

ESPON project 2.3.2. Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level. Final Report

Original

ESPON project 2.3.2. Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level. Final Report / JANIN RIVOLIN YOCCOZ, Umberto. - ELETTRONICO. - (2007), pp. 1-1328.

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/1535624 since:

Publisher:

ESPON

Published

DOI:

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

ESPON project 2.3.2

Governance of Territorial and Urban
Policies From EU to Local Level

Annex Report C

Case Study Synthesis

C

ESPON Project 2.3.2

GOVERNANCE OF TERRITORIAL AND URBAN POLICIES FROM EU TO LOCAL LEVEL

Annex Report C

Case Study Synthesis

Magareta Dahlström, Kaisa Lahteenmäki Smith & Ole Damsgaard

Separate volumes

Project Report

Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level

Annex report A

Data & Indicators

Identifying Favourable Pre-Conditions for Territorial Governance Actions

Annex report B

Synthesis of National Overviews

Annex report D

Multi-Level/Vertical Dimension of Territorial Governance

Annex report E

Horizontal Dimension of Territorial Governance

Annex report F

Spatial Planning Styles: A new Physiognomy for Europe



NORDREGIO
Nordic Centre for Spatial Development



This report represents the final results of a research project conducted within the framework of the ESPON 2000-2006 programme, partly financed through the INTERREG programme.

The partnership behind the ESPON programme consists of the EU Commission and the Member States of the EU25, plus Norway and Switzerland. Each partner is represented in the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

This report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the members of the Monitoring Committee.

Information on the ESPON programme and projects can be found on www.espon.lu

The web site provides the possibility to download and examine the most recent document produced by finalised and ongoing ESPON projects.

ISBN number: 84-690-3088-4
This basic report exists only in an electronic version.

© The ESPON Monitoring Committee and the partners of the projects mentioned.

Printing, reproduction or quotation is authorized provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is forwarded to the ESPON Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.

Table of contents

1	Researching governance issues by the use of case studies.....	7
1.1	Outline of appendix	7
1.2	Introduction.....	8
1.3	Methodological considerations.....	10
1.4	Selection of the case studies	15
1.5	Designing the case studies – overview	15
1.6	Case Studies – an overview.....	18
1.7	Synthesis of case studies.....	21
2	Trans-national and cross-border regions	28
2.1	Introduction.....	28
2.2	Case study descriptions	29
2.3	Context	31
2.4	Vertical relations	33
2.5	Horizontal relations / integration.....	35
2.6	Participation.....	38
2.7	Openness	38
2.8	Innovation.....	40
2.9	Outcomes	41
2.10	Summarising the trans-national and cross-border cases in relation to governance.....	42
2.11	Conclusions.....	46
3	National case studies.....	47
3.1	Introduction.....	47
3.2	Case study descriptions	47
3.3	Vertical relations	49
3.4	Horizontal relations.....	51
3.5	Participation.....	51
3.6	Openness	52
3.7	Innovation.....	53
3.8	Outcomes	53
3.9	Summarising the national case studies	54
3.10	Conclusion.....	60
4	'Regional', polycentric, urban networks.....	61
4.1	Introduction.....	61
4.2	Context	61
4.3	Vertical relations.....	65
4.4	Horizontal relations/integration.....	67
4.5	Participation.....	70
4.6	Openness	71
4.7	Innovation.....	71
4.8	Outcomes	72
4.9	Summarising the case study descriptions in relation to governance	73
4.10	Conclusions.....	81
5	Functional Urban Areas, Metropolitan Regions	82
5.1	Overview of the cases studied.....	82
5.2	Nature of vertical relations.....	87
5.3	Horizontal relations	90
5.4	Participation	91
5.5	Openness	95
5.6	Innovation and interesting approaches	96

5.7 Outcomes	98
5.8 Conclusions	1000
6 Identification of governance trends in Urban-Rural areas	106
6.1 The rural and urban.....	106
6.2 Cases	107
6.3 Analytical Framework.....	109
6.4 Political Context.....	110
6.5 Vertical Relations between territories, actors and administrative levels	111
6.6 Horizontal relations between actors	115
6.7 Participation, Openness and Innovation	120
6.8 Outcomes	121
6.9 Failures and Successes	122
6.10 Governance in the Urban-Rural context	124
7 Territorial Governance trends in intra-city contexts	127
7.1 Introduction.....	127
7.2 Cases	128
7.3 Analytical Framework.....	130
7.4 Political Context.....	130
7.5 Vertical relations between territories, actors and administrative levels	132
7.6 Horizontal relations between actors	139
7.7 Participation, Openness and Innovation	145
7.8 Outcomes	147
7.9 Governance in an intra-city context.....	149
7.10 Conclusion.....	150
8 Governance trends	153
8.1 Vertical relations, decentralisation, devolution, and regionalisation	153
8.2 Horizontal relations, 'multi-channel' and territorial coordination	157
8.3 Concluding on governance and public participation, openness and innovative and interesting governance practices	160
8.4 European policy impacts	164
8.5 Trends of good governance from the case studies	167
8.6 Qualitative territorial impact assessment	170
9 References.....	186
Appendix 1: analytical framework.....	188

Table of figures and maps

Figure 1	Analytical matrix for case study synthesis	10
Figure 2	Levels of coordinating Spatial Development.....	13
Figure 3	Organisation of case studies.....	16
Figure 4	Case study identification	20
Figure 5	Analytical matrix for case study synthesis	22
Figure 6	Revised version of analytical matrix for case study synthesis;	24
Figure 7	Overview of case studies	25
Figure 8	Summarising on governance outcomes in trans-national and cross-border cases	44
Figure 9	Summarising on the governance outcomes in the national case studies	55
Figure 9	continued.....	56
Figure 10	Summarising on the governance outcomes in the 'Regional', polycentric, urban networks case studies	76
Figure 10	continued.....	79
Figure 11	Summarising on the governance outcomes in the case studies of functional urban areas and metropolitan regions.....	102
Figure 12	Vertical relations with respect to spatial planning	114
Figure 13	Horizontal Coordination and Integration	119
Figure 14	'Good governance' criteria	123
Figure 15	Conflict-Harmony continuum in the urban-rural case studies	125
Figure 16	Summarising on the governance dimensions of the urban-rural case studies.	126
Figure 17	Vertical relations with respect to spatial planning in the intra-city cases	139
Figure 18	Coordination and Integration in the intra-city cases.....	145
Figure 19	Governance failures and successes in the intra-city cases	150
Figure 20	Centralised-Decentralised continuum in the intra-city case studies	151
Figure 21	Summarising on the intra-city case studies	152
Figure 22	Categories of actors in territorial governance	158
Figure 23	Vertical dimension.....	172
Figure 24	Horizontal dimension.....	173
Figure 25	Public participation	175
Figure 26	Openness.....	177
Figure 27	Innovative/interesting mechanisms.....	178
Figure 28	Accountability	180
Figure 29	Effectiveness.....	182
Figure 30	Coherence.....	184
Map 1	Distribution and location of case studies.....	19

1 Researching governance issues by the use of case studies

1.1 Outline of appendix

The outline of this appendix is designed to facilitate the independent and selective reading of different parts of the report.

Chapter 1 'Researching governance issues by the use of case studies' describes the methodology used in the synthesis and analysis of the case studies. In this chapter, there is a table (figure 4) listing all case studies. Figure 7 provides an overview of how the case studies, by the case study authors, are classified in terms of the territorial category they represent and indications of which dimensions of governance are of particular relevance to each of the case studies. Key dimensions are vertical and horizontal collaboration/integration, and participation, openness and innovative practices.

Chapters 2-7 discuss the case studies organised under the six different types of territorial categories:

- Trans-national and cross-border regions (chapter 2)
- National case studies (chapter 3)
- Regional, polycentric and urban network case studies (chapter 4)
- Functional urban areas and metropolitan regions (chapter 5)
- Urban-rural areas (chapter 6)
- Intra-city case studies (chapter 7)

All chapters deal with the key dimensions and each chapter includes concrete examples from the case studies. The overall findings of the territorial categories are summarised in a table and a short conclusion is also provided at the end of each of the chapters.

Chapter 8 provides an analytical conclusion on governance trends generated from all case studies. This chapter cuts across the territorial categories. The first part of this chapter includes the themes of vertical and horizontal collaboration as well as that of participation, openness, innovative practices and European policy impacts. Thereafter follows a section that discusses trends of good governance from all the case studies (i.e. openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence), followed by a final section on qualitative territorial impact assessment (where

examples of best practise in territorial governance found in the case studies is given).

1.2 Introduction

One of main goals of this ESPON project is to carry out case studies that will shed light on important, current developments within the realm of urban and territorial governance in the ESPON29 countries. In the ToR document it is pointed out that: “...*case studies, elaborated in a comparable way, are of an outstanding importance for this project and purpose, compared to other former ESPON projects*” (page 13). The case studies are carried out in order to provide a “comprehensive analysis and diagnosis of governance trends, applications, mechanisms at EU, trans-national, national and sub-nationals level, as well as the identification of existing territorial disparities and tentative outlining models of governance” (Tender, WP 5).

In this chapter some methodological reflections concerning the process of researching governance issues in comparative European context through case study methods is conveyed. Furthermore, we describe the process and the steps from the national overviews (NO) to the process of designing the case studies (CS) and finally undertaking the synthesis of the case studies, as well as identifying some of their potential policy implications.

Case studies can be researched by the use of either inductive or deductive approaches. Until today, a wealth of comparative case studies on urban governance and spatial planning has been carried out on an inductive basis, which has led to the acknowledgment of the variety of stakeholders and tools engaged in urban and territorial governance throughout Europe. There has however been an ambition to do something more than simply highlighting best practice, which has been evident in the overall explorative methodology of the project, stressing the advantages of combining quantitative and qualitative research methods.

There is no one way in which qualitative and quantitative methods can be combined. *Hybrid approaches* (cf. Schreier in press) comprise a number of phases, some of which are qualitative, others quantitative; all, however, are equally necessary for achieving the objective of the approach. In the case of *sequencing*, qualitative and quantitative methods are employed within one and the same study, although in different phases of the research process. The

most common example would be a qualitative phase of data collection that is followed by a quantitative phase of data analysis.


At the same time it is evident that governance defies a simple, 'a priori' definition, cf. FIR. However, within this ESPON project governance is operationalised as those ways in which a capacity to build an organizational consensus, agreeing on the contribution of each partner, and agreeing on a common territorial development vision can be achieved.

Due to the ubiquitous and multi-faceted nature of governance, the case study selection process turned out to be a useful exercise in further clarifying the research questions, by the use of working hypotheses and a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods (see for example Gissendanner, 2003). Within this ESPON project it has been the ambition to avoid the 'inductive trap'. This is done by linking the activities of various WPs, most notably the national overviews and the data collection (WP2 and WP4, respectively), and also by providing an analytical matrix. The *analytical matrix* is developed in such a way that the qualitative observations can be systematized, for example by referring to the observations in the (synthesis of the) national overviews, and yet at the same time it is 'flexible', enabling the national teams to include interpretations based on their insights into the institutional and historical legacies. The genesis of the analytical matrix is described very briefly in the next paragraph – and in greater detail in section 1.7 below.

The analytical matrix developed for the case studies and the case study synthesis draws upon the observations from the national overviews that tools and mechanisms of cooperation and coordination in the 29 countries could be grouped according to geographical scale, or geographical dimensions – as was already envisaged in the tender. Hence, as shown in the summary analysis of the national overviews, the main differences were found between (A) trans-national, cross-border regions, (B) national, (C) regional, polycentric urban networks, (D) functional urban areas and metropolitan regions, (E) urban–rural relationships and (F) intra-urban relationships. Furthermore, based on initial analysis of governance patterns, it soon became apparent that further analytical dimensions of horizontal and vertical cooperation, coordination practices and tools (formal and informal, legal and non-statutory – including civil society participation) were of relevance. These were thus incorporated in the guidelines for the case studies.

In this report the questions concerning governance will primarily be analysed 'horizontally', i.e. by analysing how various governance dimensions express themselves within each of the 'geographical dimensions'. In some cases, when it comes to the discussion of participation and innovative practices these are analysed 'vertically', i.e. by analysing the geographical variation within each of the dimensions of governance.

Figure 1 Analytical matrix for case study synthesis



1.3 Methodological considerations

In the last couple of decades the conditions of sub-national, urban and regional development have changed rather markedly throughout Europe. Concomitantly multi-level and multi-actor policy processes have unfolded in Western Europe during the 1990s. Authorities at sub-national levels have been faced with new challenges, and new ideas about co-ordination, negotiation and control involving actors at different scales. Despite the affinity of problems at the sub-national level in the different European countries, the routes towards new forms of urban and territorial governance and final outcomes display considerable variation. The

routes depend upon contextual factors, such as industrial and institutional legacies, as well as political and administrative cultures, including established practices for negotiation between public bodies and private actors, as well as the division of labour between national, regional and local authorities. The variation – and complexity of the phenomenon of governance – forms quite a challenge to comparative, European research.

The concept of governance has been discussed at length within this ESPON project in the FIR. Amongst the most important observations regarding urban and territorial governance one can note that the linear top-down decision-making model is not working effectively any more and the borders between levels of government are changing in significance. There is a wide-spread recognition that a new form of governance which involves working across boundaries within the public sector as well as between the public, private and community sectors is underway. Many European cities and regions are experiencing a shift from a traditional model of hierarchical power to a system where power is shared and split between multiple stakeholders in a network-based constellation. Central government no longer has the official monopoly of decision, if they ever had. These transformations have led to a number of further reform processes, of which the most visible are the multiplicity of actors and interests involved in decision-making and the fragmentation of responsibilities (pp. 5-6, FIR).

Governance represents however a shift, not a substitution, from 'government' to 'governance', and reflects a change from growth control to promoting development and collective action procedures, from authoritarian decisions to negotiated consensus building (in governance models, multi-actor interactions are regulated through a wide set of social modes of coordination rather than by a limited set of hierarchically defined organisational procedures), involving several actors (a governance process involves by definition a complex set of public and non-public actors, based on flexibility, partnership and voluntary participation).

Our definition of territorial governance is an organisational mode of collective action based on partnerships and coalition building amongst public and private partnerships, oriented towards a commonly defined objective (cf. SIR, p 9). The territory is a dynamic and active context, as well as an arena of action in itself, particularly stressing the role of proximity, sense of place and territorial identity to promote the collective action of local coalitions, and their capacity to organise relations with other territories.

Territorial governance actions (TGA) are the outcome of a complex negotiated process in which resources are exchanged and partly shared, objectives are defined collectively, and consensus or agreement is sought in a process of negotiation and interaction, which may be more or less formal.

The nature of the case study selection and the focus on territorial governance actions, which are often identified in cases where a spatial and/or territorial vision of some kind is emerging as part of the governance process is the reason for most of the cases being rather consensus-oriented or at least seeking an agreement through a negotiation and reconciliation process. Therefore the aspects of conflict and conflict-resolution, which are extremely central to governance, are less present in the case studies.


The key challenge of territorial governance is to create the conditions that allow collective action. Those conditions are linked to the "territorial capital", which includes

- Intellectual capital (socially constructed knowledge resources)
- Social capital (nature of relations among actors)
- Political capital (power relations and the capacity to mobilise other resources to take action)
- Material capital (financial and other tangible resources, including fixed assets and infrastructures)
- Cultural capital (material and immaterial heritage)
- Geographical capital (natural features, constraints/opportunities...)

A key challenge facing the governance process in seeking to use and develop this territorial capital is the creation of horizontal and vertical cooperation or coordination between various levels of government (multi-level governance, vertical relations), between sectoral policies with territorial impact, between territories, as well as between governmental and non-governmental actors (multi-channel governance, horizontal relations). It is equally challenging to achieve integration and coherence between disparate responsibilities, competences and visions of territories, in order to help territorial cohesion in a sustainable way. Public powers have an important role to play in meeting these challenges. The creation of horizontal and vertical co-operation/coordination between various levels of government, as well as between governmental and non-governmental organisations and achieving integration between disparate responsibilities have become central focus areas in

assessing effective governance (see Figure 2, adapted from FIR, p.4). Here the issue of effective governance vs. good governance is not going to be discussed, though it will be returned to in the analysis of the case studies. Here 'effective governance' refers to achieving the goal and main objective set for the governance process and 'good governance' refers to addressing the principles of good governance outlined through out the 232 project. Another issue worth clarifying is the question of 'losers' and 'winners' that is referred to in the synthesis analysis below. As we had a strong interest in investigating possible changes in power balance, the question of whose interests were better or worse taken into account in implementing the governance example in question was one of the aspects investigated e.g. question "Were there obvious winners and losers as a consequence of the decision which was taken?".

Figure 2 Levels of coordinating Spatial Development



Source: adapted from Fig. 7, ESDP (1999 p.36)

Vertical co-ordination addresses co-ordination among territories at different geographical levels, where the principles of multi-level governance is a key feature:

[W]e are seeing the emergence of multi-level governance, a system of continuous negotiation among governments at several territorial tiers -supra-national, national, regional and local- as the result of broad process of institutional creation and decisional reallocation that has pulled some previously centralized functions of the state up to the supra-national level and some down to the local/regional level (Marks, 1993, p.392).

Problems of *horizontal co-ordination* display themselves in many ways, posing challenges to the effective governance, as well as to the coherence of policy action. At the root of the problems here is the inability to co-ordinate both territorial policies, i.e. interaction among policy sectors and actors (public/non public actors), and territorial relations that occur at the same territorial level.

A third 'dimension' of importance for sub-national governance relates to the quality of decision-making process in terms of the principles included in the White paper on Governance. Public participation is seen as a particularly important principle here, as it is one of the core principles, not only of the White Paper on European Governance (WPEG), but also as one of the five indices of UN-HABITAT's Urban Governance Index and one of the three pillars of the Aarhus Convention. This dimension, as well as 'openness' (again one of the five principles from the WPEG) was included amongst the governance dimensions that were originally reported as a separate heading to be investigated in all the case studies. The remaining three WPEG principles, i.e. accountability, effectiveness and coherence, were also included in the guidelines for analysis.

Amongst other themes that were addressed was the degree and nature of innovation, as well as the degree of success or failure. Here the temporal aspect was equally of relevance: needless to say if the process or practice was still only being established, it was perhaps too early to judge whether it was a success. A minimum criterion of success was the final decision on implementation, but in some cases the examples provided interesting examples of the governance process, even though the final decision was not reached and in this sense the governance process turned out to be a failure.

There was also an attempt to assess factors that characterize good governance (prerequisites, "mechanisms"), as well as their possible "transferability" (transferability of conditions, but also transferability as the capacity of adaptation to solve specific territorial problems and assist decision making).

1.4 Selection of the case studies

In order to ensure in-depth, qualitative case studies it was decided that each partner should select a maximum of 2 case studies per country, including trans-national and cross-border regions. In most of the countries two case studies were indeed carried out, whilst in the smallest countries only one case study was completed. All in all, 54 case studies have been carried out, meeting the expectation that we would complete 50-60 selected cases, cf. tender. The partners were asked to indicate the profile of the selected case studies, based on ESPON typologies and a brief description of the interesting features of the case study proposed. This was intended to provide an overall picture of the proposed case studies, which could also help to avoid a situation where all of case studies would be positioned at one end of the matrix.

Every country was to have at least one case study and all case studies were to be selected in a way that would help to highlight the main governance characteristics or processes of change in the country in question.

1.5 Designing the case studies – overview

According to guidelines for the case studies, developed in co-operation by the TPG, each of the case studies should contain approximately 20 pages of information and description, organised under analytical dimensions and heading as follows (the actual questions to be answered are included as an appendix to this report):

Figure 3 Organisation of case studies



Part I, the context, is identifying objective aspects, which could be the base for typologies, while the context also enables the case studies – and the synthesis – to be linked to other ESPON classifications or typologies: the geographical type of territory, the type of institutional framework, currently, but also in the longer term (maintenance of regime, incremental change and rapid change), and spatial planning framework.

The subdivisions in *part II* stem from reflections on types of governance that were reported on in the FIR and SIR (considerations based upon the literature on governance and operationalisation of the typologies of governance, respectively). It should be noticed that in the previous interim reports it was suggested that the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) was to be analysed as a separate theme, but the national overviews (WP2) had indicated that it was more appropriate to include an analysis of OMC in the analysis of vertical relations. Also, in the preparation of the guidelines it was felt that it was too difficult to operationalise 'integrated policies'. Aspects that relate to 'integrative policies' were then included in section V 'Outcomes'. 'Outcomes' is to be understood in 'procedural' terms, i.e. it is focusing on the decision making process and the process of implementation, both of which may contain 'integrative' elements.

Beforehand, it was expected that there would be a considerable variation in the case studies due to the fact that the national teams are focusing on various thematic aspects in part II of the case study analyses. So, depending on the character of the case study in question in some of the cases, for example, issues of vertical coordination are in focus whereas in other studies issues of horizontal coordination are of prime interest. Hereby, it is ensured that the case studies are carried out in a way that allows for an in-depth analysis of the most distinctive features of each of the case studies. Accordingly, the case study synthesis (see next section) will also have to reflect the fact that some of the case studies are addressing certain issues in part II more than others. It should be noted that despite the fact that the selection of case studies has rested with the national researchers, the case studies are distributed rather evenly between the various thematic aspects in part II. This allows for a comparison of cases within each of the thematic aspects identified. Hence, there is a direct link between the typologies of governance discussed in earlier working packages as well as in the previous interim reports, and the results of the case studies.

Part III on 'Governance failures and successes' were included in the guidelines on the basis of a core team meeting held in Valencia in February 2005. The main argument for the inclusion of this, perhaps more analytical, approach was that it would be too difficult to draw conclusions on the basis of the case study material unless the national teams had worked out the pros and cons beforehand, as the effectiveness and success of the cases necessarily needed to be assessed in their national context.


In order to ensure comparability of the case studies on a more quantitative basis, each of the research teams was asked to follow a 'numeric approach' by which the qualitative analysis of the case studies is supplemented by a ranking of the importance of the themes related to part II and part III.

1.6 Case Studies – an overview

Map 1 shows the geographical distribution and location of the case studies that were eventually carried out. Figure 4 provides a list of the case studies with their identification number that is used throughout the project.

Map 1 Distribution and location of case studies

Case Studies overview



Level of Case Study

- National
- Transnational / Crossborder
- Functional urban areas / Metropolitan regions
- Urban-rural
- Regional polycentric urban networks
- Intra-city

© EuroGeographics Association for administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Source: ESPON 2.3.2 Case Studies

Figure 1.4 Case study identification

Country	Case Study
1. Portugal	1.1 The Atlantic Axis (Eixo Atlântico)
	1.2 Metro do Porto
2. Austria	2.1 Leoben
	2.2 Regional managements in Austria
3. Italy	3.1 Mezzogiorno Development Programme – Integrated Territorial Projects (PIT) – Calatino Sud Simeto
	3.2 Project of Promotion of Sustainable Development Processes in the Pinerolese (PPSP)
4. France	4.1 The “Pays” policy
	4.2 The analysis of the town planning instruments of the urban area of Lyon
5. Germany	5.1 The Socially Integrative City (Duisburg, Essen or Herne)
	5.3 New planning bodies (Hannover)
6. Belgium	6.1 The development of Zaventem airport
	6.2 The project “Tour et Taxis”
7. Switzerland	7.1. Greater Zurich Area
	7.2 “Glow.dasGlattal”
8. Slovenia	8.1 The influence of European corridors and displacement of Schengen borders on regional growth
9. Czech Rep.	9.1. Brownfields
	9.2 Sprawl in Prague Metropolitan Area
10. Spain	10.1 Pla Estratègic del Litoral Metropolità de Barcelona (PEL)
	10.2 Pla Director del Sistema Urbanístic Costaner (PDUSC)
	10.3 Pla Territorial Metropolità de Barcelona (PTMB)
11. Hungary	11.1 The Process of Developing the National Spatial Plan
	11.2 The Process of Developing the Spatial Plan for the Agglomeration of Budapest
12. Denmark	12.1 The Triangle Area
	12.2 The Oresund Region
13. Estonia	13.1 Via Baltica
14. Finland	14.1 The Structural Land Use Plan of Lahti Region
	14.2 Haparanda-Torneå
15. Latvia	15.1 Zemgale Technological Park
	15.2 Kurzeme Transport System Initiative
16. Norway	16.1 Trøndelag counties: common regional development plan
	16.2 Enhetsfylke Hedmark.
17. Sweden	17.1 Västra Götaland Region
	17.2 ARKO-collaboration
18. Lithuania	18.1 Comprehensive plan of the territory of Lithuania, adopted in 2002
	18.2 Vilnius city strategic plan 2002-2012
19. Ireland	19.1 Greater Dublin GD
	19.2 Atlantic Gateways AG
20. Romania	20.1 Development and spatial planning in the Tourism Development Micro-region “Gutin Mountains”
	20.2 Prahova County – Ploesti Area*
21. Slovakia	21.1 Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001
	21.2 Pilot Study of the residential area Jánošíková, Malacky
22. U.K.	22.1 Strategic Waste Management in England –SWM
	22.2 South Yorkshire Partnership (UK) Case Study
23. Luxembourg	23.2 The “Pôle européen de développement”

Country	Case Study
24. Cyprus	24. The "Greater Nicosia Development Plan"
25. Bulgaria	25. Master Plan for the Metropolitan Area of Sofia
26. Greece	26.1 Devolution of powers, regionalization and spatial planning
	26.2 Prefectural development companies: An instrument for...
27. Poland	27.1 Euroregion Nysa (Neisse)
	27.2 Transport Policy in a metropolitan area. The case of Warsaw
28. Netherlands	28.1 Knooppunt Arnhem Nijmegen (KAN-region)
	28.2 "Het Drielandenpark" (Park of three countries)
29. Malta	29.1 The Regeneration of Cottonera
	29.2 Garigue: A wasted land or a fertile land?

*This case study was only available in the shape of numerical tables and it is therefore not possible to include it in the case study synthesis and analysis.

1.7 Synthesis of case studies

While preparing the case study synthesis (at meetings held during the second half of 2005 in Stockholm, Brussels and Dortmund with the participation of researchers from Nordregio, IGEAT and IRPUD) a prime concern was to ensure that the synthesis would provide findings that could be related to the results of other ESPON-projects. The link between the ESPON 2.3.2 case studies, as well as the supplemental 'numerical approach', and the results of other ESPON projects is primarily established by crossing the applied 'typology of governance' (part II in the guidelines for the case studies, see above) with a 'geographical typology' that has been based upon viewpoints and definitions used in other ESPON projects, cf. SIR. By crossing the two 'typologies' it has been possible to construct an analytical matrix:

Figure 5 Analytical matrix for case study synthesis

Governance dimensions:	I: Context	II, I A: Vertical: Multi-level relations	II, I B: Vertical: Decentralisation, devolution, regionalisation	II, II A: Horizontal – ‘multi-channel’	II, II B: Horizontal – co-ordination and integrated policies	II, III A: Public Participation (ch.8.3.1)	II, III B: Openness (ch.8.3.2)	II, IV : Innovative and or interesting tools, practices and mechanisms (ch.8.3.3)	II, V: Outcomes – decisions	II, V B: Outcomes - implementation	III: Governance trends
Geographical dimensions:											
Transnational/ cross-border (ch.2)											
National (ch.3)											
Regional Polycentric Urban Networks (ch.4)											
Functional Urban Areas, Metropolitan Regions (ch.5)											
Urban-Rural (ch.6)											
Intra-city (ch.7)											

The analytical matrix can also be read as a synopsis for the case study synthesis. In general the case study synthesis has consisted of two interrelated analytical processes: a ‘horizontal’ synthesis, which was carried out by using a geographical grouping of the case studies, and a ‘vertical’ synthesis, which was primarily focusing on dimensions of ‘good governance’, e.g. public participation, openness and innovative and interesting practice. The ‘horizontal’ synthesis and the ‘vertical’ synthesis formed the principal input to the overarching synthesis. The synthesis for each of the dimensions was undertaken in an inductive way, which means that the cases were read across the governance dimensions for each of the six geographical dimensions separately. Each of those six ‘horizontal’ syntheses has then fed into the separate ‘territorial synthesis’ chapters (chapters 2-7 in this report).

A similar process was also carried out on the two governance dimensions *participation* and *openness* and the factor of *innovative practices*. These were analysed one by one and became input into a concluding sub-chapter 8.3.

In order to make sure that the chosen analytical strategy is adequate, and if necessary to adjust it accordingly, it was decided to process a number of case studies for each of the 'synthetic' chapters. A first step thus included a pilot study to formulate and test an *analytical framework* for synthesis, based upon the guidelines for case studies. In the analytical framework each question from the guidelines was still present, but the answers to the questions were now registered in a very synthetic way (in most cases 'yes' or 'no'). This synthetic way is nevertheless allowing nuances to be expressed, and even comments if something important has to be underlined. The requirement of being synthetic is obvious, as there were over 50 case studies, but the possibility for comments and nuance is also important, as based on the treatment of the case studies governance trends were then identified. The general analytical framework was then used to treat one case study for each geographical category, in order to refine it further. This process led to some changes in the analytical framework:

- The two sections on vertical relations of the guidelines, II, I, A and B (multi-level relations and decentralisation, devolution, and regionalisation) were merged
- In the section on the horizontal relations (II, II) the part concerning multi-channel relations (A), was supplemented with the part of section B that deals with territorial coordination
- The other part of section B (integration and coordination) was seen to concern both vertical as well as horizontal integration or coordination, and should be addressed in each of those accordingly
- The part on innovative tools, practices and mechanisms was extended to 'innovative and/or interesting' tools, practices and mechanisms, as the concept of innovation was in some cases seen potentially problematic.

All these changes were made after the test period, and were based on the practical treatment of several case studies. This process led to the final 'analytical framework', which was the same for each geographical territory, except for some additions for the transnational/cross-border cases, cf. appendix.

The changes can be depicted in a revised version of the analytical matrix (the synopsis) in the following way:

Figure 6 Revised version of analytical matrix for case study synthesis;

Governance dimensions:	Context	Vertical: Multi-level relations, and decentralisation, devolution, and regionalisation	Horizontal: 'Multi-channel' Territorial co-ordination	Public Participation (ch.8.3.1)	Openness (ch.8.3.2)	Innovative and/or interesting tools, practices and mechanisms (ch.8.3.3)	Outcomes - decisions	Outcomes - implementation	Governance failures and successes
Geographical dimensions:									
Transnational/ cross-border (ch.2)									
National (ch.3)									
'Regional' Polycentric Urban Networks (ch.4)									
Functional Urban Areas, Metropolitan Regions (ch.5)									
Urban-Rural (ch.6)									
Intra-city (ch.7)									

Figure 7 Overview of case studies

Governance dimensions: Geographical dimensions:	Vertical: Multi-level relations, and decentralisation, devolution, and regionalization. Open method of coordination (OMC)	Horizontal: 'Multi-channel' Territorial co-ordination	Public Participation and openness (ch.8), and innovative and/or interesting tools, practices and mechanisms (ch.9)
Transnational/ cross-border (ch.2)	1.1	1.1	12.2
	8.1	8.1	13.1
	12.2	12.2	14.2
	13.1	13.1	17.2
	14.2	14.2	23.2
	17.2	17.2	27.1
	23.2	27.1	28.2
	27.1	28.2	
	28.2		
National (ch.3)	2.2	2.2	2.2
	4.1	4.1	4.1
	9.1	9.1	9.1
	11.1	11.1	11.1
	15.2	15.2	15.2
	18.1	18.1	18.1
	21.1	26.1	21.1
26.1			
Regional, Polycentric, Urban Networks (ch.4)	3.1	3.1	3.1
	10.1	10.1	10.1
	12.1	12.1	12.1
	15.1	16.1	15.1
	16.1	17.1	16.1
	16.2	19.2	16.2
	17.1	22.1	22.2
	19.2	22.2	28.1
22.1	28.1		
28.1			
Functional Urban Areas, Metropolitan Regions (ch.5)	1.2	1.2	1.2
	4.2	4.2	4.2
	6.1	6.1	6.1
	7.1	7.1	7.1
	7.2	9.2	7.2
	9.2	10.3	9.2
	10.3	11.2	11.2
	11.2	14.1	14.1
	14.1	19.1	19.1
	19.1	20.1	20.1
	20.1	24	24
	24	25	27.2
	25	27.2	
27.2			
Urban-Rural (ch.6)	2.1	2.1	2.1
	3.2	3.2	3.2
	20.2*	5.3	10.2
	26.2	10.2	26.2
	29.2	20.2*	29.2
	26.2		
	29.2		

Intra-city (ch.7)	6.2	5.1	5.1
	18.2	18.2	6.2
	21.2	21.2	18.2
	29.1	29.1	29.1

*This case study was only available in the shape of numerical tables and it is therefore not possible to include it in the case study synthesis and analysis.

Based on the information from the case study authors, each case study was identified regarding its geographical dimension in the analytical matrix. The case study authors also indicated which governance dimensions that were of particular relevance for each case. Figure 7 provides an overview of this classification. Each case study only appears in one geographical dimension and will be dealt with in the respective chapter below (2-7). In a few cases there were ambiguities regarding the classification of a case study that may have characteristics of more than one geographical dimension. Therefore, once case (22.2) appear in the analysis both in chapter 4 and 6, but it is first and foremost regarded as belonging to the category 'regional, polycentric urban networks' and is therefore placed in that dimension in figure 7.

The development of the analytical framework has helped the persons undertaking the synthesis to extract the essential features of each of the case studies, and at the same time the process of condensing the material were facilitated. Also, the fact that some of the analyses has been done during the 'pilot study phase' in November and December 2005, while the rest were carried out in February-April 2006 and by a number of different people, clearly necessitated a common analytical framework. Based on the entries in the analytical framework (the extracted and condensed information) an overview, a synthesis, of the processes for each of the dimensions analysed was thus established.

The results of the synthesis supplement the results from the indicator-based study, and also duplicate the analytical distinction between the structural and the process level in the interpretation, as sketched out in the figure 2. Aspects relating to the process dimension (e.g. questions such as 'regionalisation' or 'devolution') can be interpreted by the use of the analysis provided in ESPON 3.2. It has been the aspiration of the research team that the two lines of research will also contribute to identifying current and possibly future trends in territorial governance. The final analysis of the case studies also included the development of first ideas for

policy implications, to be developed into policy recommendations on the three ESPON scales of analysis (micro, meso and macro) in the final report and in co-operation with the members of the TPG.

