infrastructure	Sanitary Services	1		
	Hospitals		1	
	Recreation for the elderly	1		
	Subsidized special education		1	
	Social housing	2		
	Prisons	2		
Public space	Public spaces	2		
	Construction and maintenance of parks		1	
Environment (protection)	Reduction of environmental pollution	1		
	Decontamination plan for the RM	1		
	Environmental contamination and damage		1	
Construction (real estate)	Real estate comp. with housing, transport and environment authorities		1	
	SEREMI Vivienda y Urbanismo with CChC		2	
	SEREMI Vivienda y Urbanismo with real estate developers		1	
	Public works on local level	1		
	Real estate megaprojects	1		1
	Costanera Center			1
	Portal Bicentenario	2		
	"Hundreds of high-rises"		1	
Planning / Land-use	Expansion of urban zone		2	
	Land management	1		
	Regulation Plans		2	
	PDOCs	2	2	
	Development of technical norms and control mechanisms		1	
	Norms: incentive zoning in Providencia: concept	1		
	Norms: incentive zoning en Providencia: realization		1	
	Study of norms: Colegio Arquitectos/ state	1		
Neighbourhood level	Repopulation plan for Santiago	1		
	Recuperation of the University neighbourhood	1		
	Neighbourhood Escuela Militar	1		
	Governance in Peñalolen, Vitacura, Santiago	1		
	Municipal Corporation	1		
Others	Job-creation-programmes	1		
	Corporate responsibility		1	
	Agreements with International Organizations	1		
	Agreements with Universities and/or Institutes	1		
Total		58	37	4

Questionnaire of the online survey

d) Reforma fiscal para reducir las disparidades del bienestar social	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Corrupción	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Política de privatización	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Aumento de la influencia del Estado	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Otro desafío:.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
¿Tiene Ud. otros comentarios respecto a los desafíos para la gestión urbana de Santiago de Chile en el pasado, el presente y el futuro?							
3. Por favor, ahora conteste las siguientes preguntas acerca de los actores de la gestión urbana en Santiago de Chile y su importancia en el futuro.							
3.1. En su opinión ¿quiénes son los tres actores o grupos de actores más influyentes de la gestión urbana en Santiago de Chile?	1	2	3	4	5	0	
	Disminuirá		Se mantiene		Aumentará	No lo sé	
3.2. ¿Cree Ud. que la influencia de los siguientes actores en la gestión urbana en Santiago de Chile aumentará o disminuirá en los próximos cinco a diez años?	1	2	3	4	5	0	
MOP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MINVU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MIDEPLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CONAMA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SEREMI MOP RM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SEREMI MINVU RM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SEREMI MIDEPLAN RM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SEREMI CONAMA RM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GORE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Municipios	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partidos políticos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sindicatos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Iglesias	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Federaciones y fundaciones políticas, Think Tanks (por ej. CEP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Universidades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ONGs (por ej. Chile Sustentable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Federaciones de empresas (por ej. Cámara Chilena de la Construcción)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pequeñas y medianas empresas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Empresas de infraestructura (Aguas Andinas, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Empresas Multinacionales (Telefónica, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consultoras Internacionales (McKinsey, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Desarrolladores Inmobiliarios (Socovesa, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OMC/IMF/Banco Mundial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CEPAL/PNUD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Otro actor:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4

a) Democratización después del Gobierno Militar (por ej. reformas de la Constitución)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Descentralización del Estado	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Participación en forma de elecciones (por ej. elección directa del alcalde)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Reforma fiscal para reducir las disparidades del bienestar social	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Corrupción	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Política de privatización	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Aumento de la influencia del Estado	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Otro desafío:.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4. En su opinión ¿cuáles son los desafíos más importantes para la gestión urbana de Santiago de Chile en la actualidad?	1	2	3	4	0	
	Sin importancia			Gran importancia	No lo sé	
a) Fortalecimiento de la democracia (más reformas, por ej. del sistema electoral o de la Constitución)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Descentralización del Estado (por ej. fortalecimiento de la autonomía del Gobierno Regional)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Participación de los ciudadanos en el desarrollo urbano (implementación de nuevos instrumentos de participación en nivel nacional, regional y local, por ej. presupuestos participativos)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Reforma fiscal para reducir las disparidades del bienestar social	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Corrupción	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Política de privatización	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Aumento de la influencia del Estado	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Otro desafío:.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5. En su opinión ¿cuáles son los desafíos más importantes para la gestión urbana de Santiago de Chile para el futuro (en los próximos 20 años)?	1	2	3	4	0	
	Sin importancia			Gran importancia	No lo sé	
a) Fortalecimiento de la democracia (más reformas, por ej. del sistema electoral o de la Constitución)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Descentralización del Estado (por ej. fortalecimiento de la autonomía del Gobierno Regional; Creación de un gobierno metropolitano para Gran Santiago de Chile)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Participación de los ciudadanos en el desarrollo urbano (implementación de nuevos instrumentos de participación en nivel nacional, regional y local, por ej. presupuestos participativos)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3

