

# Port governance reform and spatial planning: A comparative approach of Le Havre and Rotterdam port authorities' role in their region

*Verdol Maïté*

Paris-Sorbonne University-ENeC/UMR 8185  
Paris  
maite.verdol@paris-sorbonne.fr

## **Abstract:**

Over the last few decades, the maritime industry has undergone major changes leading national governments to implement port governance reforms. These reforms result in a renewed role of port authorities in their region, especially since spatial planning has also experienced important evolutions during the last couple of decades. This paper intends to examine the new role of port authorities towards spatial planning issues and policy-making process through a comparison of Le Havre and Rotterdam as a first step to understand the full range of interactions between port and cities in this new configuration.

**Key words:** port-city, port governance reform, spatial planning, Le Havre, Rotterdam.

## Introduction

The maritime industry has undergone major changes over the last few decades. They are mainly due to the globalization of production and distribution of manufactured goods (Brooks and Cullinane, 2007) and technological innovation. This process led to a reorganization of the maritime roads and logistic transport networks. In this new context, the nature of port activity was transformed (Chlomoudis, Karalis, Pallis, 2003). Ports are no longer only dedicated to loading and unloading. Nowadays, they are part of more complex supply chains (Haugstetter and Cahoon, 2010).

Facing these challenges, policy-makers have decided to implement port governance reforms (Ng and Pallis, 2010). Over the past twenty years, several countries have been concerned by seeking what Ng and Pallis identified as « generic solutions », largely inspired from the World Bank, when they examined the port governance reform implementation within three countries, namely Greece, Korea and The Netherlands.

France has started this port governance reform process recently. Indeed, the reform was implemented through a new legal frame established with the law n°2008-660 of July 4th 2008. It created a new institution, the “Grand Port Maritime” for the main ports. Le Havre was concerned and its port authority became the Grand Port Maritime of Le Havre.

As well as the Netherlands are concerned, the reform process has been engaged a bit earlier. The public corporation “Havenbedrijf Rotterdam N.V” (Port of Rotterdam) was created in 2004 from the reunion of the Rotterdam Municipal Port Management Commercial Affairs and the Rotterdam Port Authority (Ng and Pallis, 2010).

Both of those reform processes intend to apply the landlord port model. However, the national institutional frames of these two European countries lead to “implementation asymmetries” which condition ports’ role in their region.

Parallel to the challenges faced by port activity, planning has also underwent major evolutions during the last couple of decades. As a result of processes of devolution engaged in European countries, the narrow process fully led by central governments has been replaced by broader approaches of

planning seen as more integrated and involving various stakeholders (Sykes, 2010, Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009).

In the Netherlands this phenomenon resulted in the application of the « Polder Model », an intensive practice of public-debate (Schrijnen, 2003) where a larger place is given to the private sector. In association to this, a broader view of this policy-making process within the Randstad region where Rotterdam belongs was developed.

As for France, these circumstances also led to an enlargement of the range of stakeholders involved within a more and more integrated planning process. Le Havre city region's policy-making process was also seen in a broader view within the Communauté d'Agglomération of Le Havre (CODAH).

The reunion of these processes (the renewed institutional frame of ports and the shift towards new approaches of planning) now triggers a new configuration of spatial planning issues and policy-making process within port regions. It raises the question to know how the resultant interactions between actors in port-cities affect the role of ports in their region.

To answer that question, this paper first proposes a literature review of port governance and a brief overview on port and cities relationships studies in urban geography. A glance at the new approach of spatial planning proposed by Allmendinger and Haughton will provide an analytical frame to examine its new configuration in port cities. Following the neo-institutional approach, the publication of Ng and Pallis (2010) will be used as a starting point to compare institution structures and the resultant relationships between actors in Le Havre and Rotterdam. Finally, the consequences on the role of port authorities towards spatial planning issues and policy-making process will be dissected combining the analytical frame of spatial planning and the data resulting from the exploration of the port governance reforms.

## Section 1: Literature review

### *Literature review of port governance*

Port governance emerged as a concern for public institutions in the mid-1970'. During the previous period, the port authority seemed to be confused with the port in the widest sense of the word. That situation changed with the creation of a Port Working Group by the European Commission in 1974 (ESPO, 2010). The resultant report from these works is published in 1977. It is dedicated to the institutional and administrative structure of Europe's port and asserts that there is a considerable diversity in the organization, management, operations, finance and legal obligations of ports in the then eight maritime Member States of the European Community (ESPO, 2010).

