

Sustainable Development: towards a new method of managing local government policy? The case of Nice Côte d'Azur

Aurélia HEURTEUX¹

Résumé

Depuis quelques années un nouvel argument communicationnel est apparu au sein de la société : celui de développement durable. La métropole Nice Côte d'Azur, première métropole de France a été étudiée. Elle a mis en place un agenda 21 regroupant des projets de développement durable des petites communes. Il convient de s'interroger sur l'élaboration d'outils de pilotage et de montrer le lien entre les communes et la métropole.

Mots clés : développement durable, outils de pilotage, tableaux de bord, métropoles.

Sustainable Development: towards a new managing mode of territorial policy? The case of Nice Côte d'Azur

Abstract: In recent years a new argument of communication has emerged in society: the sustainable development. The Nice Côte d'Azur metropole, first French metropole, was studied. It has set up an Agenda 21, assembling sustainable development projects of small towns. It is appropriate to consider the development of management tools and demonstrate the link between the municipalities and the metropole.

Key-words: sustainable development, management tools, dashboards, metropole.

Introduction

Local public service and sustainable development are closely related, especially since the Grenelle environmental laws in 2009-2010. Sustainable development constitutes a set of new constraints. It modifies the very nature of the local public service and provides a new framework for reflection for those local authorities that actually implement sustainable development projects. Such projects are implemented in line with local government procedures, and impact the notions of 'public interest' and 'public service' (PWC, 2010). While some public management tools can be useful to sustainable development, notably *Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale* (SCOT) [Coherent local government urban plan], they reflect the lack of a real social dimension (Leroux, 2012). This subject is all the more topical because the environment is the subject of much debate. It is a matter of social subjectivity, with a general awareness of the problems that characterise it. Building sustainable development momentum brings together stakeholders with different interests and conventions. The concept of sustainable development therefore takes on a different meaning depending on the stakeholders involved. Indeed, for each person the environment is a subjective construct, made up of representations, values, attitudes and behaviours that vary considerably according to the type of stakeholder concerned, their socialisation and their actual experiences, and depending on the contexts in which they act (Lascoumes, 1994). While "environmental protection is an emerging value of today's consensual morality", it is not yet completely formed or structured (Draetta, 2003, p.79). Thus, this situation highlights a

¹ PhD Student in Management, Université Côte d'Azur, GRM, France

Sustainable Development: towards a new method of managing local government policy? The case of Nice Côte d'Azur / Aurélia HEURTEUX

gap between a relatively developed environmental awareness and a sensitivity that is still work-in-progress. This observation, noticed in individuals, is also present at the level of local government bodies in charge of sustainable development. The use of Information and Communication Technology in local authorities is thus seen as a means of improving communication and developing public policies in line with the public's expectations (Bertrand, 2001, Huron, Spieth, 2009). On the other hand, managing sustainable development projects leads to the development of very different models, particularly when developing dashboards and defining criteria to be considered (Siebauder, 2009, Huron, 2013). Tools have been developed in order to manage upstream and downstream sustainable development. These tools must also include the specific characteristics of the local authority, contrary to the principles of *New Public Management* (Amar, Berthier, 2007, Pollitt, Bouckaert, 2004, Jansen, 2008). *New Public Management* is a concept developed by Hood in 1991 who, faced with the public sector's loss of legitimacy, tried to introduce the concept of performance into a sector, whose sole modus operandi, until then, revolved around budgetary considerations. Faced with the proliferation of major risks in all areas of economic and social life, "*The same crisis of legitimacy which seemed to lead to a systematic retreat of government action (through the crisis of the welfare state), in favour of private solutions decorated with every merit by the Thatcher/Reagan 'revolution' or New Public Management, leads to the rapid and massive return of the State and public management as soon as the major risk arise*"(Laufer, 2008). Similarly, the crisis would lead us to believe that role of management control would henceforth require someone who is not so much an expert with numbers but instead capable of complex investigation (Lorino, 2009). Number-focused checks before the financial crisis were favoured since easier to use. Indeed, "*is it not simpler to check a quantitative measure and compare numbers than to find ways and means of collectively building a judgment in a*

situation, sometimes amid controversy and doubt, while taking into account complex multiplicity of objectives and constraints? (...) Can the complex judgment of the complex performance of complex organisations be reduced to analysing a number? "(Lorino, 2009, p.33).

The concept of sustainable development could be an answer to the problem of assessing financial performance. Moreover, the concept of sustainable development is a "*dynamic concept; the economic, environmental and social approaches are integrated. It also has an ethical dimension*"(Moquet, 2005, p168). Performance is measured using the so-called triple bottom line, which brings together the three pillars of sustainable development rather than a single financial perspective, which is still today economically viable. Integrating sustainable development into the management system would be a response to NPM criticism. Indeed, "*The change in public management towards a new approach to performance makes it possible to create a link between people, move away from a system based exclusively on variables derived from a commercial world, and understand ethics and performance as a new system of values*" (Bartoli et al., 2011, p.638). On the other hand, "*the concepts of sustainable development and a local Agenda 21 remain vaguer in the eyes of local decision-makers and elected representatives (and one might also say that it is all too often a "catch-all") and many of them do not seek to develop a comprehensive, cross-sectoral approach which could jeopardise a certain number of achievements and habits ... Thus, it may be considered that there is an intermediate path between the local Agenda 21 and the absence of any plan by promoting the inclusion of the environment and sustainable development as early as possible in the decisions of the elected representatives*"(Charlot-Valdieu, Outrequin, 1999, p.20). Sustainable development would therefore become strategic and its inclusion in management would introduce decision-making support tools compatible with the new vision of performance.

The question then arises as to the existence of management tools for integrating sustainable development in local authorities. In other words, is there a dashboard that combines sustainable development with the specific requirements of the local authority?

Several questions arise from this problem: should the dashboard take the form of a private sector tool? Which indicators should be included and why? How is the dashboard developed by the local authority staff? What role should the dashboard play in local and regional authorities?