¿Tiene Ud. otros comentarios sobre la importancia de ciertos actores para la gestión urbana de Santiago de Chile en el futuro?							
3.3.	¿Cómo estima Ud. la influencia del sector privado en el desarrollo urbano?	Demasiado grande					
	Demasiado pequeña	Demasiado grande					
3.4.	¿Cree Ud. que el Estado incrementará su influencia?	Demasiado grande					
	SI	No → por favor continúe con pregunta 3.6					
3.5.	¿En qué ámbitos del desarrollo urbano el Estado aumentará su influencia específicamente?						
3.6.	¿Piensa Ud. que aumentará la importancia de las colaboraciones público-privadas en Santiago de Chile en los próximos cinco a diez años?	SI					
3.7.	¿En qué sectores aumentará la importancia de colaboraciones público-privadas en Santiago de Chile?	SI					
	Agua	Megaproyectos urbanísticos					
	Transporte	Vivienda Social					
	Residuos	Seguridad					
	Energía	Educación					
	Descontaminación del aire	Marketing ciudadano					
	Otro sector:						
3.8.	Por favor, dénos ejemplos positivos y / o negativos de colaboraciones público-privadas en Santiago de Chile.	+ -					
4.	Ahora le pedimos que estime la importancia de actores de LA ECONOMÍA PRIVADA Y DE LA SOCIEDAD CIVIL para el desarrollo urbano en Santiago de Chile en los próximos cinco a diez años.						
	Empresas privadas tendrán una fuerte influencia en el desarrollo urbano.	Empresas privadas asumirán más responsabilidad social (Corporate Citizenship).					
	Empresas privadas dominarán la provisión de infraestructura (por ej. Aguas Andinas, concesionarios de transporte).	Se establecerá una oposición fuerte ante la influencia del sector privado en el desarrollo urbano (por ej. sindicatos).					
	Más transparencia y oportunidades de participación aumentarán la participación de los ciudadanos en el desarrollo urbano.	La influencia creciente de ONGs facilitará un desarrollo urbano sustentable.					

	La creciente ciudadanía activa y los diferentes intereses de juntas de vecinos dificultarán las decisiones políticas respecto del desarrollo urbano.	¿Tiene Ud. otros comentarios sobre la importancia futura de actores de la economía privada y la sociedad civil?					
5.	Ahora le pedimos evaluar las siguientes afirmaciones respecto a la posición del GOBIERNO REGIONAL METROPOLITANO de Santiago de Chile en los próximos cinco a diez años.						
5.1.	El GORE transferirá más y más competencias y facultades decisorias al nivel regional.	La dotación financiera del GORE no aumentará.					
	La Región Metropolitana logrará una independencia financiera más grande.	El GORE aumentará su influencia en la regulación del uso de la tierra significativamente.					
	¿Tiene Ud. otros comentarios sobre la posición futura del GORE?						
5.2.	De ser posible la siguiente frase: ¿Cuándo ocurrirá? "Un día habrá un alcalde y un gobierno metropolitano común para todo Gran Santiago de Chile".	Al 2020					
	Al 2030	Al 2040					
	Al 2050	Nunca					
	Al 2060	No puede decirlo					
	¿Tiene Ud. otros comentarios sobre el tema de un gobierno metropolitano y alcalde para el Gran Santiago?						
6.	Ahora le pedimos evaluar las siguientes afirmaciones sobre la posición de los MUNICIPIOS EN LA REGIÓN METROPOLITANA como sus relaciones entre sí en los próximos cinco a diez años.						
	La autonomía de los municipios en cuanto a sus decisiones y funciones aumentará.	El Fondo Común Municipal (FCM) experimentará una fuerte reducción de la burocracia.					
	Con las reformas del FCM se llegará a una distribución más equitativa de las capacidades financieras de los municipios.	La competencia entre los municipios por habitantes e industrias se intensificará.					