Later on, at a time when port activity was pressured to adapt and to make new investments to accommodate the larger containerships (Brooks and Cullinane, 2007), port management became an accurate issue for governments. As argued by Brooks and Cullinane, new concepts and practices such as concessions, franchising and public-private partnerships as well as privatization, commercialization and corporatization became a reality.

At the beginning of the 1990', port activity kept on transforming and the look for an enhanced performance led the thinking on ports.

Port governance studies followed this trend and were oriented towards performance by maritime economy and public institutions. These studies define the concept essentially through the criteria of ownership and share of activities between the public sector and the private one. The role and interest of having a public port authority is at the center of the debate.

The public institutions provided their views on port governance in 1995 with the UNACTD report on ports.

Among researchers, Goss's works (1990) paved the way to discussions around modeling port governance in order to define the more efficient one for ports competitiveness within their changing environment. He proposed two changes for port authorities. The first one was to avoid multiport bodies and the second one to move towards the landlord model where the port authority would have limited activities.

Pallis (1997) classified port authorities within three categories regarding the diversity of their management practices from the local municipal management typical of North Western Europe referred to as the Hanseatic type (e.g, The Netherlands, Belgium), to the Latin approach where an influential central government is a feature (e.g, France, Italy), to the trust ports found in the United Kingdom (Brooks and Cullinane, 2007b).

Baird (1995, 1999, 2000), developed a classification based upon the varying degrees of emphasis in the public-private provision of port functions (Brooks and Cullinane, 2007b). He pointed out four models (public, public/private, private/public, private) where he allocated specific port activities to the three port function roles (regulator, landlord and utility).

The years 2000 saw a burst of investigations on port governance still led by public institutions and maritime economy approaches but completed by the arrival of management sciences ones. These researches are largely linked to the implementation of the port reforms started within the 1980' (e.g, De Langen and Van der Lugt, 2007, Brooks and Balthazar, 2001).

Among the public institutions is the World Bank. The third module of the Port Reform Tool Kit (2003) exposes different ownership models (concerning port authorities, superstructures and capital investment), and dock labour and management (Brooks and Cullinane, 2007b). The document differentiates the Public Service port, the Tool port, the Landlord port and the Private Service port.

The European Seaport Organization (ESPO) also published a European port governance report using the objectives and functions of the port authorities, their institutional framework (based on ownership) and financial capability to define port governance. The report pointed out that the current reforms could make the opposition between the two traditions (Hanseatic and Latin) more vague (ESPO, 2010).

The latest contributions to port governance and port reforms use a broader approach including the public policies within which ports authorities are embedded and their internal mechanisms.

Brooks and Cullinane (2007a) stress the importance to go beyond the applicable regulation to dissect port governance. The authors propose to include detailed developments on responsibility for port activity of the port

authority, conflicts of interests and processes and safeguards for the protection of the public interest. Hence the replacement of port governance within the range of governmental policies.

In this vein, Ng and Pallis (2010) adopt a neo-institutional approach to analyse port governance and their reform within three countries, namely Greece, Korea and the Netherlands. Taking into account port authorities' national institutional frameworks, they pay a large attention to power and responsibilities within the port authorities' internal structures. Indeed, they develop a method examining first the pre-reform settings, then the chronology of the establishment of the new entities. They go on with the commonalities in the reform contents and the national specificities in the corporate nature chosen within each country. Eventually they treat the power sharing between the different levels of government before exposing the role of the national government in ports' development projects.

### ***Overview of port and cities relationships in urban geography studies***

In urban geography, port and cities relationships have been explored mainly through a spatial view. These works (e.g, Chaline, 1994) have highlighted the divorce between city and port since the 1970'. They focused on waterfront operations stemmed from the transformation of the old port areas in city center (e.g, Meyer, 1999, Lavaud-Letilleul, 2002).

Other approaches have examined port-cities through the angle of the city's competitiveness. The Research Institute in Industrial and Territorial Strategy (IRSIT) developed a comparative analysis based on 51 European city ports. Their conclusions highlighted the need for a deepening of studies on the links between port and urban dynamics.

