

# Spatial Visions and Scenarios – Thematic Study of INTERREG and ESPON activities





EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING  
OBSERVATION NETWORK

**ESPON Coordination Unit  
Technoport Schlassgoart  
66, rue de Luxembourg  
L-4221 Esch-sur-Alzette  
Luxembourg**

**[info@espon.eu](mailto:info@espon.eu)  
[www.espon.eu](http://www.espon.eu)**



**INTERACT Point Qualification and Transfer  
Jernbanegade 22  
DK-8800 Viborg  
Denmark**

**[ip.qt@interact-eu.net](mailto:ip.qt@interact-eu.net)  
[www.interact-eu.net](http://www.interact-eu.net)**

### **Disclaimer**

The views contained within this document are those of the authors. The content of this document is based on the results of applied research provided by EureConsult S.A. and TERSYN. As such the document does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ESPON or INTERACT Monitoring Committee. The Managing Authorities of the INTERACT and ESPON programmes are in no way liable for any use made of the information contained herein.

**This document is part-financed by the European Union within the INTERREG III INTERACT programme. The ESPON Coordination Unit has been contracted to carry through this study.**

## Foreword

Strategic territorial thinking has a tradition in the cooperation between regional and local authorities. In various contexts and under a variety of headings, spatial visions and scenarios have been conducted during the last decades. They have been particularly prominent in the work of INTERREG and ESPON.

This report presents the synthetic review of the work carried out by INTERREG and ESPON projects dealing with spatial scenarios and visions. Based on this, it provides input for the discussion of possible future activities and cross-fertilisation between ESPON and INTERREG.

The study has been conducted within a cooperation of the INTERACT and the ESPON 2006 Programme between June 2005 and March 2006. The study has been carried out by the project consortium EureConsult-TERSYN. The study project was led by EureConsult S.A. in its quality as 'contractor' and the authors of this report are in alphabetical order Jacques Robert, director of TERSYN (Strasbourg/France), and Dr. Thomas Stumm, Managing Director of EureConsult S.A. (Helmsange/Luxembourg).

The **general objective of this thematic study** is to provide a systematic and comparative overview on the spatial visions and scenario work currently going on in various INTERREG projects and to draw up an analysis of their differences in thematic priorities and methodologies and in particular on how ESPON results can support the further development of spatial visions in INTERREG programmes and beyond.

In order to achieve this general objective, the study compiled and compared INTERREG activities and ESPON projects dealing with spatial visions and scenario development at transnational and European level. Although the main focus was on ESPON and INTERREG IIIB activities, also a brief screening of similar experiences in the context of INTERREG IIIA (cross-border cooperation) and INTERREG IIIC (interregional cooperation) has been carried out.

In structural terms, **the present final synthesis report is sub-divided into three different parts.**

The **first part** consists of the **executive summary**, which gives a general overview on the main findings presented in the final synthesis report.

The **second part** consists of the **main report**, which itself is structured into seven chapters:

- **Chapter 1** presents the main topic to be covered by this thematic study, clarifies basic terminology and briefly explains the methodological approach adopted during the research process.
- **Chapter 2** 'sets the scene' for the analytical main part of this report and starts with a few preliminary remarks on the historic evolution of cooperative territorial development planning in the European Union (**section 2.1**). The most important steps in this evolutionary process are described separately for each of the three main types of cooperation, i.e. transnational spatial development planning (**section 2.2**), cross-border spatial development planning (**section 2.3**) and EU-wide prospective research and scenario development (**section 2.4**). In addition, a final section gives a brief overview on interregional cooperation projects that have addressed aspects more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning (section 2.5).
- At the beginning of **Chapter 3**, a number of preliminary remarks identify the different functions of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts and highlight key issues to be addressed for exploring further the overall geographical focus adopted as well as the relation of mental ownership that key stakeholders have developed in relation to these documents (**sections 3.1**). The following sections analyse - on a comparative basis - the themes, objectives, application strategies and stakeholder relations of existing transnational spatial visioning processes and of selected cross-border spatial development planning initiatives (**sections 3.2 and 3.3**). A final section gives a summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice (**section 3.4**).
- **Chapter 4** explores the methodological and procedural dimension of transnational spatial visioning processes and selected cross-border spatial development planning initiatives. This chapter also starts with a number of preliminary remarks, which introduce the key issues to be addressed during the subsequent analysis (**sections 4.1**). On ground of these remarks, the following sections elaborate an in-depth comparison of the methodological approaches and the procedures used for preparing and elaborating transnational spatial development visions and selected cross-border spatial development concepts (**sections 4.2 and 4.3**). A final section gives a summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice (**section 4.4**).
- **Chapter 5** analyses the usefulness of ESPON studies for transnational/cross-border spatial development planning and explores further the mutual level of interaction between both types of activity. After some preliminary remarks introducing the key issues to be addressed during the subsequent analysis (**section 5.1**), the results of selected ESPON study-projects are reviewed and 'key messages' regarding their usefulness are elaborated (**section 5.2**). The following sections analyse the actual level of interaction between transnational spatial visioning processes and ESPON I as well as possible interactions between selected cross-border spatial development planning processes and ESPON I (**sections 5.3 and 5.4**).
- **Chapter 6** undertakes a basic screening of 23 INTERREG IIIC projects addressing issues related to strategic territorial development planning. At the beginning, some brief preliminary remarks introduce the key issues to be addressed during the subsequent analysis (**section 6.1**). The following sections briefly analyse the main issues addressed and the focus of content-related activities, mainly by giving some examples from the sample of INTERREG IIIC projects identified (sections 6.2 and 6.3). A final section provides a summary appraisal of the main achievements realised by these 23 INTERREG IIIC projects (**section 6.4**).
- **Chapter 7** explores future perspectives for the new Structural Funds programming period 2007-13. A first section explores mutual cross-fertilisation potentials between the different types of cooperative territorial development planning and formulates suggestions for re-orienting territorial research under a future ESPON-programme (**section 7.1**). The next section formulates recommendations with respect to the important issues of how to strengthen the usefulness of strategic planning documents and of how to foster 'mental ownership' developed by stakeholders in relation to these documents (**section 7.2**). Finally, some additional recommendations with respect to further improvements and new project activities are elaborated that should be taken into consideration by future ESPON and INTERACT follow-up programmes after 2006 (**section 7.3**).

The **third part** (available as a separate document) contains a number of **annexes** that provide – in form of overview tables and maps – in depth information on specific issues dealt with in the main report.

**Acknowledgements:** The authors of this study wish to thank the large range of people from various INTERREG III programme areas who have, via their contributions to the questionnaire survey, actively contributed to the success of this ambitious study project. Also, we wish to thank the staff of the ESPON Coordination Unit for their valuable and pro-active support during the entire study process.

**Guidance note for the reader:** For those wishing to obtain a quick but in-depth overview on the most important findings of this study, please read the document alongside the follow in 'path': Executive Summary → Chapter 1 → Section 2.1 → Section 3.1 → Section 3.4 → Section 4.1 → Section 4.4 → → Chapter 5 → Section 6.1 → Section 6.4 → Chapter 7.

Explanatory notes are to be found at the end of the document.

This final synthesis report can be downloaded at the ESPON website: [www.espon.eu](http://www.espon.eu)

The final synthesis report was not validated by the ESPON Monitoring Committee and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of members of the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

<b>Part 1: Executive Summary</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Part 2: Main Report</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>1. General introduction and remarks on the methodological approach adopted</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2. The evolution of cooperative territorial development planning in the European Union</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Preliminary remarks	17
2.2 Transnational spatial development planning and the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions	18
2.3 Cross-border spatial development planning and the elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts	24
2.4 EU-wide spatial development planning and the application of prospective territorial research and scenario development	31
2.5 Interregional cooperation projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning activities	33
<b>3. Main themes, objectives and application strategies of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1 Preliminary remarks	35
3.2 Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC/IIIB programme areas	36
3.3 Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA/IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them	47
3.4 Summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice	53
<b>4. The methodological and procedural approaches employed in the context of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning</b>	<b>56</b>
4.1 Preliminary remarks	56
4.2 Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC/IIIB programme areas	57
4.3 Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA/IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them	67
4.4 Summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice	71
<b>5. The usefulness of ESPON study results and the interaction with transnational/cross-border spatial development planning processes</b>	<b>73</b>
5.1 Preliminary remarks	73
5.2 ESPON-project results and their usefulness for transnational/cross-border spatial development planning processes	74
5.3 The current level of interaction between recent transnational spatial visioning processes and the outcomes of ESPON I studies	78
5.4 Possible interactions between selected cross-border spatial development planning processes and the outcomes of ESPON I studies	82

<b>6. A screening of INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on aspects related to strategic territorial development planning</b>	<b>85</b>
6.1 Preliminary remarks	85
6.2 Main issues addressed by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects	85
6.3 Main focus of content-related activities realised by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects	88
6.4 The achievements of the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on issues related to strategic territorial development planning	91
<b>7. Future perspectives and new ideas for the follow-up programmes of INTERREG, ESPON and INTERACT after 2006</b>	<b>93</b>
7.1 Better cross-fertilisation between the different types of cooperative territorial development planning and a re-oriented focus of future ESPON-research	93
7.2 Strengthening the usefulness of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts and fostering 'mental ownership'	98
7.3 Additional recommendations for the follow-up programmes of ESPON and INTERACT	101
<b>Part 3: Annexes (available as a separate document)</b>	<b>3</b>
Annex I: 'Primary Research Issues' defined in the Terms of Reference for the thematic study on Spatial Visions and Scenarios	3
Annex II: Main development goals and policy aims formulated in existing transnational spatial development visions	5
Annex III: Main features of 'application strategies' contained in existing transnational spatial development visions	17
Annex IV: Sub-area specific differentiation approaches adopted in existing transnational spatial development visions	20
Annex V: Quantitative data used in various transnational spatial development visions	24
Annex VI: North-West Europe: Visual representation of the overall spatial development perspective	28
Annex VII: Atlantic Area: Visual representation of the desired future situation of polycentric development	30
Annex VIII: Overview on main objectives of ESPON projects with a relevance for transnational and cross-border spatial development planning	31
Annex IX: Overview on main issues addressed by the different ESPON projects	33
Annex X: Overview on the methodological approaches used by different ESPON projects	35
Annex XI: Overview on main findings of the different ESPON projects	37
Annex XII: Overview on policy recommendations formulated by the different ESPON projects	40
Annex XIII: Partnership details of the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects addressing aspects related to strategic territorial development planning	44

## TABLES

Overview Table 1:	Case study sample: Status of the planning processes and researchers responsible for the elaboration of case studies _____	16
Overview Table 2:	INTERREG IIIC projects addressing aspects related to strategic territorial development planning _____	34
Overview Table 3:	Main themes addressed by transnational spatial development visions _____	38
Overview Table 4:	Main themes addressed by the four cross-border spatial development concepts _____	48
Overview Table 5:	Overall development goals/vision statements formulated in the four cross-border spatial development concepts _____	50
Overview Table 6:	Strategic policy aims formulated in the four cross-border spatial development concepts _____	51
Overview Table 7:	Issue-specific examples of good practice among the different types of cooperation _____	55
Overview Table 8:	Vision scenarios of the 'Prospective Study for the Alpine Space' and their main characteristics _____	62
Overview Table 9:	'Pros' and 'cons' of political anchorage Baltic Sea Region (BSR) _____	66
Overview Table 10:	Issue-specific examples of good practice among the different types of cooperation _____	72
Overview Table 11:	Summary rating on the usefulness (and limitations) of ESPON project results for transnational and cross-border spatial development planning processes _____	78
Overview Table 12:	Potentially beneficial interactions that could be realised with ESPON I _____	83
Overview Table 13:	Main issues addressed by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects _____	86
Overview Table 14:	Main focus of content-related activities realised by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects _____	88
Overview Table 15:	Cross-fertilisation potentials between ESPON and transnational spatial visioning processes _____	94



## Part 1: Executive Summary

### The evolution of cooperative territorial development planning in the European Union

In the field of strategic territorial development planning, cooperation between European states, regions and local authorities has already a quite long tradition. Its very early beginnings date back to the mid-1950s. Within this wider context, one can identify three development phases:

- The years from the mid-1950s until the end 1980s can be characterised as the ‘start-up phase’.
- The decade between 1990 and 2000 can be labelled the ‘intensification and innovation phase’ of cooperative strategic territorial development planning.
- Since the year 2000, cooperative strategic territorial development planning has entered a phase that is characterised by consolidation, a further expansion and to a certain extent also by an increasing sophistication.

Throughout these phases, three major cooperation types have developed in the context strategic territorial development planning: ‘European-wide spatial development planning’, ‘transnational spatial development planning’ and ‘cross-border spatial development planning’. But also in the context of interregional cooperation, projects are realised that address aspects more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning.

Despite this dynamic and long-lasting process a joint elaboration of strategic spatial planning documents has however become more widespread and intense only during the 1990s, especially since the introduction of the Community Initiative programme INTERREG.

### Main themes, objectives and application strategies

Transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts should at least fulfil three important functions: (1) The function of ‘bringing together spatially relevant data and knowledge’ for a set of territorial entities belonging to different countries that make

up the cooperation area as a whole. (2) The function of presenting a ‘spatial policy programme’ serving the long term good. (3) The function of providing an ‘application framework’ for actually translating spatial development goals and policy aims into concrete action.

The initial transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents address a wide range of themes for which issues and/or trends related to spatial development are discussed. This helped to improve significantly the understanding of the respective cooperation area’s overall spatial situation and to highlighting common issues for spatial planning and policy. Territorial impacts of different EU policies are important factors influencing on the spatial development of individual regions, cross-border regions and transnational areas. However, one can observe especially in case of many cross-border spatial development concepts that a sufficiently comprehensive assessment of such effects was not realised.

The examined transnational spatial development visions and cross-border development concepts all contain well-elaborated ‘spatial policy programmes’ with meaningful normative provisions serving the long term good. Their structural features are however quite different. Some of them only define a series of development goals and related policy aims, while others elaborate in addition an overall development vision statement that briefly highlights the desired future situation to be reached in a long-term perspective.

The ‘application strategies’ in all transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents examined aim at translating spatial development goals/policy aims into concrete action. There are however marked differences in their effective capability of directing/inspiring spatial planning or policy processes and of assisting the formulation of programmes and projects. Well-differentiated application strategies showing a strong stakeholder-orientation can be found in all cross-border development concepts, but also in some of the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions (CADSES, Atlantic Area, North Sea Region). In several cases, one can observe a sometimes considerable take-up of their operational provisions by stakeholders located in the respective transnational co-

operation areas (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region) and cross-border regions (PAMINA, Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian).

The overall geographical focus adopted by already elaborated transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts is predominantly 'inward-looking'. This means that the assessment of territorial challenges/trends, the objective-system and the application strategy are highly centred on the respective cooperation area. Due to increasing Europe-wide and global interdependencies that also concern many issues relevant for spatial development, a need to more systematically adopt an 'outward-looking' perspective does exist.

### **The methodological and procedural approaches employed**

Various methodological approaches can potentially be used in the preparation and elaboration of transnational spatial development visions or cross-border spatial development concepts. There are also different procedural options that can be applied for 'organising' the preparation/elaboration of strategic planning documents and for structuring the cooperative spatial planning process in a medium or long-term perspective.

Most cross-border spatial development concepts and some transnational spatial visioning processes have used a combination of qualitative and quite extensive quantitative approaches for elaborating the territorial analysis of the present situation and of trends prevailing in the respective cooperation area. All cooperative planning processes have however faced to various extents problems of data availability and comparability. Transnational spatial visioning processes and most of the cross-border spatial development concepts have quite extensively used analytical maps for a visual presentation of the actual spatial context or of future trends. A map-based visualisation of the desired future spatial situation and/or of the territorial development goals was however only realised in some of the transnational spatial vision documents (North-West Europe, Atlantic Area) and cross-border spatial development concepts (Euregio Rhein-Waal concept, PAMINA concept).

An extensive direct use of sophisticated/complex ap-

proaches to forecast territorial development in the respective cooperation area can not be observed in the early transnational spatial visions and in most of the cross-border spatial development concepts. This lack of prospective territorial research and the exceptional development of alternative scenarios result in the fact that these spatial planning documents hardly take into consideration/integrate factors of significant change which are already perceivable in the present period and tend to become increasingly important for territorial development in the coming decade.

During the preparation and elaboration process, 'participatory bottom-up approaches' were applied from the outset by all cross-border spatial development concepts, but only in case of two transnational spatial visioning processes (North Sea Region, Atlantic Area). For some of the initial 'expert-centred top down approaches', however, the participatory approach was quite significantly increased in recent times (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe). A relatively heterogeneous overall situation does exist with respect to the procedural approaches adopted for ensuring a medium-term continuity of the joint planning process after a publication of the strategic planning documents. Transnational and cross-border spatial development planning is in most cases deliberately conceived as an 'open process'. With respect to a political discussion/validation and the provision of a stable political anchorage, however, relatively structured approaches had more frequently been adopted in the context of cross-border spatial development planning.

### **The usefulness of ESPON study results and the interaction with transnational/cross-border spatial development planning processes**

The current activities of the ESPON I programme clearly increase the level of sophistication of European-wide spatial development planning and help creating a significant added value when it comes to further promoting and supporting territorial analysis and projection. A first aspect of this added value is the creation of the ESPON-database, which contains many more spatially disaggregated and comparable data than EUROSTAT could produce over the years. Added value is also created by the different ESPON study-projects that have carried out a number of prospec-

tive trend analyses in various fields as well as scenario development activities.

The review of results achieved by a number of ESPON study-projects (i.e. main issues addressed, methodological results achieved, main findings and policy recommendations formulated) shows that most of them are very useful for transnational and cross-border spatial development planning processes. There are however several limitations associated to these studies, which in some cases tend to restrict the practical usefulness of the results.

The early transnational spatial vision documents and all cross-border spatial development concepts examined had been finalised before the actual start of the ESPON programme. Therefore, no 'real-time interaction' could be established by these processes in relation to ESPON research activities.

The more recent transnational spatial vision elaboration process in the Atlantic Area and various vision updating/upgrading processes (i.e. Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region, North-West Europe) have all quite extensively taken into consideration the broad range of issues/themes addressed by various ESPON study projects. They also show a quite well-developed level of awareness regarding the territorial impacts of different EU policies, which can partly be attributed to the investigations carried out by ESPON policy impact studies. Compared to this, the level of interaction in relation to methodological aspects as well as to ESPON-policy recommendations was however quite modest.

### **INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on aspects related to strategic territorial development planning**

Beyond transnational/cross-border spatial development planning and European-wide territorial research in the context of ESPON, one can identify 23 INTERREG IIIC projects that address aspects more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning. In the context of these projects, more than 300 different organisations are involved as partners.

The main themes addressed by these INTERREG IIIC projects either refer to specific policies and to particular territorial

characteristics/geographical situations that are mentioned in the ESDP, but also on strategic territorial development planning in general. The content-related activities realised by these INTERREG IIIC projects often involve interregional exchanges of experience and a dissemination of good practice for improving local/regional planning methods and for jointly elaborating model strategies or new tools supporting planning and decision making. In addition, they sometimes also involve a transfer of planning-knowledge and good practice techniques or a realisation of pilot projects, mostly for improving planning procedures/policy instruments and for upgrading planning capacities/skills in the participating areas.

Seen as a whole, these INTERREG IIIC activities do not fundamentally differ from those that are already used in the context of transnational or cross-border cooperation projects. Therefore, interregional cooperation only represents an additional means for illustrating how aspects related to strategic territorial development planning can be addressed in a cooperative manner.

### **Future perspectives and new ideas for the follow-up programmes of INTERREG, ESPON and INTERACT after 2006**

The comprehensive assessment of cooperative spatial development planning in the European Union allows formulating a number of conclusions on future perspectives and new (project) ideas that could be addressed during the new Structural Funds programming period 2007-13. These conclusions can be summarised under three main headings:

1. Stimulating a better mutual cross-fertilisation between the different types of cooperative territorial development planning and re-orienting the focus of future research under an ESPON II programme.
2. Strengthening the usefulness of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts and fostering 'mental ownership'.
3. Necessary improvements of and new activities for future ESPON and INTERACT follow-up programmes.

**(1)** The ESPON I programme has produced a significant number of research outputs that generate - for the first

time - a comprehensive and more homogenous basis of spatial knowledge in Europe (e.g. ESPON study-projects, thematic maps, ESPON-data base etc.). The growing awareness of these results allows assuming that **numerous potentialities do exist for creating a more intense interaction and stronger cross-fertilisation between future ESPON-based territorial research and transnational/cross-border spatial development planning under the forthcoming Objective 3 programmes (2007-13).**

Steps in this direction should, on the one hand, take into consideration more carefully the specific needs of transnational and cross-border cooperation areas. On the other hand, this also requires a re-orientation of the territorial research focus under a future ESPON programme in order to create a more demand-oriented dimension that produces well-targeted outputs corresponding to these 'external' needs.

- The current level of interaction between **ESPON and transnational cooperation** does not suggest a significant widening of the thematic scope of future ESPON research. However, mutual cross-fertilisation potentials do exist in the future with respect to a continuing in-depth research on themes already covered by ESPON I (i.e. further refinement of existing research; realisation of complementary research on specific issues such as polycentric development). When it comes to methodological aspects and ESPON research conclusions/policy recommendations, a number of mutual cross-fertilisation potentials do exist that should be exploited in the future. Prospective research and scenario development is an aspect with important cross-fertilisation potentials, but also an adaptation/refinement of methodological approaches on ground of the experiences stemming from transnational spatial visioning processes is expected to be a fruitful focus for the future. Another aspect worth considering is the introduction of a stronger area-specific focus in future ESPON research (i.e. review of general research issues for the different transnational cooperation areas) and the formulation of area-specific conclusions/policy recommendations.
- Significant cross-fertilisation potentials do exist between **ESPON and cross-border cooperation**. Already on ground of the current ESPON I results, the

thematic scope of territorial analyses in many cross-border spatial development concepts and some of the methodological approaches used could be further improved. Under a future ESPON II programme, an even wider scope for mutual cross-fertilisation does exist. This will however require a quite significant re-orientation of the focus of European-wide prospective territorial research under ESPON II (e.g. more comprehensive and comparative in-depth research on larger cross-border zones in Europe; complementary quantitative cross-border flows analyses for various aspects; cross-border spatial data in the ESPON-data base; more systematic consideration of the cross-border dimension in future research activities).

- **The 23 INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on issues related to spatial development planning** also show cross-fertilisation potentials with respect to forthcoming transnational and cross-border cooperation (i.e. re-production of project approaches in the respective context) as well as in relation to territorial research under a future ESPON II programme (i.e. inspiration for new thematic research).

**(2) If one intends to strengthen the usefulness of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts** in the wider context of public policies **and to foster 'mental ownership'**, at least four closely inter-related aspects have to be observed simultaneously:

- A **strong leadership** is needed to initiate a cooperative territorial development planning process and to maintain momentum over time.
- A **participatory planning approach** needs to be adopted during the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts that actively involves a wider range of area-specific key stakeholders.
- The application strategies of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts need to have a **clear 'stakeholder-orientation'**.
- Procedures need to be envisaged that allow organising a **political discussion** on finalised transnational spatial

development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts and that foresee proceeding to **some kind of formal validation**.

Beyond this, it is also strongly recommend that those promoting cooperative territorial development planning processes realise an ongoing monitoring of the actual level of 'mental ownership' achieved.

**(3)** Finally, the questionnaire-survey realised in the context of this study has allowed elaborating some **additional recommendations that pin-point necessary improvements or highlight potential new activities that could be realised in the context of future ESPON and INTERACT follow-up programmes**.

- A future **ESPON II programme** should consider a number of 'operational changes' and new activities that could help creating a closer link with ongoing transnational spatial visioning processes and strategic cross-border spatial development planning initiatives.
- A **new INTERACT programme** should include a number of activities that support better the elaboration and/or updating of transnational spatial development visions or of cross-border spatial development concepts.

## Part 2: Main report

### 1 General introduction and remarks on the methodological approach adopted

Despite the rather general title initially allocated to this thematic study ('Spatial Visions and Scenarios'), the present final synthesis report will mainly analyse 'cooperative territorial development planning' among European states, regions and local authorities.

Before briefly explaining the methodological approach adopted by this study, it seems to be appropriate **clarifying some of the basic terminology** that will recurrently be used in the following chapters.

**Strategic territorial development planning:** Under this overall term we generally summarise comprehensive planning activities that cover a wider range of themes and issues directly/indirectly relating to a precisely defined territory.<sup>1</sup> These activities are carried out either in the context of a single country by actors at national, regional, county and local levels or in a cooperative manner among different planning actors from several countries. As a common feature, these activities typically aim at producing – among other results – strategic spatial planning documents. These documents express some kind of a future-oriented development perspective for the territory in question and provide certain principles and/or (operational) guidance concepts to enhance a more spatially-oriented realisation of different public and private sector activities.

**Cooperative territorial development planning:** Cooperation between European states, regions and local authorities in the field of strategic territorial development planning has already a quite long tradition. Its very early beginnings date back to the mid-1950s and throughout a long-term evolutionary process, three different main types of cooperation have emerged:

1. Transnational spatial development planning.
2. Cross-border spatial development planning.
3. European-wide spatial development planning.

A joint elaboration of strategic spatial planning documents in the context of these different main types of cooperation has however become more widespread and intense only

during the 1990s, especially since the introduction of the Community Initiative programme INTERREG. Beyond these three main types of cooperation, one can also observe that several interregional cooperation projects have addressed aspects that are more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning.

#### **Transnational spatial development planning and the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions:**

Transnational cooperation generally aims at promoting a more integrated and balanced spatial development of larger and contiguous geographical zones (or 'groupings of regions') that cover various EU-Member States and/or neighbouring third countries. Today, transnational cooperation is mainly realised in the context of INTERREG IIIB-programmes, which adopt a multi-thematic focus and provide funding for individual cooperation projects. Transnational cooperation is therefore predominantly multilateral in nature and involves - at different degrees and during different stages - simultaneously public authorities from the national, regional and local levels, but also other public, semi-public or private actors. Since nearly 15 years, comprehensive 'transnational spatial development planning activities' are undertaken in several of these larger contiguous zones. Alongside the basic aims promoted by the ESDP, they generally focus on enhancing a polycentric development of the metropolitan and urban systems, on designing well-integrated and widely accessible transport and communication systems and on promoting a sustainable management of the environment and of cultural /natural resources. These activities have very frequently led to the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions, which cover the entire cooperation area or parts of it. Although no official definition exists for these transnational planning documents that are generally validated by politico-administrative and scientific circles, practice has shown that the expression 'spatial vision' was frequently used to designate the final outcome of such cooperative planning efforts. These documents normally contain a relatively precise cross-thematic analysis of the current spatial situation in the cooperation area (often supported by with a visual representation), a long-term strategy with objectives for the desired territorial development (mostly without a visual representation) and an application strategy defining in a more or less elaborated manner

potentials for cooperation (e.g. measures/projects). Transnational spatial development planning and a transnational spatial development vision often form part of a continuing process, which involves - according to the specific needs prevailing in the area - periodical review activities or an updating/upgrading of already existing vision documents (i.e. transnational visioning processes).

### **Cross-border spatial development planning and the elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts:**

**As a horizontal activity, cross-border spatial development planning generally deals with the deliberate effects of society, economy and the natural, structural and social environment on the territorial development of smaller or larger areas immediately located along a commonly shared border. Cross-border spatial planning nowadays involves actors from all levels of governance (i.e. national spatial planning, regional planning, county- and local level planning for land-use and building), however in various constellations and at different levels of intensity along the EU-borders. One result of such activities is very often the elaboration of comprehensive strategic planning documents for the cross-border territory that is considered a single geographical unit. In the context of this study they will generally be referred to as cross-border spatial development concepts, due to the variety of denominations allocated to such planning documents<sup>3</sup> in practice. In ideal terms these cross-border spatial development concepts provide a summary assessment of the current situation and spatial trends in the cross-border territory, define general principles/guidelines as well as a strategic cross-border development perspective with related objectives and elaborate an application strategy with policy options for joint spatial development (i.e. measures, project proposals).**

**Spatial prognoses and spatial scenarios:** This aspect generally refers to methods and techniques that might be used in connection with strategic territorial development planning and the formulation of spatial development policies both in a country-specific context and in the cooperative dimension. They generally aim at systematically describing and forecasting/exploring possible or intentionally desired future spatial constellations and processes. Within this wider context, one can however broadly distinguish two fundamental approaches:<sup>4</sup> (1) Spatial prognoses can generally be considered a tool for describing and

explaining reality as it exists, with the ultimate aim being to predict. The approach is typically quantitative and relies on a reasonably well-developed standard tool-kit of methods, ranging from relatively 'simple' trend extrapolations (i.e. projecting past evolutions into the future) to highly complex and differentiated forecasting models. (2) The variety of different scenario methods used in the context of spatial planning try – as a common feature - to conceive more than one possible future situation and to explore the paths leading to them. Spatial scenarios are expected to help stimulating strategic planning activities and interdisciplinary communication within planning institutions, but also to improve the flexibility and preparedness of (spatial) policy actors that are confronted with an increasingly uncertain environment.

For a comprehensive assessment of this rather complex topic, the initial Terms of Reference (ToR) have defined a larger number of 'primary research issues' that should guide the analytical process under this thematic study (see Annex I). Based upon these prescriptions, **a four-step approach has been adopted for elaborating the present final synthesis report:**

- **Step 1:** Transnational and cross-border spatial development planning activities in Europe were analysed according to a standardised assessment scheme that addressed the 'primary research issues' of the ToR. For this purpose, a total of 11 case studies have been selected in a way to represent a well-balanced selection of different statuses in the respective planning process (see Overview Table 1). The 7 transnational case studies actually give a full overview on all existing spatial visioning processes in this type of cooperation. The 4 cross-border case studies only represent a small part of the currently existing cross-border spatial development planning initiatives and mainly aim at illustrating some specificities of this type of cooperation. Subsequently, desk research was used to review a large number of documents related to these transnational spatial visioning processes and cross-border spatial development planning activities (i.e. already finalised strategic planning documents; available 'intermediate documents' relating to an elaboration of new visions/strategic planning documents or ongoing updating/revision processes). In addition, a questionnaire-based distance survey has been realised for further deepening the case-study

work and for gathering more widespread information on other initiatives/projects realised ‘outside’ the chosen sample of case studies.<sup>5</sup> Empirical fact-finding and subsequent desk research has also allowed ‘screening’ a number of INTERREG IIIC projects that cover actions more or less closely related to strategic territorial development planning.

- **Step 2:** According to a standardised assessment scheme addressing the ‘primary research issues’ of the ToR, desk research was again used to realise a comprehensive review of results achieved by ESPON-projects that might provide a useful input to transnational and cross-border spatial development planning.<sup>6</sup> On ground of this review, a series of key messages on the actual usefulness of ESPON project results in the context of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning activities was elaborated.
- **Step 3:** The overall results of the first and second step were presented in an intermediate Draft Final Report. The report contained the all 11 case studies, the review of ESPON projects and the results of the INTERREG

IIIC project screening. On ground this interim document, desk research has allowed drafting the documents supporting the ESPON/INTERACT-seminar in Milan that was organised on the 27 to 28 of February 2006 (Background Report; Discussion Paper).

- **Step 4:** Based upon the intermediate Draft Final Report and the Background Report of the ESPON/INTERACT-seminar, the final synthesis report was elaborated. In addition to a streamlining of already accomplished analytical work, the key messages of the ESPON project-review were used as a reference baseline for analysing more in-depth the current level of interaction between ESPON-results and transnational/cross-border spatial development planning. On ground of this, future cross-fertilisation potentials between ESPON and cooperative spatial development planning as well as other recommendations/suggestions for the next Structural Funds programming period 2007-13 were elaborated. The final synthesis report was delivered to ESPON by the mid of May 2006.

**Overview Table 1: Case study sample: Status of the planning processes and researchers responsible for the elaboration of case studies**

Area	Status of planning process		
	First time elaboration of spatial vision or concept	Revision/updating of spatial vision concept	Newly emerging spatial visioning processes
<b>Transnational Cooperation (INTERREG IIC – INTERREG IIIB)</b>			
North-West Europe	X	X	–
North Sea	X	X	–
Baltic Sea Area	X	X	–
CADSES	X	–	–
Western Mediterranean	–	–	X
Atlantic Area	X	–	–
Alpine Space	–	–	X
<b>Cross-border Cooperation (INTERREG IIA - INTERREG IIIA)</b>			
Euregio Rhein-Waal, DE/NL	X	X	–
Euroregion Viadrina, DE/PL	X	X	–
PAMINA, DE/FR	X	–	–
Eurocité Basque, ES/FR	X	–	–



## 2 The evolution of cooperative territorial development planning in the European Union

### 2.1 Preliminary remarks

As already mentioned in the general introduction to this study, cooperative territorial development planning in the European Union is not a recent phenomenon as its very early beginnings date back to the mid-1950s.<sup>7</sup> Across the various activities realised, one can identify three main phases that are characterised by relatively similar features.

- **The 35 years from the mid-1950s until the end of the 1980s can be labelled the ‘start-up phase’.**

Cooperation in the field of strategic territorial development planning was mostly launched in North-West Europe for some cross-border areas sharing a common border, but also for a few spatially larger areas transgressing the sphere of an immediate neighbourhood along a commonly shared border. Within this context, one can observe some isolated attempts for jointly elaborating strategic spatial planning documents. In parallel to these developments, some first concrete steps were also made in the context of European-wide spatial development planning: After more than 20 years of dealing with spatial planning issues in the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning (ECMRP - CEMAT) of the Council of Europe, the ‘European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter’ was adopted in 1983.

- **The decade between 1990 and 2000 can be characterised the ‘intensification and innovation phase’ of cooperative territorial development planning.**

One can firstly observe an increasing elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts along various EU-borders. Especially the Community Initiative programmes INTERREG I (1990-93) and INTERREG IIA (1994-99) have supported many decentralised cross-border spatial development planning activities as well as the elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts. Secondly, transnational spatial development planning has emerged as a major innovative element. It has started outside the narrow EU-context during the years 1992-94 with the joint preparation of a spatial planning document for the Baltic Sea Region entitled ‘Vision and strategies around

the Baltic Sea 2010’. Through the widening of the INTERREG II Community Initiative in 1996 (INTERREG IIC 1997-1999) and the introduction of innovative pilot actions for larger contiguous areas (ERDF–Article 10), transnational cooperation has been generalised throughout the EU. This has also allowed launching the elaboration of the first transnational spatial development visions for some of the newly created INTERREG IIC-programme areas. Thirdly, a number of early EU-funded interregional cooperation projects have allowed realising first exchanges of experience on this matter however mostly in the context of very specific topics. Finally, also European-wide spatial development planning has significantly gained in intensity and led – after long years of discussion and preparation – to the publication of two major strategic planning documents: The ‘European Spatial Development Perspective’ (ESDP), agreed at the Informal Council of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning in 1999, and the ‘Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development on the European Continent’, adopted by the Council of Europe’s ECMRP/CEMAT in 2000.

- **Since the year 2000, cooperative territorial development planning has entered a phase that is characterised by consolidation, a further expansion and by an increased sophistication.** One important aspect that has strongly favoured the consolidation/further expansion trend is a growing awareness on the important role of cooperative territorial development planning in an enlarged EU since the publication of the ESDP and the CEMAT-Guiding Principles. Another aspect that has considerably supported this trend is the long-term stability of the general framework conditions for cooperation. This stability has mainly resulted from the continuation of INTERREG activities in a third generation (INTERREG III 2000-06) and their ‘transformation’ into a fully fledged EU-Structural Funds objective for the next programming period 2007-13 (Objective 3 ‘Territorial Cooperation’). As a consequence, various transnational areas have engaged in updating and upgrading their existing vision documents, elaborated new spatial visions or launched the first steps for new spatial visioning processes to be completed in the future. But also in the context of cross-border cooperation, one can observe a continuing application of previously elaborated cross-border spatial develop-

ment concepts and the elaboration of new ones. Furthermore, various interregional cooperation projects are currently realised under INTERREG IIIC with the aim to exchange experiences and to transfer know-how in the field of territorial development planning. The trend towards an increased sophistication was stimulated partly by 'external factors' such as a more widespread availability and use of new techniques/tools due to the rapid development of ICTs (e.g. GPS, new mapping tools, computer-assisted planning etc), but partly also by the launching of the INTERREG-related 'ESPON 2006 programme' that supports and enhances European-wide scientific cooperation on spatial development planning.

This long-term evolutionary process is now described separately for each type of cooperation, mainly for highlighting the individual step-by-step approaches adopted as a response to particular needs that did exist in the different areas. This way of presenting the historical overview also allows underlining that most of these processes do actually co-exist in parallel, without yet having developed strong mutual relations and links (i.e. among different processes within each type of cooperation; across different types of cooperation).

## **2.2 Transnational spatial development planning and the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions**

Cooperation in the field of spatial development planning covering larger areas that transgress the more narrow focus of cross-border regions has started quite early. These initiatives can however not be fully assimilated to our today's understanding of transnational cooperation. Major innovative steps in this direction have only been made during the 1990s, which have been further consolidated and expanded up to the years 2005/2006.

### **Start-up phase**

Mainly in North-West Europe, a number of early transnational spatial development planning attempts can be observed that were either inter-state/interregional or Community level initiatives.

The very first initiative was the '**Conference of the Regions of North-West Europe**' (CRENWE), which was

structured from its foundation in 1955 as a network of planning officials and scientists. CRENWE was located in Bruges (Belgium) and its area covered the three Benelux countries, the western Federal Länder of Germany, the northern and north-eastern part of France as well as the south-east of England. During its existence from the mid-1950s up to the early 1990s, CRENWE has organised 15 'study meetings' and various spatial planning seminars. In addition, it has also published a number of thematic maps on various issues of common concern.

A second initiative was the transnational '**Prospective study on physical planning and the environment in the megalopolis in formation in North-West Europe**'. It was realised in the early 1970s at the request of the European Commission (DGs Regional Policy and Environment).<sup>8</sup> The study concentrated on the transnational analysis of the evolution of urban systems and resulting challenges for the environment.

The third initiative is the **Benelux Economic Union (Union économique Benelux)**, which brought cooperative spatial development planning within the sphere of activity outlined in the Union Treaty by the end of the 1960s<sup>9</sup> (see text box below). In 1986, the first 'Benelux Global Structure Outline' (Esquisse de Structure Globale Benelux) having the status of a recommendation, was published. It can be considered the first embryonic transnational spatial development planning document. After several years of preparation<sup>10</sup>, a radically revised version of the first Outline was published in draft form in 1996 (Second Benelux Structural Outline).

Although regional cross-border cooperation over specific sub-areas of the wider Alpine space is already practised since the 1970s/1980s and has also produced partial outputs with respect to strategic territorial development planning (see section 2.2), a more comprehensive approach covering the entire Alpine mountain chain has only appeared at end of the 1980s/beginning of the 1990s. On German initiative, the first Alpine Conference was held in Berchtesgaden from 9 to 11 October 1989 and subsequent inter-state cooperation has allowed producing the Alpine Convention. It was signed by Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Liechtenstein and Switzerland as well as by the European Union at the occasion of the second Alpine Conference in Salzburg on 7 November 1991.<sup>11</sup> The Alpine Convention,

### Spatial development planning cooperation between the Benelux Countries

Spatial development planning cooperation between the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg has a long tradition and is steered by a Ministerial Working group, a consultation body of ministers responsible for spatial planning. The Ministerial Working group does not have regular meetings but meets whenever necessary. The ‘Special Commission for Spatial Planning’, chaired by one of the members on an alternating basis, meets four to five times a year and is responsible for the official contents of the cooperation. The secretariat of the Special Commission is at the Secretariat-General of the Benelux Economic Order. The agenda of the Special Commission features all subjects with a territorial dimension connected to cross-border cooperation. An important product of the work realised within the Commission was the ‘Second Benelux Structural Outline’ of 1996, which formulated joint policy ambitions for the territory of the Benelux-Cooperation.

which entered into force on 6 March 1995, is a framework convention to guarantee the protection of the Alpine region and its long-term and sustainable development. To realise a holistic policy for the conservation and the protection of the Alps, the Contracting Parties have approved nine theme-specific ‘Protocols’<sup>12</sup>, one of which also deals with spatial planning and sustainable development.

### Innovation phase

Comprehensive transnational spatial development planning and – alongside with this – an elaboration of the first transnational spatial development visions was only launched around the mid-1990s. Both aspects are major innovative developments in the field of strategic territorial development planning and have significantly contributed to further intensify cooperation between European states, regions and local authorities during this decade.

This process started in 1992 in form of an **inter-state cooperation among ministries responsible for spatial planning and development of countries<sup>13</sup> around the Baltic Sea Region (BSR)**. Representatives from these ministries first came together at the Karlskrona Conference (August 1992)<sup>14</sup>, where it was decided to jointly prepare a document on a spatial development concept entitled ‘Vision and strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010’. Following this opening ministerial conference, interim results of the common work were discussed at a second Ministerial Conference in Gdansk (December 1993). At the third Ministerial Conference in Tallinn (December 1994), the **final report ‘VASAB 2010 – Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010’<sup>15</sup>** was presented and adopted. The ‘VASAB 2010’ report was the first transnational

vision for spatial development world-wide and laid the foundation for joint action of the participating countries and regions. For coordinating common actions and for preparing proposals to continue the VASAB-process between the Ministerial Conferences that take place every 4 to 5 years, a ‘Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region’ (CSD-BSR) was established, which - in turn - was supported by a secretariat. Subsequently, the CSD-BSR developed a follow-up document entitled ‘From vision to action’, which was to function as a practical guide on how to implement the spatial vision and to support the spatial development. This document was formally endorsed by the fourth Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development in Stockholm/Saltsjöbaden (October 1996).<sup>16</sup> In the document, especially the CSD-BSR was asked to support the upcoming EU-Community Initiative Programme INTERREG IIC (in combination with TACIS and PHARE for non-EU-countries) and to contribute to an Agenda 21 for the Baltic Sea Region (‘Baltic 21’). VASAB was also asked to continue with its projects, to extend cooperation with other transnational bodies and to contribute to cross-Baltic training and information.