	Los municipios aumentarán sus cooperaciones con otros municipios de la Región Metropolitana (por ej. para el desarrollo de infraestructura). ¿Tiene Ud. otros comentarios sobre la posición futura de los municipios en la Región Metropolitana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																										
7.	Generalmente la COORDINACIÓN VERTICAL Y HORIZONTAL de procesos de decisiones políticas muchas veces es difícil. (Algunos problemas son incoherencia en los objetivos, largos procesos de elaboración, implementaciones deficientes, entrecruzamientos de competencias, otros).																																																																																																
7.1.	Desde su perspectiva ¿cómo evalúa Ud. la COORDINACIÓN VERTICAL entre el Gobierno central, el GORE y los municipios así como la COORDINACIÓN HORIZONTAL entre los diferentes sectores en Santiago (por ej. ministerios, departamentos)?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>0</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="4">Mayor</th> <th>Menor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Coordinación vertical</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coordinación horizontal</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A nivel del Gobierno central</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A nivel del GORE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A nivel de los municipios</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							1	2	3	4	0		Mayor				Menor	Coordinación vertical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Coordinación horizontal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A nivel del Gobierno central	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A nivel del GORE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A nivel de los municipios	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																
	1	2	3	4	0																																																																																												
	Mayor				Menor																																																																																												
Coordinación vertical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Coordinación horizontal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
A nivel del Gobierno central	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
A nivel del GORE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
A nivel de los municipios	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
7.2.	En su opinión ¿cuáles son los desafíos importantes de la coordinación vertical y horizontal en Santiago?																																																																																																
8.	¿Cómo estima Ud. la importancia futura de los siguientes INSTRUMENTOS DE PLANIFICACIÓN Y INICIATIVAS CIUDADANAS para el desarrollo de Santiago de Chile (en los próximos cinco a diez años)?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>0</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="4">Sin importancia</th> <th>Gran importancia</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Política Nacional de Desarrollo Regional</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estrategia de Desarrollo Regional (EDR)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan Regional de Ordenamiento Territorial (PROT) / Plan Regional de Desarrollo Urbano (PRDU)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan Regulador Metropolitano de Santiago (PRMS) (Plan Regulador Intercomunal)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Planes de Desarrollo Comunal (PLADECO)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan regulador comunal (PRC)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan Seccional</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Límite Urbano</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan de Transporte Urbano de Santiago (PTUS)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>"Santiago Amable"</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>"Quiero mi Barrio"</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Otro instrumento:</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							1	2	3	4	0		Sin importancia				Gran importancia	Política Nacional de Desarrollo Regional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Estrategia de Desarrollo Regional (EDR)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Regional de Ordenamiento Territorial (PROT) / Plan Regional de Desarrollo Urbano (PRDU)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Regulador Metropolitano de Santiago (PRMS) (Plan Regulador Intercomunal)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Planes de Desarrollo Comunal (PLADECO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan regulador comunal (PRC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Seccional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Límite Urbano	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan de Transporte Urbano de Santiago (PTUS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	"Santiago Amable"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	"Quiero mi Barrio"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Otro instrumento:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	1	2	3	4	0																																																																																												
	Sin importancia				Gran importancia																																																																																												
Política Nacional de Desarrollo Regional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Estrategia de Desarrollo Regional (EDR)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Plan Regional de Ordenamiento Territorial (PROT) / Plan Regional de Desarrollo Urbano (PRDU)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Plan Regulador Metropolitano de Santiago (PRMS) (Plan Regulador Intercomunal)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Planes de Desarrollo Comunal (PLADECO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Plan regulador comunal (PRC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Plan Seccional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Límite Urbano	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Plan de Transporte Urbano de Santiago (PTUS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
"Santiago Amable"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
"Quiero mi Barrio"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
Otro instrumento:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																												
	¿Tiene Ud. otros comentarios sobre instrumentos y iniciativas para el desarrollo de Santiago?																																																																																																
9.	Por favor, denos ahora en la última sección UNA IMAGEN PARA EL FUTURO PROBABLE Y DESEABLE DE SANTIAGO DE CHILE.																																																																																																
9.1.	¿Cómo CREE Ud. que Santiago se desarrollará hasta el 2030?																																																																																																

