Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities
ISSN: 3007-9136
Vol. 2 No. 3 (2025): Summer

Studying the Impact of Globalization on Urban Space Management: Case Study: Kabul Province Urban Management System

[1] Mohammad Ekram Yawar
https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0203025006

Abstract:
The aim of this article is to study the impact of the requirements of competition between cities in the era of globalization on attracting private sector capital in urban spaces. In the era of globalization, cities are the center of attention of investors and urban managers to provide various attractions in attracting capital and competing with other cities.
However, the lack of coherent theoretical foundations from the process of competition between cities on a macro scale to the actions of city planners and urban managers on a local scale has reduced the competitive power of cities. In this study, using an inferential method, the factors affecting the competition between cities on the actions of city planners and urban managers have been discussed.
The results of this study show that in order to attract capital for the realization of urban space projects, the expectations and incentives of urban managers should be taken into account in the design and planning of urban space based on a market-oriented approach.
Keywords
Competitiveness, Urban Governance, Partnership, Urban Space Management.

Introduction

In the era of globalization and capital mobility, a new division of labor has become possible in the world, as economic activities are searching for places with lower costs and greater production capabilities. This trend is ongoing in both cities in developed countries and cities in developing countries.

One of the most important effects of this process is the significant measures that have taken place in various dimensions to create urban attractiveness in different cities around the world. This has made the phenomenon of cities competing with each other an attractive topic for experts in various sciences.

[1] Asst. Prof. Dr. Mohammad Ekram Yawar, Dean of the Faculty of Law, International Science and Technology University, Warsaw, Poland, ekram.yawar@istu.edu.pl, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3198-5212

In this process, managers' attention has been directed from the beginning towards discovering existing and latent economic development opportunities in cities, and in order to create attractiveness and increase their competitive power, they have taken steps to attract domestic and foreign investments, which has resulted in the marketing of cities and urban spaces.

However, by examining previous research in explaining this process, it is clear that most of the research has attempted to express generalities regarding the challenges and roles of urban design in the era of globalization or to express urban space management models in general. (Schmidta, 2010; Carmona, 2008; Magalhaes, 2006; Madanipour, 2006)

Or they have pointed out the general requirements for changes in urban management to attract capital. (Knox, 2005; Ericksona, 2004; Hall, 1998). Research conducted in the conditions of Afghanistan has also focused on the general requirements for using urban governance in the urban management system, mostly in social dimensions. The ambiguous and unknown point in this is the lack of connection between the macro requirements for attracting capital in the competitive field of cities and the desired implementation model in the partnership of urban management with investors, considering local conditions.

In other words, for most urban planners, the reasons for paying attention to investors as new stakeholders in urban space management are not clear, and the manner in which this interaction, which should be carried out in the form of providing incentives to investors by urban managers, is unclear.

Therefore, the main question of this research, which is tested in the case study of Kabul city, is: Considering the set of requirements for attracting capital in the urban space, what incentives can urban managers provide to investors and what are their expectations regarding these incentives?

In this study, a descriptive approach is used, and by studying documents and reviewing scientific and research sources, the effects of economic globalization on urban management and the new perspectives of urban managers on the issue of attracting capital in the city are discussed. In a case study (Kabul City), managers' motivations and expectations for attracting capital in the urban space are examined using a survey method and a questionnaire.

In the process of this study, the principles of investment orientation and city marketing during the economic competition of cities for attracting capital are first examined from a macro scale, and then, along with it and on a micro scale, the impact of this trend on the mutual expectations of managers and investors is discussed. This study is an attempt to analyze the roots and causes through which managers' incentives and expectations from investors should be considered in the process of designing urban space.

Globalization and the Competition of Cities

The development of technologies and the fluidity of capital have made possible a new division of labor in the world, as economic activities seek places with lower costs and greater production capacity. This has led to the globalization of the economy, in which increased flexibility in the movement of capital and dramatic advances in communication technology have played a major role, enabling fast and location-independent communications on a global scale.

This process, along with the reduction of government assistance to cities, has forced politicians and city managers to take an active role in attracting capital for the economic growth of cities.

Many urban planning organizations now operate as economic development institutions with the aim of attracting reputable commercial companies to invest in the city.

These fundamental changes in the political and economic situation of cities have had profound effects on the process of production and management of urban space (Nemeth, 2010 & Schmidt). This trend is not only present in cities in rich countries, but also in cities in developing countries. In other words, the process of globalization often occurs in city centers and not in virtual spaces or among ambiguous intercontinental connections. Therefore, this impermanent nature of material conditions makes cities part of the globalization process (Madanipour, 2006).