With **the introduction of an INTERREG II strand on transnational cooperation in the field of spatial planning back in 1996 (INTERREG IIC)**, new transnational spatial visioning activities were launched and finalised under the overall control and guidance of national/regional governments involved in the programmes during the years 1997 to 1999. Transnational spatial visioning activities in the context of the INTERREG IIC programme Baltic Sea Region were continued through the VASAB-based inter-ministerial cooperation process. Among the remaining six INTERREG IIC programmes however, only three have actually initiated

and completed joint transnational spatial visioning processes that resulted in the publication of strategic documents covering the entire cooperation area (CADSES, North Sea Region, North-Western Metropolitan Area).

- **The INTERREG IIC programme Central European, Adriatic, Danubian and South-Eastern European Space (CADSES)** can be considered the probably largest and most complex transnational cooperation area.<sup>17</sup> Spatial visioning activities were realised in the context of two parallel project-processes that shared similar objectives.<sup>18</sup> Only the INTERREG IIC project ‘Vision Planet’ focussed - among other aspects<sup>19</sup> - on elaborating a transnational spatial development perspective for the entire CADSES area. The related project activities concentrated on the common interest with respect to issues such as rural-urban relationships, regional disparities, peripherality, cross-border cooperation or integrated development and aimed at elaborating a common reference framework for future cooperation in spatial development policy and sectoral policies<sup>20</sup>. The main result achieved with respect to strategic planning was the document entitled **‘Strategies for Integrated Spatial Development of the Central European, Danubian, and Adriatic Area’** (the VISION document), which consists of two main parts: The ‘Background Report’ presents the important findings of the common elaboration process and served as foundation and explanation for the document ‘Guidelines and Policy Proposals’, which in turn contains the most important objectives and policy proposals for spatial development cooperation in the CADSES area and some recommendations for concrete measures<sup>21</sup>.
- As concerns **the INTERREG IIC programme for the North Sea Region**, transnational spatial visioning activities were realised by a ‘Vision Working Group’ that was composed of representatives of spatial planning administrations from the participating countries and regions. The main result achieved was the strategic planning document entitled **‘A Spatial Perspective for the North Sea Region’ (NorVision)**.<sup>22</sup> NorVision is an advising document that intends to influence spatial planning in the cooperation area covering Norway, Sweden, Denmark as well as parts of Germany, the Netherlands and the UK. The document represents a

‘regionalised’ understanding of the ESDP-approach and takes into consideration the specific conditions in the cooperation area. It contains a description of the spatial characteristics, the visions, aims and strategies as well as a section on how to translate the visions into concrete action. It also discusses interregional interdependencies, a transition to a knowledge-based society, the aspect of cohesion and competitiveness as well as urban-rural relationships in the area.

- **The INTERREG IIC programme North-Western Metropolitan Area (NWMA)** includes the whole of Ireland, the UK, Luxembourg and Belgium as well as parts of France (the north-west and north-east), Germany (the south-west and middle-west) and the Netherlands (south and centre). The process launched under this programme has led to the elaboration of a strategic document entitled **‘A Spatial Vision for the North-West Europe – Building Cooperation’**.<sup>23</sup> It has the overall objective to contribute to a more cohesive, balanced and sustainable development and to promote cooperation rather than competition in the regions. The document sets out some of the critical issues that need to be tackled through transnational cooperation and presents an agenda for discussion in relation to NWMA. It also contains an analysis of North-West Europe's spatial characteristics, a vision for the future (its general principles) and actions for future transnational cooperation. The document was not seen as a ‘spatial planning blueprint’, but rather as the beginning of a process of developing long-term spatial strategies. Its main aim was to serve as a reference for applying the ESDP in the NWMA area and as a document framing future transnational cooperation. Subsequently, a consultation process was realised on the vision document in each Member State concerned and the responses to this exercise had been published in a ‘Consultation Report’.<sup>24</sup>

At the beginning of the new millennium, the above-mentioned spatial visioning processes have partly achieved to translate mutual cooperation into jointly agreed and/or formally adopted strategic planning documents that are specifically drawn up with a view to providing building blocks for a transnational spatial development policy agenda in the EU. Recent research activities, which systematically compared these transnational spatial visioning

processes in the EU and critically reviewed their results achieved<sup>25</sup>, have also highlighted a number of considerable differences among the various vision documents elaborated. They concern mainly the time-period for which these documents were elaborated, the background against which spatial objectives were formulated, the level of concreteness of objectives and finally also the type of political validation given to them.

Beyond these four transnational spatial visioning processes and the elaborated strategic documents covering the entire cooperation area (i.e. VASAB 2010; 3 INTERREG IIC vision documents), one can also observe **a number of individual INTERREG IIC projects having realised comprehensive strategic planning activities**. They aimed at exploring wider territorial impacts of specific long-term developments (Western Mediterranean), at making general or theme-specific contribution to ongoing vision elaboration processes (North-West Europe) or to the preparation of future INTERREG IIIB programmes (Atlantic Area) and at designing development visions for smaller sub-areas of the wider transnational cooperation space (CADSES, Baltic Sea Area).

- Although no transnational spatial development vision was elaborated under the **INTERREG IIC programme Western Mediterranean (MEDOCC)**, a cooperation project entitled ‘Ateliers Méditerranéens Interrégionaux’ (AMI) investigated the potential territorial impacts of the free-trade zone to be created in the Mediterranean by 2010 for EU regions.
- In the context of the **INTERREG IIC programme North-Western Metropolitan Area (NMWA)**, the project ‘Sustainable Open Space’ (SOS) aimed at contributing to the NWMA's spatial vision in the field of cultural heritage, natural resources, integrated landscape planning/management and open space policy. It contains a discussion on urban pressure and land use, the demand for open space by consumers, the option of spatial planning and the concept of the network society. The objective of another project entitled ‘Spatial Planning & Emerging Communication Technology in the Regions of Europe’ (SPECTRE) was to research the impacts and effects of ICT on spatial planning issues in order to develop a ‘strategic toolbox’ and a vision for the integration of ICT in spatial planning.<sup>26</sup>
- In the context of the **INTERREG IIC programme Atlantic Space**, activities for elaborating a transnational spatial development vision covering the entire cooperation have not been undertaken during the years 1997-99. However, a number of theme-specific studies on strategic issues (e.g. transport, research and technology, tourism, environment) were elaborated and each topic was also discussed in a workshop. The findings of these studies were summarised in a joint ‘Strategic Study on Interregional Cooperation in the Atlantic Area’, which was elaborated on the initiative of CRPM's Atlantic Arc Commission. The study was concluded in 2000 and consisted of two parts: the first part analysed the current situation of the Atlantic Area prevailing during the INTERREG IIC programme period and the second part proposed objectives for a future transnational cooperation programme for the period 2000-06.<sup>27</sup>
- A good example for a sub-area vision can be found in the context of the **INTERREG IIC programme Baltic Sea Area**. The INTERREG IIC/TACIS/PHARE-project ‘Baltic Palette’ has elaborated a spatial development strategy for five diverse and dynamic metropolitan regions (Stockholm-Mälär Region; Helsinki-South-West Finland region, St. Petersburg and Leningrad Oblast Region; Tallinn region; Riga region). Beyond the formulation of a vision statement and a joint development strategy, the final report also elaborated three future scenarios (integration scenario, dual-pattern scenario, fragmented development scenario) as well as a comprehensive spatial analysis for various thematic aspects such as the socio-economic situation, the urban network, accessibility and natural/cultural assets.<sup>28</sup>
- Another example for a sub-area focussed strategic planning process was realised under the **INTERREG IIC programme CADSES** in the context of the project ‘ESTIA Space’ (European space and territorial integration alternatives: spatial development strategies and policy integration for South-East Europe).<sup>29</sup> The central aim of the ESTIA project was to study spatial development trends and policies in the project area and to identify the components for strengthening spatial integration and coordination among these countries. The main result achieved with respect to strategic spatial planning was the elaboration of the document ‘Spatial

Planning Priorities for South-East Europe'. This document is not a fully-fledged spatial vision, but rather a pragmatic formulation of a common spatial development strategy for this particular sub-area. It analyses the main features and trends of spatial organisation, defines spatial development policy objectives and priorities and identifies the conditions and prospects of spatial integration in the area covered by the project.<sup>30</sup>

### Consolidation and expansion phase

The continuing support to transnational cooperation in the context INTERREG IIIB has strongly favoured a further consolidation and expansion of transnational spatial development planning during the current Structural Funds programming period 2000-06.

#### **In the Baltic Sea Region (BSR), important new steps were made between 2000 and 2005 in the context of the VASAB-process.**

In 2001, the fifth Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development in Wismar (20 to 21 September 2001) has adopted a 'Declaration on transnational spatial planning and development measures in the Baltic Sea Region up to the year 2010' (Wismar Declaration). It was based upon a 'background report'<sup>31</sup> that reviewed the most recent spatial trends in the area, assessed the results of INTERREG IIC projects and identified future challenges for spatial development policies. Also an updated 'Spatial Development Action Programme', laid down in a new report entitled 'VASAB 2010+'<sup>32</sup>, has been prepared by the VASAB cooperation. Through this document, new goals for spatial development in the Baltic Sea Region were set up, particularly for increasing the coordination of national spatial development policies. In 2003, the focus shifted towards improved spatial integration of the area. This was particularly important for the new Member States soon to join the EU as they had the weakest accessibility to the other Baltic States and to the EU as a whole.<sup>33</sup> In 2004, the 'Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region' (CSD-BSR) started work on upgrading the vision and strategies document of 1994. To facilitate the preparation of a new policy document that should be presented at the next Ministerial Conference, a background report entitled 'Polycentric Development and Territorial Cohesion in the BSR - Strategies and Priorities' was elaborated. This report also elaborates a summary of ESPON-findings on issues related to the development of

the BSR. The new policy document entitled 'Connecting Potentials' was presented at the 6th Ministerial Conference in Gdansk (September 2005).<sup>34</sup> This document and the related 'Gdansk-Declaration' are the starting point for elaborating a new long-term spatial development perspective for the BSR (expected time-horizon 15 to 20 years), which should guide various support programmes implemented in the area. This was also a request of the Council of the Baltic Sea States, forming a political umbrella for the Baltic cooperation. The main procedural difference compared with the 1994 vision process is that the long-term perspective will be elaborated as a joint venture of VASAB CSD-BSR, regional authorities and pan-Baltic organisations.<sup>35</sup>

#### **The INTERREG IIIB programmes North-West Europe and North Sea have launched extensive updating and/or upgrading processes**

in relation to the existing transnational spatial development visions, which were previously elaborated under INTERREG IIC. These processes aim at further deepening the knowledge on spatially relevant issues and at exploring new themes that have become important for territorial development of over time. They partly also aim at designing a more 'operational' dimension for the existing vision documents in order to give clearer indications for proactive measures to be taken in the future.

- In the context of the INTERREG IIIB programme North-West Europe, a 'Spatial Vision Working Group' has been established to guide and supervise the updating and upgrading process entitled 'Towards a Strategic Framework for Action'. The working group was of the opinion that the transnational spatial visioning process should now adopt a more pragmatic and operational orientation. In order to inform the process, three thematic studies were commissioned in 2004, one for each of the ESDP's spatial objectives (i.e. on polycentric development, on parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge, on the sustainable management of the cultural/natural heritage).<sup>36</sup> After the completion of these studies, a fourth study was commissioned and finalised in form of a 'Synthesis Report' in December 2005.<sup>37</sup> This report has not only consolidated and updated the findings of the three thematic studies. It has also played a major role in identifying future priority themes through a process of consultation with the Spatial Vision Working Group.<sup>38</sup>

- Under the **INTERREG IIB programme for the North Sea Region**, the Programme Monitoring Committee decided that there should be a selective update of the initial NorVision document to have a valuable strategic input for future transnational cooperation. It was however agreed that the NorVision document continues to be relevant and should not be evaluated or reworked. The basic idea of the updating process entitled 'Towards a New Spatial Agenda for the North Sea Region' was to develop a more focused approach, which could be used to inform the future Objective 3 programme and that might form the basis for future cooperation projects. In a first phase of this process, five thematic and prospective studies on demographic change, transport and mobility, innovation, energy and coastal water management have been carried out.<sup>39</sup> Subsequently, a synthesis report summarising these five reports is elaborated that will be available by mid-March 2006.

One can also observe that **several INTERREG IIB programme areas not having previously elaborated transnational spatial development visions under INTERREG IIC or ERDF-Article 10 programmes**, now finalised such a strategic planning document (Atlantic Area) or are in a process of realising first prospective works in this direction (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean).

- Under the **INTERREG IIB programme Atlantic Area**, a study project on the 'Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective' (ASDP) was realised between September 2003 and the half first of 2005. It included around twenty regions from the Atlantic Area<sup>40</sup>, with the CPMR acting as Lead Partner and French region Brittany running the study. The ASDP-project aimed at developing a vision of the polycentric development of the Atlantic Area and focuses on four themes: regional interrelationships, production and innovation systems, transport and administrative systems. Beyond a wide range of meetings and workshops organised, the main outputs of the study project were the elaboration of a number of 'Interim Reports', of a 'Final Report' composed of a Volume 1 (plus annexes)<sup>41</sup> and a Volume 2<sup>42</sup> and of a 'Synthesis Document' on the 'Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective'<sup>43</sup>.
- Under the **INTERREG IIB programme Western**

**Mediterranean (MEDOCC)**, various study projects were carried out and their outputs are likely to contribute to a spatial vision for this area. The first one is the project 'Les Ateliers Méditerranéens de l'Aménagement du Territoire' (AMAT), in which eight EU regions participated under the leadership of Provence-Alpes Côte d'Azur.<sup>44</sup> The second project is entitled 'Coopération Métropoles Méditerranéennes' (C2M) and concerns the metropolitan areas of Barcelona, Genova, Lyon, Marseille and Sevilla. In the final stage of the MEDOCC-programme, the 'Medisdec-Stratmed' project was started. It tends to initiate a spatial vision elaboration process, but it has not yet produced outputs.

- Although no transnational spatial development vision properly speaking has been elaborated under the **INTERREG IIB programme Alpine Space**, a specific working group was set up in 2004 to elaborate a 'Prospective Study' on the sustainable territorial development in the Alpine Space. This study, for which a final draft was delivered in August 2005<sup>45</sup>, can be considered a preparatory phase for potential future spatial visioning activities to be realised under the next cooperation programme that will be supported by the future Objective 3 (2007-13).

In the **remainder INTERREG IIB cooperation areas, spatial visioning processes are either paused or not being launched at all (even not in a preparatory phase)**.

- In the context of the **INTERREG IIB programme CADSES**, no need was seen/to further develop or upgrade the strategic planning documents previously elaborated for the entire transnational cooperation area (Vision Planet-project) or for smaller parts of it (i.e. South-East Europe, ESTIA-project). In addition, both follow-up projects realised during the current programming period 2000-06 (PLANET CENSE; ESTIA-SPOSE) are not considered 'flagship projects' by the INTERREG IIB programme bodies.<sup>46</sup>
- For the INTERREG IIB programmes South-West Europe, ARCHIMED, Northern Periphery, Caribbean Space, Madeira-Azores Area-Canary Islands, Indian Ocean / Réunion Island, no precise information does exist whether preparatory activities for spatial visioning

processes covering the transnational cooperation area have been launched.

### 2.3 Cross-border spatial development planning and the elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts

Cross-border cooperation in the field of spatial development planning has started already during a very early phase (1970s – end of 1980s), mostly in areas immediately located at a commonly shared border and in the context of specific intergovernmental structures. With the introduction of the INTERREG Community Initiative programme (INTERREG I: 1990-93) and its subsequent continuation/enlargement (INTERREG IIA: 1994-99; INTERREG IIIA: 2000-06), especially decentralised cross-border spatial development planning was significantly intensified along many EU-borders during the 1990s and further expanded in the first years of the new millennium<sup>47</sup>.

#### Start-up phase

One major aspect that motivated an initiation of joint spatial development planning activities had been the growing awareness that policy consequences do not stop at borders of the respective neighbouring countries and that legal as well as organisational measures in the field of spatial planning could support a more harmonious development of the cross-border territory.

Already during the 1970s, **bilateral inter-state agreements on cooperation in the field of spatial planning** were concluded between Germany and its neighbouring countries Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Austria and Switzerland.<sup>48</sup> On ground of these agreements, also specific inter-state cooperation structures were established in form of inter-governmental spatial planning commissions and/or regional commissions and sub-commissions. Although these structures normally lack of a legally binding decision making authority, they have carried out fruitful cross-border spatial development planning activities within the confines of their limited possibilities<sup>49</sup> over the past 30 years. During the 1980s and 1990s, other inter-state agreements on cooperation in the field of regional planning were concluded that mostly involve countries from central and eastern Europe.<sup>50</sup>

Joint work within these inter-governmental commissions

has – however only more recently - led to an elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts for the respective mandate areas covered by the structures. Examples can be found along several EU-borders:

- Already back in 1982 the German-Swiss and German-Austrian Spatial Planning Commissions have finalised the 'International Development Perspective for the Lake Constance Area'.<sup>51</sup> It was subsequently revised and replaced by the 'Lake Constance Development Perspective' of 1994.<sup>52</sup>
- Based upon joint work within the German-Polish Spatial Planning Commission since 1992, cross-border spatial planning concepts covering the entire border area had been adopted in May 1995.
- Comprehensive cross-border spatial development concepts were also elaborated during the years 1996/1997 for the entire Dutch-German border (see text box below).
- Between 1996 and 1999, a 'regional planning orientation framework' for the area covered by the Upper Rhine Conference (DE/FR/CH) was elaborated with support from the INTERREG IIA programme. It should provide guidance for the organisation of future conditions related to living and economic activities and of a high quality transport system, but also for shaping the environment and nature in the cooperation area.

Another interesting example is the 'Development Scheme for the Space of SaarLorLux+' (SDE-SLL+).<sup>53</sup> It has been elaborated during the years 1995-99 for the border-area between Luxembourg, France, Germany and Belgium. The initiative has been supported by the Regional Commission Saar-Lor-Lux-Trier/Westpfalz<sup>54</sup> and received Community funding under the previous ERDF-Art 10 budget line. The SDE-SLL+ briefly summarises the spatial structures and major development trends, highlights the important role of cross-border cooperation and elaborates 'regionalised' development perspectives for the three main issues promoted by the ESDP (i.e. polycentric territorial development and a new urban-rural relationship; parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge; integrated concepts for the protection and valorisation of natural and cultural heritage potentials). Each of these thematic development perspec-



### Inter-state spatial planning cooperation between Netherlands and Germany

Based upon an inter-state agreement signed in 1976, the Netherlands cooperate with Germany within the Dutch - German Commission for Spatial Planning in the Sub-commissions North and South. The 'Sub-commission North' includes the Dutch provinces of Groningen, Drenthe, Overijssel and Gelderland, together with the German Federal State of Lower Saxony. In the 'Sub-commission South', the Dutch provinces of Gelderland and Limburg work together with the German Federal state of Nordrhein-Westfalen. The president and secretariat of both Sub-commissions change every two years. Participants of the consultation bodies are civil servants responsible for spatial planning as well as representatives of other ministries, especially regional directions of the Dutch Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management and the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality as well as of the Union of Dutch Communities, the Dutch Chamber of Commerce and - as observers - the permanent cross-border structures established among local and regional authorities, i.e. the Euregios. Both Sub-commissions deal with all issues related to spatial planning that are connected to cross-border cooperation.

Important planning outputs produced by both Sub-commissions are the following: The 'Sub-commission North' has elaborated a cross-border development perspective for regional planning (1996-97). Based upon an analysis of strengths and weaknesses prevailing in the entire cross-border area, regional planning models were elaborated for the three priority issues (i.e. rural regions & urban nodal points; mobility & transport system, natural & cultural landscape) that identify and illustrate the key elements of a desirable future development in the northern German-Dutch border area. The 'Sub-commission South' has elaborated a spatial planning model (1996-97) that contains an assessment of future prospects, opportunities, risks and tasks for spatial development with respect to a number of themes (i.e. demographic development, urban structure and rural districts, transport flows and networks, industry, leisure and cultural assets and landscapes). It also develops a regional planning model for the entire cross-border area addressing the four key topics (cross-border cooperation; regional structure, cities and municipalities; mobility and transport systems; landscape, recreation areas and environment) and identifies 'fields of action' for the different Euregios located in the area with respect to spatial development planning.

tives contains an assessment of the current situation and future development trends, a related SWOT-analysis, a vision statement up to the year 2020 and a strategic orientation framework for spatial development policy. In 2003, the SDE-SLL+ had been formally adopted by the regional commission Saar-Lor-Lux-Trier/Westpfalz.

### Intensification of decentralised cross-border spatial development planning

Since the launching of INTERREG I and the subsequent continuation of Community support for cross-border cooperation under INTERREG IIA, decentralised cooperation in the field of spatial development planning, involving regional and local level actors for both sides of a border, has become more intense and widespread. Another important factor stimulating key stakeholders involved in decentralised cross-border cooperation to carry out such activities was certainly the preparation of the ESDP, which was going on in parallel during the 1990s. In

its final version adopted in 1999, the ESDP explicitly calls upon cross-border cooperation to be one level of action for practically applying its policy orientations.<sup>55</sup>

Against this wider background, also **a growing number of cross-border spatial development concepts have been elaborated (see text box below)** that were often supported financially through funding from the respective EU-programmes (INTERREG I/IIA programmes; PHARE-CBC).

These decentralised cross-border spatial development concepts, which were elaborated mostly in the context of INTERREG I and IIA projects, have generally adopted a broad and participatory approach during their preparation. They involved a broad range of different administrative and socio-economic actors from either side of the border according to the principles of subsidiarity and partnership. In most cases, they also had a positive influence on domestic national, regional and local spatial planning on

### Examples for decentralised cross-border spatial development concepts

**EUREGIO (DE/NL):** ‘Cross-border spatial development perspectives of the EUREGIO’ with a time horizon up to 2015, elaborated between 1997 and 1998.

**Euregio rhein-maas-nord (DE/NL):** ‘euregio-plan - cross-border spatial development perspectives’ of January 1995.

**Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL):** ‘Cross-border development and action concept of the Euregio Rhein-Waal’ (1989) and revision/updating of the previous document by the ‘Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 Euregio Rhein-Waal’ (2001).

**PAMINA (DE/FR):** ‘Orientation Guidelines for the Economic and Spatial Development of the PAMINA-area’ (1996) and the subsequent further elaboration/upgrading of this approach through the ‘Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region’ (2002).

**Euroregion POMMERANIA (DE/PL/SE):** ‘Cross-border development and action concept of the Euroregion POMMERANIA’ (1993) and revision/updating of the previous document by the ‘Cross-border development and action concept of the Euroregion POMMERANIA 2000-2006’ (1999).

**Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina (DE/PL):** ‘Development and action concept of the Euroregion Viadrina’ (1999), which is a revision/updating of a previously existing cross-border development concept elaborated in 1993.

**Euroregion Spree-Neiße-Bober (DE/PL):** ‘Development and action concept of the Euroregion Spree-Neiße-Bober’ (1999), which is a revision/updating of a previously existing cross-border development concept elaborated in 1993.

**Euroregion Elbe-Labe (DE/CZ):** ‘Cross-border development concept for the Euroregion Elbe-Labe’ (1994).

**Border area between Saxony (DE), the Czech Republic (CZ):** ‘Development and action concept for the Saxony-Czech border area’ of 1999 (partly also covering Poland).

**Border area between Bavaria (DE) and the Czech Republic (CZ):** ‘INTERREG III-PHARE CBC spatial perspective for the Bavarian-Czech border region, elaborated between 1998 and 1999’.

**Border area between Austria (AT) and Slovenia (SI):** ‘Cross-border development concept for the border between Austria and Slovenia’.

**Border area between Bavaria (DE), the Czech Republic (CZ) and Austria (AT):** ‘Development concept Bayrischer Wald/Böhmerwald/Mühlviertel’ of 1994, elaborated as an UNESCO pilot project.

**Øresund-Region (DK/SE):** ‘Joint Cross-border Regional Development Plan’.

**Border area between Sweden (SE), Finland (FI) and Norway (NO):** ‘Torne Valley Development Concept’ of 1999.

**Border between France and Spain (FR/ES):** ‘Livre Blanc de l’Eurocité Bayonne – San Sebastian’, elaborated between 1998 and 2000.

both sides of a border and thus contributed to make them more concrete.

- Along various **internal EU-borders in North-West Europe**, some of the previously existing permanent cross-border structures with a sometimes very long-standing cooperation tradition have elaborated own cross-border spatial development concepts for their respective cooperation area. This is true especially for

several of the Euregios established along the Dutch-German border (i.e. EUREGIO, euregio rhein-maas-nord, Euregio Rhein-Waal). A particularly interesting case is the ‘Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010’ of the Euregio Rhein-Waal, which in 1993 became the first Euregio in Europe that was constituted as a public-law based cross-border authority.<sup>56</sup> But also the spatial development planning activities at the German-French border, realised by the cross-bor-

der cooperation structure 'PAMINA' that has recently undergone a significant transformation of its legal/organisational context<sup>57</sup>, are a very interesting example. In both cases mentioned above, one can also observe that previously elaborated strategic cross-border planning documents have either been updated (DE/NL) or further elaborated (DE/FR) in order to take account of more recent changes and developments.

- A systematic first elaboration and subsequent updating of cross-border spatial development concepts has taken place **along the former external EU-borders of Germany with neighbouring central and eastern European countries (e.g. Poland, Czech Republic)**. Already under INTERREG I, cross-border planning documents were elaborated for the territory covered by the newly created Euroregions along these borders. Under INTERREG IIA, existing euroregional concepts were frequently updated and also new cross-border concepts covering larger parts of the previous external border area were elaborated. Their general purpose was to offer a multi-thematic framework for better structuring the newly emerging cross-border cooperation activities and to provide a preparatory support-input for the elaboration of INTERREG IIA/PHARE-CBC programmes or for the upcoming INTERREG IIIA/PHARE-CBC programmes.
- Compared to the German external borders, a systematic elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts has not taken place along the **Austrian external borders with central and eastern European countries** during the INTERREG IIA period. One can however find some good examples for first-time cross-border planning activities. A first one is the INTERREG IIA-PHARE CBC project that led to the elaboration of a 'Cross-border development concept for the border between Austria and Slovenia'. Another one is the trilateral 'Development Concept Bayrischer Wald/Böhmerwald/Mühlviertel', which was elaborated in 1994 as an UNESCO pilot project. In addition, also a first 'Development Strategy for the Region Vienna-Bratislava' (AT/SK) was elaborated with support from INTERREG IIA and PHARE-CBC.
- Some isolated cross-border spatial development planning activities can also be observed **along several**

**borders between Scandinavian countries.** In the Oresund-Region (DK/SE), for example, extensive horizontal and policy-specific planning activities were realised and supported by INTERREG IIA. This has led to the elaboration of a cross-thematic 'Joint Cross-border Regional Development Plan' with planning recommendations for local authorities. Also the elaboration of a 'Joint Environmental Programme for the Oresund-Region' and a cross-border transport-development plan for the time after the completion of the fixed link between Sweden and Denmark can be observed. Another example is the 'Torne Valley Development Concept',<sup>58</sup> which was elaborated in the wider context of the INTERREG IIA programme 'Nordkalotten' (SE/FI/NO). Cross-border cooperation in the area is realised in the context of the 'Torne Rive Council', which has – through a working group – also elaborated the development concept. It was presented to the wider public in June 1999 and had the intention to lay the foundations for future INTERREG IIIA activities.

- Along the vast majority of **internal and external borders in the south of the EU**, however, activities related to comprehensive cross-border spatial development planning have remained an exception during the 1990s. There are some examples for theme-specific and area-specific approaches that cover parts of specific INTERREG programme areas such as the INTERREG I study-project on the 'Establishment of the International Marine Nature Reserve' in the area of the Bouches de Bonifacio between Corsica and Sardinia (FR/IT) and the 'Study on cross-border activities in the Euroregion Nestos-Mesa' (EL/BG).<sup>59</sup> Another noteworthy initiative that can be assimilated to a cross-border spatial development concept is the 'Livre Blanc de l'Eurocité Bayonne – San Sebastian', which was elaborated between 1998 and 2000 at the south-western part of the French-Spanish border.

Although a quite long tradition exists with respect to **large-scale cross-border cooperation among various regions that takes place mostly in the context of 'Working Communities'**<sup>60</sup>, joint activities in the field of spatial development planning have only very seldom led to an elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts. Especially the Working Communities set up for parts of the Alpine Space (COTRAO for the western Alps; ARGE-

ALP for the central Alps; ALPEN-ADRIA for the eastern Alps) have established working groups on spatial development. Joint work aims at contributing to a more harmonious development of their respective cooperation area, in particular through harmonising spatial development policies in the various member regions.

In 1996, the ARGE-ALP has adopted a 'Joint Perspective for Development and Securing the Alpine Space', which shall serve as a basis for future cross-border policy.<sup>61</sup> But also ALPEN-ADRIA has adopted in 2000 a 'Development Perspective in a Europe of the Third Millennium'<sup>62</sup> that defines the long-term objectives for mutual cooperation. Subsequently, APEN-ADRIA has produced a joint planning document for enhancing/practically realising a sustainable development in the cooperation area.<sup>63</sup> It also elaborated strategic studies that aim at further exploring the use of spatial planning instruments for more effective development solutions<sup>64</sup> and the territorial impact of EU-enlargement on the territory of the Working Community.<sup>65</sup>

## Consolidation and expansion phase

With the launching of the third generation of INTERREG programmes and the continuing support to cross-border cooperation (INTERREG IIIA), new cross-border spatial development planning initiatives are actually realised through specific projects during the years 2000 to 2006 along several borders. These activities range from an elaboration of comprehensive spatial development visions covering the entire programme zone or larger parts of the cross-border area (cross-border nature-park) to more localised cross-border planning activities at city/town level.

In the context of the **INTERREG IIIA programme Euregio Meuse-Rhine (DE/NL/BE)**, the project 'Three Countries Park – Open spaces without borders'<sup>66</sup> aimed at establishing a common development perspective with regard to land-use planning and nature. It is intended to be an instrument for the harmonisation of policy and the development of joint projects in order to protect and strengthen the unique character of this 'green heart' of the Euregio Maas-Rhein. Between 2001 and 2003, the partners have jointly elaborated the 'Three Countries Park Development Perspective'.<sup>67</sup> The document gives an overview on the current opportunities/threats and presents an integrative long-term-oriented vision (planning horizon

2030), which highlights trends and possible future evolutions. From the development perspective, a number of policy guidelines for various sectors are derived. They constitute obligations that the concerned governments<sup>68</sup> must fulfil to the best of their abilities. On the administrative level, more detailed agreements were reached on concrete development projects in 2004 and all of them should receive concrete form from 2005 onwards.

In the context of the **INTERREG IIIA programme Alpen-Bodensee (DE/AT/CH/LI)**, the project 'Common regional development in the border area Germany-Switzerland-Austria-Liechtenstein' aims at working out a development plan for the entire cross-border region. The project involves an exchange of innovative initiatives for planning in residential and rural areas as well as for integrated protection of the environment and nature. It also aims at creating cross-border structures of communications, an exchanges platform, a Meta-data bank and a data catalogue.

Interesting examples for joint policy-specific cross-border planning activities and horizontal spatial development planning activities can also be found within some of the **INTERREG IIIA programmes covering the new internal EU-borders of Austria** (e.g. Austria – Hungary, Austria – Slovakia, Austria – Czech Republic).

- In the context of an INTERREG IIIA project supported by the **programme Austria – Hungary**, all working groups and institutions of the 'Euregio West/Nyugat Pannonia' have jointly elaborated a cross-border spatial development perspective<sup>69</sup> during a two years lasting process. This strategic document, which has been adopted by the EurRegio through a formal decision, covers a wide range of different themes and contains – in the long version with more than 200 pages - 26 digital maps.
- Between the two neighbouring **INTERREG IIIA programmes Austria – Slovakia and Austria – Czech Republic**, the transport planning project CENTRAL (Central European Nodes for Transport and Logistics) was realised as an 'umbrella project' for the Vienna – Bratislava Region. It aims at preparing and implementing activities for extending/creating logistical quality offers at nodal points and at better networking them.

- The INTERREG IIIA project JORDES+ (see also text box below), which was realised jointly between the **programmes Austria – Slovakia and Austria – Hungary**, elaborated a common regional development strategy for the trilateral Vienna-Bratislava-Győr cross-border area where about 4 million people are living. All relevant public services representing a more integrated development function at national and regional levels (e.g. departments, agencies for spatial and environmental planning, business development agencies and regional development agencies, representatives of major cities)<sup>70</sup> were involved in the elaboration process. According to its own perception, JORDES+ is more detailed compared to a standard cross-border development perspective, as it gives operational recommendations for political decisions and private investment (i.e.

JORDES as an instrument for preparing/implementing projects with shared benefit).

With respect to more localised cross-border strategic development planning, concrete initiatives in this direction are launched by some **cross-border twin-cities<sup>72</sup> located at different EU borders**.

- A first example can be found under the **INTERREG IIIA Priority ‘Estonia-Latvia-Russia/North’** of the Baltic Sea Region INTERREG IIIB Neighbourhood Programme.<sup>73</sup> The project ‘One City – Two States’ aims at strengthening cross-border cooperation in fields such as spatial planning, tourism, education, healthcare, culture and sports among the towns of Valka (LV) and Valga (EE). The idea is to ‘break barriers’ between the

#### INTERREG IIIA/PHARE CBC project ‘JORDES+’

The main objective of the project JORDES+ (Joint Regional Development Strategy) was to initiate a joint cross-border growth process that – in the sense of the ESDP – allows creating a high ranking zone within the European polycentric system of regions. Several previously realised INTERREG IIA projects have made an input to JORDES+, but they only dealt with partial elements of a comprehensive cross-border spatial development concept.

In quantitative terms, JORDES+ has assessed the current situation, defined development potentials and highlighted main trends related to regional development (i.e. spatial planning, locational policy, economic development, transport systems etc.) in order to raise and rank policy issues. In the context of its qualitative approach, JORDES+ has realised joint workshops and a systematic communication process to raise awareness and to launch a joint discussion that should result in a cross-border discussion platform. On ground of this, an elaboration of potential development scenarios as well as of a regional planning and project development strategy has taken place. This strategy, which also included a visualisation of development trends and strategy elements, should be adopted by the project partners and the political institutions in the cross-border area.

The JORDES+ strategy generally aims at integrating the cross-border region into the TEN-transport networks and into the European-wide process of polycentric development. The different key elements focus on the following aspects:

- The territorial development strategy aims at improving the basis for decision-making in fields such as infrastructure development and development of settlement structures.
- The economic development strategy elaborates a mid-term scenario for sustainable regional growth poles.
- The implementation strategy of JORDES+ aims at putting into place the operational communication structure among relevant public services at national and regional levels in the three countries involved (AT, SK, HU).

As main results, JORDES+ has allowed to better conceptualise one’s thinking about the location of the cross-border area in the wider European context (territorial positioning function), contributed to establish a cross-border network of planning professionals and provided a reference framework for influencing strategic planning at regional and local levels in the cross-border area. Although one of the aims of JORDES+ was to contribute to the political debate, a follow-up INTERREG IIIA project called ‘CENTROPE’<sup>71</sup> was subsequently launched to deal more in depth with the political dimension of the Vienna-Győr–Bratislava region.

two towns in order to employ the full potential of their uniqueness. This objective is – among others - achieved by blueprinting mutual city-planning principles through elaborating a healthcare development plan, a culture development plan, an education development plan, a sports conception and a tourism-strategy.

- A second one exists in the context of the **INTERREG IIIA programme South East Finland – Russia**, where the project ‘Implementation of the Imatra-Svetogorsk twin town strategy’<sup>74</sup> aims at minimising negative effects of the gap in the standard of living, at increasing joint business activity and at creating pre-conditions for mutual cooperation. Cooperation covers issues such as business, development of infrastructure, tourism, education and training, as well as recreational activities.

Along some EU-borders, however, **comprehensive cross-border spatial development planning activities are sometimes not yet realised**. This is partly due to diverging levels of awareness of actors on either side of the border (e.g. DE/DK) or strong preferences towards realising short-term benefits (e.g. EE/LV, LV/LT), but sometimes also a result of different legal/administrative provisions existing in the respective neighbouring countries that tend to hamper such planning activities (e.g. SE/NO). These aspects seem however not to be of major importance for definitively stopping progress in this direction, as in some cross-border areas discussions on potential future activities (i.e. 2006 onwards) are currently going (DE/DK, SE/NO).

- In the context of the **INTERREG IIIA programme Sonderjylland-Schleswig**,<sup>75</sup> covering parts of the border between Denmark and Germany, no horizontal spatial development concept covering the entire cross-border area was elaborated up to now.<sup>76</sup> Only policy-specific and/or zone-specific cross-border planning activities were realised<sup>77</sup>. More recently, however, this situation tends to change. The new Danish regions have to elaborate regional development plans that are legally bound to also deal with cross-border issues. The Danish side expects that domestic planning activities can - hopefully – be realised in cooperation with the different German authorities and that this might potentially also allow starting first-time cross-border spatial

development planning activities. The Danish side wishes a widespread promotion of a future cross-border spatial development perspective and expects to achieve the following results from its practical application: to better conceptualise one’s thinking about the location of the cross-border area in the wider European context (territorial positioning function), to fulfil the function of a discussion and consensus building framework for the elaboration of the future Objective 3 programme, to contribute establishing a cross-border network of planning professionals, to provide a reference framework for influencing strategic planning at regional and local levels in the cross-border area and – eventually – also to provide suggestions for preparing Objective 3 projects that translate the objectives/contents of the future concept into concrete action.

- In the **INTERREG IIIA programme Sweden – Norway (sub-programme ‘Inner Scandinavia’)**,<sup>78</sup> up to now only zone-specific planning activities were realised in the cross-border area.<sup>79</sup> Horizontal planning activities that would result in the elaboration/adoption of a cross-border spatial development concept (or a similar document) have not been on the joint policy agenda due to different planning legislations and responsibilities for spatial planning in Sweden and Norway. Discussions are however under way for examining whether it is feasible to start working on a cross-border spatial development concept and for exploring whether participants potentially willing to become involved in such an activity will come from both regional and local political levels.
- Under the **INTERREG IIIA Priorities ‘Estonia-Latvia-Russia/North’ and ‘Latvia-Lithuania-Belarus/South’**,<sup>80</sup> which are both new cross-border priorities under the Baltic Sea Region INTERREG IIIB Neighbourhood Programme,<sup>81</sup> horizontal planning activities that will result in the elaboration of a ‘cross-border spatial development concept’ for the entire area are not yet undertaken. This is mainly due to the fact that especially the local project partners are seeking to achieve very concrete results through their activities (mainly in form of investments). Some policy-specific cross-border planning activities are however realised in the context of INTERREG III projects that cover larger or smaller parts of the entire cooperation area (see text box next page).

### Examples for policy-specific cross-border planning projects:

#### INTERREG IIIA Priority ‘Estonia-Latvia-Russia/North’:

- **NICE:** Development of activities on the territory of nature reserves (border of Estonia and Latvia), where only nature friendly activities are allowed. Specific objective is to elaborate coherent policy, joint services, products and infrastructure for environment friendly tourism development in North Livonia Coastal Region.
- **Cross-border lakesides:** Creating common vision and strategy of tourism sectors perspective development, investing in local human resource capacity broadening the information, knowledge, skills and experience, developing new modern cross-border tourism products, constructing new attractive infrastructure objects.

#### INTERREG IIIA Priority ‘Latvia-Lithuania-Belarus/South’:

- **Water supply services:** Elaboration of technical documentation for reconstruction of waterworks systems in small settlements that is to continue the project.
- **Region Regeneration:** Cooperation between cities for developing and testing an innovative approach to sustainable regeneration of cities and their surrounding areas within the cross-border region.

## 2.4 EU-wide spatial development planning and the application of prospective territorial research and scenario development

Up to the end of the 1990s, only a few attempts have been made to realise prospective territorial research and to develop spatial scenarios in a multi-country perspective across Europe. With the adoption of the ESPON programme at the beginning of the new millennium, however, these approaches start to play an increasingly important role and contribute to raise the level of sophistication of European-wide spatial development planning.

### Start-up phase

Very early attempts have been made in the context of the **Council of Europe’s Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning (ECMRP - CEMAT)**. A number of studies<sup>82</sup> were realised between 1978 and 1981, which – in a today’s view – are not this sophisticated due to limited information and processing resources available at that date.

**Within the European Union**, a first step towards prospective territorial research and spatial scenario development has been made in the context of the Commission’s study programme supporting the elaboration of development perspectives for a future spatial development of the Community territory. In the **‘Europe 2000’** document, published in 1991,<sup>83</sup> some long-range forecasts were elaborated for specific issues that are particularly important for spatial development.<sup>84</sup> The spatial research activities of this

first step were subsequently continued and have finally resulted in the publication of the **‘Europe 2000+’** document in 1994.<sup>85</sup> In an appendix to this document, a transnational perspective of the European territory was developed. It had been elaborated on ground of a number of ‘prospective studies’ for larger transnational areas that were realised between 1991 and 1993.<sup>86</sup> For 6 out of the 11 areas examined in this appendix, summary assessments of ongoing development trends and resulting spatial problems as well as ‘active scenarios’ highlighting necessary policy interventions – each illustrated by a map – have been elaborated.<sup>87</sup>

In addition to this first step, an attempt to use spatial scenarios for the Community territory in the long-lasting and ‘informal’ work process among the EU-Member States for elaborating the **‘European Spatial Development Perspective’ (ESDP)** has been made. Under French Presidency, a trend scenario for an ‘undesirable future situation’ has been elaborated by extrapolating current spatial development trends up to the year 2015. This trend scenario was presented at the Informal Council meeting in Strasbourg (March 1995) in form of three overview maps, one for each of the main fields of action of the future ESDP (i.e. balanced and polycentric development, parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge, wise management of natural/cultural heritage).<sup>88</sup> Despite the interesting contribution made by these scenario development activities to the subsequent further elaboration process, its visualisation component (i.e. the maps) was not included in the

final version of the ESDP that had been agreed at Informal Council of Ministers Meeting in Potsdam (May 1999).