In order to do this, the first metropolitan area set up in France, Nice-Côte d'Azur, has been studied, in particular because it includes projects of small towns and villages within certain strategic approaches of Agenda 21. It then becomes vital to understand your management system, especially if management tools are implemented.

1. Management control: between the theory of New Public Management and organisational hypocrisy?

1.1. Management control tools: what features and uses for local authorities?

Local authorities consider the expectations of all stakeholders, and particularly those of the general public, can be broken down into several dimensions. Individuals are at once users, taxpayers, voters and customers (Huron, Spindler, 1998, p.12, Jansen 2008). They give their opinions by using their right to vote (voters). Their point of view can be defined as the perception of a community of voters on the performance of governmental organisations. This opinion is translated into the results of the elections, and thus concerns the elected representatives. Faced with these electors, the local authority seeks to legitimise its actions. There is a legitimate condition for the existence of organisations: *"for an organisation to be recognized as legitimate within a given society, the system of norms and procedures that characterise it must be such*

that, if members of the organisation respect it, their interests, that of the organisation and that of society are generally compatible" (Burlaud, Laufer, 1997, p 1758). This principle of legitimacy is at the heart of the definition of public management: *"public management is what the management of the public organisation becomes when it undergoes a legitimacy crisis, that is, when the legal norms of the public service criterion (and the corresponding positivist scientific standards) no longer suffice to ensure the legitimacy of the public sector. Public management is therefore not the management of the public sector (the crisis of the administrative law criterion renders such a definition inoperative) but management in the face of public opinion which, in a democracy, represents the ultimate body of legitimation "* (Burlaud, Laufer, 1997, p. 1765). The system of legitimacy is not yet fully established, and evolves over time. The administration increasingly tries to legitimise itself by the methods used, as guarantees of the public opinion. Taxpayers are increasingly looking for explanations regarding the distribution and management of their money, especially when dealing with local authorities, who are much closer to the public.

The aim of the local authority is to satisfy public interest (unlike companies which have an objective of profitability) in order to justify itself to its stakeholders (in reference to Freeman's stakeholder theory, 1983). However, public interest *"is not easily quantifiable a priori and it is susceptible of different interpretations, particularly in relation to political choices"* (Barilari, 2007, p.226). The specific nature of local and regional authorities therefore requires a process of adapting existing tools. Another adaptation can also be envisaged: including sustainable development in management tools. This concept that is still vague and complex, in particular because the financial dimension is always the most visible in the triple bottom line. Indeed, sustainable development could be a new approach to project design and regional development that takes into account the social and

Sustainable Development: towards a new method of managing local government policy? The case of Nice Côte d'Azur / Aurélia HEURTEUX

environmental dimensions. It is also about changing mind-sets, which are only focussed on financial issues. Each stakeholder, each taxpayer should be involved in this process so that it can change over time and therefore endure.

In the literature, very few references deal with including sustainable development into management tools exist, as the following table shows:

Table 1 : Management control tools that include sustainable development

Forms of integration	Limits
External view: – To communicate – To be accountable – Ratings, certification and ISO standards (Christophe, 2009)	No standardization of reporting (Capron, Quairel, 2009); Two views of social responsibility: American and European (Bartolomeo 2000; Moquet, 2010)
Accounting approach: – Social accounting (Capron, 2009) – Environmental accounting (Christophe, 1995)	No long-term management (Capron, Quairel, 2010); Only financial measure (Hubbard, 2009; Quairel, 2006)
The approach by a set of indicators: – The Sustainability Balanced Scorecard (Bieker, 2002; Epstein, Wisner, 2001; Figge <i>et al.</i> , 2002)	Inclusion too partial (Germain, Gates, 2010); Only economic measures (Mousli, 2010); Problem of indicator selection (Boulanger, 2004)

Source : the author

These studies were mainly conducted within the private sector (and therefore not specific to the public sector). Few studies have shown that they can be applied in the public sector. The most appropriate tool for addressing sustainable development in the strategy appears to be the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard, which is in fact a dashboard built on the Balanced Scorecard model of Kaplan and Norton by adding a development axis, Sustainable development, to the four existing ones. Although it has been shown that this type of dashboard is flexible, it has been problematic when applied to the public sector, in particular because of the lack of knowledge and the lack of studies on it. Benzerafa (2007) proposes transposing the Balanced Scorecard from the private to public sector, by transforming the 'shareholder' axis into a 'societal/political/guardian' axis (for socio-economic efficiency) and 'clients' axis into 'Customers/users/beneficiaries' (in terms of the quality of service rendered).

We need to ask whether all these tools coming from the private sector can be implemented in local authorities, and in particular with regard to the theory of New Public Management (Hood, 1995), which seems to want a kind of privatisation of the public sector.

1.2. New Public Management in the face of sustainable development

According to Christopher Hood (1995), *New Public Management* (NPM) advocates the implementation of management tools, modelled on the private sector. The seven doctrinal components are: division of the public sector into corporate units, organized by product/service (with reference to decentralisation); Increasing contracts based on competitive clauses, with internal markets and futures contracts; Emphasis on private sector management practices; Emphasis on discipline and frugality in the use of resources; The emphasis on accountability of top managers; The explicit format of measurable standards and measures of performance and success; And finally the emphasis on the control of *outputs*. Christopher Hood introduced the measure of performance and success. The NPM makes it possible to "*perfect and modernize public action, often judged as counterproductive, by introducing within it sections of managerial rationality*" (Amar, Berthier, 2007, p.7).