2 Trans-national and cross-border regions

It is Incremental Evolutionary Transformation, that is, gradual tinkering and bricolage, punctuated by moments of epochal or paradigmatic change, that best describes the processes of change in western capitalist states and it is probably this which is captured by the exploding number of works on "governance" in recent years. (Loughlin 2004, 8)

In the context of an increasing Europeanisation and internationalisation of non-central governments, cross-border co-operation among contiguous local and regional authorities is only one special case amongst a variety of other such initiatives. [...] These co-operation initiatives tend to focus on public policy co-ordination among participating authorities provided they manage to go beyond merely ceremonial declarations of common cross-border visions. (Perkmann 2003, 12)

2.1 Introduction

This analysis seeks to address the nature and challenges of governance in trans-national and cross-border regional constellations in Europe. The citations above refer to some of the key aspects apparent in the governance of these European cross-border entities: **the evolutionary nature** of these constellations and their gradual **Europeanisation**, which often oscillate between mere declaratory or diplomatic nature and more explicit co-ordinating efforts within different policy sectors, including territorial/spatial planning. Examples of both extremes are found amongst the case studies and the decisive factors influencing the nature of these entities seem to be linked to the degree of formality and the legal status, the functional / sector-specific scope, and the historical perspective (connected also to cultural and identity issues). Schmitt-Egner's definition of 'cross-border co-operation' as 'cross-border interaction between neighbouring regions for the preservation, governance and development of their common living space, without the involvement of their central authorities' (Schmitt-Egner 1998: 63, cited in Perkmann 2003, 4) is one part of the story, even though there are degrees to which the central authorities are involved and in some cases the extension of cross-border regions from mere (?) 'working communities' to legal entities

in their own right may require a more active participation of the central authorities as well.

Most of the case study regions are cross-border cases and Euroregions (or examples of processes taking place in them). Whilst it is beyond the scope of the analysis here to provide a more universal analysis of 'Euroregions', some clarifying remarks may be called for. In most cases the case studies are types of cross-border or "frontier institutions" (CoE 2000, 16), which are denoted by a collective relationship across a frontier with at least publicly recognised, if not necessarily official, status. It may cover situations ranging from a relationship endorsed by an intergovernmental agreement to the close links established between associations on different sides of a frontier. All these relationships that are institutionalised by agreements, protocols, statutes or lasting and regular contacts must have three basic parameters, which tie in with any definition of the trans-frontier region:

- an area of varying size, delimited to a certain extent;
- communities or administrative units separated by a common frontier:
- local and regional functions, whether single, multiple or general, with corresponding powers. (Ibid.)

The institutionalization may vary and here the legal personality becomes of interest. Three types of 'Euroregions' have been identified in this respect:

1. Euroregions without legal personality (working communities or communities of interest)
2. Euroregions which are based on private law
3. Euroregions which are based on public law (Council of Europe 2006)

As has been noted previously by the Council of Europe, many of the "Euroregions", especially those newly established in the central and eastern European countries seem to be in fact working communities and communities of interest, perhaps more appropriately seen as forums for informal trans-frontier information and consultation.

2.2 Case study descriptions

1.1 Atlantic Arc is a Portuguese-Spanish cross-border case of a voluntary association comprising 18 municipalities, half of which are

located in Northern Portugal and the other half in the region of Galicia (far North-western Spain). The initiative's main goal was to enhance the role of the North-western Iberian Peninsula and especially that of its main cities. The Axis's Charter was approved in June 1992.

12.2 The Öresund Region is a cross-border initiative, initiated by the Swedish and Danish government to jointly develop Skåne and Zealand regions with the aim of integrating economic development in the two regions, located on each side of the Sound. Whilst the co-operation stems from early 1960s, the current form of political organisation 'The Öresund Committee' was established in 1992 and consists of political representatives from regional and local authorities in Skåne and Greater Copenhagen. Öresund is one of the 8 cross-border regions under the auspices of the Nordic Council of Ministers, as well as an Interreg Programme area.

13.1 Via Baltica is a trans-national case study, consisting of the international road corridor running from Finland to the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, that is of vital importance for land transport in the Eastern part of the BSR. Development of the route started in 1991 and obtained the status of a Pan-European Corridor in 1994.

14.2 Haparanda-Tornio is a cross-border case, summarised here in the ways in which it has put forward a spatial plan for the city centres developed within this twin city on the northern Swedish-Finnish border (project "On the Border" / "Rajalla"). The cities have a long tradition of close co-existence and co-operation and gradually this have been developing towards an idea of a merged twin-city across the national borders.

17.2 ARKO co-operation (named after the two original communities that established the co-operation, i.e. ARvika and KOngsvinger) is a Swedish-Norwegian cross-border collaboration, originally established in 1965. Co-operation consists today of 7 Norwegian and 4 Swedish municipalities and is one of the Nordic Council of Ministers cross-border areas.

23.2 'Pôle Européen de Développement' (PED, European Pole of development) represents a cross-border case around the "agglomeration of the PED" covering 27 municipalities, of which 20 are in France, 4 in Belgium and 3 in Luxembourg. The initiative is centred around "Parc International d'activités", including activity zones in the three countries seeking to promote the economic dynamism of the area.

27.1. *Euroregion NYSA* represents a cross-border case, which was established in December 1991 as the very first Euroregion in Central Europe across the Polish, German and Czech borders. There are 50 municipalities belonging to the Euroregion from Poland.

28.2 *Het Drielandenpark/Park of Three Countries* encompasses the southernmost part of the Netherlands, the eastern part of Belgium and the German area of Aachen and Eschweiler, that have a long history of co-operation, in which in 2001 the Drielandenpark project was established as a cross-border initiative for achieving an integrated management approach to the Spatial Development of the area, focusing on nature conservation, landscape qualities, cultural heritage, integrated water management and sustainable agricultural practice.

In the case of cross-border communities, it seems to be the case that the more mature ones (e.g. those in the Nordic countries), with a long history behind them may in some cases be willing to move to a more legally advanced form of co-operation as well (e.g. the Finnish case study). The Nordic cases of "***På Gränsen/Rajalla***" in Tornio-Haparanda, ***ARKO*** across the Swedish and Norwegian borders, and ***Öresund*** across the Danish-Swedish border are all examples where previous co-operation and long-standing historical and cultural ties are central to achieving new governance models across borders. They are closely connected to the Nordic Council of Ministers co-operation, under which cross-border co-operation has been financed and promoted in an organized manner since 1971, with some of the cross-border initiatives stemming from even earlier (e.g. Öresund-co-operation was already established in 1964). The nature of the co-operation and the concrete modes of governance and management have however adjusted to changing circumstances and have become more 'Europeanised', as the countries involved in these initiatives have joined the EU. The latest additions to the cross-border 'family' thus include those of the latest accession, where the co-operation was established since the end of the Cold War and has become institutionalised as Euroregions e.g. NYSA-co-operation from 1991.

2.3 Context

The countries represented by the trans-national and cross-border case study regions vary in their nature from a decentralised unitary (e.g. Sweden and the Netherlands) to unitary centralised and geographically limited (Luxemburg) or centralised (Portugal). There

are no case studies however from federal EU Member States, though the cross-border areas include one case of Portuguese-Spanish co-operation (though from the point of view of Portugal). This means that the perspective of the regions is that of predominately unitary states, with differing degrees of decentralisation. In most cases the case study regions are constellations of voluntary co-operation between municipalities, ranging from one municipality on both sides of the border (as in the case of Tornio-Haparanda) to a broader group of municipalities (most other case studies). All of the case studies also reflect strong autonomy and activity from the local authorities. It seems that the more recent the initiative, the more dependent it is on local authorities and less attention is given to the involvement of private stakeholders and the third sector. It is quite surprising however that in cases where local authorities are the driving forces, relatively little attention is given to the role of the citizens. One would assume that these two go hand in hand, in the form of traditional representative democracy. Openness and participation are however quite limited to the traditional public sector representatives.

All cases are summarised below, with the exception of the Slovenian case study that had a different template. Some examples based on it are however given where relevant.

Four of the cases are centralised in terms of their (national) politico-institutional context (Portugal, Via Baltica, Luxemburg and Slovenia), the rest are decentralised unitary (Öresund, Haparanda-Tornio, ARKO, NYSA and Het Drielandenpark). The status and also the scale differ from one case to the next. Three are defined first and foremost as 'Euroregions' ("Integrated Euroregions" with a formal status - Atlantic Arc, Öresund, NYSA), two as voluntary co-operation regions formed by municipalities (ARKO and Tornio-Haparanda), Via Baltica is a TEN-project, PED/Lux a 'co-operation area' and Het Drielandenpark a cross-border project. All have municipalities as their constituent parts, except Öresund, where the sub-national regional level is the main unit. The history of co-operation also varies considerably, as the oldest have already 40 years of existence behind them (Öresund - 1964, though the current Öresund Committee dates from 1992 and ARKO - 1965, though "revitalised" with the Swedish EU-membership), whilst even the relative new-comers have existed since the early 1990s (Via Baltica and NYSA since 1991, Atlantic Arc since 1992). The Luxemburg case is slightly different, as it represents a cross-border

agglomeration or “European tri-national pole” (and therefore has a more functional status).

Except for the Luxemburg case, all case studies have a connection to Interreg (or PHARE in case of NYSA), be it as a Interreg IIIA region (Öresund) or as an active element in such a programme (Interreg IIIA in the case of Haparanda-Tornio, Sweden-Norway in the case of ARKO) or as a recipient of Interreg project funding (Atlantic Arc - Interreg (A, B, and C), also Leader, Equal and Urban; Via Baltica Nordica-Interreg IIIB, Het Drielandenpark – previous IIC funding).

The spatial planning framework is in most cases informal, as in most cases the constituent parts cannot have formal status in this area, but strategic planning is undertaken with a common vision as a framework for this activity (this is the core of the Haparanda-Tornio case study). In the ARKO case it is argued that ‘collaboration has no remit in spatial planning’.

2.4 Vertical relations

In terms of the co-ordination efforts involved in the cross-border cases, there is a lot of intangible “social capital” that is created and whilst difficult to identify in quantifiable terms is central for the future success of these initiatives and to the possibility of creating innovative forms of co-operation, both vertically and horizontally. As is argued in the Portuguese case...

The process has been fuelled by a great deal of political goodwill over the last 18 years and has evolved accordingly – with ups and downs in levels of enthusiasm. This Euro-region has nevertheless achieved a certain degree of consolidation. There is territorial identity and continuity, cultural identity and population density, and this implies a strong density of liaison. Even so, the cross-border character of this space of territorial governance naturally gives rise to new issues on governance which are at times difficult to overcome. (Portuguese case study report)

This also relates to the correspondence between national and cross-border forms of governance. If the national governance model is centralized and top-down, it is very difficult to foster cross-border initiatives that would be otherwise. The administrative culture is therefore an aspect that needs to be borne in mind.

In most cases membership in the co-operative bodies is distributed evenly between the member countries' representatives and there is a rotating Presidency (e.g. Öresund, Atlantic Axis).

Most cases represent incremental change, though in the case of Öresund there was also more profound structural reform and in the case of PED/Luxemburg regime maintenance.

Central government has a role in implementation in Via Baltica and Tornio-Haparanda, has an indirect role in NYSA and Atlantic Arc (supervisory in the first, more central in the second with the central authority with regional representation, i.e. the Northern Region Planning and Development Commission of Portugal approves the projects). In Öresund the central committee has observer status. Only in ARKO is it argued that central government is without any role.

Local interests are the main focus of the case studies in general, though it is worth pointing out that also traditional governmental/inter-governmental concerns are of relevance. The vertical relations thus are central and the reliance on the national level for setting the rules of the game and facilitating the creation of advantageous circumstances for trans-national or cross-border initiatives should not be overlooked. In most cases the only conflict-management practice that exists is national rather than local or regional (e.g. the referendum possibility which was available in the Finnish case and in fact used on the Swedish side of the border, or the fact that both Sweden and Finland received an official notification from the EU commission concerning the directive on environmental impact assessment). The question of legal status may also be central, as in the Finnish case.

The Finnish cross-border case may also be of relevance for other cross-border or trans-national regions that seek to solve the legal conundrums associated with cross-border entities of this type, as spatial planning is traditionally very much a national issue, and in most cases also local. The case is an example of a first spatial plan in a cross-border context, which has necessitated a national level investigation into how to ensure that this can take place in a legally appropriate and sustainable manner. The Ministry of the Interior set up a working group for this purpose in 2001 and co-operation was undertaken between the governments. The aim was to clarify the legal potential for intensifying cross-border cooperation between municipalities in Finland and Sweden on both sides of the national

frontier, and to make proposals on this basis. The group was to focus primarily on ways of setting up a joint cooperation body under public law through which such municipalities would be able to operate. There have been potential constitutional issues however that have stood in the way of starting the drafting of a constitutional treaty upon which the cross-border public body with legal status could be based. These are in most cases connected to the need to ensure that the constitutional rights of all citizens are respected, e.g. the issue of linguistic rights. On the Finnish side these issues have been solved in the investigation since 2002, in Sweden there is another national investigation on-going, to be reported in 2006. (Based on the Finnish case study report.)

In almost all of the cases it is argued that there is no conflict resolution mechanism. In the Haparanda-Tornio case this is included in national planning legislation and also the referendum possibility (used on the Swedish side) is seen as potentially playing such a role. In ARKO it is argued that there is no mechanism, but neither have there been conflicts.

National or intergovernmental agendas and interests are naturally also of key relevance when the future of Interreg funding is considered, which is particularly referred to in the Nordic and Dutch case studies. Bargaining will have to be undertaken and here the local actors need to mobilize and get support both from national capitals and across the EU. Here also the broader dynamic of European integration may be of relevance. It is referred to specifically in the Polish case study, where the broader European agenda is also present through the post-Cold War context and it is argued that the "future development of the Euroregion will depend upon the advances in building of the European unity".

2.5 Horizontal relations / integration

The nature of co-ordination and co-operation varies, with some 'best practice' being identified. All cross-border forms of co-operation seem to have 'consensual decision-making' as their ideal. The degree to which this is achieved depends on the nature of the sector and the nature of the questions at stake, i.e. how politicized the issues at stake are.

The co-operative constellations are not seen as particularly dynamic in terms of their actor-base, as none report 'new actors being involved'. Co-operation and dialogue is the preferred mode of

interaction in almost all. In Öresund this includes specifically certain strategically prioritized areas (e.g. innovation), in NYSA 'planning and implementation in dialogue' is referred to and "Negotiation for a common vision" in Het Drielandenpark / Park of 3 Countries. The Dutch tradition of 'poldermodel' is an example of consensus democracy and promoting inclusion in planning.

In governance practice terms we can refer to the Dutch case as a 'benchmark, as the 'consensus democracy' or 'poldermodel' is an important characteristic of Dutch governance and corporatist political tradition, also when it comes to spatial planning. As a basis for this polder-model in spatial planning, a web of institutions and discussion boards have been created, under which are the Spatial Planning Bureau and the Central Planning Bureau. Other non-spatial planning institutions are the Social Economic Council (SER), the Council of state (Raad van State) and the Scientific Council to Governmental Policy (WRR). (Dutch case study report; see also Ven 1998;Delsen 2002)

Also, in the Portuguese case the horizontal nature of the initiative was the very core of the functional motivation and driving force behind the co-operation, also providing an impetus for business involvement in the future. In most cases the initiatives are organised in loose voluntary models of co-operation and no specific formal co-ordination efforts are included. In Atlantic Arc this is attempted through ad hoc working groups, in Öresund, Haparanda-Tornio, ARKO, NYSA and Het Drielandenpark partnership-based steering groups have this role. In PED/Lux co-ordination efforts are attempted in the transport sector. Specific co-ordinating efforts in spatial planning are even more rare (in Het Drielandenpark there is a Development Perspective, i.e. a strategic Spatial Plan for this purpose, in Lux there is an activity park that is mentioned as an example). Only in Haparanda-Tornio has there been actual cross-border planning in the form of the plan for the shared city centre area.

The question of accountability is usually settled in the national context. In Atlantic Arc the Presidency is seen as holding this position, in Haparanda-Tornio the Provincia Bothniensis' 'government', in ARKO and Het Drielandenpark / Park of 3 Countries a non-binding steering group.

Conflicts are rarely referred to, though they clearly can be on the agenda when it comes to spatial planning. Tensions between

economic and ecological aspects of sustainability and the choice between investing in nature conservation or infrastructure projects are such typical examples. As the project leader of the Drielandenpark stated: "economics now prevail over ecologies and sustainability. In this economic crisis, the Euroregion rather spends money on large infrastructural projects to boost the economy of the region than on the development of a nice footpath or promenade through the hills and valleys of a naturepark" (Blokland 2005). Accordingly, the EU (through the Euroregion) is no longer prioritizing the Drielandenpark project (Poulsen 2005) (Blokland 2005).

Territorial co-ordination most often takes place in thematically organized working groups or similar (e.g. in the case of the Het Drielandenpark Landscape and Culture; Urbanization and Infrastructure; Nature; Water and the environment; Agriculture and Tourism).

Similarly in the Portuguese case, working groups and committees are established for co-ordination purposes, through they tend to be more ad hoc and connected to the projects (e.g. also Technical Assistance Committees and Deputy Committees, in the areas of culture and sports, tourism, the environment, or education and youth). Yet this is not seen as a particularly successful means of achieving policy integration and participation and it is argued that "In Northern Portugal, despite public policies aiming at the consolidation and reinforcement of Portuguese cities (through PROSIURB or the Regional Operational Programme), the funding has not favoured an urban and territorially integrated approach in a clear and transparent manner." (Portuguese case study, p. 6)

The geographical scope can also be of a more dynamic and co-ordinated nature. In the case of Via Baltica Nordica for instance the meso level involves the co-ordination and administration of the project, transnational co-operation covering the whole zone, common marketing activities and co-operation between different actors in the Baltic Sea Region.

In the Öresund case there has both been a long-term commitment to integration on the grass-roots level (through addressing the different types of barriers and problems that borders entail for the local population and its ability to commute etc.) and a more strategic focus, in recent years trying to promote cluster development and innovation (e.g. "Öresund Science Region"). Here

there has been an active attempt to include new actors from the R&D and business sectors.

The closer to a “normal” national initiative one gets, the more inclusion and formal requirements for participation, accountability in the form of public hearings etc. one finds. In the Tornio-Haparanda case the “interested parties” identified in the participation and impact assessment of the “På Gränsen –Rajalla” project’s detail plan, range from residents and landowners to customs authorities, the regional environmental authorities, road administrations, regional and local museums, county administrative boards, neighbouring municipalities, border authorities, all the branches of local government (education, culture, social and health issues etc.), and a variety of local voluntary associations and organisations (from neighbourhood associations to birdwatchers).

2.6 Participation

All of the cases mention consultation processes and participation. In most of the cases the participation procedures are informal and voluntary; only in the Finnish case are they defined as statutory, being prescribed by an Act. The participation mechanisms are not considered to be particularly effective (Portuguese, Luxemburg, Poland, Netherlands), or in some cases it was difficult to judge (Sweden). The non-governmental participation in particular was seen to be low. In five of the cases however participation is considered as having importance in boosting awareness and public debate (Danish, Estonian, Finnish, Luxemburg, Poland). In one of the cases the business community was considered most active in co-ordinating interests (Finland). Politicians are by far most relevant as mobilising actors (only in the Netherlands and Estonian case were they not seen in this role).

2.7 Openness

In four of the cases, there existed a mechanism for openness, such as a website, meetings and in one of the cases (Finland) there was also legislation guaranteeing openness. None of the case mentioned any mechanism to involve actors which should be involved but are not participating. Also, no human or financial resources were available for mechanisms for openness. In the Öresund case there are earmarked resources in the activity programme for minor co-

operation projects in order to create 'public anchorage' / local embeddedness.

In many cases there are quite active information activities, though perhaps in most cases based on a more one-way flow of information and communication, rather than actual interaction. All cases report having a website and information letter or similar. In the more top-down initiatives the coordination of information activities (as other co-ordination efforts) is incumbent on the political leadership, such as in the case of Portugal where the Secretary-General submits proposals of his own to the President and the other members, or accepts proposals from the different members to present to the remainder for discussion and to be put to the vote. In some cases, other institutions may possibly become partners or offer specific technical assistance, at times as a contribution to support applications.

In cases where we come closer to traditional local government, openness is particularly well catered for.

For example, these issues are formally well catered for in the Finnish system and "the mechanism is prescribed in the Finnish Planning and Building Act. The legislative basis for public participation and influence on public matters is defined mainly in the Finnish constitution, Local Government Act, Act on the Openness of Government Activities, Administrative Procedure Act and in Land Use and Building Act." Yet even here there is less attention to new forms of mobilizing associations and groupings of citizens.

In the other cases the practice is familiar from cross-border initiatives and Interreg contexts and involve ad hoc meetings, consultations, surveys, newspaper articles and other media activities, as well as publicity flyers and public inquiries (these examples from the Portuguese case study).

In fact, in some of the case studies the very need and motivation of citizens participation and making the initiative known amongst the public at large is analysed. Who are the final beneficiaries of this type of activity is a question that these types of co-operation constellations are necessarily facing.

As argued in the Portuguese case study report....

...Euro-regions should exist as a means to bring together collective know-how, with a view to building spatial policies at a European level. In other words, they should exist for the

political powers. But should they also exist for companies and people?

The answer to this question can only be found once evolutionary processes have determined its greater or lesser relevance. The spheres of liaison do not have to be transversal to all the agents and to people in general; they may favour cooperation networks of variable geometry in accordance with the interests at hand, some giving priority to proximity, while others involve participants at greater distances from each other.

If what is at stake is the construction of a new sphere of belonging, a matter which has as yet to be clarified within the project, insufficient attention has been paid to the processes required to foster participation and dissemination of information. (Portuguese case study, p. 13.)

2.8 Innovation

Leaving aside the cross-border constellations as innovation in themselves, another aspect of innovation was the strategic insight and consensus-building that takes place. In a majority of the cases the innovation was perceived to be found in the initiative itself, i.e. the establishment of a cross-border community and integration and co-ordination process. "Flexible structure for voluntary co-operation" as it was referred to in the Portuguese case, or "a type of informal network governance" in the Swedish ARKO case are typical aspects of organisational innovation referred to. In the Luxemburg case the development pole itself, as well as the cross-border 'EU laboratory' were referred to as dimensions of innovation.

Depending on the maturity of the initiative however, the expectations may increase and the traditional motivations for cross-border co-operation may be gradually diminished in comparison to economic gains for the business community, more tangible value added to the local population, as well as a more clearly outlined legal context for co-operation.

Examples of innovative and interesting mechanisms or tools have been identified in three of the cases and all these were related to the way of cooperation between the cross-border regions. However, at least in the Swedish and Finnish cases the cooperating organisations built do not have any legally binding decision-making power. These cases involve local, municipal level actors whereas the Luxembourg case also involves authorities on province, region and

state levels. All of the cases are aimed at improving the local living conditions and promoting economic life. In the vast majority of the cases there are no formal conflict-resolution procedures, rather conflicts are dealt with through dialogue.

It also seems that more attention should be given to technical solutions and practices that can promote participative planning. In the case of Via Baltica for instance GIS/ Internet technologies, including hardware, software, know-how and dissemination of possibilities, are transferred to the property of the regional and local actors as a result of the pilot projects. Similarly innovations in methodologies, such as work with trans-national indicators (e.g. Öresund) are interesting.

In particular in the Drielandenpark case the involvement of public sector representatives was seen to be an issue that contributed to the absence of innovation in the sense that this type of co-operation between sector authorities is the most traditional co-operation and seldom manages to create real innovation. It is not necessarily the case that in the cross-border context governance innovation requires a form of co-operation that goes also beyond the sector authorities and also relies on co-operation patterns between the residents, politicians and voluntary sector – innovation can also entail a transfer of practice between national/local and regional authorities. It does seem to be the case however that national legislation and regulation can be an element hampering further trans-national governance innovation.

The possibility of boosting the visibility of the region and the initiative were not discussed very much, though it may be worth noting that in innovation terms the means by which these cross-border initiatives promote the interests, visibility and voice of their constituents may be of broader interest to similar initiatives across Europe. Examples such as Galician / Northern Portugal Centre of Euro-Regional Studies (Portuguese case study, p. 6) or the activities undertaken in the Öresund (e.g. Öresund network, as well as "Öresund direct" service) are interesting in this respect.

2.9 Outcomes

The objective of the governance process was referred to as investments and closer co-operation (Portuguese case); to create an attractive region to work and live in, and a breeding ground for industrial investments and expansion (Danish case); closer co-

operation (Estonian case); spatial plan and its implementation (Finnish case); collaboration across the border (Swedish case); economic development and cross-border functional area (Luxemburg case) and the achievement of the Euroregion with a legal status (Polish case).

The outcomes are in the majority of cases either the establishment of a co-operation region (Euroregion or the like) or a drafting of a spatial plan (to be implemented later and therefore the results and final benefits are still difficult to identify). In many cases planning documents or shared strategies merged (e.g. in the Luxemburg case "charte d'agglomération"), and this was a concrete sign of an emergent shared understanding of spatial planning and territorial development on the agenda in all of the case studies.

In most cases the local authorities are the key stakeholders and the governance mode is not particularly integrated, rather sector-specific interests prevail and remain to be co-ordinated.

2.10 Summarising the trans-national and cross-border cases in relation to governance

In most cases the success of the cross-border cases was interpreted in strict exclusionary terms, i.e. whether the programme was implemented or a spatial plan drafted. Less explicit attention is given here to the issue of 'good governance'. As good governance is understood in a broad, process-based fashion in this project, the elements that were outlined above do contribute to the assessment of good governance however, e.g. in the form of policy integration, horizontal co-ordination, citizen participation and broader stakeholder involvement.

Despite the network-based co-operation and local links, there is much that is regulated nationally, when it comes to the cross-border and trans-national initiatives and Euroregions. Vertical relations are thus important and the role of the central government in providing the institutional and financial support needed remains important. There are in fact many potential paradoxes emerging from the trans-national and cross-border cases. Whilst much is relying on social capital, networks and historical ties between individuals and administrations, there are still many issues where formal ties and vertical relations are central in determining the future of these types of co-operation.

The constitutional issues relating to the legal status of trans-national and cross-border entities referred to in the Finnish case may be of broader interest, e.g. in relation to the issue of the 'European grouping of cross-border cooperation' (EGCC) - (COM(2004)0496 - C6 0091/2004 - 2004/0168(COD)). Here the intention is to establish a European grouping of cross-border cooperation (EGCC) that would be invested with legal status and capacity on behalf of its members, basically for the purposes of implementing and being responsible for the management of cross-border initiatives (of Interreg type). At least in the Finnish case, establishing legal status within a cross-border public body seems for the time being to require an international treaty.

In cases where governance success was considered to have been achieved, this was judged on the basis of the general objectives, such as "leading to increased mutual understanding" and "creating common spatial goals" (the Dutch case). In some cases where more tangible concrete results were also referred to, such as in the case of NYSA region (Poland), positive issues were said to include the construction and modernisation of numerous border crossings, wastewater treatment plant etc.

Policy integration has also helped to raise awareness on spatial planning themes and the ESDP. In the Via Baltica case for instance one of the main contributions of the initiative has been the positive impact on integration of actors and sectors. The development has improved the access to infrastructure and knowledge and contributed to more polycentric spatial development.

The degree of politicisation varies. In the Portuguese case for instance it was emphasized that the long-term perspective has been jeopardized by the fact that there is such strong reliance on political leadership, which is then is responsible for the Presidency of the Atlantic Arc. In most cases the nature of decision-making is not very political, rather technocratic.

Befittingly for the trans-national and cross-border scales discussed here, the broader dynamic of European integration is of relevance to the future. It is referred to specifically in the Polish case study, where the broader European agenda is also present through the post-Cold War context and it is argued that the "future development of the Euroregion will depend upon the advances in building of the European unity".

Figure 8 Summarising on governance outcomes in trans-national and cross-border cases

Criteria	1.1 Atlantic Arc	12.2 The Öresund Region	13.1 Via Baltica	14.2 Haparanda-Tornio	17.2 ARKO co-operation	23.2 PED/Lux	27.1. Euroregion NYSA	28.2 Het Drielandenpark / Park of 3 Countries
Success rate of the whole initiative	Successful	Successful: 'a flagship among cross border regions' (OECD 2003)	Yes	Successful thus far, the final outcomes in terms of the legal status remain to be seen	Successful	Success in terms of the outcome, implementation more contested	Partially	Yes
Consensus	Yes (though not one single decision, more as a sum of parts)	Yes	Yes	Yes, though also top-down (within the municipal sphere)	Yes	Yes, on the basis of dialogue	Yes	Yes
Winners?	Politicians in power	Not clear from the case study report.	No clear individual winners or losers	Economic interests and business community	No clear individual winners or losers	Open question – depends on the redistribution of taxes	Local communities	Local planning communities
Losers?	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report.		Not clear from the case study report	No clear individual winners or losers	Same as above	No	No
Obstacles to consensus	Political interests	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Not really, long co-operation tradition paved the way	No	National interests and priorities (possible contradictions)	Complicated project financing	Not clear from the case study report
Common spatial vision	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not yet (currently	Yes (Common regional plan)	Yes

Criteria	1.1 Atlantic Arc	12.2 The Öresund Region	13.1 Via Baltica	14.2 Haparanda-Tornio	17.2 ARKO co-operation	23.2 PED/Lux	27.1. Euroregion NYSA	28.2 Het Drielandenpark / Park of 3 Countries
						elaborated)		
Integration of territorial action and links to the ESDP	Polycentricity at different scales	Interreg III is considered a 'test bed' for ESDP application	Yes	Thematic co-ordination, polycentricity	Has not worked explicitly with ESDP	Strong link to the ESDP, the Chartre d'agglomeration is build on the principles	Not clear from the case study report	Developed gradually
Strengths	Different scales, concerted efforts in cross-sector issues	Not clear from the case study report.	Strengthened cooperation and integration.	Close co-operation both locally and on national level	Good co-operation with long history, a common vision	Official involvement of states	Collaboration of partners from three countries	Shared vision, consensus
Future	Tensions between enlargement and internal cohesion	Not clear from the case study report	Future plans exist and new applications for Objective 3 projects are prepared.	Connections to both structural reform in Finland and to European processes such as for instance the legal personality of "European grouping of cross-border cooperation"	Will continue the work according to strategy	Financing open question	A broader question: "will depend upon the advances in building of the European unity."	Uncertainty due to the unavailability of (Interreg/Objective 3) funding

2.11 Conclusions

There are three key concluding dimensions of the analysis, that pose challenges for closer integration and more successful territorial governance that relate to processes of Europeanisation within these case study areas: **funding** (availability of Interreg funding in particular), **identification of final beneficiaries, stakeholder and interested parties**, as most of the trans-national cases are based upon and developed as exercises in co-operation for the local authorities, and **cross-sector co-ordination**.

In terms of the financial resources required, the reliance on European funding is a central factor. Yet in the future the commitment of local authorities and in particular business representatives and private sources of financing are also clearly required. This can be achieved only if the benefits are more tangible than "merely" the promotion of co-operation and networking. In very few cases is this point made (Portugal is perhaps the clearest exception here; also the Dutch and Finnish cases emphasize the need for other sources of investment than that currently provided through the Interreg).

What is the objective in terms of creating tangible trans-national benefits? The involvement of the citizens, as well as that of a broader set of stakeholders remains an open question and very few good examples of 'best practice' come across in the cases.

The third challenge is the familiar difficulty of cross-sector co-ordination: the activities are in most cases organized through working groups and similar and the integration of the activities of these remains poorly developed and weakly grounded outside the technocratic elites involved in the programme management and implementation. As long as the local authorities are the main initiators and implementing actors, and the activities are co-ordinated through sector-based working group structures, it seems unlikely that the activities will achieve a broader impetus or dynamic beyond the public sector. This is not to say that cross-border initiatives are not important, rather that they are at the heart of the European project and have great potential for working also in the future as channels of information, exchange of experience and learning. They are the laboratories through which trans-national ideas can be channelled and tested.

3 National case studies

3.1 Introduction

Eight of the case studies belong to the national group. Despite all being national case studies, it is a heterogeneous group in their scope. Three of the national cases describe a process of creating a spatial plan; the national spatial plan of Hungary (11.1), the comprehensive plan of the territory of Lithuania (18.1) and the Slovak spatial development perspective (21.1). The different policies or programmes that are described in the case studies are; regional management in Austria (2.2), the 'pays' policy in France (4.1), the regeneration of post-industrial brown-fields in the Czech Republic (9.1), the Kurzeme Transport System Initiative in Latvia (15.2) and finally the devolution of powers, regionalisation and spatial planning in Greece (26.1).

With the exception of the federal state of Austria, all other countries represented in the national case studies group are unitary in their nature. However, these states show different degrees of decentralisation. Greece has a tradition of being a very centralised state, so this case study that deals with devolution of powers from the national level is particularly interesting here.

3.2 Case study descriptions

2.2 Regional managements in Austria

Regional management bodies have been detected as an important innovation in Austrian regional development. Regional management is an organisation or a consolidation of several organisations which had been created solely to implement regional goals. The objective of the organisations is to enhance development, build up a network, and consult and implement regional pilot projects and key projects. They act on a level between the province and the municipalities to enable strategic thinking and cooperation beyond administrative borders and are financed mainly through the municipalities' budget as well as through support from the federal provinces and the EU.

4.1 The "Pays" policy - France

The France "Pays" policy case study describes the country's move towards decentralization. "Pays" are defined by a law in 1995 as a territory with a certain degree of cohesion in terms of geographical,

cultural, economic and social components. On this basis the local authorities can gather to propose a local development project, which must be elaborated with the actors concerned. The experts tend to think that the "Pays" policy is a good experiment in changing the relations the local elected representative have towards civil society and form a good balance between representatives and participative democracy.

9.1 Brownfields – Czech Republic

The brownfields left behind by declining industries, railways, the military etc. are one of the main problems in Czech cities. While these problems are present in most cities, only in a few selected places, for instance locations close to downtown Prague, are brownfields managed by private capital. In the majority of instances support from public sources is needed to initiate private capital. The case study explores the problem of brownfield regeneration, looking at the coordination of urban, regional, national and EU funds with special attention to differences between Objective 1 and objective 2 areas.

11.1 The Process of Developing the National Spatial Plan – Hungary

The Act on Spatial Planning and Development (1996) has defined the spatial planning system in Hungary and prescribed the responsibility for preparing a National Development Strategy and National Spatial Plan to the national government. This legislation was prepared in parallel and in cooperation with the work on the National Spatial Plan (elaborated in 1998-2003). The work began with the elaboration of the spatial plan, which was finally adopted by the Parliament in the form of an Act, in order to impose rules and regulations on the local governments, which are legally and politically very strong due to the Local Government Act issued in 1990.