During the entire elaboration process of the ESDP (1989 to 1999) it has become clear to all parties involved that the scientific basis for EU-wide spatial development planning needed to be improved. In particular, it was considered necessary to select appropriate indicators for spatial development and to suggest possible strategic directions that should be followed up and elaborated in policy terms. Due to this, an already existing idea for **setting up a network-based ‘European Spatial Planning Observatory’**<sup>89</sup> has been taken forward by the EU-Member States towards a concrete policy initiative. It aimed at establishing a common platform for applied spatial research in relation to the ESDP. In a first step, a ‘Study Programme on European Spatial Planning’ (SPESP) was set up in 1999. The Study Programme was also a test exercise, intended to provide insights on how a possible future European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON) could be organised and what should be expected of it. In a second step, the EU-Member States elaborated a joint application for ESPON within the framework of the Community Initiative INTERREG III.

### Phase of increasing sophistication

The **‘ESPON 2006 Programme - Research on the Spatial Development of an Enlarging European Union’** has been adopted by the European Commission on the 3rd of June 2002. Alongside the seven general objectives of the ESPON programme<sup>90</sup>, numerous research projects were launched that are already finalised or (in many cases) in an advanced stage of completion.<sup>91</sup>

All research projects are intended to follow an integrated approach and to have a clear territorial dimension. They cover a wide range of issues and are therefore of different nature, stretching from scientific methods and data bases via strategic projects to institutional and instrumental questions. Due to the considerable knowledge stock ESPON has made available on trends, policy impacts, imbalances and potentials within the European territory, a number of ESPON Briefings and Synthesis Reports have been published with the aim to communicate the most important findings of the various projects to practitioners, scientists and policy makers.<sup>92</sup>

Seen altogether, the current ESPON-activities clearly increase the level of sophistication of European-wide spatial development planning and help creating a significant added value when it comes to further promoting and supporting territorial analysis and projection.

A first aspect of this added value is the creation of the **ESPON-database**, which contains many more spatially disaggregated and comparable data than EUROSTAT could produce over the years.

Added value is also created by the different **ESPON study-projects** that have carried out a number of prospective trend analyses in various fields as well as scenario development activities. With respect to scenario development, one must however distinguish between two basic approaches that can be observed across the different ESPON study projects:

- Although various **ESPON studies covering thematic or policy impact-related issues (e.g. demography, impact of transport policy etc.)** have actually produced a wide range of analytical results, they do only contain a few long-term projections.<sup>93</sup> And where they exist, such projections are generally based on other sources than the ESPON-database. Another characteristic of these ESPON-study projects is that they analyse in detail various aspects of territorial development, but they do not investigate the relations of causality, i.e. the driving forces behind the situation and changes observed or described. Finally, some of these thematic or policy impact-related studies have also produced scenarios, however mostly as ‘by-products’. These scenarios are based on modelling approaches and are rather speculative in nature (they are based on deliberately chosen hypothesis).
- The programme also supported one **cross-thematic ESPON-study that aims at producing long-term spatial scenarios for 2030 (project 3.2)**. Here, the overall approach adopted is quite different and two categories of scenarios are being produced: (1) In a first phase, scenarios follow a deliberate didactic approach and aim at highlighting causality relations (impact of driving forces) that are largely skipped in most of the thematic ESPON-projects. To this end, a series of thematic scenarios was elaborated referring to demogra-



phy, transport, economy, energy, climate change, EU-enlargement, territorial governance, rural development and socio-cultural integration. By choosing rather extreme and opposite hypotheses for each scenario, the purpose was to provide an insight into the widest but realistic dimensions of possible territorial evolution. A number of these scenarios include policy factors and explore also the possible range of policy attitudes. (2) In a second phase, a limited number of integrative (multi-thematic) scenarios will be elaborated. Although they will not be finalised before the end of 2005, information about their hypothesis and orientations will be available. The ESPON 3.2 scenarios are largely qualitative in nature, but two models are elaborated to provide quantitative outcomes (e.g. for regional GDP, on flows of freight and passenger transport) at least for the medium-term range (until 2015).

## 2.5 Interregional cooperation projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning activities

The 'European Spatial Development Perspective' (ESDP) has recognised that the application of its policy options and the promotion of an integrated spatial development policy at EU scale require new and voluntary forms of cooperation, also between actors at the regional and local levels. Within this wider context, interregional cooperation (beyond transnational and cross-border cooperation) was considered an appropriate field of action.

Although interregional cooperation apparently lacks one essential precondition that is important for strategic territorial development planning (i.e. project partners are normally not located in a contiguous territorial context), one has to acknowledge that an interregional exchange of experience, a transfer of know-how and a dissemination of good practice can facilitate strategic territorial development planning processes.

This has already been demonstrated by some **early inter-regional cooperation projects funded under various EU-support programmes during the 1990s.**

- Examples for projects that have realised multi-thematic or issue-specific territorial development planning activities can be found especially under the **RECITE I programme** (1990-93).<sup>94</sup> The relatively narrow thematic focus adopted for the **RECITE II programme** (1997-

99)<sup>95</sup> was not this appropriate for realising this type of projects.

- But also among the 15 innovative or demonstrative pilot projects approved under the **TERRA programme**,<sup>96</sup> which deliberately adopted interregional networking among regional/local authorities to create synergy and to develop complementarity, some measures focussed directly on spatial planning activities.<sup>97</sup>

Interregional cooperation is currently supported under **Strand C of the Community Initiative INTERREG III (2000-06)**<sup>98</sup> and aims at improving the effectiveness of regional development policies and instruments through large-scale information exchange and sharing of experience (networks). By July 2005, the four INTERREG IIIC programmes provide co-financing to 264 operations, involving more than 2 600 local and regional actors from 49 different countries<sup>99</sup>. The majority of project partners (94%) come from the EU-Member States, 20% of them from the new EU-Member States. With respect to the project-specific areas of work, the overall situation can be summarised as follows:<sup>100</sup>

- The large majority of INTERREG IIIC projects concentrate their activities on four wider themes that are regional planning, territorial regeneration and urban development (58 projects), environment, risk prevention, energy and natural resources (57 projects), heritage, culture and tourism (44 projects) and SME-development and entrepreneurship (41 projects).
- A smaller number of projects focus on issues such as research, technology and innovation (26 projects), the information society and e-Government (21 projects), employment, social inclusion, human resources and education (17 projects) and accessibility, mobility and transport (13 projects).

**INTERREG IIIC projects that address aspects more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning** can be found under 3 out of the 4 zone-specific INTERREG IIIC programmes (see Overview Table 2).<sup>101</sup> Most of these projects have been approved under the 'West Zone' programme (13 projects), followed by the 'South Zone' programme (seven projects) and by the 'East Zone' programme (three projects). No projects

addressing the study's main topic were approved under the 'North Zone' programme, which is mainly due to the fact that all operations have a very narrow focus on economic development, support to SMEs, environmental protection or tourism development.

**Overview Table 2: INTERREG IIIC projects addressing aspects related to strategic territorial development planning**

INTERREG IIIC Zone	Project reference name	Lead Partner
<b>East</b>	AAP2020	COMUNE DI ANCONA, Italy
	EARD	InvestitionsBank des Landes Brandenburg, Germany
	INCORD	Bundesvereinigung der Landesentwicklungsgesellschaften (BVLEG), Germany
<b>West</b>	AWARE	Provincie Zeeland, the Netherlands
	CoPraNet	EUCC The Coastal Union, the Netherlands
	ENLoCC	Lead partner: Wirtschaftsförderung Region Stuttgart GmbH, Germany
	ESIN	Comhdhail Oileain na hEireann Inis Oirr, Arainn, Cuan na Gaillimhe, Ireland
	EWM	Provincie Fryslân, the Netherlands
	FARLAND	Dienst Landelijk Gebied, the Netherlands
	FLAPP	Stichting Euregio Maas – Rijn, the Netherlands
	GRIDS	Cardiff University, UK
	InterMETREX	Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Structure Plan Joint Committee (GCVSPJC/RC), UK
	PIMMS	London Borough of Bromley Civic Centre, UK
	PSPE	Dienst Landelijk Gebied, the Netherlands
	RECORE	Mairie de RIEULAY, France
	SULFANET	Provincie Noord-Brabant, the Netherlands
	<b>South</b>	DEDEL SDEC
PROGRESDEC		Region Lazio, Italy
POLYMETREX		Gouvernement of Catalan Region, Spain
RIVERLINKS		Mairie de Florence, Italy
CORONAS METROPOLITANAS		Consortium of the Zone North-West Madrid, Spain
Euromountains		Province of Turin, Italy
MARE		Commission de Coordination et de Développement de la Région Lisbonne et Vallée du Tage, Portugal
<b>North</b>		–

### 3 Main themes, objectives and application strategies of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning

#### 3.1 Preliminary remarks

A review of existing scientific literature generally suggests that the wider purpose of transnational or cross-border spatial planning documents lies in the provision of ‘interpretative frameworks’ that allow bettering the understanding of spatial structures in the cooperation area, identifying the normative provisions for policy and translating these normative provisions into concrete action.

Accordingly, at least the following **three important functions and a number of related requirements** should be fulfilled by transnational spatial development visions or cross-border spatial development concepts:

- **The function of ‘bringing together spatially relevant data and knowledge’ for a set of territorial entities belonging to different countries that make up the cooperation area as a whole:** This function aims at improving the understanding of the current spatial situation, of development trends and/or trend breaks, of wider inter-dependencies (i.e. territorial impact of national and EU policies) as well as of the spatial challenges, risks and opportunities prevailing in the individual territories belonging to the respective cooperation area. The elaboration of a transnational spatial development vision or a cross-border spatial development concept therefore requires a sufficiently sound assessment of all these issues. It needs to be worked out in cooperation with the neighbouring areas by using agreed compatible categories of description and analysis. A better understanding about the situations and development needs allows defining the specific interests of each territory in the cooperation area and highlighting common issues for spatial development planning and policy. This common interest is however (...) *not simply defined by the summation of all individual interests, but by considering the optimal use of all resources available in the greater set, for the sake of sharing in a fair way the advantages that can be expected from joining forces and development efforts.*<sup>102</sup>
  - **The function of providing an ‘application framework’ for actually translating spatial development goals and policy aims into concrete action:** This function aims at giving direction and inspiration to spatial planning or policy processes at various levels (transnational, national, cross-border, regional, local) and at assisting the formulation of transnational/cross-border programmes and projects, mainly for changing direction of policy through specific decisions in the short term.<sup>103</sup> Within this wider context it is however more appropriate to speak of ‘application’ rather than of implementation. This is due to the fact that long-term oriented transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents normally lack of a formally binding status.<sup>104</sup> As a consequence, a transnational spatial development vision or a cross-border development concept is therefore expected to include an application strategy with operational provisions (i.e. policy recommendations, suggestions for concrete activities and projects) that are well-oriented towards the key stakeholders targeted in the respective cooperation area.
- These different functions of transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts are normally intended - as the main effect – to generate changes in the reference framework of key actors located in the respective cooperation area. Some of the most crucial changes expected to emerge are the following: new ways of positioning oneself spatially within the cooperation

aims at making explicit the shared normative provisions of a responsible spatial policy, which allow pursuing together the common interests in the cooperation area and optimising development by overcoming problems through making the most efficient use of available resources and instruments. A transnational spatial development vision or a cross-border development concept is therefore expected to include a part that outlines the desired future spatial structure of the cooperation area (i.e. a development vision) and defines a set of meaningful development goals, policy aims or general principles/guidelines. These normative provisions must be in line with the territorial analysis realised beforehand and may address both spatial policies properly speaking as well as other spatially relevant structural/sector-specific policies not directly involving spatial planning responsibilities.

area by adopting a view that goes beyond that of the respective country, but also an improved capacity to conceptualise one's thinking about the location of the whole cooperation area in the wider spatial context of Europe.<sup>105</sup>

The **overall geographical focus adopted by transnational or cross-border spatial planning documents** reveals a lot about the possibilities to stimulate such changes, wherefore this issue needs to be further explored. Two important aspects will have to be examined more closely: Firstly, whether the strategic spatial planning documents contain (or not) approaches that differentiate between specific sub-zones with particular territorial characteristics or problems in the cooperation area. Secondly, whether the finalised strategic spatial planning documents actually develop (or not) a view for specific issues that goes beyond the agreed territorial limits of the respective cooperation area.

With respect to the finalised transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents and their application strategies, **key stakeholders located in cooperation areas might subsequently develop (or not) a relationship in form of 'mental ownership'**. If one agrees that transnational and cross-border spatial development planning is more an issue of communication rather than of programming, then the precise nature of this relationship could alternatively be described as follows: It is a direct result of the extent to which transnational visions or cross-border concepts (and their respective application strategies) are experienced useful and important by the wider group of key stakeholders to whom they are actually addressed.<sup>106</sup> The above-said therefore also allows assuming that the level of mental ownership is much more depending upon the extent to which the targeted key stakeholders could previously contribute to the elaboration of these documents and their application strategies, rather than being influenced by the formal status of the respective documents.

An interesting test for examining the actual level of 'mental ownership' that has developed over time is to review the **subsequent take-up of operational provisions contained in transnational visions or cross-border concepts by the targeted stakeholders in the respective cooperation areas (practical application results achieved)**. A coherent comparative appraisal of application results achieved will however be difficult to realise

across the different transnational and cross-border processes. In many cases this is directly attributable to a lack of updated information with a more or less similar level of concreteness, as systematic follow-up evaluations that could have been realised by the 'promoters' of still on-going processes do not exist.

### 3.2 Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC/IIIB programme areas

The different aspects mentioned in the preliminary remarks will be reviewed separately for two main groups of transnational spatial visioning activities, which all had been subject to an in-depth examination in the context of this study.

The first group consists of already elaborated spatial development visions covering the entire transnational cooperation area. They have been realised either outside the strict context of Community support programmes (Baltic Sea Region) or as a part of INTERREG IIC-IIIB programme activities (North-West Europe, North Sea, CADSES, Atlantic Area). More recently, some of these spatial development visions are currently undergoing an updating and upgrading process (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe, North Sea), while other vision-elaboration processes have either come to a stand-still (CADSES) or were only very recently completed (Atlantic Area).

The second group covers newly emerging spatial visioning processes that were launched only very recently in the context of two transnational cooperation areas (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean) and are yet only partly accomplished.

### Main themes addressed

With respect to the main themes for which issues and/or trends (and possible trend breaks) related to transnational spatial development are discussed, one can observe **relatively strong similarities** within each of the two main groups identified above.

A first set of similarities can be observed in case of the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions, which were finalised between 1994 and 2000/2001 (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe, North Sea, CADSES) or later under INTERREG IIIB (Atlantic Area).

- Generally speaking, all of the initial documents tend to

address a wide range of main themes and related issues that are important for spatial development planning and policy. An important reason behind this was certainly the wish to generate a better understanding of particular spatial situations, trends and problems as well of area-internal and wider international relations/inter-dependencies, which previously did not exist. The most comprehensive assessments can be found in the visions for the Baltic Sea Region and CADSES, but also in the Atlantic Area document if one considers its more limited overall purpose<sup>107</sup> (see Overview Table 3).

- Throughout the different documents, assessments generally focus on a present-time situation analysis as well as on some partial past-present trends analysis for some themes. A systematic and prospective trends analysis for all the themes/issues addressed has not been realised. Most of the documents contain however some qualitative statements with a forward-looking nature ('future challenges'). Only in the CADSES-vision document, a deliberately future-oriented scenario-approach has been adopted for assessing the spatial impacts of European integration and more specifically of the forthcoming Eastern enlargement of the EU.<sup>108</sup>

A second set of similarities can be observed in case of the more recent vision updating and upgrading processes, which are currently under way in various transnational cooperation areas (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe, North Sea Region).

- The Baltic Sea Region and the North Sea processes tend to adopt a more narrow thematic focus. A new spatial agenda has become evident in the North Sea Region, wherefore the updating process now focuses on issues that have become more urgent or important in recent years or which have not been thoroughly addressed in the NorVision document. In case of the Baltic Sea Region, the recently started VASAB-vision upgrading process (2004/2005) deliberately aims at re-orienting the scope of themes to be covered by a future long-term spatial development perspective. The focus is now on the most important transnational themes with a direct relevance for spatial integration of the Baltic Sea Region (i.e. transport corridors, development zones, transnational tourist routes, urban networks). This new orientation tries however to achieve a fairly

balanced approach between these specific themes and more general aspects, as an exploration of ways how to tackle common problems will be continued (i.e. for issues such as rural area development, urban issues, natural and cultural heritage).

- Only the updating and upgrading process launched under the North-West Europe programme continues to adopt a relatively wide thematic focus, probably for balancing out some weaknesses of the initial INTERREG IIC vision document.

A third set of similarities can be observed in case of the newly emerging spatial visioning processes, which were launched under the INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space and Western Mediterranean (MEDOCC). Both processes generally adopt a wide thematic focus.

- The 'Prospective Study' on the sustainable territorial development in the Alpine Space assesses - in a first part - trends for a wide range of different issues mainly related to economy, social aspects and environment/nature.<sup>109</sup> Beyond this, numerous other relevant trends were identified and attention was also paid to highlight main future territorial development trends.
- In the context of the Western Mediterranean Programme, the two INTERREG IIIB study projects that can be considered as preparatory work for a spatial vision covering the MEDOCC area investigated territorial challenges that EU-Mediterranean regions are facing either for a larger number themes (AMAT)<sup>110</sup> or in relation to the metropolitan/urban systems and polycentric development (C2M)<sup>111</sup>. The recently started 'Medisdec-Stratmed' project, which focuses on the elaboration of a spatial vision for the MEDOCC area, primarily investigates spatially relevant themes in relation to the ESPD, the new European priorities of the Lisbon-Gothenburg strategy and the national/regional priorities with respect to territorial cohesion and competitiveness.

### **Territorial impacts of different EU and national/regional policies**

Territorial impacts of different EU and national/regional policies that are important factors influencing on issues and/or trends related to spatial development. Among the transna-

**Overview Table 3: Main themes addressed by transnational spatial development visions**

Main themes and related issues addressed	CADSES *)	Atlantic Area	Baltic Sea Region		North Sea		North-West Europe	
	Status by 2000/2001	Status by 2005	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent updating	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent updating	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent updating
<b>Issues related to the general external and internal context of the transnational area</b>								
Positioning in the European and EU context	++	+	++	+	++	0	++	++
Positioning in the wider international/worldwide context	0	0/+	++	+	+	0	++	+
Basic physical & geographical conditions	++	+	++	0	++	0	++	+
Population structure & demographic change	++	++	++	0	++	++	+	++
<b>Issues related to the economic system and the social situation</b>								
Productive fabric, structural change, industrial reconversion,	++	++	++	+	++	0	+	++
Research, technology and innovation	+	+	++	+	++	++	0/+	++
Trade links among the countries/regions	++	0	++	0	0/+	0	0	0
Competitiveness and productivity	++	++	++	+	++	0	0	++
Economic growth and regional disparities	++	++	++	0	++	0	+	++
Labour market, employment and unemployment structure, patterns of qualification	++	++	++	0	+	0	+	++
Social cohesion and patterns of social disintegration	++	0/+	++	0	+	0	0	+
Changing life styles and new needs of population	+	0	+	0	++	++	0/+	+
<b>Issues related to the settlement system</b>								
PUrban system and city networks	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++
Rural areas and sparsely populated areas	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	+
New rural-urban relationship	++	++	++	++	++	+	+	++

\*) For the document elaborated by the VISION-Planet project.

Intensity of consideration:

0=not at all; += to some extent (with larger gaps); ++ = extensively covered

Main themes and related issues addressed	CADESSES *)	Atlantic Area	Baltic Sea Region		North Sea		North-West Europe	
	Status by 2000/2001	Status by 2005	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent updating	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent updating	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent updating
<b>Issues related to the communication links</b>								
Transport infrastructure, transport flows, internal and external accessibility	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
Telecommunication and information infrastructures, overall accessibility	+	+	+	++	+	0	+	++
Energy networks and energy provision status	0/+	0	++	0	++	++	0	+
<b>Issues related to environment, natural and cultural heritage</b>								
Status of environmental media (air, water, soil, etc.)	+	+	++	0	+	0	+	+
Waste management and water management	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0
Biodiversity, protection of natural heritage, green networks	++	0	++	0	++	0	++	++
Cultural heritage and cultural landscapes	++	+	++	0	++	0	++	++
Climate change and natural hazards	+	++	++	++	++	0	+	++
<b>Issues related to areas with specific problems and potentials</b>								
Border areas	++	++	++	0	0	0	+	0
Coastal zones and islands, integrated costal zone management	+	++	++	++	++	++	+	+
Mountain areas	++	+	0	0	0	0	0/+	+
<b>Issues related to the governance system</b>								
Basic features of territorial administration	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
National/regional spatial planning policies	++	++	++	0/+	0/+	0	0	+
Existing spatial plans and legislation	++	++	++	0/+	0	0	0	+
National/regional sector policies	++	+	+	0/+	+	0	0	+

\*) For the document elaborated by the VISION-Planet project.

Intensity of consideration:

0 = not at all; + = to some extent (with larger gaps); ++ = extensively covered

tional spatial visioning processes one can generally observe that the large majority of them show a well-developed level of awareness in relation to such effects.

Within the group of already elaborated transnational spatial development visions, only three out of the five initial vision documents have quite extensively taken into consideration

territorial impacts resulting from different EU and national/regional policies (i.e. Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, Atlantic Area). Among these three vision documents, the most comprehensive coverage of related aspects has been realised in the context of the relatively long-lasting VASAB-spatial visioning process (see text box below). But also the vision documents elaborated for CADSES and

### **Baltic Sea Region, the VASAB process between 1994-2004 and beyond**

The major documents produced by the VASAB process between 1994 and 2004 have generally well taken into consideration territorial impacts resulting from different EU or national/regional policies.

- Impact of the transition process in Eastern European countries during the 1990s and subsequent steps towards EU-enlargement (1996-2004).
- EU-transport policy (e.g. TEN-T network, TINA-process) and national transport policies (all transport modes; existing infrastructure).
- National and international energy policies (pipelines, nuclear power plants, electricity networks).
- EU's Common Agricultural Policy and national policies for agriculture and rural development.
- International conventions in the field of environment (e.g. RAMSAR-convention, HELCOM-convention), EU-level environmental policy (NATURA 2000 network), national environmental policies (legally protected areas).
- Bilateral or multilateral cross-border cooperation (e.g. impact of inter-state cooperations in the field of spatial planning commissions; regional/local initiatives) and EU-support to cross-border cooperation.
- EU Cohesion Policy, especially project-level transnational cooperation under INTERREG IIC.
- National spatial planning policies and main problems/issues addressed in this context, as well as new territorial trends revealed through European-wide initiatives in the field of spatial development (e.g. ESDP adopted by the EU; CEMAT process in the context of the Council of Europe).

During the upgrading process started by VASAB in 2004/2005, different EU and/or national policies as well as their main territorial impacts are considered:

- The EU Transport Policy, which has as the main territorial impact to strengthening large cities and their cooperation, generally tends to influence on the trends of a growing peripheralisation and of a weakening accessibility.
- The EU Maritime Policy, which has an impact on the integrated development of coastal zones including off-shore areas, generally tends to influence on the trend of managing conflicts in coastal zones.
- The EU Environmental Policy, which has as the main territorial impact to favour the protection of specific areas, generally tends to influence on the trend of an increasing pressure on linking protection with development in protected areas (i.e. NATURA 2000 areas);
- National transport policies, which have an impact on the clustering of cities and the enhancement of the development of territories adjacent to the linear transport infrastructure as well as on a strengthening of polycentricity at meso and local levels, generally tend to influence on the trend of spatial integration/disintegration.
- National innovation policies, which have an impact on the clustering of cities and the strengthening of spatial development zones, generally tend to influence on the trend of spatial integration/disintegration.
- National urban development policies, which have an impact on strengthening polycentricity at meso and local levels, generally tend to influence on the trend of spatial integration/disintegration.



more recently for the Atlantic Area have taken into consideration a wide range of policy-related territorial impacts, however mostly in their preparatory 'background reports'.

Compared to the above-mentioned examples, one has to conclude that very little if no attention at all was devoted to the important role of territorial policy impacts by the initial spatial vision documents elaborated under INTERREG IIC for the North Sea Region and the North-West Metropolitan Area. Only during the recent vision updating/upgrading processes launched under the respective INTERREG IIIB programmes, substantial 'catch-up efforts' are realised mostly in the context of the various thematic background studies elaborated for this purpose.

Among the newly emerging spatial visioning processes launched under the INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space and Western Mediterranean, especially the study projects with a wide thematic focus (i.e. 'Prospective Study' for the Alpine Space; 'AMAT-project') have quite extensively considered territorial impacts of a number of EU policies<sup>112</sup> as well as of national/regional policies. Under the thematically more focussed 'C2M project', territorial impacts of EU and national policies were taken into consideration more selectively (transport and innovation policies were particularly investigated).

## Development goals and policy aims promoted

If one looks at the various transnational spatial visioning processes examined in the context of this study, two introductory observations can be made. Only the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions contain well-arranged objective-systems that set out overall development goals and policy aims for addressing particular features/problems and future challenges in the respective cooperation areas. In case of the newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean), it is yet too early for making a clear statement on goals and policy aims that will be pursued in the future.

At a very general level, one can observe that already elaborated transnational spatial development visions as well as documents produced by newly emerging spatial visioning processes all contain direct references to wider spatial

development policy goals/objectives that were defined in the 'European Spatial Development Perspective' (ESDP) and in CEMAT's 'Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development on the European Continent'. More recently elaborated spatial visions (Atlantic Area), ongoing updating/upgrading processes (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region, North-West Europe) and newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean) also directly refer themselves to the overarching objectives of the EU's Lisbon-Göteborg Strategy.

Beyond these similarities, one can however observe a number of marked differences between the objective-systems in the five already elaborated transnational spatial development visions. A summary of their structural features can be found in several overview tables that are attached to this report as Annex II. Basically two different approaches can be distinguished:

- The first approach identifies a number of basic values and spatial development principles and contains an explicit vision-statement, which highlights a desired development status to be reached in the transnational area over a long-term perspective. From this vision-statement a limited number of overall development goals are then derived, in relation to which strategic policy aims are subsequently elaborated (i.e. visions elaborated for the Baltic Sea Region<sup>113</sup> and the North Sea Region<sup>114</sup>).
- The second approach is mainly characterised by the absence of an explicit overall vision statement in the respective documents. Instead, the documents directly identify a number of overall development goals that are each further deepened by strategic policy aims for spatial development (e.g. visions elaborated for CADSES<sup>115</sup>, North-West Europe<sup>116</sup> and the Atlantic Area<sup>117</sup>).

If one looks finally at the more recent development of some of these existing transnational visions, it can be observed that especially the VASAB upgrading process for the Baltic Sea Region and the NorVision updating process tend to stronger focus their future goals/policy aims on specific themes. Only in case of the North-West Europe updating process, future goals/policy aims continue focussing on the wider range of basic principles defined under the INTERREG IIC vision document.

## Application strategies and their stakeholder-orientation

Whereas the newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space and Western Mediterranean) have not yet resulted in an elaboration of concrete operational provisions, the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions all contain a consistent and more or less well-elaborated ‘application strategy’.

None of these transnational vision documents has a binding status, wherefore operational provisions in the application strategies do not generate ‘formal obligations’ with respect to plans drawn up/activities realised at lower levels of government (national, regional, local). The application strategies are all mostly indicative reference frameworks, which have as the main purpose to orientate and inspire concrete actions that could be realised in the future. All of the initially elaborated vision documents state - directly or indirectly - that their operational provisions should generally be taken into consideration by a wide range of different stakeholders from national, regional and local government levels, but also by other non-governmental stakeholders (e.g. research institutes; sector-specific institutions, associative organisations etc).

The stakeholder-orientation of application strategies in

already elaborated transnational spatial development visions is strongly conditioned by the way how they are presented. By looking at their basic structural features (i.e. themes/topics addressed, degree of further differentiation), which are summarised in Annex III to this report, one can observe considerable differences with respect to their degree of stakeholder-orientation.

- The most elaborated and well-differentiated application strategies are certainly those of the visions for CADSES, the Atlantic Area and the North-Sea Region. The first two documents formulate a large number of ‘policy recommendations’ or ‘policy proposals’ for the same topics previously addressed under the objective-system (goals/policy aims). The initial NorVision-document adopts a slightly different approach. It identifies 9 ‘key themes’ for integrated planning approaches and sustainable development that are somehow cross-cutting the 10 development vision statements. The application strategy is then further differentiated by a specific annex, in which a large number of concrete project suggestions are elaborated (see text box below).
- Compared to the above, one can observe that the application strategies in the initial vision documents of North-West Europe and the Baltic Sea Region (VASAB 2010 document) were not this elaborated and well-dif-

### North Sea Region, types of projects suggested in the ‘NorVision’ document

In a specific annex to the NorVision document, the Vision Working Group has elaborated a larger number of project ideas that were grouped according to the 10 vision statements. These suggestions, which have the purpose to demonstrate possible ways of concrete action, should however be developed in line with the nine ‘key themes for sustainable development’. Four different types of project ideas were suggested:

- Development studies: Certain types of shared problems and opportunities in the NSR have already been well researched. Nevertheless a common strategy to tackle these issues is often missing. Other issues have not gained sufficient attention and need deeper analysis. Proposed projects focus on the identification of joint efforts among the North Sea countries.
- Implementation projects: These proposals aim at preparing the practical implementation of development measures, especially as regards technical and social infrastructure.
- Networking projects: Many of these proposals deal with the establishment of networks to pursue common aims. Networking is essential to raise awareness on shared issues and joining forces may enhance the effectiveness of action.
- Best practice projects: These proposals aim at collecting and evaluating different national approaches on a variety of issues with a view to stimulate the transfer of know-how across the NSR, and across European macro-regions.

ferentiated. Although they address the same topics as under the respective objective-system, only a few policy recommendations and suggestions for concrete transnational activities/projects were elaborated in relation to these topics. Due to this, the VASAB process has already quite early focussed on further refining the operational dimension of the initial vision document during the subsequent updating activities realised in 1996 and 2000/2001.<sup>118</sup> Only more recently, however, a similar objective is pursued by the vision updating process launched under the INTERREG IIIB programme North-West Europe.

### The overall geographical focus adopted

Among the different transnational spatial visioning processes examined, one can observe relatively strong similarities.

The already elaborated transnational spatial development visions have all **adopted a predominantly ‘inward-looking’ perspective** throughout the different parts of the document (i.e. assessment of territorial challenges/trends, objective-systems, application strategies). Although this highly focussed view on the respective transnational programme area can somehow be understood, it is however equally important to systematically adopt an ‘outward-looking’ perspective that relates the transnational area to the wider European and world-wide context. In doing so, it might well be the case that some aspects identified as particularly relevant for transnational spatial development will

slightly change in nature, especially if one considers the increasing Europe-wide and global interdependencies for some specific issues (i.e. international transport flows, direct investment flows and capital movements, global climate change).

A growing interest in adopting a view that goes beyond the formal boundaries of the respective cooperation area can only be observed more recently in the context of the vision updating and upgrading processes. Themes for which such an extended view is most frequently adopted are European and global aspects of transport connections, including the ‘Motorways of the Sea’ and the connectivity to TEN-T and pan-European transport corridors (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region, North-West Europe), the marketing of area-specific assets (Baltic Sea Region) and energy-related issues (North Sea Region).

An interesting example that has made a more systematic effort to adopt an ‘outward-looking’ perspective is the newly emerging spatial visioning process, launched under the INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space (see text box below).

The already elaborated transnational spatial development visions all contain **approaches for geographically differentiating among sub-zones** located in the wider context of a transnational cooperation area. Such a geographical differentiation is mostly elaborated against the specific characteristics or problems prevailing in these sub-zones

#### ‘Prospective Study on the sustainable development of the Alpine Space’

Under this study, an interesting approach is adopted for the elaboration of the six visions (scenarios) that follow two main logics.

In the first logic (visions 1, 2 and 3), the Alpine Space is in priority addressed as an area of internal regulation that has to manage its own diversity, to arbitrate its internal conflicts, to find accommodations between contradictory stakes concerning it. The Alpine Space remains concerned by itself.

In the second logic (visions 4, 5 and 6), the Alpine Space is regarded in a larger global perspective of Europe and the world. The stake is not its internal regulation in priority any more, but its integration in these encompassing areas, the preservation of its specificity, the role that it plays at a higher level.

These two logics do not exclude each other, but are complementary. However, they lead to significant differences when understanding transnational cooperation.

and normally applied throughout the different main components of the various vision documents (i.e. the assessments of territorial challenges/trends, the objective-systems and the application strategies). A summary overview on the actual approaches adopted by the five transnational vision documents can be found in a number of tables that are attached to this report as Annex IV.

Geographical differentiation is continued to be adopted in the context of the recent updating and upgrading processes (Baltic Sea Region, North-Sea Region, North-West Europe) as well as by the newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean).

### **‘Mental ownership’ and practical application results**

Bearing in mind the preliminary remarks made on factors conditioning the potential development of a ‘mental ownership relationship’ with respect to spatial visions and their application strategies (see 3.1), one can observe significant differences among the various transnational visioning processes examined.

One can realistically assume that a **relatively high level of mental ownership has subsequently been developed by key stakeholders in North Sea Region** with respect to the initial NorVision document and its application strategy. This is mainly due to the fact that a quite extensive bottom-up consultation was realised during the elaboration process before the final editing of the NorVision document (see also section 5.2). The above-made remarks are also supported by the practical application results achieved in the North-Sea Area. It was decided from the start that NorVision would only be an inspiring document that should not substitute national planning documents or aim at becoming a transnational ‘masterplan’. The strategic document was also not conceived as a framework for evaluating sector-specific policies at national, regional and local levels. Despite these limitations, the operational provisions were quite substantially taken up by the targeted stakeholders in the area. The themes identified in NorVision were used as a backbone for drafting the INTERREG IIIB North Sea Programme and the significant number of transnational projects has helped to put the visions and strategies identified by NorVision into practice. Due to the broad consultation process realised, also new networks not only

among planning professionals could be created. Finally, some evidence exists that NorVision has been taken into account especially by regional planning activities.

Due to the broad bottom-up consultation process adopted during the first-time spatial visioning process in the **Atlantic Area (INTERREG IIIB), a potentially high level of mental ownership** can also be assumed to develop in relation to the recently completed strategic document. As this visioning process yet lacks of an application experience, there are however no practical results to further underpin this assumption.

In case of the other transnational spatial visioning processes (**Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe, CADSES**), one can assume that comparatively **lower levels of mental ownership have been developed by stakeholders in relation to the initial vision documents**. In all of these transnational cooperation areas, the initial processes did not organise broad stakeholder consultations before the final publication of the vision documents (see also below section 5.2). The initial application strategies are mostly ‘expert-based top-down approaches’ and the subsequent take-up of operational provisions by stakeholders in the respective cooperation areas had in most cases also been quite modest. Clear indications for such weaknesses do exist for CADSES, where the spatial visioning process has actually come to a stand-still. But also in case of North-West Europe, the recent efforts made to improve the stakeholder-orientation of the application strategy and to create an ‘ex-ante bottom up consultation processes’ can be considered evidence in this respect. Only the long-lasting VASAB process in the Baltic Sea Region is an exception to this trend, as the application strategy of the 1994 document was quite early elaborated further (1996-2001) and because more extensive use of preparatory bottom-up consultations will now be made during the recently started upgrading processes (since 2004/2005).

- The **CADSES visioning process** realised in the context of the ‘Vision Planet’ project has allowed widening the already established cooperation on spatial planning in western Europe towards the central and south-eastern European states. Furthermore, it has contributed to an increased cooperation between these states themselves. The vision document itself also constituted a

basis for a further development of national spatial development concepts. It thus made a contribution to the coordination of pre-accession instruments (such as PHARE and ISPA) at national level and also to a more efficient use of these EU funds. Despite these positive achievements, one has to observe that the spatial development vision has only occasionally been used as a reference document by the current INTERREG IIIB programme bodies. This is mainly due to the fact that during the early preparation/implementation phase of the INTERREG IIIB programme, it was hardly possible to draw direct conclusions from the vision document with respect to operational programme priorities.<sup>119</sup>

- In the context of **North-West Europe**, the initial spatial visioning process has certainly contributed to establish a transnational network of planning professionals and to enrich the debate on transnational cooperation in the field of spatial planning. The vision document properly speaking and the consultation report were only to a certain extent used for drafting the INTERREG IIIB programme. They also inspired some cooperation projects subsequently supported under the programme. Beyond this, however, it can not be observed that the political and administrative appropriation of the initial vision contents was very substantial.
- Since the publication of the initial VASAB 2010 document in 1994, a quite impressive list of results has been achieved in the **Baltic Sea Region**. During the first

years (1994-2000), the VASAB cooperation framework helped 'binding together' EU-Member States with non-EU countries in the Baltic Sea Region and allowed establishing a new forum for discussion on spatial development policy issues. It helped to improve the basic knowledge on spatial development processes and challenges, strengthened spatial planning at national and regional levels and facilitated the elaboration of a sustainable development strategy for the transnational cooperation area. In addition, 'own' VASAB pilot projects were initiated for demonstrating the benefits from transnational cooperation in spatial development and for identifying ways how to implement the spatial development vision. The VASAB process has also made a decisive contribution to elaborate the INTERREG IIC programme for the Baltic Sea Region and inspired many INTERREG IIC projects, the ESDP elaboration process and other emerging transnational spatial visioning processes. After a critical review of past activities, realised during the updating process that has led in 2001 to the adoption of the 'VASAB 2010+' report ('Spatial Development and Action Programme'), some of the previous actions were continued or re-focused. Additional activities were also launched alongside the new principles, key themes and lines for action set out in the VASAB 2010+ document, which allowed further expanding the list of previously achieved results. The current status of practically applying the VASAB-approach in the Baltic Sea Region are summarised in the text box below (status by 2004/2005)

#### **'Baltic Sea Region (BSR), summary of the most important results achieved by the VASAB process between 1994 and 2004/2005**

**The application of the VASAB approach has allowed to better conceptualising one's thinking about the location of the BSR in a wider European context (territorial positioning function):** VASAB is considered to be the 'common Baltic voice', i.e. it allows reaching consensus on the most important spatial priorities for development of the BSR. This consensus-based process, taking place during meetings of the 'Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region' (CSD-BSR), includes also an examination of the BSR position in the wider European context. The vision documents have served as a reference document for many BSR stakeholders and thus helped developing a 'BSR-identity' and positioning the BSR in the European and global activities of those stakeholders.

**The application of the VASAB approach has fulfilled the function of a discussion and consensus building framework for the elaboration of INTERREG IIC/IIIB programmes:** The vision document of 1994 has served as one of the main inputs for elaborating the INTERREG IIC programme. In the year 2000/2001, VASAB has again contributed to the elaboration of the INTERREG IIIB programme for the BSR. Preliminary results of the ongoing

updating process, leading to the adoption of the 'VASAB 2010+' document in 2001 ('Spatial Development Action Programme'), were incorporated into the programme.

**The application of the VASAB approach has contributed to establish a transnational network of planning professionals:** The CSD-BSR of VASAB is a network of planning professionals from the national level. During each CSD-BSR meeting there is time reserved for exchange of professional information about changes of spatial planning in the BSR countries. Periodical seminars and workshops are organised for a broader audience to discuss spatial planning methodological issues. In 2003, VASAB organised a seminar on Spatial National Strategic Documents and Policies. In addition, the identification of good practices in transnational spatial development is likely to be provided by the INTERREG IIIB project 'Commin'.

**The application of the VASAB approach has provided suggestions for preparing INTERREG IIC/IIIB projects that translate the objectives/contents of the vision into concrete action:** The vision document of 1994 has helped to inspire many INTERREG IIC projects that address aspects promoted by VASAB 2010. The 'Spatial Development Action Programme' and the Wismar Declaration of 2001, adopted at the fifth Ministerial Conference, have provided suggestions on possible focuses for INTERREG IIIB projects. Several of the six 'key themes' for transnational cooperation on sustainable spatial development (promoted by the VASAB 2010+ document) are currently addressed and taken forward by several INTERREG IIIB projects. Projects such as 'South Baltic Arc', 'String II' 'Metropolitan Areas+', 'MECIBS', 'Baltic Palette II', 'Seagull' and 'Baltic+' address the cooperation of urban regions on key issues of sustainable development (theme 1) and the strategic development of zones important for transnational integration (theme 2). For the issue of transnational transport links important for cross-BSR and cross-Europe integration (theme no 3), important strategic results are to be delivered by the INTERREG IIIB projects 'Baltic Gateway', and 'BaSIM'. Positive expectations in relation to a more effective integration of the mobility network in the BSR are associated with the INTERREG IIIB project 'Rail Baltica', which was approved in 2005. With regard to an integrated development of coastal zones and islands (theme 6), the INTERREG IIIB project 'Baltcoast' is expected to make an interesting contribution.

**The application of the VASAB approach has provided guidance for project selection under INTERREG IIC/IIIB:** The VASAB Secretariat took active part in project assessment teams both under INTERREG IIC and IIIB. The link to VASAB is part of the assessment procedure (see the application form). VASAB members form also part of INTERREG programme's Steering Committee.

**The application of the VASAB approach has provided a reference framework for influencing strategic planning at state, regional and local levels:** In many BSR countries, especially the new EU-Member States, VASAB documents were used in national and regional planning. An example is Latvia, where VASAB-recommendations on spatial planning in the coastal zone have been incorporated to the national law. In Lithuania, the construction of the bi-polar system of Vilnius-Kaunas was inspired by VASAB. In Poland, the 'South Baltic Arc project' initiated by the Wismar Ministerial Conference of 2001 reshaped spatial visions of three coastal regions of northern Poland. In Germany, the 'Baltcoast' project results were used for preparing the off-shore plan in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. In the core area of the BSR, the 'Baltic Palette' joint strategies are essential parts of Swedish regional development policies and programmes. In other parts of Sweden, similar actions have been taken to integrate results from the VASAB documents/INTERREG projects into regional development frameworks. A recent achievement with regard to supporting co-ordination of sectoral planning is the VASAB-driven 'East-West Forum' project of TACIS. It aims at capacity building among Russian spatial planners to make them engaging more actively into transnational cooperation.