9.2.	¿Cómo DESEA Ud. que Santiago se encuentre en el 2030?	
9.3.	¿Qué medidas tienen que ser tomadas para llegar allí?	
10.	Estamos muy interesados en su opinión. Con mucho gusto Ud. puede agregar otras observaciones sobre nuestra encuesta.	
11.	Por último le querríamos pedir por algunos datos estadísticos:	
11.1.	¿Cuál es su último nivel que aprobó en la enseñanza formal?	<input type="checkbox"/> Media incompleta <input type="checkbox"/> Licenciado <input type="checkbox"/> Media completa <input type="checkbox"/> Título universitario <input type="checkbox"/> Técnico incompleto <input type="checkbox"/> Post título / Magister <input type="checkbox"/> Técnico completo <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorado <input type="checkbox"/> Otro:
11.2.	Actividad profesional:	
	Campo de actividad / tareas:	
	Tipo de empresa / institución:	
	Sólo si trabaja en el sector público, indique nivel administrativo:	<input type="checkbox"/> Nacional <input type="checkbox"/> Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Municipal
11.3.	Años de experiencia profesional:	
11.4.	¿Desde hace cuántos años Ud. se dedica a la gestión urbana (o temas comparables) de Santiago de Chile (en su vida profesional o honorífica)?	
11.5.	Año de nacimiento:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1940-1944 <input type="checkbox"/> 1950-1954 <input type="checkbox"/> 1960-1964 <input type="checkbox"/> 1970-1974 <input type="checkbox"/> 1980-1984 <input type="checkbox"/> 1945-1949 <input type="checkbox"/> 1955-1959 <input type="checkbox"/> 1965-1969 <input type="checkbox"/> 1975-1979
11.6.	Sexo:	<input type="checkbox"/> Femenino <input type="checkbox"/> Masculino
12.	¿Cuánto tiempo tardó en rellenar el cuestionario?	
13.	<p>¡Muchas gracias por su participación!</p> <p>Si quiere recibir información sobre los resultados de nuestra encuesta, por favor envía un email a:</p> <p>Corinna.hoezl@ufz.de</p>	

Guidelines used for the focus group discussion

Charla sobre el tema "Perspectivas de futuro para la gestión urbana en Santiago de Chile"
Asociación de Arquitectos, Santiago de Chile, 25 de marzo 2009

Guía para la discusión

Ámbitos del desarrollo urbano:

¿Usted está de acuerdo con lo presentado? ¿Quiere añadir algún aspecto?

Los actores más influyentes:

¿Usted está de acuerdo con lo presentado? ¿Quiere añadir algún aspecto?

La influencia del MIVU parece estar más grande que la del MOP. Eso no es como nosotros hemos pensado.
¿Puede ser que la influencia del MOP se esconde detrás de las empresas privadas? ¿Tiene comentarios respecto a otros actores?

Muchos expertos sostuvieron que la influencia del sector privado en el desarrollo urbano es demasiado grande. Además, muchos creen que la influencia del sector público aumentará. Por qué y en qué medida el último aumentará la influencia? Con qué medidas el estado está capaz en realidad de ampliar sus márgenes de actuar?

Colaboraciones público-privadas:

Más que tres cuartos de los expertos contestó que las colaboraciones público-privadas van a aumentar. ¿Qué cree usted? En cuáles sectores? Quien participe por lado del estado y de los privados? Quien profita más? ¿Dónde ve los problemas?

Rol de actores del sector privado y de la sociedad civil:

¿Cree que se establecerá una oposición fuerte antes la influencia del sector privado? ¿Cuál importancia las ONG tienen para el desarrollo urbano en Santiago? ¿Cuáles son sus posibilidades? ¿Cree usted que el sector privado aumentará más responsabilidad social en el futuro? ¿Cómo se puede apoyar un cambio de roles?

Participación de la sociedad civil:

¿Cómo se puede aumentar la participación? ¿Cuáles serían los ámbitos más importantes? ¿Usted puede nombrar algunos ejemplos de *best practice*? ¿Por dónde ve problemas?

Descentralización (fiscal, política, administrativa):

Los resultados arrojan la impresión que la descentralización en Chile no tenía gran influencia hasta ahora. Unos expertos aún dijeron que no había descentralización en Chile. ¿Cuál es su opinión?

Gobierno metropolitaniano:

Los opiniones de los expertos respecto a este tema son muy diversas. ¿Cuál es su opinión? Respecto al GORE, los resultados dan una imagen parecida. Parece que los expertos están de acuerdo que debe cambiar algo pero poco están optimistas. ¿Qué cree usted?