15.2 Kurzeme Transport System Initiative - Latvia

Kurzeme Region Development Strategy envisages the improvement of the transport system in the region, paying particular attention to the railroad system and road system. The current proposed transport system developments do not match those of the Ministry of Transport. Kurzeme Regional Spatial Strategy encompasses two alternative proposals. A regional initiative was undertaken to propose regional transport to be in line with national needs. The process was coordinated by the Kurzeme Region Development Agency and this initiative is to be regarded as of national importance.

18.1 Comprehensive plan for the territory of Lithuania, adopted in 2002

The case study focuses on the process of drafting the first comprehensive plan for the territory of Lithuania. The focus of the study is on the national territory and vertical institutional relations between the different levels of state territorial organisation with respect to spatial planning. The process is considered as a successful example of horizontal governance. The plan comprises a horizontal integration approach, where sector policies and regional plans were evaluated and integrated into the draft comprehensive plan.

21.1 Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001 - Slovakia

Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001 is an example of a spatial planning document of national importance. It covers the processes of the state as a whole, as well as the regional level, expressing a vision of spatial development. It also harmonises spatial development with international spatial connections, as well as coordinating sub-regional connections.

26.1 Devolution of powers, regionalization and spatial planning - Greece

The object of the study is the Greece decentralization policy of the last decade (since 1994) - the process of the transfer of powers to the new prefectural authorities, especially of spatial planning competences. Examined is the history of this process, the context in which it took place, the role of a variety of actors, the legal complications and the outcome as it stands in autumn 2005.

3.3 Vertical relations

Since this group of case studies are characterised as 'national' it is hardly surprising that central government plays a role in all of them. However, the role of the state varies and includes being a source of funding, a supporter, or the formulator of a programme, plan or strategy.

The regional level is of importance in all of the cases, but the role and actual regional actor in each of the case studies varies. The regions are the most important partners for the arrangement of the national spatial planning document in the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective case study (21.1). While in the case of the Kurzeme Transport System Initiative (KTSI) in Latvia (15.2), the

Kurzeme Region Development Agency plays a crucial role, where it is the main coordinating sub-national actor. The KTSI is of national importance. It was undertaken to propose a regional transport network that was to be in line with national needs. In the French case (4.1), the national decentralisation policy called 'Pays' is partly funded through the regional actors. In the Czech Republic, Lithuanian, Slovakian and Latvian cases, the importance of the regional level is recognised in relation to drafting of spatial plans. Most often the implementing bodies of the state policy or plan are found at regional level.

In all of the national case studies the local level governmental actors are involved in one way or another, consulting or supporting a national programme or organisation, participating in a planning process or implementing a national programme. An example of strong involvement of the local level can be found in the French 'Pays' policy case. 'Pays' are defined by law as a territory with a certain degree of cohesion in terms of geographical, cultural, economic and social components. On this basis the local authorities can gather to propose a local development project, which must be elaborated with the actors concerned.

A particularly complicated case with regards to vertical relations is that of devolution of powers, regionalisation and spatial planning in Greece (26.1). Focussing on the spatial planning field, spatial planning powers were transferred from the state at the regional level to the self-elected prefectures in 1994. Since then, the Council of State (the supreme administrative court of justice) has decided that planning power (although not its implementation) rests exclusively with the state. This means that planning power can not rest with the self-elected prefectures since they are not part of the central state. The central government has tried to bypass this decision by introducing new legislation, but that too has been declared unconstitutional. Hence, the relationship between the state and the self-elected prefectures seems, at least in terms of responsibility for spatial planning, to be regulated through the administrative legal system. The case study highlights how, in terms of planning powers at the moment, the division of responsibilities between the national, regional prefectural and local levels is utterly confusing.

The vertical relationships are, hence, multifaceted and plentiful among the different case studies. That means that there is potential for various types of conflicts between different levels and actors. The case studies refer to formal and informal mechanisms to deal

with any conflicts. In the Lithuanian, Slovakian, Greek and Hungarian cases, formal conflict resolution is said to be in the hands of state legislative or state governmental bodies.

Development organisations, agencies and ministries are the types of bodies that are held accountable for the processes in the case studies. In some cases it was not possible to identify an ultimate or single body that was responsible, e.g. in the French case where the complex structure of the "Pays" policy with many different actors makes it difficult to pin down ultimate accountability.

3.4 Horizontal relations

Horizontal relations between different types of actors in the case studies are generally characterised by cooperation and coordination. Interaction can be both formal and informal. The latter includes e.g. seminars, discussions and studies, as in the case of the development of the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective (21.1).

Most cases indicate territorial integration related to actors or sectors. In the case of the regional managements in Austria (2.2) regional management institutions described interactions with various departments of the regional administration such as spatial planning, economic affairs, tourism and culture. Also in the Slovak case (21.1) territorial integration was characterised by involvement of different sectors such as economic, social and cultural development. In the Lithuanian case (18.1), the planning document is in itself an integrating factor, as it guides the overall spatial development and it is also cross-sectoral. All national sector policies are integrated into the Comprehensive Plan. A failure with regards to territorial integration was noted in the Latvian case (15.2) where a decision on the spatial plan was not reached.

3.5 Participation

Public participation varies in the cases often depending on the national traditions of involving non-governmental actors in decision making. However, the overall pattern is that the involvement of civil society is limited. Most national cases refer to consultation processes. In some of the cases, e.g. in France and Hungary this is a statutory procedure. Three different examples of participation are:

The case of the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective (21.1) where involvement of civil society is not statutory, but nevertheless

there is some participation. There are, for example, ad hoc meetings and discussions with member of civil society, particularly in the proposals prior to decisions. The most common type of civil society actor that participates is that of ecological movements.

The case of the plan for Lithuania (18.1), where public participation is a constituent part of the territorial planning process in the preparation of the comprehensive plan. Public participation in the process is regulated, and examples of actors that participate include professionals and experts, NGOs, associations and universities. This means that it is mainly organised interests that take part and in some cases institutions that are not those that one normally think of in terms of civil society.

The French co-operative instrument "Conseil de développement", a body which is compulsory to create the framework of a "Pays" which is an administrative entity (4.1). The body by itself and its basic role are statutory, but the real mechanism depends on local actors and to what extent these are mobilised. The final result is not binding. The new method seeks to involve also non-public actors. The case of Lyon was the first time this method was used in France.

3.6 Openness

Several cases also have mechanisms contributing to openness such as internet websites, meetings open to the public and proactive campaign work. In the Slovakian and Lithuanian cases territorial planning laws ensure openness. In general, openness seems to be based more on informing the public than on interaction. To ensure openness in the Latvian case (15.2), the Kurzeme Regional Development Agency has taken a number of steps. All Council meetings are open to the public, an internet web site was launched, and pro-active campaign work was also carried out. In addition, seminars and conferences were held. In the Hungarian case (11.1), it is an obligation to publicly present draft spatial plans. However, this is not yet well known by the public. There are signs that this situation is in the process of changing, and information does appear in general media.

3.7 Innovation

Only two of the national case studies mentioned examples of innovative and interesting governance mechanisms. In the Lithuanian case cooperation, openness and public participation itself were considered as innovative since the country in general lack traditions in public participation procedures.

In the Slovakian case study a new meeting system was mentioned. This system was used during the preparation of the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001. At the meetings, *the involved actors and interested individuals were informed about procedures and results at the same time as the meetings were used to gain information and ideas from the regional level. Another innovative element in this case was the use of independent experts:*

"During KURS 2001 [The Slovak Spatial Development Perspective] creation, selected experts were individually spoken to. These experts were selected from two areas – from the area of theoretical professional research (accepted experts professors from Universities from the spatial development, regional policy and environment area) and experts from particular regions (experts from spatial planning area, which are good specialists of local conditions). In cooperation with these experts, as well specialization and document content was created, so then concretization of development aims in particular regions" (Case study report)

In addition, in the Greek case of devolution of powers, regionalisation and spatial planning (26.1), it was argued that the process of decentralisation would, in the Greek context, be revolutionary, if genuinely applied.

3.8 Outcomes

The national case studies constitute a group of very heterogeneous examples of national governance processes. Hence, it is to be expected that the outcomes of these case studies are varied and they are difficult to summarise. In the cases of Slovakia, Hungary, Lithuania and Latvia, the outcomes comprise the drafting of a spatial plan, either at the national level as in the three first cases, or at a regional level but of national importance as in the remaining case. In the Czech Republic case the process resulted in a strategy regarding the regeneration of brown-field sites. In the Austrian case, regional managements were established and in the French

case the main outcome is the contractual process (between the "Pays" and the Region) within the national "Pays" policy. Finally, it can be argued that the outcome of the Greek case is uncertain since the devolution of powers regarding spatial planning has been deemed unconstitutional by the Council of State.

Sustainability is mentioned in most of the case studies, particularly in relation to those that deal with spatial plans. In the Hungarian case, for example, a balance between social, economic and environmental dimensions is a crucial principle, at least formally. In the Lithuanian case, principles of sustainable development have been applied in the preparation of solutions for the Comprehensive Plan. Regarding the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective, its preparation was coordinated with sectoral policies and with the National Sustainability Strategy. Furthermore, before the approval of the Spatial Development Perspective in 2001, an Environmental Impact Assessment of the plan was carried out. Sustainability is a crucial element in the case of the regeneration of the post-industrial brown-fields in the Czech Republic. In this country, the State Environmental Policy for 2004-2010 and Sustainable Development Strategy of 2004 have identical principal aims concerning brown-fields as the Brownfield Regeneration Strategy of August 2005.

3.9 Summarising the national case studies

Figure 9 summarises the governance outcomes of the national case studies. Below the figure a summarising discussion follows.

Figure 9 Summarising on the governance outcomes in the national case studies

Criteria	2.2. Austria, Regional managements in Austria	Case 4.1 The "Pays" policy in France	9.1. Czech republic, Regeneration of post-industrial brownfields	11.1 The process of Developing the National Spatial Plan
Success rate of the whole initiative	Not clear indicators of success	Partly success	Not clear from the case study report	Considered partly success depending on the focus
Consensus	Not clear from the case study report	Yes	Yes	Yes
Winners?	Not clear from the case study report	Local lobbyist	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report
Losers?	Not clear from the case study report	Elected bodies	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report
Obstacles to consensus	Not clear from the case study report	Local elected representatives The "Conseil general State at regional or local level	Not clear from the case study report	Low public interest in large (not local) spatial vision
Common spatial vision	Not clear from the case study report	No	Yes	Yes
Integration of territorial action and links to the ESDP	Not clear from the case study report	No	Yes	Partly
Strengths	Not clear from the case study report	- National policy - Contractual framework - Territorial basis for action	Not clear from the case study report	-Horizontal intersectoral cooperation -Multilevel dialogue -Involvement of NGOs (environment)
Future	Not clear from the case study report	At present, it can only be said that the future is linked to the will of local actors and strongly to the one of the local elected representatives to go further in the governance direction.	Not clear from the case study report	Opening to civil society and subnational level

Figure 9 continued

Criteria	15.2. Latvia, Kurtzeme Transport System Initiative	18.1 Comprehensive plan of the territory of Lithuania, adopted in 2002	21.1 Slovakia, Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001	26.1 Devolution of powers, regionalization and spatial planning
Success rate of the whole initiative	Failure	Success from the horizontal governance point of view	Not clear from the case study report	Failure, because of the ultimately unsuccessful implementation of devolution of spatial planning powers.
Consensus	No	Yes	Yes	No
Winners?	There were no obvious losers nor were there winners, because no decision was taken.	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	In the long run, the prefectural reform led to locally-based, powerful authorities, as initial winners. It was however left unfinished, when legal complications blocked the devolution of powers from the centre. The absence of clear competences left as winners the central state, party – affiliated local political personnel, and isolated private interests.
Losers?	No obvious losers	No obvious losers could be identified	Not clear from the case study report	After the initial prefectural reform, the loser was the central state and its control over local affairs. Because of the stalemate of real power devolution, the end-losers are the local collectivities, the prefectural authorities, the prospects of local development and the opportunity for autonomous local expression and local emancipation.
Obstacles to Consensus	Consensus was not reached	There are no traditions of deep partnership and public participation as well as openness.	Yes. wider and more thorough cooperation with the actors, which are beyond of legislatively given relevant partners.	The barriers are mostly due to the structures of the central state, the nexus between central power and political parties alternating in government, the conflicts between them and the resolutions of the Council of State.

Criteria	15.2. Latvia, Kurtzeme Transport System Initiative	18.1 Comprehensive plan of the territory of Lithuania, adopted in 2002	21.1 Slovakia, Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001	26.1 Devolution of powers, regionalization and spatial planning
Common spatial vision	No	Yes	Yes	No clearly defined vision was produced.
Integration of territorial action and links to the ESDP	No	Yes	Yes	Yes, partly
Strengths	Not clear from the case study report	Sectoral policies issues were connected and showed in territorial scale for the first time	Existing and historically developing legislation about territorial planning with good tradition	The original 1994 reform of the creation of new prefectural authorities; The urgency of finally resolving the problem of competences after years of uncertainty
Future	Existence of planning regions is solely for planning purposes. Yet, if there were regional authorities then one might assume that policy integration into "given" territory would happen.	Replacement of mandatory principle of the national comprehensive (general) planning solutions by other principle – to give a set of recommendations, guidelines, to avoid too many details.	To the future, it is possible to assume the new forms increase of governance assertion. Simultaneously, there is a possibility to expect the creation of given formal frames for a different new forms utilization of governance implementation.	It depends on the opportunities listed above, on the development of a cohesive model of effective and genuine decentralisation, on the attitude of the Council of State and on the attainment of a broad consensus

Only two of the national cases were clearly identified as successful, and one was considered a partial success. The comprehensive plan of Lithuania (18.1) was considered particularly successful regarding the horizontal governance development. In the case of the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective (21.1) the increased participation was also seen as a successful governance development. The process of developing a national spatial plan in Hungary (11.1) was evaluated as a mixed success. The particularly successful parts of this process were related to the more technical phase of developing the plan. Here, the importance and formative influence of horizontal, inter-sectoral cooperation and the use of dialogue with agencies at the sub-national level were pointed out as successful. However, there were difficulties with the process of politicised consultations. The national plan was raised to a high legal status, something that also created more problems for the spatial plan. These problems were partly because the positive, pro-active elements of the original proposal had to be dropped due to a narrowly defined regulative document, and partly because of its controversial influence on spatial planning at the sub-national level.

There are a couple of examples of good governance among the national cases related to participation procedures. For example in the Slovakian case new elements of governance were found. In that case the meeting system mentioned above and independent experts (academic and regional) were used so that it contributed successfully to the new spatial development perspective. However, one should stress that participation here relates to professionals rather than to members of what is normally termed 'civil society'. Nevertheless, in the Slovakian context, this process was considered a success.

The governance problems in the national cases often seem to be related to coordination and decentralisation processes. For example in the Latvian case study report it was argued:

'The case of Kurzeme Transport System Initiative is considered a failure (bad practice of territorial governance) in terms of failing to ensure spatial common vision. It appeared impossible for Kurzeme Region Development Agency to undertake leading coordinating role and transpose national interests to region and vice versa.' (Case study report)

Moreover in the Greek case study, as indicated above, there were considerable problems concerning the decentralisation policies:

'The parliamentary debates over the years show clearly that no consensus exists on decentralisation policy. No consensus was reached so far either between the government and the Council of State or between the government and the local level.' (Case study report)

Most often the obstacles to consensus seem to be related to the participation of the non-governmental actors. The cases mention non-involvement of NGOs, lack of public participation or low public interest as the biggest obstacles to consensus. Other obstacles in the national cases are related to lack of time and money and structures of the central state. None of the case studies have identified any particular winners or losers in the processes.

With regards to the ESDP, it was argued that e.g. the French Pays policy and the Kurzeme Transport System Initiative had weak links with the document. In the case of the Hungarian national plan, the legal framework for spatial planning was elaborated in line with EU spatial development criteria.

The case of the comprehensive plan for Lithuania (18.1) is, however, a very clear example of ESDP application. Or to quote the case study:

'The preparation of the Comprehensive Plan of the Territory of Lithuania could be mentioned as the most effective example of the practical application of the ESDP in Lithuania. /.../ The ESDP policy aims and options were applied into the National Comprehensive Plan accordingly to the Lithuanian situation. /.../ First of all, the ESDP document served as a resource document. The ESDP principles introduction into National Comprehensive Plan, which is a basis for county level comprehensive and special plans, shows vertical integration from the Community level to the national level. The integration from the national level to the regional and local levels proceeds step by step. /.../ Due to the ESDP and other factors the major principles of spatial development has been risen in the Plan as follows:

- sustainable and balanced social, economic and environmental development;*
- polycentric development of the settlements system;*
- formation of the new urban rural relations;*
- promotion of better accessibility to the infrastructure and*

information;

- *protection and rational use of natural and cultural heritage.'*
(case study report)

3.10 Conclusion

It is very difficult to draw conclusions on the national case studies since they are such a heterogeneous collection of cases. However, an interesting finding is that the three examples of national spatial plans or perspectives that are included, the Hungarian, Lithuanian and Slovak, all seem to be examples of, at least partial, success stories regarding governance processes. It is probably not a coincidence that these three cases relate to new member states that are undergoing transitions in many ways. Hence, in the context of these countries a greater vertical and horizontal integration and collaboration represent new ways of working regarding planning.

4 'Regional', polycentric, urban networks

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the case studies of the compiled category entitled "'regional", polycentric, urban networks'. This category '...refers to polycentric urban networks, larger than a city, FUA or Metropolitan Area, but smaller than the national level. In this case 'regional' scale refers to institutional or otherwise' (Second Interim Report, p. 167). It is a heterogeneous group of case studies, but the common denominator is the 'regional' level in one sense or other. The inverted commas indicate that there is no single definition of *regional* in this matter other than the fact that it is at a geographical scale below the national and above the local. It may include regions that are identifiable as administrative regional units, such as the case of the County of Hedmark in Norway (16.2), or collaboration between several local authorities such as in the case of the KAN-region in the Netherlands (28.1). 'Region' can also indicate that it is a national policy initiative that is played out at the regional level and demands collaboration at that level, such as in the case of Strategic Waste Management in England (22.1). The use of the term *region* should in this chapter be understood as simply referring to this intermediate geographical level between the national and the local unless otherwise stated.

4.2 Context

This chapter deals with eleven case studies in nine countries. All cases refer to unitary nations that include elements of decentralisation or regionalisation. In some instances the actual case studies are pilots of increased regional power that is being tested out. Several of the case studies deal with some form of strategic planning at the regional level ranging from the quite specific such as the waste management in England (22.1), via the development of a strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona in Spain (10.1) to the responsibility for working out a regional development plan for an administrative region such as the Västra Götaland Region in Sweden (17.1)

Since this group deals with regional cases, it is perhaps not surprising that horizontal collaboration between local authorities is present in all cases. In addition, there are cases where other type of actors are involved in horizontal collaboration. The vertical dimension is also present in one form or another in most cases. Many of the cases are recently established or even in a start-up

phase. For the latter the case studies give an insight in the reasons for the collaborations and of the various actors involved. However, in these cases it is not possible to evaluate the outcomes or judge whether the cases are a success or not. Two cases (Hedmark in Norway [16.2] and Västra Götaland in Sweden [17.1]) are official pilots which means that they are new constellations or regions with new powers and responsibilities that are being tested out. This means that, at least in their own national contexts, these cases are innovative by their very existence.

None of the case studies hold Interreg status, but Hedmark county in Norway (case 16.2) is an actor in an Interreg project.

3.1 Mezzogiorno Development Programme – Integrated Territorial Projects (PIT) – Calantino Sud Simeto -Italy

Calantino sud Simento area in the Silicon Region in the South of Italy (15 municipalities) is characterised by a development delay. The policies for the development in depressed areas in Southern Italy have passed from a top-down and centralised type of model to a local, bottom-up model that, also in reference to European regional policies, aims at the development of endogenous territorial resources. The key document for the new organisation of the policies for Southern Italy is the Development Plan for Southern Italy (Piano di Sviluppo del Mezzogiorno PSM). The key instrument through which the complex objectives of PSM can be reached is PIT – Programma Integrato Territoriale.

10.1 Pla Estratègic del Litoral Metropolità de Barcelona (PEL) – Spain

PEL, the Strategic plan for metropolitan coast of Barcelona, (2004-2005) is a bottom-up strategic plan launched by an association of municipalities, a new governance-like initiative, approved in September 2005. The plan is a voluntary agreement made by 27 municipalities along the coast. The non-mandatory plan has as its goal to define common development strategies and interact more efficiently with sectoral institutions, especially the National Ministries responsible for coastal management, road and rail infrastructures, and regional institutes responsible for environmental management.

12.1 The Triangle Area - Denmark

The Triangle Area consists of eight municipalities, covering three counties, with total of almost 230,000 inhabitants. The cooperation was started in 2003 and initiated as one of the so-called "example

projects” that was proposed in the Danish National Planning Report, issued the same year. The report can be seen as the forerunner of the ideas later to be included in the ESDP document, in the sense that it focuses on the advantages of urban networks.

15.1 Zemgale Technological Park - Latvia

Zemgale Planning Region Development Programme envisages the establishment of several inter-related technological parks, covering all centres of the planning region. Zemgale Technological Park in Jelgava is one such technological parks. It envisages improving connectivity among rural and urban areas by improving the public transport system among the urban centres where technological parks will be located. The parks will serve as a tool for the development of polycentric urban systems. A number of institutions, governmental and non-governmental, are involved in the planning process for the establishment of Zemgale Technological park.

16.1 Trøndelag counties: common regional development plan – Norway

The subject of the study are the Nord-Trøndelag and Sør-Trøndelag counties which are understood to be the two politically elected regional councils as well as the two county administrations in all their responsibilities and activities. In addition, it included the Trondheim municipality, which is located in Sør-Trøndelag County and the central municipality of a functional Travel-to-work area that spills over to include Nord- Trøndelag municipalities as well. A successful implementation of a common ‘greater Trøndelag’ regional development plan, confirmed in 2005, may be a significant demonstration of how both counties and municipalities may strategically develop their role as regional development agents.

16.2 Enhetsfylke Hedmark – Norway

The subject of the study is the Hedmark County, which is understood to be the politically elected regional council and the county administration with all their responsibilities and activities. Enhetsfylke is a part of an ongoing centrally-initiated regional governance pilot scheme that is currently underway in two Norwegian counties, Hedmark, and Møre and Romsdal. Unitary governance arrangements coordinating the regional administrative tasks of the county councils (fylkeskommune) and offices of the regional state representatives (fylkesmenn) have been set up in these counties.

17.1 Västra Götaland Region – Sweden

The Västra Götaland Region is part of an official regional governance pilot in Sweden that has allowed two regions to be formed by the merger of a number of county councils. These are the Västra Götaland Region, with Göteborg as its main urban centre, and Region Skåne, with Malmö as its main urban centre. In these regions, directly elected regional bodies have taken over responsibility for regional development from the County Administrative Boards which are the state bodies at regional level. The pilot trials are currently running until 2010.

19.2 Atlantic Gateways AG – Ireland

As a response to the concentration of growth in the Greater Dublin Area on Ireland's eastern seaboard, the NSS (National Spatial strategy 2002-2020) developed the concept of the Atlantic Gateways as a way of complementing and counterbalancing Dublin's growth. The four Atlantic Gateway cities, and particularly the wider city region corridor, cover a large part of the territory of Ireland. Atlantic gateways are small cities by European standards, which form the centre of city regions. The basic premise of the concept is that by cooperation the development potential of the Gateways would be greater than if each of them were to focus solely on their own development.

22.1 Strategic Waste Management in England – UK

In the past two decades the context for strategic waste planning in the UK has faced a change both in terms of its policy agenda and its institutional landscape. The policy agenda has been captured in an EU-driven move away from total reliance on landfill to more sustainable waste management practices and the institutional landscape has been manifested in a constant reconfiguration of powers and responsibilities. These changes have taken place in the context of wider processes of transition from more traditional forms of government to governance.

22.2 South Yorkshire Partnership – UK

In the UK the contemporary governance trend is a prevalence of partnership at local government level, which has been encouraged by numerous central government initiatives. Local partnerships are essential in order to bid, for example, for government funds for urban regeneration initiatives, or for financial assistance in infrastructure development for recycling, etc. Of particular relevance in the case study are local strategic partnerships which are the key mechanism being promoted by government for joining up public services at an authority-wide level. The South Yorkshire Partnership

(SYP) is an innovative and somewhat unusual example of an LSP since it covers the area of four local authorities while a majority of LSPs cover just one local authority area.

28.1 Knooppunt Arnhem Nijmegen (KAN-region) - Netherlands

The Framework Act Changing Government (1994) is one of the most important recent agreements on a spatial level in Netherlands. It aims at nurturing cooperation between municipalities in urbanized regions around large agglomerations. The Knooppunt Arnhem Nijmegen (KAN-region) was one of the first Framework Act regions to be active in the eastern part of the Netherlands. The KAN-region, the two major cities Arnhem and Nijmegen and 18 mostly rural municipalities, sought for a strong regional cooperative policy to overcome the problems of increasing urbanisation, growing mobility and economic competition with other regions.

4.3 Vertical relations

All the case studies encompass examples of vertical relations that include some form of decentralisation or regionalisation. This means that the regional level has become, or is becoming, more powerful than previously. Across the eleven case studies this 'increased power' take different shapes and can be very limited, such as in the case of Atlantic Gateways in Ireland (19.2). Here, the increased power is a matter of increased collaboration between local authorities aiming at stimulating growth and counterbalancing the strong economic dominance of the Greater Dublin Area of Ireland. There is no formal devolution of powers; any increase in power is due to the strength in collaboration. On the other hand, there are examples of formal devolution of powers to the regional level such as in the case of the Västra Götaland Region in Sweden (17.1) where the responsibility for regional development has been transferred from the state at the regional level (the County Administrative Board) to the directly elected regional council. This particular case is a pilot which means that the new responsibilities are tested out and can become a model for other parts of Sweden too.

The vertical relations in the case studies are dominated by various forms of collaboration with actors both at the national level and at the local level. There are several examples of national ministries and national public agencies being parts of such vertical relations. The central state plays a strong role in the governance of Ireland

and in relation to the Atlantic Gateway case (19.2) the whole initiative was initiated by the state through the National Spatial Strategy of 2002. The Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government is responsible for formulation of planning policy and overall administration of land-use planning systems and plays a strong role for the Atlantic Gateway. A ministry also plays a central role in the case of Zemgale Technological Park in Latvia (15.1). The Ministry of Regional Development and Local Governments is the main state actor and has a formal role in respect of regional development issues and special planning for Zemgale.

Regarding vertical relations with local actors, most case studies include collaboration between the region and local authorities. Some of the cases are in themselves examples of collaboration between several local authorities at the same geographical level, and are in that respect best characterised by their horizontal relationships, something that will be discussed further below. The case study of the strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona (10.1) is an example where a strong region collaborates with strong local authorities. The region is an administrative unit with high autonomy, major competences, financing and negotiating powers. The local level with 27 municipalities has strong involvement and plays a major role. Another case where the local authorities have important vertical relationships with the region is Västra Götaland in Sweden (17.1). The local level is strong in Sweden, and in this case the 49 local councils in the Västra Götaland Region collaborate with the region through four formalised local authority associations.

The majority of the vertical relations, both at region-national level and region-local level, are between public bodies. However, there are some examples where non-public actors are involved. In the Calatino Sud Simento governance process in Italy (3.1) a wide spectrum of actors are involved, e.g. trade associations, non-profit associations, banks, trade unions and expert groups. In the case of the strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona (10.1) interest groups are involved, but particularly interesting here is the wider participation issue that will be discussed below.

There are also examples of non-public actors involved in the case of strategic waste management in England (22.1). All nine English regions have formed Regional Technical Advisory Bodies (RTAB). These are multi-stakeholder voluntary organisations that have been given a specific role to play in assisting the regional assemblies in strategic planning for waste. Approximately half of the actors

involved in the RTABs are representatives from local authorities, mainly county councils, but also unitary authorities and, in a few cases, district authorities. A majority of these representatives are planners, i.e. they are representing waste planning authorities, while the remainder are waste management professionals. The other actors involved in RTABs are the regional offices of the Environment Agency, the regional Government Offices, regional representatives of the waste industry, regional planning bodies, and various other bodies, including in particular regionally-based voluntary community and environmental groups.

In terms of the dynamics of the processes of vertical relations there are examples of both top-down and bottom-up developments. The Atlantic Gateway in Ireland (19.2) is a very clear example of a top-down initiative that came about as part of the National Spatial Strategy of 2002. A bottom-up example is the case of Västra Götaland Region in Sweden (17.1) when delegations from local authorities took the initiative in the process that later became a pilot test of regional governance.

4.4 Horizontal relations/integration

All case studies exemplify horizontal relations, particularly characterised by coordination, cooperation and dialogue between local authorities, and in some cases with other types of actors as well. In all cases the coordination deals with spatial planning in one form or another including those of producing development plans. In some cases, the spatial planning dimension may only deal with a particular factor, such as waste management (22.1), or may not produce a joint spatial plan for the entire area but coordinate the various spatial plans within that area such as the case of Atlantic Gateways in Ireland (19.2). Territorial integration is an aim in all case studies, but the aim has different foci. Territorial integration is for example the major aim for two of the three task forces in the pilot experiment of 'Enhetsfylke' in Hedmark, Norway (16.2). These task forces deal with *Agriculture, education/schooling, business development and innovation/entrepreneurship* and *Planning, environmental issues, energy and transport/communications* respectively. In the case of the strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona in Spain (10.1) territorial integration of policies is a main aim. A more thorough territorial integration is outlined in the Knooppunt Arnhem Nijmegen (KAN-region) in the Netherlands (28.1) that will be discussed below.

In terms of accountability, information is lacking on some of the case studies. For the others, accountability seems to rest either with the regional councils or assemblies (16.1, 16.2, 17.1, 22.1) or the local authority association (10.1). Or, there is no accountability for the entire area but the local authorities participating in the collaboration have accountability for their own area (19.2, 22.2) In the Latvian case, accountability rests ultimately with the Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government.

Three case studies are of special interest and will be presented briefly below, beginning with the Knooppunt Arnhem Nijmegen (KAN-region) in the Netherlands (28.1). The KAN-region consists of 20 municipalities; two major cities, Arnhem and Nijmegen, and 18 mostly rural municipalities. Their collaboration takes place within the Framework Act context.

One of the more important recent agreements on a spatial level is the temporary Framework Act Changing Government (Kaderwet bestuur in verandering, 1994). It aims at nurturing cooperation between municipalities in urbanized regions around large agglomerations. Involved municipalities are obliged to co-operate in policy fields of spatial planning, housing, transport and infrastructure, economic affairs and environmental issues.’ (Case study 28.1, p. 2)

The act provides a solid basis to the objective of the KAN-region; to overcome the problems of increasing (sub-)urbanization, growing mobility and economic competition with other (inter-)national regions, and to achieve economic, socio-economic and spatial development within its region. Horizontal collaboration within the KAN-region is particularly strong in relation to spatial planning and the economy. The Regional Structure Plan (RSP) is the central pillar of the spatial planning policy of the KAN. It integrates regional plans in the other policy areas and provides the framework for the implementation of regional projects such as sites for housing construction, business parks, infrastructure, ‘green’ areas and recreation projects. The RSP 1995-2015, and the forthcoming RSP 2005-2020 provide the basic frameworks for coordinated spatial planning in the KAN-region. In terms of spatial planning it can be said that the KAN-region exemplifies a horizontally well integrated relationship between the 20 municipalities.

Another interesting example of horizontal relations and emerging integration is the South Yorkshire Partnership in the UK (22.2). In

this case, the concept of polycentricity has been influential in the development of the spatial planning framework for the area.

'Particularly pertinent for South Yorkshire was the ESDP principle of 'polycentric urban development'. The existing settlement pattern of South Yorkshire is seen as exhibiting a relatively polycentric pattern, and in an assessment of a variety of spatial scenarios that South Yorkshire could follow, a polycentric approach was seen as a crucial element. Although the final Spatial Vision is not explicit about the influence of the ESDP, the influence of the notion of a polycentric pattern of urban development can be seen in the document.' (SYP Case study 22.2, p. 17)

SYP is a broad partnership covering the area of four local authorities that are particularly influential in the partnership. Other members are drawn from the full range of sub-regional stakeholders, both public and private, particularly those concerned with economic regeneration. The SYP has succeeded in producing good collaboration between four local authorities that have previously mainly been competing with one another. The partnership has resulted in the development of a Spatial Vision for South Yorkshire 2006-2021.

A third case of particular interest is the Triangle area in Denmark (12.1). The Triangle Area consists of 8 cooperating municipalities located in 3 counties. Six of the eight municipalities have collaborated since 1993 and the project was identified as an 'example project' in Denmark during 1993-1995. In 1997 the now extended collaboration of eight municipalities agreed on a common planning perspective in line with the ESDP and has produced a joint master plan for the area for 2003-2014. In this, the overall objectives for planning and land use as well as for other issues like local business development, education, culture, etc. are described.

A core idea of the cooperation is a division of labour between the specialities and specific characteristics of the municipalities. The Triangle Area promotes a 'balanced internal competition', using one voice to lobby for governmental institutions to be placed in the area and then having a 'kind of agreement' for competing within the area. Thus, one of the main ideas of the strategic planning of the

Triangle area is that the cities in the co-operation complement each other in a way that is beneficial for the development of the whole region, a classic polycentric way of thinking.

The achievements of the Triangle area show how inter-municipal strategic cooperation, supported by national authorities, can be applied.

4.5 Participation

Seven of the eleven cases refer to consultation processes that vary greatly in scope. In several cases consultation, or involvement of civil society, forms part of the work with development plans such as in the case Västra Götaland region in Sweden (17.1) and the two rounds of hearings on the regional development plan in the case of the Trøndelag common regional development plan in Norway (16.1). However, civil society participation is limited. In the KAN-region case in the Netherlands (28.1) participation of civil-society and other private actors takes place on a project level. Here there are examples of coordination of interests, e.g. among movements for the elderly and for the environment.