**The application of the VASAB approach has to some extent provided a reference framework for evaluating sector-specific policies at state, regional and local levels:** VASAB related documents are used by some countries for an evaluation of strategic infrastructural investments. An example is the 'Rail Baltica' transport project conducted in the Baltic States.

### 3.3 Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA/IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them

The four cross-border spatial development concepts elaborated during the second half of the 1990s, which were examined more in-depth in the context of this study<sup>120</sup>, show a number of similarities. They are relatively strong with respect to the main themes for which issues and/or trends related to spatial development are discussed, but also regarding the most important goals/policy aims that are promoted by these spatial development concepts.

Equally important are however the sometimes considerable differences that can be observed among the four concepts. They are particularly evident when it came to considering territorial impacts resulting from different EU/national policies. But also with respect to the stakeholder-orientation of application strategies and the mental ownership or the geographical focus adopted by these documents, differences are quite strong.

#### Main themes addressed

For establishing a comprehensive diagnosis of the territorial situation prevailing in the cross-border area, quite similar themes were addressed across the four spatial development concepts examined. Only some variations do exist with respect to the intensity of their consideration (see Overview Table 4). The most striking case is the Viadrina 2000 concept (DE/PL), which could have better taken into consideration a number of strategically important themes in the current situation assessment and should improve thematic consistency throughout the different parts of the document.<sup>121</sup>

In several cases (e.g. FR/ES, DE/FR) a wider range of themes and related sub-themes has been considered during the preparation phase, which were subsequently 'merged' under more compact or cross-thematic headings in the final version of the cross-border spatial development concepts.

With respect to future development trends (possible trend breaks), only the 'Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 of the Euregio Rhein-Waal' (DE/NL) contains an explicit trends-assessment for all main themes addressed. The other concepts mainly focus on a present-time situation analysis, whereas future trends are either indirectly mentioned in the context of some theme-specific comments (DE/FR ES/FR) or not at all (DE/PL).

#### Territorial impacts of different EU and national/regional policies

Although such territorial impacts are important factors influencing on spatial development, one can generally observe that none of the concepts examined has carried out a sufficiently comprehensive assessment of the related effects emerging in the respective cross-border areas.

This is somehow astonishing, as during the 1990s a growing number of widely accessible strategic assessments and studies was elaborated at EU-level that assessed in-depth the spatial consequences of the wider European integration process (i.e. Internal Market; EU-enlargement) and especially the sometimes considerable territorial impacts of various EU-policies. Although not directly geared towards the cross-border context, use could at least have been made of these studies by key stakeholders in border areas for raising the awareness on such aspects during the elaboration of cross-border development concepts.

Among the four cross-border spatial development concepts examined, only the 'White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian' (FR/ES) has explicitly used such EU-level strategic studies such as Europe 2000+. It also made quite frequently reference to territorial impacts resulting from the wider European integration process, from specific EU-level policies and from national, regional or local policies (see also text box below).

The other concepts elaborated along the borders between

**Overview Table 4: Main themes addressed by the four cross-border spatial development concepts**

Main themes addressed	FR/ES: Eurocity White Paper	DE/PL: Viadrina 2000 concept	DE/NL: Euregio Rhein- Waal concept	DE/FR: PAMINA region concept
Basic physical conditions of the cross-border area	++	++	++	++
Cross-border area and wider European, transnational and national context	++	+	++	++
Settlement structure and urban system/network	++	+	++	+
Rural areas, agriculture and rural-urban relationship	0/+	0/+	++	++
Population structure and demographic evolution	+	++	++	++
Transport infrastructure, transport flows, public transport and overall accessibility	++	+	++	++
Information/communication infrastructures and overall accessibility	++	0	++	0/+
Situation and availability of other public services/infrastructures *)	++	0/+	+	++
Economic fabric, structural change, industrial reconversion, quality of locational factors	++	++	++	++
Research, technology and innovation	++	+	++	++
Labour market and qualification	+	++	++	++
Environment, nature and cultural heritage	++	++	++	++
Current state of cross-border cooperation and level of integration	++	++	++	++

\*) e.g. waste disposal/sewage water treatment, fresh water provision, health care services, recreational infrastructures/services

Intensity of consideration:

0=not at all; += to some extent (with larger gaps); ++ = extensively covered

DE/PL, DE/NL and DE/FR have directly or indirectly addressed only some isolated aspects. They are mostly related to the Common Transport Policy (TEN-T), the EU's environmental policy (NATURA 2000, new EU-wide legal standards) and the EU's Structural Funds policy (effects resulting from INTERREG-support).

### Development goals and policy aims promoted

If one looks at the objective-systems of the various cross-

border spatial development concepts examined, one can observe quite strong similarities.

- At a first level, each of the four cross-border spatial development concepts sets out an overall development goal or a development vision, which briefly highlights a desired future situation that should be reached in a long-term perspective (see Overview Table 5). This is done either directly through an explicit goal/vision statement (DE/PL, DE/FR, DE/NL) or indirectly through the wider purpose assigned to the concept (FR/ES, realisa-



### **‘White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian’(FR/ES)**

The Eurocity-initiative is explicitly embedded into the wider context of an increasingly integrated European Union and the wider effects resulting from a subsequent dismantling of EU-internal borders. This overall process and the related re-orientation of territorial functions is considered to create new potentials for a more integrated development, but also new challenges that manifest themselves simultaneously at all government levels and across different public policies. This requires an extended view towards the external environment and a new consideration of the area's own situation as well as a new conceptual approach for actually realising a new type of integrated development.

Against this wider context, the White Paper has taken into consideration a number of territorial impacts that are related to specific Community policies:

- The increasing restriction of public budgets in the domestic context, due to the realisation of the EU's economic and monetary union.
- Need for local/regional/national adaptations, due to the introduction of new EU legislation with regard to telecommunication, transport, water and waste management.
- The general objectives of the Commission's White Paper on transport policy and the priority that should be given to rail transport, but also new challenges resulting from the development of high-speed rail technologies and long-distance rail freight transport.
- The effects of an EU-wide harmonisation and liberalisation of public interest services.
- The need for making more concrete EU-citizenship and new instruments required for better urban governance (in line with the Commission's White Paper on Governance).

With regard to the territorial impact of national, regional and local policies, the role of national high-speed rail policies (AVE, TGV) and especially the negative effects resulting from a situation when different territorial or sector-specific policies are ‘meeting at the border’ are taken into consideration. With regard to the latter, the White Paper observes that numerous dysfunctions, area-internal neutralisation effects and double work do exist. In case of transport policy, all instruments, regulations and administrative directives currently ‘end’ at the common border and thus create a considerable incoherence in the wider cross-border perspective. But also in relation to spatial planning and regional development policies, each side of the border disposes of own instruments and regulations that can not be simply ‘added’ or juxtaposed for achieving a coherent cross-border result. The challenge of creating a new cross-border Eurocity requires therefore that different territorial and sector-policies implemented on either side of the border take better into consideration the wider cross-border territorial dimension and that the institutional representatives co-operate closer towards a common goal.

tion of the Eurocity). In the context of the cross-border concepts that were an update of former planning documents (DE/PL, DE/NL), one can observe that the previously elaborated long-term development goals were still considered valid and only more recent evolutions had been considered.

- At a second level, a limited number of strategic aims are formulated for guiding spatial development policy that should be pursued in the cross-border area to actually achieve the long-term development goal (see Overview Table 6). Within each of the four planning documents

examined, these strategic policy aims normally constitute a ‘meta-level’ that is situated between the overall development goal/vision and the operational part of the concept (i.e. the application strategy).

If one looks at the relationship established by the objective-systems of the four cross-border concepts with wider goals or objectives defined for EU spatial development policy, a relatively astonishing situation can be observed: Only the ‘Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region’ (DE/FR) and the ‘White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian’ (FR/ES) make a direct reference to the ESDP,

**Overview Table 5: Overall development goals/vision statements formulated in the four cross-border spatial development concepts**

<b>FR/ES:</b> <b>Eurocity White Paper</b>	<p>The wider purpose assigned to the White Paper is to promote the emergence of the ‘Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian’ as a truly cross-border European metropolitan area with 600 000 inhabitants that plays an important role in the wider context of the Atlantic Arc and of the EU, mainly through transforming the current juxtaposition of different administrative entities and the loose grouping of medium-sized cities/smaller towns in the cross-border area.</p>
<b>DE/PL:</b> <b>Viadrina 2000 concept</b>	<p>The updated overall development goal has been defined as follows in the concept: ‘Raising the standard of living and increasing the economic capacity through creating a cross-border integrated economic region. Future efforts of the Euroregion in this direction should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lead to an improvement on the living conditions of the population in the long-term and, considering the different ways of life, reach similar levels on both sides of the border,</li> <li>• increase the economic capacity in order to lower wealth disparities within the Euroregion and to enable a balanced development in the cross-border region under the conditions of a globalised competition.’</li> </ul>
<b>DE/NL:</b> <b>Euregio Rhein-Waal concept</b>	<p>The updated overall development vision has been defined as follows in the concept: ‘Sustainable development of a European region without borders - the Rhein-Waal region as an area for living and economic activities that is secure in the future and competitive and characterised by a high quality of locational and living conditions within the inter-metropolitan core area of North-West Europe.</p>
<b>DE/FR:</b> <b>PAMINA region concept</b>	<p>The overall development vision has been defined as follows in the concept: ‘The PAMINA-area is pre-designated to become a European cross-border model area. The cross-border dimension creates its specificity and allocates to the area a particular attractivity: decisions on both sides of the border are jointly supported, policy shapes the common future in a co-ordinated manner, PAMINA occupies a singular position in the wider Upper Rhine area and positions itself in the global competition. Little by little, the jointly defined development perspectives will be integrated into planning efforts realised at different levels of subsequently be implemented. The joint cross-border development objectives will be backed by a ‘cross-border local purpose association’ established alongside the provisions of the Karlsruhe-Agreement and new perspectives for a realisation of these objectives will emerge with a further development of legal instruments of European level.’</p>

whereas the other two concepts do not explicitly consider this wider EU-dimension in relation to their development goals and policy aims (DE/NL, DE/PL).

### **Application strategies and their stakeholder-orientation**

The four cross-border spatial development concepts examined contain well-elaborated application strategies, which are all characterised by a high degree of stakeholder-orientation. The operational part of the respective planning documents adopt either a medium-term perspective with around five years (DE/PL) or a long-term perspective with 10 or more years (FR/ES, DE/NL, DE/FR).

The medium-term application strategy of the ‘Viadrina

2000 concept’ is generally considered a guiding framework for future INTERREG IIIA/PHARE CBC interventions. This relatively narrow approach identifies seven thematic support priorities, which are however not very consistently related to the two strategic policy aims previously defined in the cross-border spatial development concept<sup>122</sup>. For these support priorities, the application strategy also identifies a total of 24 different ‘fields of action’ as well as 40 related ‘suggestions for potential projects’.

The application strategies with a long-term perspective (FR/ES, DE/NL, DE/FR) adopt a comparatively wider approach. Their main purpose is to set out a non-binding orientation framework that aims at promoting general cross-border cooperation in the area, also including support interventions from related INTERREG programmes. In

**Overview Table 6: Strategic policy aims formulated in the four cross-border spatial development concepts**

<b>FR/ES:</b> <b>Eurocity White Paper</b>	<p>The White Paper formulates three ‘basic objectives’ for developing the Eurocity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating an Atlantic platform for intermodal change, communication and information, mainly by transforming the current ‘transit corridor’ into a ‘Eurocorridor for development’.</li> <li>• Structuring the Eurocity as a linear and polycentric metropolitan area organised as a network, mainly by practically managing the territory, the infrastructures and the public service offer in a way that they are well linked and at quality level that corresponds to the standards of other European metropolitan areas.</li> <li>• Protection and proactive use of the area's natural heritage potentials, mainly by applying the principle of environmental excellence in the context of the concept of a ‘green metropolitan area’.</li> </ul>
<b>DE/PL:</b> <b>Viadrina 2000 concept</b>	<p>The concept formulates two ‘main objectives’ for the future development of the Euroregional territory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strengthening of economic potentials and the lowering of unemployment, while preserving and developing nature and landscape.</li> <li>• The active support to the establishment of good neighbourly relations.</li> </ul>
<b>DE/NL:</b> <b>Euregio Rhein-Waal concept</b>	<p>The future development of the Euregio should be centred around the following three ‘strategic objectives’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening of the regional economic structure,</li> <li>• Improvement of the regional economic framework conditions,</li> <li>• Intensifying of the regional organisation and integration.</li> </ul>
<b>DE/FR:</b> <b>PAMINA region concept</b>	<p>The future development of the PAMINA area should focus on the following three ‘basic principles’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable development of the PAMINA-area: Improvement of the general living conditions and the environment; mobilising synergies through networking and joint action.</li> <li>• Co-ordinated action in the PAMINA-area: Realisation of a joint spatial development policy with the aim to preserve/extend existing qualities, to use diversity and to ensure balanced development through solidarity.</li> <li>• The European dimension of the PAMINA-area: REGIO PAMINA as a pilot area for the implementation of the ESDP and as a test-area that illustrates the leading role of regionalised action and thinking („Europe in a nutshell”).</li> </ul>

addition, the overall design of the application strategies is also relatively more complex compared to the one of the ‘Viadrina 2000’ concept.

- At a first level, the three long-term concepts normally foresee a limited number of main interventions that are in a consistent way directly related to the previously defined strategic policy aims. The main interventions of the Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)<sup>123</sup> and the Euregio concept (DE/NL)<sup>124</sup> are horizontally cross-cutting the different policy aims, whereas those of the PAMINA concept (DE/FR)<sup>125</sup> are further differentiated according to a territorial/non-territorial dimension and focussed on specific policy aims.
- At a second level, each of these main interventions is then made further operational by the definition of a lar-

ger number of theme- or area-specific measures<sup>126</sup> and of related project proposals that are more or less well-elaborated.<sup>127</sup> A particularly interesting ‘double filtering approach’ has been adopted by the PAMINA concept for identifying and selecting potential measures and pilot projects (see text box below).

### The overall geographical focus adopted

Across the four different cross-border spatial development concepts examined, one can observe some commonalities and differences among the approaches adopted.

All concepts obviously focus their territorial assessments, their objective-system and their application strategies on the targeted cross-border areas. Throughout these main

### **‘Spatial planning scheme for the PAMINA-region’ (DE/FR)**

The potential measures and pilot projects listed in the in the ‘Spatial planning scheme for the PAMINA-region’ have been gathered and subsequently selected through a ‘double filtering process’. During an initial phase, proposals have been gathered that where derived - on the one hand - from the requirements for action (based upon the SWOT-analysis realised for PAMINA) and - on the other - from already existing objectives defined for the entire PAMINA-area or for specific sub-areas as well as from actor-specific preferences.

From this overall sample of suggestions, a limited number of measures and project proposals have been filtered out - in a first step - through applying a number of specific ‘eliminating criteria’. Proposals were eliminated if projects have already been realised in this context or are currently implemented, if an implementation has already been tried and subsequently failed or if proposals were not politically validated or where a double-mentioned. Based upon this first selection, the remaining proposals were allocated to the 6 strategic priorities according to their respective implementation contribution.

In the second step, a number of pilot projects were selected among the remaining proposals that are particularly important for the PAMINA-area and show a specific relevance/need for related cross-border cooperation efforts. This selection of pilot projects has been realised by applying the following eight ‘filtering criteria’ (F1-F8):

#### a) Filtering criteria related to the character of the project

- F1. Demonstration- and lead function of the project and transferability of the approach.
- F2. The project should not yet exist in this way in the respective area.
- F3. The project should correspond to existing selection criteria for support (mainly in relation to INTERREG IIIA), in order to ease its implementation.
- F4. The problem to be solved by the project should be important.

#### b) Filtering criteria related to the project content

- F5. The cross-border interest for the project and the cross-border relevance of the project should exist.
- F6. The theme of the project should have the ability to be well communicated to the wider public (e.g. transport-related projects) and the project should produce a concrete benefit for the wider public.
- F7. The project should have a link to other projects/pilot projects in order to generate synergy effects.

#### c) Filtering criteria related to the project results

- F8. The project should cover the various dimensions of the concept of sustainability.

The 14 finally selected pilot projects were then directly included in a well-elaborated manner into the cross-border spatial development concept.

elements of each concept, also a differentiation at the level of sub-areas is elaborated (where necessary) in order to better take into consideration the specific particularities of the cross-border territory.

The main difference among the four concepts is the extent to which the wider spatial context has been taken into consideration: Only the ‘White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian’ (FR/ES) and the ‘Cross-border develop-

ment and action concept 2000-2010 of the Euregio Rhein-Waal’ (DE/NL) contain specific sections/chapters that aim at ‘localising’ the cross-border area in the transnational and/or European-wide macro-space.

## ‘Mental ownership’ and practical application results

One can realistically assume that key stakeholders have subsequently developed **a high level of ‘mental ownership’** in relation to these cross-border spatial planning concepts and their application strategies.

Operational provisions in all cross-border spatial development concepts (i.e. the measures and project-proposals) were generally elaborated on ground of the results of specific ‘bottom-up consultation processes’. These consultations were organised during the preparation phase of the respective planning documents and involved either a wide range of public and private actors (DE/PL, DE/FR, DE/NL) or mostly actors from various public and semi-public organisms (FR/ES) located in the cross-border area.

Due to this participatory approach, most of the finalised application strategies were able to effectively call upon the particular competences of a wide range of public- and private-sector key stakeholders in order to contribute realising specific goals and policy aims of the spatial development concept (DE/NL, DE/FR, DE/PL). Only the ‘Eurocity White Paper’ application strategy (FR/ES) seems implicitly to be stronger oriented towards different public policy actors, which can be derived from the general nature of the lines of intervention and measures mentioned.

The above-made remarks on the ‘mental ownership relation’ are also partly supported by the level of **subsequent take-up of operational provisions through stakeholders located in the respective cross-border areas**. For those cases where appropriate information has been made available<sup>128</sup>, one can generally observe that the application strategies allowed initiating and realising a sometimes considerable number of follow-up activities:

- Since the publication of the **‘White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian’ (FR/ES)** in June 2000, reflections were launched to progressively integrate its proposals for action into the respective territorial or sector-specific policy planning applied on either side of the border. These activities were intended to help converting this virtual reference framework into a truly joint master plan for the development of the Eurocity. In addition, various follow-up activities have

been carried out in order to progress towards actually realising the cross-border metropolitan area. These activities focus on three strategic themes (i.e. transport, industrial/urban re-conversion and environment) and can be allocated to two wider categories: Firstly, various initiatives covering the entire area of the future Eurocity were realised<sup>129</sup> that aim at establishing cross-cutting guidelines for supporting a better structuring of the cross-border territory. Secondly, follow-up actions in the context of sector-specific policies were accomplished.<sup>130</sup> They aim at illustrating the concept of a ‘functional urban zone’, which the initiative wishes to develop for applying the ESDP and for putting into place a multi-sectoral policy in the context of a process of co-ordinated decision-making between all territorial levels of government involved.

- In case of the **‘Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region’ (DE/FR)**, the newly established public-law based cross-border local purpose association REGIO-PAMINA has decided in 2002 to take over the results and recommendations of the concept in its future working programme. It was also decided to derive from it a comprehensive orientation framework for the future development of the PAMINA area, the ‘Guideline Objectives for the PAMINA-area’.<sup>131</sup> This orientation framework has an informal character for cities and municipalities in the area and therefore only creates a kind of ‘self-binding effect’ for the public law based cross-border body, its members and its partners. A related document was presented in early 2005 and enumerates the six ‘Guideline Objectives’, together with a number of related potential measures that aim at their implementation.

### 3.4 Summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice

By referring back to the different aspects mentioned in the preliminary remarks of this chapter (see 3.1.), a brief summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice in the field of cooperative territorial development planning is now elaborated in this final section (see Overview Table 7).

## Main functions to be fulfilled by strategic spatial planning documents

All transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents examined generally address a wide range of themes. This helps to improve significantly the understanding of the respective cooperation area's overall spatial situation and to highlighting common issues for spatial development planning and policy. Only in the context of various cross-border spatial development concepts, substantial weaknesses do exist with respect to a consideration of the territorial impacts of EU policies.

The examined transnational spatial development visions and cross-border development concepts all contain well-elaborated 'spatial policy programmes' with meaningful normative provisions serving the long term good. The structural features of these policy programmes are however different. Some of them only define a series of development goals and related policy aims, while others elaborate in addition an overall development vision statement that briefly highlights the desired future situation to be reached in the long-term (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region, Euregio Rhein-Waal concept, PAMINA region concept).

An 'application framework' for actually translating spatial development goals/policy aims into concrete action can be found in all of the transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents examined. Among them, one can however observe marked differences in their stakeholder-orientation and thus with respect to their effective capability of directing/inspiring spatial planning or policy processes and of assisting the formulation of programmes and projects. Well-differentiated application strategies with a large number of policy recommendations and suggestions for concrete activities or projects can be found in all cross-border development concepts, but also in some of the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions (CADSES, Atlantic Area, North Sea Region).

## Overall geographical focus adopted by strategic spatial planning documents

In general, the transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts examined allow key actors to well position themselves within the respective cooperation area. All spatial planning docu-

ments contain approaches that differentiate between specific sub-zones in the cooperation area showing particular territorial characteristics or problems.

Substantial weaknesses can however be observed across these documents when it comes to improve the capacity for conceptualising one's thinking about the location of the cooperation area in the wider spatial context of Europe:

- The predominantly 'inward-looking' strategic planning documents have only in some cases made punctual efforts to localise their area in the wider European context (Euregio Rhein-Waal concept; Eurocity White Paper).
- Apart from some attempts that look at specific issues with a view going beyond the agreed territorial limits of the respective cooperation area, a more systematic approach in this direction was only developed in one case (Prospective Study of for the Alpine Space).

## 'Mental ownership' and application results achieved

The previous assessment results allow formulating the realistic assumption that key stakeholders have developed a strong relation of mental ownership mostly with respect to cross-border spatial development concepts, but also with respect to some transnational spatial visions (North Sea Region, Atlantic Area). In all these cases, the strategic spatial planning documents and their application strategies were elaborated on ground of participatory approaches that involved targeted key stakeholders in the respective cooperation areas.

This assumption on the mental ownership relation is also supported by the high level of take-up of operational provisions, which was realised by the targeted key stakeholders located in most of the cooperation areas (North Sea Region, Eurocity White Paper; PAMINA concept). A certain exception is the transnational spatial visioning process in the Baltic Sea Region, where substantial efforts have successfully been undertaken to strengthen the application strategy's stakeholder-orientation and to improve the participatory dimension in the elaboration process.

**Overview Table 7: Issue-specific examples of good practice among the different types of cooperation**

Type of cooperation. Issue	Transnational cooperation	Cross-border cooperation
<b>Main themes for which issues/trends are discussed</b>	Baltic Sea Region CADSES Atlantic Area	Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL)
<b>Territorial impact of different EU and national policies</b>	Baltic Sea Region CADSES Atlantic Area	Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)
<b>Goals/policy aims promoted by strategic planning documents</b>	Baltic Sea Region North Sea Region	Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL) PAMINA region (DE/FR)
<b>Stakeholder-orientation of application strategies</b>	CADSES Atlantic Area North Sea Region	PAMINA region (DE/FR) Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL) Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)
<b>Overall geographical focus adopted</b>	Prospective Study of the Alpine Space	Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL) Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)
<b>Mental ownership</b>	North Sea Region Atlantic Area *)	Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES) PAMINA region (DE/FR)
<b>Application results achieved</b>	Baltic Sea Region North Sea Region	Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES) PAMINA region (DE/FR)

\*) For this more recent case, the judgement is mainly a 'realistic expectation'.

## 4 The methodological and procedural approaches employed in the context of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning

### 4.1 Preliminary remarks

Various methodological approaches and techniques are nowadays available that can potentially be used by key actors involved in the preparation and elaboration of transnational spatial development visions or cross-border spatial development concepts. There are also different procedural options that can be applied for 'organising' the preparation/elaboration of strategic planning documents and for structuring the cooperative spatial planning process in a medium or long-term perspective.

In order to support the basic functions transnational spatial development visions or cross-border spatial development concepts are to fulfil (see 4.1), at least the following **methodological approaches and techniques** should be used during the preparation and elaboration process:

- The elaboration of a spatial development planning document generally requires - as a starting point - a territorial analysis of the present situation and of trends prevailing in the area concerned, which is normally realised on ground of quantitative and qualitative approaches. This may comprise a global analysis and/or several theme-specific analyses for the entire cooperation area (i.e. on population, economy, transport, environment etc.), but also analyses for smaller sub-areas in the cooperation area. **Quantitative approaches** applied in the context of cooperative strategic territorial development generally tend to face problems of data availability and comparability. Transnational spatial visioning processes are normally more exposed to such constraints, because the number of countries and regions involved is quite high. Although such problems do exist in the context of cross-border cooperation<sup>132</sup>, the relatively smaller number of territorial entities involved (two and, in some cases, three) allows more easily to realise a wider range of thematic in-depth analyses that can also quite well take into consideration the specificities of smaller sub-areas in the cross-border area. **Qualitative analyses** are generally used to describe a number of constraints and opportunities that can not be properly quantified, but which are important for the elaboration

of the spatial development strategy. Also the strategies of transnational spatial visions and cross-border spatial development concepts are normally expressed in qualitative terms, as they generally do not contain quantified objectives.

- The elaboration of a spatial development planning documents also requires information about the future territorial development in the cooperation area. This information can normally be generated by using **linear and more complex/cyclic approaches** such as projections and forecasts (modelling) or prospective investigations (scenarios, speculative research).
- Another important aspect belonging to the methodological dimension is the **visualisation approach** that is adopted by these strategic planning documents. A use of cartography and map-images may help rising the awareness and understanding of complex spatial situations or development trends, but it can also support the communication of political key messages by illustrating the desired future spatial structure.

The actual mix of methodological approaches/techniques used during the preparation and elaboration phase is normally quite well reflected by the finalised spatial development planning document. This mix becomes most obvious in the section presenting a summary territorial assessment of the area concerned, but also in the parts highlighting 'key issues' relevant for spatial development policy and presenting the desired overall territorial development perspective.

Beyond these methodological issues, also the **procedural approaches applied during the cooperative planning process in a transnational or cross-border context are of major importance.**

**During the preparation and elaboration phase** of a transnational or cross-border spatial planning document, one key issue needs to be carefully considered: It is the extent to which the actual procedural approach adopted provides for a direct participation of key stakeholders located in the respective cooperation area. Two possible options might help to illustrate this aspect.

- The first option is an '**expert-centred top-down**



**approach**: Preparatory work and the actual drawing-up of a transnational spatial vision/cross-border development concept is realised by a small group of administrative planning professionals. During the preparation and elaboration process, they might also be supported by some other administrative key actors and by external experts. An involvement of key stakeholders located in the cooperation area is not envisaged or only realised on ground of an ‘ex-post consultation’ after the finalisation of the planning document.

- The second option is a **‘participatory bottom-up approach**: The aforementioned key actors still realise essential parts of the work, but a wider range of public, private or semi-public key stakeholders located in the area is also involved in the elaboration process before the document is finally published (i.e. through questionnaire surveys, consultation procedures, workshops, etc.). This involvement of key stakeholders normally aims - in a narrow sense - at gathering additional specialist contributions (not yet available to planning experts) or at validating already elaborated suggestions and - in a wider sense - at creating an extended ‘functional legitimacy’ for the future spatial planning document.

But also **after the final publication of a strategic spatial planning document**, procedural aspects continue to play an important role in a medium-and long-term perspective. A first related issue to be considered is **whether cooperative spatial planning is conceived as an ‘on-going process’**. Here, procedural provisions can help structuring the realisation of follow-up activities that aim at further fine-tuning and/or adapting the already elaborated spatial planning document. A second important issue to be examined is whether specific proceedings are envisaged that allow **submitting the finalised planning document to a wider political discussion and validation**. The result of such a political discussion and validation can be an important element of support, which may be used later by spatial planners or practitioners in the countries involved to argue for improvements in policy practice. A final important aspect in this context is whether specific procedures are foreseen that **provide the entire cooperative planning process with some kind of stable political anchorage in a medium- and even long-term perspective**. In the respective cooperation areas concerned,

this can be realised by organising regular gatherings between high-ranking administrative officials from various levels (local/regional/national) or even meetings between national/regional ministers responsible for spatial planning and regional development.

#### 4.2 Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC/IIIB programme areas

If one looks across the various transnational spatial visioning processes examined, the impression prevails that there are quite strong differences with respect to the methodological approaches/techniques and procedural approaches used. This heterogeneity somehow underlines the specificity of each process and the relatively weak links/exchanges that have developed among them over time.

#### Qualitative and quantitative approaches used

Qualitative and quantitative approaches were normally used for generating a better understanding of the particular spatial situation in each area (i.e. current problems, future trends, development prospects) and of wider international inter-dependencies. With respect to the actual mix of approaches adopted during the preparation phase of the various transnational spatial visions, it is clear that the emphasis has been on the side of qualitative approaches.

A number of initial transnational spatial visioning processes did not rely at all on extensive quantitative analyses (e.g. NorVision, North-West Europe). This observation can also be made for the newly emerging spatial vision processes in the MEDOCC area (preparatory studies for a spatial vision) and the Alpine Space (Prospective Study).

Only the transnational spatial visioning processes in the Atlantic Area, the Baltic Sea Area and in CADSES have combined qualitative and quantitative approaches. Quantitative analysis was mainly realised in the preparatory background reports and considered a quite impressive amount of data, for which a summary overview can be found in Annex V. Based upon the results of these quantitative assessments, a qualitative approach has generally been used for elaborating goals/objectives and proposals/recommendations for action in the respective vision documents.

- In case of the **Atlantic Area**, especially Volume 1 of the 'Final Report' has adopted a dominantly quantitative approach in the strategic evaluation (general description) of the Atlantic Area. This assessment was carried out in four steps, but only the first three steps were focussing on the quantitative diagnosis properly speaking. This quantitative approach has made use of a large range of social, economic, accessibility and dynamics indicators. The final step was mainly of a qualitative nature and identified common issues that are faced by all of the Atlantic regions with regard to the proximity of the sea.
- In the context of the **Baltic Sea Area** and the initial VASAB 2010 document of 1994 ('Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea'), mainly a descriptive and qualitative approach has been adopted for describing and analysing the current situation in the BSR. Only very few quantitative indicators had been directly used in the VASAB 2010 document. For the VASAB 2010+ document, adopted in 2001 at the Ministerial Conference in Wismar, the 'background report' has provided an extensive qualitative presentation of spatial trends and challenges in the BSR that was supported by a wide range of quantitative data. In most cases, the quantitative data show either a static situation for a given year or establish a dynamic past-present development path in a medium-term perspective. The overall approach adopted by the recently started upgrading process of the BSR spatial vision (2004/2005) can be best characterised as a 'fairly balanced consideration of immediate problems and long-term oriented developments'. This overall approach focuses on essential issues for territorial development and is mostly of a qualitative nature, using 'brainstorming' for exploiting knowledge and experience of the CSD-BSR members.
- The **CADSES** spatial visioning process was mainly realised by the INTERREG IIC project Vision Planet, but partly also by the ESTIA-Space project. In both documents, different qualitative and quantitative approaches were used for analysing the respective spatial situation and future development trends. The Vision Planet 'Background Report' has to a larger extent than the document 'Guidelines and Policy Proposals' used a quite extensive quantitative approach for explaining territorial features at the level of CADSES, but also at the

national and regional levels. Nevertheless, the description deliberately avoided country-by-country descriptions in order to preserve a unified and synthetic character of the document (i.e. national specifics are rather shown in tables and maps). The document 'Spatial Planning Priorities for South-East Europe' of the ESTIA-Space project has assessed spatial development trends and prospects on ground of a quite extensive quantitative approach for this particular sub-area of CADSES.

Many quantitative approaches have faced constraints and limitations of data availability and comparability in a transnational context. This is true for the Baltic Sea Region, where some quantitative data were not complete, comparable or compatible at the time of the initial VASAB 2010 document of 1994 (especially in the case of Russia). For characterising the main spatial structures and development trends in CADSES, the Vision PlaNet project had to use quantitative information from different international sources in order to ensure comparability. Only in the absence of international statistics, national statistical yearbooks had been used in which identical and standardised definitions and contents were however not always ensured. Also in the context of the ESTIA Space project (CADSES)<sup>133</sup>, the collection of sufficient, comparable and homogeneous data (e.g. demographic, economic, labour market data) was very difficult and in some cases even impossible.

### **Linear and more complex/cyclic approaches applied**

In order to take a look into the future, linear and more complex/cyclic approaches may be used to 'forecast' territorial development. In practice, however, an extensive direct use of sophisticated or complex approaches can not be observed throughout the various transnational spatial visioning processes. This observation particularly applies to the early spatial visioning processes in the North Sea Region and North-West Europe (under INTERREG IIC), but also to the newly emerging one under the INTERREG IIIB programme MEDOCC.

**Only for very specific issues**, three of the early transnational spatial visioning processes have **directly made use of more complex approaches**:

- In the **Baltic Sea Region**, the different steps of the VASAB process between 1994 and 2004 have not used specific model-based approaches for analysing spatial patterns in the and for ‘forecasting’ territorial development. Only in the context of the ‘VASAB 2010+’ document of 2001, a prospective long-term view for some transport-related aspects has been established.<sup>134</sup> In the currently ongoing upgrading process, mainly an ‘intuitive trend exploration’ with an extrapolation/linear projection is used to forecast territorial development of the BSR. The basic assumption is that the current trend will continue if no regulatory policy measures are adopted. The main purpose of this intuitive trend exploration and the extrapolation/linear projection approach is to raise awareness and to highlight potential threats during the process of shaping the future territorial development of the BSR.
- In the **Atlantic Area** spatial visioning process, an interesting but mostly static approach was used by the ASDP-study project. It helped designing and calculating a ‘relative development index’ (RDI) for NUTS III level regions in the Atlantic area. The purpose of the RDI was to deliver quantitative data that allow classifying the different regions with regard to their economic performance. Such a classification appears to be useful for deepening the knowledge on the regional environment of urban systems as well as their current and future positioning in the wider Atlantic Area (see text box below).
- In the context of **CADSES**, the spatial vision document elaborated by the Vision PlaNet project contains three descriptive and complex scenarios with a future-oriented perspective that aim at identifying territorial impacts

#### ‘Atlantic Area, calculation of a ‘relative development index’ for NUTS III regions

In order to constitute the basis of the relative development index RDI, a number of socio-economic variables that are common to all the regions concerned have been selected, integrated and aggregated in a first step (variables: population density, third sector specialisation, primary sector specialisation, number of company headquarters per capita, average labour productivity, unemployment rate, gross national product per capita, annual average growth rate of gross national product).

In a second step, these variables have been ‘normalised’ through an arithmetical transformation according to the following formula (see below).

$$\frac{X - X_o}{X_m - X_o} \quad \text{if } X \text{ is of a growing type}$$

$$\frac{X_m - X}{X_m - X_o} \quad \text{if } X \text{ is of a decreasing type}$$

With:

X: observed variable  
X<sub>o</sub>: minimum value observed by the variable considered  
X<sub>m</sub>: maximum value of the variable

In a third step, the aggregation was ‘territorialised’ in order to highlight asymmetrical development in the Atlantic Area. According to the following formula, the level of relative development for different NUTS 3 regions can be obtained (see below).

$$IDR(U_i / R) = \frac{1}{p} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p (x_{ij})^2}$$

With:

i: index of the spatial unit (i = 1 to n)  
j: index of the development dimension (j = 1 to p)  
U<sub>i</sub>: spatial unit examined  
R: reference region  
X<sub>ij</sub>: value of the indicator j taken in the spatial unit i  
R<sub>j</sub>: value of the indicator j taken in the reference region

related to the forthcoming Eastern-enlargement of the EU. The vision document has also quantified a demographic prognosis for CADSES over the time period 1997-2025. In the context of a wider assessment of the sectoral employment structure, the ESTIA Space project has analysed both the absolute and the relative specialization of regions in Bulgaria, Romania and Greece on ground of a more sophisticated quantitative approach (based on available data on employment in the three sectors of economic activities). The INTER-

REG IIIB follow-up projects 'PlaNet CenSE' and 'ESTIA-SPOSE', which do not carry out spatial visioning activities properly speaking, have however clear potentials for generating methodological improvements. They might allow a future application of more complex or cyclic approaches in the assessment and forecasting of spatial trends/developments (see text box below).

More recently, however, **some spatial visioning**

### **CADSES, INTERREG IIIC projects 'PlaNet CenSE' and 'ESTIA-SPOSE'**

The **INTERREG IIIC 'PlaNet CenSE'** aims - on the one hand - at building bridges to other European activities focussing on spatial political consultancy (e.g. the ESPON 2006 Programme) and thus at developing a common sense on space-related processes and strategies. On the other hand, space-related themes (e.g. Trans-European Transport Networks, Global Economic Integration Zones of an enlarged EU) will be evaluated and – for the purpose of strategic spatial development – specific project-related actions will be brought together. A vital basis for PlaNet CenSE will be the Vision Planet document 'Guidelines and Policy Proposals', which sets out a framework for spatial planning on the ideas of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). Methodological improvements can mostly be expected to emerge from the following two project modules (of three in total):

- The module 'European Spatial Planning Gateway' (ESP GATEWAY) is an expert dialogue, research information and knowledge exchange about the application and further development of the ESDP. On the one hand, it aims at transferring information and knowledge from the EU-level to the national levels, i.e. the application of ESPON-approaches and ESDP-concepts by countries in the PlaNet CenSe project. On the other hand, a converse flow of information is organised in order to influence the EU-level by the national levels, i.e. in evaluating and further developing ESPON and the ESDP by the new EU-Member States, Candidate Countries and Neighbouring Countries. The main aim of is to translate the common learning process/the common understanding realised under this module into a strategic spatial development document with objectives for future development of the urban system and transport infrastructure in central and south-east Europe. This strategic document should provide both a framework for national spatial development perspectives and place the urban system/transport network of CenSE in a wider European perspective (? revising the ESDP).
- The module 'Forum for Territorial Impact Analysis' (TIA FORUM) will develop the planning instrument TIA and provide an opportunity for testing its application at the transnational and cross-sectoral level. This will be achieved in the context of two pilot projects, i.e. 'Metropolitan Networks in central and South-East Europe' and 'North-South Transnational Transport Corridors'. A 'platform' has been established to co-ordinate different transport projects and initiatives in CenSE with similar aims and overlapping geographical scope to the proposed North-South corridors in order to stimulate dialogue among different stakeholders, to utilise synergy effects and to reduce redundancies.

The overall goal of the **INTERREG IIIB project ESTIA-SPOSE** is to reinforce the capability of south-east European countries for collaborating in spatial planning and development issues at national level and to elaborate and analyse spatial data in a comparative way. Methodological improvements can be expected to emerge from the three main components that will be realised:

- The Territorial Indicators System (TIS) is the conceptual and methodological component of ESTIA-SPOSE. The construction of an integrated territorial indicators system (TIS) is the most decisive factor for the establishment of a spatial planning observatory in south-east Europe. The base for the construction of TIS is the overall framework and the incoming results of the European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON). The value added of TIS lies on the adaptation of the system of indicators to the south-east European situation and the construction of a comprehensive data-base. In particular the TIS will focus upon the basic socio-economic and environmental conditions of the ESTIA-SPOSE space, the southeast part of CADSES, consisting of EU Member States, accession countries and other non-EU member states.
- The Pilot Applications of Indicators (PAI) in selected sectors and areas is the empirical component of ESTIA-SPOSE. The applicability of the TIS will be tested in real terms. The empirical field is defined at NUTS II and NUTS III level areas including major urban areas and development corridors. The specific areas of pilot applications will be selected by the national teams and the joint project panel in ways intended to stabilise the method of calculation and to locate the sources for all kinds of indicators in each country within the broader ESTIA-SPOSE space.
- The Spatial Planning Observatory Platform (SPOP) intends to establish a more permanent network of agencies of spatial planning and development that will support the operation and discuss all conceptual, methodological and practical aspects of SPOSE based on TIS and PAI in ESTIA-SPOSE space. The SPOP meetings will play also the role of the disseminator and political promoter of the ESTIA-SPOSE in order to increase its use in policy decision-making and policy impact assessment.

**processes have indirectly used more sophisticated approaches**, mostly by making reference to information that was generated ‘externally’ on ground of an application of linear or cyclic approaches. A first example is the vision updating and upgrading process in North-West Europe, where reference was made to the TEN-STAC transport scenarios<sup>135</sup> in the thematic study on parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge. Other examples are the preparatory studies for the emerging MEDOCC spatial visioning process that have referred back to various ESPON studies.

Also the **elaboration of alternative scenarios** is still rather exceptional in the preparation and elaboration of transnational spatial development visions. This is mainly due to the yet still limited availability of harmonised spatial data, which is required to carry out such an exercise. An interesting attempt that is worth being mentioned has been developed in the context of the newly emerging spatial visioning process under the **INTERREG IIB Alpine Space Programme** (i.e. ‘Prospective Study for the Alpine Space’). Six prospective vision scenarios have been identified for the Alpine Space. Each of them comprises strategic issues (substantial key issues and procedural key issues) as well as the definition of key actors, whose

activities are necessary for the realisation of the scenario. The various vision scenarios are not exclusive from each other; they co-exist among the stakeholders of transnational cooperation. These vision scenarios must be thought of as a basis for reconciling different points of view and building a consensus for action (see Overview Table 8 next page).

### Visualisation approaches adopted

With respect to visualisation and the use of mapping during the various transnational visioning processes, a clear distinction has to be made between two different aspects:

- The cartographic presentation of the actual spatial context and/or of future trends (i.e. through analytical maps).
- The map-based representation of the desired territorial development perspective (future situation) and of the related goals/policy aims.