### ***A framework to examine spatial planning issues and policy-making***

To contribute to the investigations on the relationships between port and urban dynamics and examine the new configuration of spatial planning issues and policy-making process in city ports regions, it seems useful to adapt the neo-institutional approach developed by Ng and Pallis to port

governance reform and to couple it with Allmendinger and Haughton's analysis on spatial planning and Sykes' one.

Sykes (2010) argues that spatial planning has a larger scope than planning, taking into account other policies. Hence spatial planning is considered more integrated.

According to Allmendinger and Haughton, spatial planning has underwent a large evolution resulting in the fact that "[...] at all levels, an increasingly wide range of bodies and institutions are being drawn into planning apparatus to varying degrees: substantially in the case of economic development, transports, environmental regulators, increasingly so in the case of energy and water providers and very unevenly in the case of social infrastructure, such as education and health sector" (2009).

Sykes and Allmendinger and Haughton's work on the evolution of spatial planning were used to define specific fields concerned by spatial planning activity. Five variables were obtained: land use, economic development, transports, environment and education. The analysis will lead to evaluate the resultant interaction of port authorities with spatial planning issues and their degree of implication in the policy-making process itself.

In this view section two compares the French and Dutch port governance reforms while section three addresses the impact of port governance reform on the role of ports in their region.

## **Section 2: Comparison of the port governance reform processes and contents**

Section two is dedicated to the comparison of the port reform processes and contents in order to draw a picture of the French and Dutch current port governance. In compliance with Ng and Pallis' method, it introduces first the national frame, then the chronology of the new port authorities. Eventually, it attends to the commonalities and specific points of the nature of each port authority and the power sharing between the different levels of government. It has to be said that the role of the national government in ports' development projects is not deeply treated regarding the fact that Le Havre

main project (Port 2000) was decided and started before the reform process begun.

### ***The national institutional settings and the role of ports***

The Dutch national institutional and political context is marked by the Dutch tradition and recent endorsement of new public management which challenge bureaucratic tendencies and advance the concepts of flexibility and entrepreneurship as keys in understanding and executing public policies' (Ng and Pallis, 2010). Another factor to be taken into account in this picture is the development of public debate, according to the "Polder Model" (Schrijnen, 2003) since the years 1980.

The French national institutional and political context is marked by the devolution process, the "décentralisation" which led to give more importance to the regional and local scales in strategic fields (such as economic development and land use). However, the Jacobin tradition is still present as well as national interests are concerned.

According to Pallis' (1997) classification, the Dutch ports responded to the Hanseatic tradition of landlord port authority with powerful managerial economic presence of local or municipal management (Ng and Pallis, 2010) before the reform was implemented.

On contrary, in France, ports were considered as strategic assets by governments. They were given the status of governmental agency (Industrial and Commercial Public Establishment) directly managed by the central government. The French ports among which Le Havre responded to the Latin tradition involving ownership and intervention by national government, via a public managerial body, where the concept of public welfare services prevailed and national authorities acted as both regulators and service providers through a state-appointed, state-controlled, public port authority (Ng and Pallis, 2010).

In the Netherlands, port competitiveness –particularly Rotterdam's one – has been a core part of the national industrial policies. The port of Rotterdam was seen as a way to maintain the national economy. Hence, the national strategies sought to improve the embedding of the nation's two main ports (Schipol Airport and the Port of Rotterdam) in continental Europe's

transport network and at the same time to accommodate the need for their expansion (Schrijnen, 2003).

On contrary, in France, while ports have been seen as an industrial asset during the 1970', they were not allowed enough funds the finance their development as stated in the Court of Accounts report of 2006.

### *Chronology of the port reform processes*

#### *- Rotterdam*

In 2004, the RMPM (Rotterdam's Municipal Port Management) Commercial Affairs Department and the Rotterdam Port Authority (RPA) formally detached from RMPM to form a public corporation, Havenbedrijf Rotterdam N.V (PoR) (Ng and Pallis, 2010).