Two interesting cases regarding participation is the Calatino Sud Simeto in Italy (3.1) and the strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona in Spain (10.1). In the first case, civil society participation is one of the main objectives of the governance process and it is considered very important both in the decision making and implementation phases. Despite that, the participation aim has been only partly reached. Furthermore, participation is not binding and due to the limited success so far with actually achieving participation, the most important role is played by public actors both in terms of decision making and implementation.

In the Spanish case, participation is not statutory either. However, participation has been more successful and it is a politically strong factor in decision making. It is a bottom up approach from several municipalities to cooperate in concrete terms and includes multilevel dialogue. It is argued that the organised stakeholders are those whose interests are best represented and that interest groups coordinate themselves in the participation. In fact, the one actor that seems to be missing, but should be involved in this collaboration, is the national government.

Instruments to involve civil society in the Spanish case are effective, and a significant and representative number of people

participate in the process. Demands are taken into account when decisions are made and actors are involved in the implementation. There is a strong possibility for non-governmental actors to influence public decisions through their participation. Those that participate include council administration employees, local experts, trade unions, and academic groups.

Overall it can be argued that there is still a lack of participation and an under-representation of civil society in the various types of governance cases. The general pattern is that the public actors are those whose interests are best represented.

4.6 Openness

Seven of the eleven case studies provide information on openness. In some cases (e.g. the KAN-region in the Netherlands [28.1] and the Västra Götaland region in Sweden [17.1]) there are legal/constitutional regulations in place that guarantees access to documents in the authorities. In those and other cases, special measures are also put in place to improve openness and encouraging the citizens to use it. In at least three cases web sites are used to improve openness and a special attempt to reach out to young people is reported in the case of the Trøndelag common regional development plan in Norway (16.1) where two youth conferences discussing the regional development plan were held.

As regards participation, the strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona in Spain (10.1) seems to be a proactive case for openness. Several different mechanisms are used to improve openness, including a website, meetings, weekly informative bulletin, enquiries and interview. Furthermore, a communication plan (with marketing material) was made to give much more publicity to the results and to enforce the lobby goals.

Overall, however, one must say that the case studies show disappointingly little activity on the matter of openness.

4.7 Innovation

Six of the case studies provide information on innovation. In several cases the innovation was perceived to be found in the initiative itself, e.g. the fact that the regional level of working with waste management is new in England (22.1). the pilot of the Västra Götaland Region in Sweden (17.1) and the Catalino Sud Simeto

development programme in Italy (3.1) are also new types of regional governance.

An innovative and successful way of working is the Triangle area in Denmark (12.1) where the collaboration between the different local authorities have resulted in a joint Master plan that replaces the hitherto general structure of each of the municipal plans. The individual municipal plans are still legally binding, but the general structure of each municipal plan is identical. Each city council is free to supplement or make more detailed strategies and plans to the general structure of the Triangle Area for concerns that are relevant for the city council.

Another type of innovation is that reported in the case study of strategic waste management in England (22.1). As mentioned above, it is new to work with this matter at the regional level, but even more innovative is the breadth of the partnerships that, apart from public authorities and agencies also include regional representatives of the waste industry and regionally-based voluntary community and environmental groups.

Also the case of Zemgale Technological Park in Latvia (15.1) is regarded as innovative in terms of the partnership. In this territorial governance case study coordination, cooperation and participation leading to partnerships of stakeholders is regarded as innovative practice because it is not so common that institutions cooperate in an open way.

4.8 Outcomes

In the majority of the cases the outcomes, apart from increased collaboration, take the shape of a joint spatial development plan or vision, or alternatively a joint strategy such as in the case of waste management. Some of the cases are pilots or in their very early stages and only forerunners to joint strategies or visions have been agreed on. There are also examples of failures to reach the desired outcome of a strategic plan, e.g. the case of Calatino Sud Simeto (3.1) where the difficulties among the public and private actors in cooperation have hindered success. Nevertheless, more integrated planning instruments have been implemented in this case, so collaboration has increased.

Another outcome is the achievement of some stakeholder participation in all cases, although very limited in some instances.

4.9 Summarising the case study descriptions in relation to governance

All case studies were considered successful, at least to some extent. One case study, Calatino Sud Simeto (3.1) was considered moderately successful, while in two cases, County Hedmark in Norway (16.2) and Atlantic Gateways in Ireland (19.2) it was considered too early to say, but so far there were positive developments. A distinct success is the case of the KAN-region in the Netherlands (28.1) which is considered as one of the most important successes of regional cooperation/governance in the Netherlands.

With regards to winners and losers in the different case studies, it was in a few cases too early to say, while in most cases there were very few losers clearly identified. An example of losers was, however, mentioned in the Dutch case. Regarding one of the projects in the KAN-region, large infrastructural and transport companies were identified as losers. In the County of Hedmark case potential future losers were mentioned; some sectoral interests and some sectoral department employees at the county administrative board.

There were more examples of winners, in several cases identified as 'the citizens of the region' or 'all involved actors'. A few specifically identified winners are worth mentioning. In the Triangle area in Denmark (12.1) the participating cities were identified as winners because of their complementarity – i.e. one of the key ideas with polycentricity. It was also argued that the rural municipalities in this area benefited from the collaboration with the more urban areas – hence another important ESDP dimension present. More specifically, it was also argued that the professionals in planning across the region benefited from the collaboration through access to better and more detailed information for their work. Another example of winners is the case of Zemgale Technological Park in Latvia (15.1) where the positive attitude that was developed during the consensus building with actors at all levels was stressed. The participating partners were winners in the way that they have improved their cooperation for the benefit of all.

The majority of the cases were consensus based, but there were nevertheless some obstacles to achieving consensus. In this respect the Calatino Sud Simeto case study (3.1) was the most problematic where consensus was not achieved due to the misunderstandings in the setting up of the public-private partnership and the inability of both the partnership and the technician members of the Agency to

define a strategic plan for the development of the area. Otherwise, there were a few cases where at least potential obstacles to consensus were identified in the shape of differences in organisational cultures between participating institutions. This was mentioned both in the case of Västra Götaland Region in Sweden (17.1) and County Hedmark in Norway (16.2). Another similar potential obstacle is the lack of experience of collaboration between local authorities that was mentioned in the case of Atlantic Gateways in Ireland (19.2).

There were several examples of links with the ESDP among the case studies, even if they were not always explicit or in fact had little to do with ESDP itself. An example of the latter is the Swedish case (17.1).

'In the Västra Götaland region, there is a strong connection to ideas of the ESDP, but not as a result of the ESDP itself, but developed for more pragmatic reasons. E.g. the polycentricity thinking in terms of allocating main offices for different areas of responsibility to different towns/cities in the region: The regional administration is spread over six Offices across the region. Vänersborg is the regional 'capital' where the Regional Council meets and the Regional Executive Board with its secretariat resides. The regional development unit is located in Göteborg, the environmental unit in Borås, culture in Uddevalla and the Health and Medical Executive Board in Skövde with the Public Health Committee in Mariestad. (Case study 17.1 report, p. 2)

The polycentricity theme of the ESDP is also clear in the Irish case (19.2) where that and other mainstream EU policies form the underlying objective to counter Ireland's excessively monocentric urban development around the Greater Dublin Area. Also in the case of the South Yorkshire Partnership (22.2), attention was paid to the ESDP. This was particularly in the study that was carried out in the preparation stages of the strategic vision, in relation to the principle of polycentric urban development. The final Vision is not explicit about the influence of the ESDP, but the notion of a polycentric pattern of urban development can be seen in the document. Furthermore, there is a strong connection between the establishment of the SYP and mainstream EU policy. The overriding

factor in the setting up of SYP was to provide a coordinated response to (and initially to lobby for) the challenge of South Yorkshire being designated an Objective 1 region.

In the case of the Triangle area in Denmark (12.1) it seems as if the ESDP issues were picked up in the process of the ESDP being formulated. In 1997 the 8 municipalities agreed upon "The Planning Perspective for The Triangle Area 1996-2008". This planning perspective was inspired by the ideas presented in The National Planning Report 1997, where the Ministry of the Environment recommended the creation of sub-national polycentric urban networks – along the lines of the ESDP-document that was launched three months after the Danish National Planning Report. The participating municipalities considered the document as 'political binding' - although it was not formally in accordance with the Danish hierarchical planning system. Concerning the theme of 'urban development' in the National Planning Report, the network sent in an application to the national planning authorities in order to obtain status as a centre of national importance. The application was later to be approved as The Triangle Area was given the status of one of 7 national centres in Denmark. However it has to be said that, in general, there is very low awareness of ESDP among decision-makers and civil servants in The Triangle Area.

The future outlook for the case studies indicates that a couple of the pilots are likely to become permanent fixtures, and may become examples of best practice for other parts of the countries where these experiments are taking place. This is a possible development at least for the regional governance pilot of the Västra Götaland Region in Sweden (17.1) and the Trøndelag common regional development plan in Norway (16.1). The opposite may be the case in terms of the future for the Triangle area in Denmark (12.1) due to the amalgamation of municipalities that is taking place nationwide in Denmark in 2007. This is part of a major local government reform that will alter the size, competencies and fields of responsibilities for all local authorities in the country.

Figure 10 Summarising on the governance outcomes in the 'Regional', polycentric, urban networks case studies

Criteria	3.1 Mezzogiorno Development Programme – Integrated Territorial Projects (PIT) – Calatino Sud Simeto	10.1 Pla Estratègic del Litoral Metropolità de Barcelona (PEL)	12.1 The Triangle Area, Denmark	15.1 Zemgale Technological Park, Latvia	16.1 Trondheim municipality, Nord-Trøndelag and Sør-Trøndelag counties: common regional development plan, Norway	16.2 Pilot experiment 'Enhetsfylke' in Hedmark county
Success rate of the whole initiative	Medium	Success	Success	Success	Too early to say	Not clear from the case study report
Consensus	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Winners?	Not clear from the case study report	All involved actors	Cities complement each other in a way which is beneficial for the whole region; Rural municipalities in the area may benefit from industries locating in the larger areas; Municipal planners have access to detailed information re. municipal plans in the area.	Positive attitudes were developed during consensus building with actors at all levels as well as considerable progress was achieved towards cooperation and formation of partnerships.	Citizens	Regional administrators, public sector agencies and sectoral agencies. Indirectly the population of the region.
Losers?	Not clear from the case study report	None	Not clear from the case study report	There were no obvious losers as a consequence of decisions taken regarding Zemgale Technological Park.	None	Perceived losers – some sectoral interests and some sectoral department employees at the regional state governor.

Criteria	3.1 Mezzogiorno Development Programme – Integrated Territorial Projects (PIT) – <i>Calatino Sud Simeto</i>	10.1 Pla Estratègic del Litoral Metropolità de Barcelona (PEL)	12.1 The Triangle Area, Denmark	15.1 Zemgale Technological Park, Latvia	16.1 Trondheim municipality, Nord-Trøndelag and Sør-Trøndelag counties: common regional development plan, Norway	16.2 Pilot experiment 'Enhetsfylke' in Hedmark county
Obstacles to consensus	The failures are due to the misunderstandings in the setting up of the public-private partnership and the incapacity of both the partnership and the technicians members of the Agency to define a strategic plan for the development of the area.	No	Not clear from the case study report	It is assumed that rather “passive” role of the state, non-involvement of NGOs, as well as insufficient financial resources and human resources could be characterized as obstacles making it difficult to use governance practices.	No, not yet	Organisational cultural differences between the county administration and the governor's offices.
Common spatial vision	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Integration of territorial action and links to the ESDP	Not clear from the case study report	Fully related with the philosophy of EU polices	Yes, particularly in relation to polycentricity. Introduced prior to the adoption of ESDP in 1999. But in general, very low awareness of ESDP among decision-makers and civil servants generally in The Triangle Area.	Partly. Territorial integration of policies has happened in Zemgale thanks to “idea” of technological parks there. Not applicable to Latvia in general. Overall relation to EU strategies and policies is quite comprehensive and coherence is observed for instance with the ESDP, Lisbon Strategy.	Territorial integration very important but no link to ESDP	Norway is not part of the EU

Criteria	3.1 Mezzogiorno Development Programme – Integrated Territorial Projects (PIT) – <i>Calatino Sud Simeto</i>	10.1 Pla Estratègic del Litoral Metropolità de Barcelona (PEL)	12.1 The Triangle Area, Denmark	15.1 Zemgale Technological Park, Latvia	16.1 Trondheim municipality, Nord-Trøndelag and Sør-Trøndelag counties: common regional development plan, Norway	16.2 Pilot experiment 'Enhetsfylke' in Hedmark county
Strengths	Setting up of a local middle subject having the functionalities of an integrated development Agency. Implementation of a set of policies aimed at a creation of Partnership between public and private actors. Implementation of intersectoral policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership • Build a consensus and shared rules • Achieve integration of territorial action • Reach a common spatial vision • Capacity to integrate local interest and 	Not clear from the case study report	Common spatial vision for the region	Regional identity	Administrative efficiency gains and hopefully some synergies by better coordination of regional bodies. Pooling of resources.
Future	Not clear from the case study report	It will be an opportunity to order definitely the future Metropolitan Region of Barcelona	The balance may erase due to the amalgamation of municipalities in 2007. It might occur that municipalities individually will have to spend more resources in administrative changes and on working with new tasks.	Not clear from the case study report	This type of planning will continue long term. Very important collaboration as a pilot – may be seen as best practice for other parts of Norway.	Uncertain as long as the national regionalisation policy change is not settled.

Figure 10 continued

Criteria	17.1 Västra Götaland	19.2 Atlantic Gateways, Ireland	22.1 Strategic Waste management in England	22.2 South Yorkshire Partnership	28.1 Knooppunt Arnhem Nijmegen, the Netherlands
Success rate of the whole initiative	Yes	AG is still at an early stage but the overall concept has been well received.	Success	Success	Yes
Consensus	Yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Winners?	Those living and working in the region overall	Overall objective is that the whole AG city regions will benefit.	Too early to say, but if RWSs are implemented, local authorities that have traditionally been the recipients of large amounts of waste from neighbouring authorities should benefit by seeing a gradual reduction in these flows.	Too early to say.	The public transportation projects and housing construction projects in the Arnhem Nijmegen region are examples of implemented KAN policies.
Losers?	No	Possibly, in the long run, the Greater Dublin Area.	Too early to say.	Too early to say.	Regarding the MTC project: large infrastructural and transport companies
Obstacles to consensus	No serious obstacles, but probably some individuals in the former county councils that were merged or in the county administrative board that lost the responsibility for regional development.	Institutional: the LAs are separately constituted planning authorities with no statutory obligation to with other authorities outside their region, and no experience of doing so.	Not clear from the case study report	There were and still remain obstacles. Because there are four separately constituted planning authorities, each with their own planning departments, planning officers, development plans and indeed planning culture. Moreover, final decisions on spatial planning matters rest with LA members, who are subject to political pressures within their individual authorities.	The main critique to KAN policy is that, notwithstanding the Dutch participatory governance traditions of the polder model, it does not include significant private participation. Where there is public-private cooperation, this is most of the time based on skewed representation of the private sector by local businesses and other market-based parties.
Common spatial vision	Yes	yes	Yes in terms of regional waste plan.	yes	Yes

Criteria	17.1 Västra Götaland	19.2 Atlantic Gateways, Ireland	22.1 Strategic Waste management in England	22.2 South Yorkshire Partnership	28.1 Knooppunt Arnhem Nijmegen, the Netherlands
Integration of territorial action and links to the ESDP	Strong connection to the ideas of the ESDP, but not as a result of the ESDP itself, but developed for pragmatic reasons to address issues in the region.	The main relationship to the ESDP and other mainstream EU policies is in the underlying objective of the promotion of polycentricity to counter Ireland's excessively monocentric urban development.	The strengthening of the regional level in general is at least partly due to the way EU structural funds are administered. But there is unlikely to have been any direct influence from the ESDP on this policy development.	The study paid attention to ESDP, particularly the principle of polycentric urban development. The final Vision is not explicit about the influence of the ESDP, but the notion of a polycentric pattern of urban development can be seen in the document. There is a strong correlation between the establishment of the SYP and mainstream EU policy. The overriding factor in the setting up of SYP was to provide a coordinated response to (and initially to lobby for) the challenge of South Yorkshire being designated an Objective 1 region.	No information
Strengths	Shared vision, more long term development strategies.	A general acceptance that greater networking and improved connections between the cities would result in overall benefits. The initiative has strong government support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • brings together key actors in waste, which would not otherwise happen • wide and inclusive membership • level of technical and specialist knowledge • also thinks strategically to some extent 	The relative amount and longevity of cooperation between the four LAs in the area of spatial planning.	In general one can say that KAN cooperation was consensual at least at municipality level.
Future	This pilot type of regional governance will become a permanent fixture and will provide an example of best practice for other Swedish regions.	The case study is about a newly started initiative, so most of what the aim is and the implementation stage lie in the future.	It is believed that RTABs will continue to be seen as an integral part of regional waste planning.	Little reason to think that the level of joint working between the LAs will decline. As for the SYP itself, its future in the short term is assured as the RDA have guaranteed funding for at least the next two years. The SYP was set up for an indefinite period of time, but it might be superseded in the future by more formal arrangements between the LAs.	Despite of the fact that a real shift from government to governance (when seen as an open form of management of public matters, structurally involving both public, market as civil-society actors) has not entirely been made yet, the tendency of KAN governance towards more (private) participation indicates that a process of change has been brought into action. So, coordinated regional spatial policy in combination with more open forms of governance as a process within the KAN region has already improved the (economical) status of the region and promises much more to come.

4.10 Conclusions

The overall impression of the case studies in the “regional, polycentric, urban networks” category is one of increasing collaboration and integration both vertically and horizontally. The latter dimension is particularly strong. There are also examples of increased participation, both in terms of civil society and private actors. However, this is an area where development seems to be fairly slow. The same can be said for initiatives regarding openness and also innovative practices of governance. There are a few interesting cases but progress overall is limited.

Among the challenges for achieving good governance in the case study areas is the issue of **participation**. With the exception of the positive examples in this matter mentioned above, too little seems to be done to involve civil society in the processes. Overall it seems as if the increased collaboration is mainly achieved between different public actors, which may well be a start of a deeper involvement to other actors as well, but it is important not to be complacent with this but to attempt a still broader participation.

An interesting question is that of the importance of the **ESDP** and matters such as explicit polycentricity thinking. It seems as if many of the successful cases of increased collaboration resulting in joint spatial development plans or visions are generated through a pragmatic need for collaboration as the functionality and interaction in regions cover larger and larger areas. Collaboration across administrative borders and involving different types of actors is one way to address the problems with this geographical expansion of functionality. Such collaboration may not first and foremost stem from the ESDP itself, but has in many cases grown out of a bottom-up need to cooperate. This is hardly surprising, since the work with the ESDP was a process over a long time involving planning actors that would be well aware of the pressing matters on the ground. Hence, it can be argued that both bottom-up and top-down policy and practice developments become visible as part of many of the different case studies.

5 Functional Urban Areas, Metropolitan Regions

As globalisation progresses, urban regions are emerging as key players in the world economy. The pursuit of competitiveness in urban regions has become a major local and national policy objective. However, although globalisation and technological change have the potential to accelerate material well-being, they can also exacerbate socio-economic disparities between regions and increase the risk of social exclusion within them. This poses a major threat to social cohesion in metropolitan regions. Social capital constructed over decades, if not centuries, is at risk of being weakened. (OECD 2000: The Reform of metropolitan governance, p.2)

5.1 Overview of the cases studied

The 13 cases represent great variety in terms of their political organisation: federal, unitary centralised, unitary decentralised, and unitary regionalised. There does not seem to be any correspondence between the form of organisation and the type of governance or governance problems for that matter, when it comes to the metropolitan areas. Yet the type of political organisation is of relevance for two reasons, i.e. due to the role of the State and central government and its authorities, and the way in which the State uses the institutional framework available, including hierarchical relations, but also financial and normative capacities. Here also the role of sub-national level is of relevance, as the institutional context allows for possibilities for relations between sub-national levels of authorities.

Also, many of the countries included in the sample here have faced some changes, radical or incremental, in their institutional framework and political organisation in the last 20 years. It would indeed most likely be impossible to identify ones that have not. The changes having taken place after the end of cold war in the Central Eastern European countries is particularly interesting here.

In this chapter, as elsewhere in the case study analysis, it was the task of the national experts to propose interesting case studies and defining the metropolitan areas and FUAs in their national context. The term "metropolitan regions" as used here is inspired by the ESPON 111, where the term is taken as referring to the greatest centre of a whole group of urban conglomerations, enjoying easy accessibility, large size and a varied economic and human environment. The historical development is of essence here, as the

acceleration of the relative strengthening of the power of 'metropolises' or 'metropolisation process' has taken place globally. In this process a small number of large towns generally enjoying a very high status in the network of central spaces, this process has enhanced the ability to further attract activities linked with primary entrepreneurial organisational functions, new activities for which the metropolitan market is a privileged place for experiment and activity, for which the immediate proximity of an adjacent wide and diversified conglomerate of companies is an advantage. (ESPON 111, 2nd Interim Report, 35).

Here the issue of 'metropolitan governance' is a process of change visible in many ways, e.g. as outlined for instance by OECD, ways in which institutional capacity-building, strategic planning and foresight, as well as functional specialisation are addressed through setting up certain organisational, politico-administrative and functional practices and processes. Here the principles of metropolitan governance outlined by the OECD (e.g. OECD Policy Brief on the reform of metropolitan governance from October 2000) largely correspond to the 'good governance' criteria of EU's White paper, i.e. coherence, co-ordination, participation etc., analysed in the 232 case studies.

The cases are introduced in brief below.

1.2 Grande Area Metropolitana do Porto involves the development process of a co-operative metropolitan planning for the conglomeration of 14 municipalities in a n incremental process of change, with the spatial planning context being marked by the distribution of tasks in a system where the national level plays a sectoral and strategic role, whilst the regional level has a territorial strategic role and the local level is involved through its mandatory role in urban planning.

4.2 Town planning instruments of the urban area of Lyon:

An analysis of the town planning instruments of the urban area of Lyon, with a local/regional spatial planning framework and within a context of incremental change.

6.1 The development of Zaventem airport:

Case study is a contested airport development project in the context of strong federal dynamism, with a multi-level spatial planning context of practically no role played by the national level, the regional level playing a strategic and mandatory role, the municipal level having a strategic and mandatory role and the provincial level having a strategic and mandatory role. The case study is analysed against

the backdrop of major institutional and constitutional change (of adapting to a federal structure) in the last 30 years.

7.1 Greater Zurich Area:

An example of a Public-Private-Partnership of seven cantons, two cities and several private companies, with the aim of co-ordinating the economic development policies and of promoting the Greater Zurich Area business region, a large metropolitan area with strong functional relations. The spatial planning context is complex, with the confederation, 26 cantons and about 3,000 municipalities, each having its own spatial planning responsibilities, as outlined below:

- National level: strategic planning and coordination (not mandatory), legislative
- Cantonal level (main responsibility): integrated planning (structure plans), strategic and mandatory
- Municipal level: land use planning; strategic and mandatory

The case study represents an example of incremental institutional change (e.g. new agglomeration policy).

7.2 Glow.dasGlattal:

A case of eight autonomous communities working in a form of metropolitan strategic co-operation, organised as a regional association "glow.dasGlattal". The spatial planning context and change as above.

9.2 Sprawl in Prague Metropolitan Area

A case addressing the vertical and horizontal relations between strategic and physical planning initiatives and instruments in Prague metropolitan area, in a system that is moving towards unitary decentralised model. Spatial planning context is still marked by centralisation, though moving towards more regionalisation in an incremental change process.

10.3 Pla Territorial Metropolitana de Barcelona (PTMB)

A case study analysis of 162 municipalities, where a metropolitan master plan is established to cover issues such as natural protection, networks of transport infrastructures and urban growth. The spatial planning context is multi-level, with the national level having a role in sectoral, as well as strategic and mandatory planning and the regional level has a territorial planning, strategic and mandatory role. The role of the local/municipal level is in urban mandatory) planning, mandatory. The context of change is incremental.

11.2 The Process of Developing the Spatial Plan for the Agglomeration of Budapest

An analysis of co-operation in the area of metropolitan planning, consisting of an urban centre densely inhabited (City municipality of Budapest, with 23 districts) and its surrounding green belt, and small urban settlements around (Pest County, 80 local governments). The spatial planning context is one in which the national level has a strategic and mandatory role on land use and in drafting a strategic national development plan, whilst regional level is charge of a spatial regulatory plan (strategic and mandatory) and local level: spatial plan, strategic and mandatory. The context of change is one of major constitutional change (radical change since 1989).

14.1 The Structural Land Use Plan of Lahti Region

An example of co-ordinated inter-municipal plan in a context of having had inter-municipal cooperation since late 1960's, pilot sub-region project 2002. Spatial planning context is one of emerging broader metropolitan policy + land use planning process that involves municipal, sub-regional and regional levels. Change taking place is incremental.

19.1 Greater Dublin GD

Case study describes the governance relationships between the 4 separate authorities in the metropolitan region, set in a centralised national context. The spatial planning context is one of National Spatial Strategy: 2002 – 2020, with the main legislation stemming from the 1960s and the context of change being incremental.

24. The "Greater Nicosia Development Plan"

A case of working towards an integrated plan within a divided city. Spatial Planning context is seen as problematic, as a major (metropolitan) development plan is promoted since 1990 and a comprehensive plan addressing issues of preservation-rehabilitation within the central area of Nicosia (within the walls) under the UNDP, is nearing completion. However legislation required poses major challenges under present political circumstances which prevent productive cooperation between the two sides. The context of change is one of deep but incremental change

25. Master Plan for the Metropolitan Area of Sofia

Consists of the process of drafting a spatial plan for the 8 municipalities of the Sofia metropolitan region. An important component of the Plan itself is the programme for management of the implementation of the Plan. Draft Law on Implementation of the

General Spatial Development Plan (Master Plan) of the City of Sofia was specifically produced for this purpose.

27.2 Transport Policy in the Warsaw metropolitan area.

The case study addresses the development of a common transport policy for the capital region, within the context of broader establishment of the Metropolitan Area of Warsaw, i.e. obligatory co-operation framework special status as the capital (Law from 2002). Governance relationships are analysed between the four separate authorities in the metropolitan region, set in a centralised national context of major politico-administrative change since 1989.

Five out of the case studies in this category are capital regions and their planning processes or documents, 5 second cities and similar cases of seeking to achieve an integrative plan or organisational structure that could achieve this.

One is a case study of a FUA within the broader metropolitan region (Lahti, which is in some cases included in the Helsinki capital region – e.g. in OECD's territorial review of Helsinki metropolitan area) and one is a case study of a controversial infrastructure development project in the metropolitan area of Brussels (Zaventem airport in Belgium). Thus we may be able to draw more pertinent conclusions on metropolitan areas than on FUAs as a whole. Most of the case studies are spatial planning processes, the plans resulting of such processes or associations set up for co-ordinating metropolitan planning.

The roles of the different actors in the traditional governmental and administrative structures are not changing to any considerable extent, but the amount of actors involved are growing, mainly in public authorities at different level. The picture emerging from the case studies is one of an attempt at more integrated planning (in particular in the metropolitan regions) and the utilisation and testing of new instruments and institutional structures to achieve this, but with important difficulties in the area of associative forms of collaborative planning. Difficulties in attempts at co-ordination are caused by conflicts of interests, priorities and power, and to the fragmentation of power.

A tentative categorisation can be made in dividing the cases into three types: conflictual, consensual and a 'in-between' group that could be called co-operative (seeking actively to build a consensus even though it is currently unavailable). The third type also includes cases where there is a certain institutional or political lock-in, i.e. where conflicts of interest are blocking the governance solutions

sought in the final instance, or only allowing a short-term compromise solution. 5 cases are 'consensual' (4.2, 7.1, 7.2, 19.1 and 14), whilst 4 are 'conflictual' (6.1, 9.2., 10.3, 27.2) and 4 'co-operative' (1.2, 11.2, 24 and 25). It is worth emphasising here that even in conflictual cases there can be attempts by certain groups to achieve an *agreement* (for a common spatial vision or similar), even though consensus may not be a viable option, whilst in 'co-operative' forms there is a shared interest in – not only in agreeing on a compromise agreement, but in a longer term of building a consensus.

Plans are usually drafted in a long participatory process, where the process may be more important than the emerging planning document. Therefore it is hardly surprising that the decision-making usually aims at findings a consensus. In cases where conflicts emerge, they are dealt with in the traditional political decision-making processes or bargaining processes where compromises can be struck. There are not really process examples available amongst the case study reports that could help us to identify 'recommended' or 'successful' consensus-building processes. In most cases tradition of co-operation and consensus-building seems to be more important. Yet neither can we argue on the basis of the case studies that a consensual process is more advantageous for the actual policy outcome, or even for the process. It seems that in cases where consensus-building fails, the solutions/plan/document is simply put on hold, in order to be addressed in a different political situation. Therefore it can be argued that few innovative tools for conflict resolution emerge from the case studies.

5.2 Nature of vertical relations

The case studies confirm the importance of the role of the state and the central government, which is always installing the framework and regulative context in which the other actors will then find their places. Also, it is often at national level (government and/or parliament) that final agreement, on policies or spatial plan, has to be given. This agreement is needed for reasons of accountability, but also for reasons of traditional and persistent hierarchy, or/and because the national state is usually still in control of budget and allocations of resources. It is also necessary for the State to decide, when other actors cannot come to a decision. The mediating role of the central government is visible in the case studies in this sense, as the central role has the potential role as mediating factor even in cases where this is not its main responsibility.

Nevertheless, there is an important evolution if we consider the different ways a national State can play its role. They can be quite differentiated, depending on the possibilities offered by the institutional framework, the political context (the opportunity structures available), as well as depending on their utilisation of the tools and instruments such as spatial planning framework, delimitation of metropolitan areas, transfer of financial capacities, transfer of normative capacities. Here the role has been relatively stable, with the exception of countries having gone through main constitutional changes (e.g. Belgium) or transition processes (e.g. the post-Cold War changes). What has perhaps evolved more is the role of sub-national levels of public authorities, at the regional and local/municipal levels.

Central government level usually has the role of setting the broader strategic guidelines and institutional frameworks, as well as financing major infrastructure developments. In many cases here also the private actors and regional mobilisation is becoming more important however. Even in cases where the central government has a limited role (e.g. Swiss confederation, where the confederation must limit itself to laying down principles), there can be an important role for it in regulating in detail particularly important strategic areas (e.g. Law on spatial planning). The co-ordinating role is central here, as also in the Swiss case the confederation promotes and co-ordinates the spatial planning of the cantons through the approval of cantonal structure plans.

Another key issue is the amount of competences which was transferred to local authorities. The role of sub-national levels of public authorities, regional and local levels, as well as their relations work, whatever the political organisation, seems to be a major key for governance on metropolitan areas. This is illustrated in a 'conflictual' way in 5 of the cases (Belgium /Brussels, Spain/ Barcelona, Hungary/ Budapest, Czech Republic/ Prague, Poland/Warsaw), as the general trend of fragmentation of power in a metropolitan area leads to lock-in situations, with no apparent possibility to come to an agreement, as each level of public authority has enough competences to stop any 'integrating' process (even if the competence or power they have is not followed with sufficient transfer of finance).

In that fragmented context, problems arise when conflict of interests between the 'geographical' centre of the metropolitan area and its immediate surroundings, or between the metropolitan area and the next level of authority, block any possible cooperation, even if this

cooperation would be sorely needed for functional reasons. This is the case in almost all metropolitan areas studied. They are linked strongly to finance and economic development, as well as conflictual or difficult history (of radical change). Vertical relations are naturally greatly influenced by the degree of regionalisation and in federal states in particular the dynamics are unique in this respect.

Conflict resolution is more formalised with intergovernmental negotiation, court arbitration, mediation service etc. in the formal sphere and activities by political networks mobilising in the informal sphere.

An important issue in federal systems is the taxation base, as it is an important resource insuring the maintenance of autonomy and here the more prosperous areas tend to have more capacity to impose their will. Yet this is also secondary or subservient to the question of institutional structure. The possibility to enforce one's will in metropolitan policies is seldom simply reliant on financial resources. It is the case in all types of politico-organisational systems that institutional context is most important. Unitary countries with a strong local level autonomy may have a situation where individual local authorities block (or for practical purposes veto) decisions in situations where they have strong interests (even when majority would be 'for' a specific decision), whilst in federal systems this role may be available to the regional level.

In the Polish case it was emphasised that the non-public actors play an important part, but not so much on the decision, rather in the implementation stages, where a range of stakeholders also from the private sector (construction companies and investors etc.) were referred to. Yet this influence is in stark contrast with the centralisation of decision-making and strategic steering, which is very much based on hierarchy and national predominance.

Special circumstances were referred to in the Cypriote case, where the challenges posed by being a divided city are obvious and the central authorities, as well as international organisations still have a strong role. With the exception of the areas within the 'walled city', no contact is maintained between responsible authorities of the two sides. For projects within the 'walled city' there are constant contacts and cooperation between the municipalities of Nicosia on either side. The two municipalities act as the responsible authorities for the development of mutually agreed dual projects (bi-communal) within this area.

In very few cases are there specific conflict resolutions models and methods. In the Warsaw case administrative courts are referred to. In the Brussels airport 'Zaventem' case, a mediation service was put in place, and there was also a trend to go to Court. Nevertheless, this trend towards turning the conflict into a legal or judicial matter quickly reached its limits however, as different Courts were expressing different, and some contradictory, judgements. This shows clearly that were a political agreement is needed, to involve the judiciary power is not really relevant, or it cannot be relied upon as the final solution.

5.3 Horizontal relations

Several case studies represent attempts at integrated territorial or spatial processes and instruments. The organisational forms in fact seek to co-ordinate the various tools, as in the case of Lyon for instance, where "Grand Lyon" is involved in a "Contrat d'agglomération" and uses several planning instruments, like SCOT ("Schéma de cohérence territoriale"); urban planning instrument for the urban area, as well as the PLU ("Programme local d'urbanisme"), urban planning instrument at municipal level. Also the SCOT and the PLU define spatial planning priorities and actions to resolve urban problems as land use, living conditions, accessibility, economic attractiveness, urban segregation. These are all integrated policies.