However, many contributions lead to criticism of the NPM. The recurring argument is that management tools are poorly adapted to the

public sector. It *"is about improving adaptability of methods and tools, to the problems encountered. It is necessary to shift from the "standardised" clumsily adapted to the public sector to "tailor-made"* (Amar, Berthier, 2007, p.11)³. Indeed, the environment and the level of complexity of the public and private sectors are not comparable. For others, *"purely and simply transposing private management tools would be irrelevant and would be counterproductive by giving ammunition to opponents of change. The tools need to be adapted to the public sector, where application is most often carried out by other methodologies and above all by a fundamentally different notion of time, since the public sphere has a much broader temporal conception"* (Lachmann, 2011, P.12t). Indeed, the public authority does not consider itself to be mortal, unlike companies (Barilari, 2007). The Neo-Weberian State (NWS), whose main authors are Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011), and Drechsler (2005), has emerged as a critical European movement to challenge the NPM. In their view, the NPM has failed to achieve its objectives, particularly the more efficient and efficient public organisations in the developed countries of central and eastern Europe. The NWS has developed in Europe since public authorities are based on the bureaucratic organisation of Max Weber. The four principles are: centralisation of the state, reform and enforcement of administrative law (guaranteeing equality for all individuals before the law), preservation of the public service, and representative democracy. Other principles, such as external referrals to the public, additional public consultation and direct public participation, outcome orientation and professional management, are "mirror" principles of the NPM (Dunn, Miller, 2007). NPM and NWS are similar in terms of the virtually identical nature of their principles. There are, however, some distinct principles, such as, for example, the leading role of the State, which is central to the NWS. Many perspectives appear as abstract, broad and

often ambiguous. NPM and NWS tend to ignore the mixed or obviously ineffective outcomes of the organisations that historically have been governed by these principles. Both embody a technical-utilitarian perspective and ultimately ignore other forms and contexts of rationality that are central to administrative reforms of democracies (Dunn, Miller, 2007).

For other authors, the NPM adopts a performance perspective that differs from the traditional public sector approach. Traditionally, the measurement of performance in the public sector is focused on inputs: decisions must be made on the basis of the budgets allocated to certain tasks and performance assessment is focused on differences between budgets and expenditures. Financial indicators therefore played a key role. NPM's emphasis on efficiency implies a more internal and explicit view of performance, and the emphasis on outputs and outcomes implies taking into account clients' views on performance (Jansen, 2008). After conducting three case studies, the latter comes to the conclusion that policy makers seem to combine the financial perspective with the public's perspective on performance. For him, the model of the NPM defined by Christopher Hood does not make it possible to distinguish between the perspective of the general public and that of the client. Successful implementation of the NPM requires that the public's perspective has a clear link to the other perspectives of performance. Although the NPM has encouraged the use of performance management systems, the fact remains that many criticisms, particularly regarding tools and the nature of measured performance, have been heard. Indeed, the measured performance is predominantly economic, in order to reduce public deficits. But the measurement of public performance is complex, because of the multiplicity of objectives (responding to the expectations of the public, while respecting legislation and budgets) and stakeholders. In addition, the

³ A statement agreed by public, notably Laurent Roturier, DGS of the city of Bron in the

Territorial Framework Letter no. 408 of 1 October 2010

subprime financial crisis provides an insight of measurement systems in society. Measurement is not a neutral device but an active agent in the processes of society. And therefore, public organisations need a better measurement system (De Caluwe et al., 2012).

In addition, sustainable development projects do not only affect financial performance, which runs counter to NPM theories. Sustainable development is a new rationale that would be a response to the many financial crises of this century but also to the crisis of legitimacy of the State to respond to public interest. The public can not only be considered as customers; this is problematic when developing projects and monitoring tools. The tool that should be implemented in public bodies to comply with NPM principles is the *Sustainable Balanced Scorecard*, but this tool mainly measures financial performance (Mousli, 2010) and the indicators are still too complex (Boulanger, 2004) and unsuitable for local authorities. The rationale of sustainable development includes the different stakeholders of organisations and allows a broader vision than the simple financial approach, a major element of the NPM which tends to want a client-based approach within the public sector. However, it should be recalled that the public sector responds to public interest, represented through the rationale of sustainable development. Could sustainable development be a response to local authorities' concerns to respond to the public interest or is it only a reflection of organisational hypocrisy and a simple means of communication?

1.3. Sustainable development: simple organizational hypocrisy?

Organisational hypocrisy can be defined as "*the result of conscious tactics adopted by individuals, groups, parties, dominant majorities, and leadership*" (Brunsson, 2002: 29). Sustainable development can be nothing but organisational hypocrisy in order to convince stakeholders of the merits of policies. For Brunsson, organisational hypocrisy concerns the contradictions between

declarations, decisions and actions, but also a way of managing contradictions. Leadership, rather than binding them, must separate them using hypocrisy. This practice makes it possible, for the organisation of action, to create a mobilizing ideology, which privileges the informal and which satisfies the interests of the organisation and, for the political organisation, to satisfy the requirements for moral and ethical order. However, in order for this type of management to endure, hypocrisy must not be unmasked, otherwise it runs the risk of being rejected on the part of the environment.

Three cases can thus appear in a metropolitan area: the existence of a management tool derived from the private sector, a management tool specific to the metropolitan area or the absence of this tool while the discourse is quite the reverse. Is sustainable development not a bulwark of policies to tame the public and win votes in elections? Sustainable development may be only a fad to counter the financial aspect of our society. It is then necessary to question the existence of a management tool to include sustainable development into the strategy of the metropolitan area, or whether the metropolitan area conducts sustainable development projects without any management control.

The theory of organisational hypocrisy makes a distinction between the political organisation and the organisation of action (Brunsson, Geoffroy, 2012). It is the political organisation that satisfies legitimacy towards the environment (stakeholders). Thus, politicians use organisational hypocrisy to satisfy the demands of the public. The public sector would then come closer to socially responsible companies, which "*have no choice but to symbolically respond to society's aspirations for sustainable development and social responsibility*" (Antheaume, 2005, p. 1). According to him, the company is forced to separate speech from action. This would explain why some metropolitan areas do not have management tools for including sustainable development. "*The implementation of specialised environmental*

accounting tools may answer to other purposes than a sole need for technical evaluation. It can be a means of signalling and demonstrating to other stakeholders that they have adopted a responsible behaviour "(Antheaume, 2005, p.16). There is a significant gap between what is said and concrete sustainable development practices. (Cho et al., 2015). According to these authors, social and institutional pressures demand that organisations engage in hypocrisy and develop facades.