The result of these changes in the distribution of economic power in the past two decades has been the emergence of the phenomenon of competition between cities, which has become an interesting topic for many scholars. (Kotler et al. 1993). In such a situation where there is no guarantee that today's success will continue tomorrow, the consensus is that urban planners and designers can use the positive benefits of competition in the form of an approach to attracting investment for economic development.

Therefore, the landscape of many cities has now changed and adapted to the new approach of capital attraction activities (Hubard, & Hall, 1998, 19). Hence, cities that implement active strategies designed to attract capital can be more successful in achieving competitive advantages in unpredictable economic conditions than their competitors (OECD, 2007: 18).

The extent to which cities are able to compete on the global stage depends on important factors such as city size, local economies and urbanization economics (Petrakos, 2000). Of course, this also depends on the type of government policy in relation to the above factors that can create and strengthen these types of competitive activities. In summary, the most important factors affecting the competition of cities with each other can be listed as follows:

(1) A diverse economic base and qualified human capital.

(2) High-tech services and strong connections with knowledge-based institutions.

(3) Modern and developed infrastructure, especially in the field of transportation and communications.

(4) High quality of urban space and civic life.

(5) Institutional and organizational capacity to develop and implement future-oriented development strategies.

In this process, the task of urban management is increasingly to create sufficient conditions for marketing the city to attract capital, which includes new urban policies in various dimensions. (Knox, 2005).

From City Government to Urban Governance

New urban policies in the era of globalization and competition between cities have been accompanied by new forms of urban governance in which the private sector plays a guiding role in urban programs. This type of cooperation between different sectors that makes it possible to implement the capital attraction approach is in fact a coalition for urban development. (Tewdwr, 1996:194).

In the new approach, institutions for physical development have been created that no longer use the traditional forces of local governments because state institutions, especially municipalities, are unable to move more to seize the benefits of the globalized economy and are now seen as obstacles to private investment in the city. Privatization, decentralization and multi-actor politics are key components of the new policy, a policy that reflects a new balance between government and society; a move away from the public sector and more towards the private sector. In this regard, new types of partnerships between government institutions, economic enterprises and urban society have been formed, such that urban planning policy is now shaped by a wide range of organizations and their partnerships, rather than being determined solely by government institutions, as was common in the old way of urban planning. This fundamental change in the form of the organizational framework for urban planning is interpreted as the shift from city government to city governance. (OECD, 2007: 24) In fact, this approach is about the privatization of public goods, the most important reason for which is related to the efficiency of the private sector.

Of course, another reason that is raised in this context is that the government is less competitive in its financial and control systems and is under external pressure, therefore it acts inflexibly and contradictory in the management of goods and services. (Officer, 1999:1) Instead of focusing on a hierarchical model of different levels of government, the new urban governance is defined by order in diversity, in which actors from different levels of government, along with a wide range of private and semi-private figures, are involved.

In fact, urban governance is a diffuse and multifaceted form of government to regulate and standardize things. (Healey, 2006:97) In urban governance, urban public institutions are expected to avoid extensive intervention in the economy and limit their activities to regulation and support.

This issue has created a plurality of power, whereby more actors are involved in shaping the political economy of the city. This shift in overall governance from a powerful state to a group of partners has had a profound impact on the management of urban areas, and of course this new mechanism needs to ensure effective cooperation between the various partners (Madanipour, 2006).

Since urban governance emphasizes building a platform for cooperation with the private sector to increase the city's competitiveness, a shift has occurred in the urban management structure, whereby instead of being fully involved in urban issues, urban management seeks opportunities for the private sector to solve problems and attract capital. This shift is called the shift from managerialism to capitalism.

The impact of this shift has been accompanied by an increased understanding among urban planners that cities can compete in an unpredictable global economy is to pursue active strategies to gain and maintain competitive advantages over other competitors.

Traditionally, physical development plans were prepared by technical groups in interaction with politicians, and hierarchical relationships between levels of government were the only way to manage those plans. This is reflected in the comprehensive plans prepared by urban planners and the allocation of public funds for their implementation.