In cases where territorial integration is attempted and a co-ordinated strategy sought, there are often conflicts emerging that are difficult to deal with. In many cases it is the central government or the courts that are the final arbitrator of such conflicts, but often there is reluctance from the central government to intervene (there may be political conflicts also that make this difficult). For instance in the Czech Republic case study it was argued that:

"at present there is no agreement between the Capital City of Prague and Region Central Bohemia to practice an integrated territorial planning in Prague metropolitan area. The central government, despite its ability to do so, does not intervene into this situation and leaves it unsolved." (case study report)

In most cases predominant type of interaction consists of dialogue and consultation. Only in the Greater Dublin case is the main interaction mode one of hierarchical and regulated interaction. In the cases of Metro do Porto and Lahti the role of co-operative / partnership-based working group interaction is identified as the main mode of interaction. In two of the cases conflictual nature is directly

referred to: in the case concerning the development of the Brussels airport this is the main mode of interaction and in Budapest the conflict within the process is acknowledged, whilst the main mode of interaction remains one marked by dialogue. Prague and Budapest cases also refer to conflict and competition, though dialogue and interaction is attempted.

When it comes to territorial integration, there are indications that this should be the future direction of metropolitan governance, but there is still a long way to go. In some cases the case study deals with a programme or plan instrument that has a co-ordinating motivation or should develop such a role (Porto, Glow.dasGlattal, Prague, Lahti, Dublin). In the Grater Dublin Area the Plan for a new strategic land use and transportation planning authority for the Greater Dublin Area was dropped by the government in 2004. This is not necessarily a co-ordination failure though, as the Irish government's solution was that strategic planning for the area was now covered by the joint Regional Planning Guidelines produced by the two regional authorities. The degree of co-ordination specifically in spatial planning seems to be even lower, as only the Swiss and Spanish analysis this is said to be the case. In several cases this is formally attempted through the plan (e.g. in Dublin - attempted through the National Spatial Strategy and through informal meetings of the Council Managers).

In terms of accountability, once again, a mixed picture emerges. Either elected officials are responsible on the local level (e.g. in Lyon, Lahti and Dublin) or the body responsible for the co-ordination of the metropolitan initiative (e.g. in Porto - Metro do Porto S.A., Zurich - 'Foundation Board', Glow.dasGlattal - 'regional conference'), or it is the regional level (federal state), or the central State (e.g. Budapest), or a mix of them depending on the issues and area of competences (e.g. Brussels).

5.4. Participation

About half of the cases refer to consultation processes, which are often statutory but not with binding results. Results are never officially binding, but politically they have to be taken into account, so the actual impact is still difficult to assess.

The degree of non-governmental participation seems to be low. Nevertheless about half of the cases indicate that non-governmental actors do have an influence on public decisions. In most cases the participation patterns seem very stable and there are very few cases where new actors are appearing in a policy and/or planning process

for the first time. In very few cases is there reference to new actors being or becoming involved. In the Porto case lobby organisations are referred to as such, as are some of the organised protest committees in the Brussels airport case.

In many cases a broad base of participation is achieved, but within the public-dominated partnerships. Very little attention is given to the role or activation of civil society or citizens. On the whole participation of non-governmental actors is not particularly actively promoted. The reasons most often referred to are related to lack of interest and the relatively low profile of the planning issues, lack of visibility in the media etc. The reasons for mobilisation are thus one aspects of the issue that we cannot really analyse in any depth based on the case study material available. It does seem however that here also the general observation on (new) social movements and citizens mobilisation holds, i.e. participation processes, even when existing and working (e.g. in protest committees and interest movements), tends to favour socio- economically and culturally 'middle class', rather than the disenfranchised or the excluded (e.g. Melucci 1996, 295-296).

Participation for non-governmental actors is quite differentiated depending on the types of actors involved. Formal processes to involve citizen in the decision making process concern mainly one-way flow of providing better access to information. Organised groups are naturally better placed, as there are formal ways for some of them to be in the process in the traditional corporatist system. Private sector has also organised interests, and are often well organised and well represented, though our case study material does not allow us to analyse these processes and the tensions in depth (e.g. in relation to the types of actors and organised interests that are favoured in partnership-based forms of participation etc.)

Partner constellations are based on predominance of public actors, which is partially dependent on the connection between the governance and the financing and budgetary structures, with more local taxation bases ensuring autonomy, which is then in turn reflected into the planning and power over this. There is also an increasing focus on mobilising private actors. This is particularly the case in partnership-based initiatives. The interest that are perceived as being 'best represented' in the processes are most often either public authorities or businesses. There are some attempts at co-ordinating the public and private interests, as through the 'Urban Regeneration Company' in Nicosia, which seeks to co-ordinate the possible cooperation with the private sector. In some cases (Ireland,

Swiss cases, Finnish, Bulgarian), public-private partnerships are currently developed.

Mechanisms for involving the civil society exist as part of normal political participation or formal consultation (i.e. Porto, Lyon, Budapest), in Lahti as part of a formal hearing process as required by the Land use and building act, in Budapest as part of the statutory, but non-binding consultation. In the Brussels airport case some consultations are formal, even statutory (environment permit) but not on the whole area concerned by the development of the airport. An attempt to establish a 'Concertation committee' was not successful. Nevertheless, a mediation service could be implemented. In the Prague case the participation is supported through workshops and other elements of the preparatory work and expert assessments, which have involved the participation of a total of 662 people, in the form of methodological guidance and support from external consultants for partnership-building. Also in the Sofia case the participation is targeted at stakeholders, i.e. estate owners and large companies, rather than the public at large. Here also business community is identified as the main actor type mobilising for participation

Effectiveness of the methods is difficult to judge on the basis of the reports, only in four cases it is argued that the participation processes have been effective (Porto, Lyon, Prague and Lahti). A general trends is the consultation of targeted actors (private sector, administration, public level, expert), with more influence of those actors than in general public consultation

In a very conflictual case as the Belgian case, due the political context but also to the project at stake, which has a direct, daily impact on life of citizen, there can be a great degree of organisational capacity mobilised also amongst the non-public actors, and addressing the different level authorities e.g. environmental NGOs, who lobby and aim protests towards the executive and lobby to the legislative branch of different government (regional and federal). There is also action in Courts, as well as different types of public information and mediation activities by various organised group (Specific protest committee, Professional associations, Unions etc. Direct action by citizens' movements is not uncommon either, whilst at the same time the private sector (e.g. air transport companies, investors) are active in lobbying the executive. Co-ordination of interests is very seldom referred to, and seems to be a weak point for civil society. Coordination is a real difficulty for the citizen and protest committee, due to lack of time and resources, but mainly, because

different interests, sometimes conflicting, are at stake. There is no over-all co-ordination, but economic investors and 'One Region' (RF) seek to present a co-ordinated interest view amongst them. Also, on one occasion, almost all the protest committees were uniting to influence a decision, and they won.

In the Lahti case conflict resolution is done by political means, in Portugal it is argued that regional governments seek to strengthen their role in such a role, as actors representing interests of ('poor') villages and small towns against ('rich') major cities and regional centres. In Porto and Lyon there are more partnership- or working groups based co-ordination models in place.

Which interests are then best represented? A broad-based inclusion of local and regional stakeholder is said to be the case in Porto and in Lyon, Prague and Dublin local political and administrative interests. In Sofia, Budapest and Zurich the business community are referred to. In some cases this is seen to depend on the issue at hand, e.g. in Nicosia "those attracting the largest interest", which are economy oriented; environment oriented and culture and history oriented interests. Also in the Brussels airport case the representation of interests is issue-based.

Actors that are not involved, but are seen as they 'should be' were in many cases not identified. It is interesting to note that in some cases the absence of the central government was seen as a limitation (Porto and Barcelona). Civil society and NGOPs were referred to in Budapest case and in the Brussels airport case it was argued that actors representing socio-economically more marginalised groups should be more involved.

Concerning the mobilizing of the territory, it is quite often the policy makers which are mobilising, with the official or non official influence of economic interests. Often mobilisation is connected to the local political leaders and their commitment and understanding of local development issues (e.g. the French case) and therefore reflecting quite traditional political dynamics. In some cases planners are important, in others protest committees (but in general, coordination seems to be a weak point for civil society). In the Porto case the mayors have this role, in Lyon it is seen to be difficult to involve the general public, rather a small number of selected actors from different socio-economic fields and public authorities, in Barcelona and Budapest local political representatives, in Lahti case local village or neighbourhood associations. In Nicosia such a role is most clearly that of the media, potentially also political parties, workers unions and professional associations. In Sofia a lack of mobilising actors was

reported. In the Brussels airport it is the protest committees that have a mobilising role, but also the public authorities and the unions at different times.

Finally, we have to underline a trend towards the involvement of judiciary power, used by citizens and public authorities alike (cf. vertical relations).

5.5. Openness

Another strong general trend is to promote 'openness', with information concerning public (governmental) involvement. Formal processes to involve citizen in the decision making process concern mainly better information (cf. openness infra).

In several cases, there exist mechanisms for openness (e.g. through legislation, consultation processes, hearings, websites, and mediation services), which can be and are used by stakeholders. Concerted efforts to involve actors who should, but are not, participating seems to be rare.

Nevertheless, in most cases the information flow is one-way – not really interactive, rather information is 'made available' through the website, or via the media. Yet the aim of creating a concerted information policy and a shared approach are central to many of the cases. As was argued in the Glow.dasGlattal case for instance, concerted information policy, own internet homepage and a periodical press coverage are tools in informing the public, but also of strengthening the spirit of a "regional identity".

Mechanisms of improving openness are either based on legal obligation in the form of legislation for 'open administration' or Information Act or similar (in the cases of Barcelona, Lahti, Nicosia, Sofia and Brussels – "Law on Administrative Transparency") and in two of the cases on less formal processes of promoting openness (Porto and Budapest).

In most cases information is made available to the general public through websites, weekly info bulletins, media information or similar (all cases except Lyon, Prague, Dublin). In Sofia the information is made available through the media. In the cases of Porto and Glow.dasGlattal a specific communication strategy is referred to. There are no separate agencies or resources for this purpose however, except in the case of the Brussels airport, where a 'mediation service' is referred to.

In most cases the question of 'openness' (and participation) are seen as more national level issues that are valid for all levels of governance and therefore do not need to be addressed specifically on the sub-national level. In the case of the Swiss case studies for instance, it was argued that openness and participation are:

"... territorial highly valued in Switzerland in general and ensured by several instruments of direct democracy. In the case study, openness and participation are guaranteed as a result of the connection to the political process on cantonal level." (case study report)

5.6 Innovation and interesting approaches

Innovation is a very relative thing and in many cases it is emphasised that the case study in question presents an innovation in this country / regional context, not across Europe. Thus there are aspects of Europeanisation of spatial planning practice, as indicated for instance in the case of Warsaw, Budapest and Sofia.

In some cases the external challenges have been particularly considerable and simply achieving initiatives and attempts for integrated spatial planning or metropolitan governance are important first steps, whilst it may be banal to talk about innovations in such a stage. The plan itself is an innovation (e.g. Nicosia, Sofia, Budapest...). Examples of innovation are mentioned in few cases and these usually related to the introduction of an integrated metropolitan planning level / model. This is the case e. g. in the envisaged introduction of a metropolitan planning level in the extended Warsaw area, or in the actual attempt for spatial planning on the metropolitan area of Budapest, as well as in the integral approach in Zurich, as well as working group model for interactive planning in six Finnish municipalities in the Päijät-Häme region.

Associations and new institutional/organisational forms for co-operation in a metropolitan planning context are an interesting innovation in their national and local contexts, and can contribute to the identification of best practice across the EU. One of the examples referred to here is the association "glow.dasGlattal" initiated the Best Practice Model "Networkcity Glattal" situated within the Swiss agglomeration policy.

Bottom-up working practice, partnership-based methodologies and the dialogue this entails are the most common aspects referred to as innovative (Porto, Zurich Glow.dasGlattal and Lahti). Similar content

is likely to be involved in those cases where the interactive planning process is referred to (Lahti, Barcelona, Dublin and Warsaw).

The approach and methodology associated with Glow.dasGlattal is interesting in its utilisation of 'The Best Practice Model', where the project is seen as an open learning process, where clarification of the common goals for the region and towards a better understanding for each other and possible procedures of cooperation is developed.

Objectives of the governance process vary from an attempt to "deal with shared problems" (Porto) to modernisation and development of a more inclusive governance model applied to business promotion (Zurich) and a new waste management plan (Dublin). The ambiguity of the governance processes developed is apparent in the way in which only Zurich, Lahti and Dublin argue unequivocally that the process has been a success (in the sense of having resulted in the result envisaged). In Glow.dasGlattal the answer is a cautious 'yes' ('fragile' and 'positive thus far') and in two cases it is too early to judge (Barcelona, and Warsaw).

Public-private partnerships and active attraction of investments are often tools used in order to promote the metropolitan regions in particular. There is increasing interest in drafting new marketing approaches in collaboration in the metropolitan region as a whole, such as the case of Zurich PPP solution. Here the aim has been to promote awareness of the Greater Zurich Area in selected markets and lines of business and to encourage foreign companies to settle in the Greater Zurich Area and to provide complimentary support to international companies interested in settling in the area, at the location evaluation stage and in cooperation with the business promotion agencies in the member cantons and cities. Similar strategic aim is at least partially behind most cases, where collaboration in planning for the common area is used to market the region to the outside.

The modernisation of planning processes and 'good governance' are in many cases the actual objectives of the case studies. In the French case study of Lyon for instance the objectives were defined as:

- to better take into account users' needs and expectations,
- to modernise the governance and the management of the local public utilities, to improve the quality and the efficiency of public services,
- to evaluate the activity and quality of public services in relations with associations of users or with individuals,

- to better the accountability and the efficiency of public action to promote confidence between the institutions and the citizens.

In many cases the process of supporting urban governance is seen as an open-ended process, where collaboration and planning strategies etc. have a key role to play. In particular amongst the more recent entrants into the EU, the EU models and best practices are an inspiration source in this respect. Here also less attention is placed on innovation, rather the more traditional ideas of collaborative planning and co-operation through strategic plans etc. are seen as the 'ideal'. It was argued in the Prague case study for instance that making sure the country introduces the necessary practices required to apply the European guidelines, regulations and principles is still for the time being a major objective, with which the substantive objectives must be consolidated with (e.g. the changes that can help to mitigate the negative consequences of suburbanisation and urban sprawl).

Thus in such cases it is understandable that policy integration and an integrated territorial approach are seen as the policy ideal, whilst at the same time our case studies show that there are few cases even in the older member states where all these points have been successfully implemented.

5.7 Outcomes

The objectives were in most cases the 'minimum' sense, as they related to the drafting of a plan, introducing a common vision or promoting a trans-border initiative. This was helped by achieved consensus, which was in most cases a prerequisite for the outcomes, though at the same time leading to compromise and in some cases 'smallest common denominator solutions.

If we have in mind the criteria chosen in this project to identify success of territorial governance - was it possible to build a consensus, to agree on the contribution of stakeholder, to achieve 'negotiated and shared rules' in a governance mode (e.g. shared vision), to achieve an integration of the territorial action, in general, to reach a consensual decision, and to go on with implementation - five of these cases are not considered a success: two are quite problematic, and no solution has been found yet, one could reach only short term sectoral decision, one could arrive to an agreed consensual decision, but with a low profile, and it seems it will be the same for the last one. The governance of metropolitan areas is a

highly difficult theme, with main aspects of fragmentation of power on the area and conflict of interest.

Two cases are more successful, a convergence of interest and a top down 'framework-decision' being two elements of this success.

The last case, Sofia, seems to be also successful in terms of the outcome of the planning process and achieving consensus and shared vision for a metropolitan area, but is blocked by national level at this stage, so not implemented yet.

It seems from the preliminary results that institutional organisation is not the main decisive factor, rather that political context and history are of major importance.

Three key issues appear to be at stake concerning governance on metropolitan area, characterised by an important fragmentation of power in an area which is functionally and morphologically coherent. One is the 'non equalisation' of finances, the non redistribution of financial resource, which is a general problem in metropolitan areas, accentuating disparities and provoking individualistic behaviour. (Even if mechanisms of redistribution exist at national level.) Another one is the blocking possibilities for more organised supra-structure on the territory, is the reluctance of any actual power, regional or local, to give away competences and finances to any kind of 'supra-structure' or collaborative constellation, and finally, it is also the national state which can be extremely reluctant to establish any metropolitan power which could become too powerful (cf. Catalonia and Greece for instance).

Even in case where success was achieved in terms of drafting the plan or putting into place a co-operative form of policy-development, there were still open questions and considerable degree of scepticism. This is often caused by the difficulty in achieving an integrated approach to territorial planning and development, as different sectors and actors tend to contradict each other. A few cases had in common that the main changes leading to new territorial governance had to do with regional competitiveness and/or collaboration. The (explicit) relations to the EU and ESDP were weak in general. Only a few cases were able to identify winners and losers. Barriers to use governance practice seemed mostly institutional, financial and political. Even in cases where participatory methods could influence the final policy implementation, there are bottlenecks. In cases where new competences were related to the planning, these bottlenecks and tensions most often relate to the loss of competence on some level. Political competition is also a source of uncertainty, as it is not always

clearly known whether the planning processes in place will be maintained by the next government for instance. In this sense the administrative and technocratic processes have the advantage of long-term perspective, though at times questioned by the shifting political constellations.

Attempts at innovation in ways in which actors are involved and mobilised are tried, but politico-institutional systems are quite resistant to changes. In the latest EU-member countries the spatial and metropolitan planning instruments and new urban policy initiatives are all innovations in the national context.

In some cases the achievement of a positive decision required such an extent of negotiation and consultation that a compromise solution is necessarily arrived at, as was argued for instance in the Hungarian case. The originally proposed plan was weakened quite strongly to reach a (political) consensus, and no civil society member (organised or not) could participate in this process. On the other hand, large consultations were made towards public authorities of different level and administration, as well as professional organisation, and inter-sectoral coordination took also place.

5.8 Conclusions

The processes of bottom-up mobilisation and consensus-building in a FUA or metropolitan context are perceived as important steps forward in governance terms. Several remain conflictual, dependent on difficult political agreement and/or top-down processes (e.g. Barcelona, Warsaw, Budapest, Brussels,...), which need to be settled in political negotiations, what ever the final results. In some cases such an agreement has been reached at the expense of the quality of the plans finally implemented (e.g. Budapest), but this is all in the nature of compromise and consensual decision-making. The political nature of planning is one of the main starting points of the analysis, and proposal for better governance should strongly take this aspect into account.

There seems to be more conflicts in cases where the national system has been under considerable reforms in recent years or even in recent decades. All those more fragmented and decentralized institutional contexts are coming from a pre-existent conflictual political context or difficult history, which can be more or less exacerbated. Of course, the more partners in the game, the more possibility for conflict of interest and complexity, and more reluctance to share power.

Therefore, there is no easy solution for metropolitan governance and differentiated models are required. A very interesting notion about this is the 'configurations territoriales' that E Négrier is using in his book 'La question métropolitaine (2005). This means taking into account the full context in which and on which the metropolitan area territory is implanted, socio-economic, political, functional, but also cultural and symbolic, when trying to understand metropolitan governance, and imagining possible solutions and evolution.

A real problem is the general trend we identified about accountability: it seems more difficult than before to identify who is accountable, in the multiplicity of public actors involved. This is strongly linked to the legitimacy of our democracies, and should be integrated in any proposal for better governance, as of course it is on the level of discourse and political principle.

On the basis of our case studies here, there are no easy answers or solutions presenting themselves. In many cases the sub-national, either regional or local level is blocked or steered by the central government level in ways that make it difficult for the regions to put into practice their even most consensually achieved plans and initiatives, if the national level objects.

The short-term nature of the political 'cycle' might also be an obstacle to a long-term strategic vision that is required for metropolitan policies. The conflicts, tensions and power struggles may be ongoing on the national level, but they are played out on the local level.

When it comes to the principles of "White Paper on Governance", openness is quite well catered for, but participation less so. In policy terms coherence is usually lacking, and in many cases sector policies remain either under-co-ordinated or even mutually conflicting. Therefore effectiveness of the outcomes is questioned.

In most cases dialogue, bargaining and negotiation remain the methods and there were no cases where a specific body would have been put into place for dealing with conflict, including conflicts with civil society. In the end these become issues for the national government, and in concrete building cases, of Courts of justice.

The FUA and metropolitan region case studies are summarised in figure 11.

Figure 11 Summarising on the governance outcomes in the case studies of functional urban areas and metropolitan regions

	1.2 Metro do Porto	4.2 Town planning instruments of the urban area of Lyon	6.1 The development of Zaventem airport	7.1 Greater Zurich Area	7.2 Glow. Das Glattal	9.2 Sprawl in PMA	10.3 Pla Territorial Metropolità de Barcelona (PTMB)	11.2 The Process of Developing the Spatial Plan for the Aggl. Budapest	14.1 The Structural Land Use Plan of Lahti Region	19.1 Greater Dublin GD	24. The "Greater Nicosia Development Plan"	25. Master Plan for the Metropolitan Area of Sofia	27.2 Transport Policy in a metropolitan area. The case of Warsaw
1													
Success?	No / Too early to judge	Yes, though 'fragile'	No	Yes	Yes (/too early to judge)	Tentative yes	Not yet	Not yet	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not yet (if implemented)	No
Consensus	No (attempted)	Contractual bas, 'fuzzy' when it comes to rules	No	Yes	Yes	No	Not achieved	Yes (leading to a weakened plan)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not clear from the case study report
Winners	All the actors involved	Not clear from the case study report	Economic investors RF public authorities	None	All regional actors	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Economy, local authorities	Municipalities	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Difficult to judge	No

1	1.2 Metro do Porto	4.2 Town planning instruments of the urban area of Lyon	6.1 The development of Zaventem airport	7.1 Greater Zurich Area	7.2 Glow. Das Glattal	9.2 Sprawl in PMA	10.3 Pla Territorial Metropolità de Barcelona (PTMB)	11.2 The Process of Developing the Spatial Plan for the Aggl. Budapest	14.1 The Structural Land Use Plan of Lahti Region	19.1 Greater Dublin GD	24. The "Greater Nicosia Development Plan"	25. Master Plan for the Metropolitan Area of Sofia	27.2 Transport Policy in a metropolitan area. The case of Warsaw
Losers	None	Not clear from the case study report	Environmental Actors	None	No	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Not identified	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	As above	No
Obstacles to consensus	Lack of leadership and common agenda, political short-termism	Political power struggle	Conflictual context	Not identified	None, though weak mechanisms of coordination	Not clear from the case study report	Disagreement between the autonomous regional level and the urban area	Strong conflicts, in tradition of governance on local level	Some scepticism towards the new planning tool at first, but smoothed during the process	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Yes, not specified	Yes ²

² . The resistance came from two directions = from the suburban self-governmental units (due to loss of competence) and from the large state-owned companies (mainly Polish State Railways).

1	1.2 Metro do Porto	4.2 Town planning instruments of the urban area of Lyon	6.1 The development of Zaventem airport	7.1 Greater Zurich Area	7.2 Glow. Das Glattal	9.2 Sprawl in PMA	10.3 Pla Territorial Metropolitana de Barcelona (PTMB)	11.2 The Process of Developing the Spatial Plan for the Aggl. Budapest	14.1 The Structural Land Use Plan of Lahti Region	19.1 Greater Dublin GD	24. The "Greater Nicosia Development Plan"	25. Master Plan for the Metropolitan Area of Sofia	27.2 Transport Policy in a metropolitan area. The case of Warsaw
Common spatial vision	No	Yes	No (not relevant)	No	No	Not clear from the case study report	No	Yes	Yes	No, regional waste management plan	Not clear from the case study report	Yes	No
Integration of territorial action and links to ESDP	Under construction, polycentricity relevant, though not explicitly addressed	The core of the case study	No	Integration of economic development, no relation to ESDP	Yes, NO to ESDP	No, attempted through The strategic concept for the City of Prague	Yes	No	Yes, Though national guidelines	Yes, full adoption	Metropolitan Administration planned	Yes, ESDP – 'attempt to implement the principles'	Yes ³
Strengths	Links to active Agenda 21	Contractual model part of national	None	New form of cooperation between cantons,	Functionality and flexibility	Possibilities of the emerging	Strong regional and local power	More competences to the	Good project management and positive	History of co-	Involve ment of private	Integrated territorial	Integrated transport policy,

³ Conformity with the objectives of the ESDP policy:
Expansion of the strategic role of metropolitan regions (policy aim 3.2.2.)
Promotion of better accessibility in cities (...) and the use of public transport (policy aim 3.2.2.)

1	1.2 Metro do Porto	4.2 Town planning instruments of the urban area of Lyon	6.1 The development of Zaventem airport	7.1 Greater Zurich Area	7.2 Glow. Das Glattal	9.2 Sprawl in PMA	10.3 Pla Territorial Metropolitana de Barcelona (PTMB)	11.2 The Process of Developing the Spatial Plan for the Aggl. Budapest	14.1 The Structural Land Use Plan of Lahti Region	19.1 Greater Dublin GD	24. The "Greater Nicosia Development Plan"	25. Master Plan for the Metropolitan Area of Sofia	27.2 Transport Policy in a metropolitan area. The case of Warsaw
	work	policy, territorial basis for action		Involvement of private companies (Private-Public Partnership), Creating synergy effect on international scale	of the best practice model	national urban policy	(possibility of consensual coordinated and integrated planning)	local level	process	operation	actors, building of trust	plan for the 1 st time in over 30 years	broad competence of Mayor of Warsaw
Future	Low levels of public participation and institutional cooperation may jeopardize	Dependent on both national government and local actors	Open (Ministry of transport's plan on the table, no agreement)	Mission pursued	Implementation	Challenge of lack of urban policy	Open	Not clear from the case study report	Implementation and monitoring, next process in 10 years	Increased joint working	Putting good governance into practice	Implementation	Not clear from the case study report

6 Identification of governance trends in Urban-Rural areas

... the latter half of this century has witnessed the most profound shift in city and country relationships. Pushed by the advances in transportation technology, new manufacturing and communications systems, and public sector growth incentives and pulled by residential preferences, the connection between city and country side has become closer and more intimate. Traditional concepts of rural life versus urban lifestyle are increasingly marginalized. (Lapping and Furuseth 1999)

No longer can [we] afford to consider land use just a local town, city or county issue. Rather it is time to examine regional approaches to land use and growth management that reflect the interaction of the several counties, the core city, the many suburbs, the edge cities, The implications for accommodating population and economic growth, as well as issues of environmental quality and competitiveness in the global economy, are profound (Daniels 1999)

6.1 The rural and urban

The relationship between 'the rural' and 'the urban' is often viewed upon from a rather oppositional perspective (Caffyn and Dahlström 2005; Daniels 1999; Lapping and Furuseth 1999). From such a perspective, the urban is associated with terms as modern, developed, built-up, administration, political power, but also with more negative issues such as congestion and deprivation. Its relation to 'the rural' is often seen as imperialistic, as 'imposing on'. While the rural is quite commonly linked with the idyllic country-side, environmental values, agriculture and traditional communities, 'the urban' is seen as inflicting damage to the pure and naturalistic 'rural'. Traditional territorial governance modes within urban-rural regions seemed also to be focusing on such dichotomous conceptions of 'the rural' and 'the urban' (Daniels 1999; Lapping and Furuseth 1999). However, in current policy trends there seems to be a shift from such a dichotomous thinking towards more integrated and embracing approaches. Although the differences between 'the rural' and 'the urban' are of course still existing and specific 'urban' pressures on 'rural' areas are certainly real (Esparcia and Buciega 2002), the approaches to solve these problems slowly move away from the 'oppositional misconceptions' about what 'the urban' and 'the rural' are really like today (Caffyn and Dahlström 2005) towards an

integrated and networked territorial governance approach of urban and rural relationships. Hence, interaction between the urban and the rural is of key importance within these new governance trends.

Below an analysis of 8 European cases of territorial governance within a rural-urban framework is given. This analysis clearly indicates a shift in governance trends towards a more integrated approach of the rural-urban relationship as described above. However it also shows that 'we are not yet there'. Several cases clearly indicate that traditional forms of territorial governance within a rural-urban framework are still present today, often leading to conflict situations.

Besides the (slow) shift towards a more integrated territorial approach of rural-urban areas, the cases also illustrate other important trends in regional governance today. This includes, for example, the shift from traditional forms of government to more dialogical, cooperative and open forms of governance. This does not only mean a move away from hierarchical governmental levels towards a more egalitarian approach in governance, but also to more open and participative forms of governance that also include non-governmental actors. Before going into the analysis, first the cases are introduced.

6.2 Cases

Eight cases formed the basis for this analysis. Each of them is shortly introduced here.

26.2 The case of Milos - Greece

Within the region of Milos (island), environmental, aesthetic and biological values are threatened by land use practices. Mining activities, economic land development interests and tourism seem to collide with the (EU-initiated) need to protect endangered ecosystems and species. The need for territorial governance within this specific sector is high; however there is a clear friction between the interests of local municipalities (and sub-region) and the central state, which seems to be allied with the mining-companies in the area.

3.2 The Project to Promote Sustainable Development Processes in the Pinerolese (PPSP) - Italy

In order to create a shared development strategy for the rural-urban Pinerolese region, the PPSP was erected to provide a coordinative framework for these efforts. The Pinerolese region can be characterized as an economically restructuring region, trying to overcome the crisis within the traditional industrial sectors of the

region (mechanics and automotive industry). Hence, the PPSP is a governance initiative in search of 'new ways to promote and support development policies in an area that is close to the high urban densities of Turin's metropolitan area, however prevalently has rural mountain areas' (Italian case, p. 4)

10.2 The Pla Director del Sistema Costaner (PDUSC) - Spain

The PDUSC is a top-down governmental regulation focused on the protection of land still not urbanized closer than 500 meters from the sea in the coastal area of Catalonia. As the urbanization process within the coastal region of Catalonia is almost arrived at a level of saturation, the remainder of coastal space has become an important issue in terms of territorial governance. Issues at hand are environmental and aesthetic issues, but also 'the future economical valuation of the landscape' (Spanish case, p. 15).

22.2 The South Yorkshire Partnership (SYP) - United Kingdom (region of England)

Within the framework of territorial governance in the UK, the development of new Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) are encouraged by 'numerous central government initiatives' (English case, p. 3). These are seen as the key mechanisms for joining up public services at an authority-wide level and consist of a single non-statutory, multi-agency body that matches local authority boundaries and aims to bring together the public, private, voluntary and community sectors to provide a single, overarching local coordination framework. The focus of the case is the South-Yorkshire Partnership, which encloses four municipalities in the proximity of Sheffield.

5.3 The Hanover Region (HR) - Germany

This case illustrates a merger of two formerly independent administrative units within the German state of Lower Saxony, the Region of Hanover. As many other agglomerations, the Hanover Region is affected by internal migration of population with middle or high income from the central city to its surrounding rural municipalities. This causes a lot of traffic problems, and also results in an above average share of low income populations in the region's core (city of Hanover). As tax-revenues are distributed by number of inhabitants, this results in a tax-revenue distribution privileging the hinterland municipalities. Hence, this was an initiating reason for the city of Hanover and as well the 21 surrounding municipalities to consider a merger.

29.2 The Garigue - Malta

This case is a typical case concerning the collision of economic and sustainable (and social) values. A large land-development company bought land within the region that has important environmental, historic and aesthetic values. However, the company planned to use the land to build tourism related projects. Local NGOs, farmers, citizens and municipalities resisted to these plans.

2.1 Leoben - Austria

Leoben is both the name of an old industry and mining region in Austria as well as the name of the region's main city. The case describes a primarily urban strategic planning process which focuses on urban development. However, the urban planning process also provides some links to the wider region. As Leoben is 'the administrative, cultural and economic centre of the entire province', 'an upgrading of the town implicates an upgrading for the rest of the region'. The urban strategic planning project aims at overcoming the problems of the mono-sectoral region, such as the overcrowded secondary sector labour market.

20.1 Gutin Mountains - Romania

The Romanian case focuses on the development of the micro-region 'Gutin Mountains'. As the region is a relatively densely populated mountain area with declining industry and mining sectors and high unemployment rates, 'a common strategy of socio-economic development' was developed in order to increase the region's economic performance.

6.3 Analytical Framework

The framework which is used for the integral analysis of the cases focuses on four key-aspects of political relations within territorial governance frameworks. First, the overall political context (political organization and spatial planning framework) of the cases is described. Second, vertical relations between governmental levels and between governmental and non-governmental actors are analyzed. Third, the horizontal relations are described. The final part will focus on the outcomes of the specific forms of territorial governance within the regions, in terms of governance successes and governance failures.

6.4 Political Context

6.4.1 Political Organization

The political organization of the states which the urban-rural cases are embedded in range from Federal (Spain, Austria and Germany) to Unitary (Greece, Malta and UK) and Unitary Decentralized (Italy, Romania). Governance, within all these cases, is represented as an ongoing process of incremental changes which seems to include a slow but gradual shift towards decentralization. Although in all cases the central state (or sub-central states in federal contexts) still has a large influence over governance processes within its territory, some competencies and powers are being distributed towards the sub-national, regional and local. Even though change is intrinsic to governance processes, the last few decades show more significant changes towards this tendency to decentralize.

However, despite of the trends described above, the traditional hierarchical pyramid of governance power (i.e. State, Sub-national, Local) still plays an important role within the cases analyzed.

6.4.2 Spatial Planning

On a level of spatial planning there have also been several (incremental) changes within the national frameworks of the cases. These changes are largely related to the decentralization tendencies in the national political systems⁴. As 'common' government/governance structures seem to be shifting to more sub-national, regional and local levels, spatial planning competencies also devolve along these lines.

This means that competences in the field of spatial planning are spread out over the various governmental levels within the state. The relevance of each of these levels differs from case to case, however, in general one could argue that the central state is providing the lower levels with a general frame, and the local and sub-national levels playing a more direct role in not only the design of spatial plans, but also in the implementation. This is however not always the case, within the Greek and Maltese cases, the national state remains dominant. Within the cases that are encapsulated in a federal system, the federal state also plays an important 'frame-setting' role

⁴ This is however less the case in the contexts of Greece and Malta

(Catalonia within the Spanish case, or Lower Saxony in the German case, and Stiermarken within the Austrian case).

6.5 Vertical Relations between territories, actors and administrative levels

6.5.1 Central State Level

As argued above, the role of the central/federal state is still very important within the framework of regional territorial governance. It is the key provider of competencies (and in most cases also funding) and generates the overall framework for territorial governance and spatial planning within the lower levels. This does not mean, however, that the central state always directly influences local and regional decision-making procedures. In fact, in several cases this is not the case (German case, Italian case, Austrian case, and Romanian case). Although the state of course could directly influence these processes (due to its constituted legal power), in the former cases it purposefully devolved actual decision-making and implementation procedures to the sub-national and local authorities.