It is then necessary to determine whether the metropolitan area of Nice Côte d'Azur possesses its own management tools, if they come from the private sector or if sustainable development is ultimately merely organisational hypocrisy.

2. A qualitative methodology: the case of the Nice Côte d'Azur metropolitan area

In order to answer this question, a qualitative study is envisaged, especially since there is little data in the literature of the public sector. In order to understand the phenomenon, an exploratory case study (Yin, 2009) was conducted within the Nice Côte d'Azur⁴ metropolitan area.

The metropolitan area is a Public Intercommunal Cooperation Establishment (EPCI), created by Act n ° 2010-1563 of 16 December 2010, on the reform of local authorities. In France, a metropolitan area [*'métropole'* in French] constitutes a single, uninterrupted administrative area, without any isolated areas and must have more than 500,000 inhabitants. The metropolitan area of Nice Côte d'Azur was the first metropolis to be created in France on 1 January 2012. It is the will to unify four 'intercommunalities': Nice Côte d'Azur, Vésubie, Tinée and the Mercantour ski resorts. The metropolitan area consists of 49 municipalities with nearly 550,000 inhabitants spread over 1.4 square kilometres. This metropolitan area is the

second most popular tourist destination (leisure and business) in France and the top "Games" destination in France. It has the second largest international airport in France. The metropolitan area has developed a five-year Agenda 21 programme (from 2013 to 2018). It is an action programme for the 21st century that takes into account sustainable development's triple bottom line: financial, social and the environmental. It stemmed from a broad, concerted reflection on the policies carried out in an administrative area, with the aim of implementing a programme of sustainable development actions. In concrete terms, it is based on an audit and leads to a strategy and an action plan aimed at boosting the inclusion of sustainable development in the administrative area of a local authority. Developed in collaboration with the municipalities, the metropolitan Agenda 21 programme for the period 2013-2018, provides the administrative area, with a strategy and an action plan to provide solutions to the three dimensions of sustainable development (financial, social and environmental); To tackle the issues in the administrative area, as well as to specific issues in the Coastal, Foothill and Highland regions that make up the metropolitan area; To tailor the programme to the expertise within the metropolitan area; To get member municipalities that are interested, involved in issues that fall within their powers and to expand and update the existing sustainable development projects and approaches in the former urban authority as well as in the former '*Communautés de Communes*' [group of cities, towns and/or villages] of the Mercantour, Tinée and Vésubie-Mercantour ski resorts and La-Tour-sur-Tinée. This document makes it possible to realise the ambitions of the Metropolitan area, that is to say, to be a benchmark administrative area for sustainable development in the Mediterranean and Southern Europe; Strengthen and develop its international status; and finally, to initiate an economic transformation on innovative and environmental grounds.

⁴ www.nicecotedazur.org/

Sustainable Development: towards a new method of managing local government policy? The case of Nice Côte d'Azur / Aurélia HEURTEUX

Agenda 21 was adopted on April 19, 2013 and received the national recognition 'Local Agenda 21 France' on December 19, 2013. It is the public policy master plan in the metropolitan area, including the Local Habitat Plan, the Local Integration and Employment Plan, the Local Climate Energy Plan and the Urban Travel Plan. It is therefore a global project to formalise and structure the metropolitan area's sustainable development strategy and set out a programme of concrete actions. It is a unifying document, accessible to the public and the local stakeholders. It makes it possible to monitor and measure progress in sustainable development policies. The Agenda 21 programme of Nice Côte d'Azur constitutes a unique approach in France, since it is the first to involve municipalities in its development, by asking them to run projects that fall under their administrative powers and respective local areas. Here we find a form of empowerment of the various entities with the metropolitan area, which harks back to the rationale of *New Public Management*. This approach the local authority can reach all the skills and expertise available to serve the public without administrative restrictions. Agenda 21 sets out 62 actions, across five strategic sustainable development areas: 'tackling climate change', 'conserving biodiversity, resources and environments', 'social cohesion and aid between local authorities and generations' 'Quality of life and thriving living beings', 'responsible production and consumption'. Of these 62 actions: 48 are managed by the metropolitan area and fall within its powers; 6 are managed by the municipalities in their respective administrative areas but they can take advantage of synergies within the metropolitan area (in particular, developing access to culture, developing inter-generational projects, tackling neighbourhood noise, developing a service that provides organic and local produce in school canteens); 10 are jointly managed by the municipalities and the metropolitan area (for example, improving the energy performance of municipal and metropolitan buildings). This joint management strengthens the metropolitan area's coordinating role and

maximises feedback between the Agenda 21 member municipalities.

In order to study this metropolitan area, semi-structured interviews were carried out using an interview guide, containing questions to ask the interviewee. These questions cover relevant themes, and may come from intuition and observation. "*Due to the relative freedom left to the respondent, the flexibility of the semi-directive interview gives a better understanding of its rationale while at the same time the wording in the guide favours comparative and cumulative analysis strategies between respondents and lends itself better to certain constraints in the field*" (Gavard-Perret et al., 2011, p.92). The interview guide includes some thirty questions covering the three parts of the literature review: the use or absence of management tools, are such tools from the private sector or have they been developed by local government employees, does it stem from a legal obligation or political will. Each interview lasted at least one hour. The interviews took place in the of the main offices of the metropolitan area, but also at two of the coastal municipalities: Beaulieu-sur-Mer and Cagnes-sur-Mer. The coastal towns are larger than those in the high country, in terms of surface area but also, in terms of the movements of inhabitants because they are highly tourist destinations. No municipality provided information about the implementation of Agenda 21 or the implementation of sustainable development actions, apart from Cagnes-sur-Mer, which is ahead of others and has implemented its own Local Agenda 21. Respondents are grouped into three communities. First of all, within the metropolitan area, with the participation of the Managing Director for Environment, Sustainable Development and Agenda 21, and the Coordinator of the Local Energy Plan for the metropolitan area, who both answered more technical questions. Within the town of

Cagnes-sur-Mer⁵, the Sustainable Development Manager was able to give answers to more local problems. Finally, in the town of Beaulieu-sur-Mer, three people took part in the interviews: the Green Space Manager, the Town Planning (and sustainable development) Manager, the Communications Manager and the Managing Director of Services.