The status, objectives and governance structure are stated within the Articles of Association of Havenbedrijf Rotterdam N.V (2009). The public corporation has a major goal proclaimed in the second article. That is to operate as the port authority and to operate or have operate the port industry in order to strengthen the position of the Rotterdam port and industrial estate with a European perspective in the long term and the short term. This main object is divided into two missions. On the one hand, the port authority is supposed to "promote effective, safe and efficient processing of shipping traffic and to ensure nautical and maritime order and safety and to act as the competent port authority in the Rotterdam port area". On the other hand, the port authority is expected to "develop, construct, manage and operate the port and industrial estate in Rotterdam in the widest sense of the word".

The port authority has a large range of tools to achieve its missions, including managing property, entering into joint ventures, providing different types of services, providing loans and exercising port activities outside the Rotterdam region, and "anything else that may be beneficial to realizing the set objects, all in the widest sense of the word".

Those choices have to be exposed each year within a "written summary" (art. 25.5) of the strategic policy, the general and financial risks and the Company's management and audit system and within a Business Plan (The

port Vision) prepared for a period of four years (art 25.7). The last Port Vision, *Port Vision 2030*, was built in 2011.

The shareholders are the Nation-state and the municipality of Rotterdam.

The port authority of Rotterdam is more autonomous in terms of financing since it no longer relies on the municipal services to make common investments. However, as stated in articles 40 and 41 of the Articles of Associations, dividends gained from the port activity must be paid to the shareholders gathered in the General Meeting.

- *Le Havre*

The Port Reform Act was enacted after the French authorities understood the lack of competitiveness French ports were facing. An important report was established by the Court of Accounts in 2006 about French ports' performance.

The starting point of the reform process itself is the recovery plan decided and announced by the central government on January 14<sup>th</sup> 2008. Two parliamentary reports were written within that year: the Revet report and the Besselat one. The law n°2008-660 was enacted on July 4<sup>th</sup> 2008. A new entity was institutionalized, the Grand Port Maritime (Main Seaport) among which the Grand Port Maritime of Le Havre. The disclosed objectives were to refocus the port authorities' missions, to simplify the organization of dock work, to modernize governance and to coordinate the action of port authorities located on the same range or on the same river.

The implementation of the reform lasted three years, especially because of the redaction of strategic projects and of the transfer of superstructure and employees to the private sector (Lacoste and Gallais-Bouchet, 2010).

The objectives given to port authorities are to ensure order and safety in the port, to realize, exploit and maintain maritime access to the port. Besides they are expected to manage and promote the domain owned by them. Port authorities are also expected to manage the natural area and to promote the supply of road, rail and river transport service provided. Eventually, they are expected to plan and manage industrial and logistic estates related to port activity (art. L.101-3).

The main tool of the port is its strategic project. As stated in the article L.103-1, it sets the strategic policy of the port, its actions and its budget for five years. Le Havre strategic project was made in 2009 for the period 2009-2013. It has not been published.

As well as financial aspects are concerned, the article L.111-4 states that the port authority is fully responsible for choosing investments related to its common missions. The port authority also has to pay dividends to its shareholder, that is to say the national government.

### ***Commonalities in the reform contents***

Both countries have chosen corporatization. Within this process, an organization, originally belonged to the public sector, transforms into a corporation with legal status where the government bodies hold the shares of this newly established corporation (Ng and Pallis, 2010).

While there was a powerful coalition in favour of reform in the Netherlands (Ng and Pallis, 2010), this agreement seems to have been present but in a less important way in France. The different levels of government and the private sector expected it (OECD, 2012), but there were still strikes and debates over the labour management aspects.

Along with Ng and Pallis we can observe a shift to a governance system involving more stakeholders as it will be further detailed in the next paragraph.

The two port authorities are concerned by a progress towards financial autonomy as already mentioned.

### ***The corporate nature of port authorities***

The supporting legal documents, namely the Articles of Associations and the Maritime Code resultant of the Law 2008-660 are used here to examine the corporate structures (table 1) and their management organization (tables 2 and 3).

The analysis of the corporate structures of the port authorities reveals that in the case of Rotterdam, the reform results from an arrangement. Indeed,

Rotterdam's municipal authorities invited the national government into discussions on the port's positioning with a view to implementing the Main Port Policy (1992) and the financing of the port expansion project, Maasvlakte 2 (Brolsma, 2007).

On contrary, in France, the port reform has been implemented through a legal process imposed by the state who kept the full shareholding of the port new institutional entity.