Within other cases, for example the Greek and UK case, the central state has a more traditional role in the territorial governance framework. Here, the central state plays an important decisive role, whereas the local and regional levels are responsible for the implementation of the top-down decisions. Hence, the territorial governance framework in both the Greek case as the UK case is still rather hierarchical in the sense that the central state decides and the lower levels execute. The regional level, however, gradually gains more policy competences, but still has minor competences compared to the central state.

In general, one could state that the central state is the enabler, the controller of the devolved decision-making procedures and usually commands budgetary and legal powers. So far, the role of the state does not seem to have changed significantly. It still plays its overarching and facilitating role towards the lower levels, and provides the necessary resources to them to act.

6.5.2 Sub-national level: Regional and Local governance

The actual change in the governance system therefore takes place at different sub-national levels of territorial governance: regional and the local.

At the regional level, the traditional sub-national layers (such as provinces, districts or prefectures) more or less continue to play the same role as they did before. In most cases this level of territorial governance still is concerned with the larger picture of for example larger scale infrastructure development or public transportation issues and provides an overarching framework for the region which they encapsulate. In terms of the devolution and evolution of powers and competences to the 'new' regional level of governance, they provided largely coordinative (i.e. the case of Italy and Germany⁵), advisory (i.e. Greek case) and financial (most cases) roles. For the case of South Yorkshire in the United Kingdom this does not apply, in the sense that a traditional regional structure in England did not exist before. Hence, from this point of view, the regional structure which is being created in the English case is actually 'new'. The central state within the English case remains dominant with respect to the 'new' regional bodies by setting out rather strict guidelines.

Interestingly, in most cases a 'new' form of sub-national governance at this regional level has evolved. This level has gained competences derived of, particularly, the municipal levels, but also (to a lesser extent) of other regional levels. Hence larger than the municipal and (in most cases) smaller than the sub-national, this 'new' body of regional territorial governance provides a strategic tool to integrate and coordinate regional objectives.

6.5.3 Strong role of the local level

Within these newly founded (sub-)regional governance projects, local governmental actors also play an important (powerful) role. This is particularly illustrated by the English and Italian cases. Within the English case, the four municipalities were actually the most supportive actors within the development of the South-Yorkshire partnership. They played an important role in the development of the institutional framework of the Partnership and mobilized other actors to join. As it became 'their' project, the municipalities gained a rather

⁵ However, the German case of Hanover is an exception in another way, because it actually replaced the pre-existing sub-regional level. But in first instance the Bezirksregierung (the sub-national level) played an enabling role towards the Hanover Region.

powerful vote within the partnership. Within the Italian case, the four Mountain Communities (municipalities) which already shared a cultural background and a history of close cooperation, played a similar role. Together with the main city of the region, Pinerolo, these were the most powerful actors within the PPSP. Within the Austrian case the project focuses mainly on urban planning processes, wherein the local also plays a strong role. Within the Romanian case, the 9 mountain communities were the initiating actors.

In figure 12, the vertical relations with respect to regional territorial planning are outlined.

Figure 12 Vertical relations with respect to spatial planning

Case	Role of Central State/ Federal State		Role of sub-national (ie province, department)	Role of newly founded regional institutions	Role of Municipal Authorities	Relations
PDUSC – Spain	enabling	Catalonia - strong Sectoral policies	Enabling Territorial Planning	Dialogue	Weak implementation of coastal plans	Conflict
Milos - Greece	Strong final decision/ & approval		Enabling/ weak (compared to central state) Advice, development planning & approval of general town plans (see also Greek case study 26.1 in chapter 3 on devolution of powers)		Weak Implementation	conflict especially between state and lower levels
Hanover - Germany	Enabling Bund: Provides general Spatial Plan. Lower Saxony funding and enables the HR administration		Enabling Bezirksreg.: enabled and coordinated the development of the Hanover Region	Cooperative & Coordinative Region of Hanover: gained competences from municipalities and sub-regional	Cooperative relatively strong Implementation and planning of several planning themes (increased competencies)	consensus/ dialogue/ cooperation
South Yorkshire - UK	Strong Overarching framework (national guidance and supervision) very powerful		Enabling Government Offices & Regional Development Agencies advising and lobbying with central state	Cooperative & Coordinative Development of regional spatial strategy lobbies and advises sub-national and national levels coordination between municipalities (however confined by central state guidelines)	Cooperative (strong towards SYP) (weak compared to central state) Local authorities developing local policy instruments & regulate spatial development however following the (strict) guidelines of the central state	dialogue and cooperation between sub-national levels and coordination from central state level
PPSP – Italy	Enabling Sets overarching framework and sectoral policies		Enabling Regional governments: coordination Provinces: develop and coordinate regional plans and funds the PPSP	Cooperative & coordinative The PPSP - no defined policy instruments	Cooperative, relatively strong Municipal level: urban planning instruments approve; subnational and central state level plans with regards to location details and territorial impact	Coordination and cooperation
Garigue, Malta	Not clear from the case study report		Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report
Leoben, Austria	Bund: enabling but <i>weak</i> mainly develops sectoral plans Land (Stiermarken): enabling & regulative		Not clear from the case study report	Regional Management <i>role not explicitly defined within this case</i>	Strong role , high autonomy of Leoben-city has ' <i>full competences</i> ' in urban planning (however should also consider regional and national planning)	disorganized boundaries are not clearly defined, however no conflict is described role of the local is most important within the case
Gutin Mountain, Romania	Enabling; national strategic framework		Not clear from the case study report	County, relatively strong role	strong role, initiating actors	largely regulated context

6.6 Horizontal relations between actors

Within the territorial governance frameworks of the case-studies, horizontal relations between actors involved within decision-making processes both formally and informally have important impacts on the actual outcomes of the governance processes.

Within the case studies, four important categories of actors active in these (regional) territorial governance projects can be distinguished. First, and still foremost important, is the involvement of public (governmental) actors, such as administrative authorities, majors, political leaders et cetera on all territorial levels (although the municipal and central state level play a more significant role). On the other hand, non-governmental actors seem to have a growing importance within these governance processes. Although growing, their role is in most cases still a marginal one (advisory, dialogue, however no formal power within decision making procedures).

The group of non-governmental actors can be divided in experts, private actors (market), and civil society actors. The next section will describe these more clearly.

6.6.1 Experts

Interesting to see is the role of the academic community within the design of regional territorial governance projects and within the actual (decision-making) governance processes. Universities (such as in the example of the PPSP in Italy, the case of South Yorkshire in England) and academic experts often 'facilitate the interaction and action of local actors' (PPSP-Italy, p. 9) by advising these local actors to coordinate and cooperate their governance efforts within the region. Although their role has not been described as the very core of regional governance projects, these experts do play a significant role in underlining the importance of regional governance within the region, and consequently, in the establishment of bodies of regional governance (cases: Hanover-Germany, PPSP-Italy, South-Yorkshire Partnership-UK). Within the Austrian case of Leoben, the university (department of Geography) played an important role in 'establishing the strategic planning paper'. The role which experts play within the Romanian case is not clear from the case description.

A critical remark should be made here. As already described above, territorial governance projects in urban-rural contexts often remain highly governmental and technocratic. Some cases refer to the term 'elite-governance', pointing at the fact that most actors that are

involved are either from the administrative community or the expert community. In this sense, actors involved within these territorial governance projects can be seen to form a bureaucratic, elite community involved in rather technocratic administrative processes of governing territories. As the Hanover-case (Germany) illustrates: '...[the territorial governance project] is an administrative reform on a level relatively remote to citizens' perception who primarily identify with their immediate environment (municipality)'(Hanover-Germany, p. 14). It is hence important to be aware of the significance which is contributed to these 'experts', as 'expert-focused' territorial governance projects are in danger of becoming too technocratic and elite-driven. The case of the South Yorkshire Partnership is illustrative for this. Within the first 'designing' round of the Local Strategic Partnership (the SYP), the design heavily drew on academic advice and consultation. However, it was argued that the design had no real political backbone. Hence a new designing round was developed by the four municipalities, which more or less came to the same conclusions, however this time from a political background.

6.6.2 Private, market-based actors

In most of the cases, private sector actors also play a role within decision making procedures; however, this is a relatively small one. The role of the private sector is mostly advisory, such as in the UK, Italian, Austrian, Romanian and Greek cases. In these cases, private actors contribute to regional governance structures with no real decisive competences. However, they are quite often formally involved as advisors and consultants to the (governmental) decisive actors. Another role which private actors play within territorial governance procedures is a more conflictual one. One can especially refer to the role of private landowners in the Greek, Spanish and Maltese cases. As policies developed or issued by regional governance agencies focused on changing land-use patterns that were quite negative towards these private landowners, these resisted to these policies by appealing to them at the high courts of the countries involved. Here, their role was quite deconstructive towards the regional governance initiatives, which were in their eyes rather governmental and stood not open for their interests.

6.6.3 Civil society actors

Although a shift from traditional 'government' structures to 'governance' structures can be distinguished, civil society involvement in decision-making procedures remains on a rather small basis. However, regional governance structures within the urban-rural cases are increasingly opening up for civil society involvement. This is an ongoing tendency which has now a quite undersized basis, but is gradually evolving. Especially within the cases that focus upon sustainability (the Spanish case, the Greek case, the Maltese case), civil society, in the form of Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), is trying to gain access towards primarily governmental decision-making procedures. In some (conflictual) cases these NGOs actively try to mobilize the general public in order to influence decision-making procedures, in other (more harmonious) cases their role is primarily a consultative and advisory one.

Also non-environmental NGOs are participating within territorial governance practices in the cases. Their part is often concerned with advice and public scrutiny of issued policies and decision-making procedures (German case, English case). Hence, in this sense one could better speak of openness than of participation of civil society in territorial governance practices within the urban-rural context.

To summarize, the role of civil society and NGOs is still rather diminutive and not formally institutionalized in decision-making procedures. In some cases this seems to be leading to conflict and resistance towards governmental and political decisions taken without participation of civil society. In other cases, gradually, civil society is gaining more influence.

6.6.4 Horizontal Relations

Relations between the various actors within these rural-urban territorial governance cases range from strongly conflictual (Greek case; Spanish case) to strongly cooperative (German case, Austrian case and to a lesser extent the Italian and Romanian cases). Interesting to notice is that the cases with 'horizontal' conflict are cases in which the central state plays a dominant role (except the UK case which also has a strong Central State dominance, whereas in the South Yorkshire Partnership case-study no strong conflict is described). In those cases in which the central state rather loosely coordinates and enables regional territorial governance, the main characteristic of horizontal relations is cooperation and dialogue.

The focus of regional territorial governance within the cases that are built upon a consensual dialogical framework (English case, German case, Italian case and Austrian case) seems to be coordination through cooperation. The regional governance level is the level at which all (governmental) stakeholders (and to a far lesser extent non-governmental stakeholders) are involved in generating shared views on regional governance (UK, Italy, Germany, Romania). This has led to the development of consensual and integrated strategic plans for the regions, which are supported by most (governmental) stakeholders. Due to central state dominance in the UK, the direct influence of the South-Yorkshire Partnership (the intra-municipal governance framework) on territorial policies is relatively low, as: the state decides and the partnership advises.

Another interesting relation which is particularly present within the non-conflictual cases is the importance of the local level (municipalities) within the regional territorial governance structures. As local level relations seem to be characterized by (often historic) cooperation and dialogue, and the municipalities involved seem to be coordinating their efforts, these have a relatively powerful status within the regional governance framework. In some cases, for example the Hanover case, the former regional level even withdrew itself in order to give space to the cooperative municipalities, which created a new cooperative regional governance framework.

The more conflictual cases of Spain, Greece and Malta differ in approach. Both the Greek and the Maltese cases have a rather thematic/ sectoral approach of regional territorial governance and hence focus on one single problem (which involves the restriction of specific types of land use, due to environmental values), while the Spanish case has both thematic (coastal urbanization restrictions) and cross-sectoral sustainable governance aspects.

An overview of horizontal coordination and integration in the case studies is provided in figure 13.

Figure 13 Horizontal Coordination and Integration

Case	Coordination	Integrative policies
PDUSC –Spain	Yes Regional government	Both sectoral (coastal) as integrated
Milos - Greece	Yes Central State	No (sectoral: environmental protection)
Hanover -Germany	Yes Hanover Region Administration	Yes
South Yorkshire - UK	Yes, Central State (decisive) SYP on regional level (coordination through cooperation)	Yes Cross-sectoral Regional Strategic Development plan
PPSP –Italy	No Diffused coordination within PPSP, however mountain communities play a small coordinative role	Yes Regional Strategy is cross-sectoral
Garigue, Malta	Yes Central State	Not clear from the case study report
Leoben, Austria	Yes, through cooperation	Yes
Gutin Mountains, Romania	Yes, Micro-region association	Yes

6.6.5 Mobilization

The mobilization of regional actors which goes beyond the political mobilization of governmental actors can not really be distinguished within the cases. Moreover, it is the policy makers themselves which are mobilizing and are being mobilized. Again, especially the lower (municipality) governmental levels are most important here. On some occasions (Spanish case, English case) political leaders try to raise public interest to their territorial governance efforts, but these are only marginal efforts. In the Greek case the regional development company itself (ANETKY) is trying to 'mobilize the territory', but is however only marginally succeeding.

Some NGOs, especially those concerning environmental and sustainable values also tried to raise public awareness to the issue of territorial governance, but the general public is rather hard to get for their 'regional goals'. NGO mobilization is most clearly present in the conflictual cases of Greece, Spain and Malta.

6.7 Participation, Openness and Innovation

Formally, issues of participation and openness are increasingly important in territorial governance processes in rural-urban regions. In most of the cases laws on openness and governmental transparency exist and consultative rounds for non-governmental actors within decision-making procedures seem to be increasingly present in most of the cases (except for the Greek case).

An example of participation is that of Leoben in Austria. This case describes a primarily urban strategic planning process which focuses on urban development. A core team with scientists and decision-makers drafted the project design trying to ensure creativity, flexibility and involvement. All Leoben citizens were invited to a kick-off meeting. In this case a model illustrates the strategic planning process including an (advisory and interfacing) steering committee, (thematic) working groups, a citizen's forum, a (neutral) scientific project team, a local project team, public relation and politics (also represented in the steering committee).

Another example is that of Hanover where in order to enhance participation and give a granted communication corridor, the region has appointed a Regional Agenda 21, being the region's only standing participation body. The Agenda 21 representative convenes monthly meetings, which are open to everybody. Despite the principle of openness, most participants however are institutions and agenda representatives from regional municipalities.

Despite some participation among the urban-rural case studies, the role of public participation within decision making procedures seems to be rather small. Decision making is still considered to be a primarily governmental process, where non-governmental actors only play an advisory role. So, as there seems to be an increasing use of the 'language of public participation' in rural-urban territorial governance, the effectiveness of public participation still is rather low.

An example of innovative working procedures was reported from the Spanish case dealing with the Urban Directive of the Coastal System in Catalonia:

"This plan constitutes the first time that a supramunicipal plan in Catalanian coast has been made, which means an innovative approach to the coast land use and littoral protection in Spain."

Concerning methodology, there was made an effort to improve cartography available and make it much more detailed. /.../ Although it is a top-down plan, consensus was built by meetings with town councils and land owners. During that process, some territorial conflict arose but the public interest was never abandoned. All the database collected and the final decision was published on the Internet.” (Case study report)

6.8 Outcomes

In the more consensual cases the outcomes of the regional territorial governance efforts are largely related to political cooperation and coordination within the (somewhat) new regional bodies. In Italy a common framework (the PPSP) was erected in order to create a shared development strategy to address issues of environmental, social, economic and political sustainability in the region. In England, the new South Yorkshire Partnership had been founded, which provided the basis for coordination, cooperation, integration and dialogue in order to develop a 'sub-regional spatial strategy'. The non-statutory partnership focuses on this 'shared sub-regional spatial strategy' as a way to 'represent local visions on spatial planning to external actors [i.e. Central State, Government Offices and Regional Development Agencies]'. In the German case of Hanover, the development of the Hanover Region administrative level led to a shift in competences between the various governmental levels involved. The HR itself gained several competences from the former district government and municipal planning association; however it also devolved some of the responsibilities and competences that formerly belonged to the county administration to the region's municipalities. As a consequence, cooperation and coordination between the various governmental actors (especially between municipalities) in the region increased. Within the Romanian case, the Association for the development of the Gutin Mountains region was erected in order to develop a common regional strategy.

Sustainability in these cases proves to be an important if not key element of the policies issued by these relatively new regional governance bodies. Especially in the Italian case, sustainability is presented as a core element of the coordination and integration of policy within the region. Also in the German case sustainability seems to be a key issue. In the English case, sustainability also is an important element; however, economic development in the former mining-region is also of key importance. Hence, the strategy is

'economic...but sustainable'. The Romanian case focuses less explicit on sustainability.

The friction between economics and sustainability seems to be central within the more conflictual cases of Malta, Greece and Spain. As these cases focus on land-use regulations in specific zones (coastal zones, Spain), specific environmental issues (biotope protection, Greece), and in specific land-ownership conflicts (permit conflicts over land use in environmental and archaeological sites, Malta) economic actors (owners) are particularly resistant toward sustainable politics. Within these conflicts, governmental actors often choose sides. In the Greek case for example, the more powerful central state is suspected by the local community of favouring the mining companies on the Island of Milos, whereas local governmental actors do not explicitly choose side (however do resist the central authority). However, in the Greek case the central state is being forced by the European Union (fines) to develop a sustainable policy within the area. Within the Spanish case, the regional authority cooperated with environmental NGOs and developed a sustainable policy for the coastal zones which is conflicting with the economic interests of land-owners and some (underdeveloped) municipalities.

Decisions within these conflictual cases are mostly taken from a hierarchical top-down approach. The central state (Greece) or the sub-national states (Catalonia, Spain) are the responsible actors here.

6.9 Failures and Successes

It is hard to state if any governance process could be considered successful or problematic. In order to make such a statement one should clearly define the angle from upon which the process is being evaluated. The criteria that are used here to evaluate the governance success and failures of each of the cases, are: 1. consensus; 2. stakeholder involvement; 3. the development of 'negotiated and shared rules'; 4. a shared spatial vision; 5. integration of territorial action; 6. consensual decision; 7. implementation.

Viewing the scores of each of the cases on these criteria, two cases seem to illustrate governance failures (Greece, Malta) and four cases illustrate governance successes (Spain, Italy, Germany, England). The scores that are used here are directly derived from the case-studies made by the national experts. This is outlined in figure 14.

Figure 14 'Good governance' criteria

Criteria	Milos, Greece	PDUSC, Spain	PPSP, Italy	Hanover, Germany	SYP, England	Garigue, Malta	Leoben, Austria	Gutin, Romania
Consensus	No (however local opposition has consensus)	Yes (however top-down driven)	Yes	Yes	Yes (with the creation of sub-regional strategy, however in general the central state has firm decisive powers)	No	Yes,	Yes
stakeholder participation	No	Yes (however not all stakeholders agree: i.e. landowners who loose from these decisions)	Yes	Yes (However, participation is largely governmental)	Yes (however the 4 municipalities have a strong position within the SYP)	No	Yes,	Yes, 'all interested parties can participate'
Negotiated & shared rules	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Common spatial vision	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partly	Yes
Integration of territorial action	No	Yes (however still rather thematic (coastal zone protection) but with a tendency towards more integrated perspective)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partly	Yes
Consensual Decision	No (central state decides and is not accounting for regional interests)	More or less	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Implementation	Not yet, (however	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partly	In an early

Criteria	Milos, Greece	PDUSC, Spain	PPSP, Italy	Hanover, Germany	SYP, England	Garigue, Malta	Leoben, Austria	Gutin, Romania
	central state will decide because of EU fine)							stage
Sustainability	Not yet	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, (however, economic priorities...but sustainable)	No	<i>not clear from case</i>	<i>not clear from case</i>

However, such an evaluation is rather strict and the lines drawn are relatively hard. For example in the English case, as a common spatial strategy has been developed by regional cooperation and coordination, yet the central state sets out the directives and guidelines in which this vision could be developed. So one could ask, is this really an example of consensus based, integrated policy cooperation or is the English framework still based upon top-down hierarchical governance?

Another criticism is that even the regional governance projects which are considered 'successes' still are rather 'elite' in the sense that only those actors explicitly interested in participating are actually participating. This means that these governance projects most of the time remain very 'governmental' and 'technocratic' since the larger part of participants are governmental actors or experts. Civil society and citizen's cooperation has not really come of the ground yet (some argue that this has to do with a certain disinterest of the general public to regional territorial governance projects).

6.10 Governance in the Urban-Rural context

Concluding one could state that territorial regional governance in the rural-urban context is embedded within a process of incremental change towards new, more open forms of governance. However, this does not mean that the goals of 'good' governance as described in the SIR are actually achieved. Especially in the conflictual cases, which are often steered by traditional hierarchic, closed, top-down modes of governance (Greek case, Maltese case) the 'new' and open modes of governance are far from the truth.

Also in the more harmonious cases, open and participative modes of governance have not been achieved yet. Territorial governance within the rural-urban context still remains a rather governmental process,

in which in some rare cases other (non-governmental) actors actually have a real vote. So participation actually comes down to advising and scrutinizing.

Another issue is that within the regional governance projects reminiscences of traditional governance structures remain highly important. In all cases, for example, the traditional role of the central (or sub-central) state remains very important if not decisive.

However, as several of the cases show, governance practices are slowly shifting towards the forms which the ESPON 232 project described as 'good governance'. Participation, openness and sustainability are key words which one comes across in all of the cases. Coordination, cooperation and dialogue are now also words which have become familiar terms within the context of rural-urban governance projects. However, as these have become familiar terms, this does not mean that reminiscences of traditional more governmental structures are not present. Moreover, traditional governmental actors remain the most powerful actors within these processes. It is therefore still rather difficult to speak of 'true' governance instead of government.

Figure 15 Conflict-Harmony continuum in the urban-rural case studies

	Traditional closed/ hierarchic/ top-down modes of governance	government	governance	New Open, participative, flat modes of governance
Conflict				
Garigue, Malta	X			
Milos - Greece	X			
PDUSC – Spain		X		
PPSP –Italy			X	
South Yorkshire - UK			X	
Leoben - Austria			X	
Gutin - Romania			X	
Hanover - Germany			X	
Harmony				

As illustrated in figure 15 above, the more conflictual cases are situated near the more traditional hierarchic forms of governance, while the more harmonious cases seem to be closer towards new

modes of governance; however, these are still closer to 'government' forms of administration than to governance.

Traditional forms denote a strong role of the state, mainly governmental actors present in decision making processes, with a top-down hierarchy of State, sub-regional, local.

The urban-rural case studies are summarised in figure 16.

Figure 16 Summarising on the governance dimensions of the urban-rural case studies

	Milos, Greece	PDUSC, Spain	PPSP, Italy	Hanover, Germany	SYP, England	Garigue, Malta	Leoben, Austria	Gutin, Romania
Institutional context	Centralized	Federal (functional)	Unitary (regionalized) decentralized	federal	Unitary (partly) decentralized	Centralized	Federal	Unitary decentralized
Regional level	weak	strong meso	strong local	strong local	weak	weak	Not clear from the case study report	strong local, strong regional
Relations state/region	hierarchic	federal state: soft hierarchy	soft hierarchy/ cooperative	cooperative	hierarchic	hierarchic	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report
Relations region/local	hierarchy	hierarchy	strong local	cooperation	cooperation	hierarchy	Not clear from the case study report	cooperation
Type	conflictual	conflict low profile	consensus	consensus	coordinated by central state	conflictual	consensus	consensus
Spatial Plan	national	regional	regional (national: sectoral)	regional	national (regional filling-in)	national	local (urban)	regional
Non governmental Participation / consultation	weak		yes	yes	yes	weak	yes	yes

7 Territorial Governance trends in intra-city contexts

...Rather than treating cities and city-regions as mere subunits of national administrative systems, ... urban policy has become an essential political mechanism through which a profound institutional and geographical transformation of states has been occurring (Brenner 2004)

...cities are spaces for the regulation of conflicts and for developing compromises between social groups, as well as spaces of cultural conflicts, and ... because of this they contribute to the regulation of European societies as a whole (LeGalès 2002)

7.1 Introduction

Since the 1980s there is a growing attention to the local level concerning territorial governance. This has in many European states led to a 'new institutional dynamics affecting the government of their cities' (Jouve 2005). These 'new' dynamics were closely related with perceived changes within the economic and political settings, where globalization and the end of 'Fordist state-organization' were important focal points. Hence as these processes seemed to be calling for a revision of the political organization of European states, stories of decentralization and participation increasingly gained attention of policy makers (Brenner 2004; Jouve 2005; Salet, Thornley, and Kreukels 2003). Picked up by policy-makers, these concepts were employed to restructure territorial governance frameworks within their national states more broadly focusing on lower levels and participative structures. To what extent these changing perspectives have led to significant changes within traditional territorial governance frameworks has often been questioned (Jessop 1997). It has been argued that although there might have been some change within these structures, traditional hierarchies and power-relations remain to exist. Through an analysis of urban governance trends within three European cases, this paper aims to shed some empirical light upon these issues.

7.1.1 Analysis of intra-city governance trends

This paper is written on the basis of the analysis of five intra-city cases, i.e. Tour et Taxis, Belgium; Jánosikova Area, Slovakia; Vilnius

city, Lithuania; Cottonera region, Malta; and Duisburg-Marxloh, Germany. It focuses on describing governance trends and spatial policy development within the context of urban territories throughout Europe, with a special focus on changes in the institutional frameworks of traditional territorial governance. Although these cases indicate that 'shifts in governance' are clearly present within intra-city contexts, it is argued here that these changes, although these might seem radical, are not such a far shot away from traditional territorial governance structures⁶. When it comes to urban territorial governance, vertical relations between the central government, regional level, and the local level have not shown large changes within these cases, although some smaller changes are present. Especially the tendency to integrate public and non-governmental views within urban territorial governance is notable. Although these 'civil-society voices' still have little decisive power, their views and beliefs increasingly gain possibilities to be heard in decision-making processes.

7.2 Cases

A synthetic analysis of the five cases is given below, after the cases are briefly introduced.

21.2 The Residential Area of Jánošíkova, Malacky - Slovakia

This case-study focuses on the development of a residential housing area in Malacky city. As a territorial plan was created and presented towards the current inhabitants of the area, these inhabitants were given voice in the decision making process. Inhabitants disagreed with the proposed plan on several points, which resulted in the adaptation of the plan. The case shows the decision making process and the horizontal and vertical relations of actors and stakeholders within this process.

6.2 The Site of Tour and Taxis, Brussels - Belgium

The case describes decision-making procedures concerning a vacant inner city area, Tour and Taxis (T&T), close to the inland port of Brussels. Due to Brussels' deindustrialization, the area, which was furnished as a service-area for the port (including a railway station, customs office, warehouses), has not been put into use since the

⁶ It can however be argued that the Slovakian and Lithuanian cases illustrate significant changes within both the institutional context of, but also the practices of, territorial governance, since their national frameworks were subjected to severe changes due to the collapse of the communist system and the focus on decentralization afterwards.

1980s. From the 1990s on, several development plans were initiated, but none of these succeeded. As the surroundings of T&T are densely populated with generally poor and unemployed working class immigrants, socio-economic cohesion is also an important aspect of the case. The T&T site is seen as a first order 'opportunity site' for both public and private interests, however a highly contested terrain with multiple stakeholders '*playing out their struggles*'. Central within the case are the decision-making procedures concerning building-permits.

5.1 The Duisburg-Marxloh Soziale Stadt program - Germany

This case-study covers the development of the German 'Socially Integrated City program' (SIC), which is closely related to the European URBAN initiative. Fostering participation and coordination from as well the government, NGOs and citizens, the program aims to reduce the widening socio-spatial disparities within cities and neglected urban areas. In the case of Marxloh, a city quarter of Duisburg, the decline of the coal and steel industry led to a relatively high unemployment rate especially within its migrant-population. Under the SIC program, an urban revitalization project has been developed within Marxloh in order to regenerate the area.

29.1 The Cottonera region - Malta

The Cottonera is not a single municipality, but an area consisting of three cities with their own local governments (Cottonera- case study, p. 7). To generate economic growth in this relatively poor Maltese area, in 1999, the central government decided to develop a urban regeneration project for the three-city area. Focusing on attracting major private sector investments within the Cottonera area, a plan to redevelop the waterfront of this area was designed. The aim was to generate a '*thriving cultural, commercial and recreational area for tourists and locals*'. The case is characterized by strong central government dominance over the local levels⁷.

18.2 Vilnius city strategic plan - Lithuania

The development of a municipal strategic plan in Vilnius city is central in this case. As a post-soviet country, the Lithuanian political institutional context has experienced significant changes since the early 1990s. This also has consequences on the level of spatial planning. This case illustrates that local-level self-government of municipalities is an important aspect of territorial governance within

⁷ The author is aware of the fact that this case also fits into the territorial category 'inter-city', however during the analysis of the various case studies, the categorization used by the case-study authors was made decisive.

Lithuania. Issues of public participation and integrated policy approaches characterize this case.

7.3 Analytical Framework

The framework used for the integral analysis of the cases focuses on four key-aspects of political relations within urban governance frameworks. First, the overall political context (political organization and spatial planning framework) of the cases is given; second, vertical relations between governmental levels and between governmental and non-governmental actors; third, the horizontal relations. The final part will focus on the outcomes of the specific forms of territorial governance within the regions, in terms of successes and failures.

7.4 Political Context

7.4.1 Political Organization

The political organizations of the states which the intra-city cases are embedded in are federal (the cases of Belgium and Germany), centralized (Malta) and 'decentralized unitary' (cases of Slovakia and Lithuania). Decentralization tendencies do play an important role within the cases. Within the German, Slovakian and Lithuanian cases, decentralization of powers and competences has been especially important to the local municipal level, while within the Belgium case the Région Bruxelles Capitale (RBC) (sub-national state) plays a dominant role. The central government retains a dominant role within the Maltese case and decentralization tendencies are of lesser importance here.

Despite of decentralization tendencies within the cases, the central and sub-national state representatives continue to play important roles in terms of the provision of the overarching framework, although the central government (as within most former socialist countries) within the Slovakian case plays a minor role.

Change is an important element within the national political frameworks of all of the cases. In this context, the Slovakian and Lithuanian cases especially stand out. Since the collapse of the communist system of the early 1990s, Slovakia and Lithuania experienced significant changes within their political frameworks.

Shifting from a centrally planned system with a powerful hierarchy vested within the central government and its authorities, decentralization became an important characteristic of the system that evolved after the collapse of the communist system. Although the central state provides the political (constitutional) framework, the power of the lower levels is relatively strong. This is because the political organization of territorial governance within these cases is vested in principle of 'self-government' of lower levels (regional and local in the Slovakian case local in the Lithuanian case). In the other two cases (the Belgium and German cases), the sub-national state representatives still play an (more traditional) important role. Within the Belgium case the RBC (state) holds almost all decisive powers, and within the German case, the states developed the overall guidelines and overarching framework for the SIC funding program.

7.4.2 Spatial Planning

Along the lines of decentralization of competences within the national institutional frameworks, the spatial planning framework also changed within the contexts of the case studies. Belgium for instance has gone through a process of federalisation since the 70s, and spatial planning was attributed to the regional level since the 80s. The central state does not have any competence anymore on this matter. Within the Slovakian context, after the collapse of the communist system and the erection of the Slovakian state in 1993, the centralized spatial planning system was changed along the lines of decentralization and self-government. The redefinition of the spatial planning system in Slovakia is however still an ongoing and unfinished process. This is also very much the case within Lithuania. In the German case the changes appear to be less radical, yet changes are present. Especially in terms of the institutionalization of sustainability objectives within the spatial planning framework (especially since the late 1990s) there have been important changes within the German system⁸. The Maltese case seems the most stable in terms of the spatial planning framework, the central government remains dominant and top-down hierarchies remain.

The diffusion of competences and powers within the different institutional frameworks of the cases analyzed cannot easily be generalized. Within the Slovakian context, the national state authority plays a role which is far less powerful than the lower sub-national levels (especially the municipal) and the same goes for the Lithuanian

⁸ See, amongst others, changes within the Regional Planning Act in 1998 and 2004.

case. Although the national state within the Belgium context also plays a minor role, the role of the sub-national state of Brussels is rather important (hierarchical) with respect to the municipal levels (although these do play a role). In the Maltese case the central government plays a role which can be compared to the Belgium RBC. Within the German case, the role of the state authorities on the sub-national level is more important than the national state on a level of spatial planning and on a project level within the SIC framework municipal levels play an increasingly significant role.

The role of the central state, although differing from case to case, is generally one which focuses on providing an overall (constitutive/legal) framework for the competences and tasks of the lower, sub-national levels⁹. Within the federal systems, the role of the sub-national states is also one of 'frame-setting', however, their influences seems to be more direct than those of the central state.

7.5 Vertical relations between territories, actors and administrative levels

Before going into the synthesis of the analysis of vertical relations within the case studies, first the vertical relations per case study are schematically represented.

⁹ This is also true for the Maltese case, however, here the central state rather strictly defines competencies of the lower levels and remains to play a dominant role.

**Case: Germany - Duisburg
Marxloh**

Political
Framework

Federal

*coordinated by Federal
Ministry for Transport,
Building and Housing sets*

**Central State
Level**

Overarching legal
framework/ funding 1/3rd

*joint state ministries of
housing developed '**Socially
Integrated City**' programme*

**Sub-National
Levels**

*Sub-National
State*

North Rhine-
Westphalia

*co-funding by states/ funds
administered by regional
authority/ states set out
guidelines*

Regional Body

Regional
Administration

*joint state ministries of
housing developed '**Socially
Integrated City**' programme*

**Local
Level**

*Municipal
Authorities*

Duisburg city

*cooperation and
coordination*

*funds local
projects*

Development
Association
Duisburg
*coordinates on
local level*

Civil Society

*cooperation and
coordination*

Housing companies;
Schools; Social Welfare
Organizations (churches);
Economic Organizations
(chambers; Trade unions)

Relations are focused on dialogue rather than on Hierarchy

Case: Belgium - Tour & Taxis

Political Framework

Federal

Central State Level

No clear role

Sub-National Levels

Sub-National State

Région de Bruxelles-Capitale

main decision-maker
coordinator, powerful (holds major competences in spatial

Regional Body

Not applicable here

'difficult' hierarchical relationship; RBC is main decision-maker

Local Level

Municipal Authorities

Municipalities of Brussels and Molenbeek

Building permits; several spatial competences however less powerful than RBC

building-permits for projects

Civil Society


Neighborhood committees
dialogue/ cooperation


La Fonderie (industrial heritage conservation)
from conflict to dialogue

protest/ conflict to dialogue

private actors implement

Relations slowly move from a conflictual situation towards more cooperation (and coordination); regulated context





7.5.1 Central State Level

The Central state continues to play a role within the institutional framework of territorial governance within the cases. In most cases, its role is largely related to enabling and funding (German, Belgium, Slovakian and Lithuanian). Due to the federal context of the Belgium and German cases, and the highly decentralized context of the Slovakian case, the central state does not play an important decisive role within the cases. However, together with the EU, the central state remains an important 'funding' actor. Within the Maltese case the central state, however, plays an explicitly powerful role. In this case it is the main decision maker within the inter-city Cottonera project.