Most transnational spatial visioning processes have extensively elaborated **analytical maps** in order to illustrate the territorial dimension of various socioeconomic and environ-

**Overview Table 8: Vision scenarios of the ‘Prospective Study for the Alpine Space’ and their main characteristics**

Vision Scenario	Main characteristics
<b>Alpine core and major urban areas (MEGAs)'</b>	Metropolisation, attractiveness, global sustainability, protection, city/mountain solidarity, international tourism
<b>'Regional diversity: puzzle and competition'</b>	Territorial systems, multi-level governance, clusters, cultural partnerships, regional heritage, local development
<b>North-south mediation'</b>	Transit routes, governmental cooperation, infrastructures, impacts, ports and airports, technological risks
<b>Network, corridors, connecting elements'</b>	Polycentrism, distribution, knowledge networks, mobility management
<b>Openness and Enlargement'</b>	Large basins, openness, enlargement, 'little Europes', solidarity, Alpine experience
<b>Positioning: us and the others'</b>	Key words: globalisation, international tourism, Alpine amenities, global competition, image, joint promotion

mental aspects and/or of related future trends (Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North Sea Region).

- In the context of the **Atlantic Area visioning process**, volume 1 of the 'Final Report' contains in total 55 maps that illustrate very different issues. A large majority of these maps provide a static geographical illustration of a specific socio-economic indicator (e.g. employment in the primary sector in 2000) or a particular feature (e.g. number of maritime links or number of protected zones), whereas others visualise past socio-economic development trends (e.g. average variation of per capita GDP during 1991 and 2001). Some of the maps shown in this volume were directly drawn from ESPON projects. The 'Synthesis Document' on the Atlantic Spatial Development Perspectives takes up 12 of these maps to illustrate the current development status.<sup>136</sup>
- In the initial 'VASAB 2010' document of 1994 covering the **Baltic Sea Region**, maps are an important element that are used for illustrating each main theme addressed. Altogether 21 theme-specific maps were elaborated and one comprehensive map covering all themes. Also in the analytical 'background report' elaborated for the 'VASAB 2010+' document of 2001, a total of 32 maps were elaborated to illustrate a wide range of different aspects in the Baltic Sea Region.
- The spatial vision documents produced by the 'Vision Planet' covering **CADSES** as a whole have also extensively used maps (i.e. the 'Background Report' and the

'Guidelines and Policy Proposals') . Most of the maps illustrate the static spatial situation of specific aspects (e.g. transport infrastructures, natural & cultural heritage potentials), but in one case also the dynamic evolution of long-term development trends (population density). Also the spatial visioning document produced by the ESTIA-Space project entitled 'Spatial Planning Priorities for South-East Europe' has made use of maps (19 in total), mainly for illustrating static spatial situations of several aspects.

- In the context of the **North Sea Region**, the NorVision document contains a series of static maps reflecting the existing situation in a number of fields (energy production, regular air links, sea transport flows between ports, intermodal terminals, nature potential areas, population density, existing urban settlements). NorVision does however not contain a mapping of trends.

**A map-based representation of the desired territorial development perspective (and of related goals/policy aims)** was only elaborated in two of the already existing transnational spatial vision documents (North-West Europe, Atlantic Area), but also in the context of one newly emerging spatial visioning process (Alpine Space). Among the early spatial vision documents elaborated up to the year 2000, only the INTERREG IIC spatial vision for **North West Europe** contains a map that highlights the global cities and gateways, the strategic polycentric areas, the strategic centres, the counterweight global gateways and economic centres, the eurocorridors/transport axes to be

### North Sea Region and Baltic Sea Region, reasons explaining a ‘non-mapping’ of the spatial development perspective

In the **North Sea Region**, it was considered that NorVision is a long-term framework intended to remain valid for coming decades. Maps that allocate specific roles or status to towns and cities could potentially derail political debates as they have the tendency to attract attention more than verbal images.

During the current upgrading process of the 1994 vision-document for **the Baltic Sea Area** (started by VASAB in 2004/2005), it is not envisaged to make use of maps for explicitly visualising the territorial development principles of the future spatial vision. This is mainly due to the fact that negative experiences in this respect have been made in the past. The VASAB process had problems with a ‘politically acceptable’ visualisation of some aims and goals while preparing the ‘Spatial Development Action Programme’ of 2001. Due to the fact that VASAB is based on consensus, maps must be acceptable by all countries. There had however been some attempts in using ‘sketches’, but also this was not acceptable.

strengthened, the communication bottlenecks and the external connections to be enhanced (see Annex VI). In the ‘Synthesis Document’ of the **Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective**, a map illustrates the main structuring axes to be developed in order to achieve the desired future situation of polycentricity in the Atlantic Area (see Annex VII). But also the **‘Prospective Study’ for the Alpine Space** contains a limited number of simplified maps, which illustrate the vision scenarios produced.

In the other cases, ‘non-mapping’ has mostly been a deliberate choice and the main reasons behind this were of a political nature. The examples of the Baltic Sea Region and the North Sea Region clearly suggest that a map-based representation of the desired future development perspective might be politically damaging.<sup>138</sup> Although in both cases transnational vision documents have clearly a non-binding status, it was decided not to accompany the textual formulation of spatial development perspectives and objectives by such ‘voluntary maps’ that tend to generate stronger local and regional impacts (see text box above).

### Procedural approaches applied during the cooperative planning process

The procedural approaches adopted during **the preparation and elaboration of existing transnational spatial development visions** are quite heterogeneous and have strongly conditioned the extent to which a participatory dimension did actually exist throughout the entire cooperative planning processes.

In case of several transnational spatial visioning processes, the preparation and elaboration phase of the initial vision documents has clearly to be characterised as an **‘expert centred top-down approach’** (Baltic Sea Region, CAD-SES, North-West Europe). The vision documents were generally drafted by a relatively small group of experts, belonging or not to the respective spatial planning administrations of the countries concerned. Only the finalised vision documents were submitted for consultation to a wider range of bodies and organisations that were previously not involved in the preparation/elaboration activities. For the still continuing spatial visioning processes, however, it can be observed that the ex-ante participation of key stakeholders is quite significantly increased in recent times (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe).

- In the **Baltic Sea Region**, the VASAB-process was launched on ground of a high-ranking intergovernmental decision back in 1992. The initial VASAB 2010 report of 1994 was the result of common work among a ‘group of focal points’, representing the ministries responsible for spatial planning of the participating countries/regions in the Baltic Sea Region. On the initial document a very limited ex-post consultation has taken place, as only 3 Pan-Baltic organisations and the EU Commission were contacted to comment on the document. Subsequently, the final document had also been disseminated to/discussed with other transnational initiatives, national and regional bodies, mainly to promote joint action. Due to the limited ‘openness’ of the entire approach, many regional (and local) actors in the Baltic

Sea Area have quickly reclaimed that the distance between VASAB-process and the local-regional levels needs to be reduced and that the role of VASAB should be further clarified. During the first substantial updating of the initial vision document that led to the publication of the VASAB 2010+ document in 2001, an ‘external concertation approach’ was adopted. The main actors directly involved in the elaboration of the VASAB 2010+ document were again the 10 national Ministries responsible for Spatial Planning and Development and the 3 regional governments from Russia and Germany. This time, however, a wider range of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at local, regional, national and transnational levels were contacted before the finalisation of the document, mainly for gathering additional inputs.<sup>139</sup> More recently, the VASAB Ministerial Conference at Gdansk (2005) has decided to adopt a very open and participatory approach for preparing and elaborating the new long-term spatial perspective for the Baltic Sea Region. A larger number of key stakeholders located in the BSR will be involved in this upgrading process. Beyond the national governments from 11 countries, probably one or two regional government representatives per country (representing the other regions in the country) will be directly involved in the process. In addition, also around 10 Pan-Baltic organisations are willing to directly participate in the process. Some 100 other regional and local stakeholders will be indirectly involved through a specific ‘concertation process’.

- In **CADSES**, the INTERREG IIC project ‘Vision Planet’ has started from the working level and was strongly oriented towards communication and process. However, it has actually adopted a top-down approach during the preparation and elaboration phase that mostly involved high-level planning experts. This can be illustrated by the composition of the different project working structures, which have played an essential role in the entire vision elaboration process. An international ‘Working Team’ from thirteen countries, consisting of spatial planning experts from national administrations or experts nominated by them, elaborated strategies and formulated the common vision document. The conceptual work was supported by a structured dialogue on spatial planning, which took place within the ‘Project Panel’. This Panel was composed of representatives

from national ministries or government agencies responsible for spatial planning. The Panel also gave the necessary orientation for communication and organised thematic seminars/workshops on topics related to the strategy document.<sup>140</sup>

- The initial elaboration process of the spatial vision for **North-West Europe** under INTERREG IIC was strongly expert-centred. National or regional authorities were only consulted to a limited extent during this phase (in the context of workshops or seminars). The main consultation process took place after the spatial vision has been published as a ‘Discussion Document’ (September 2000). The Spatial Vision Group agreed this consultation should start in each Member State from January 2001 in order to gather comments on the vision document.<sup>141</sup> Subsequently, a ‘Consultation Report’ was published in June 2001 that describes and summarises the responses in the country reports and also includes examples of comments from individual respondents. Surprisingly, no attempt was made from the part of the Spatial Vision Group to provide an answer to the comments. Instead, it was decided that this was something to be taken up during subsequent spatial visioning activities under a follow-up programme. The recent updating and upgrading process launched under the INTERREG IIIB programme has however made considerable efforts to improve the participatory dimension. During the elaboration of the three thematic background studies, a series of country-specific workshops covering all of the strategic themes addressed was organised. They involved not only a wide range of local, regional or national administrations, but also actors representing sector-specific organisations or the civil society.<sup>142</sup>

There are a few transnational spatial visioning processes that were conceived from the outset as ‘**participatory bottom-up approaches**’ (North Sea Region, Atlantic Area). They have realised quite extensive stakeholder consultations before the finalisation of their initial vision documents (NorVision, Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective) and continue to adopt such an approach during recent updating activities (North Sea Region).

- In the context of the **North Sea Region spatial visioning process**, a draft of the initial NorVision document



elaborated under INTERREG IIC was circulated to all counties throughout the region. The vision working group received many comments that were integrated into the work. It then subsequently revised the vision draft to as large extent as possible, without hampering the basic ideas. In the context of the more recent updating process realised under the INTERREG IIIB programme, 18 workshops with 229 participants in all seven countries were organised by the experts elaborating the thematic background studies and additional input was collected in numerous interviews. Discussion papers were presented to the nearly 400 participants and debated during seminars (one per study) at the Annual Conference for the North Sea Programme in June 2005. In September 2005, during the consultation process on the draft final reports for the thematic studies, the relevant stakeholders in each of the countries were contacted.

- In the **Atlantic Area**, background research for the ‘Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective’ has been realised with an active participation of the regions and the socio-economic actors located in the area. This participation was made operational – on the one hand – in the context of the ASDP-project’s steering committee and – on the other hand – through the organisation of ‘national workshops’ (one or more workshops realised in each country). These events had the aim to directly link up with key stakeholders in the Atlantic Area and with other projects working on similar topics. In addition, also a close co-ordination with other networks and study projects existing in the Atlantic area has been established.<sup>143</sup>

Also in case of the **procedural approaches adopted after the publication of transnational spatial development visions**, a quite heterogeneous situation can be observed. There are several transnational areas that have explicitly conceived spatial visioning as an ‘on-going process’ (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region, North-West Europe). Some of them have also submitted the initial transnational spatial development visions to a wider political discussion (North Sea Region, Atlantic Area) or to some kind of a political/administrative validation (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region, CADSES). Compared to this, however, a medium- and even long-term political anchorage was given to the entire cooperative planning process only in one case (Baltic Sea Region).

- The most coherent procedural approach in relation to all of the above-mentioned issues has been adopted by the **Baltic Sea Region**. The initial VASAB-document of 1994 has explicitly mentioned the need for updating and further refining this document in the future. As a consequence, various updating and upgrading activities have subsequently been realised during the years 1994-2004. In addition, a major effort to elaborate a new long-term perspective for the spatial development of the Baltic Sea Area was recently launched (2005-2008). In order to support this ongoing process, the application strategy of the initial 1994 document had already formulated a number of suggestions for establishing coherent working procedures.<sup>144</sup> Today, the VASAB cooperation is backed by a lean permanent structure (VASAB secretariat) and organises regular meetings of senior government officials (Committee on Spatial Development in the Baltic Sea Region, CSD-BSR) as well as periodical ‘Ministerial Conferences’ (one every four to five years). The VASAB-chairmanship is rotating on a yearly basis, with a ‘Troika’ ensuring the continuity. Despite these structures, transnational cooperation is still relatively informal and not overburdened with many formal procedures. This makes it easy to focus on strategic issues and creates flexibility in finding the right focus. Together with the formal recognition of VASAB by the ‘Council of the Baltic Sea States’, the afore-mentioned working procedures provide a relatively strong political anchorage of the entire process<sup>145</sup>, which also includes a formal political/administrative validation of the respective outcomes (i.e. through the ‘Ministerial Conferences’). According to a critical self-assessment on behalf of BSR-actors,<sup>146</sup> the positive and negative aspects of this political anchorage can be summarised as follows (see Overview Table 9).
- Also the **North Sea Region** has adopted a procedural approach that aimed at creating a medium-term perspective for the transnational spatial visioning process by means of a ‘continuing dialogue’ and a political discussion/validation. The application strategy in the finalised NorVision document explicitly stressed the need for a ‘continuing dialogue’ with concerned key stakeholders in the area. This early commitment to launch an ongoing process is currently fulfilled in the current INTERREG IIIB updating process by a further continuation of the ex-ante consultation approach. In

**Overview Table 9: ‘Pros’ and ‘cons’ of political anchorage Baltic Sea Region (BSR):**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of processes having a strong spatial impact (in particular those of sectoral nature) at the state level.</li> <li>• Influence on national legislation, plans and documents to make them ‘Baltic’ friendly.</li> <li>• Creation of a forum for discussing strategic issues and challenges not biased by day-to-day administrative operations.</li> <li>• Attempt to take care of the long-term Baltic results of the spatial actions of different stakeholders.</li> <li>• Continuity and reliability.</li> <li>• Integration of the spatial planning parts of the central governments in the BSR facilitates building a common region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group of highly qualified professionals in their own circle (restricted focus on national issues, external sources of expertise less attractive etc.).</li> <li>• Narrow ownership of the vision and all other strategic documents.</li> <li>• Two institutions having political mandate to stimulate spatial development of the Baltic Sea Region (CSD and INTERREG IIIB Secretariat).</li> <li>• Question marks about the tangibility of the results achieved since they have to be of a political nature.</li> </ul>

addition, the final NorVision document was presented at the CRPM North Sea Commission’s General Assembly in Bergen in 2000. At this meeting, the chairman had prepared a resolution that aimed at approving the NorVision document and at agreeing to work for its application. This recommendation, which was finally accepted by the regional politicians from the countries around the North Sea, had however no further formal status. Beyond these aspects, however, permanent structures or regular working procedures among high-level representatives (i.e. senior officials, ministers) were not established in order to support the ongoing spatial visioning process.

Compared to the above-mentioned examples, the other transnational areas have **adopted a less structured procedural approach for the continuation of their spatial visioning processes in a mid-term perspective (CADSES, North-West Europe, Atlantic Area).**

- In case of **CADSES**, only the document entitled ‘Guidelines and Policy Proposals’ (GPP-document) has been approved by the representatives of national government services sitting on the ‘Project Panel’. Beyond this, however, no further political discussion on/validation of the documents elaborated by the Vision Planet project has taken place. Although project members were aware of the fact that transnational cooperation in CADSES on spatial development was still in an initial phase and needed therefore both continuity and further

concretisation, no explicit procedural approach was foreseen to structure an eventual future upgrading of the elaborated spatial vision documents during the programming period 2000-06. In fact, the current situation clearly shows that the spatial visioning process in CADSES has - despite existing INTERREG IIIB follow-up projects - actually come to a stand-still.

- The initial spatial vision document of **North-West Europe** and the ‘Consultation Report on the Vision Document’ both explicitly consider the INTERREG IIC activities a starting point (or a first step) in an ongoing process that should continue under INTERREG IIIB. Beyond this basic agreement among the partners involved on the issue of continuity, no further action was taken with respect to other aspects important for structuring this medium-term process (e.g. political debate/validation; establishment of regular working procedures). In fact, the conclusions of the ‘Consultation Report’ highlight that there was little support for the creation of major new institutional arrangements to support the future visioning process. There is however a (...) *clear recognition that if the Vision process is to play a more significant role in relation to directing investment, then the proposals must be discussed and agrees at the political level (...)*. In addition, there is also some agreement among the actors (...) *that political debate is needed to raise awareness of alternatives and strategies chosen, and to assure accountability (...)*.

- The finalised document on the polycentric development of the **Atlantic Area** does neither contain an explicit reference indicating that spatial visioning is considered an ongoing process, nor has it foreseen permanent or regular working structures/procedures. The only aspect worthwhile mentioning is that the ASDP-document had been presented at the CRPM Atlantic Arc Commission's annual meeting in June 2005, however without a formal resolution being adopted that could be considered a kind of political validation.

#### 4.3 Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA/IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them

With respect to the methodological approaches/techniques and procedural approaches used, one can remark relatively strong similarities among the four cross-border spatial development planning processes examined.

#### Qualitative and quantitative approaches used

As in the case of transnational spatial visioning, a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches was adopted for preparing and elaborating the four cross-border spatial development concepts. This can be illustrated by looking at the cross-border spatial development concepts elaborated for the PAMINA area, the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian and the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina.

- In case of the **PAMINA cross-border development concept (DE/FR)**, a larger number of sources/data were used during an early stage of the preparation phase for performing an extensive quantitative diagnosis of the present-time situation. With respect to the cross-border economic development, however, more profound assessments were still missing for a number of important key issues (i.e. cross-border labour market, framework conditions for economic development, spatial distribution of already existing enterprises, location of local business zones). As a consequence, the spatial analysis has used and updated already existing theme-specific assessments and deepened the cross-border assessment of all aspects related to economic development. The results of the initial quantitative present-time situation diagnosis have been summarised in four cross-cutting analyses. On ground of these, also a

distinction of 26 relatively homogeneous sub-territories with typical characteristics existing within the wider PAMINA-cross-border area has been made possible.

- The **White Paper for the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian (FR/ES)** was based upon an extensive quantitative research carried out during the preparatory phase on either side of the border. A comparative diagnosis of the current situation and of development trends has been realised alongside a number of common themes and specific criteria for both parts of the cross-border territory as well as for the Eurocity as an entity. This comprehensive assessment has also allowed establishing a description of the major strengths and weaknesses of the cross-border territory.
- The analysis of the socio-economic situation currently prevailing in the **Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina (DE/PL)** has faced some problems with respect to data availability/compatibility, especially on the Polish side. Despite this, the cross-border development concept 'Viadrina 2000' has adopted a quite extensive quantitative approach. It is predominantly static (i.e. analysis of certain indicators for one specific year), but sometimes also of a dynamic nature (development path analysis of specific indicators from a previous situation to the present time).

#### Linear and more complex/cyclic approaches applied

The approaches generally used for preparing cross-border spatial development concepts have a less sophisticated character, not going beyond usual static or dynamic quantitative analyses. However, some examples do exist where linear and more complex/cyclic approaches have been used (Euroregion Rhein-Waal, Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian):

- The **Euroregion Rhein-Waal concept (DE/NL)** contains a systematic but descriptive exploration of future development trends. It has been realised for the six strategic themes and a larger number of related sub-themes that are considered important for the development of the cross-border area up to the year 2010 (see text box below). This comprehensive trends assessment has been elaborated on ground of basic research realised

### Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL), descriptive trends assessment in the concept

The general description of trends for the Euregio Rhein-Waal focuses on six strategic themes, but within each of them, specific trends are also indicated for a larger number of related sub-themes:

- Spatial structure and accessibility: specific trends are indicated for the national/international environment, the urban-rural relationship, freight transport, passenger transport, population development and information/communication infrastructures.
- Economy, technology and innovation: specific trends are indicated for the aspect of structural changes, development of markets, requirements for locational factors.
- Labour market and qualification: specific trends are indicated for aspects related to a harmonisation on the labour market, employment patterns and requirements with regard to qualification.
- Culture and tourism: specific trends are indicated for culture and societal leisure time behaviour.
- Nature, environment and agriculture: specific trends are indicated for aspects such as cultural landscape, agriculture, environment and sustainability.
- Cross-border integration: specific socio-cultural trends are indicated (open health and rescue services in the cross-border context, consumer behaviour).

during the preparation phase and alongside the concept's assessment of the current situation. An important input was also information that has been derived from discussions, workshops and seminars organised during the elaboration phase.

- In case of the **Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)**, only the application strategy contains some forward-looking development options (proposals) that were elaborated in a descriptive manner for similar issues/themes and sub-areas of the future Eurocity. After the publication of the White Paper in 2000, however, a number of follow-up activities were realised up to the year 2004 that made use of complex/cyclic forecasting approaches and or improved the methodological capacities in the area. The studies further exploring themes of strategic relevance (e.g. transport infrastructures and cross-border mobility, cross-border waste treatment, joint public services<sup>147</sup>) contain quite sophisticated quantitative assessments and have realised prospective exercises or elaborated scenarios in a local, regional and cross-border perspective. In addition, other follow-up activities helped to further upgrade the quality/capacity of the 'methodological toolbox' available in the cross-border area<sup>148</sup>.

Although not directly related to specific methods/techniques, it is worth mentioning that the entire approach

adopted for preparing and elaborating **the PAMINA concept (DE/FR)** was relatively complex. It can also be considered innovative, as it aimed at further developing already existing standardised approaches in Germany and France for elaborating spatial planning schemes in the national, regional and local context. This was achieved mainly through introducing specific adaptations that were appropriate for adequately addressing the cross-border dimension. This innovative methodology has allowed preserving the territorial specificity of sub-areas in the context of the wider cross-border area throughout the different phases of the elaboration process.

### Visualisation approaches adopted

In most cases, **visualisation and mapping approaches** generally form part of the cross-border spatial development concepts examined, either for illustrating the territorial analysis or for translating in a visual way the spatial development objectives.

- The **'Spatial planning scheme for the PAMINA-region' (DE/FR)** has adopted a quite extensive mapping approach. Especially the maps illustrating the specific key messages of each strategic priority with a territorial character (three maps) and the overall approach of the cross-border spatial development strategy (one

### **PAMINA (DE/FR), mapping approach adopted by the cross-border spatial development concept**

The cross-border concept contains three thematic ‘main maps’ that visualise the strategic priorities with an explicit territorial dimension in relation to the PAMINA area:

- Map 1 on the landscape park PAMINA.
- Map 2 on communication/networked spaces.
- Map 3 on a balanced development of locational factors.

These thematic ‘main maps’ are supplemented by a number of basic sketches/topic-oriented maps that aim at deepening - on a visual basis - specific aspects related to the territorial strategic priorities mentioned above. The most important ones are the following:

- The sub-areas identified with respect to the Strategic Priority A1: Landscape park PAMINA.
- Proposal for a development of railway transport in the PAMINA-area (high-speed rail network TGV-ICE).
- Proposal for a development of long-distance railway transport in the PAMINA-area.
- Proposal for the development of the motorway network in the PAMINA-area.
- Proposal for the development of urban/inter-urban railway transport in the PAMINA-area.
- Proposal for the development of regional railway transport in the PAMINA-area.

A fourth comprehensive ‘main map’ establishes an overlap of the previously mentioned 3 thematic ‘main maps’. This approach allowed obtaining an overall visualisation/illustration of the entire cross-border development concept. The primary benefit of this summary map lies in its orientation-function for spatial planning at regional, sub-regional and local levels. As such, the summary map also helps to take into consideration the cross-border aspects in a systematic way and to support further steps with respect to a joint and coherent spatial development.

map) can be considered examples of good practice (see also text box above).

- The ‘Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010’ for the **Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL)** uses visualisation and mapping techniques for highlighting the current situation, for illustrating theme-specific future development perspectives (thematic maps on ‘mobility’, ‘territory for economic activity and working’, ‘culture and landscape’) and for presenting an overall cross-thematic development model to be achieved around the year 2010. The document has however not elaborated a map-based representation of the vision statement properly speaking, mainly to avoid a confusing parallel existence of different illustrations and related discussions.
- The visualisation approach adopted in the **Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)** aimed at positioning the cross-border area in the wider European context, at illustrating potential options to re-structure/further develop the narrow cross-border urban context (i.e. the ‘Consortio Bidasoa-Txingudi’) and at determining the future loca-

tion of new transport infrastructures (major and secondary infrastructures).

Only the **‘Viadrina 2000 concept’ (DE/PL)** did not make use of mapping techniques for illustrating aspects of the current socio-economic situation or of the future development perspective.

### **Procedural approaches applied during the cooperative planning process**

**During the preparation and elaboration phase** of the different cross-border spatial development concepts, all cooperative planning processes made use of broad participatory approaches that involved different actors from either side of the border. Although the number of actors involved was quite significant in all cases, participation did not always concern the same types of stakeholders.

The four processes generally involved public stakeholders, mainly from local and regional authorities and from various other public organisations in the cross-border area. A particular case is the **Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)**, where

### Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL), elements of the participatory elaboration process

The 'Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010' was elaborated on ground of a broad participatory approach that was supported by a number of events:

- In parallel to the elaboration of the INTERREG IIIA sub-programme 2000-06, various workshops for the elaboration process of the cross-border concept have been organised.
- Discussions in the structures of the Euregio Rhein-Waal have been organised (e.g. committees, Euregio-council).
- The assessment of a questionnaire survey realised among the members of the Euregio (realised in spring 2000) has given important information on the current level of cross-border networking and contacts (80 questionnaires have been sent out, a return rate of 60% was achieved).
- A seminar on the 'Cross-border development and action concept 2000-10' has been organised in December 2000 by the Euregio Rhein-Waal, which aimed at further completing and fine-tuning the existing draft concept and allowed to achieve consensus on the specific recommendations for action in the region.

also the central state authorities from both sides of the border were actively involved in the elaboration process. In addition, also a large debate has taken place on the provisional recommendations for a future development of the Eurocity<sup>149</sup>, which were presented already in December 1999 before the publication of the final document. A wide range of non-public stakeholders was involved especially in the elaboration of the spatial development concepts for the **Euregio Rhein-Waal** (see text box below) and the **Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina**<sup>150</sup>. Their participation was realised through an organisation of pro-active events, stimulating an intensive cross-border discussion and opinion-building/consensus-finding process.

Also after the publication of cross-border spatial development concepts, **various procedural approaches had been adopted to ensure the medium-term continuity of cross-border spatial development planning**. Joint planning was in each case deliberately conceived as an 'open process'. Also intensive political discussions were organised on most of the documents (Euregio Rhein-Waal concept, Viadrina 2000 concept, Eurocity White Paper) and in some cooperation areas, even a formal cross-border political validation has taken place (Euregio Rhein-Waal, Euroregion Viadrina). As regards the provision of a stable political and administrative anchorage of these processes, one has to observe that the actual success achieved is somehow more variable.

- The final version of the **Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES)** had been presented in 2000 to the institutional commit-

tee of the 'reflection group on cross-border spatial development', which was composed of the highest political and administrative representatives from the different local, provincial, regional and national organisations concerned. Subsequently, also a political discussion between partners from both sides of the border has taken place that was further continued during the year 2001. Despite these debates, the document was never formally validated by the political structures of the local/regional authorities on either side of the border and no precise (political) decisions were taken up to now on the actual realisation of the proposed strategic issues. This lacking formal validation has however not prevented the White Paper from successfully acting as a source of inspiration for various follow-up projects that were subsequently realised by various actors. Through the private law-based 'Cross-border Agency of the Basque Eurocity' (Agence Transfrontalière de l'Eurocité Basque), the overall process initiated with the White Paper is also provided with a stable political/administrative anchorage in a medium- and long-term perspective.

- The 'Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010' for the **Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL)** is explicitly conceived as an 'open process'. Its options for development and action are therefore not of a static nature. They rather constitute a guiding framework for stakeholders in the cross-border area that can be subject to an adaptation or revision. Subsequently, a political discussion has taken place on the finalised

cross-border concept and it had also been subject to a formal cross-border political validation by the Euregio Council in November 2001. Due to this, one can assume that a stable political and administrative anchorage of the cross-border concept is mainly ensured by the structures of the public-law based Euregio. In practice, however, it seems that the envisaged process launched by the concept has somehow lost some of its dynamism. This is mainly due to the fact that day-to-day work in the cross-border area and the Euregio is strongly focussed on the implementation of the INTERREG IIIA programme during the current programming period.

- The finally elaborated **‘Viadrina 2000 concept’ (DE/PL)** has been subject to a formal cross-border political approval, which took place in the Council of the Euroregion at its 12th meeting in December 1999. The concept explicitly considers itself an ‘open concept’, as the continuing reform of the territorial administration on the Polish side as well as the forthcoming accession of Poland to the European Union will certainly stimulate further adaptations. Another factor supporting a somehow automatic continuity of the process is the medium-term orientation of the entire concept, which mostly aims at providing an input for the EU-Structural Funds programming process. Due to this, a forthcoming updating exercise was already ‘programmed’ in advance to elaborate a contribution for the new Objective 3 programme.
- The final version of the ‘Spatial planning scheme for the PAMINA-region’ (DE/FR) contains explicit procedural provisions for ensuring an ‘openness’ of the entire process in a medium-term perspective. Although the partners financially supporting the initial project have validated the final working results, they did however not engage in actually realising the envisaged follow-up processes. Neither the discussion on the concept among regional/local authorities and the concerned people and the validation of suggested pilot projects in all PAMINA sub-areas, nor the planned signature of a ‘Development Charter for the PAMINA Area’ (to take place by mid of 2001) have actually taken place. And also the subsequent ‘appropriation’ of the concept by the newly created public law-based cross-border structure REGIO-PAMINA (i.e. through the ‘Guideline

Objectives for the PAMINA-area’) can only not be considered a partial success. This is mainly due to a lack of political willingness and the result of an actual mismatch of competencies in relation to the issues that should be addressed.

#### **4.4 Summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice**

By referring back to the different aspects mentioned in the preliminary remarks of this chapter (see 4.1.), a brief summary overview on issue-specific examples of good practice in the field of cooperative territorial development planning is now elaborated in this final section (see Overview Table 10).

### **Methodological approaches and techniques used**

In order to elaborate a territorial analysis of the present situation and of trends prevailing in the cooperation areas concerned, a combination of qualitative and quite extensive quantitative approaches has been used by most cross-border spatial development concepts (PAMINA concept, Eurocity White Paper, Viadrina 2000 concept) and by some of the transnational spatial visioning processes (Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Area, CADSES). All cooperative planning processes have however faced to various extents problems of data availability and comparability.

The early transnational spatial visions and most of the cross-border spatial development concepts examined have not made an extensive direct use of sophisticated/complex approaches to generally forecast territorial development in the respective cooperation area. Only the Euregio Rhein-Waal concept has systematically explored future development trends for all of the six strategy themes in a descriptive way. Some transnational spatial visions have also made punctual efforts to generate issue-specific information about the medium or long-term future, either in a qualitative way (CADSES) or on ground of a quantitative approach (Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Area). More recently, however, sophisticated and complex approaches are either used ‘indirectly’ by some transnational spatial visioning processes (e.g. vision updating process for North-West Europe, preparatory studies for MEDOCC) or directly in the context of newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Prospective Study for the Alpine Space) and

specific cross-border follow-up projects (Eurocity White Paper).

Transnational spatial visioning processes and most of the cross-border spatial development concepts have quite extensively used analytical maps for a visual presentation of the actual spatial context or of future trends. A map-based visualisation of the desired future spatial situation and/or of the territorial development goals was however only realised in some of the transnational spatial vision documents (North-West Europe, Atlantic Area) and cross-border spatial development concepts (Euregio Rhein-Waal concept, PAMINA concept).

### Procedures applied for elaborating strategic planning documents

During the preparation and elaboration process, 'participatory bottom-up approaches' were applied from the outset by all cross-border spatial development concepts, but only

in case of two transnational spatial visioning processes (North Sea Region, Atlantic Area). For some of the initial 'expert-centred top down approaches', however, the participatory approach was quite significantly increased in recent times (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe).

A relatively heterogeneous overall situation can be observed with respect to the procedural approaches adopted for ensuring a medium-term continuity of the joint planning process after a publication of the strategic planning documents. Transnational and cross-border spatial development planning is in most cases deliberately conceived as an 'open process'. With respect to a political discussion/validation and the provision of a stable political anchorage, however, relatively structured approaches had more frequently been adopted in the context of cross-border spatial development planning (Eurocity White Paper, VIADRINA-concept, Euregio Rhein-Waal concept) than by transnational spatial visioning processes (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region).

**Overview Table 10: Issue-specific examples of good practice among the different types of cooperation**

Type of cooperation. Issue	Transnational cooperation	Cross-border cooperation
<b>Qualitative and quantitative approaches</b>	Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Region CADSES	Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES) PAMINA region (DE/FR) Viadrina 2000 concept (DE/PL)
<b>Linear and more complex/cyclic approaches</b>	Atlantic Area Prospective Study of the Alpine Space	Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES) Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL)
<b>Visualisation/mapping of trends and development perspectives</b>	North-West Europe, Atlantic Area	PAMINA region concept (DE/FR) Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL)
<b>Procedures during the preparation/elaboration phase: participatory dimension</b>	North Sea Region Atlantic Area	Viadrina 2000 concept (DE/PL) Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL)
<b>Ongoing nature of the process, political discussion/validation, political and administrative anchorage</b>	Baltic Sea Region North Sea Region	Eurocity White Paper (FR/ES) Viadrina 2000 concept (DE/PL) Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL)



## 5 The usefulness of ESPON study results and the interaction with transnational/cross-border spatial development planning processes

### 5.1 Preliminary remarks

The comparative analysis realised in Chapters 3 and 4 has clearly shown that a cooperative elaboration of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts is very demanding and complex. This applies not only to the task of ‘bringing together’ and analysing relevant spatial information or data, but also to the considerable effort needed for integrating the diversity of planning cultures and already existing national/regional planning approaches, interests, working methods or languages prevailing in the transnational/cross-border areas concerned.

Due to this, transnational and cross-border spatial development planning calls at least for the establishment of a common denominator in terms of ‘spatial knowledge base’ as well as for the creation of more flexible and intermediate tools that enable to progress further in the joint design of possible and desirable future situations for transnational/cross-border territories. As such, the European-wide spatial research activities of the current ESPON-programme represent a good starting point in this direction and might well be able to provide an interesting support for territorial analysis and projections in the context of transnational /cross-border spatial development planning.

If one identifies an ‘ideal set of steps’ for the cooperative elaboration process of such strategic spatial planning documents, potential inputs could be made by ESPON in relation to the following aspects:

- Provision of basic information about the present situation and recent trends in the transnational/cross-border area in terms of harmonised data related to main themes relevant for spatial development (demography, economy, environment, natural and cultural assets etc.).
- Provision of geographical information about networks, poles, specific areas represented through homogeneous mapping systems.
- Provision of processed information related to the spatial structure of the transnational/cross-border area in terms of harmonised concepts and typologies concerning for instance the accessibility, functional and physical polycentricity, sensitiveness to natural and technical hazards, etc.
- Provision of information about the positioning of the transnational/cross-border area in a wider European and international context and about its functional relationships with neighbouring areas.
- Provision of information about the future evolution of the transnational/cross-border area, related to a diversity of aspects: projections under various hypotheses (trends, policy-oriented projections); knowledge about the potential evolution of driving forces likely to shape the territory; speculative investigations in the form of alternative scenarios; knowledge about the potential evolution of the wider context of the transnational/cross-border area; knowledge about the impacts of policies and programmes already in a process of implementation.

The level of expectation should however not be placed too high, as there are several reasons explaining why not all of these desirable inputs could actually be delivered by the current ESPON programme. Firstly, the contribution of ESPON to the elaboration of such strategic spatial development planning processes is only one task among others that the programme has to fulfil. Secondly, the diverging programme agendas and time-schedules of ESPON and INTERREG (II & III) did not make possible to establish a systematic process of mutual cooperation and synergy-creation.<sup>151</sup> Thirdly, the basic focus of ESPON activities and transnational/cross-border spatial development planning activities is quite diverse.<sup>152</sup> This - finally - also implies considerable differences with respect to the way how important key issues are identified<sup>153</sup>, to the methodological approaches/analytical processes applied for deepening these key issues<sup>154</sup> and to the nature of the ‘final product’ that is delivered in the end.<sup>155</sup>

**Despite these factual limitations,  
the following sections of this  
study will however analyse**

- the results of selected ESPON-studies and their useful-

ness for transnational/cross-border spatial development planning,

- the levels of interaction that have actually developed between ESPON and ongoing transnational/cross-border spatial development planning processes.

## 5.2 ESPON-project results and their usefulness for transnational/cross-border spatial development planning processes

A number of ESPON study-projects have – among other aspects - realised prospective trend analyses and spatial scenario development activities for various themes. These studies, for which the main objectives are summarised in Annex VIII, can potentially provide a valuable support to/input for the cooperative elaboration and updating/upgrading of strategic spatial development planning documents in the context of transnational and cross-border cooperation:

- ESPON study-project 1.1.1: Potentials for polycentric development in Europe.
- ESPON study-project 1.1.2: Urban-rural relations in Europe.
- ESPON study-project 1.1.3: Particular effects of enlargement of the EU and beyond on the polycentric spatial tissue with special attention on discontinuities and barriers.
- ESPON study-project 1.1.4: The spatial effects of demographic trends and migration.
- ESPON study-project 2.1.1: Territorial impacts of EU transport and TEN policies.
- ESPON study-project 2.4.2: Integrated analysis of transnational and national territories based on ESPON results.
- ESPON study-project 3.2: Spatial scenarios and orientations in relation to the ESDP and cohesion policy.
- ESPON study-project 3.3: Territorial dimension of the Lisbon and Gothenburg process.

The next paragraphs will therefore give a brief overview on the most important results achieved by these ESPON study-projects (i.e. main issues addressed, methodological results achieved, main findings and policy recommendations formulated) and elaborate a number of ‘key messages’ regarding their actual usefulness in the context of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning processes.

### Main issues (themes) addressed

In the context of the afore-mentioned ESPON study-projects, a wide range of territorial issues has been addressed and investigated (see Annex IX). These issues are mainly derived from the ESDP (polycentric development, parity in terms of accessibility, regional competitiveness, etc.) and from the EU Treaty (economic and social cohesion, sustainable development). Some issues covered by these studies were also derived by referring back to the objective of territorial cohesion, although it does not yet have an official value or a precise definition.

Among the ESPON study-projects, one can globally distinguish between ‘territorial analyses’, ‘policy impact analyses’ and in addition a few ‘horizontal analyses’. With respect to the assessment/judgement of territorial trends and policy impacts properly speaking, a difference can be made between two basic approaches:

- Projects that investigate the impacts of specific driving forces such as changes in demography, in energy price, the acceleration of climate change and of globalisation.
- Projects that analyse cross-thematic territorial situations and trends and elaborate various types of spatial typologies, especially for urban systems as well as for urban-rural relations.

As far as the territorial policy impact studies are concerned, various types of policies are taken into account, such as ‘sectoral policies’ (transport, telecommunication, agriculture) more horizontal policies (Lisbon and Göteborg Strategy) or global political decisions (EU enlargements). A more systematic investigation of the drivers of territorial change and of their evolution over time has been undertaken in the context of the elaboration of long-term scenarios under project 3.2.

## Methodological results achieved

The afore-mentioned ESPON study-projects have realised a broad range of methodological results, for which a project-by-project summary overview is given in Annex X.

Most ESPON studies have adopted quantitative approaches. These ESPON study-projects have produced a variety of theme-specific spatial data, which enable realising more homogeneous territorial analyses that are not handicapped by the existence of national borders and by the related heterogeneity of spatial information systems.

For the analysis of territorial situations and trends, several projects elaborated harmonised territorial typologies and concepts (e.g. ESPON study-projects 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3) that generate an added value in the sense that they facilitate an in-depth understanding of complex spatial structures, disregarding the existence of national borders. In addition, some study projects provide information about the future through the elaboration of a wide range of scenarios. These scenarios are mainly policy scenarios and show the potential territorial impacts of various policy options in the different themes and sectors considered (e.g. ESPON study projects 1.1.1, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.1 and 3.2).

Most of the above-mentioned policy impact studies have elaborated hypotheses upon the cause-effect relations. These are derived partly from theoretical literature and partly from EU policy documents. The nature of hypotheses strongly reflects the policies considered. While in a number of studies a rather 'loose' set of hypotheses is presented, other studies rely upon complex, integrated models (SASI, CGEurope, STIMA in the case of transportation and TENS, CAPRI in the case of the CAP, MASST in the case of macro-economic policies).

Only more recent policy impact studies that are not considered here (e.g. ESPON-study 2.4.1. on impacts of environmental policy) use already the logic of a model for the ex-ante evaluation of territorial impacts (i.e. the TEQUILA model, see also ESPON-study 3.2) with two levels of interactions: A general (or European) level with basic connections and influences between policies, trends and territorial objectives and a regional level, taking into account the specific characteristics of each of the regions concerned.

Most ESPON studies attempt to validate or invalidate the

hypotheses elaborated, but the techniques used vary widely. A number of studies use rather simple quantitative statistical techniques (regression and correlation analyses), whereas other carry out simulations by using complex models and produce quantitative ex-post or ex-ante scenarios. A third category of studies analyse the impacts more qualitatively, explaining generally the processes at work.

Numerous ESPON studies were confronted with a lack of appropriate data; a fact which considerably limits the process of validation/invalidation of selected hypotheses. Although indicators are widely used in the policy impacts studies, a number of them are only proxies.

## Main findings and policy recommendations formulated

Taken all together, the ESPON studies have produced a large variety of findings (see Annex XI) and most of them have also formulated policy recommendations that might help inspiring new ways and approaches for dealing with territorial development (see Annex XII).

The numerous territorial typologies elaborated make possible to consider the European territory and its evolution from very different perspectives, a fact which enriches the content of territorial analyses, especially in their transnational dimension. The policy impact studies have thrown a new light on the issue of incoherence caused by various sectoral policies. They have made clear that possible conflicts of objectives exist in reality (for instance, high levels of road pricing may counteract the economic development of peripheral regions). The most important findings, however, are possibly those related to an analysis of the drivers of territorial development and of their evolution in time, including the long-term future. It results from ESPON outputs that a number of significant changes are taking place which will lastingly affect the evolution of the European territory. These are in particular population ageing, which will have numerous impacts (interregional migrations, weakening of labour markets, changing life styles, etc.), new issues of economic and socio-cultural integration of young age groups originating from immigrant families, the increase of energy price and the changing energy paradigm, the acceleration of climate change with severe impacts mainly for southern European regions and finally the intensification of

the globalisation process calling for a deeper economic adjustment in Europe.