Through these interviews and the analysis of documents such as the metropolitan area's Agenda 21, the sustainable development report and dashboards, different results began to emerge, notably thanks to a horizontal content analysis, i.e., spanning all documents. According to Gavard-Perret et al. (2011), content analysis makes it possible to compare responses in terms of the interests of different groups (especially line managers and subordinates). The thematic analysis, which counts items or themes, making it possible to highlight the opinions expressed (Bardin, 1977), improving this content analysis. The thematic analysis was developed using the NVivo 10 software. Major themes are repeated in each interview: The Metropolitan area's Agenda 21, communicating on actions, stakeholder opinion, Management and dashboards. These are descriptive codes which "suggest no interpretation, but merely the attribution of a class of phenomena to a segment of text" (Huberman, Miles, 2003).

3. Results and discussion: the different sustainable development visions and management problems encountered within the metropolitan area

First of all, there was unanimous agreement on the definition of the concept of sustainable development, i.e., a concept combining three areas: ecology, finance and social action (seven out of seven interviewees). A more specific vision was highlighted: "Sustainable development is much more a state of mind, a state of empowerment and education," said

the Managing Director of Services for Beaulieu-sur-Mer. Some interviewees also think that a fourth area of culture should be added the three preceding ones: "But it is about respecting heritage. Maintaining our heritage sites and beaches are part of sustainable development, by highlighting this approach", said the town planning officer of the Beaulieu-sur-Mer town council. Moreover, the specific aspect of this metropolitan area's Agenda 21 is that it allows for acknowledgement and exchange of good practices at meetings since each municipality is free to carry out its sustainable development actions. The metropolitan area seeks to empower and enhance participating municipalities ahead of others ("But a certain freedom is left to the municipalities. The aim of Agenda 21 is to encourage people to change their behaviour. The metropolitan area wants to incentivise and bring value rather than monitor and control). For certain actions, the metropolitan area provides financial support to the municipalities. The results are presented in the tables below, based on three positions in the literature: applying private sector techniques to the public sector, techniques specific to the public sector and the theory of organisational hypocrisy.

3.1. Applying private sector techniques to the public sector

Management control is quite recent in the public sector. It appeared in response to requests from public organisations for transparency in meeting stakeholder requirements, in particular those of the general public. but can this management control be applied in the same way as the private sector? Is it currently being implemented or is it only a means of reassuring the public?

⁵ http://www.cagnes-sur-mer.fr/agenda_21/index.html

Table 2 : Management control system

Indicator	Citation	Item ⁶	Comment
Lack of a management control system. Separate management control and sustainable development services	"Management control in the municipality is rather a state of mind, a representation of ethics. There is no management control, no tools as such " "Management control services are separate from the sustainable development services of the metropolitan area"	7	In small municipalities, there is no management control system. Within the metropolitan area, sustainable development services are separate from management control services. We can ask ourselves whether there is a real management system of overall performance.

Source: the author

Moreover, even if tools are developed, such as dashboards, they are not completely specific to the metropolitan area. It is mainly

developing indicators but also the ignorance of dashboard models which raise problems.

Table 3 : Metropolitan Scoreboards

Indicator	Citation	Item	Comment
Difficulties in developing indicators	"The indicators come mainly from the Internet (one looks at what others do) or are drawn from the legal indicators. They must be adapted to those that already exist, but some are difficult to fill in" "Outcome indicators are difficult to envisage because too many factors come into play. Some are difficult to fill in because the financial team only uses figures at the departmental level, so these indicators are not adapted"	15	Numerous difficulties are encountered in the dashboard modelling: inadequate indicators, very few qualitative indicators, lack of knowledge of private models, and thematic indicators placed after the others without being cross-sectorial.

Source: the author

The local government employees mentioned problems in filling in the outcome indicators. Indicators are poorly adapted and there are no cross-sector indicators as recommended by the private sector authors for the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard. This therefore highlights the difficulty of importing private sector tools as they are. They must either be modified to take into account the specific issues of the metropolitan area or they should be designed from scratch. But are there any specific management tools for the public sector, and especially the metropolitan area?

3.2. Techniques specific to the public sector

Since the tools of the public sector cannot be borrowed directly from the private sector due to a lack of employee training, but especially because they are not adapted to the specific characteristics of the public sector and more particularly, a local authority, the very existence of management tools needs to be questioned. Within the Nice-Côte d'Azur metropolitan area, a tool in the form of a

⁶ Item: Number of times the indicator is used

scoreboard has been set up. This is called the Metropolitan Agenda 21.

Table 4 : Metropolitan Agenda 21

Indicator	Citation	Item	Comment
Legal obligation to produce a sustainable development report before implementing an overall and 'inter-communal' Agenda 21,	"If there had not been a sustainable development report, NCA would still have developed the Agenda 21" "This is an overall, inter-communal Agenda 21 listing NCA actions and municipal actions. The NCA Agenda 21 has 5 purposes and 62 actions."	9	Agenda 21 was developed to create the broadest scope of public services, both at the municipal and at the metropolitan level.

Source : the author

This table presents the desire of the Nice Côte d'Azur metropolitan area to involve all municipalities within a sustainable development strategy so that the public can have a wide choice of services to improve their living standards. But this wide range of actions is not sufficiently communicated and public does not seem to be receptive to sustainable development issues, as the following table shows.

3.3. Organisational hypocrisy

Despite implementing a Metropolitan Agenda 21, it is necessary to consider whether this tool is actually used in policy-making or whether it is merely a façade to convince the public that public money is well used. Does the metropolitan area encounter difficulties in carrying out sustainable development actions.