Within the federal cases, the traditional role of the central state has been assumed by the sub-national states (i.e. North Rhine Westphalia and Région Bruxelles Capitale). Within the Belgium case, the RBC still plays a rather hierarchic role compared to the municipal authorities. Within the German case, North-Rhine Westphalia plays an enabling role in terms of funding, but also sets out (together with the other states and the federal state) the guidelines for the SIC funding program. However, on a project level (the decisions taken on the actual local projects) the municipalities and local actors play decisive roles.

Within the Slovakian context (and to a lesser extent also the Lithuanian context), the central state is concerned with an ongoing process of devolving its competences to lower, de-central levels. Regional bodies as well as municipalities gain competencies from the national state, which gives them sufficient power to 'self-govern'. However, financial decentralization has not come of the ground yet.

7.5.2 Sub-national level: Regional and Local Governance

Within the federal cases, the role of the regional/ sub-national is being played by the state level (i.e. RBC and NRW) as described within the central state section above. A different role for 'other' regional authorities is not present within these cases. Within the Belgium case, most coordination is top-down, from the RBC state upon local projects (building permits). Within the German case, the coordination of the SIC funding program is through cooperation between the German states and the federal state. The local embedding of projects funded by this SIC program is achieved

through cooperation on the local level (between civil society and local governmental actors)¹⁰.

Within the Slovakian case, the sub-national/ regional level does also play a role within territorial governance, however not on the local/ municipal levels. As competencies of territorial governance are distributed amongst the territorial governance levels in a 'complementing' way, there is no overlap of powers. Hence, the municipality is self-governing and fully autonomous within its own territory, as the regional bodies and districts are self-governing on regional issues. Within the Lithuanian context this is also the case. However, here, the regional body is much more 'a puppet of the national state' than an independent self-governing authority. Opposite, the municipal level is seen as fully-autonomous concerning territorial governance in the urban context.

7.5.3 Role of the local

In three cases (German case, Slovakian case and to a somewhat lesser extent the Lithuanian case) the role of local governmental actors is relatively strong. Within the German case, funding and general guidelines are forwarded from the national and sub-national levels, however the filling in and the specification of the program in the local context rests in the hands of local authorities. In order to do so a new agency (The Development Association Duisburg) was erected. Under its guidance, a conference uniting governmental, civil society and some private partners cooperated in order to develop local projects on the basis of SIC funding. Within the Slovakian case, a territorial plan for the area of Jánosíkova within the city of Malacky was developed on the basis of dialogue with all involved stakeholders. The municipal authority however had the final say.

In Figure 17, the vertical relations with respect to regional territorial planning are outlined.

¹⁰ Although only governmental actors can decide

Figure 17 Vertical relations with respect to spatial planning in the intra-city cases

Case	Role of the central/ federal state	Role of the sub-national state	Role of the regional level	Role of municipal authorities	Relations
Jánosíkova - Slovakia	Weak; Overarching framework; funding	<i>not applicable here</i>	Cooperative & Coordinative based on principles of territorial self-governance; Development of regional territorial plans	Cooperative & Coordinative based on principles of territorial self-governance; Development of municipal plans	Complementing; (no formal overlap of competences) cooperative
Tour et Taxis - Belgium	Weak; Overarching legal framework	Strong; Decisive power lies within the RBC; which is the main coordinator	<i>not applicable here</i>	Less strong Several spatial competences, however less powerful than the RBC	Conflictual; however, slowly moving towards cooperation strongly regulated context
Marxloh-Duisburg - Germany	Enabling; 'Bund' is for 1/3 rd responsible for funding Federal ministry for Transport Building and Housing coordinates the SIC program and sets out the general guidelines (together with states)	Enabling; States cooperate and contribute to a relatively large part of the funding Set out guidelines for SIC together with Bund	<i>not applicable here</i>	Cooperative & Coordinative set up Development Duisburg Association (on the basis of the SIC program) in dialogue with civil society. the DDA is the main coordinator at the local level	Cooperative and Dialogue relations are focused on dialogue rather than on hierarchy
Vilnius - Lithuania	Enabling funds and supervises the regional level; has a less strong authority over municipal level	<i>not applicable here</i>	rather weak , the regional body can be seen as a ' <i>straw man</i> ' of the state authority	Cooperative & Coordinative based on principles of territorial self-governance; Development of municipal plans	Cooperative and Dialogue relations are focused on dialogue rather than on hierarchy
Cottonera - Malta	Strong & decisive the central state has the final say	<i>not applicable here</i>	<i>not applicable here</i>	weak only play an advisory role	top-down the central state decides

7.6 Horizontal relations between actors

Horizontal relations between actors, both governmental as non-governmental play an important role during decision-making procedures within the cases. Although in all cases there seems to be a tendency to integrate stakeholders and participants within decision

making procedures, their role is largely informal in terms of direct influence. Hence, power still rests with primarily governmental actors. This is most obvious in the cases of Jánosikova, Slovakia; Cottornera, Malta; and Tour et Taxis, Belgium. Although public participation has in the case of Slovakia and Belgium been constitutionally formalized within territorial governance procedures, the effects of participation however remain relatively low, since these structures do not have formal *power*. So participation in these two cases is more a formal procedure rather than a way to powerfully influence decision making procedures.

In the German case, public participation is a bit more integrated within decision-making procedures, although still, governmental actors have far more decisive powers. Within this case, the Duisburg Development Association (the local level agency which focuses on developing projects within the national SIC framework) focuses to involve all non-governmental stakeholders in a formal body where these can develop project ideas and bring forward important issues. However, the body has no formal decisive power and hence focuses on informal (network like) structures in order to influence the 'real' governmental decision-makers.

7.6.1 Governmental actors

Hence, the role of governmental actors in all five cases remains significant. Especially the municipal level (in the cases of Jániskova, Vilnius and Duisburg-Marxloh) is highly important. In these cases municipal authorities are the final decisive powers (concerning the local projects). Central state, districts and regions only play an enabling role.

Within the more conflictual cases of Tour and Taxis and Cottonera, the role of the state (Belgium: the sub-national level RBC; in Malta: the central state) is most important. Based on a hierarchic institutional context, the RBC is the decisive power when it comes to issuing building permits within the region. Although to a certain extent open for dialogue with the municipal level and non-governmental actors, power remains in the hands of the state. Within the Maltese case, the central government is quite firmly pulling the strings of territorial governance, even on local levels.

In the other three cases, the role of the central, and sub-national state is less relevant, although it provides the overarching framework for the lower governmental levels to act.



7.6.2 Residents and neighbourhood committees




Although non-governmental actors might formally have little power, informally a specific type of actors is of significant importance within the cases. Although more clear within the Slovakian, Lithuanian and Belgium case, this is also true for the German case. Within the Slovakian and Belgium case, inhabitants and neighbourhood organizations play an important role in protesting against plans which potentially affect their situations in a negative sense. By openly contesting the plans issued (or in the Slovakian case: petitioning against plans), these have a significant influence on the course of decision-making procedures¹¹.

Within the German context, inhabitants do play a much more positive role, since these are asked (together with other non-governmental stakeholders) to issue ideas for projects in their direct environment (neighbourhood). Immigrant populations got special attention within this case, but also indigenous inhabitants play an important role.

Beneath the horizontal relations within the cases are illustrated schematically.

¹¹ within the Maltese case the role of inhabitants is not explicitly described within the case-study





7.6.3 Mobilization, Coordination and Integration

Within the case studies one could distinguish two types of mobilization. The first has a more negative undertone and focuses on contesting and resisting policies which are imposed upon citizens, house-owners and other stakeholders, and rather negatively affect them. This type of mobilization is especially present within the conflictual case of Belgium, but also in the Slovakian case. In both cases, inhabitants protested to policies which would negatively affect their neighbourhoods.

A more positive mobilization is present within the Duisburg-Marxloh and the Vilnius case. Within the German case, governmental actors tried to create a basis for public identification of urban (regeneration) policies, by involving inhabitants, migrants and other stakeholders to participate in decision-making procedures. This resulted in the participation of over 70 actors in the quarter conference, which focused on issuing project ideas and other important issues for the Development agency to elaborate upon. Within the case of Vilnius, civil society interaction also formed the basis of the development of an urban plan. Through consultative meetings and creative methods, civil society, inhabitants and other stakeholders were stimulated to be involved in the process.

There was only a small amount of involvement of civil society within the Maltese case.

Horizontal relations within the five cases are rather coordinated. Within the German case the Duisburg Development Association is the coordinating body which integrates both governmental decision-makers as civil-society and inhabitant actors (consultation). Within the Belgium case, the RBC plays a powerful coordinative role. The Slovakian case is characterized by municipal coordination as is the Lithuanian case. Within the Maltese case the central state is the main coordinator.

Most of the projects within the cases are related to integrated policy packages, although in the Slovakian (housing) and Belgium case (regeneration) sectoral policies are also important. Figure 18 shows coordination and integration within the cases.

Figure 18 Coordination and Integration in the intra-city cases

Case	Coordination	Integration
Duisburg-Marxloh, Germany	Yes coordination by the Duisburg Development Association	Yes, urban renewal, local economic development, housing; environmental policies Not on federal state level, very sectoral approaches by state ministries there
Tour et Taxis, Belgium	Yes regulated coordination by the state (RBC)	No integration at T&T level Integration on other levels: contrat de quartier: social economic environmental integration of policies
Jánosíkova, Slovakia	Yes Malacky municipal authority	Sectoral (housing-plans) Integrated (municipal master-plan)
Cottonera, Malta	Yes Central state	Yes although there are three separated projects, these integrate several policy sectors to achieve economic and cultural development within the region
Vilnius, Lithuania	Yes Vilnius municipal authority	Yes 'the territorial plan involves integrated policies'

7.7 Participation, Openness and Innovation

Within all cases, except for the Maltese case, the policy-issues of participation and openness are increasingly integrated in territorial governance procedures. Within the cases of Duisburg-Marxloh and Janosíkova and to a lesser extent the Tours et Taxis case, participation and openness issues are even formalized within policy-development procedures.

The Duisburg-Marxloh project is considered especially benefiting from active and interested local politicians and citizens and long traditions and multiple participation possibilities:

"The Socially Integrative City" implements an innovative approach of governance, aiming to include everybody and aiming to build a societal consensus (in the programme area)... The degree and the value of integrating citizens into local programme decisions generate varying conclusions by the assessing sources. While in a study on the political culture in Marxloh different stakeholders judge the degree of public participation low, legal bodies exceed their participation obligations by far. In the course of many years of experience with the

programme, it has developed a good climate for participation, in which stakeholders from the codetermination bodies, the programme offices and non governmental organisations offer a large range of possibilities for citizens to take part in discussions and join project working groups. As part of the latter, citizens are able to influence single step decisions within projects they support”.

In the 'Tour and Taxis' case in Belgium, the obligation for public authorities to inform and consult the population and to take into account the result of this consultation is considered innovative. In addition the informal aspects of the process are considered innovative.

Another example of innovation is the Slovak case study of the Residential Area Janosikova, Malacky. Here an innovative mechanism related to participation was used: meeting system which had the dual function of information sharing and generating new ideas and impulses from the participants.

However, despite these innovative attempts non-governmental actors have not gained more decisive powers within policy development procedures, as formal decisions are still taken by governmental actors. Non-governmental actors do, in most cases, have the opportunity to appeal against decisions taken by governmental actors, but have no formal power to 'have a decisive-say' in policy-development procedures.

Another remark that should be made here is that despite of governmental efforts to increase public participation and openness in policy development procedures, the general public remains highly disinterested in (regional) territorial governance. This also has consequences for the levels and contents of public participation, which amongst inhabitants is rather low. Public participation is therefore most of the times an effort of coordinated organizations, NGO's and committees (which is especially clear in the Belgium and German cases).

When referring to innovative and interesting practices of territorial governance, in most cases, mechanisms for openness and participation are seen as most important. The integration of public participation and openness into formal policy-making institutions (and laws) are most significant here.

Within the Maltese case of the Cottonera area, no forms of public participation openness and innovation are described.

7.8 Outcomes

The issues and outcomes of the intra-city governance procedures described within the cases are rather diverse. In order to come to some general conclusions about the outcomes of intra-city governance procedures, the cases will first be presented on a 'case-by-case' basis.

7.8.1 The Lithuanian case

The slogan "Vilnius - capital of Lithuania, the most modern city in central and eastern Europe, an international centre of politics, business, science and culture" characterizes the highly ambitious vision behind the development of the urban strategic plan for Vilnius city. Through a 'well planned, open and honorable [?!] decision-making process' a long term integrated spatial plan for the city was developed. Citizens, NGOs, private actors as well as governmental decision-makers were involved in the development of the plan. The final decision, however, was taken by the Vilnius city council.

7.8.2 The German case

The general focus of intra-city territorial governance within the Duisburg-Marxloh case is on *governance, participation, and activation*. The national expert describes the case as being successful in terms of participation and the focus on governance instead of government. Co-determination and co-thinking of civil-society during decision-making procedures, and the developing of new policy-ideas and issues by local stakeholders really improved the legitimacy of the project. However 93% of stakeholders involved feel that since the start of the program in Germany, the social situation in quarters funded by the program has declined or remained unaltered. This shows that problems of urban renewal lie deeper. They cannot solely be solved with the help of governance or urban renewal programs but are influenced by national economic and city-wide segregation development. A comment that should be made here also is that participation within the project still is 'socially selective' in the sense that only a small amount of the migrant population participates within the project.

Overall, the national expert considers the case successful due to the development of integrated policy packages, the integration and participation of non-governmental stakeholders and the long-term focus of the project.

7.8.3 The Belgian case

The decision that was taken by the RBC state on building permits for the Tour et Taxis area was actually a negative one. Permits were refused, although more recently on some other projects permits were granted. The decision taken was actually a top-down one, although local actors actually supported this decision. Hence, slowly, territorial governance within the area moves towards a more consensual approach. Since a general and integrated vision for the area still lacks, sustainable policies are also not really present within the T&T case. Economic development prevails over sustainable values.

Although the T&T site was identified by the RBC as a 'pole of opportunities', actual implementation (by mainly private actors) has not significantly come of the ground yet.

7.8.4 The Maltese case

Within the Maltese case, the central Maltese state developed a policy for the redevelopment of the Cottonera area. The three cities within this area had a rather diminutive role within this process. Although there were some options for dialogue, the central state took the final decision, without much consultation of the local authorities and civil society. Private parties could sign in on each of these three projects and the implementation of the projects now rests in their hands.

7.8.5 The Slovakian case

A territorial plan for the city of Malacky concerning the development of the Jánosikova area was approved by the municipal authority of Malacky. The city of Malacky also consulted non-governmental stakeholders in meetings before approving the plans. As a traditional territorial plan, the focus was as well on policy integration as upon specific sectors. For the Jánosikova area this particular sector was housing. Within the plan, sustainability was one of the elements that had to be integrated. Although the actual implementation of projects

based on this document has not come of the ground yet, private actors will possibly start the implementation on a short notice.

Avoiding the issue of making general statements on the basis of the outcomes as presented above, the focus here is on governance failures and successes within the cases. This will be done on the basis of the criteria of 'good governance' as established in the SIR. The scoring on each of these criteria will be based upon the description of the national experts within the case studies and is dependent upon their evaluation of the cases.

7.9 Governance in an intra-city context

Territorial governance in intra-city contexts is highly diversified within the five cases which stood at the basis of this analysis (see figure 19). It is therefore rather difficult to derive general statements from this analysis. However, there are several characteristics within the intra-city governance processes that seem to be present in all cases. First, there is the attention for non-governmental participation and influence within decision-making processes. Non-governmental actors seem to be increasingly present within urban governance processes, although these might have no formal powers or competences. As their presence is growing one might expect their influence to do the same.

Another 'shared' characteristic is that the intra-city governance procedures seem to be rather coordinated. In the German case the newly erected DDA was the main coordinative body on the local level, as the municipal authority of Malacky was the main coordinator within the Slovakian case. The same goes for the Vilius municipal authority in the Lithuanian case. Within the Belgium context, processes on the local level (concerning building-permits in the T&T area) were coordinated by the RBC state. Within the Maltese case the central state was the main coordinator.

Figure 19 Governance failures and successes in the intra-city cases

Cases	Consensus	stakeholder participation	negotiated & shared rules	common spatial vision	integration of territorial action	consensual decision	Implementation	sustainability
Duisburg-Marxloh	Yes <i>the general aim is to 'build a societal consensus</i>	Yes <i>participation and openness are the main principles at stake</i>	Yes	No <i>none of the decisions and project aim at developing a spatial vision</i>	Yes <i>intersectoral approach</i>	Yes	Not clear from the case study report	Not clear from the case study report
Jánosíkova	Yes	Yes <i>most stakeholders were consulted</i>	Not clear from the case study report	Yes	Not clear from the case study report	Yes	Yes <i>is to be started</i>	Yes <i>sustainability principles had to be met in the development of the territorial plan</i>
Tour et Taxis	No	Some	No	No	No	No	Partly	No
Vilnius	Yes	Yes <i>a wide range of actors were involved</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes <i>Multi-sectoral approach, integrating existing spatial and sectoral policies</i>	More or less <i>at least on a political level</i>	Yes	Not clear from the case study report
Cottonera	Not clear from the case study report	No <i>central state authority dominated the decision-making process</i>	No	No	Yes, <i>multiple sectors were integrated in the development project</i>	No	Yes,	Not clear from the case study report

7.10 Conclusion

It remains difficult to answer the questions raised within the introduction of this project. Has there been significant change within territorial governance structures in the context of these five European cases? Surely, some change are present, the focus on participation of the non-governmental sector is exemplary for this. Decentralization tendencies seem also to be increasingly present within the cases (see figure 20). But still, are these changes significant? Does this mean a

real move away from traditional territorial governance structures? Avoiding to give a direct and final answer to these questions, this paper argues that the process of territorial governance shows some trends towards the tendencies described. As change is almost intrinsic to governance processes, this process is not expected to stop here, or come to a full and final end-state. Rather territorial governance is a process with an open-end, which now seems to move towards processes of decentralization and participation.

The intra-city case studies are summarised in figure 21.

Figure 20 Centralised-Decentralised continuum in the intra-city case studies

	Traditional closed/ hierarchic/ top-down modes of governance	government	governance	New Open, participative, flat modes of governance
Centralized				
Cottonera - Malta	X			
T&T - Belgium		X		
Duisburg-Marxloh - Germany		X		
Vilnius - Lithuania		X		
Jánosíkova - Slovakia		X		
Decentralized				

Figure 21 Summarising on the intra-city case studies

	T&T - Belgium	Duisburg-Marxloh - Germany	Jánosikova - Slovakia	Vilnius - Lithuania	Cottonera - Malta
Institutional context	Federal	Federal	Decentralized	Decentralized	Centralized
central	enabling	enabling	enabling	enabling	strong
sub-national level	(RBC) strong	<i>enabling</i>	complementing regional and local	weak	non-existing
Relations state/ sub-national	strong sub-national	enabling (flat)	strong role for sub-national	strong role state	-
Relations region/ local	strong role sub-national	enabling;	complementing no overlap	strong role local	state dominance
Type	conflictual (moving towards a more consensual model)	consensus	consensus (a bit conflictual)	consensus	conflictual
Spatial Plan	Regional & local	regional & local	regional & local	local	regional

8 Governance trends

In this final chapter we seek to summarise the most prevalent trends in territorial governance, as they appear from the case study synthesis. The chapter begins with a section discussing the headings around which the case studies have been compiled; vertical and horizontal relations, public participation, openness and outcomes, and degree of innovation and interesting practices in the cases. Thereafter follows a section concluding on the European policy impacts of the case study areas. Following the themes emerging from the White Paper on Governance, tentative conclusions on trends of good governance generated from the case study analysis are then addressed. Finally, a section on qualitative territorial impact assessment closes the chapter.

Apart from the final section, concrete examples from the case studies will not be given in this chapter. Instead, we make references to the individual case studies by using the identification number for each case study (see figure 4), and by indicating in which chapter more information on the particular case(s) can be found.

8.1 Vertical relations, decentralisation, devolution, and regionalisation

Devolution, decentralisation and regionalisation are all themes clearly emerging as important trends in the cases. 'Vertical relations' between public authorities are still however predominant, as much of the cases still describe more traditional policy processes of seeking to accommodate different interests between these. Even in the more 'innovative' governance forms, the arbitrator often remains the central government level. It can thus be summarised that even in the more network-based governance models (e.g. the cross-border initiatives) there is an important role for the national central government level. Whilst the driving forces of trans-national and cross-border co-operation may be local municipalities, public authorities on local and regional level, as well as (increasingly) the local and regional business community, central government remains the final guarantor and facilitator, as well as having a role in conflict resolution. In fact there are very few cases where conflict resolution seems to be otherwise catered for; rather, the national government, and in the end the courts, are referred to here.

In the trans-national and cross-border cases (chapter 2) some interesting tensions relating to the nature of vertical relations emerged. Whilst great expectations relate to bottom-up, network-based, flexible cross-border and trans-national initiatives, there are still a number of traditional government issues, requiring solutions in the vertical scale. Central government has a role in implementation in case studies 13.1 and 14.2, has an indirect role in (27.1) and (1.1) (supervisory in the first, more central in the second). In case 12.2 the central committee has observer status. Only in case 17.2 is it argued that central government is without any role.

In terms of the financial resources required, the reliance on European funding is a central factor, as is the need for national financial support. Yet in the future the commitment of local authorities and in particular business representatives and private sources of financing are also seen as increasingly required. This can be achieved only if the benefits are more tangible than the promotion of co-operation and networking. In very few cases is this point made, although there are some exceptions (e.g. case studies 1.1, 14.2 and 28.2).

The Finnish-Swedish cross-border case (14.2, chapter 2) may be of relevance for other cross-border regions seeking to solve the legal conundrums associated with cross-border territorial collaboration. This collaboration has resulted in a cross-border spatial plan for the centre of the twin city area.

There is certain path-dependence when it comes to vertical relations and the development of cross-border practice. In terms of the co-ordination efforts involved in the cross-border cases, there is a lot of intangible "social capital" that is created and that, whilst difficult to identify in quantifiable terms, is seen as central for the future success of these initiatives and to the possibility of creating innovative forms of co-operation, both vertically and horizontally. (See e.g. case study 1.1, chapter 2). This also relates to the correspondence between national and cross-border forms of governance. If the national governance model is centralized and top-down, it is very difficult to foster cross-border initiatives that would be otherwise. The administrative culture is therefore an aspect that needs to be born in mind.

Whilst voluntary co-operative initiatives are necessary in order to develop **metropolitan planning initiatives** and create a shared vision of which direction the region wants to develop into, it is clear that there in most cases is still need for national support. In many cases national policy sets the context and provides the preconditions within which a bottom-up urban policy initiative can act.

The case studies confirm the importance of the role of the state and the central government, which is always installing the **framework and regulative context** in which the other actors will find their places. Also, it is often at national level (government and/or parliament) that **final agreement**, on policies or spatial plans have to be given. This agreement is needed for reasons of accountability, but also for reasons of traditional and persistent hierarchy, and/or because the national state is usually still in control of budget and allocations of resources. It is also necessary for the State actors to decide, **when, due to conflict, other actors cannot** come to a decision. The mediating role of the central government is visible in the case studies in this sense, as the central role has the potential role as arbitrator even in cases where this is not its main responsibility.

Nevertheless, there is an important evolution if we consider the different ways a national State can play its role. This role can be quite differentiated, depending on the possibilities offered by the institutional framework, the political context, as well as depending on their utilisation of the tools and instruments such as spatial planning framework, delimitation of metropolitan areas, transfer of financial capacities and transfer of normative capacities. Here the role has been relatively stable, with the exception of countries having gone through main constitutional changes (e.g. Belgium) or transition processes (e.g. the post-Cold War changes). What has perhaps evolved more is the role of the sub-national levels of public authorities; regional and local/municipal.

The central government level usually has the role of setting the broader strategic guidelines and institutional frameworks, as well as financing major infrastructure developments. However, in many such cases private sector actors and regional mobilisation is becoming more important.

Regional level seems to be important in all of the cases. In some cases the central focus of the study lies on a process of decentralisation and empowering of the regional level (see e.g. cases 21.1, 15.1, 15.2, 4.1, 9.1, 18.1, 18.2 and 17.1). Most often implementing bodies of the state policy or plan are found at regional level.

In all of the **national case studies** the local level governmental actors are involved in one way or another consulting or supporting a national programme or organisation, participating in a planning process or implementing a national programme. Local level

involvement can also be strong, as in the example of the France “Pays” policy case (4.1).

In general, one could state that the central government and state representatives have a role as the enabler, the controller of the devolved decision-making procedures, as well as in most cases in having the final budgetary and legal powers. So far, the role of the state actors does not seem to have changed significantly. They still play an overarching and facilitating role towards the lower levels, and provide the necessary resources to them to act. It seems however that the actual change in the governance system takes place at the sub-national levels of territorial governance: the regional and local.

Interestingly, in most cases a ‘new’ form of sub-national governance at the regional level has evolved. This level has gained competences derived particularly from the municipal level, but also (to a less significant extent) from other sub-national levels, or from the national level. This ‘new’ body of regional territorial governance provides a strategic tool to integrate and coordinate regional objectives.

Within these newly founded regional governance projects, local government actors also play an important and powerful role and local authorities can have important vertical relationships within the framework of such new regional governance projects (see e.g. case 17.1 in chapter 4).

In the **intra-city cases** the Central state continues to play a role within the institutional framework of territorial governance, with a role mostly relating to enabling and funding. Within the federal cases, the traditional role of the central state has been assumed by the sub-national states.

Autonomous regions provide a case apart precisely due to their relative autonomy that may include major competences, financing and negotiating powers. Strong regional collaboration with powerful local authorities regarding the development of a strategic plan is exemplified by a case from Barcelona (10.1) (chapter 4). There are also examples of non-public actors involved in vertical relationships, e.g. the case of strategic waste management in England (22.1) (chapter 4).

Changing vertical relations involve the shifting of power and competences between actors and/or geographical levels. This can result in complicated situations with uncertainties regarding the allocation of responsibility and subsequently accountability. A particularly complicated case in this respect is that of devolution of

powers, regionalisation and spatial planning in Greece (26.1) (chapter 4).

8.2 Horizontal relations, 'multi-channel' and territorial coordination

Here we conclude on the ways in which the various actors (including public, private, civil society etc.) are present in the policy processes seeking to launch or implement a more integrated policy methodology, new plan or similar. What are the possibilities and limitations in terms of achieving coordination or integration? More integrated territorial approaches are often set as a goal, but many of the challenges of sector coordination and increased horizontal integration make this problematic. Here we seek to identify examples amongst the cases where this has been achieved, as well as asking what have been the reasons and effects.

At least four important categories of actors in territorial governance can be distinguished. First, and still foremost important, is the involvement of public, mainly governmental, actors e.g. authorities, agencies, mayors, political leaders and such forth on all territorial levels. The second type of actor is the different types of non-governmental actors, which seem to have a growing importance and indicate a shift from government towards governance. Despite their increasing importance, the non-governmental actors still have a more limited role, relating mainly to advisory functions or the promotion of dialogue. This latter group of actors can, in turn be divided into experts, private actors (or the market) and civil society actors, see figure 22.

Figure 22 Categories of actors in territorial governance

	Public/governmental	Non-governmental actors		
Examples of actors		Experts	Private actors (market)	Civil society
	National government Regional government Local government Public Agencies, e.g. Highway Agency Majors Political leaders	Academics, Professional associations, Trade unions, Employers' associations etc.	Land owners, Developers, Construction companies, Other businesses etc.	Environmental NGOs, Social interest groups, Neighbourhood associations etc.

Horizontal relations in governance process are particularly noticeable among **the 'regional', polycentric and urban networks case studies** (chapter 4). This is only to be expected since these geographical categories take the shape of 'regional' as being below national level but above the local level and, hence, many horizontal actors are present already among the public institutions. Collaboration between different local authorities are therefore commonly at the heart of horizontal relations, but they also include collaboration between other actors horizontally as well as vertically with levels that are geographically above or below that of the region.

The case studies exemplify fairly well established, as well as more recent initiatives of territorial integration. Several cases describe new ways of working regarding spatial planning and development involving increased horizontal collaboration, including greater participation of different actors and some also making references to polycentricity. (See e.g. cases 12.1, 22.2 and 28.1 in chapter 4). Despite the indications that there are cases illustrating shifts towards governance, it is worth pointing out that in some cases the implementation of the spatial plans or other horizontal collaborations is still to come. The shift from government toward governance is clearly a slow process that takes time. It is too early to provide an evaluative assessment of whether cases are success stories in terms of good governance or not.

Cross-border initiatives typically provide examples of horizontal collaboration with regards to cooperation between local authorities on both sides of a border (see. e.g. case 1.1 in chapter 2). These cases often also include other types of actors at other geographical levels. Cross-border initiatives remain predominately organised through

working groups and similar, which could potentially have positive repercussions on horizontal integration.

Also **urban-rural cases** tend to have horizontal relations between local authorities, in addition to other types of horizontal and vertical relations. We distinguished between more consensus-based and more conflictual cases in our analysis (e.g. chapter 5 on metropolitan regions) and here it seemed as if it was among the non-conflictual cases, where the local level within the territorial structures was most important. Local level relations appear to be characterised by cooperation and dialogue and the municipalities involved seem to be coordinating their efforts. Perhaps it could be labelled *coordination through cooperation*. The municipalities have relatively powerful status within the regional governance framework. In these cases the central state authorities rather loosely coordinate and enable regional territorial governance. This governance approach facilitates the development of consensual and integrated strategic plans for the regions which are supported by most stakeholders.

The more conflictual cases have a rather thematic or sectoral approach of regional territorial governance and focus on a single problem. The central state seems to play an important role in the cases that are conflictual. (See e.g. case 29.2 in chapter 6.)

Horizontal relations in governance processes at the levels of **FUAs, metropolitan regions and intra-city cases** can also build on collaboration between local authorities at the same geographical level, but in these cases there are also likely to be examples of horizontal integration of other types of actors within an administrative area. (See e.g. case 7.2 in chapter 5.)

In the **intra-city cases**, horizontal relations between actors, both governmental and non-governmental play an important role during decision-making procedures. Although non-governmental actors might formally have little power, informally a specific type of actors is of significant importance within the cases; inhabitants and neighbourhood organisations. By openly contesting plans, either through protests and/or petitions, civil society actors can have a significant influence on the course of decision-making procedures. (See e.g. 6.2, 18.2 and 21.2 in chapter 7) There is also an example where citizens play a much more positive role, when they, along with other non-governmental stakeholders, are asked to issue ideas for projects in their neighbourhood (5.1, chapter 7).

To sum up and reconnect with the introductory questions, information from the case studies indicates that there are many possibilities to

achieve more integrated territorial approaches and by so doing improved horizontal governance. As several cases illustrate, there are good examples to use as inspiration. Dialogue and broad involvement of different actors seem to be an important means to promote such achievements. Territorial integration is likely to be both time and resource-intensive and some of the examples relate to collaboration that has been going on for many years. Apart from lack of financial and human capital resources, other barriers can be the presence of strong conflictual elements such as competing interests for land use and particular national, regional and/or local cultures in policy-making.

8.3 Concluding on governance and public participation, openness and innovative and interesting governance practices

As outlined on good governance in the previous reports of ESPON 232, it has been assumed in the White paper on Governance that the quality, relevance and effectiveness of EU policies depend on ensuring wide participation throughout the policy chain – from conception to implementation. Improved participation is likely to create more confidence in the end result and in the institutions which deliver policies. Participation crucially depends on central governments following an inclusive approach when developing and implementing EU policies, but also on regional and local authorities within their competences and areas of responsibilities. Here we have sought to identify whether this is the case and if so, provide some examples. Also, we have sought to identify policy initiatives that are relevant in this context and asked whether all participation is of equal value, a goal in itself.

The case studies revealed relatively little new in terms of public participation, openness and innovative practices of governance. Is interactive and participatory planning still an ideal that is attempted through traditional methods? Are there any successes among the case studies regarding these important governance features? What sort of tools and practices have been used to stimulate participation and openness? The factors of participation, openness and innovation are in many cases interrelated. In this chapter we highlight the most important examples under separate headings beginning with public participation, followed by openness and finishing with innovative practices.

8.3.1 Public participation

Based on the information from the case studies, it is clear that the issue of public participation overall is still fairly limited although there are progressive examples. In many cases public participation is discussed regarding a wide range of actors that represent many aspects of society apart from government at national, regional or local levels. It is clear that the most common type of public participation regards *organised actors* and often on the *public side* such as agencies. Other types of organisations or institutions that are fairly widespread in those case studies where more focus on participation is reported include universities, trade unions, professional associations of experts, business and commercial interests. There are also some examples of participation from NGOs and interest groups such as environmentalists. Very rarely are individual non-organised citizens involved and as is typical to social movements more generally, participation is socially selective and those that are active tend not to be the most disenfranchised (as already noted also in chapter 5.4). One could argue that, in terms of participation, it is a sliding scale where the best represented organisations and actors are government representatives at different levels, followed by other organised stakeholders and in very few cases individual non-organised citizens.

Participation is most commonly referred to in terms of *consultation*. Consultation is, with regards to the specific issues dealt with in the case studies, sometimes a statutory requirement, for example in Finland, France, Hungary, Belgium and Malta. Other cases report that participation in the activities described in the case studies is voluntary, for example in Slovakia and Spain. The fact that consultation is not statutory does not necessarily mean that it is limited or unimportant. Participation can be a politically strong factor in decision making even when voluntary, as reported in case 10.1 in chapter 4.