However, these methods, which have been accompanied by the public sector's emphasis on regulating and controlling the private sector and providing a fixed pattern in land use, are now incompatible with the fluid nature of capital (OECD, 2007: 108). In this process, the task of urban management has increasingly become to create sufficient conditions for city marketing to attract capital, which includes new urban policies in various dimensions (Knox, 2005).

In other words, to realize the investment-oriented approach and attract private sector capital, it is necessary that the city's capabilities be presented to investors in the form of marketing. In city marketing, with market pressures on city managers, it can be expected that market logic will increasingly enter city management. (Roberts & Erickson, 1997.)

This point in urban development means that the city's government and public institutions are expected to provide the necessary frameworks that can support the private sector in providing essential spaces and services. Therefore, the role of public institutions has changed from those who produce the city to those who regulate and promote the various features of the city as a commodity (Madanipour, 2006).

Urban marketing is concerned with the links that exist in the cooperation between city authorities and the public sector with the private sector, the cooperation that is carried out to implement development strategies in the city or urban space (Polidano, 2000).

There is a strong link between the philosophy of city marketing and the methods of urban management and local development. City and urban space marketing can create a new level of quality in terms of competitiveness, creativity and flexibility in the form of local development policy. In the city marketing method, a strategic approach can be created and expanded for the cooperation of urban planners and urban designers with the private sector.

Therefore, a new relationship must be defined between the way urban space management and city marketing in order to present the desired image of urban space to citizens and investors. In other words, when there is a need for flexibility If urban programs are to be marketed, then management practices are also needed that can facilitate effective market implementation in urban programs and ensure a higher quality of life (Sellers, 2002).

Based on studies conducted in the field of urban governance and its relevance to the conditions of Afghan cities, criteria such as citizen participation, effectiveness, responsiveness, openness, transparency, legality, consensus orientation, justice, strategic vision, and decentralization have been mentioned as criteria for urban governance in Afghanistan (Barakpour, 2006: 501).

Among the above criteria, the discussion of capital attraction in urban space can be interpreted in terms of effectiveness and consensus orientation criteria. The effectiveness criterion is based on the use of available resources to meet the needs of citizens, provide urban services, and satisfy the people, and the consensus orientation criterion is the adjustment and creation of agreement between different interests through communication and joint efforts between government organizations, citizens, and non-governmental organizations (Taqvaei and Tajdar, 2009: 54). To examine the attraction of capital in the urban space in the Iranian context and in a case study, considering the above criteria, the relationship between urban governance and urban management models is first discussed.

Urban Governance and Urban Space Management

In addition to the effects of urban governance on the creation of a capitalist approach to urban management, significant effects of capitalist approach on urban space management have also been created. Urban spaces are places that belong to all citizens, are not limited to the physical aspect and are present in cities in various forms (Kashanijo, 2009: 96).

Historically, urban spaces, like other public goods, have been created and managed by popular institutions or public institutions, and now by the government through taxation. (Carmona et al.2008:66). But now, in the arena of globalization and the creation of economic competition between cities, urban spaces have also undergone many pressures and changes, and today we are faced with completely new forms of urban spaces and their management. (Hardy, 2004: 17) In order to examine this effect on urban space management, a definition must first be provided.

By examining the historical background of urban space, various definitions of urban space management can be obtained, but the most comprehensive definition that has been provided for urban space management is: a set of processes and actions that strive to ensure that urban space can perform all the expected roles and at the same time manage the interactions and effects between various functions and activities in urban space in a way that is acceptable to users.

Urban Space Management Can Be Identified in Four Interconnected Processes:

- Regulation or ordering of activities and control of the relationships between them.

- Methods of maintenance or Compatibility between the physical components of urban space so that urban space is usable.

- New investments in urban space: The regulation of activities and maintenance of urban space requires investment, and their effectiveness depends on the amount of financial resources available. Capital can be obtained from various sources with their own possibilities and limitations, so it is very important to recognize the available financial resources; and

- Coordination of interventions in urban space (Carmona et al.2008:71).

Urban Space Management Models

Based on a review of urban space management records in different countries, three management models for urban space can be identified. The use of each of these models depends on the priorities and power of the institutions involved in urban space management.

- State-based model: In this model, the main task of urban space management is with the government or municipality and is the dominant method in most countries. This model relies on public organizations in planning and providing services with minimal use of private sector facilities.