Table 5 : Communication of actions

Indicator	Citation	Item	Comment
Communication problems within municipalities and between the metropolitan area and the municipalities	"A city that does not communicate" "The metropolitan area tries to collect information in the municipalities but communication is difficult because of political, managerial structure and the fact that this type of research takes time"	6	There are many sustainable development actions, especially in small municipalities, but the public is not aware of them and therefore local awareness building is difficult. Communication is also problematic between the various stakeholders, in particular because of the elected representatives.

Source : the author

However, the public are not alone in slowing down the development of sustainable development projects. Some elected officials are not focused on this issue. Thus, projects can be put on hold because they are not supported by the elected representatives, but only by council employees. There therefore needs to be constant contact between the

elected officials, local authority employees and the public.

Table 6 : Mixed opinions between the public and politicians

Indicator	Citation	Item	Comment
Some do not realize the need for sustainable development	"Local meetings focusing on sustainable development projects are virtually empty" "The elected representatives do not yet fully understand sustainable development. For example, for them, it is untidy to let grass grow".	8	Public policies are hampered by the lack of awareness and by the indifference of both the public and elected officials.

Source : the author

On top of these communication difficulties, there are problems in managing sustainable development policies, either because there is no management control system or due to disjointed services within the metropolitan area.

According to this thematic study, many problems are encountered in these communities, particularly for developing dashboards with limited scope. Here the vision is for no more than five years (the end date of the current Agenda 21) and certain projects, once finished, are removed from the dashboard (according to the metropolitan area's sustainable development manager). The indicators present difficulties, especially the social and results indicators, which are difficult to fill in, either because some indicators are only known at the end of the project (for example, with the tramline's second service), or because they are not metropolitan indicators. A lack of training and knowledge of management tools that include sustainable development, in particular the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard, was felt (by the sustainable development manager and ETHP's office manager in the metropolitan area). This development of 'DIY' tools is addressed by the theories of appropriation that should lead to new management tool practices (De Vaujany, 2006). This example also shows the problem of using private sector tools in the public sector, notably because of the lack of knowledge of

municipal staff, the short time-frame allocated (*"In the interests of time, we create one card per action that is not cross-sectoral. We use Excel for the dashboard, but there is a software created by a company: the ViaMP software but it is not used due to lack of training, lack of time but also because the tool is too complicated"*)⁷, and also the problem of developing indicators. On the contrary, empowering municipalities is in line with *New Public Management* theories, thereby creating a paradox within the metropolitan area itself. This case shows that *New Public Management* has its limitations but has enabled public sector management systems to be questioned. Some points of *New Public Management* are respected and others, such as management tools are specific to the local authority, perhaps because of the staff's lack of training.

Perhaps it is not feasible to manage overall performance in the metropolitan area's organisation in its present form? Perhaps the development of overall indicators is too complex, or perhaps overall performance cannot be managed in the metropolitan area's environment, but at a lower level, such as in municipalities. The example of Cagnes-sur-Mer is an example of this (dashboard and Agenda 21 specific to the municipality), but the politics have relegated the issue of managing performance to second place⁸. The importance of politics is therefore essential in managing sustainable development, but also the point of

⁷ The words of the Sustainable Development Manager of the Metropolitan area

⁸ The words of the Cagnes-sur-Mer Sustainable Development Manager

view of the public. (Take the example of weevil treatment. There are three treatments: chemical, mixed (bio-nematode) and injection (100% organic) The politicians prefer chemicals because it is cheaper but this treatment is constraining since it requires a 6-hour security perimeter and the market is not promising since manufacturers do not want to provide the chemicals ")⁹.

It is therefore pointless to generalise these results, in particular because the communities each have their own specific issues (differences in policies, administrative areas, inhabitants). This case study shows that there may be some organisational hypocrisy within a large metropolitan area. Three choices were identified: the use of private tools, public management tools and finally the use of organisational hypocrisy. The single case study has limited transferability of results (Yin, 2009). A more in-depth study of the French metropolitan areas would make it possible to know if any of them have specifically developed tools by staff, or if the metropolitan areas have ultimately opted only for management via organisational hypocrisy.

Conclusion

The concept of sustainable development has been growing rapidly in recent years. Local and regional authorities must now be able to attest to the existence of sustainable development projects, brought into the spotlight by Agenda 21 and the sustainable development report, which is a legal obligation. In order to fulfil this sustainable development report, indicators are developed in Agenda 21 to monitor the actions, in particular to know whether they have been effectively carried out (qualitative indicators). The problem is that this does not really count as management, firstly, because these indicators are not developed in the same departments as the management control teams, but also because the indicators are poorly adapted. In the end, these dashboards

are used to inform the public, some departments in the metropolitan area in order to make decisions and the State. The metropolitan area seeks to empower and encourage stakeholders (public, municipalities) around good practices in sustainable development.

It is also a question of raising the awareness of elected officials (because some are not aware of the development of Agenda 21), to inform them and change mind-sets ("*but we still need to change mind-sets. Elected officials are not yet fully up-to-speed on sustainable development*"). Sustainable development issues must be instilled by politicians and all stakeholders to ensure that projects are implemented, and that a real management system is instigated internally. Here, what passes for a control system is nothing but a tool for communicating and informing. This is in line with Brunsson's theory of organisational hypocrisy. To legitimise their actions, metropolitan areas may seek to use organisational hypocrisy around the concept of sustainable development in order to satisfy the demands of the stakeholders.

This case study could therefore be extended with a more organisational rather than instrumental vision, in order to study the phenomenon through the "glasses" of the theory of organisational hypocrisy, but also by studying other cases within the sector. Particularly in other metropolitan areas, to see whether this phenomenon is widespread or whether there is a metropolis with its own management tools that include sustainable development.