The policy recommendations in many ESPON-projects are generally formulated for the various spatial categories identified in the numerous typologies elaborated. They normally consider the three spatial scales (macro, meso and micro) and address therefore different types of policy stakeholders. It must however be considered that such policy recommendations are often biased by either a too academic approach, taking insufficiently into account the specificities of individual regions, or by a too sectoral or thematic approach, ignoring partly cross-sectoral interactions.

### Key messages on the usefulness of ESPON project results

After this brief review of results achieved by ESPON study-projects, their actual usefulness for transnational and cross-border spatial development planning processes will finally be assessed. Our impressions are presented in form of 'project-specific key messages' as well as in form a summary rating for each project, which can be found in a table at the end of this section (see Overview Table 11).

- **ESPON project 1.1.1, 'Potentials for polycentric development in Europe':** The project actually provides an interesting framework (or starting point) for the analysis of transnational and cross-border urban systems as well as recommendations for structuring cooperation among cities. But the actual usefulness (or practical applicability) for the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts is facing quite considerable limitations. The elaboration of transnational or cross-border spatial planning documents requires a substantial amount of additional in-depth studies, which should aim at both refining the concepts introduced by the ESPON project 1.1.1 and complementing them with other types of investigations related to the future potentialities of urban entities not provided by the ESPON study (in particular the functional aspects of urban systems).
- **ESPON project 1.1.2, 'Urban-rural relations in Europe':** The study has the merit of providing for the first time a typology of spaces according to their urban or rural character (six categories) and to show for these categories trends related to population change and change of GDP/capita for the period 1995-2000. The study does however not provide Europe-wide analyses of urban-rural relationships in terms of flows or functional interdependence, mainly because of the lack of relevant data. The area-specific typology (the six categories) is of a certain interest for the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts. By using more recent and differentiated data, this model can be considered an interesting tool that is perfectible and applicable in more limited geographical contexts.
- **ESPON project 1.1.3, 'Particular effects of enlargement of the EU and beyond on the polycentric spatial tissue with special attention to discontinuities and barriers':** This study will be of interest for the elaboration of transnational spatial visions and cross-border spatial development concepts, especially in the eastern part of the EU (i.e. in the new EU Member States and in the EU-15 countries adjacent to them). The territorial impacts of a number of policy options, in addition to the impacts of trends, which are all tested in the two series of scenarios, provide valuable guidelines for the elaboration of spatial development planning documents. A particularly interesting aspect is the assessment of situations and policy impacts in the lagging behind and rural areas of the new EU Member States. This has so far not been the object of much consideration in other studies devoted to enlargement issues. A weak point is however the discrepancy in time horizons used for the two series of scenarios. While the SASI scenarios consider the year 2021, the RESSET scenarios consider the end of the 21st century. This extremely long-term perspective is not easily usable in the context of economic scenarios based on models, which seriously reduces the credibility and usefulness of their outcomes.
- **ESPON project 1.1.4, 'The spatial effects of demographic trends and migration':** This study is fundamental for the elaboration of spatial development planning documents for transnational and cross-border areas. It provides a sound basis for the analysis of population changes over the 1990s at a highly dis-

aggregated level (NUTS 3 areas), showing the most determining factors of population change for the various areas. This makes it possible to compare the current demographic situation and its evolution between a specific cooperation area for which a transnational spatial vision or a cross-border spatial development is being elaborated and other neighbouring areas. The study is however subject to some limitations. Interactions between demography and other factors (e.g. economy, technology, foreign policies, integration policies, social policies, cultural policies etc.) have not sufficiently been taken into account, both in the explanation of trends and in the elaboration of scenarios. It will therefore be necessary to carry out complementary investigations about the specificities of the various areas for which spatial visions/spatial concepts are elaborated, which may then enable the adaptation of study-results with respect to a potential future evolution.

- **ESPON project 2.1.1, ‘Territorial impacts of EU transport and TEN policies’:** This study offers various opportunities for a practical use in the context of the elaboration of transnational spatial visions or cross-border spatial development concepts. Its main merits are to highlight the territorial impacts of individual policy measures (didactic impact) and of combinations of policy measures (contribution to the elaboration of integrated approaches). The study reaches however its limits, both in terms of simulations and of policy recommendations, which is mainly due to the Europe-wide perspective in which research had been carried out. The study offers a valuable conceptual and instrumental framework for the elaboration such planning documents. But it also stresses the need to apply and further elaborate the outcomes and strategies in more limited spatial contexts, which is precisely the case for transnational spatial visions or cross-border spatial development concepts. Another important limitation is that the study does not integrate the significant increase of oil price in the various transport simulations. This is presently one of the most critical factors for the development of future transport policies, as it directly concerns the potentialities of the various transport modes as well as the issues of mobility in general and the relationships with substitution possibilities through more efficient ICT-applications in the field of transport.
- **ESPON project 2.4.2, ‘Integrated analysis of transnational and national territories based on ESPON results’:** The study contains various types of useful approaches and analyses that should be considered in the elaboration of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning documents. The impression prevails that the transnational integrated analysis could be of particular importance for the elaboration of spatial visions, as it precisely highlights the rationale and needs for transnational cooperation in spatial development policies. This analysis should provide information about the areas best suited for transnational cooperation and about the most relevant themes to which cooperation should be devoted to. The other analyses could provide complementary information, in particular as far as the identification of problem areas is concerned, both at transnational and national level.
- **ESPON project 3.2, ‘Spatial scenarios and orientations in relation to the ESDP and cohesion policy’:** This project is expected to have significant impacts on the elaboration of transnational spatial visions and cross-border spatial development concepts. At present, the first series of thematic scenarios can only contribute to awareness rising about the issues mentioned above. The more integrated scenarios to be elaborated in the third phase of the project will contribute in a more structured manner to the elaboration of transnational spatial visions and cross-border spatial development concepts. The baseline scenario will provide an extensive picture of trend evolutions, using a variety of reference values and indicators. The rollback scenario is intended to show the policy path leading to a competitive and spatially balanced Europe. A particularly important aspect of this study is the provision of information about the various driving forces of spatial development, while other studies only consider policy impacts as factors of change.
- **ESPON project 3.3, ‘Territorial dimension of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Strategy’:** The usefulness of this study for an elaboration of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning documents will become clearer when final results are available. The main aim of the study is to contribute, in general terms, to the improvement of the Lisbon and Gothenburg

strategy and not to the spatial visioning exercises. However, provisional results indicate that a key of success of the Lisbon and Gothenburg strategy in a context of compatibility with the objectives of the ESDP and of the Structural Policies is to pay greater attention to individual regional potentials and to specific territorial characteristics at meso/micro scales. In this respect the study outcomes are therefore likely to be of some interest also for transnational or cross-border spatial development planning, especially when it comes to a development of the area-specific competitiveness in a context of sustainability and of territorial and social cohe-

sion.

### 5.3 The current level of interaction between recent transnational spatial visioning processes and the outcomes of ESPON I studies

Considering the above-elaborated summary appraisal on the general usefulness of ESPON studies, the following paragraphs will now explore the level of interaction with transnational spatial visioning processes that has actually developed in relation to themes, methods and the take-up of policy recommendations.

**Overview Table 11: Summary rating on the usefulness (and limitations) of ESPON project results for transnational and cross-border spatial development planning processes**

ESPON Project	Usefulness for the elaboration of ...	
	... transnational spatial development visions	... cross-border spatial development concepts
<b>ESPON project 1.1.1: Potentials for polycentric development in Europe</b>	+/--	+/--
<b>ESPON project 1.1.2: Urban-rural relations in Europe</b>	++/-	++/-
<b>ESPON project 1.1.3: Particular effects of enlargement of the EU and beyond on the polycentric spatial tissue with special attention to discontinuities and barriers</b>	+/--	+/--
<b>ESPON project 1.1.4: The spatial effects of demographic trends and migration</b>	++/-	++/-
<b>ESPON project 2.1.1: Territorial impacts of EU transport and TEN policies</b>	++/-	++/-
<b>ESPON project 2.4.2: Integrated analysis of transnational and national territories based on ESPON results</b>	++	+
<b>ESPON project 3.2: Spatial scenarios and orientations in relation to the ESDP and cohesion policy</b>	++	++
<b>ESPON project 3.3: Territorial dimension of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Strategy</b>	+	+

+ = generally useful

- = with punctual limitations

++ = very useful

-- = with considerable limitations

## Thematic interaction with ESPON

The **early transnational spatial vision documents** all cover a wide and relatively similar range of issues for which the current situation/future trends have been assessed (Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North Sea Region, North-West Europe). Most of these documents also show a well-developed level of awareness with respect to the territorial impacts of different EU and national/regional policies (Baltic Sea Area, CADSES). With respect to the overall geographical focus adopted, one can observe that all vision documents are characterised by a predominantly ‘inward-looking’ perspective.

These early vision documents were however all finalised before the actual start of the ESPON programme, wherefore no ‘real-time interaction’ could be established in relation to ESPON-research activities and their provisional outcomes/results. Despite this limitation, the initial spatial visioning processes already show a quite strong ‘common thematic denominator’ with ESPON projects covering policy impact assessment, trend analysis and scenario development. At a very general level, they are both closely linked to the three strategic themes of the ESDP and to the related objectives/policy options, i.e. (1) to urban systems and polycentric development as well as urban-rural relationship, (2) to parity of access to infrastructures and knowledge and (3) to the enhancement of cultural and natural heritage. But also at the level of more specific issues relevant to spatial development, a significant overlapping can be observed between these initial transnational spatial visioning processes and the specific themes covered by ESPON studies.

Due to this ‘common thematic denominator’, one can assume that still ongoing transnational spatial visioning processes and especially newly emerging ones are in a good position for establishing a more intense thematic interaction with ESPON research.

This expectation can clearly be confirmed for the **recently completed spatial vision elaboration process in the Atlantic Area and for the updating/upgrading processes in the Baltic Sea Region, the North Sea Region and in North-West Europe**. They all have quite extensively taken into consideration issues/themes

addressed by various ESPON study projects and could also further raise the awareness on territorial impacts of different EU policies, which can partly be attributed to the investigations carried out by ESPON policy impact studies.

- The **Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective** has extensively considered the issues/themes addressed by ESPON study 1.1.1, but also those of other studies (ESPON studies 1.3.1 ‘Natural hazards’ and 1.3.2 ‘Natural heritage’). Especially study 1.1.1 has made a considerable contribution to research carried out in the context of the ASDP-project. In fact, both approaches basically focus on identifying the territorial systems on which it would be possible to envisage the development of polycentricity in Europe (in case of ESPON) and of a ZGEI in the Atlantic Area (in case of ASDP). Beyond this basic commonality, however, the ASDP-project had no intention of automatically taking over the thematic focus advocated for in study 1.1.1 during its own analysis of the morphology and the relational nature of polycentricity in the Atlantic Area. The ‘strategic evaluation’ of the ASDP-project has actually covered a much wider range of sub-themes and indicators that allowed a more profound diagnosis of the situation prevailing in the Atlantic Area.<sup>156</sup>
- In the context of the still ongoing **upgrading process of the VASAB spatial vision that was started in 2004/2005**, the background document ‘Polycentric Development and Territorial Cohesion in the Baltic Sea Region - Strategies and Priorities’ has reviewed several ESPON-studies<sup>157</sup> that were considered of a thematic relevance. During this early phase, especially the ESPON studies 1.1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.1.1 were considered most relevant for enriching the future vision upgrading process. From study 1.1.1, everything related to the morphology of polycentricity and the general polycentricity-approach as well as the specific concepts used for describing/establishing a typology of the urban network in Europe (Metropolitan European Growth Area-MEGA, Functional Urban Area-FUA) and for analysing the territorial context of cities and the potentials for polycentric integration based on morphological proximity (Potential Polycentric Integration Areas-PIAs) was used. From study 1.2.1, especially the transport trends and forecasts, the different concepts of accessibility and the BSR links to other pan-European regions were

considered. From study 2.1.1, finally, the main outcome considered was the impact of the proposed transport investments on the development of the BSR.

- **In the North Sea Region**, a number of ESPON studies are mentioned as sources of information in the various thematic studies realised during the updating process (e.g. ESPON studies 1.1.4 ‘Demography’, 2.1.4 ‘Energy services/networks & EU energy policy’, 1.2.1 ‘Transport trends’). The issues addressed here were mainly used for better describing the current situation and the expected spatial challenges. In addition, various issues addressed by the ESPON study 3.2 (‘Scenarios’) have also been directly addressed in the updating process.<sup>158</sup>
- **In North-West Europe**, the spatial vision updating and upgrading process has - among numerous other sources – quite extensively taken into consideration information from a variety of ESPON studies.<sup>159</sup> The issue-specific analytical results and thematic maps from ESPON studies were used by the three thematic studies and the ‘Synthesis Report’ (all realised in 2005) mainly for deepening the analysis of the current situation and of future development trends in NWE.

In case of the **newly emerging spatial visioning processes (INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean)**, however, the results of ESPON were not very extensively considered by the projects realised. The ‘AMAT project’ of the MEDOCC programme shows a certain convergence with various ESPON studies, especially with respect to the territorial impacts of EU policies, and a number of ESPON-maps had been reproduced that are related to accessibility, CAP impacts and the impact of EU R&D policy. The analyses realised by the ‘C2M project’ of the MEDOCC programme have quite extensively used EUROSTAT data, but ESPON study 1.1.1 was not used or even quoted. The ‘Prospective Study for the Alpine Space’ has used some ESPON concepts (e.g. concept and identification of MEGAs), but only in a rather marginal way.

### Methodological interaction with ESPON

In methodological terms, **the early transnational spatial**

**vision documents** have all used a mix of rather standardised qualitative and quantitative approaches for generating a better understanding of the particular spatial situation in the respective area. An extensive use of quantitative analyses can be only be observed in some cases (Baltic Sea Area, CADSES), while others did not rely at all on such exercises (NorVision, North-West Europe). Also a wide direct use of more complex/cyclic approaches to ‘forecast’ territorial development can not be observed throughout these early spatial visioning processes. Already more common had been a punctual direct application of such approaches for very specific topics (CADSES, Baltic Sea Region). This general lack of prospective research in transnational spatial visioning processes is accompanied by the fact that they hardly take into consideration/integrate factors of significant change already perceivable in the present period, which tend to become increasingly important in the coming decade. Finally, most transnational spatial vision documents have quite extensively used analytical maps to illustrate the actual spatial situation or future trends (Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North Sea Region), but there was only one cases where the territorial development perspectives had been visualised (North-West Europe).

Since the finalisation of these initial vision documents, the ESPON programme has produced more and more methodological results. This also tends to increase the opportunities for establishing methodological interaction between ESPON and ongoing or newly emerging transnational spatial visioning processes.

In reality, however, such interactions were however quite limited in case of several **vision updating/upgrading processes (North Sea Region, North-West Europe)**. And also in those cases where an interaction can be observed, the outcome ranges from positive (**upgrading processes in the Baltic Sea Region**) to critical and rather negative (**vision elaboration process in the Atlantic Area**).

- In the context of the **Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective**, a critical review of the typology/concept proposed by ESPON study 1.1.1 for describing the morphological nature of polycentricity in Europe<sup>160</sup> and of its relevance for the Atlantic Area has taken place. In fact, the ASDP-project has decided not to use the dif-



ferent concepts of study 1.1.1. Especially with regard an identification of PIAs, it was considered that the method is somehow ‘too mechanical’.<sup>161</sup>

- Within the still ongoing **vision upgrading process in the Baltic Sea Region**, new perspectives do exist for further improving certain methodological aspects of spatial development planning by using the results of several ESPON studies. Of particular importance in this respect are the elaboration and use of specific indicators (ESPON study 2.4.2), the elaboration of typologies for specific areas in the BSR (ESPON Studies 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3) and a better consideration of long-term forecasts (ESPON Studies 1.1.4, 3.2).
- The NorVision updating process in the **North Sea Region** does not significantly refer back to methodological approaches of existing ESPON studies. This is due to the fact that the thematic background studies of NSR were mainly of a qualitative nature. The overall approach of these background studies is however much closer to the one adopted by the ESPON study 3.2 on ‘Spatial scenarios and orientations in relation to the ESDP and cohesion policy’. Although still in the elaboration process, especially the first thematic ESPON-scenarios on energy issues have been used in the INTERREG IIIB NSR-programme workshops organised in the context of the Annual Conference of the held in Middelburg (NL) in June 2005 for raising awareness about this strategic issue.
- Although many ESPON studies had been used as information sources in the spatial vision updating and upgrading process of **North-West Europe** (see above), only a few of them have actually played a role in terms of methodology. In the NWE-background study N°1, the section devoted to ‘morphological aspects of polycentricity’ has used as a starting point the concept of MEGAs as developed by ESPON study 1.1.1. The background study N°2 used the accessibility maps that were produced by ESPON Study 1.2.1 to analyse the discrepancies in accessibility within NWE. Finally, also the ESPON scenarios of study 3.2 were considered especially in relation to increasing energy price and its impacts on transportation systems and flows, to population ageing and to climate change.

The **newly emerging spatial visioning processes (INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean)** do not show a substantial level of methodological interaction with ESPON. This is mostly due to the fact that there is no clear common denominator between the methodological approaches adopted by the different projects (MEDOCC: ‘AMAT project’ & ‘C2M project’, Alpine Space: ‘Prospective Study’) and those of employed by ESPON projects.

There are a number of **reasons that might help explaining this rather modest level of methodological interaction between ESPON and more recent transnational spatial visioning processes:**

- If one compares the methods/approaches/techniques applied in most ESPON studies, it becomes evident that they are not easily and immediately exploitable by those who are elaborating or actualising transnational spatial development visions. Whereas most ESPON studies elaborate complex typologies or use econometric and other types of models to realise projections and quantitative scenarios, the spatial analyses carried out for the preparation of transnational spatial development visions are - with a few exceptions – still much less ambitious or sophisticated in nature. This clearly produces a quite significant discrepancy between the actual needs of practitioners/spatial planners involved in the elaboration or updating/upgrading of transnational spatial development visions and the academic community, which is predominantly involved in the elaboration of ESPON studies.
- Another factor partly explaining the low level of methodological interaction is the terminology used in ESPON studies. It is considered as too abstract and not enough understandable by those involved in the elaboration or updating/upgrading of transnational spatial development visions. This might also be related to the fact that ESPON produces studies only in English, while not all actors involved in field processes are familiar with the English language and especially with its academic terminology (in particular in southern Europe).
- A final limitation is the fact that the hypotheses chosen for the elaboration of scenarios or projections under the various ESPON studies have no common denominator, neither in terms of general orientation nor in terms of

practical aspects such as time horizons or geographical scope. This makes the use of such scenarios particularly difficult during the elaboration or updating/upgrading of transnational spatial development visions.

### Interaction with respect to ESPON policy recommendations

The **early transnational spatial vision documents** all contain specific application strategies that are however quite different from each other. Some of them show a high degree of stakeholder-orientation due to the large number of policy proposals and suggestions for measures/projects made in the documents (CADSES, North Sea Region). Others are clearly characterised by initial weaknesses in this respect, which are however pro-actively addressed during more recent updating/upgrading processes (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe). Due to their early completion, these documents could not actively take into consideration policy recommendations formulated by ESPON studies.

Only the more recent **spatial vision elaboration in the Atlantic Area** and especially the **updating/upgrading processes** in various transnational areas (**Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region, North-West Europe**) had a realistic opportunity to consider the policy recommendations formulated in ESPON studies.

- The elaboration process of the **Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective** has allowed realising a critical review of policy recommendations formulated by the ESPON 1.1.1 study. Compared to the three general levels at which polycentricity should be promoted in Europe (macro-level, meso-level and micro-level), the ASDP-project has clearly opted for the meso-level that is considered the priority focus for a development of polycentricity in the Atlantic Area. With respect to a support for the development of voluntary inter-urban cooperation, the ASDP-project does not consider the focus of ESPON-study 1.1.1 as being very helpful for the Atlantic context (i.e. development of polycentrism mostly at PIA-level<sup>162</sup>).
- Due to the fact that the process of elaborating a **new long-term spatial development concept for the Baltic Sea Region** is just at its very beginning, it is

quite difficult to exactly determine the level of interaction between ESPON-recommendations and the ongoing VASAB upgrading process. If one looks however at the main themes that will be in the centre of attention during this upgrading process<sup>163</sup>, a number of recommendations formulated by the related ESPON studies will certainly be reviewed and examined according to their suitability for the BSR context. Examples are the recommendations formulated in the ESPON studies 1.1.2 ('Urban-rural relations in Europe'), 1.1.3 'Enlargement and Polycentricity'), 1.1.4 'Demographic trends') and 3.2 ('Spatial scenarios').

- In the **North Sea Region**, no basic contradictions can be observed between the operational provisions of the recent NorVision updating process and the recommendations formulated in the various ESPON studies considered. The five thematic studies elaborated for the updating process have obviously been inspired by the results and policy recommendations of the ESPON studies, especially in the field of cooperation. But it must be stressed that recommendations in the thematic NSR-studies are more focussed than those of the ESPON studies, which are normally of a more general nature.
- In case of the **North-West Europe vision updating and upgrading process**, ESPON recommendations were generally considered as too academic and quantitative in order to be directly applied at regional, cross-border or transnational level. They have been used, up to a certain extent, in the thematic studies, to start or to complement the respective analyses of the existing situation, trends and challenges.

Considering the above-said, one can observe that the actual level of interaction between ESPON-policy recommendations and the operational orientation of recent transnational spatial visioning processes is rather modest and ranges from clearly negative (Atlantic Area) to slightly positive (Baltic Sea Area, North Sea Region, North-West Europe).

#### 5.4 Possible interactions between selected cross-border spatial development planning processes and the outcomes of ESPON I studies

All cross-border spatial development concepts examined

have been elaborated and finalised before the start of the ESPON programme. No ‘real-time’ interaction could therefore be established in relation to the provisional outcomes/results of the various ESPON study-projects realised since the start of the programme.

As a consequence, the following paragraphs will briefly review the results achieved under the various cross-border processes and formulate a number of speculative assumptions on possible interactions that could be realised during eventual future updating or revision processes.

## Possible thematic interaction with ESPON

Among the four cross-border spatial development concepts examined, most of them have addressed a coherent and consistent set of issues/themes able to guide spatial development on a cross-border basis (Eurocity White Paper, Euregio Rhein-Waal, PAMINA).

In all cases examined, however, potentials for a closer theme-specific interaction with respect to the current ESPON-results do exist. These interactions could help further deepening themes already addressed by the various cross-border concepts and promote an inclusion of topics that are not yet sufficiently considered (see Overview Table 12).

**Overview Table 12: Potentially beneficial interactions that could be realised with ESPON I**

Area	Deepening of themes already addressed by cross-border concepts	Including new themes not yet sufficiently considered by cross-border concepts
<b>FR/ES:</b> <b>Eurocity</b> <b>White Paper</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept of polycentric development.</li> <li>• Transport related issues.</li> <li>• Demographic evolution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of climate change.</li> <li>• Natural risks/hazards in the coastal area.</li> <li>• Evolution of energy prices.</li> <li>• Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg and Lisbon process.</li> </ul>
<b>DE/PL:</b> <b>Viadrina 2000</b> <b>concept</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The general patterns of the settlement structure.</li> <li>• Potentials in the field of higher education/universities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Polycentrism and the urban-rural relationship.</li> <li>• Research and development and innovation.</li> <li>• Role of Trans-European transport corridors.</li> <li>• The role modern ICT-infrastructure.</li> <li>• Aspects related to accessibility and connectivity.</li> <li>• Natural/cultural heritage potentials.</li> <li>• The existence of potential sources for industrial/natural risks.</li> <li>• Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg &amp; Lisbon process.</li> </ul>
<b>DE/NL:</b> <b>Euregio</b> <b>Rhein-Waal</b> <b>concept</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept of polycentric development and rural-urban partnership.</li> <li>• Transport related issues.</li> <li>• Demographic evolution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Territorial impacts of climate change/related natural risks and hazards.</li> <li>• Evolution of energy prices and impact on transport and the logistics sector.</li> <li>• Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg and Lisbon process.</li> </ul>
<b>DE/FR:</b> <b>PAMINA</b> <b>region concept</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental issues.</li> <li>• Rural-urban partnership.</li> <li>• Transport-related issues.</li> <li>• Demographic evolution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept of polycentric development.</li> <li>• Territorial impacts of climate change/related natural risks and hazards.</li> <li>• Evolution of energy prices.</li> <li>• Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg &amp; Lisbon process.</li> </ul>

## **Possible methodological interaction with ESPON**

In methodological terms, the overall results achieved by the four cross-border spatial development planning processes can be situated between a just satisfactory level of sophistication ('Viadrina 2000' concept, DE/PL) and a medium-high level of sophistication (Eurocity White Paper, Euregio Rhein-Waal, PAMINA). The elaboration of all cross-border spatial development concepts has used a mix of standard-level quantitative and qualitative approaches. They normally combined a partly dynamic (past-present) and a partly static (present-time) analysis of the socio-economic situation with a descriptive SWOT-analysis and a description of basic development perspectives. With the exception of the descriptive trends exploration in the Euregio Rhein-Waal concept (DE/NL), the other initial cross-border planning processes did not make use of complex or cyclic methodological approaches to forecast territorial development (Eurocity White Paper<sup>164</sup>, Euroregion Viadrina, PAMINA).

Also in this context, a stronger interaction with ESPON might help further improving the methodological approaches of future updating/revision activities.

Beneficial impacts can be expected to emerge with respect to further deepening/sharpening of the present-time situation analysis (e.g. use of homogeneous and theme-specific spatial data; use of harmonised territorial typologies/concepts) and especially with respect to a long-term oriented exploration of future socio-economic development trends affecting the cross-border territory.

## **Possible interaction with respect to ESPON policy recommendations**

The three long-term application strategies (Eurocity White Paper, Euregio-Rhein-Waal, PAMINA) are consistent with the territorial assessments and the development goals/policy aims promoted. Only the medium-term application strategy of the 'Viadrina 2000' concept (DE/PL) shows some weaknesses in this respect. All application strategies are generally well-differentiated (i.e. suggestion of a larger number of operational measures and/or project ideas), which allows them to effectively provide key stakeholders with practical orientations for deriving concrete cross-border activities that can be realised in the future. Even if the

range of stakeholders addressed might sometimes vary, this clear and explicit 'stakeholder-orientation' of the concepts was in all cases strongly supported by the fact that during their elaboration process an intensive cross-border participatory approach had been adopted (i.e. brainstorming & discussion events, consensus-building processes).

In relation to this particular issue, the potentials for establishing a fruitful interaction between cross-border spatial development planning and the provisional outcomes/results of ESPON study-projects are yet very limited. This is mainly due to the fact that ESPON-research only generated policy recommendations that are of a too general nature in order to provide an appropriate orientation for practical cross-border activities.

## 6 A screening of INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on aspects related to strategic territorial development planning

### 6.1 Preliminary remarks

The very broad range of topics for which interregional cooperation had been made possible under INTERREG IIIC<sup>165</sup> has certainly favoured the emergence of a number of projects that address aspects more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning.

In the context of these 23 INTERREG IIIC projects that could be identified by a questionnaire survey involving the four programme secretariats, more than 300 different organisations are involved as partners (see Annex XIII). They come from nearby all countries of the European Union (except Luxembourg) and many non-EU-countries (Albania, Croatia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Norway, Switzerland, Romania, Russia, Yugoslavia).

Considering the average size of partners involved in these 23 projects (app. 13 partners), one can see that

- some project-partnerships are significantly above this overall threshold (e.g. AAP2020, CoPraNet, FLAPP, InterMETREX, Sulfanet, POLYMETREX);
- eight projects have a number of partners more or less in line with this average (> 10 partners/< 15 partners: e.g. EARD, INCORD, AWARE, ESIN-IIEP, EWM, FARLAND, PSPE, Euromountains);
- a larger number of projects have project-partnerships that are significantly below the overall average (e.g. ENLoCC, GRIDS, PIMMS, RECORE, DEDEL SDEC, PROGESDEC, RIVERLINKS, Coronas Metropolitanas, MARE).

Compared to the transnational and cross-border spatial development planning processes examined (Chapter 3 and 4), most of these 23 INTERREG IIIC projects do not realise cooperative planning over a contiguous territory. As a consequence, the following sections will mainly focus on screening the main issues addressed and the nature of content-related project activities realised, but also on exploring further cross-fertilisation potentials in relation to other types of cooperative territorial development planning processes.

### 6.2 Main issues addressed by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects

The 23 INTERREG IIIC projects are quite evenly addressing three main issues that are more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning (see Overview Table 13):

- Eight INTERREG IIIC projects **strongly focus on a particular policy** and the themes addressed are mostly related to transport policy, environmental policy (in a wider sense) and to land-use/re-conversion policy.
- Nine INTERREG IIIC projects **strongly focus on specific territorial/geographical characteristics** and the themes are mainly related to the particular situation of coastal zones/islands, metropolitan and urban areas, mountainous areas and coal mining areas.
- Six INTERREG IIIC projects **are dealing with strategic territorial development planning in general**. They are focussing on planning at the level of NUTS II or NUTS III regions and sometimes also aim at promoting new approaches for delivering planning in practice (participatory planning).

The following paragraphs briefly describe a number of projects for each of the above-mentioned main issues, mainly for highlighting that interregional cooperation projects are also able to adequately address themes related to strategic territorial development planning.

#### Projects focussing on a particular policy

The INTERREG IIIC network '**FLAPP**' (**Flood Awareness and Prevention Policy in border areas**) deals with the increased risk of water-related catastrophes (flooding, extreme droughts) as a consequence of the global climate change. This risk is especially worrying for Europe, where growing population density is making complex societies and economies increasingly vulnerable to such natural disasters. By involving those actors responsible for European river systems and their feeders, FLAPP intends producing new strategies for flood management in border areas where flood-related issues are likely to arise and seeks to contribute to common European strategies for flood risk management in relation to the new EU flood water directive.

The INTERREG IIIC network **‘PIMMS’ (Partner Initiatives for the development of mobility management services)** aims at creating more effective ‘mobility management policies’<sup>166</sup> that can be included into comprehensive regional transportation strategies taking into account environmental and social concerns. Due to the fact that the EU places increasing importance on sustainable transportation in urban areas (i.e. to reduce pollution, to cut road deaths, to increase mobility access for non-car users, to improve air quality), information on mobility management is

exchanged among the partners and experiences from successful initiatives are transferred to other regions.

The INTERREG IIIC network **‘SUFALNET’ (Sustainable Use of Former or Abandoned Landfills Network)** focuses on former landfills, which are mostly located near the edge of cities and villages. As these sites take up a considerable amount of space in many EU Member States, they can potentially provide alternative locations for companies, offices, golf courses or ski runs as well as for greenhouse farming and for the cultivation of forests.

**Overview Table 13: Main issues addressed by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects**

Main issues	INTERREG IIIC programme zone		
	East	West	South
<b>Projects strongly focussing on a particular policy</b>	EARD (airport regions)	AWARE (risk management)  ENLoCC (transport & logistic)  FLAPP (water & flood management)  PIMMS (transport)  EWM (waste management)  SULFANET (landfills management)	MARE (transport)
<b>Projects strongly focussing on specific territorial characteristics or geographical situations</b>	AAP 2020 (Adriatic region)	CoPraNet (coastal areas)  ESIN-IIIEP (small islands)  InterMETREX (metropolitan areas)  RECORE (coal mining areas)	Polymetrex (metropolitan areas)  Coronas Metropolitanas (metropolitan areas),  Riverlinks (metropolitan/urban areas)  Euromountains (mountain areas) PROGRESDEC
<b>Projects strongly focussing on strategic territorial development planning in general</b>	INCORD (planning in smaller regions)	FARLAND (land development)  GRIDS (regional planning)  PSPE (participatory spatial planning)	DEDEL SDEC (balanced local development & application of the ESDP)

However, many former landfills tend to pose a risk to the environment and might require a special treatment before an actual re-use (e.g. digging out landfills, hydraulic engineering). Against this background, SULFANET aims at exchanging information, knowledge and best practice experiences among the different partners with respect to a redevelopment and aftercare of former landfill sites. The project shall also enable the partners to deal more effectively with the environmental risks posed by these former landfills and to help finding new uses for these sites, thus increasing the efficient use of building space.

### Projects focusing on specific territorial/geographical characteristics

The individual INTERREG IIIC project **‘AAP 2020’ (Adriatic Action Plan 2020)** wants to explore how (economic) development can be reconciled with sustainability and how sustainability policies can be integrated into the political and administrative management practices of regions and cities along the Adriatic coast. At date, these actors are faced with conflicting trends: on the one hand, there is wide recognition of the importance of environmental action; and on the other hand, sustainability policies are often implemented at random, without co-ordination, limited in time and space and frequently confined to conservation actions. ‘AAP 2020’ is based on an existing network, the Forum of Adriatic and Ionian Cities & Towns<sup>167</sup>, and identified the following overall objectives: to exchange experiences on policies, instruments or administrative procedures, to identify and disseminate best practices and to jointly implement improved policies for local sustainable development. The final results will be formalised in an Adriatic Action Plan that contains common strategies, objectives, actions and commitments with respect to implementation. The action plan will be promoted widely across Adriatic and Ionian cities.

By launching the INTERREG IIIC projects **InterMETREX** and **PolyMETREXplus**, the Network of European Metropolitan Regions and Areas (METREX)<sup>168</sup> generally aims at practically addressing strategic ESDP-objectives and policy options that make reference to metropolitan areas. In order to support the achievement of a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development in Europe, the network project **InterMETREX** aims at improving metropolitan spatial planning and development practice. By

improving the competence and processes of existing spatial planning, one means is created for more effective metropolitan governance that is capable of addressing long-term challenges such as urban sprawl, economic development, social cohesion, integrated land use and transportation. The network project **PolyMETREXplus** aims at giving territorially representative metropolitan response to the ESDP policy options relating to ‘Global Integration Zones’ (GIZs), polycentricity and complementarity. The overall objectives are to contribute to effective polycentric metropolitan relationships based on complementarity and cooperation as well as to highlight the metropolitan dimension in European-level spatial development planning (i.e. by producing a ‘Framework for a Polycentric Metropolitan Europe’, a related Action Plan and a Polycentric Practice Benchmark).

The INTERREG IIIC network **‘ESIN-IIIEP’ (European Small Islands’ Network Inter-Island Exchange Project)** was initiated by the European Small Islands Network, which is an umbrella organisation established by island representatives from six European countries.<sup>169</sup> Small islands share a pressing concern to retain a minimum year round resident population so as to sustain even existing levels of economic, social and cultural development. The overall goal of ESIN-IIIEP is to promote the sustainable economic, social and cultural development of small islands. By promoting the transfer of information, ideas and experience among islanders, professionals and policy-makers concerned with the future of small islands, the project aims to devise models of sustainable development for small islands throughout Europe and to identify specific policy measures that could be taken into account at national and EU-level.

### Projects dealing with strategic territorial development planning in general

The individual INTERREG IIIC project **‘INCORD’ (Integrated Concepts for Regional Development)** focuses on the promotion of bottom-up oriented and integrated regional development concepts, which shall help facing structural problems caused in part by the transition process in Eastern Germany and the new EU-Member States (e.g. co-ordinated and targeted planning processes for the construction of essential basic infrastructure, the redevelopment of old industrial and military areas or for

tourist development projects). The overall objective of INCORD is the establishment of a targeted interregional transfer of know-how and exchange of experience with respect to integrated regional development concepts in border regions and to improve their application through the development of transferable guidelines, good practice examples and recommendations. Sub-objectives include the optimisation of institutional structures for regional development and an improvement of the efficiency of EU-Structural Fund support.

The INTERREG IIC network **‘GRIDS’ (Best practice guidelines for instruments of regional development and spatial planning in an enlarged EU)** has the overall objective to examine good practice in relation to regional development strategies and spatial planning documents in an enlarged EU. Guiding investments and achieving balanced growth in a sustainable manner is an important and on-going issue across the whole of the EU, wherefore the preparation of regional development strategies and spatial plans for EU regions has attracted increasing interest in recent years. Based upon previous EU-initiatives on spatial development planning (ESDP, INTERREG IIC projects) that identified principles of good practice in preparing regional development strategies, the GRIDS project involves a sharing of good (and bad) practice and a production of best practice guidelines for the preparation of such documents.

The individual INTERREG IIC project **‘PSPE’ (Participatory Spatial Planning in Europe)** believes that change in both public spaces and in the area of sustainable regional development is only possible through the involvement and responsibility of citizens, social organisations and private enterprises from within that region. Given the complexity of spatial themes and the need for citizen empowerment, communication represents one of the most crucial elements of participatory planning. However, the knowledge and ability needed to communicate effectively and to develop realistic scenarios with an understanding of their impact on landscapes and citizens is currently insufficient and underused. Against this wider background, PSPE aims at improving spatial information exchanges in participatory regional planning through a renewal and accelerated transfer of interactive approaches that make use of geo-visualisation. By practically linking innovations relating to regional planning, e-government and ICT, the added-value of this operation is to make communication/

geo-visualisation approaches feasible and accessible in diverse regional and cultural settings.

### **6.3 Main focus of content-related activities realised by the 23 INTERREG IIC projects**

The 23 INTERREG IIC projects combine simultaneously different types of content-related activities, wherefore their overall focus can only be summarised in an indicative way (see Overview Table 14):

- **A clear majority of projects** focuses their project activities on an improvement of existing planning approaches, an elaboration of new model strategies/support tools for decision making as well as on an improvement of administrative planning procedures and policy instruments.
- Only a few projects concentrate their activities on a promotion of participatory planning processes and on an improvement of stakeholder involvement/consultation.

Here again, a number of project examples are described for each of the above-mentioned activity-types in order to highlight how interregional cooperation can contribute improving strategic territorial development planning.

#### **Improvement of planning methods**

In order to improve metropolitan spatial planning and development, the partners of the network project **Inter-METREX** have carried out self-assessments on their current planning practice against the ‘METREX Practice Benchmark 2003’ during five analysis workshops.<sup>170</sup> The findings and conclusions were presented at a Synthesis Workshop in Barcelona (October 2004)<sup>171</sup>. The related discussion have identified the value of explicit goals for metropolitan planning processes and highlighted that they should be coherently linked to the concept of Functional Urban Regions and Areas. The workshop conclusions have also been incorporated in a modified ‘METREX Practice Benchmark 2005’. The final outcome of the project, entitled the ‘European Practice Benchmark’, will present the findings and conclusions of all 32 partners on what constitutes effective policy and practice in spatial development planning at metropolitan level and on how the ESDP objectives can be best achieved. The overall findings from the project will be presented and disseminated at the



**Overview Table 14: Main focus of content-related activities realised by the 23 INTERREG IIC projects**

Focus	INTERREG IIC programme zone *)		
	East	West	South
<b>Improvement of existing planning approaches (quantitative/qualitative methods, forecasting approaches).</b>	INCORD	CoPraNet ESIN-IIEP EWM FARLAND FLAPP GRIDS InterMETREX PIMMS PSPE RECORE SULFANET	Coronas Metropolitanas Euromountains Polymetrex Riverlinks
<b>Elaboration of new model strategies and/or new tools supporting planning and decision making.</b>	AAP2020 EARD INCORD	AWARE CoPraNet ENLoCC ESIN-IIEP EWM FARLAND FLAPP GRIDS InterMETREX PIMMS PSPE RECORE SULFANET	Coronas Metropolitanas Euromountains Polymetrex Riverlinks
<b>Improvement of administrative planning procedures and policy instruments.</b>	INCORD AAP2020	AWARE CoPraNet ENLoCC ESIN-IIEP EWM FARLAND FLAPP GRIDS InterMETREX PIMMS PSPE RECORE SULFANET	DEDEL SDEC PROGRESDEC Riverlinks Coronas Metropolitanas Euromountains MARE
<b>Promotion of participatory planning, improvement of stakeholder involvement/consultation.</b>	–	PSPE AWARE	Riverlinks

\*) Possible double mentioning of projects, due to the mix of content-related activities.

METREX Conference in Szczecin (2006) and data will also be made available online on the METREX website. The project also intends creating an e-Atlas, which features extensive information on the specific context of Inter-METREX partners (i.e. national planning contexts; political, social, economic and environmental characteristics of the urban regions; future planning and development issues; relevant contact details). This web-based tool will also enable other regions to identify potential networking partners and thus promote networking between metropolitan regions and areas.

The INTERREG IIC network project **PolyMETREXplus** is realised through a 'planning component' and a 'practice component', involving metropolitan regions/areas from across the EU as well as from third countries. (a) The planning component will realise four interregional analysis workshops during 2004 to explore potentials for polycentric metropolitan relationships on a geographical basis.<sup>172</sup> In 2005, a synthesis workshop is organised to integrate previous findings/conclusions (Towards European Urban Balance) and two sectoral workshops will be held.<sup>173</sup> This component concludes with another synthesis workshop to integrate the findings and conclusions of all previous workshops into the final output, the 'Framework for a Polycentric Metropolitan Europe' and its related 'Action Plan for metropolitan clusters, corridors or coastal areas'. The result of the Framework/Action Plan will be the metropolitan response to the three key policy options promoted by the ESDP. (b) On ground of these previous outputs, the practice component will select a number of representative social, economic, transportation and environmental networking activities interregional networking activities (RINAs) that are realised during the years 2006-07. In addition, a 'Polycentric Practice Benchmark' will be produced. The RINAs and the Benchmark shall demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of a polycentric approach.