- Market-based model: This model is based on transferring responsibilities for urban spaces to the private sector. This model is involved in transferring rights and obligations for management and, in some cases, the authority to define management objectives. The logic in this model is based on public-private partnerships. Key features of this model include:

Increasing public budget by stimulating private resources, using skills and expertise that do not exist in the public sector, providing more services than the public sector is usually able to provide, creating more responsible and customer-oriented management strategies for urban space activities.

- People-centered model: This model has had the least growth and application, and its main difference from the market-centered model is that the organizations involved are not necessarily selected based on market principles for profit and competition. Their main concern is the quality of urban space and its basic services. These organizations belong neither to the government structure nor to market interests. They pursue their goals through formal and informal links with other similar organizations and with the private and public sectors. (Carmona et al., 2008: 71-77) .

Given the context in which the transition from urban government to urban governance has occurred, it must be said that urban space management has not been resistant to the impact of the extensive changes in urban governance.

Changes in the cultural and political contexts of urban governance, changes in the relationship between local and central government, society and government, economy and government; have challenged the way governments control and exercise power in cities.

Therefore, recent trends in urban space management are part of a process in which city government is being replaced by city governance (Kooiman, 2003:4), as no single actor has a complete solution to urban space problems (Wagenaar, & Hajer, 2003:7). Therefore, the change in urban space management is a reflection of the broader changes between government, especially local government, and society, which have been clearly manifested in the management of many public services (Goss, 2001:24).

In the conditions of Afghanistan, there is no basis for implementing the principles of good governance, either by the government or by the people, so that interaction between the government, the people and the private sectors takes place. In Afghanistan, since until recently the huge burden of urban management has been completely on the shoulders of the government, the transfer of powers to the private sector has created the fear that local management will become arbitrary institutions, which has caused some problems in our country (Ismailzada and Sarafi, 2006: 9). Therefore, the common model in the cities of the country is still the state-oriented model, but considering the goal of capitalism and marketing in urban management, the market-oriented model is the most desirable model for attracting private sector capital to the urban space, which should be done in the form of cooperation between the private sector or the market and the municipality.

Public-Private Partnerships

As the literature review suggests, capital investment is the process of creating value for citizens by bringing together public and private sector resources to explore social opportunities (Jones, & Morris, 1999:71). Therefore, the management of city capital is engaged in a fundamental shift from traditional management to a relationship with the private sector economy, and in doing so, it must demonstrate a strong commitment to working with the private sector. In this regard, public-private partnerships have now become a dominant organizational framework for planning and implementing urban strategies.

This shift is based on the recognition that, in the face of intense global competition among cities for economic growth, partnerships between the public and private sectors provide a strategic basis for competitiveness. (OECD, 2007:22)

Public-private partnerships generally refer to collaboration between the public and private sectors in the provision of public services. Its main goal is to provide that part of public services that cannot be achieved without cooperation with the private sector. In the form of public-private partnerships, the private sector is more involved in the planning process, and this is often a factor in the private sector being the pioneer and implementer of programs.

Four groups of actors are involved in the process of public-private partnerships, which are: the government, non-governmental organizations, local organizations and the private sector. The classification of types of partnerships depends on the type of service, the nature of the partnership and its objectives. In the form of these partnerships, the public sector will be able to maintain partial ownership and management of services and leave the provision of services to the private sector without reducing its responsibility and accountability to the people and at the same time be able to meet the needs of different segments of the people in a balanced way.

The private sector pays more attention to the market mechanism in terms of supply and demand and also has better mobility in the market, but it does not enter into partnerships in the provision of services and goods that do not have financial benefits. The desired option in facing this challenge is to promote the role of both the public and private sectors in the ownership, production and distribution of public goods and services (Ngowi, 2005: 4). In other words, partnership in cases where there is no desired interest and profit requires specific prerequisites in the form of various incentives. Successful partnerships require a strong intermediary role from the government or municipality to regulate the details of cooperation between partners and protect the interests of low-interest partners (Miraftab, 2004). Therefore, public-private partnerships are the most important tools for realizing the capitalistic approach in the city and attracting capital. Among these cases, the city of Seoul can be mentioned, where decentralization reforms and the move towards urban governance led to extensive programs for urban development, resulting in the implementation of 114 projects with public-private partnerships (OECD, 2007: 108). Urban space Public-private partnerships can be considered as a hybrid between public functions and private capital, in which the cost of creating and managing urban space is divided between the public and private sectors, of course, this division of labor is done based on the competence and ability of each sector, such as filling the capital gap in the public sector by the private sector (Pancewicz& Rembeza 2010: 1208). This method has not been used much in Afghanistan. Experts have cited the lack of clear laws and regulations, the complexity of administrative, executive and supervisory matters, and the lack of fully defined projects as the reason for their lack of proper use (Samen Construction and Housing Company, 2005). However, among the experiences of such partnerships within the country, the participation of the government and the private sector in the construction of freeways can be mentioned, in which the investor, as the project financier, shares in its risk (Qasemi, 2008).