Municipios:

¿Qué hay que hacer para aumentar las capacidades financieras de los municipios?

Muchos expertos afirman que la competencia entre los municipios por habitantes e industria se intensificará. Casi la misma cantidad de expertos defendió la opinión que las cooperaciones con otros municipios aumentarán. ¿Qué cree usted? ¿Se puede nombrar ejemplos para el uno y el otro caso?

Instrumentos de planificación:

Por lo visto, los instrumentos "duros" (formales) que hacen reglas obligatorias son los que se evalúan como las más eficientes. ¿Eso coincide con su opinión? Y, ¿usted le parece bien esta situación o apoyaría la consecución de principios de planificación más participativos?

Imagen del futuro y medidas:

¿Cuál es su opinión, ¿asocia con las temáticas respectivas una expectativa más positiva o negativa?

¿Usted se reencuentra en uno de estos "campos de deseos"? Llame la atención que algunos terrenos casi no son tocados, por ejemplo, empleo y competitividad. ¿Qué piensa usted de eso?

¿Según su opinión, cuáles son las medidas que tienen que ser tomadas? ¿Cree que son realistas, las nombradas? ¿Hay algunos indicios para un desarrollo urbano integrado en Santiago?

Charla sobre el tema "Perspectivas de futuro para la gestión urbana en Santiago de Chile"

Asociación de Arquitectos, Santiago de Chile, 25 de marzo 2009

Las investigaciones respecto al tema "Perspectivas de futuro para la gestión urbana en Santiago de Chile" se inscriben en el marco de la iniciativa chileno-alemana "Risk Habitat Megacity", cuyo objetivo principal es elaborar estrategias para un desarrollo urbano sustentable de dicha ciudad. Para poder desarrollar estrategias exitosas, en Risk Habitat Megacity se construyen escenarios realistas acerca del desarrollo futuro de la Región Metropolitana de Santiago.

Respecto a la construcción de escenarios, las condiciones institucionales de Santiago de Chile constituyen una base fundamental y en esto las siguientes preguntas tienen especial relevancia: 1) ¿Cuáles son las características más importantes que marcan actualmente la gestión urbana en Santiago? 2) ¿Cómo se desarrollará la gestión urbana en Santiago y cuáles son los desafíos que enfrentará la ciudad en el futuro? 3) ¿Cómo debería desarrollarse la gestión urbana en Santiago en el futuro? 4) ¿Qué medidas tendrán que ser tomadas para avanzar en el tema?

Como no es posible generar las respuestas a estas preguntas a partir de la literatura solamente, y ya que la construcción de escenarios y estrategias requiere la integración de actores locales, el Centro Helmholtz de Investigación Medioambiental (UFZ) de Leipzig/Alemania y el Instituto de Estudios Urbanos y Territoriales (IEU-T) de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile realizaron una encuesta a expertos, vía Internet, entre el 1 de febrero y el 13 de marzo de 2008. El Gobierno Regional Metropolitano de Santiago y la CEPAL supervisaron y apoyaron la realización de la encuesta, a la cual responsables políticos a nivel nacional, regional y municipal, investigadores, así como representantes del sector privado y de la sociedad civil fueron llamados a participar.

La charla mencionada se llevará a cabo con el objetivo de divulgar los resultados de la encuesta e iniciar un intercambio con expertos locales. En combinación con la encuesta, la charla forma una base metodológica sustancial para la investigación sobre "preguntas de gobernanza" en el marco de Risk Habitat Megacity, por lo cual se planea analizar los resultados de la charla juntamente con aquellos de la encuesta. Por consiguiente, los resultados pueden servir como base para el desarrollo de estrategias orientadas a un desarrollo urbano sustentable en Risk Habitat Megacity.

La charla misma debe componerse esencialmente de dos elementos: primero una presentación sobre la intención de la investigación y algunos resultados de la encuesta (15-20 minutos) seguida por una discusión con ayuda de una guía (una hora 30 minutos).

Agenda:

- Rolf Siefeld:
Bienvenida
- Corinna Höhl:
"Perspectivas de futuro para la gestión urbana en Santiago de Chile" – Presentación de resultados preliminares de la encuesta a expertos por Internet
- Discusión:
 - Repreguntas respecto a la presentación
 - Intercambio sobre temas seleccionados así como expectativas, esperanzas y estrategias necesarios para el futuro de Santiago