### **Elaboration of new support tools for planning and decision making**

The activities of the INTERREG IIC project '**AAP 2020**' (**Adriatic Action Plan 2020**) mainly focus on producing and implementing procedural, communication and marketing tools, which were defined during six technical workshops. They will help defining a common space and improve administrative/commercial relationships between

Adriatic partners as well as environmental and quality-of-life standards. Firstly, a set of new common tools is created for public sector institutions that help analysing/evaluating local systems and orientating local sustainable development. These tools include environmental and social reporting alongside a number of common indicators (Adriatic Common Indicators, ACI), environmental management systems (EMAS-Iso) and an integrated sustainability accounting procedure (Adriatic Sustainable Accounting Procedure, ASAP). Secondly, a Sustainable Innovation Market (SIM) is created for private sector operators to help disseminating and exchanging good practices and procedures. Beyond this, the project organises annual Adriatic Forum meetings<sup>174</sup> and launched The AAP 2020 web platform, providing support and utilities to the partners and to any kind of users. After the second Adriatic Forum in 2004, local initiatives of different kinds have started. Based upon the elaborated tool-kit, each local authority chooses appropriate tools depending on the specific situation and sets its own implementation agenda by using common methodologies. In a number of pilot sites the full range of tools and procedures will be applied and tested. The final results will be summarised in a program (Adriatic Action Plan 2020), which includes common strategies and actions to be implemented before the year 2020.

The INTERREG IIC network '**FLAPP**' (**Flood Awareness and Prevention Policy in border areas**) is pooling past experience and best practice to produce new strategies for flood management, balancing safety as well as social and spatial impacts. This pooling consists of a vast data collection exercise, which is backed by conferences, meetings and study visits. The project also develops an online database that is accessible via the project website, which the partners can use to access information on best practice. This database is the platform for a best practice manual that is to be published in 2006. The network project will have a lasting impact on Europe's water management policies, as the lessons learned from FLAPP will be geared towards the participating regions and those developing the EU flood water directive.

### **Improvement of administrative planning instruments/procedures**

The individual INTERREG IIC project '**INCORD**' (Integrated Concepts for Regional Development) organises an intense

exchange of experience and mutual learning process between border regions in old and new EU Member States with respect to integrated development concepts (IDCs). The project is expected to enhance the capacity of decision makers and professionals in regional or local institutions with respect to an elaboration of IDCs and to provide specific information, expertise and guidelines for promoting the application of these innovative regional development instruments. Between July 2004 and the beginning of 2005, first steps of this process were already realised (i.e. exchange of experience on regional development processes; discussion of the role of Regional Development Agencies; discussion of structure implementing the EU Structural Funds policy; definition of IDC-pilot projects; preparation of regional SWOT-analyses). By applying these IDCs, the project will also provide recommendations for more efficient regional development structures and a more targeted use of EU-funds in border regions. Through all of the planned activities, the project will generate multiple benefits for sustainable and balanced regional development and help reducing existing regional disparities.

The individual INTERREG IIIC project **'EWM' (European Waste Management)** is developing innovative solutions for aspects related to waste disposals as part of a wider ambition to create environmentally friendly and cost effective regional waste management systems (i.e. exploring ways to decrease the amount of waste dumped in landfill sites; increasing the amount of waste that is collected separately and reused; introducing new strategies on a regional scale; and building public acceptance of new waste disposal techniques). EWM is organising a series of meetings, exchange visits and workshops to produce 150 ideas for regional waste management practices and 15 proposals for improving practices in specific regions. The operation is also developing a manual on how to manage landfills, a number of feasibility studies for new solutions to regional problems, an action plan on how to deal with public resistance to new waste disposal techniques, a cost-benefit analysis comparing waste collection practices, proposals for how to deal with animal waste as well as for improved methods of waste composition analysis and studies of waste management systems. With the intended improvement of regional waste management practices, EWM will reduce the production of waste in partner regions in the long term and help to reduce carbon monoxide levels across Europe.

## Promotion of participatory planning/ stakeholder involvement

The INTERREG IIIC project **'PSPE' (Participatory Spatial Planning in Europe)** is improving knowledge in the fields of government communication, participatory decision-making and spatial planning, geo-information science and urban architecture/landscape design. The partners have identified technologies for generating high-impact presentations of GIS data and developed techniques to ensure that they are integrated into the planning process. These findings and proposals have then been put into practice in four cases studies in order to apply, adjust and evaluate the approaches in current participatory regional planning. These case studies allowed to develop best practices and to transfer/share know-how, tools and experiences, but also to realise an exchange of experts on visualisation and communication in participatory planning between the partners. Project activities finally include the creation of a best practice database on ground of shared experience and the use of newsletters/a website to keep Europe's regional planning community informed on the project findings.

### 6.4 The achievements of the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on issues related to strategic territorial development planning

The **main issues addressed** by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects examined are all of relevance for strategic territorial development planning.

- The themes referring to specific policies and to particular territorial characteristics/geographical situations are generally mentioned in the ESDP, but in most cases the interregional projects are dealing with them on ground of a more needs-oriented approach (i.e. transport related themes, environment, metropolitan areas, coastal zones & islands, mountainous areas).
- Also the interregional projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning in general demonstrate quite well how territorial planning contributes to improve policy-making at various levels and how innovative approaches can be developed that help developing further this particular means for managing socio-economic and environmental change.

The **content-related activities** realised by these INTER-

REG III C projects are generally quite diverse. Various types of activities are used in combination in order to achieve the overall goal of the respective project.

- Interregional exchanges of experience and a dissemination of good practice are very frequently used for improving local/regional planning methods and for jointly elaborating model strategies or new tools supporting planning and decision making.
- Several projects also involve a transfer of planning-knowledge and good practice techniques or a realisation of pilot projects, mostly for improving planning procedures/policy instruments and for upgrading planning capacities/skills in the participating areas.

Seen as a whole, these interregional activities do not fundamentally differ from those that are already (can be) used in the context of transnational or cross-border cooperation projects. Therefore, interregional cooperation only represents an additional means for illustrating how aspects related to strategic territorial development planning can be addressed in a cooperative manner.

## 7 Future perspectives and new ideas for the follow-up programmes of INTERREG, ESPON and INTERACT after 2006

### 7.1 Better cross-fertilisation between the different types of cooperative territorial development planning and a re-oriented focus of future ESPON-research

Until very recently, the territorial knowledge bases upon which transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts have been elaborated were often relatively weak. Many of the early initiatives faced sometimes considerable limitations in the availability/comparability of spatial data and did not use prospective research for generating future-oriented information and knowledge on territorial development. But also more recent processes that aim at elaborating new transnational spatial development visions and at updating/upgrading already existing documents in some transnational areas clearly show a necessity to integrate more efficiently this type of strategic and future-oriented information. General progress in this direction will help increasing the value, interest, credibility and policy-relevance of transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts.

Since the effective start of the ESPON I programme, more and more research outputs are produced (e.g. ESPON study-projects, thematic maps, ESPON-data base, etc.). They generate for the first time a comprehensive and more homogenous basis of spatial knowledge in Europe.

Yet, a number of limitations and inconsistencies inherent to the current ESPON I research process have quite strongly restricted a wider practical use of these results in the context of transnational/cross-border spatial development planning.

- Although the results of ESPON study-projects are generally quite useful for transnational and cross-border spatial development planning initiatives, they are also characterised by a number of important limitations. A particular weakness of the present ESPON study results is the lack of systematic research on drivers and factors of causality related to territorial change. The only drivers of change taken into account are those concerning policy options, but all factors of change not explicitly related to policies (for instance changes in the

values, behaviours and ways of life of the European society, factors underlying migration patterns or the location of businesses, technological evolution etc.) have largely been ignored. This lack of available knowledge on causality relations and on their evolution over time has also severely restricted the elaboration of long-term scenarios under ESPON study 3.2, which in theory had to rely upon previous ESPON works and to integrate their results.<sup>175</sup>

- Problems with respect to the availability/comparability of spatial data also underline the importance of the ESPON data base, which can be a very useful tool for cooperative spatial development planning. In fact, the data base covers a wide range of themes that largely correspond to the data and indicators used by the most ambitious transnational spatial visioning processes and cross-border spatial development planning initiatives. However, the ESPON data base was unfortunately not available/accessible when the existing transnational spatial visions were elaborated or recently updated/upgraded and newly prepared.

It can be concluded from the above-made remarks that numerous potentialities do exist for creating a more intense interaction and a stronger cross-fertilisation between future ESPON-based territorial research and transnational/cross-border spatial development planning under the forthcoming Objective 3 programmes. In the new Structural Funds programming period (2007-13), these potentialities should be taken seriously.

Steps in this direction should, on the one hand, take into consideration more carefully the specific needs of transnational and cross-border cooperation areas. On the other hand, this also requires a re-orientation of the territorial research focus under a future ESPON programme in order to create a more demand-oriented dimension that produces well-targeted outputs corresponding to these 'external' needs.

### Cross-fertilisation between ESPON and transnational cooperation

Our analysis in section 5.3 of this study has shown that a certain level of interaction on themes, methods and policy recommendations has already started to take place

between ESPON I and the various transnational spatial visioning processes.

Based upon these analytical results and a review of responses to our questionnaire survey, a number of mutual cross-fertilisation potentials can be identified, which also suggest to slightly re-orientate the focus of territorial research under a future ESPON-programme (see Overview Table 15).

- Due to the thematically broad focus of ESPON I research, the direct needs of individual transnational spa-

tial visioning processes do not suggest a significant widening of the thematic scope of future ESPON research. Cross-fertilisation potentials mostly exist with respect to future transnational spatial visioning processes (i.e. a better consideration of ESPON I themes), but also in relation to continuing in-depth research on themes already covered by ESPON I (i.e. further refinement of existing research; realisation of complementary research on specific issues such as polycentric development). Beyond these immediate needs existing throughout the different areas, there are however several new themes important for transnational spatial visioning processes

**Overview Table 15: Cross-fertilisation potentials between ESPON and transnational spatial visioning processes**

Area	ESPON → Transnational spatial visioning processes	Transnational spatial visioning processes → ESPON
<b>Atlantic Area</b>	<p>A future Objective 3 programme should include a number of issues addressed by ESPON I that are not yet sufficiently addressed in spatial visioning (i.e. linkages needed between urban and rural areas; demographic evolution; evolution of energy prices; territorial dimension of climate change and natural hazards).</p> <p>Due to the specific focus of the 'Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective', only a few potentials do exist for including additional themes related to the Lisbon and Gothenburg agendas ('integration of problem groups into the labour market', 'socio-cultural issues').</p>	<p>The specific approach adopted by the ASDP-project could inspire future follow-up research of ESPON on polycentric development to review specific aspects (i.e. the range of themes addressed, the quantitative approaches used for their assessment, the area-specific classification developed, the policy recommendations formulated).</p> <p>Due to the critical review of ESPON study 1.1.1, future ESPON research should also better address 'zone-specific issues' that do not coincide with political or administrative boundaries in such a way as to identify them otherwise than through existing administrative structures/procedures.</p>
<b>Baltic Sea Region</b>	<p>Due to the already quite extensive use of ESPON I studies during the first steps of the vision upgrading process (inspiring mostly the thematic analysis, but partly also the methodology), various potentials for enriching the future upgrading process after 2006 will certainly exist.</p>	<p>Future ESPON research should focus on urban networking (transnational city clustering) i.e. functional polycentricity and accessibility down-scaled to the level of pan-European regions. For example, the current concept of potential accessibility does not fit into the BSR needs since it is driven/biased by the population density factor and does not contain ICT component.</p> <p>Future ESPON research should focus on the complex development of specific transnational areas (e.g. global integration zones) or on specific themes that are of importance in those areas (e.g. key technologies as regional development factor, risk assessment and mitigation; managing/governance of larger cross-border areas, functional transformation to development zones etc.)</p>

Area	ESPON → Transnational spatial visioning processes	Transnational spatial visioning processes → ESPON
<b>North Sea Region</b>	<p>A number of themes identified by ESPON should be more intensively addressed in a future Objective 3 programme. These are mainly the demographic evolution (cross-cutting theme, but with limited transnational added value), the acceleration of the globalisation process (cross-cutting theme) and the digital divide (cross-cutting theme with limited transnational added value).</p>	<p>The direct use of a number of issues addressed by ESPON 3.2 scenarios during the updating process of the NSR spatial vision shows that long-term oriented prospective research and scenario development can be of use in transnational spatial visioning activities.</p> <p>Improvement of policy recommendations formulated, in order to create a closer link to the specificity of the transnational area.</p>
<b>North-West Europe</b>	<p>A future Objective 3 programme should include/better address issues such as demographic evolution (population ageing, immigration, socio-cultural issues) and the increase of energy price.</p>	<p>Adaptation of methodological approaches adopted by ESPON research and improvement of the policy recommendations formulated (too academic and quantitative), in order to create a broader basis for mutual understanding with this spatial visioning process.</p>
<b>CADSES</b>	<p>Based upon ESPON I findings, a review of some strategic topics in the existing vision documents (and even at the level of reduced CADSES sub-areas) could be realised in case of a potential updating/upgrading process (e.g. concept of polycentric development, rural-urban partnership, transport-related issues; demographic evolution, environmental issues) and better integrating a number of other themes not yet sufficiently addressed (e.g.; impact of climate change/related natural risks and hazards, evolution of energy prices; themes related to the Lisbon and Gothenburg agendas).</p> <p>Some of the methodological approaches of ESPON could be used and reviewed in case of a potential updating/upgrading process: typologies elaborated with respect polycentric development (project 1.1.1), the analytical approaches used for exploring urban-rural relations (project 1.1.2) and the long-term/very long-term scenarios elaborated for themes particularly important for future territorial development (projects 1.1.4 and 3.2).</p>	<p>The INTERREG IIIB projects that are a follow-up of previous spatial visioning projects do represent interesting potentials:</p> <p>The PlaNet CenSe project module ‘European Spatial Planning Gateway’ (ESP GATEWAY), establishes an expert dialogue that aims at transferring information and knowledge from the EU-level to the national levels, i.e. the application of ESPON-approaches and ESDP-concepts by countries in central and south-east Europe.</p> <p>The conceptual and methodological component of the ESTIA-SPOSE project entitled ‘Territorial Indicators System’ (TIS) aims at constructing an integrated territorial indicators system that is adapted to the south-east European situation and mainly based upon incoming results of the ESPON-programme.</p>
<b>MEDOCC</b>	<p>Although significant expectations are placed on ESPON, the present outputs only meet very partially these expectations (English language only, non-accessibility to the ESPON data base).</p> <p>Future follow-up research in relation to ESPON study 1.1.1 and in relation to other existing policy impact studies could be exploited further and considered in a future spatial vision document.</p>	<p>Adaptation of methodological approaches adopted by ESPON research (less theoretical and academic approaches), in order to create a broader basis for mutual understanding with this newly emerging spatial visioning process.</p>

Area	ESPON → Transnational spatial visioning processes	Transnational spatial visioning processes → ESPON
<b>Alpine Space</b>	Follow-up activities to the 'Prospective Study for the Alpine Space' could take into consideration a number of topics addressed by ESPON: impacts of climate change and related natural risks and hazards, or the demographic evolution.	Adaptation of methodological approaches adopted by ESPON research in order to create a broader basis for mutual understanding with this newly emerging spatial visioning process.  The elaboration of the prospective 'visions scenarios' for the Alpine Space could inspire future prospective research/scenario development activities of ESPON.

that have so far not yet been properly tackled in the context of ESPON I (e.g. housing and social-spatial issues, functional aspects of urban systems).

- Due to the current but rather modest level of methodological interaction between ESPON I and transnational spatial visioning processes, a number of cross-fertilisation potentials do exist that should be better exploited in the years to come. Future ESPON research should in general adapt or refine its methodological approaches (where possible) to create a broader basis for mutual understanding with ongoing transnational spatial visioning processes. For some issues, inspiration for methodological improvements or new approaches can be taken from recent spatial visioning processes (Atlantic Area) or specific INTERREG IIIB projects that relate to ESPON-activities (CADSES). Prospective research and scenario development is also an aspect where mutual cross-fertilisation is expected to be particularly fruitful in the future. And also here, recent transnational spatial development planning initiatives (Alpine Space) might provide some inspiration for launching new prospective research/scenario-development activities under a future ESPON programme.
- The most significant scope for improvement can certainly be found in the context of ESPON research conclusions and policy recommendations. Future ESPON study-projects should always be required to complement general research by an area-specific focus (i.e. review of the issue addressed for each transnational cooperation area) and to formulate also area-specific conclusions/policy recommendations. This would significantly help supporting ongoing transnational spatial visioning processes and strengthen a more demand-

oriented production of practically usable outputs.

- Short-term cross-fertilisation potentials not directly related to one of the above-mentioned issues also exist between ESPON I research and existing transnational spatial visioning processes on the one hand and the new Objective 3 programmes for transnational cooperation on the other. The transnational operational programmes covering the programming period 2007-13 should generally be required to include a robust and forward-looking territorial development strategy. The strategy should be built upon the outcomes of existing transnational spatial visioning processes (where existing) and also reflect useful results of the current ESPON I research. Such an approach would not only give an opportunity for strengthening the political dimension of transnational spatial development visions<sup>176</sup>, it could also contribute to initiate new spatial visioning processes in areas not yet active in this field.

### **Cross-fertilisation between ESPON and cross-border cooperation**

One can assume that all of the existing cross-border spatial development concepts did not consider ESPON study results during the elaboration process (even not the most recent ones), which is mainly due to their effective finalisation before the start of the ESPON I programme. This assumption is also confirmed by the review of the four concepts examined more in-depth in the context of this study.

Yet, this lacking interaction does not mean that there are no immediate cross-fertilisation potentials that could already be established on ground of the current ESPON I results:



- Important cross-fertilisation potentials exist especially with respect to the themes for which the current situation and future development trends in cross-border areas are analysed. On ground of ESPON I results, the cross-border spatial development concepts examined could further deepen the analysis of themes already addressed by these documents. In addition, they should definitively include a number of ESPON I themes that are often not sufficiently explored by their territorial assessments (e.g. polycentrism and the urban-rural relationship; research & development and innovation; role of Trans-European transport corridors; role of modern ICT-infrastructure; aspects related to accessibility and connectivity; natural/cultural heritage potentials; existence of potential sources for industrial/natural risks; territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg and Lisbon process; very long-term evolution of demography and energy prices).
- Also in methodological terms, a number of cross-fertilisation potentials do already exist with respect to ESPON I results. It would be of particular interest for cross-border spatial development planning to review the ESPON-typology elaborated with respect polycentric development (ESPON study 1.1.1) and the analytical approaches used for exploring urban-rural relations (ESPON study 1.1.2) against the area-specific context. In addition, cross-border spatial development planning should also consider more intensively the results of very long-term scenarios elaborated for a number of themes (in particular ESPON studies 1.1.4 & 3.2). This could help increasing the prospective/future-oriented dimension of cross-border territorial development in the respective cross-border spatial development concepts.

A more intense mutual interaction and cross-fertilisation under a future ESPON II programme (2007-13) will however require a quite significant re-orientation of the focus of European-wide prospective territorial research:

- Future ESPON-research needs to carry out more comprehensive and comparative in-depth research on cross-border areas in Europe. This can be justified by the drastically changing framework conditions for the EU's territorial cohesion after 2006, which are mainly a result of the subsequent steps in the EU-Eastern enlargement (EU 25 ↓ EU 27).<sup>177</sup> This research should focus on 15-20 spatially contiguous and larger 'cross-border cooperation zones', which each cover various future Objective 3 programmes.
- Future ESPON-research should also realise complementary quantitative cross-border flows analyses for various aspects (e.g. transit traffic, intra-area traffic, cross-border labour market commuting, cross-border exchange of goods and services, etc.), in order to increase the European knowledge base on these issues. In order to be needs-oriented, the exact scope and content of these flow analyses should be determined after a consultation of European border regions
- In addition, it must be ensured in the future that the ESPON data base also contains a sufficiently diversified and homogenous set of spatial data at the lowest territorial levels in order to meet the specific needs of cross-border spatial development planning (i.e. availability of comparable border region-specific data; availability of aggregated data for cross-border areas).
- Finally, future ESPON-research activities not directly relating to cross-border cooperation should however be asked to briefly reflect upon a potential cross-border dimension of the theme/issue addressed and – if there is such a dimension – formulate specific conclusions/policy recommendations in this respect.

### **Cross-fertilisation between interregional cooperation and other types of cooperative spatial development planning**

Our screening of the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on issues related to spatial development planning shows that mutual cross-fertilisation potentials do exist with respect to future transnational and cross-border cooperation, but also in relation to territorial research under a future ESPON II programme.

The INTERREG IIIC projects addressing issues related to specific policies and to particular territorial characteristics/geographical situations show a number of cross-fertilisation potentials. They exist in relation to future transnational and cross-border cooperation, as only minor adaptations are necessary to carry out similar project activities in areas that share similar problems/needs. They also exist with

respect to a future ESPON follow-up programme, as some of the policy- and context-related issues can serve as a starting point for launching new and more comprehensive European-wide research that aims at exploring further their territorial dimension and at revealing future needs to be addressed throughout Europe (e.g. waste management and re-use of former landfills; role of small islands; role of and territorial challenges in airport regions).

With respect to the INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning in general show interesting cross-fertilisation potentials. Again, only minor adaptations are necessary to carry out similar projects in the context of transnational and cross-border cooperation that aim at improving existing cooperative planning processes or at promoting cooperative territorial planning at a smaller scale. These activities could be backed by additional ESPON-research activities that would compare best practice at a European-wide scale and formulate recommendations in this respect.

## **7.2 Strengthening the usefulness of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts and fostering ‘mental ownership’**

Transnational spatial development visions and cross-border spatial development concepts can play a very useful role in the wider context of public policies. Examples for beneficial effects with a significant added value that can be initiated by such documents are that they

- help widening territorial thinking, mainly by considering cross-thematic problems, challenges and development potentials that are jointly shared in the cooperation area;
- improve the long-term orientation of sustainable spatial development, mainly by considering a wider range of driving forces and their probable evolution in the future that may have significant territorial impacts/cause new territorial challenges;
- improve mutual understanding of spatial development processes, instruments and institutions in the various countries and regions of the cooperation area and strengthen the feeling of solidarity between the countries and regions concerned;
- complement domestic public policies in the field of territorial development by a cooperative component, mainly through bundling the energy and development potentials of various national/regional authorities involved;
- become a reference document for strategic territorial development planning at state/regional/local levels and make it possible to introduce a European/transnational/cross-border dimension into national/regional/local spatial development plans and strategies that is often missing up to now;
- provide an enlarged territorial reference framework for the implementation of sectoral policies in the cooperation area and allow evaluating the wider territorial effects of sector-specific policies at state, regional and local levels;
- contribute to the concretisation of the ESDP principles and make a contribution to highlight the territorial dimension of widely adopted EU-policy strategies (i.e. the Lisbon and Göteborg strategies);
- make effective contributions to the content of new EU-supported transnational cooperation programmes and help generating project ideas and/or support future project selection processes;
- contribute to the setting up of sustainable networks of planning professionals in the cooperation area.

In order to realise this added value, transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents must at least fulfil simultaneously three basic functions. They should bring together spatially relevant data and knowledge, they should present a ‘spatial policy programme’ and they should provide an ‘application framework’ for actually translating spatial development goals and policy aims into concrete action. The preconditions for fulfilling these functions are normally laid by carrying out adequate planning activities and by applying the most appropriate spatial research methods and techniques.

But our assessment has clearly highlighted that the usefulness of transnational and cross-border spatial development planning documents is not only determined by the

quality or sophistication of this scientific/technical dimension. **Transnational and cross-border spatial development planning can not take place in a scientific no man's land where the final outcomes (i.e. visions/concepts) are elaborated without directly considering complex and sometimes even contradictory socio-economic or political interests.**

On the contrary, **a continuous participatory planning process** that facilitates interaction and exchange with a variety of area-specific key stakeholders needs to be created. Such a process helps stimulating the adhesion of these actors to the final product of the planning process and significantly increases the probability that elements of these planning documents are subsequently implemented. The above-said also suggests that a turning point has been reached from which onwards the issue of a **stronger political backing** for transnational/cross-border spatial planning documents needs to be considered more seriously by those promoting cooperative planning processes. Political debates on transnational/cross-border documents and their formal validation do not intend to change their indicative nature. An improved political backing 'only' aims at adding-on a wider administrative and political credibility to these documents, which in turn contributes to further strengthen their actual usefulness.

These remarks are particularly relevant for ongoing and newly emerging transnational spatial visioning processes, where progress in this direction still needs to be made: With respect to the issue of participation, it has been shown that the preparation and elaboration of early transnational spatial development visions was in most cases realised through a 'top down approach' (e.g. Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North-West Europe). More recently, however, one can observe a trend towards increasingly involving a wider range of area-specific key stakeholders at an early stage in vision elaboration processes (Atlantic Area) and in ongoing updating/upgrading processes (Baltic Sea Area, North-West Europe, North Sea Region). This clearly demonstrates that the time is over when vision documents had been realised by relatively small circles composed of planning professionals and academic experts without any significant participation of other actors from the 'real world'. Compared to this, one has to observe that the overall political backing provided to transnational spatial visioning processes is still very weak. Several of the ini-

tial transnational spatial vision documents have not been subject to a wider political debate and were also not politically validated (North-West Europe, CADSES including ESTIA). Only in a few cases, however, spatial vision documents were at least discussed in specific cooperative structures composed of political representatives from the respective regions (North Sea Region, Atlantic Area) and in one case even formally adopted by the ministerial authorities of the respective states involved (Baltic Sea Area). And finally, again with the noteworthy exception of the Baltic Sea Region, Ministers responsible for spatial planning or their Directors General have never met in all other transnational cooperation areas during one decade of existing INTERREG-based transnational cooperation (1996-99, 2000-06).

But also in those transnational or cross-border areas where cooperative territorial development planning does not yet exist, the above-made remarks should be considered carefully if the intention exists to move forward in this direction. Compared to the northern half of Europe, the wider Mediterranean hemisphere represents however a quite specific case where the overall situation is often more complicated. In many of these countries, a culture of comprehensive territorial development planning is not yet widely developed and a more solid acceptance for horizontal and spatially-oriented policies still needs to be created/further enhanced. In the south, also the territorial impacts of uncoordinated sectoral policies are significantly higher than in the north of Europe. Finally, also the intensity of general cooperation at all levels has so far been significantly lower in southern Europe compared to other areas, which of course is also reflected in the very low level of cooperative territorial development planning.

As a consequence of the above-said, **it is of primary importance that those promoting cooperative territorial planning processes pro-actively foster from the beginning on 'mental ownership'**. In the context of already existing transnational and cross-border spatial development planning processes, practice allows distinguishing between two levels of 'mental ownership':

- At a **first level**, a kind of **'narrow mental ownership'** in relation to these strategic planning documents is mostly developed by those who actually promote and animate the cooperation, i.e. the group of national,

regional and local representatives directly involved in the process. Within their respective administrative and political context, however, these key players are very often not extremely powerful (i.e. lacking intervention competencies or financial means). Due to this, but also because transnational spatial visions and cross-border development concepts will not be transformed into formally binding spatial development plans, the adherence to these documents needs to be expanded in order to facilitate their application.

- This leads us to the **second level**, which is the **‘wider mental ownership’** that other stakeholders develop in relation to objectives/principles and application strategies of these spatial development planning documents. This expanded mental ownership strongly depends upon the quality and intensity of communication established with a wider range of other actors (e.g. sectoral administrations, private actors, structures representing the civil society etc), but also upon the level of mutual consensus achieved on future territorial challenges, development strategies and the required actions.

The results of the comparative assessment realised in Chapters 3 and 4, but also the discussions at the ESPON/INTERACT-seminar in Milan<sup>178</sup>, clearly indicate that **a number of closely inter-related aspects have to be observed simultaneously if a substantial level of ‘mental ownership’ is to be achieved:**

- **A strong leadership is needed to initiate a cooperative territorial development planning process and to maintain momentum over time:** Cooperative territorial development planning has to be initiated, promoted and maintained over time by a small core group of key actors that is continuously involved in all stages of the process. These actors represent the common interest (or ensure that common interest is respected) and should be able to think ‘vertically’ and ‘cross-sectoral’. They should also jointly play the role of a ‘facilitator’/‘referee’, helping to avoid/solve emerging conflicts. As already said above, this core group of actors only represents one segment of the future ‘owners’ of a transnational spatial development vision or a cross-border spatial development concept (i.e. ‘narrow mental ownership’).
- **A participatory planning approach needs to be adopted during the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts that actively involves a wider range of area-specific key stakeholders:** A strong and necessarily quite centralised leadership often implies that the process runs top-down. It is therefore highly important that a feedback from the territory is integrated into the process (bottom-up component). Due to this, an early involvement/consultation of key stakeholders from the public sector as well as from the wider civil society should be realised already during the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts, but also in the context of subsequent updating and upgrading processes. This involvement makes it possible to consider and include additional thematic expertise and information about strategic evolutions or potential structuring projects, which is generated by circles other than the spatial planners primarily involved in the process. The crucial role of an early stakeholder involvement is also confirmed by the future expectations of those actively promoting a wider stakeholder-involvement in transnational spatial visioning processes.<sup>179</sup>
- **The application strategies of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts need to have a clear ‘stakeholder-orientation’:** These transnational and cross-border documents are originally not intended to (and should not) function as a ‘blueprint’ for a concrete implementation scheme comparable to an operational INTERREG IIIB or IIIA programme. But the way how application strategies are presented is important for establishing an effective reference framework that helps to orientate and inspire future actions to be realised in the area. In order to achieve a clear stakeholder-orientation, the themes addressed must be consistent and appropriate (i.e. reflect the territorial assessment and the overall goals/policy aims), but also well-differentiated through a suggestion of concrete policy recommendations (i.e. territorial and sector-specific) and a wide range of practical measures/project proposals.
- **Procedures need to be envisaged that allow organising a political discussion on finalised**

### **transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts and that foresee proceeding to some kind of formal validation:**

The intention of these processes is not to change the indicative/non-binding status of these strategic documents, but to increase their overall administrative and political credibility. Political discussions could be realised in the competent committees of elected assemblies at State and regional levels, but also in the context of existing cooperative associations that are politically active in the area. A formal validation of such documents can either take place at Ministerial level or at the highest administrative levels.

By observing these inter-related recommendations, one can realistically expect that the wider circle of addressees will actually consider transnational spatial development visions or cross-border spatial development concepts as useful and important. In order to further support this trend, practical experience from some existing processes has shown that a number of additional pro-active measures could be realised to reach/involve key stakeholders in the respective cooperation area on a continuous basis (i.e. marketing strategy for the planning document; ongoing PR activities; regular seminars/workshops etc.).

Yet, the level of ‘mental ownership’ achieved should not be taken for granted once and for all. It is therefore strongly recommend **that an ongoing monitoring** is realised by those promoting cooperative territorial development planning processes. Such a monitoring could be achieved by regularly reviewing the actual take-up of operational provision through stakeholders in the context of practical ground-work or within new cooperation projects/initiatives. A good example in this respect is the VASAB updating process of 2000/2001 leading to the adoption of the ‘VASAB 2010+ document’, which has also critically reviewed a wide range of previous own activities and external projects/initiatives.

### **7.3 Additional recommendations for the follow-up programmes of ESPON and INTERACT**

Beyond the above-made suggestions for a re-orientation of future ESPON research during the forthcoming programming period 2007-13 (see section 7.1), this final section formulates some additional recommendations that are often inspired by responses given to the questionnaire-sur-

vey realised in the context of this study. These recommendations pin-point necessary improvements or highlight potential new activities that could be realised in the context of future ESPON and INTERACT follow-up programmes.

With respect to **ESPON**, some comments suggest that the current programme is too far away from practitioners and topics ‘on the ground’ and that necessary adaptations need to be made. Due to this, a future ESPON II programme should consider a number of aspects that would create a closer link with ongoing transnational spatial visioning processes and strategic cross-border spatial development planning initiatives:

- It is generally considered important and useful that a future ESPON-programme helps co-ordinating transnational spatial visioning processes (and analyses) realised under future Objective 3 programmes and promotes/raises awareness on this wider issue.
- A future ESPON programme should contribute to a better understanding of the development trends within transnational cooperation areas and also introduce such a level in the field of research on regional and spatial development. In instrumental terms, this could be realised through elaborating ‘territorial profiles and foresight’ for the transnational cooperation areas, based upon harmonised spatial development indicators (fundamental importance for better monitoring trends across the European territory) as well as on prospective and foresight investigations taking into account both worldwide and European-wide factors of change and more regional dynamics. If such activities would be realised as ‘joint ventures’ between scientists (TPG) and political/administrative bodies responsible for transnational/cross-border cooperation, this could definitively help achieving a more client-oriented approach.
- A future ESPON-programme should also elaborate a coherent scientific methodology for transnational spatial visioning processes and provide practical guidance in this respect. In addition, it should also support and facilitate the extraction of regionally relevant information.
- The ‘terms of reference’ for future ESPON-projects need generally to be more oriented towards practical needs and the projects themselves should also formu-

late results/recommendations that are understandable and directly transferable into the field work of spatial visioning practitioners, programme managers and project developers.

- The ongoing project-work of ESPON should (internally) be better and more systematically exploited in order to make information usable and transferable to regional strategic planning activities or transnational/cross-border planning activities that are constantly developed and/or updated throughout the EU.
- A future ESPON programme should also stronger focus on dissemination towards the national and especially the regional levels, in order to ensure that the information/findings of project activities gets to those responsible for carrying out regional-level spatial planning activities or transnational spatial visioning exercises (i.e. through national or interregional information seminars). In this respect it is also important to meet and exchange opinions with on-the-ground stakeholders and the end-users.

As concerns a **new INTERACT programme**, the following activities are suggested to better support the elaboration and/or updating of transnational spatial development visions or of cross-border spatial development concepts:

- The organisation of workshops and a dissemination of results are considered very useful. Important would be to organise further events on results and methodology of spatial visioning processes. This could also help synchronising parameters of various processes to make them more comparable e.g. with regard to territorial impacts of policies, territory-related categorisation or stakeholder involvement/mental ownership, etc.
- Also the training of (INTERREG) staff with respect to spatial visioning activities and practical guidance with respect to potential inputs provided for by work done on an EU-wide/European level could be a concrete field of activity.

## Explanatory notes

- <sup>1</sup> This horizontal planning approach, addressing the spatial expression of a variety of economic, social, cultural and environmental/ecological aspects in a given territory with the ultimate aim of promoting a balanced and sustainable spatial development, should be seen as opposed to more sector-specific planning approaches that consider only a limited range of aspects (e.g. regional economic development planning) or even one singular aspect (e.g. transport planning) in relation to given territory.
- <sup>2</sup> Association of European Border Regions/European Commission: LACE-GUIDE – Practical Guide to cross-border cooperation (1st edition, September 1995). Practical Guide to Cross-border Cooperation (3rd edition, 2000). LACE-Infoblatt zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit – Raumentwicklungsplanung (Ausgabe 1, Juni 1997). LACE-Infoblatt zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit – Forschung und Studien (Ausgabe 10, Dezember 1999).
- <sup>3</sup> E.g. cross-border regional development prospects, cross-border development and action concepts, cross-border spatial development perspective, cross-border spatial development concept, cross-border spatial development planning programmes etc.
- <sup>4</sup> Stiens, G.: Prognosen und Szenarien in der räumlichen Planung. In: Methoden und Instrumente räumlicher Planung. Ed. Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung. Hannover: ARL, 1998.
- <sup>5</sup> The distance survey was realised on ground of two different questionnaires: A more extensive 'case study questionnaire' was addressed to 11 previously selected transnational and cross-border areas to be examined in depth. Replies to the 'case study questionnaire' were given by the INTERREG IIC-III B areas North Sea Area, North-West Europe, Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Area, and CADSES as well as by one cross-border initiative, the Eurocité Basque (ES/FR). In addition, a shorter 'general screening questionnaire' was addressed to all other INTERREG IIIA, IIB and IIIC programmes not covered by the 11 case studies.
- <sup>6</sup> The review of ESPON projects 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.4.2, 3.2 and 3.3 was realised by Jacques Robert.
- <sup>7</sup> Stumm, Th./Noetzel, R.: Die Europäische Raumentwicklungspolitik (Ed. Europäisches Parlament, Generaldirektion Wissenschaft, Reihe Regionalpolitik REGI 100 DE. Luxembourg 1996). Stumm, Th./Gabbe, J.: Trans-European Cooperation between territorial authorities – New challenges and future steps necessary to improve cooperation. (Ed. Committee of the Regions, CoR Studies E-2/202, Brussels, October 2001).
- <sup>8</sup> 'Prospective Study on physical planning and the environment in the megalopolis in formation in North-West Europe'. European Research Institute for Regional and Urban Planning. The Hague.1975.
- <sup>9</sup> Inter-state agreements on spatial planning between Belgium-Netherlands-Luxembourg (1969).
- <sup>10</sup> 1989-1995: Organisation of study days and conferences, formal adoption of a 'Note d'Orientation' (in October 1993) and a 'Note d'Approfondissement' (in January 1995).
- <sup>11</sup> Monaco became a party to the Convention on the basis of an additional protocol. Slovenia signed the Convention on 29 March 1993.
- <sup>12</sup> Conservation of nature and the countryside, energy, mountain farming, mountain forests, soil conservation, settlement of disputes, spatial planning and sustainable development, tourism, transport.
- <sup>13</sup> Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, Poland. Germany and Russia participate also through representatives from the regions which are adjacent to the Baltic Sea Region (Länder in Germany, Oblasts and Republics in Russia).
- <sup>14</sup> The conference was also attended by representatives from international organisations such as the European Commission, the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Helsinki Commission (HELCOM) and the Nordic Council of Ministers.
- <sup>15</sup> Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010. Towards a framework for Spatial Development in the Baltic Sea Region. Third Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development. Tallinn, 7 tp 8 December, 1994.
- <sup>16</sup> Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010. From vision to Action. Fourth Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development. Stockholm 22 October, 1996.
- <sup>17</sup> The cooperation area includes the whole of Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Yugoslavia and parts of Austria, Germany, Italy, Poland and Ukraine.
- <sup>18</sup> The first process was initiated by Austria, Germany and Italy through the INTERREG IIC project 'Vision Planet' and covered the CADSES programme area as a whole. The second process was initiated by Greece through the INTERREG IIC project 'ESTIA Space' (European space and territorial integration alternatives: spatial development strategies and policy integration for south-east Europe) and focussed mainly on countries from the Balkans and south-east Europe (i.e. Albania, Bulgaria, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Greece, Romania and the Former Republic of Yugoslavia).
- <sup>19</sup> The project supported the development of joint spatial development strategies and provided a framework for a direct dialogue between public administrations and institutions responsible for spatial development issues. Through these activities it was expected that the project would contribute to the development of a common base of understanding, to an increased awareness on the possibilities of spatial development policy and to the elaboration of different policy proposals.
- <sup>20</sup> General sources of information on the project are: Working Paper for the 3rd Seminar of the Vision Planet Project Panel (Trieste, 30.6.-1.7.1999). Resolution, adopted by the Vision Planet Project Panel at the seminar on 12 January 2000, Vienna (Austria). Vision Planet – Reviewing Transnational Spatial Planning (Document presented at the Bratislava Conference of January 2000, Vienna March 2000).
- <sup>21</sup> VISION-Document entitled 'Strategies for Integrated Spatial Development of the Central European Danubian and Adriatic Area (April 2000), with its part 1 ('Background Report', prepared by the Working Team) and its part 2 ('Guidelines and Policy Proposals').
- <sup>22</sup> NORVISION. A spatial perspective for the North Sear Region. Vision Working Group with representatives from spatial planning offices from the participating countries and regions. Drafted by PLANCO consulting GmbH. 2000).
- <sup>23</sup> A spatial vision for North-West Europe – Building Cooperation. A discussion document co-financed by the Interreg IIC Community Initiative (September 2000).
- <sup>24</sup> Consultation Report on the Vision Document – Summary of Responses (prepared by the University of the West of England in consultation with the Lead Partner, June 2001).