Capital Attracting and Managing Urban Space

When cities are competing for capital, they are forced to offer incentive packages to attract capital (Jones, 2006: 4). These incentives are necessary to encourage investors to pay more attention to the quality of urban space at the beginning of the partnership. (Rowley, 1998) It should be noted that in public sector partnerships with the market and attracting capital to improve the quality of urban space, the private sector seeks to do things that are profitable, but the public sector should encourage the private sector to participate in less profitable matters by creating incentives (Lang, 2005: 19).

Therefore, incentives should be developed that direct development in a specific direction and provide facilities that are desired by the public but not profitable for the investor. (Ibid, 53). With regard to the capitalist approach, the creation and management of urban space is rapidly being privatized, so municipalities are Engaging with investors in the form of providing incentives to the private sector, usually in the form of incentive density and changes in land use regulations, leaves the creation and management of public space to the private sector.

Another example of these incentives, common in the United States, is the designation of areas of the city that are more easily accessible to the private sector through urban development regulations, and in return, the management of urban space is carried out by the private sector. Proponents of this approach argue that the efficiency of the private sector in providing and distributing public goods is more important than any potential negative effects on society from delegating urban space management to the private sector (Németh, & Schmidt, 2010).

Therefore, many local authorities have attempted to solve urban space problems by providing incentives and transferring some responsibilities to the private sector, although the extent of this transfer varies. For example, in some major commercial developments where the owners have a long-term interest in the quality of urban spaces remain privately owned and managed, often with municipal support.

Private sector support in urban furniture, landscaping, street patrols, and public space security are other ways of involving the private sector in urban space management (Magalhães & Carmona, 2006). In general, providing incentives emphasizes the private sector's ability to solve problems and uses public money to Stimulating weak markets is used to free up more private sector capital.

Other incentives include effective direct or indirect subsidies to the private sector, which if not supported, will not move forward. This approach also includes tax reduction, infrastructure development and land preparation by the public sector to reduce acquisition costs for private sector developments (OECD, 2007: 20).

On the other hand, city officials also have expectations from investors in terms of providing incentives. These expectations vary according to the needs and goals of each area of the city, but in general, the expectations of managers are to improve the quality of the urban space and satisfy the public.

The items in question in terms of officials' expectations from investors in terms of receiving incentives include improving environmental quality, supporting public sector services, creating jobs, urban renovation, attracting private resources and creating vitality in terms of society. (Woolley, 2003: 161-162; Carmona et al. 2008: 52)

Case study (Kabul Province Urban Management System)

Kabul is the first metropolis in Afghanistan, which is also the capital of Afghanistan, and is internationally famous due to its mountain and tourist attractions. The large number of tourists and people in Kabul has attracted special attention from domestic and foreign investors to this city, and huge amounts of money are spent annually in the city's tourism and commercial sectors. Therefore, recently, the city's management institutions, in competition with other cities, have begun an effort to attract this capital in the way of providing public services in urban spaces. This part of the research was conducted using a survey method and by completing a questionnaire from city managers.

The community of city managers includes those managers who have a direct connection with the issue of capital attraction, including the mayors of the 21 districts of Mashhad, managers of the

Mashhad Municipality's macro-economic partnerships, managers of the Kabul Comprehensive Planning Institution, and managers of the Deputy Urban planning and urban architecture.

According to the findings of the theoretical foundations, a questionnaire was developed that includes the desired incentives from the perspective of investors and the actions expected from managers that investors should take in return for receiving incentives in urban space. These questions were developed based on the theoretical foundations as well as pre-test interviews conducted with investors and managers.