As claimed previously, the French port reform has led to open the port governance system what resulted in a shift from a single board to three organs. The board of directors in charge of treating the daily port activity is composed of four members among which a key executive nominated by the president of republic. This board of directors is monitored by a supervisory board which composition is fixed by the article L 102-2 of the French Maritime Code applied by the regional state representative, the prefect. On top of monitoring the key executives, the supervisory board is in charge of preparing the port's strategic policy.

The port's strategy is also discussed within the Conseil de Développement according to the law. This organ is composed of thirty members installed within four colleges (the representatives from the port community, the representatives from the port private companies' workers, the representatives from the local governments surrounding the port area, the representatives from qualified people interested in the port development among which nongovernmental organizations).

Rotterdam's port authority is composed of an Executive board fully appointed by the Supervisory Board. The supervisory institution's constitution is not legally fixed but is not supposed to welcome politicians nor members of interest groups (Ng and Pallis, 2010). Besides it has a voice only as far as the nomination of the Executive Board is concerned.

The shareholders, in other words the different levels of governments, are gathered within the General Meeting who must adopt the Business plan after approval of the Supervisory Board (art. 25.7) and approve the significant port's investments and financial decisions (art.25.8).

**Table 1:** The corporate structures of port authorities

Category	Rotterdam	Le Havre
Name	PoR	GPMH
Legal document	Private law company	Law n°2008-660
Shareholding	Yes	Yes

Source: Adapted from Ng and Pallis (2010), Maïté Verdol

**Table 2:** The supervisory institutions and key appointments within port authorities

Category	PoR	GPMH
Name	Supervisory Board	Supervisory Board
Composition of supervisory board	Depends on circumstances, but no politicians/members of interest groups	Fixed by article L102-2: 5 representatives from the government 4 representatives from the local institutions 3 representatives from the workers 5 qualified people chosen by the representatives of the State among which one elected member of the chamber of commerce ad one representative from the private
Functions	Nominates and appoints Executive Board members, including CEO as well as their deem if necessary	Prepare the strategic policy of the port authority and manage the Board of directors

Source: Adapted from Ng and Pallis (2010), Maïté Verdol

**Table 3:** Key executives appointments within port authorities

Category	PoR	GPMH
Name	Board of Directors	Board of Directors
CEO appointed by	Supervisory Board	National government
Other executives members appointed by	Supervisory Board	Supervisory Board

Source: Adapted from Ng and Pallis (2010), Maïté Verdol

### ***Power sharing between different levels of governments***

As detailed in table 4, one can see that 30% of the shares are hold by the state which is slightly involved within port activity. The major part of its involvement is regulatory and financial. The municipal level seems to have more relationships with the port authority since it owns 70% of the port's shares. However, the more relevant element is the ownership of the port's land by the municipality of Rotterdam. Indeed, since the Second World War, the municipality owns the whole port area, that is to say 40 kilometers from the city center to the North Sea.

On contrary, the state's involvement in Le Havre port authority is more important since the national government is the only one shareholder and has managed to enact precise elements in the law about the port's missions and partnerships.

**Table 4:** Power and responsibilities of the national government

Category	Rotterdam	Le Havre
Shareholding	30%	100%
Ownership of the land	No	No
Construction of infrastructure	Uninvolved	Uninvolved
Introduction and enactment of port related laws and regulation	Only ensure that port operation and development are in compliance with national and European regulations	Only ensure that port operation and development are in compliance with national and European regulations
Assistance in port networking and marketing	Uninvolved	Ensure that it is applied as in the law for the collaboration within a river axis
Involvement in port development projects	Limited	Limited
Others	---	---

Source: Adapted from Ng and Pallis (2010), Maïté Verdol

**Table 5:** Power and responsibilities of the municipality

Category	Rotterdam	Le Havre
Shareholding	70%	0%
Ownership of the land	Yes	No
Construction of infrastructure	Fully involved	Uninvolved
Introduction and enactment of port related laws and regulation	Limited	Uninvolved
Assistance in port networking and marketing	Limited	Limited
Involvement in port development projects	Limited	Limited
Others	---	---

Source: Adapted from Ng and Pallis (2010), Maïté Verdol

The analysis confirms Ng and Pallis's (2010) conclusions about the co-existence of similar governance reformations especially regarding decisional and financial autonomy as well as the involvement of new stakeholders with remaining implementation asymmetries.