⁹ The words of the Beaulieu-sur-Mer Head of Green Spaces

Appendix : Interview guide

Sustainable development projects

Key Issues	Complementary questions
<p><u>Sustainable development concept</u> How can you define sustainable development?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Are public policies for sustainable development drawn up separately from the general policy or at the same time? – Grenelle laws make it necessary to implement public policies for sustainable development. But do you sometimes go beyond the mere legal obligation in developing sustainable development policies?
<p><u>Sustainable development projects</u> Are there sustainable development projects in your internal organisation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Specify the scope – Do you use management tools to manage your projects?
<p><u>Communication actions</u> Do you communicate on your sustainable development policies, either internally or externally? If so, via what media and who are the target recipients?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For you, is communication a strategy tool? – Does the public give you their views on sustainable development policy? – Is the opinion of the public used to improve communication, sustainable development strategies? – In your opinion, how could communication on sustainable development be improved?

Sustainable development management

Key issues	Complementary questions
<p><u>Management and Sustainable Development</u> Do you use tools that measure overall performance against the three areas of sustainable development or do you use an own tool for each specific area (socially responsible, ecologically tolerable and financially viable)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Do the tools used include the specific issues of the community? – Are they in line with the policy? – Are stakeholders involved in developing the tools? If so why? and how? – Are they private sector tools? If so, is there not a risk that private sector management could dehumanise public service? – How can public service be linked to public policy assessment?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Can we talk about performance in the public sector? Is it the same type of performance as in the private sector?
<p><u>Costs, budgets</u> Do you include sustainable development policy into costs and budgets?</p>	<p>How do you include sustainable development when calculating costs, for example by adding them to hidden costs?</p>

<p><u>Dashboard</u></p> <p>Do you use dashboards? If so, how are they developed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you use qualitative, quantitative indicators or both? - Is your vision more or less than five years? - Have the dashboards been developed using as a sample dashboard from the private sphere, such as the Balanced Scorecard? - Have you heard of the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard? - How are the indicators applied?
--	--

Governance and management

Key Issues	Complementary questions
<p><u>Small communities and metropolitan areas</u></p> <p>Why develop an Agenda 21 by involving each community in particular areas?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In what strategic area does your community appear? Why? - How are relations organised between your local authority and the metropolitan area?
<p><u>Managing joint projects</u></p> <p>How is project management organised?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who is responsible for managing sustainable development projects? - Do you have your own indicators or are they developed by the metropolitan area? - If they are developed by the metropolitan area, do they answer the specific issues of your town?
<p><u>Implementation of projects</u></p> <p>How are projects performed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How is the implementation of these projects organised? Who manages them? The municipality or both bodies? - Is there feedback, i.e., an assessment of these achievements?

Bibliography

AMAR A., BERTHIER L., 2007, « Le nouveau management public : avantages et limites », *Gestion et Management Publics*, vol.5.

ANTHEAUME N., 2005, « L'entreprise « socialement et écologiquement responsable » est-elle contrainte à l'hypocrisie ? Le cas des indicateurs de performance écologique d'une gamme de pesticides, Comptabilité et connaissances, pp. CD-Rom. <halshs-00581107>.

BARDIN L., 1977, *L'analyse de contenu*, Editions Presses universitaires de France, Paris.

BARILARI A., 2007, « Peut-on réformer l'Etat avec les méthodes du secteur privé ? », *Regards croisés sur l'Economie*, n°2, p. 225-232.

BARTOLOMEO M., BENNETT M., BOUMA J.,

HEYDKAMP P., JAMES P., WOLTERS T., 2000, «Environmental management accounting in Europe: current practice and future potential », *The European Accounting Review*, vol.9, n°1, p.31-52.

BARTOLI A. et al., 2011, « Vers un management public éthique et performant », *Revue Française d'Administration Publique*, n°140, p. 629-639.

BENZERAFA, Manel, 2007, « L'introduction de la *Balanced Scorecard* dans les administrations de l'État en France. Premières conclusions d'une recherche empirique », *Politiques et Management Public*, vol.25, n°4, p 81-97.

BERHAULT G., 2010, « Les technologies de l'information au service du développement durable des territoires », *Revue Française d'Administration Publique*, vol.2, n° 134, p. 385-394.

BERTRAND N., 2001, « Technologies d'information et de communication : quel rôle dans les

Sustainable Development: towards a new method of managing local government policy? The case of Nice Côte d'Azur / Aurélia HEURTEUX