Given the large number of investors in large commercial complexes in Kabul and their interest in improving the quality of urban space, managers were asked about how to cooperate with investors in commercial complexes in improving the quality of urban space in a five-point spectrum from completely disagree to completely agree with the above. (Tables 1 and 2)

Table 1. Average rating of managers' expectations of investors

Managers' expectations from investors		**Average scores**
1	Providing public parking	3.67
2	Providing amenities in urban space	2.89
3	Improving green space, lighting and flooring in urban spaces	3.65
4	Cleaning of urban space	3.34
5	Getting advice from the municipality on designing a commercial complex	1.78
6	Providing suitable urban furniture	2.78
7	Investing in better urban design of urban space	3
8	Paying more fees	1
9	Participation in the ceremony	2.12
10	Donating part of your land to urban space	0.88

Table 2. Average rating of incentives available to investors

Incentives that can be given by managers to investors		**Average scores**
1	Granting loans or other financial facilities	2.56
2	Determining a suitable urban space in the city for investment with easier criteria	2.67
3	Removing or modifying uses incompatible with the commercial complex in the urban space	3.45

4	Establishing greater communication and coordination with other government organizations to facilitate the creation of a commercial complex	2.56
5	Giving advice or receiving and acting on investor opinions	2.34
6	Giving a better view and perspective to the commercial complex by changing the building regulations	2.78
7	Reducing licensing fees and costs	3.67
8	Creating the possibility of investor advertising in urban space	3.56
9	Shortening the legal process for approving commercial complex plans	3.78
10	Granting more density	3

The findings of this study show that the best incentives for managers to provide to investors include shortening the process of approving complex commercial plans, reducing the costs and hassles of issuing permits, and establishing communication and coordination with other government agencies. The most important actions that managers expect from investors include providing public parking, improving green spaces, lighting, flooring, and cleaning urban spaces.

Conclusion

At whatever social and economic level cities are, competition to attract capital on a national and transnational scale is inevitable for them. The competition of cities to attract capital on a large scale and its series of effects on urban governance and capitalization in urban management have made the partnership of urban managers with the private sector on the scale of the city and urban space an important weapon in the global competition arena (Table 3). However, the private sector does not enter into partnerships that do not have financial benefits, including the quality of urban space.

Therefore, partnership requires specific prerequisites in the form of various incentives, and urban management must create a suitable platform for attracting private capital by providing targeted incentives in the overall urban design activities.

Of course, there is a risk that providing incentives and economic justifications in urban space management will take priority and end up benefiting the interests of investors. On the other hand, there is a risk that plans and programs will become idealistic and far from economic justifications.

Therefore, in order to be present in the urban competition arena and Capital attraction should be based on a market-oriented approach, taking into account the mutual expectations of investors and urban managers in the design and planning of urban space.

However, in examining the local conditions of Iran and specifically in the Kabul metropolis, it is observed that possible incentives in the field of managers are limited to administrative measures and there is no news of financial and technical incentives that can be effective in attracting small investors. The interesting point here is that in the expectations of managers, despite the lack of financial resources, more development and technical measures are required from investors than receiving more fees.

Therefore, it is clear that most of the cooperation of urban designers in attracting capital and improving the quality of urban space should be on the side of investors to meet the expectations of urban managers, instead of being present in connection with the incentives of managers.

Table 3. Series of effects of city competition on capital attraction in urban space

Globalization and the competition of cities	⇨	**Urban governance**	⇨	**Capitalism**	⇨	**City Marketing**	⇨	**Public Private partnership**	⇨	**Setting expectations and actions**
Capital liquidity and the competitiveness of cities in attracting capital		Greater cooperation with non-governmental sectors in providing public services		Laying the groundwork for attracting private sector capital – a market-based approach to urban space management		Declaring the economic advantages and capabilities of the city and urban spaces to investors		Developing a mechanism for cooperation with investors in the provision of public services		Determining managers' expectations and incentives for attracting capital in urban space
Global										Local
The macro-scale of the overall goals of mental criteria										Micro-scale implementation strategies of objective measures

References

Barakpour, Nasser. (2006) Urban Governance and the City Administration System in Iran. Publisher. Urban Planning and Management Conference. March 2006, 493-3. Mashhad: Ferdowsi University. For access: https://civilica.com/doc/74704/

Carmona, M. & Magalhães, C. (2006). Innovations in the Management of Public Space: Reshaping andRefocusing Governance. Planning Theory & Practice,7,289-303.

Carmona, M., Magalhães, C., & Hammond, L.(2008). Public Space The management dimension.New York: Routledge.

Erickson, B., & Roberts, M. (1997). Marketing local identity. Urban Design, 2,35-59.