The Dutch port reform was implemented with a consensus and a slight legal frame as the frequent use of the expression "in the widest sense of the term" in the Articles of Associations may let it think. Besides, one can note the strong wish from the port services (confused with municipal services at that time) to implement the reform process. Eventually, the port authority, which is now clearly business-oriented (Ng and Pallis, 2010) is identified as a distinguished stakeholder.

The French port reform took place in a context marked by a large state intervention providing a detailed legal frame. Despite the wish from the port authority to see the reform implemented, its mode and agenda were imposed by the national government. Given the various missions of the port authority and the large scope of stakeholders gathered in the port authority's organs established as a response to the criticism about the previous autonomous port, one can observe that this young complex organization will require subtil arrangements in the future to avoid conflicts of interests between the different members of the said organs.

### **Section 3: Comparison of the port authorities' role in their region**

As detailed in table 6, the Dutch port reform contents a reference to the land use issue through the questions of allocation of site (art.25.6) and property in a context where the land belongs to municipality. Economic development issues are addressed through the second article of the Articles of Associations where it is said that the port has to contribute to the development of "port and industrial estates in Rotterdam in the widest sense of the term". However, neither transport, environment nor education are evoked.

The French port reform refers to four of the five spatial planning issues identified. Land use issues are addressed through the fact that the port

authority is owner of its land, has to manage and promote an area of 27 kilometers long and 5 kilometers large from the dikes to the Tancarville Bridge in the surrounding of not least than six municipalities (Le Havre, Harfleur, Gonfreville-l'Orcher, Rogerville, Oudalle and Saint-Vigor). Economic development is treated through the references to the planning of industrial and logistic estates related to port activity. Transports are evoked through the obligation for the port authority to promote the use of road, rail and water transport service in compliance with the national transport strategy. Finally, environmental issues are broadly dealt with. The natural areas have to be identified within the port strategic plan as well as their preserving policy.

**Table 6:** The spatial planning issues in the port governance reforms

Category	Rotterdam	Le Havre
Land use	Yes	Yes
Economic development	Yes	Yes
Transports	No	Yes
Environmental regulation	No	Yes
Education	No	No

Source: Maïté Verdol

As far as the port positioning in the policy-making process of spatial planning is concerned, even though the reform did not address every aspects of spatial planning, the new configuration impacts each one of them.

A view of the settings of the municipal, urban-regional and national governments legal competences and of their strategic documents reveals the way port authorities are concerned by those topics and implied in their policy-making. The strategic documents of the municipalities detailed in *Rotterdam Urban Vision* for Rotterdam and on the city's website for Le Havre were used. For the urban-region level, in Rotterdam, the contribution

of Salet (2006), Schrijnen (2003) and the *Rotterdam Urban Vision* were used to examine the port’s role in that area. In Le Havre, the city website also detailed the policies led by the Communauté d’Agglomération of Le Havre (CODAH). As for the national level, in the Netherlands, the *Economische Visie op de langetermijnontwikkeling van Mainport Rotterdam* (Economic vision of the long term development of the Mainport Rotterdam) and the *Port Vision 2030* were used as well as Schrijnen’s contribution. In France, the parliamentary Revet report as well as the Port of Le Havre activity reports 2009 and 2010 were used.

Table 7 details the level of implication of the port authorities for each sector of spatial planning at the different levels of governments (municipal, urban regional, national). The colored boxes indicate that the level of government does not have the competence detailed in the column category.

**Table 7:** Degree of implication of the port authorities in the spatial planning policy-making

Category	Rotterdam			Le Havre		
	<i>Municipal level</i>	<i>Urban-regional level</i>	<i>National level</i>	<i>Municipal level</i>	<i>Urban-regional level</i>	<i>National level</i>
Land use	Fully involved			Limited		
Economic development	Limited		Limited	Fully involved	Limited	Not involved
Transports	Fully involved		Fully involved			Not involved
Environment		Limited	Not involved			Not involved
Education	Fully involved		Not involved	Limited		Not involved

Source: Maïté Verdol

### ***Land use***

Rotterdam's port authority is fully involved in the policy-making process of land use. Indeed as required by law, the port authority is heard on the municipal land use plans. Besides, the port authority has largely expressed its views regarding the creation of "buffer zones" (*Port Vision 2030* adopted by the Municipality of Rotterdam as its shareholder) in Rotterdam and the other surrounding municipalities. Moreover, the port is actively taking part to the current thoughts about the land use plans revision concerning its area. As far as land use is concerned, the reform has led to a greater wish for coordination of land use issues from the port authority. Indeed, the institution considers it as a main concern for the good proceeding of its activity.