- dynamiques territoriales de développement ? », *Revue d'Économie Régionale et Urbaine*, vol.111, n°, p.135-152.
- BIEKER T., 2002, « Managing corporate sustainability with the Balanced Scorecard: Developing a Balanced Scorecard for Integrity Management », oikos PhD summer academy 2002 « Sustainability, Corporations and Institutional Arrangements ».
- BOUCKAERT G., POLLITT C., 2011, *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis-New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, 367 p.
- BOULANGER P.-M., 2004, « Les indicateurs de développement durable : un défi scientifique, un enjeu démocratique », *Les Séminaires de l'Idri*, n°12, 24p.
- BRUNSSON N., 2002, *The organization of hypocrisy*, Seconde édition, Copenhague, Copenhagen Business School Press, 242 p.
- BRUNSSON N., GEOFFROY F., 2012, « Quand l'hypocrisie managériale protège l'organisation », *Revue internationale de psychosociologie et de gestion des comportements organisationnels*, Vol.13, n°46, pp. 301-315.
- BURLAUD A., LAUFER R., 1997, « Légitimité », in SIMON Y., JOFFRE P. (dir), *Encyclopédie de gestion*, 2^{ème} édition, Paris, Economica, p.1754-1772.
- CAPRON M., QUAIREL F., 2009, « Le rapportage 'Développement Durable' entre reddition et communication, entre volontariat et obligation », *Revue de l'Organisation Responsable*, vol.4, p.1929.
- CAPRON M., QUAIREL-LANOIZELEE F., 2010, *La responsabilité sociale d'entreprise*, Paris, La Découverte, 126 p.
- CAPRON M., 2009, « Comptabilité sociale et sociétale », in COLASSE B. (dir), *Encyclopédie de Comptabilité, Contrôle de Gestion et Audit*, 2^{ème} édition, Paris, Economica, p. 475-489.
- CHARLOT-VALDIEU C., OUTREQUIN P., 1999, « La ville et le développement durable », *Cahiers du Centre Scientifique et Technique du Bâtiment*, 70 p.
- CHO C., LAINE M., ROBERTS R., RODRIGUE M., 2015, « Organized hypocrisy, organizational façades, and sustainability reporting », *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol.40, p.78-94.
- CHRISTOPHE B., 1995, *La comptabilité verte. De la politique environnementale à l'écobilan*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, 180 p.
- CHRISTOPHE B., 2009, « Environnement naturel et comptabilité », in COLASSE B. (dir), *Encyclopédie de Comptabilité, Contrôle de Gestion et Audit*, 2^{ème} édition, Paris, Economica, p. 749-761.
- De CALUWE C., VAN DOOREN W., LONTI Z., 2012, «How to measure Public Administration Performance: A Conceptual Model with Applications for Budgeting, Human Resources Management, and Open Government», *Public Performance & Management Review*, vol.35, n°3, p.489-508.
- DESCHENAUX F., 2007, « Guide d'introduction au logiciel QSR Nvivo 7. ARQ », *Les cahiers pédagogiques de l'Association pour la recherche qualitative*.
- DE VAUJANY F.-X., 2006, « Pour une théorie de l'appropriation des outils de gestion : vers un dépassement de l'opposition conception-usage », *Management & Avenir*, vol.3, n° 9, p. 109-126.
- DRAETTA L., 2003, « *Le décalage entre attitudes et comportements en matière de protection de l'environnement* », in GENDRON C., VAILLANCOURT J.-G., *Développement durable et participation publique : de la contestation écologique aux défis de la gouvernance*, Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Canada, p.79-89.
- DRECHSLER W., 2005, « The Re-Emergence of Weberian Public Administration after the fall of the New Public Management: the central and Eastern European Perspective », *Halduskultuur*, n°6, p. 94-108.
- DUNN W.N., MILLER D.Y., 2007, «A Critique of the New Public Management and the Neo-Weberian State: Advancing a Critical Theory of Administrative Reform », *Public Organization Review*, n°7, p. 345-358.
- EPSTEIN M., WISNER P., 2001, « Using a Balanced Scorecard to implement Sustainability », *Environmental Quality Management*, p.1-10.
- FIGGE F., HAHN T., SCHALTEGGER S., WAGNER M., 2002, « The sustainability Balanced Scorecard Linking Sustainability Management to Business Strategy », *Business Strategy and the Environment*, n°11, p. 269-284.
- GATES S., GERMAIN C., 2010, « L'engagement des parties prenantes internes dans les démarches de Responsabilité Globale (RG): l'intégration des indicateurs de RG dans les outils de pilotage du contrôle de gestion », *Management & Avenir*, vol.3, n°33, p.223-237.
- GAVARD-PERRET M.-L., GOTTELAND D., HAON C., JOLIBERT A., 2011, *Méthodologie de recherche*.

Réussir son mémoire ou sa thèse en sciences de gestion, Paris, Pearson Education France, 383 p.

HOOD C., 1995, « The 'New Public Management' in the 1980s: Variations on a Theme », *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 20, n°2/3, p.93-109.

HUBBARD G., 2009, « Measuring Organizational Performance: Beyond the Triple Bottom Line », *Business Strategy and the Environment*, n°19, p. 177-191.

HUBERMAN A.M., MILES M.B., 2003, *Analyse des données qualitatives*, 2^{ème} édition, de Boeck, Paris, 625 p.

HURON D., 2013, « Les indicateurs du développement durable urbain : expérimentations et diversités de pratiques », in PISSALOUX J.-L., ORANGE G., *La ville durable après le Grenelle de L'environnement*, L'Harmattan, Paris, p. 65-89.

HURON D., SPIETH G., 2009, « Communication intercommunale : entre construction d'image du territoire et modification du comportement des usagers », *Communication & Organisation*, vol.1, n° 35, p. 112-122.

HURON D., SPINDLER J., 1998, *Le management public local*, Paris, Editions Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 106 p.

JANSEN P., 2008, « New Public Management: Perspectives on performance and the Use of Performance Information », *Financial Accountability and Management*, vol.24, n°2, p. 169-191.

LACHMANN J., 2011, « Le management public au cœur des réformes », Actes du premier colloque de l'Association Internationale de Recherche en Management Public, Versailles-St Quentin.

LASCOUMES P., 1994, *L'éco-pouvoir, environnements et politiques*, La Découverte, Paris, 318 p.

LAUFER R., 2008, « Où est passé le mangement public ? Incertitude, institutions et risques majeurs », *Politiques et Management Public*, vol.26, n°3, p. 25-48.

LEROUX E., 2012, « Le SCOT : un outil de Management public territorial au service du développement durable des territoires ? », *Gestion et Management Public*, vol. 1, n°1, p. 38-52.

LORINO P., 2009, « Le contrôle de gestion après la crise : Expertise obstinée du chiffre ou métier d'enquête complexe ? », *Revue Française de Gestion*, n°193, p. 29-35.

MOQUET A.-C., 2005, « De l'intégration du

développement durable dans la stratégie au pilotage et à l'instrumentation de la performance globale », *Management & Avenir*, vol.1, n°3, p. 153-170.

MOUSLI M., 2010, « Le déplacement du contrôle de gestion vers la RSE : un « éco-contrôle » plus juste ou juste l'écho d'un contrôle ? Cas de 50 sociétés cotées françaises », *Management & Avenir*, n°40, p. 54-72.

PWC, 2010, *Développement durable : aspects stratégiques et opérationnels*, éditions Lefebvre, Levallois, 400 p.

QUAIREL F., 2006, « Contrôle de la performance globale et responsabilité sociale de l'entreprise », *Actes du Congrès de l'Association Francophone de Comptabilité*, Tunis.

SIEBAUDER F.R., 2009, « Elaboration d'un tableau de bord de l'environnement urbain », in LAZZERI Y., *Les indicateurs territoriaux de développement durable, questionnements et expériences*, L'Harmattan, p.211-238.

YIN, R.K., 2009, *Case study Research. Design and Methods*, 4th éd, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, 219 p.