Ghasemi, Saman. (2008) Book of Methods of Financing and Foreign Investment in Projects. Place of Publication: Publication: Economic Affairs Research Institute. For access: https://tinyurl.com/mwstd2d8

Goss, S. (2001). Making Local Governance Work: Networks, Relationships and the Management of Change. Palgrave :Basingstoke.

Hajer, M., Wagenaar, H. (eds) .(2003). Deliberative Policy Analysis:Understanding Governance in the Network Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, T., Hubbard, P. (1998). The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics of Regime and Representation. Chichester: Wiley.

Hardy, H. (2004). Public Spaces:Partnership, Collaboration, Reclaiming. London :place mark award.

Healey, P. (2006). Urban Regeneration and the Development Industry. Regional Studies, 25,97-108.

Helbrecht, I. (1994). Conflict, consent, cooperation: Comprehensive planning in Germany beyond market and state In Braun GO (ed.), Managing and Marketing of Urban Development and Urban Life. Berlin :Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Ismaeil Zadeh, Hossein; and Sarafi, Mozaffar. (2006). The place of good governance in the urban planning of Tehran Metro. Humanities Lecturer, Special Issue on Geography. 48, 10-28. For access: https://tinyurl.com/4hd7ty5f

Jones, H. (2006). Cultural Regeneration & Global Neoliberal Political Economies : Amsterdam - A Case Study. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Kashani Jo, Khashayar. (2010) Recognizing Theoretical Approaches to Public Spaces of the City. Publisher: City Identity. p. 95-107. For access: https://tinyurl.com/5bkttsx8

Knox, P. (2005). Creating Ordinary Places: Slow Cities in a Fast World. Urban Design. 10 (1), 1–11.

Kooiman, J. (2003). Governing as Governance.London: Sage.

Kotler ,P., Rein, I., & Haider ,H. D.(1993). Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry, and Tourism to Cities, Regions and Nations.New York: Free Press.

Lang, J. (2005). URBAN DESIGN: A Typology of Procedures and Products- Illustrated with over 50 Case Studies. Sydney: Architectural Press.

Lang, J. (2005). URBAN DESIGN: A Typology of Procedures and Products- Illustrated with over 50 Case Studies. Sydney: Architectural Press.

Madanipour, A. (2006). Roles and challenges of urban design. Urban design, 11(2),173-193.

Miraftab, F. (2004). Public-Private Partnerships.The Trojan Horse of Neoliberal Development?, Planning Education and Research,1,89-101.

Morris, M. H., & Jones, F. F. (1999). Entrepreneurship in Established Organizations: The Case of the Public Sector. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 24(I),65- 82.

Ngowi,P. H. (2005). Public-Private Partnership (PPPs) in the Management of Municipalities in Tanzania –Issues and Lessons of Experience. Mzumbe : Mzumbe University, Economics Department.

OECD. (2007). Competitive Cities:A New Entrepreneurial Paradigm in Spatial Development. Paris: Author.

Officer, R. R. (1999). Privatization of Public Assets. Melbourne: Melbourne Business School,University of Melbourne.

Petrakos,G. (2000). Economy and Space: Towards a re-examination of relationships and policies. Volos,Dept. of Planning and Regional Development, Univeristy of Thessaly eds.

Polidano, C. (2000). Measuring Public Sector Capacity. World Development, 28(5) ,805-822.

Rembeza,M., & Pancewicz, L. (2010). Public Private Partnership as an urban regeneration tool for the inner city, large-scale public spaceprojects in Poland. May18- 20 (1208-1210). Vienna: Technical University of Gdansk.

Rowley, A. (1998). Private-property decision makers and the quality of urban design. Urban Design, 3(2),151-173.

Samen Construction and Housing Company. (2005) Study report on the study of project financing solutions. Mashhad: Publisher.

Schmidta, S., & Némethb, J.(2010). Space, Place and the City: Emerging Research on Public Space Design and Planning. Urban Design, 15(4),453-457.

Sellers, J. (2002). Governing from Below: Urban Regions and the Global Economy. Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press.

Taqvaei, Ali Akbar; and Tajdar, Rasoul. (2009). An Introduction to Good Urban Governance in an Analytical Approach. Publisher. Urban Management, No. 33, 45-58. For access: https://tinyurl.com/bde2ryp7

Tewdwr, M.(1996). British planning policy in transition. London :UCL Press.

Woolley, H. (2003). Urban open spaces. London and New York: Spon Press.

Received: 22.03.2025
Revised: 25.03.2025
Accepted: 30.03.2025
Published: 04.04.2025