Le Havre port authority's case is more difficult to address since the reform's implementation has been achieved quite recently. Yet it is possible to distinguish trends about its territorial inscription. As far as land use is concerned, the reform introduces a more global approach of land use since the port is now responsible for its management. However, the port's land being managed by the national state before and as a result, quite far from the local considerations, the reform does not have a significant impact on the way the port deals with the other stakeholders on that point.

### ***Economic development***

Rotterdam's port authority is involved in a limited way in the field of economic development. Indeed, Rotterdam municipality's strategy is to diversify its economic structure. As proclaimed in the *Rotterdam Urban Vision*, even though the city considers the port as an "economic driving force", the city identified "knowledge and innovation" in the medical and creative fields as development trends at the same level as port activity. Hence the port authority services have been consulted only on the port and industry clusters projects.

Being considered as an important asset for the Dutch economy, the port authority is more implied within the policy-making process of the national strategy of economic development. The port authorities were associated to the thoughts on the development of logistic activities.

In that way, the reform has sort of replaced the port within the planning system: from a very local base, it went to a national one.

As far as Le Havre is concerned, the port authority is fully involved in that field at the local and supra-local scale. Indeed, the executives from the municipality, the chamber of commerce, the CODAH and the port authority gather together in the “Quadripartite” to discuss the economic policies they intend to implement in order to coordinate their action. However this informal area of exchange was created in the 1970 (it was then called the Tripartite since the CODAH had not been created yet) and is not linked to the reform. As far as the national level is concerned, the port authority is not associated to the policy-making in a specific way.

### *Transports*

Concerning transport issues, the port of Rotterdam authority is fully involved. This kind of policy gathers every level of governments. After the port governance reform was implemented, a public corporation, De Verkeersonderneming (Traffic Enterprises) composed of the port authority, the municipality of Rotterdam, the Dutch ministry of Transport and Environment, the enterprises’ associations (e.g:Deltalinqs) and the Chamber of Commerce was created to solve the transports problems linked to the port activity. In this case, the port is now able to express and fully take part to the resolution of the transport policy-making.

Besides, the port’s needs for other infrastructures are accepted by the national government whose policy integrates them. Here one could talk about a strong cooperation of the port authority with the national government.

In the French case, the port authority is submitted to the national perspectives in terms of infrastructure. Indeed, as expressed in the law, the port authority’s choices have to be in compliance with the national government’s ones. The reform did not change this situation.

### ***Environment***

Le Havre and Rotterdam are submitted to the rules imposed by their national governments and the European Union in that field.

### ***Education***

The port authority of Rotterdam is fully involved at the local scale. Indeed, the port authority is taking part to the promotion of port activity related education. For instance, the port is investing in the Rotterdam Transport Schools, a network promoting training and research related to port activity (De Langen and Van der Lugt, 2007).

As well as links with research and port activity related education are concerned, the OECD argues that there are still not enough links established (OECD, 2012) in Le Havre.

The strengthening of the Rotterdam port authority's role in the education field is sensitive since the reform took place. Indeed, the port authority became more aware of the fact that investment to ensure qualified workers in port activity was required.

The analysis reveals strong asymmetries between the renewed positioning of Rotterdam and Le Havre port authorities' role in their region.

Rotterdam port authority get involved in a larger way within the spatial planning policy-making process even though less of these issues are enacted within the reform. By clarifying the port authority's goals and *marge de manoeuvre*, the reform process allowed the port authority to adjust its relationships with the other stakeholders involved in the spatial planning policy-making process.

As well as Le Havre port authority is concerned, the reform took into account a large range of spatial planning issues. Despite the fact that the reform process has been achieved more recently as already mentioned, a larger involvement of the port authority in the spatial planning process does not seem to result from the reform.

## Concluding remarks

The study showed that analyzing port and city relationships through the mean of spatial planning issues and policy making process with a neo-institutional approach enabled to understand better the port and city dynamics and the new configuration in this particular type of region.