- <sup>25</sup> Wil Zonneveld has realised a comparative assessment of transnational spatial visions elaborated in the context of INTERREG IIC. The assessment was realised alongside an analytical framework addressing 6 different aspects: (1) the areas covered by transnational visions, (2) the planning principles of the visions, (3) the functions of spatial visions, (4) the different aspects of the content of spatial visions, (5) the spatial concepts/designs and the spatial images and finally (6) the application of spatial visions (In Zonneveld, W.: *Expansive spatial planning: The new European transnational spatial visions*. Paper presented at the AESOP-ACSP- Conference Leuven/Belgium (8-12 July 2003). Vincent Nadin has reviewed in depth various transnational spatial visioning processes in the European Union (Nadin, V.: *Transnational Spatial Development and Planning – Experience from the Spatial Vision from North-West Europe* In: Ch. Bengs, Ed: *Facing ESPON. Nordregio Report*, Stockholm 2002. Nadin, V.: *Visions and Visioning in European Spatial Planning*. Paper presented at Lincoln Institute Conference on European Spatial Planning, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, June 29-30, 2001). Nadin has also compared transnational spatial visioning processes in the European Union with other spatial visioning experiences in the wider international context (i.e. Japan and the USA). For this purpose, a 'framework for comparison' was elaborated that addressed four specific issues in the analysis: (1) Purpose and objectives of the vision process, (2) vision content, topics and concepts, (3) visualisation, cartography and expression and finally (4) process, procedure and consultation (Nadin, V.: *Review of existing transnational spatial planning documents*. In: F. Schindegger, Ed: *Reviewing Transnational Spatial Planning. Proceedings of the VISION PLANET Conference in Bratislava on 13/14 January 2000*. Vienna, March 2000).
- <sup>26</sup> INTERREG IIC NWMA Programm: Kompendium bewilligter Projekte 1998-2001.
- <sup>27</sup> INTERACT Workshop: Strategic, territorial development workshop for transnational INTERREG programmes (24-25 February 2005, Brussels). Workshop document: 'Summary of Programme Spatial Vision Work to Date'
- <sup>28</sup> Main sources of information on this project are: The Baltic Palette – a region full of colours (Final Report, approved at the Baltic Palette Political conference in Stockholm, March 23-24, 2000). Action Group Reports on (1) Urban Systems, (2) Infrastructure connecting the urban system and (3) natural and cultural assets.
- <sup>29</sup> The project was initiated by Greece and covered the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, FYROM, Greece, Romania and the Former Republic of Yugoslavia.
- <sup>30</sup> Main sources of information on this project are: ESTIA SPACE – 'Preparing for Action. Spatial planning priorities in South-East Europe' (Thessaloniki 2000). Vision Planet – Reviewing Transnational Spatial Planning (Document presented at the Bratislava Conference of January 2000, Vienna March 2000). ESTIA-SPACE - 'European space and territorial integration alternatives: Spatial planning priorities for South-East Europe' (September 2000).
- <sup>31</sup> Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010. Background Documents for VASAB 2010+. September 2001.
- <sup>32</sup> Leitbild und Strategien rund um die Ostsee 2010. Konferenz der Raumordnungsminister. Erklärung von Wismar und VASAB 2010+ (Aktionsprogramm zur Raumentwicklung). Wismar, 20-21 September 2001.
- <sup>33</sup> INTERACT Workshop: Strategic, territorial development workshop for transnational INTERREG programmes (24-25 February 2005, Brussels). Workshop document: 'Summary of Programme Spatial Vision Work to Date'.
- <sup>34</sup> Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010, 6th Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development: (1) Gdansk-Declaration and policy document 'Connecting Potentials', Gdansk 19 September 2005. (2) Statements and documents.
- <sup>35</sup> Information from the Questionnaire that was returned by actors involved in the BSR-visioning process (VASAB and INTERREG IIIB programme).
- <sup>36</sup> INTERREG IIIB programme North-West Europe, Spatial Vision Group: Polycentric territorial development (including urban-rural relationships) in North-West Europe. Final Report (University of the West of England, June 2005). Parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge. Final Report (TERSYN/EureConsult, CERTE, June 2005). Sustainable management of the cultural and natural heritage of NWE. (EURONET, June 2005).
- <sup>37</sup> Study No 4, Synthesis Report: Towards a Strategic Framework for Action. Centre for Urban Development and Environmental Management, Leeds Metropolitan University, December 2005.
- <sup>38</sup> According to the document's introduction, the synthesis report (...) represents a significant stage in the Spatial Vision Process by providing the evidence-base for the development of a Strategic Framework for Action for NWE. It is intended that the Framework will then be drawn upon in the development of the operational programme for post-2006 territorial cooperation.
- <sup>39</sup> INTERREG IIIB programme North Sea. Towards a new spatial agenda for the North Sea Region - Updating Norvision: 'Demographic change'. University of the West of England, Bristol (Draft final report. August 2005). 'Transport and Mobility'. Resource Analysis. Antwerp (Draft final report. 2005). 'Facilitating Innovation'. INNO AG Karlsruhe (Draft Final Report, September 2005). 'Energy'. COWI Consult (Draft Final Report, Aalborg 2005). 'Coastal water management'. Resource Analysis N.V.Antwerp (Draft final report. 2005).
- <sup>40</sup> Conseil régional de Basse Normandie (FR); Conseil régional Aquitaine (FR); Conseil régional Bretagne (FR); Conseil régional des Pays de la Loire (FR); Conseil régional de Poitou-Charentes (FR); Conseil régional du Centre (FR); Comissao de coordeacao da regio do Alentejo (PT); Comissao de coordeacao da regio Centro (PT); Comissao de coordeacao da regio de Lisboa a Vale do tejo (PT); Comissao de coordeacao da regio Norte (PT) ; Gouvernement de la principauté des Asturias (ES); Junta de Andalucia (ES); Junta de Castilla y Leon (ESP); Xunta de Galicia (ES); Gobierno de Navarra (ES); Cornwall County Council (UK); Conseil Régional Limousin (FR); ARGYLL & BUTE (UK); Welsh Assembly (UK); Mid-West Regional Authority (IE).
- <sup>41</sup> Schéma de Développement de l'Espace Atlantique: Rapport Final, Volume 1. Evaluation stratégique des systèmes territoriaux et urbains atlantiques. Juin 2005.
- <sup>42</sup> Schéma de Développement de l'Espace Atlantique: Rapport Final, Volume 2. Stratégie de développement de l'Espace Atlantique. Juin 2005.
- <sup>43</sup> Schéma de Développement de l'Espace Atlantique: Document de Synthèse. Juin 2005.
- <sup>44</sup> Other EU-partner regions are: Algarve, Andalusia, Murcia, Comunidad Valenciana, Langudoc-Roussillon, Sardinai, Toscana, Umbria. Two regions of the southern Mediterranean (Sousse in Tunisia and Tanger-Tetouan in Morocco) participated as observers
- <sup>45</sup> Prospective Study (Final Draft). Sustainable territorial development in the Alpine Space: towards long-term transnational cooperation. T. Bausch, T. Dax, U. Janin-Rivollin, F. Parvex, S. Praper, M. Vanier. August 2005.



- <sup>46</sup> Information based upon a reply in reaction to a questionnaire sent to the INTERREG IIIB programme secretariat.
- <sup>47</sup> Association of European Border Regions/European Commission: LACE-GUIDE – Practical Guide to cross-border cooperation (1st edition, September 1995). Practical Guide to Cross-border Cooperation (3rd edition, 2000). LACE-Infoblatt zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit – Raumentwicklungsplanung (Ausgabe 1, Juni 1997). LACE-Infoblatt zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit – Forschung und Studien (Ausgabe 10, Dezember 1999).
- <sup>48</sup> E.g. Inter-state agreements on spatial planning between Belgium-Germany (1971), Switzerland-Germany (1973), Austria-Germany (1974), France-Germany (1975) and the Netherlands-Germany (1976).
- <sup>49</sup> Coordination of neighbouring domestic spatial planning activities at various levels through a joint formulation of non-binding recommendations, joint elaboration of non-binding spatial development concepts etc.
- <sup>50</sup> Austria-Hungary (1985), Germany-Poland (1992), Slovak Republic-Poland (1994), Slovak Republic-Hungary (1995) and Czech Republic-Poland (1995).
- <sup>51</sup> Internationales Leitbild für das Bodenseegebiet.
- <sup>52</sup> Regio Bodensee: Bodenseeleitbild, 1994.
- <sup>53</sup> Schéma de développement de l'espace SaarLorLux+. Résumé. Équipe d'études Schéma de développement de l'espace SAARLORLUX+/Institut für Ländliche Strukturforschung (ILFS). Frankfurt am Main, November 2000.
- <sup>54</sup> A steering committee (comité de pilotage) under Luxembourg presidency has been established by the regional commission that was composed of representatives from Luxembourg, the German Länder Saarland and Rheinland-Pfalz, the French Region Lorraine and the Belgium region Wallonie.
- <sup>55</sup> This position and also the related thematic issues promoted by the ESDP were extensively covered by widely disseminated EU-publications supporting practical cross-border cooperation (e.g. Association of European Border Regions/European Commission: Practical Guide to Cross-border Cooperation, 3rd edition 2000).
- <sup>56</sup> This has been made possible by the Inter-state Treaty of Anholt, which was concluded 1991 between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany.
- <sup>57</sup> In April 1997, a cooperation agreement for establishing PAMINA was signed in Wissembourg. In October 2000, after the entry into force of the Karlsruhe inter-state agreement on cross-border cooperation, a political decision was taken to establish the public-law based cross-border local purpose association 'REGIO PAMINA' on ground of Articles 11-15 of the Karlsruhe-Agreement. In December 2001 the cooperation agreement on the local purpose association was signed and in March 2003 the constituting meeting cross-border local purpose association 'REGIO PAMINA' has taken place in Wissembourg.
- <sup>58</sup> With 510km length, the border river Torne is the largest unregulated river in Europe. The cross-border area has a surface of only 35 000 km<sup>2</sup> and was included as 'Sub-programme Torne-Valley' in the wider INTERREG IIA programme 'Nordkalotten'.
- <sup>59</sup> This study was supported under the AEBR/LACE programme for technical assistance in the field of cross-border cooperation. See: LACE-Infoblatt zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit – Forschung und Studien (Ausgabe 10, Dezember 1999).
- <sup>60</sup> Communauté de Travail des Alpes Centrales (ARGE ALP, 1972); Communauté de Travail des Alpes Orientales (ARGE ALPEN ADRIA, 1978); Communauté de Travail des Alpes Occidentales (COTRAO, 1982); Communauté de Travail des Pyrénées (CTP, 1983); Communauté de Travail de Jura (CTJ, 1985); Communauté de Travail Villes des Alpes (CTVA, 1988); Comunidade de Trabalho Norte de Portugal-Galicia (1991); Comunidad de Trabajo Extremadura-Alentejo (1992).
- <sup>61</sup> Arbeitsgemeinschaft Alpenländer, ARGE-ALP: Daten, Fakten, Ziele (download on [www.argealp.org](http://www.argealp.org)).
- <sup>62</sup> Arbeitsgemeinschaft ALPEN-ADRIA: Leitbild im Europa des Dritten Jahrtausends (Adopted at the plenary meeting of the heads of government in Sárvár/Hungary on 24 November 2000).
- <sup>63</sup> Arbeitsgemeinschaft ALPEN-ADRIA: Beitrag zur nachhaltigen Raumentwicklung (Linz, 2000).
- <sup>64</sup> Arbeitsgemeinschaft ALPEN-ADRIA: With spatial planning instruments to more effective solutions (Ljubljana, 2002).
- <sup>65</sup> Arbeitsgemeinschaft ALPEN-ADRIA: Spatial consequences of the European Union enlargement (Ljubljana, 2003).
- <sup>66</sup> VAN DER NIET, A.: Cross-border projects in the MHAL region. In: local land & soil news 12/13, bulletin of the European Land and Soil Alliance (ELSA) e.V.
- <sup>67</sup> Projectgroep Drielandenpark/Groupe de projet/Projektgruppe: ONTWIKKELINGSPERSPECTIEF DRIELANDENPARK Open ruimte zonder grenzen/PERSPECTIVE DE DEVELOPPEMENT DU PARC DES TROIS PAYS Espace ouvert sans frontières/ENTWICKLUNGSPERSPEKTIVE DREILÄNDERPARK Offener Raum ohne Grenzen.
- <sup>68</sup> i.e. the Walloon Region, the Flemish Region, the Land North Rhine Westphalia/Aachen, the Dutch and Belgian provinces of Limburg, the German-speaking Community in Belgium.
- <sup>69</sup> Entwicklungsleitbild „EuRegio West/Nyugat Pannonia“ (Stand: Oktober 2003. Kurzfassung).
- <sup>70</sup> Spatial planning and transport planning departments of the Austrian Länder involved (Burgenland, Vienna, Lower Austria), relevant departments in the Slovak Higher Territorial Units (self-governments at NUTS-III level), transport associations (Verkehrsverbände), City of Győr mainly in the fields higher education, City of Bratislava and City of Vienna.
- <sup>71</sup> CENTROPE is an 'umbrella project' consisting of several sub-projects with a different focus (i.e. cooperation of business agencies, cluster development, youth projects etc). It seeks to strengthen cooperation at the levels of the regional self-government units in Austria (Länder Vienna, Burgenland, Lower Austria), the Hungarian cities and counties and the Slovak self government units (city of Bratislava, samospravne kraje Trnava and Bratislava).
- <sup>72</sup> As a commonly shared feature, these cities are directly located at and separated by the border.
- <sup>73</sup> The priority is not separate Strand A programme, but follow the principles of the strand A cooperation, i.e. cross-border cooperation between neighbouring countries.
- <sup>74</sup> Imatra and Svetogorsk are the only twin towns which gaze over the border between the European Union and the Russian federation.
- <sup>75</sup> Information based upon a reply in reaction to a questionnaire sent to INTERREG IIIA programmes.

- <sup>76</sup> The Danish side was not willing to wait for the slow and not-so-advanced German partners. In addition the political 'wind' did not accept physical planning, but only the formulation of general political strategies and objectives.
- <sup>77</sup> Business development (strategic advice), labour market (promoting conditions for commuting; optimising employment), environment & natural heritage (Wadden Sea; national park; ICZM planning, socio-economic projects) education (joint university studies, jointly accepted diploma).
- <sup>78</sup> Information based upon a reply in reaction to a questionnaire sent to INTERREG IIIA programmes.
- <sup>79</sup> The project 'Growth Corridor Oslo-Karlstad-Stockholm': The focus of planning activities is on increasing the cross-border knowledge with respect to new opportunities for companies in the region, on cross-border networks and alliances as well as on an institutionalisation of cross-border cooperation.
- <sup>80</sup> Information based upon a reply in reaction to a questionnaire sent to INTERREG IIIA programmes.
- <sup>81</sup> Both priorities are not separate strand A programmes, but follow the principles of the strand A cooperation, i.e. cross-border cooperation between neighbouring countries.
- <sup>82</sup> Studies realised for CEMAT: European Regional Planning No. 12: The effect of changing demographic patterns and structures on urban and regional planning (P. DREWE 1978). European Regional Planning No. 14: The use of long-range forecasting techniques and projections for the definition of a European regional planning policy (Association Internationale Futuribles, 1978). European Regional Planning No. 16: Long-range forecasting and regional disparities in Europe (J. ROBERT, 1978). European Regional Planning No. 25: The impact of international economic change on development trends in Europe's regions (Annette ROBERT-MULLER et Jacques ROBERT, 1979). European Regional Planning No. 26: Interrelations of systems analysis, long-range forecasting and regional development, with special reference to the Mediterranean area (Bruno GRASSETTI, 1981). European Regional Planning No. 28: European Prognoses on regional development –Tendencies of population and employment development (1974-1990) in the countries of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning (PROGNOS, 1979).
- <sup>83</sup> European Commission, DG Regional Policy: Europe 2000 – Outlook for the development of the Community's territory (Luxembourg 1991).
- <sup>84</sup> Examples are the development of the population (1985-2015), the development of the active labour force (1990-2010), the impact of demographic change on cost spent for education (1990-2000-2010), the prospective evolution of transport infrastructures, future perspectives of energy supply and the prospective evolution of specific area-types in the EU (e.g. urban areas, rural areas, border areas, coastal zones & islands).
- <sup>85</sup> European Commission, DG Regional Policy: Europe 2000+: Cooperation for European territorial development (Luxembourg, 1994).
- <sup>86</sup> The appendix of 'Europe 2000+' and the 'prospective studies' have also strongly influenced the future delimitation of transnational cooperation areas for INTERREG IIC programmes and for ERDF-Article 10 pilot actions in the field of spatial development.
- <sup>87</sup> North-West European Metropolitan Area, Alpine Arc, Continental Diagonal, Western Mediterranean, Atlantic Arc, North Sea Area.
- <sup>88</sup> Stumm, Th/Noetzel, R.: Die Europäische Raumentwicklungspolitik (Ed. Europäisches Parlament, Generaldirektion Wissenschaft, Reihe Regionalpolitik REGI 100 DE. Luxembourg 1996).
- <sup>89</sup> Conceptual paper presented at the Seminar of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning and Regional Policy in Echternach on the 9th December 1997 (Luxembourg Presidency).
- <sup>90</sup> (1) To add value to existing national research by taking a clear European and transnational focus and improving the understanding of the diversity of the European territory and territorial development, including the prospective dimension and sustainable development, and beyond the usually employed statistical units. These would include an analysis of territorial trends in the 13 candidate countries and neighbouring countries as well as in the Member States to draw conclusions for the territorial development of the Union. (2) To specify the implications of the ESDP policy orientations on transnational-national spaces, the interpretation of existing ones (such as Interreg II/III) and eventually evolving ones in the wake of the enlargement of the EU. (3) To develop orientations for instruments and institutions necessary for a better perception and application of the ESDP policy options by policy actors at all levels from the EU to the local level; also including a better co-ordinated application of the ESDP principles. (4) To contribute to a better understanding of the enhancement of the spatial dimension of the Structural Funds, Cohesion policy and other Community policies, and national sector policies. (5) To make concrete contributions and proposals to improve co-ordination of territorially relevant decisions, taken at different levels (at the Community, national, regional and local level) and in different sector policies. (6) To bridge the gap between policy makers, administrators and scientists. (7) To create a network of the scientific European Community in the fragmented field of spatial development.
- <sup>91</sup> By spring 2005, half of the 30 ESPON projects have provided their final results.
- <sup>92</sup> E.g. ESPON: 'In search of territorial potentials. Midterm results by spring 2005' (April 2005).
- <sup>93</sup> Due to problems of data availability and compatibility, the period chosen for these trend analyses was rather short (1995 to 2000). It was not really appropriate to produce long-term projections.
- <sup>94</sup> A brief review of the RECITE I projects HYDRE, ROCNORD, SEALINK, EUROSUNET, ECONOMIC COOPERATION and STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR MEDIUM-SIZED CITIES has been realised in Stumm, Th/Noetzel, R.: Die Europäische Raumentwicklungspolitik (Ed. Europäisches Parlament, Generaldirektion Wissenschaft, Reihe Regionalpolitik REGI 100 DE. Luxembourg 1996).
- <sup>95</sup> RECITE II projects mostly focussed on the following topics: local economic development & job creation; innovation in SMEs, internationalisation of SMEs; environment & energy. equal opportunities. See for this aspect: Stumm, Th/Gabbe, J.: Trans-European Cooperation between territorial authorities – New challenges and future steps necessary to improve cooperation. (Ed. Committee of the Regions, CoR Studies E-2/202, Brussels, October 2001).
- <sup>96</sup> TERRA – An experimental laboratory in spatial planning (Ed. European Commission, DG Regional Policy. March 2000). Stumm, Th/Gabbe, J.: Trans-European Cooperation between territorial authorities – New challenges and future steps necessary to improve cooperation. (Ed. Committee of the Regions, CoR Studies E-2/202, Brussels, October 2001).
- <sup>97</sup> TERRA-projects DIAS, EUROGISE, DUERO-DOURO, ALBA-TER, GROOTSTAD, POSIDONIA and CONCERCOST.

- <sup>98</sup> Communication from the Commission to the Member States of 7 May 2001: INTERREGIONAL COOPERATION, Strand C of the Interreg III Community initiative. Commission communication C(2001) 1188 final (2001/C 141/02).
- <sup>99</sup> 'North Zone': 35 operations; 'East Zone': 71 operations; 'South Zone': 82 operations, 'West Zone': 76 operations. As for the types of operation, 40 are 'Regional Framework Operations', 136 are 'Individual Projects' and 88 are 'Networks'.
- <sup>100</sup> Information on [www.interreg3.net](http://www.interreg3.net)
- <sup>101</sup> Information based upon the replies given by the four INTERREG IIIC programme JTS to the 'screening questionnaire'.
- <sup>102</sup> See also Treuner, P.: Functions and features of transnational spatial visions. (In: F. Schindegger, (Ed): *Reviewing Transnational Spatial Planning*. Proceedings of the VISION PLANET Conference in Bratislava on 13/14 January 2000. Vienna, March 2000).
- <sup>103</sup> See also Nadin, V.: Review of existing transnational spatial planning documents (In: F. Schindegger, Ed: *Reviewing Transnational Spatial Planning*. Proceedings of the VISION PLANET Conference in Bratislava on 13/14 January 2000. Vienna, March 2000).
- <sup>104</sup> European-wide, transnational and cross-border spatial planning documents are yet not directly included into EU/national/regional/local legislation, wherefore the actual use of such plans is accordingly not self-evident. The term 'application' can therefore be described as the influencing of future policy actions without their content being 'dictated'. See also Zonneveld, W.: *Expansive spatial planning: The new European transnational spatial visions*. Paper presented at the AESOP-ACSP- Conference Leuven/Belgium (8-12 July 2003).
- <sup>105</sup> See also Zonneveld, W.: *Expansive spatial planning: The new European transnational spatial visions*. Paper presented at the AESOP-ACSP- Conference Leuven/Belgium (8-12 July 2003).
- <sup>106</sup> See also Zonneveld, W.: *Expansive spatial planning: The new European transnational spatial visions*. Paper presented at the AESOP-ACSP- Conference Leuven/Belgium (8-12 July 2003).
- <sup>107</sup> i.e. to evaluate the possible shapes of an area-specific polycentricity-model, to develop a territorialised vision of Atlantic polycentrism.
- <sup>108</sup> With respect to this issue, also three complex and future-oriented scenarios for the Eastern-enlargement of the EU and their respective impact on the area's spatial structure had been elaborated. Scenario 1: 'Euro-Realism' (continuation of existing trends). Scenario 2: 'Deadlock Integration' (change for the worse). Scenario 3: Intensifying Integration (change for the better).
- <sup>109</sup> The main territorial trends identified are: dynamic increase of natural hazards; loss of habitats and biodiversity; variety of landscapes endangered; increasing pressure on natural resources and natural heritage; growing importance of accessibility to infrastructure and knowledge; over-aging population; growing interest in higher education, but also stronger competition between universities; emerging opportunities for European cities and R&D location.
- <sup>110</sup> Main challenges identified are the risks of economic and spatial fragmentation, the risks of environmental fragmentation, the imbalances which may occur in the territorial evolution of the Mediterranean basin and the challenges in the transport sector. A number of trends were also analysed with respect to the governance and cooperation systems (i.e. role of regions and states, evolution of the various types of cooperation).
- <sup>111</sup> The main objective of the C2M Project (concluded in 2005) was to contribute to the reduction of regional and territorial inequalities in Europe through the strengthening of the metropolitan and urban systems in the MEDOCC area. An additional objective was to create, through the strengthening of cooperation between the metropolitan areas of the MEDOCC space, the conditions for territorial cohesion and competitiveness. The third objective was to favour European polycentricity according to the ESDP.
- <sup>112</sup> The Prospective Study for the Alpine Area mainly considered the following EU policies: the Common Agricultural Policy, the EU's research and development policy and the Structural Funds policies. The AMAT project mainly considered the following EU policies: the Common Agricultural Policy, the Structural Funds policies, the EU's research and development policy, the Common Transport policy and the EU's environmental policy.
- <sup>113</sup> In the initial VASAB document of 1994, one single vision statement was formulated to which 4 major themes were related (i.e. 'Pearls' - an urban network of international importance; 'Strings' - effective and sustainable links between cities; 'Patches' - areas supporting dynamism and quality of life; 'System' - comprehensive spatial planning in function). With respect to these major themes, in total 14 different policy aims were formulated.
- <sup>114</sup> The initial North-Sea Region document (NorVision) has formulated an overall vision that consists of 10 individual vision statements (four statements relate to the North-Sea Region as a whole, four statements relate to the urban regions and two statements relate to rural areas). For each of these vision-statements, a larger number of 'aims' and 'strategies' were subsequently formulated.
- <sup>115</sup> The initial CADSES-vision (VISION PLANET document 'Guidelines and Policy Proposals') has identified five 'fields of activity' for the development of transnational area, in relation to which a larger number of not clearly identifiable policy aims were defined. In addition, also four 'principal objectives' for spatial development policy were identified.
- <sup>116</sup> The initial NWMA-vision document identified six 'principles' for the development perspective, in relation to which a total of 28 policy aims were formulated.
- <sup>117</sup> The recently elaborated vision document for the Atlantic Area has identified two 'strategic guidelines', in relation to which a number of more general policy aims were formulated.
- <sup>118</sup> At the 4th Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development in Stockholm (October 1996), the VASAB-document 'From Vision to Action' was adopted. The following up-dating process launched in 2000/2001 has led to the adoption of the document 'VASAB 2010+ Spatial Development Action Programme', which was adopted at the 5th Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development in Wismar in September 2001. The 'Spatial Development and Action Programme' defined the future role of VASAB and further specified concepts and priorities for the six 'key themes'.
- <sup>119</sup> Information based upon a reply in reaction to a questionnaire sent to the INTERREG IIIB programme secretariat (the remarks also concern the partial vision document produced by the 'ESTIA' project): In the opinion of the current programme authorities, a vision is not and can not be a blue print for implementation. Of course it can be a first step for preparing a scenario that might be better suited for the development of operational objectives, but such a scenario was neither developed for CADSES nor for its sub-regions. Some reasons for this are the following: One could imagine that there was just not sufficient time and energy to work on a vision while programme actors were clearly forced to develop a common management structure, which itself turned out to be a difficult and energy consuming task for mem-

- ber states. One could also imagine that the war in Yugoslavia had an 'indirect impact' on this, as bombers were crossing the Adriatic from Italy and Germany towards Belgrade while member states met to prepare CADSES. What vision can one expect from countries on both sides of the front that at the same time participated in CADSES.
- <sup>120</sup> Euregio Rhein-Waal (DE/NL): 'Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 Euregio Rhein-Waal' of 2001. PAMINA (DE/FR): 'Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region' of 2002. Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina (DE/PL): 'Development and action concept of the Euroregion Viadrina' of 1999. Border between France and Spain (FR/ES): 'Livre Blanc de l'Eurocité Bayonne – San Sebastian' of 2000.
- <sup>121</sup> Although a number of strategic themes are currently reappearing in these different parts of the concept (i.e. assessment of the present situation; development vision; priorities for EU-support), one can observe that their precise denomination as well as the listing of related sub-themes slightly changes throughout the sections.
- <sup>122</sup> (1) Infrastructure, (2) economy, (3) tourism, (4) environment & nature protection, (5) agriculture & rural development, (6) spatial planning & local/regional development, (7) social aspects, culture science, education youth and sports.
- <sup>123</sup> The Eurocity – White Paper mentions 10 different 'lines of intervention': Eurocorridor for multimodal transport, logistical bridge-heads, excellence in the field of equipment, own and common symbols, structuring the metropolitan area, competitive public services, support to public transport/ restricting private transport, strengthening of the urban environment, excellence in the field of environment, reinforcement of the existing values.
- <sup>124</sup> The 'Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 Euregio Rhein-Waal' (DE/NL) mentions six strategic themes: (1) Spatial structure and accessibility, (2) economy, technology and innovation, (3) labour market and qualification, (4) culture and tourism, (5) nature, environment and agriculture, (6) cross-border integration.
- <sup>125</sup> The 'Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region' (DE/FR) contains the following 6 'strategic priorities': (1) landscape park PAMINA; (2) communication/networked spaces; (3) balanced development of the location or factors; (4) diversity and solidarity; (5) Europe-oriented, networked and co-operative; (6) future chances through integration.
- <sup>126</sup> FR/ES: 25 proposed 'actions'; DE/NL: 56 'options for development & action', DE/FR: 109 'potential measures' defined in relation to 20 'sub-objectives'.
- <sup>127</sup> DE/NL: 208 'fields of action'; DE/FR: 16 'pilot projects'.
- <sup>128</sup> For the cross-border spatial development concepts DE/PL and DE/NL no information on this aspect does exist, as the respective 'case study questionnaires' were not returned to the researchers.
- <sup>129</sup> A prospective study on transport infrastructures has been elaborated, which was accomplished in June 2004. A study on local public services in the Eurocity has been realised (December 2000) and another prospective study on the cross-border treatment of waste has been finalised in 2002. The Internet site of the Eurocity (already launched in 1999) was further developed. A measurement indicator system for the Eurocity was progressively created and a structured cross-border observation of different sectoral aspects such as health or housing was put into place (it is based upon a number of sectoral and theme-specific observatories that have been created on either side of the border). Based upon this measurement/observation system, a 'Cross-border Mobility Study' was finalised in 2002 that is a point of reference for defining future exchange scenarios and for establishing transport infrastructures especially with regard to the light rail metro that is currently studied. The further integration of the respective Territorial Information Systems existing on either side of the border is also considered an imperative, as cartographic illustration allows better highlighting different aspects of the socio-economic reality.
- <sup>130</sup> A first step was to suggest a new planning scenario to administrations responsible for certain sector-specific aspects in order to create a set of common 'rules for the game'. Against this wider background, various sector-specific cross-border working groups have been created (environment & sustainable development, culture & tourism, social services, synergies in the economic structure, sports) and two specific observatories have been established (observatory on public health 1999/2000; observatory on housing and habitat in 2002).
- <sup>131</sup> Zweckverband REGIO PAMINA: Leitziele für den PAMINA Raum – PAMINA Zukunftsregion in Europe (März 2005).
- <sup>132</sup> LACE-Infoblatt zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit – Statistik in den Grenzgebieten (Ausgabe 11, Dezember 2000).
- <sup>133</sup> The basic aim of the vision document was to present comparative data for the total ESTIA-area and its specific countries/regions.
- <sup>134</sup> Time space map for rail passengers (1993 and 2020). Change of daily accessibility by a road, 1996-2016, due to TEN/TINA investments.
- <sup>135</sup> TEN-STAC 'Scenarios, traffic forecasts and analysis of corridors on the Trans-European Network' (Coordination, NEA NL). European Commission, 2004. Starting from a base year in 2000, the TEN-STAC Study has produced various scenarios that all incorporate the same common socio-economic assumptions, meaning a 'normal' economic development in all countries. In terms of transportation policies, mostly the outcomes of two extreme scenarios had been considered (i.e. the 'Trend+' and the 'European+' scenarios).
- <sup>136</sup> Maps on the distribution and concentration of employment, on the dominant sector specific specialisation, on a sector specific specialisation coefficient, on road-based connectivity of urban centres, on the average annual evolution of GDP between 1991 and 2002, on the per capita GDP variation between 1991 and 2002, on a cross-reference between the variations of per capita GDP and population between 1991 and 2002, on the importance of urban areas, on the 'indicator for relative development', on the dynamics in demography and exchange.
- <sup>137</sup> The 'Background Report' contains in total 21 maps, whereas the document 'Guidelines and Policy Proposals' has taken over 10 maps from the 'Background Report'.
- <sup>138</sup> This position is somehow similar to the experiences made in the elaboration of the ESDP, where the 'Committee of Spatial Development' decided not to include maps on future territorial conditions as they could potentially have derailing effect.
- <sup>139</sup> During spring 2001, a first draft of the 'VASAB 2010+ report' has been widely spread to the EU-Commission, to international or Pan-Baltic organisations (six contacted) and to some 100 national sector-specific organisations or regional and local authorities. Members of CSD-BSR have arranged presentations and discussions inviting the addressees to comment on the report. A considerable number of direct comments have been received (more than 100), including proposals how to further improve the report, to broaden its focus or to address more intensively issues and problems of some BSR sub-regions. These 'external inputs' have been taken into account as far as possible when revising the draft report.
- <sup>140</sup> The 'Project Panel' had also organised several seminars that offered a chance for taking into account main elements of the policy environment (e.g. ESDP, TINA process, EU programmes for CEEC). These seminars were open to the members of the Working Team, so that a continuous thematic exchange took place.

- <sup>141</sup> The national consultations should be led by the relevant members of the Spatial Vision Group. In order to focus comments on certain topics, a consultation briefing paper was drawn up and put at their disposal. Each national contact point was asked to prepare a report summarising the findings of the consultation in their country.
- <sup>142</sup> The purpose of these workshops was to collect ideas and opinions from key stakeholders both for identifying theme-related planning issues and possible projects for future transnational cooperation.
- <sup>142</sup> Within this context, especially the 'Atlantic Arc Commission' of the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions, the 'Conference of Cities in the Atlantic Arc' (CVAA), the 'Association of Agricultural Chambers in the Atlantic Arc' (AC3A) and the 'Atlantic Transnational Network' (RTA) with its studies on mobility and maritime transport, maritime safety and innovation have been considered in the work process.
- <sup>144</sup> It was proposed to organise regular meetings of BSR ministers responsible for spatial planning and also the establishment of a common VASAB secretariat for organisational support and co-ordination was suggested. The secretariat should assist in the preparation of regular ministerial meetings, organise the concertation process, support the marketing of the BSR, accompany research/pilot projects and identify new required common actions.
- <sup>145</sup> There are however still some deficits in this respect. They are mainly caused by a lacking recognition of the VASAB process from the EU-Commission and from sectoral ministerial cooperations in the BSR, but also by the different profiles of the ministers representing BSR-countries in the VASAB-process and the different functions of spatial planning at state level.
- <sup>146</sup> Source: Presentation 'From vision to Action – Baltic Sea Experience', prepared for the INTERACT seminar at Milan (27/28 February 2006).
- <sup>147</sup> Study on local public services in the Eurocity (December 2000). Study on the cross-border treatment of waste (2002). Prospective study on transport infrastructures (June 2004). Cross-border Mobility Study (2004).
- <sup>148</sup> Setting up of a measurement indicator system for the Eurocity. Further integration of the respective Territorial Information Systems existing on either side of the border. Establishment of the observatory on public health (1999/2000) and the observatory on housing and habitat (2002).
- <sup>149</sup> The debate involved all concerned administrative/political institutions and the universities on both sides of the border as well as the newly created 'Cross-border Agency of the Basque Eurocity'.
- <sup>150</sup> The basic definition of the strategic guidelines for EU-support during the years 2000-2006 has been elaborated during the 'II. Forum on Spatial Planning and Local Development' (II. Forum Raumplanung und kommunale Entwicklung), which was organised in March 1999 in Głisno/Poland. Around 70 participants from the German and Polish side have been attending this workshop.
- <sup>151</sup> A number of transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts were already elaborated during the previous INTERREG programming period (1994-99), but the ESPON programme did not yet exist. In the present INTERREG programming period (2000-06), the first results of ESPON research only became available at a stage when continuing work on transnational spatial development visions/cross-border spatial development concepts was already quite advanced.
- <sup>152</sup> ESPON studies and scenario development-activities are normally complex research projects, covering a European-wide dimension and often also a long-term time perspective. Ongoing transnational/cross-border spatial development planning activities are more geared towards the specific needs of a comparatively smaller territory and increasingly address issues related to a practical application in a short- and medium-term perspective.
- <sup>153</sup> Coverage of one single topic or a wider range of themes in a European-wide perspective (ESPON) versus pragmatic concentration on a number of key topics in which area-specific cooperation appears to be an appropriate tool for problem solution (transnational/cross-border spatial development planning).
- <sup>154</sup> Profound analytical work based upon extensive quantitative data (mostly by using existing information sources) and a sophisticated methodological toolbox for modelling purposes (ESPON) versus a pragmatic and dominantly qualitative assessment that is sometimes supported by a limited use of genuine quantitative approaches, often based upon a very limited set of existing data (transnational/cross-border spatial development planning).
- <sup>155</sup> Publishing of a scientific study (ESPON) versus publishing of a reference document for joint spatial development policy (transnational/cross-border spatial development planning).
- <sup>156</sup> The assessment realised by the ASDP-project also revealed that many 'zone-specific issues' (such as rural development, accessibility, urban issues...) do not necessarily coincide with existing political or administrative boundaries. The relatively strong focus of ESPON 1.1.1 to address such issues in the context of existing administrative structures/procedures can however lead to a situation where perceived conflicts or contradictions may - in some cases - be revealed as false from an issue-orientated perspective (this could also apply to the 'high potential integration sub-areas' and the 'weak integration sub-areas' if taken as a whole).
- <sup>157</sup> Among these are some studies reviewed under section 5.3 of our study (ESPON studies 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 3.3), but also various other ESPON-study projects (ESPON studies 1.2.1 'Transport trends', 2.4.2 'Zooming on territories', 3.1 'Integrated tools for European Spatial development').
- <sup>158</sup> These are: The territorial impacts of technological evolution (used in the thematic studies 'Facilitation of innovation' and 'Energy' for identifying challenges for the NSR). The territorial impacts of socio-cultural issues, such as integration etc. (the thematic study 'Demographic change' identifies challenges for the NSR). Issues related to water supply (addressed by the thematic study 'Coastal Water Management'). The territorial impacts of other EU policies, such as competition, culture, neighbourhood policy etc. (considered in the thematic studies on energy, transport and innovation).
- <sup>159</sup> Various studies examined in depth in the context of section 5.2 have been considered (ESPON studies 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 3.3). Beyond this, also the results of a larger number of other ESPON studies has been considered (e.g. ESPON-studies 1.2.1 'Transport trends', 1.2.2 'Telecom trends', 1.2.3 'Information Society', 1.3.1 'Natural hazards', 1.3.2 'Natural heritage', 2.1.3 'CAP impact', 2.1.4 'Energy services/networks & EU energy policy', 2.4.2 'Zoom In').
- <sup>160</sup> i.e. Functional Urban Areas-FUA; Metropolitan European Growth Areas-MEGAs; Potential Urban Strategic Horizon-PUSH; Potential Polycentric Integration Areas-PIAs.
- <sup>161</sup> Also the demarcation of PIAs, as proposed by the ESPON 1.1.1 study, is not taken over in this approach as the ASDP-analysis does not just come down to highlight areas of proximity (the ASDP-approach also combines accessibility with other indicators).
- <sup>162</sup> The ESPON 1.1.1 approach tends to underestimate the development potential of intermediate and medium-sized cities in regions without strong MEGAs and where the upper level of urban structure is comparatively weaker. Instead of designing and implementing a PIA-

- focused polycentric development model in the Atlantic area, the ASDP-project considers the three types of sub-areas that have been identified by the ASDP-project (i.e. 'motor sub-areas', 'high-potential integration sub-areas', 'weak integration sub-areas') as being the most appropriate operational (and methodological) spatial units.
- <sup>163</sup> i.e. city clustering within a polycentric development strategy for urban systems; transnational development zones/macro-regions and accessibility; fulfilling ICZM principles by joint Baltic actions within the EU maritime policy.
- <sup>164</sup> A number of follow-up activities implemented after the publication of the Eurocity White Paper have however realised explorative and/or prospective thematic studies that are based upon complex or cyclic methodological approaches (quantitative and qualitative).
- <sup>165</sup> Topic 1: Exchange on activities supported under Objective 1 and 2 of the Structural Funds. Topic 2: Interregional cooperation linking public authorities or equivalent bodies involved in other INTERREG programmes'. Topic 3: Interregional cooperation in the field of urban development. Topic 4: Interregional cooperation linking regions involved under the three themes of the regional innovative actions for 2000-06. Topic 5: Exchange on other subjects appropriate to interregional cooperation', among (e.g. maritime and coastal cooperation, spatial planning issues, cooperation on insular and ultra-peripheral issues, on solutions to natural or man-made catastrophes as well as on alleviating the economic effects of handicaps such as very low population density or mountainous conditions). Topic 6: Cooperation on border regions with the candidate countries.
- <sup>166</sup> Mobility Management, also referred to as 'Transportation Demand Management', is a tool that encourages more efficient use of transport resources. However, Mobility Management is currently poorly understood and lacks a clear definition. Administratively, it is still a minority policy area and is rarely considered as a stand-alone strategy. Furthermore, the impact of Mobility Management is yet not always sufficiently demonstrated to key decision-makers.
- <sup>167</sup> The Forum of Adriatic and Ionian Cities & Towns was set up in 1999 with the 'Charter of Ancona', providing criteria to establish and develop a commitment of local administrations for a sustainable development of the Adriatic region.
- <sup>168</sup> There are some 120 recognised metropolitan areas (500.000 inhabitants and more) in the wider Europe. METREX was founded in 1996 and has 50 member authorities from 38 metropolitan areas.
- <sup>169</sup> The formation of ESIN-IIEP grew out of the desire to tackle the challenges of development that presently threaten the very survival of many small island communities in Europe. Each island association represents groups of islands or archipelagos with the number of inhabitants residing on any one island ranging from less than 10 persons to approximately 1,000.
- <sup>170</sup> Workshop STUTTGART (June 2003), Workshop STOCKHOLM (September 2003), Workshop BOLOGNA (March 2004), Workshop PORTO (July 2004), Workshop LONDON (September 2004).
- <sup>171</sup> A number of partners have identified scope for improvement of their practice and processes, primarily with respect to the need for better and more coherent relationships between planning at higher or lower levels (national and regional levels, sub-regional and municipal levels) and greater coherence between administrative boundaries and functional urban regions and areas. Other capability and process-related issues include the need for a better integration of forecasts, projections, scenarios and sectoral plans, particularly on socio-economic issues; urban capacity studies for sustainability; the integration of the planning and implementation processes; earlier involvement of stakeholders in the planning process; better management of planning strategy; and tighter controls on monitoring and review.
- <sup>172</sup> The four interregional analysis workshops focus on (i) the existing Global Intergration Zone/Northern Parallel, (ii) Southern Parallel/Western Mediterranean, (iii) Eastern Mediterranean and (iv) Baltic/Danubian area.
- <sup>172</sup> The first workshop will identify and consider social and economic polycentric relationships such as social cohesion (governance, culture, health, higher education) and economic cohesion (research/development, services, manufacturing, tourism, higher education/training). The second workshop will identify and consider the specific territorial cohesion issues of transportation relationships (TEN's programme, gateways, interchanges, routes) and environmental relationships (landscape, water catchment areas, natural resources).
- <sup>174</sup> The first one was held in Rijeka (Croatia), 23/24Oct 2003, in a parallel session with the 5th annual Assembly of the Forum of Adriatic and Ionian Cities and Towns. The second Adriatic Forum was held in Venice on 18 Sept 2004, with a wide presence of partners, as well as others Adriatic cities and stakeholders.
- <sup>175</sup> ESPON-study 3.2 has therefore to carry out research about drivers of change in a variety of fields, but the scope of this kind of investigation is limited by the resources available.
- <sup>176</sup> Operational programmes in the context of the new Objective 3 have a strong political dimension because they are endorsed by the respective national governments and approved by the European Commission, despite the fact that their political impact is limited to transnational cooperation activities.
- <sup>177</sup> In the recently enlarged European Union (25 member states), the surface of border regions has increased from 40% of the EU territory (EU 15) to 46% (EU 25) and the share of people living in borders in the EU's total population has risen from 25% (EU 15) to 32% (EU 25).
- <sup>178</sup> INTERACT-ESPON seminar on 'Spatial Visions and Scenarios', 27-28 February 2006 Milan. Summary of workshop discussions.
- <sup>179</sup> In case of North-West Europe and the North Sea Region, for example, the promoters of the respective visioning processes expect from progress in this direction that stakeholders responsible for planning and development policies at national and regional levels in the countries concerned will be more actively involved in implementing recommendations generated by transnational cooperation activities. In case of the recently launched VASAB upgrading process (started in 2005), the promoters expect that transnational networking will be further intensified and that sub-regions are prompted to harmonise their own visions with the new VASAB-document. This new document should - in turn - serve as a basis for future territorial cooperation programmes and hopefully help coordinating better sector policies at the national and transnational level.





[info@espon.lu](mailto:info@espon.lu)  
[www.espon.lu](http://www.espon.lu)

**ESPO Coordination Unit**  
Technoport Schlassgoart  
66, rue de Luxembourg  
L-4221 Esch-sur-Alzette  
Luxembourg

**INTERACT Point Qualification & Transfer**  
Jernbanegade 22  
DK-8800 Viborg  
Denmark



[ip.qt@interact-eu.net](mailto:ip.qt@interact-eu.net)  
[www.interact-eu.net](http://www.interact-eu.net)