The study also revealed a gap between the ways spatial planning issues are taken into account regarding the spatial planning policy-making process. Adding formal references to spatial planning issues in port governance reform does not ensure a larger role of port authorities into their regions today. The case of Rotterdam shows that a port authority gets actively involved into spatial planning policy-making only when a common interest can be found with its own goals.

Developments dedicated to the renewed positioning of the municipal governments will be necessary to understand the full range of interactions between cities and ports and the way they impact spatial planning in these regions.

## Bibliography

- Allmendinger Phil, Houghton Graham “Soft spaces, fuzzy boundaries and metagovernance: the new spatial planning in the Thames Gateway”, *Environment & Planning A* 41, volume 41, 2009, pages 617-633.
- Brolsma Ir.J.U., *Havens, Kranen, dokken en veren. De Gemeentelijke Handelsinrichtingen en het Havenbedrijf der gemeente Rotterdam, 1882-2006*, (Ports, cranes, drydocks and ferries, Rotterdam’s Municipal Dock Company and Municipal Port Management, 1882-2006) Stichting Matrijs, 2007, 400p.
- Brooks Mary R., Cullinane Kevin, « Introduction », in « Devolution, port governance and port performance », *Research in Transportation Economics*, n° 17, 2007, pages 3-28.
- Brooks Mary R., Cullinane Kevin, “Governance models defined”, in « Devolution, port governance and port performance », *Research in Transportation Economics*, n° 17, 2007, pp 405-435.

- City of Rotterdam, *Rotterdam Urban Vision, spatial development strategy 2030*, 2007, 161 pages.
- De Langen Peter W., Van der Lugt Larissa M., “Governance structures of Port authorities in The Netherlands », in « Devolution, port governance and port performance », *Research in Transportation Economics*, n° 17, 2007, pp 109-137.
- European Sea Ports Organization, *European port governance 2010, Report of an inquiry into the current governance of European seaports*, ESPO, 2011, 109 pages.
- France, *Code des ports maritimes*, La documentation française, 2009, 232 pages.
- Institut de Recherche en Stratégie Industrielle et Territoriale, *Les villes portuaires en Europe, analyse comparative*, rapport, 2004, Montpellier, 168 pages.
- Lacoste Romuald, Gallais-Bouchet Anne, « La réforme des Grands Ports Maritimes de 2008, Premier bilan », *Note de synthèse de l’ISEMAR*, n°121, 2010, 4 pages.
- Merk Olaf, *Compétitivité des villes portuaires: le cas de l’Axe Seine (Le Havre, Rouen, Paris, Caen) –France*, OCDE, 122 pages.
- Netherlands, Act of Association of Havenbedrijf Rotterdam N.V., 2009.
- Netherlands, *Economische Visie op de langetermijnontwikkeling van Mainport Rotterdam* (Economic vision of the long term development of the Mainport Rotterdam), 75 pages.
- Ng.KYA, Pallis A., « Port governance reforms in diversified institutional frameworks : generic solutions, implementation asymmetries », *Environment and planning A*, volume 42, n°9, 2010, pp.2147-2167.
- Port of Le Havre, rapport d’activité 2009.
- Port of Le Havre, rapport d’activité 2010.
- Port of Rotterdam, Port vision 2030.
- Revet Charles, *Rapport sur le projet de loi portant réforme portuaire*, Sénat, n°331, 2008, 96 pages.
- Salet Willem, “Rescaling territorial governance in the Randstad Holland: The responsiveness of spatial and institutional strategies to changing socio-economic interactions”, *European Planning Studies*, n°14, vol7, 2006, pp. 959-978.
- Schrijnen Joost, «The port of Rotterdam in a regional and supra-regional context », *DISP*, n°154, 2003, pp46-51.

Sykes Olivier, « La planification spatiale régionale en angleterre: un pari gagné ou une ambition irréalisable? » *L'information géographique*, n°4, vol 74, 2010, pages 91-115.

Verdol Maïté, *Développement local et attractivité de la région havraise, 1975-2008*, Mémoire de recherche de Master 2 à l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2009, 129 pages.

Verdol Maïté, « Le Grand Paris et ses ouvertures portuaires, Le Havre et Rouen », *Population et Avenir*, n°701, janvier-février 2010, pages 14-17.