One way of increasing participation is through partnerships. This way of working relates to organised actors, but it implies a broader participation as compared to the situation when only government at different levels takes part. Partnership arrangements are increasingly common in spatial planning across Europe and there are several examples of this way of working among the case studies. In the preparation of planning or development strategies or plans, partnerships are important players in many cases, e.g. case 28.2 in chapter 2, cases 16.1, 17.1, 19.2 and 22.2 in chapter 4 and cases 7.1 and 19.1 in chapter 5.

In many cases limited participation is identified as a problem and there are several examples of attempts to increase participation and to boost public awareness and debate. This is done in various ways, including workshops supported by consultants in partnership-building, kick-off meetings where citizens are invited to attend the beginning of a planning process, round table meetings and thematic working group meetings, the setting up of a quick release fund to enable activation of citizens and youth organisations particularly aiming at involving young people in discussing a regional development plan. See e.g. case 4.1 in chapter 3, cases 3.1 and 16.1 in chapter 4, case 9.2 in chapter 5, case 2.1 in chapter 6 and case and cases 5.1 and 18.2 in chapter 7.

However, despite many attempts at increasing participation, the overall pattern is that participation aims have only been partly reached to date. The most important role is still played by public actors, and particularly government bodies at various geographical levels. In terms of other interests, the organised interests are clearly more involved than individual citizens. Among the organised interests, the importance of different actors varies between the different types of cases. For those dealing mainly with regional strategic plans or visions, it tends to be business organisations, universities and other stakeholders in the region such as construction companies. Among the NGOs, there are also examples of active environmentalist groups. In other cases, particularly dealing with urban matters, it can be environmental groups or support groups of social matters such as associations looking after the interest of the elderly population.

The governance processes would gain from a greater participation of civil society. Several case studies highlight that particularly marginalised groups are poorly represented in terms of participation. However, there are also examples of 'missing' public actors in the governance processes. In at least two of the case studies it was argued that the national governments ought to be involved in the processes (See cases 10.1 in chapter 4 and 1.2 in chapter 5).

8.3.2 Openness

The mechanisms or instruments for openness in the case studies encompassed legislation, consultation processes, websites, hearings and mediation on services, open meetings, media, proactive campaign work, inquiries, seminars and conferences.

Most of these mechanisms were used in the transnational and cross-border cases (e.g. case 23.2 in chapter 2). In the national cases most of the mechanisms were considered to be known and used by the stakeholders even though the results were generally not seen as a success (e.g. case 21.1 in chapter 3). Considering the regional polycentric cases, about two thirds reported about openness (e.g. case 10.1 in chapter 4). In those cases, several different mechanisms are used to improve openness. Overall, however, one must say that the case studies show disappointingly little activity in this matter. Also among the the FUA and metropolitan cases is there a trend to promote openness, e.g. in cases 1.2 and 7.2 (chapter 5). Nevertheless, in most cases the information flow is one-way and not really interactive; rather, information is 'made available'. Only a few urban-rural case studies mention any mechanisms for openness, and these mainly refer to the dissemination of information in newspapers, and on web pages. All of the intra-city cases refer to consultation processes and some also to mechanisms for openness (e.g. case 5.1 in chapter 7).

Despite good practices and increasing attention to the issue of openness, there is still a lot to be done in this matter if openness is perceived as a broader issue than simply meeting certain regulative minimum standards.

8.3.3 Innovative and interesting mechanisms

The innovative mechanisms or tools in the case studies were often related to participation processes (e.g. case 21.1 in chapter 3). In some cases they refer also to plans, planning models, marketing tools or other working practices. In some cases the very object of the case study was seen as an innovation in its national context because it related to a new way of working (e.g. cases 3.1, 19.2 and 22.1 in chapter 4), Sometimes the cases were even an official pilot (e.g. case 17.1 in chapter 4).

Among the **trans-national and cross-border cases**, it was summarised that as long as the initiatives are public-sector led, they also tend to remain embedded in innovation within this sector. There are however also attempts at promoting innovation more broadly and developing innovative tools that can be of benefit for the wider regional community, including the business and R&D sectors (e.g. case 12.2 in chapter 2). Cross-border initiatives in spatial planning are in themselves important, with great potential for working also in the future as channels of information, exchange of experience and

learning. They can be used as 'laboratories' through which transnational ideas can be channelled and tested. Information and marketing tools and working practice are also referred to as dimensions where innovations can be found. For example a network where actors from the local, regional and national level have set up a service for official information- and marketing activities (case 12.2 in chapter 2).

Among the '**regional', polycentric, urban network cases** examples of innovative tools or mechanisms that all are related to the ways of cooperation are mentioned (e.g. cases 10.1 and 15.1 in chapter 4). In the Spanish case of the strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona, several features were considered innovative. Among the FUA and metropolitan cases a few examples of innovation are mentioned. They are usually related to the introduction of an integrated metropolitan planning level or model (e.g. case 27.2). Considering **the urban-rural cases**, there was limited information regarding innovative practice, but some examples were given. One case reported from a new type of plan, at supra-municipal level, and also innovative use of maps (10.2 in chapter 6). Among the **intra-city cases** there were also few examples of innovation reported. One such case described an innovative mechanism related to a new kind of participation mechanism: A meeting system which had the dual function of information sharing and generating new ideas and impulses from the participants (case 21.2 in chapter 7). In another case (6.2 in chapter 7) was regarded innovative in relation to the consultation process.

8.4 European policy impacts

The following section discusses in brief some of the findings from the case study analysis regarding the question of whether there are indications of European policies and initiatives of spatial or territorial relevance having an impact on forms of territorial governance practice. Special attention is paid to the ESDP, sustainability, Interreg and Open Method of Coordination.

8.4.1 ESDP

Of particular relevance when addressing European policy impacts is the inclusion of **ESDP** and matters such as polycentricity and urban-rural interaction, either implicitly or explicitly. It seems as if many of the successful cases of increased collaboration resulting in joint

spatial development plans or visions are generated through a pragmatic need for closer functionally based co-operation and interaction in regions covering increasingly large geographical areas. Collaboration across administrative borders and involving different types of actions is one way to address the problems with this geographical expansion of functionality. Such collaboration may not first and foremost stem from the ESDP documents themselves, rather it has in many cases grown out of a bottom-up need to cooperate. This is hardly surprising, since the work with the ESDP is in itself a long process involving actors and organisation within spatial planning well aware of the pressing policy needs in their own territory. Hence, it can be summarised that both bottom-up and top-down policy and practice is visible in many of the different case studies.

Examples of ESDP applications can be found in several cases, not least in new member states that are former centrally planned countries (see e.g. 13.1 in chapter 2, 11.1, 18.1 and 21.1 in chapter 3) In these cases the development of national spatial plans or other spatial planning strategies have made use of a number of the characteristics from the ESDP such as polycentricity, urban-rural dimensions and attempts to balance social, economic and environmental development. This is part of the adjustment to the prevalent policy discourse and practice in European spatial planning and therefore it is hardly surprising adjustments to the ESDP thinking have been major influences in these countries.

One of the most common ways in which Europeanisation impacts upon territorial policy is through the methodological inspiration and learning related to thinking about the ways in which different territorial levels of governance are to work with spatial and territorial planning issues. The emergence of spatial plans and strategic regional plans, where common visions are outlined, in turn influenced by European ideas such as those of ESDP is thus an important influence here. This may even be the case where no formal competence exists in spatial planning area (e.g. case 17.2 in chapter 2).

Developments in line with the ESDP may also appear in cases where no explicit reference to the perspective is mentioned such as in case 4.1 (chapter 3), 12.1 (chapter 4) where, e.g. increased urban-rural collaboration is promoted, case 19.2 (chapter 4) aiming towards greater polycentricity and case 22.2 (chapter 4) where the ESDP including both the themes of polycentricity and urban-rural integration were mentioned in the background research for the strategic vision, but without mentioning the ESDP in the final document. Other European policies have also played a role for the

governance process, e.g. increased collaboration in relation to Objective 1 that was decisive for the establishment of the horizontal collaboration between the local authorities in case 22.2 in the first instance.

8.4.2 Sustainability

The issue of sustainability is highlighted in several case studies, including a couple where particularly environmental sustainability forms the core of the case study (e.g. case 9.1 in chapter 3 and 22.1 in chapter 4). In these cases national strategies have been developed in line with the Brownfield Regeneration Strategy of August 2005 and EU directives aimed at a more sustainable approach to the management of waste respectively. European directives on waste management are also seen as important drivers in case 19.1 (chapter 5). Sustainability is also a significant factor in case study 5.3 (chapter 6) where Agenda 21 plays an important role.

8.4.3 Interreg

One of the most powerful tools for integrating European spatial policy ideas and policy thinking as a trans-national process of creating a shared understanding of spatial development into the national, regional and local territorial planning is provided by Interreg. This is partly related to the historical background of the current Interreg programming period and ESDP. The guidelines for the INTERREG III Programme (2000-2006) were published in 2000, and thus the themes introduced in the ESDP document of 1999 were quite timely and central to spatial development themes and objectives across Europe. The Interreg guidelines thus made direct reference to the ESDP, stating for example that Strand B proposals (involving trans-national cooperation) should take account of Community policy priorities such as the TENs and the recommendations for territorial development of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). Policy co-ordination and the objective of horizontal inclusion of territorial integration has thus often been inherent in the regulative framework. (Relationship between Interreg and ESDP is analysed more closely in ESPON 2.3.1 project. It has equally been addressed in ESPON 2.2.1, i.e. Territorial Effects of the Structural Funds.)

8.4.4 Open Method of Co-ordination

The Open method of Co-ordination was investigated in all the case studies, as the interview guide included questions on this, but it soon became obvious that this is a non-issue in the territorial policy and spatial planning fields. As such this seems also supported by the national overviews, where the topic seemed for the time being remain implemented mainly in labour and employment policy sectors (e.g. Ireland, Hungary, Latvia, Norway, Sweden, Finland), in some cases in connection with policies addressing social inclusion (e.g Spain).

8.5 Trends of good governance from the case studies

The five dimensions of good governance as identified in the WPG, openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence will be dealt with below. Since openness and participation are already addressed above, these will only be mentioned briefly in this section. However, the remaining three dimensions are analysed somewhat more in depth.

8.5.1 Openness

In most cases national legislation sets the parameters for openness, but the issue is not otherwise specifically addressed. There are websites, public meetings etc. referred to as tools for improving openness, but in many cases information is often seen more as a one-way flow, an issue of 'informing the public', rather than communicating with it. This is also linked to the issue of participation, as the minimum standard of openness is often dealt with through legislation and as such seems to be better catered for in more traditional forms of government (legal guarantees for access to public information and transparent decision-making etc.), whilst the issue of participation is a separate issue, also more linked to the degree of public interest.

8.5.2 Participation

Participation is often not very actively promoted. Neither is it the case that more innovative (in the sense of new) forms of governance are necessarily more inclusive or better at supporting and promoting participation. In fact, in some cases the opposite seems to be the case, as the governmental initiatives and those involving local

authorities for instance are often bound by legal and formal regulations to take this issue into account, where as the new forms of governance, whilst being more inclusive in the sense of being partnership-based, do not necessarily have the same obligation for participatory mechanisms.

In participatory terms, scale may be of particular significance, at least in the cross-border and intra-city cases. It is easier to promote participation and raise interest in initiatives which are more locally based, whilst the trans-national scale makes this naturally more difficult.

8.5.3 Accountability

The various forms of national, regional and local governance reflect very different ambitions and aims, as well as traditions when it comes to accountability. In many cases the clarity of roles and division of responsibilities, which is at the very heart of the traditional model of government, with representative democracy and administrative accountability, is much more difficult to ensure in the new governance models emerging across Europe today. This is the case in public-private partnership (PPP) models, informal and multi-level associations and movements, where the whole idea has in many cases been to provide alternatives to the previous models of government, which have been perceived as overly hierarchical and inflexible models of government. There are a number of New Public management inspired examples of governance, which seek to address accountability in a less hierarchical and less transparent form, but do not manage to settle the issue, as accountability still seems to be bound to the traditional forms of government.

One of the questions of interest here is: can accountability be shared? If so, by which means and principles, especially in light of the need to maintain transparency of the system? Accountability seems to rest either with the regional councils or assemblies (when directly elected) or the local authorities (when regional level does not have a directly elected accountable body). In some cases there is no pooling of responsibility, rather the local authorities participating in the spatial planning collaboration schemes each hold the accountability for their own area. In some cases (particularly those with a tradition of centralised unitary government, new Member States in particular), accountability rests ultimately with the national level.

8.5.4 Effectiveness

As outlined in the White Paper on governance, effectiveness has to do with both effectiveness of policy delivery and the appropriateness of measures implemented, i.e. policies must be “effective and timely, delivering what is needed on the basis of clear objectives, an evaluation of future impact and, where available, of past experience” (White Paper on Governance, 10). This entails both appropriate information about the needs of the regions and localities in question in the sense of strategic foresight etc. and the existence of a system that ensures effective policy delivery. The clearer the strategy to be implemented, the easier it is to deliver policy interventions and measures in an effective way.

Clear strategic visions and plans that were in many cases part of the case study context are tools by which effectiveness can be improved. They are often prepared and structured in a thematic fashion, and in organisational terms around working group structures. This can be a factor that contributes to maintaining the sector-divisions intact and not ensuring policy coherence by better sector co-ordination. Some themes that we conclude upon here are interlinked. A real problem is the general trend identified in the cases regarding accountability: the more ‘new governance’ is introduced, the more difficult it is to identify who, amongst the various actors involved, is accountable in the final instance. This has repercussions also on policy coherence, which tends to be seen as lacking, with sector policies remaining either under-co-ordinated or even mutually conflicting. Therefore effectiveness of the outcomes is questioned.

Policy effectiveness is improved by a long-term focus and potential obstacles to effectiveness thus include the absence of such a long-term perspective. This can relate to the uncertainty about funding, as well as long-termism in planning. Many new governance models emerge first as projects or connected to projects, which entails the usual problems of project culture (difficulties in project management, short-term strategies, conflicting or competing policy objectives, inefficient over-laps etc.). It was also argued that though political support and commitment allows for accountability, it also entails shorter time-perspectives and here the challenges lies. Essentially long-term strategic issues such as spatial and territorial development do not fit very well into an election-cycle timeframe.

Our focus has been both on policy delivery and its effectiveness, as well as the effectiveness of decision-making. At the same time we have been interested in governance, which necessitates a strong focus on process, rather than (only) outcome, i.e. it may be more

relevant to ask *how* policies are developed, implemented and monitored, rather than asking what is the policy *content*. Here we can also conclude that the tension between the issues of conflictuality and effectiveness in terms of arriving at a decision (despite the process of how one gets there) is of essence.

8.5.5 Coherence

In the White paper on governance, coherence is articulated as both an issue of clarity of single policies and of coherence across policies, relating also to co-ordination and integration of interventions across sectors. In some cases we have been only looking at one sector, i.e. planning or territorial development, but in many cases these have entailed policy tools and practices that necessarily include many sector measures. In some cases (waste management and transport for instance) different sector interests have come to play in a more direct fashion.

Coherence is also connected to the way in which broader policy-level themes and objectives (e.g. those incorporated in the ESDP, territorial cohesion, sustainability, Lisbon and Gothenburg themes etc.) are integrated into territorial initiatives. We will deal with some of these below (chapter 8.6).

Here the theme of territorial integration is central, as it was assumed that better policy coherence in a territorial context can only be achieved through a better co-ordination of different sector policies with a territorial impact. The synthesis analysis here provides multiple examples of such processes of improving coherence, mainly on the regional and sub-national levels, but also in some cases on the national level. One way in which better co-ordination and policy coherence is achieved is through the development of 'national spatial development perspectives', 'comprehensive plans', 'plans for territorial development' etc., which are actively consolidated with other existing spatial plans and visions. This is attempted through territorial pacts, in some cases taking contractual forms, in others more voluntary. In many cases, however, this degree of integration remains limited.

8.6 Qualitative territorial impact assessment

As outlined previously (e.g. in the TIR), the main challenge with a territorial impact assessment of governance is connected to the fact

that whilst impact assessment seeks to provide cognitive base in the form of evaluative information on **how policies impact on different types of organisation, territorial scales** etc., governance is not a policy, rather a means of developing, implementing, evaluating and assessing policies. It refers to the style and form of the policy cycle from agenda-setting to ex post assessment, and thus is of major relevance to policy, but cannot be assessed through the same methodology as policies can (for the simple reason that the financial and budgetary inputs and outputs are not distinguishable). Thus the model developed for instance in the ESPON TIA Manual, developed as part of ESPON project 3.1 „Integrated Tools for European Spatial Development“ by Friedrich Schindegger & Gabriele Tatzberger (Österreichisches Institut für Raumplanung, (ÖIR) does not really suit our purposes here.

Most of the dimensions of the ESPON TIA-model have been addressed in the questions posed in the case studies (see appendix for the template for case studies). We have thus addressed issues relating to governance form, impact, success, references to past and future, relevance of different territorial interventions and effects where identified, policy goals referred to (e.g. Polycentric spatial development, Cohesion – in economic terms, as well as social and territorial). Equally we have investigated the various applied meanings of ‘spatial/territorial’ and the territorial dimension.

Whilst it is not methodologically possible to undertake a TIA exercise based on governance, due to the nature of governance, as well as the type of material that these types of qualitative case studies contain, we have sought to give indications of best practice and good examples. One of the selection criteria that the case studies should include some elements of innovative mechanisms, processes or tools, which makes the TIA approach difficult, as impacts are not yet there to be assessed. In terms of good governance and quantitative indicators, part of WP5 addresses this question, though only in terms of coincidence (of certain characteristics as measured in selected indicators), rather than as causalities.

We have however sought to highlight good examples of governance mechanisms and practices (see figures 1-8 below), which in turn could be used in order to promote ‘good governance’ and by so doing potentially contribute to better policy effectiveness.

For the purposes of providing an analytical synthesis, we have summarised one example per governance dimension investigated and

per type of region. In most cases there were a number of examples to choose from and here we sought to select different types of examples, as well as referring to as many case studies as possible, for reasons of geographical balance and coverage. In extremely few cases there were no best practices given in the case study material. Underneath each figure we summarise the key aspects of the 'best practice'.

Figure 23 Vertical dimension

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
<p>Vertical: Multi-level relations, and decentralisation, devolution, and regionalization</p>	<p>Trans-national, cross-border</p> <p><i>The Finnish case (14.2) is an example of developing for the first time a spatial plan in a cross-border trans-national context, which has necessitated a national level investigation into how to ensure that this can take place in a legally appropriate and sustainable manner.</i></p> <p>National</p> <p><i>An example of strong involvement of local level can be found in the France "Pays" policy case (4.1). "Pays" is defined by the law as a territory of certain cohesiveness in terms of geographical, cultural, economic and social components. On this basis the local authorities can gather to propose a local development project, which must be elaborated with the concerned actors.</i></p> <p>Regional</p> <p><i>In the Västra Götaland Region case (17.1), the mobilisation of the 49 local councils lead to formalised local authority associations and to decentralisation of powers to the regional level that was initiated by delegations of local authorities, which took the initiative to the national level and thus set in motion a process that later became a pilot test of regional governance. Here the responsibility for regional development has been transferred from the state at the regional level (the County Administrative Board) to the directly elected regional council.</i></p>	<p><i>Potential legal repercussions on constitutional status of cross-border entities in planning</i></p> <p><i>Local involvement and mobilisation</i></p> <p><i>Local mobilisation as a source of inspiration, national level pilot part of the regional experiments on-going across Europe.</i></p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>FUAs and metropolitan regions</p> <p>The case study of the strategic plan of the metropolitan coast of Barcelona (10.1) is an example where a strong region collaborates with strong local authorities. The region is an administrative unit with high autonomy, major competences, financing and negotiating powers. The local level with 27 municipalities plays a major role.</p> <p>Urban-rural</p> <p>Within these newly founded (sub-)regional governance projects, local governmental actors play an important role (e.g. Italian, English and Austrian cases).</p> <p>Intra-city</p> <p>In the German case of Duisburg-Marxloh (5.1), the Development Association (the local level agency focuses on developing projects within the national SIC framework) seeks to involve all non-governmental stakeholders in a formal body where these can develop project ideas and bring forward important issues.</p>	<p><i>Strategic plan where strong local and regional autonomy is non-exclusive.</i></p> <p><i>Local level as a driver of development of an institutional framework of a regional Partnership and as a mobilising actor.</i></p> <p><i>The emergence of new actors with informal facilitator roles</i></p>

In the vertical case study examples, 'best practice' or inspirational examples are in most cases connected to the emergence of new forms for local and regional mobilisation and involvement and ways in which the local and regional levels can exert influence. In most cases good examples are given, where formal roles are less central as compared to informal ones, though potential constitutional repercussions of cross-border entities are also referred to.

Figure 24 Horizontal dimension

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
Horizontal: 'Multi-channel', Territorial co-ordination	<p>Trans-national, cross-border</p> <p>In the Atlantic Arc (1.1) case, the horizontal dimension of the initiative reveals a strong potential to horizontal integration, e.g. through the services and projected creation of a collective transport company and a global GIS framework.</p>	<p><i>Horizontal collaboration as a driver of further functional co-operation and improved policy coherence</i></p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>National</p> <p>In the Lithuanian case (18.1), the planning document is in itself an integrating factor, as it guides the overall spatial development and it is also cross-sectoral. All national sector policies are integrated into the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Regional</p> <p>The Regional Structure Plan (RSP) is the central pillar of the spatial planning policy of the KAN case study in the Netherlands (28.1). It integrates regional plans in the other policy areas and provides the framework for the implementation of regional projects such as sites for housing construction, business parks, infrastructure, 'green' areas and recreation projects.</p> <p>FUAs and metropolitan regions</p> <p>"Network city Glattal" in Switzerland (7.2), is a case of eight autonomous communities working in a metropolitan strategic co-operation in greater Zurich, organised as a regional association: "glow.dasGlattal", which is a community of interest.</p> <p>Urban-rural</p> <p>In a number of the cases interesting examples of a pro-active and facilitator role of the academic community was referred to, e.g. Hanover-Germany 5.3, PPSP-Italy 3.2, South-Yorkshire Partnership-UK 22.2. Within the Austrian case of Leoben (2.1), the university (department of Geography) also played an important role in establishing the strategic planning document.</p> <p>Intra-city</p> <p>Whilst traditionally the role of neighbourhood associations is strong in the intra-city context in the form of protesting against plans, there are also examples of more pro-active and positive roles, as in the German case of Marxloh-Duisburg (5.1), where inhabitants are asked (together with other non-governmental stakeholders) to issue ideas for projects in their direct environment (neighbourhood).</p>	<p><i>The introduction of spatial planning documents aiming at an integrated territorial policy approach, integrating policy interventions and potentially enabling better cross-sector co-ordination (or at least making visible the necessity for such an integrated approach)</i></p> <p><i>Regional structural plan as a tool of providing an integrated territorial planning approach.</i></p> <p><i>New forms of voluntary co-operation involving both public and private actors as a basis of new types of 'communities of interest'</i></p> <p><i>Utilisation of expertise and local/regional knowledge resources for spatial planning</i></p> <p><i>Active utilisation of local inhabitants as a source of new ideas for local planning, particularly seeking to integrate immigrant groups by providing them with a more active role here.</i></p>

'Best practice examples relating to the horizontal relations are often related to spatial planning processes, where cross-sector interaction is promoted and more coherent policy packages are developed as a consequence. Actor perspective is relevant through the involvement of experts and citizens in spatial planning processes and by so doing promoting new communities of interest and better integrated spatial policy approaches.

Figure 25 Public participation

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
Governance and public participation	<p>Transnational and cross-border</p> <p>Where participation is most actively addressed, is usually through national legislative processes requiring participation. Thus is the Finnish case study (14.2), the participation and impact assessment of the På Gränsen –Rajalla detail plan is based on national legislation defining as 'interested parties' residents, landowners, customs authorities, the regional environmental authorities, road administrations, regional and local museums, county administrative boards, neighbouring municipalities, border authorities, all the branches of local government (education, culture, social and health issues etc.), as well as a variety of local voluntary associations and organisations (neighbourhood associations, birdwatchers etc.)</p> <p>National</p> <p>Also in national cases focus is on formal roles of participation, as in the French case (4.1), where the co-operative instrument "Conseil de développement" is a body which is compulsory to create the framework of a "Pays" (an administrative entity). The legal requirement is only to contact it to inform its members on the project and on the way it is implemented. The body by itself and its basic role are statutory, but the real mechanism depends on local actors and to what extent these are mobilised. The final result is not binding. The new method seeks to involve also non-public actors.</p> <p>Regional</p> <p>In the case of Calatino Sud Simeto (3.1) in Italy, development policies have shifted from a top-down and centralised process to a local, bottom-up model. Civil society participation is one of the main objectives and considered central to both the decision making and implementation phases.</p>	<p>Broad definition of stakeholders, who are to have a formal role in participation</p> <p>Non-binding participation processes seeking to mobilise local actors, involvement of non-public actors</p> <p>Decentralisation of development policies</p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>FUA and metropolitan regions</p> <p>The case of Greater Dublin (19.1) is an example of partnership-building between the public and private sectors, in urban regeneration and local development. Bodies such as the National Trust, the Dublin Civic Trust, the Irish Business and Employers' Confederation (IBEC), and the Construction Industry Federation are involved, as are professional bodies, such as the Irish Planning Institute and the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI). Almost half the members of the Advisory Committee of the DTO are from the non-governmental sector, such as the IBEC, Earthwatch, the Dublin Cycling Campaign and the RTPI. The Strategic Policy Committees contained within each local authority also have a significant number of members from outside the Authority.</p> <p>Urban-rural</p> <p>There seems to be an increasing use of the 'language of public participation' in rural-urban territorial governance, the effectiveness of public participation still is rather low.</p> <p>Intra-city</p> <p>In the Trøndelag common regional development plan in Norway (16.1), a special attempt was made to reach out to and involve young people in the region. Two youth conferences discussing the regional development plan were held.</p>	<p>Active partnership-building and involvement of the non-governmental sector in the advisory committee</p> <p>A gradual discursive shift – little in the way of concrete examples?</p> <p>New ways of engaging the public – e.g. involving the youth</p>

'Best practice' within promoting public participation is connected to both the more inclusive definition of 'interested stakeholders' and to the processes of participation. In general there seems to be a gradual discursive shift going on towards placing more value on participation, though in some cases (e.g. urban-rural) there is still little more than anecdotal evidence of this.

Figure 26 Openness

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
Openness	<p>Transnational and cross-border</p> <p>The Luxembourg case (23.2) represents an example of a cross-border case in which diversified mechanisms for openness are used. In addition to website, structured meetings of local executive authorities are used, a monthly letter is published and a map of the trans-border agglomeration was published and sent to schools. Moreover, a special agency for the management of openness was created.</p> <p>National</p> <p>As regards to national cases in the Slovakian case (21.1), there is presented a mechanism to involve actors which should be involved but are not participating (Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001). All relevant actors were addressed directly and the rest of actors can submit their suggestions or objections on the base of the information about preparation published, over the processing period and about prepared proposals become public in mass media on the national field of activity and on the official web page of the ministry.</p> <p>Regional</p> <p>Considering the regional polycentric cases, the strategic plan for the metropolitan coast of Barcelona in Spain (10.1) seems to be a proactive case for openness. Several different mechanisms are used to improve openness, including a website, meetings, weekly informative bulletin, enquiries and interview. Furthermore, a communication plan (with marketing material) was made to give much more publicity to the results and to enforce the lobby goals.</p> <p>FUA and metropolitan regions</p> <p>The association "glow.dasGlattal" (7.2) attaches great importance to a concerted information policy. With an own internet homepage and a periodical press coverage it intends to inform the public and to strengthen the spirit of a "regional identity".</p>	<p>Utilising a variety of information and communication tools, as well as involving new types of actors, e.g. informing schools</p> <p>Formal 'information' activities and possible public consultation</p> <p>Active information strategy with both formal and informal activities</p> <p>Active information activities as a means of strengthening regional identity</p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>Urban-rural</p> <p>In Hannover region case (5.3) participation and communication has been promoted through the creation of a Regional Agenda 21, which is the region's only standing participation body. The Agenda 21 representative invites for agenda meetings once a month. The meetings are open to everybody, though most participants are institutions and agenda representatives from regional municipalities.</p> <p>Intra-city</p> <p>In the German Duisburg-Marxloh intra-city case (5.1), the programme regularly issues press information in order to inform the public. The programme provides a well located public programme office acting as an agency for safeguarding openness in terms of good governance. A public programme office (Stadtteilbüros) acts as the agency for safeguarding openness. The office informs about current transport and construction projects, programmes and plans, but also asks specified target groups, e.g. seniors, women, teenagers or children for their opinions regarding future development of the city quarter.</p>	<p>Utilisation/creation of new communication forum</p> <p>More targeted and varied communication and information activities, seeking to create communication as close to the citizens as possible and engaging different population groups.</p>

In relation to 'openness', most 'best practice' seems to be connected to the informal ways in which the public and different stakeholder groups are informed (utilisation of a variety of information and communication tools, as well as involving new types of actors in deliberation), though also more formal processes are sometimes referred to (e.g. hearings and consultations).

Figure 27 Innovative/interesting mechanisms

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
Innovative/interesting mechanism, tools or practices	<p>Transnational and cross-border</p> <p>In the Slovenian Schengen case (8.1) study, the introduction of pilot region can be taken as a 'best practice', as "Pomurje is a pilot region selected for research and concrete policy measures, support and training" (Case study 8.1, p. 4)</p>	<p>Experimenting and learning with regional pilots</p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>Regional</p> <p>Within the Slovakian case (21.2) new elements of governance were found in which the meeting system and independent experts (academic and regional) were used so that it contributed successfully to the new spatial development perspective.</p> <p>FUA and metropolitan regions</p> <p>The introduction of an integrated metropolitan planning level or model is considered innovative in the Warsaw (FUA) case (27.2). In the extended Warsaw area has been made an attempt to integrate the public transport system in Warsaw area through the joined takeover of Warsaw Commuter Lines by the local authorities ('self-governments').</p> <p>Urban-rural</p> <p>The Spanish case dealing with Urban Directive of the Coastal System in Catalonia (10.2), found an innovative mechanism related to the new type of plan. For the first time a supramunicipal plan in Catalonian coast has been made, which means an innovative approach to the coast land use and littoral protection in Spain. There was i.e. made an effort to improve cartography available and make it much more detailed. Although it is a top-down plan, consensus was built by meetings with town councils and land owners.</p> <p>Intra-city</p> <p>In the German intra-city case of Duisburg-Marxloh (5.1) 'The Socially Integrative City' implements an innovative approach of governance, aiming to include everybody and aiming to build a societal consensus. In the course of many years of experience with the programme, it has developed a good climate for participation, in which stakeholders from the codetermination bodies, the programme offices and non governmental organisations offer a large range of possibilities for citizens to take part in discussions and join project working groups.</p>	<p>Utilisation of external experts as a resource</p> <p>New distribution of responsibility contributing to the empowerment of the conglomeration of metropolitan local authorities.</p> <p>New plan for sub-national regional level in coastal management</p> <p>Project working groups as a means of building a societal consensus and dialogue</p>

Depending on how innovation is defined, it can be found as an under-lying cross-cutting theme across the different topics addressed in this section. In some cases 'innovation' in the case study context (be it territorial, regional, local or national) is specifically addressed however. The 'best practice' here seems to fall under the three main categories that each represents types of organisational and social innovation:

- Experimenting and learning with regional/national/local pilots (e.g. pilots in division of responsibility, empowering the regional or local level)
- Promoting policy learning through new spatial policy ideas (e.g. specialisation, polycentricity)
- Reform of structures, planning instruments and methods (e.g. working group-based organisational mode, new thematic plans)

Figure 28 Accountability

Dimension of analysis	<i>Type of case study region</i>	<i>Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?</i>
<p>Accountability</p> <p>Examples of cases where levels of responsibility are clarified by the new initiatives and governance practices</p>	<p>Trans-national / cross-border</p> <p>In the cross-border cases accountability is usually relatively clear, remaining in the hands of the local entities making up the co-operation, e.g. the case of ARKO (17.2)</p> <p>Regional</p> <p>The Hedmark County (16.2) is formed by the politically accountable elected regional council and the administrative county administration in line with the 'enhetsfylke' pilot model. Unitary governance arrangements coordinating the regional administrative tasks of the county councils (fylkeskommune) and offices of the regional state representatives (fylkesmenn) have been set up in this context.</p> <p>FUA/Metropolitan</p> <p>Lahti (14.1) is an example of co-ordinated inter-municipal plan, during the process of which a working group was established, consisting of planners from each municipality and a representative from Päijät-Häme regional council</p>	<p>Clarity of responsibility and distribution of tasks for each level of governance follows the national model (i.e. local autonomy and accountability carried through in the cross-border context)</p> <p>Pilot where new distribution of powers and responsibilities are being tested. The initiative increases effectiveness and regional autonomy.</p> <p>An example of new type of cooperation within planning context.</p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>Urban-rural</p> <p>The development of new Local Strategic Partnerships is encouraged in the South Yorkshire case (22.2) (LSPs) are encouraged in the as key mechanisms for joining up public services at an authority-wide level and consist of a single non-statutory, multi-agency body that matches local authority boundaries and aims to bring together the public, private, voluntary and community sectors to provide a single, overarching local coordination framework. The South-Yorkshire Partnership encloses four municipalities in the proximity of Sheffield.</p>	<p>Joined-up planning, Partnership organised for providing a single, overarching local coordination framework.</p>

Accountability refers to the clarity of division of roles and responsibilities and the 'best practice' identified can be divided into the following three main types:

- Experimenting and learning with regional/national/local pilots (e.g. learning from the way in which accountability is ensured nationally and putting this into practice in a cross-border context, strengthening regional autonomy)
- Promoting new types of co-operation in planning (involving new actors and organisations and re-drawing boundaries in their tasks)
- Reform of planning instruments and methods (e.g. joined up and better co-ordinated planning processes)

Figure 29 Effectiveness

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Effectiveness is analysed in relation to the set objectives, both in terms of effective policy delivery and the appropriateness of measures implemented.</p>	<p>Trans-national / cross- border cases</p> <p>Via Baltica (13.1) is a case where the meso level involves the co-ordination and administration of the project, transnational co-operation covering the whole zone, common marketing activities and co-operation between different actors in the Baltic Sea Region.</p> <p>National</p> <p>In the Lithuanian case (18.1), the planning document is in itself an integrating factor, as it guides the overall spatial development and it is also cross-sectoral. All national sector policies are integrated into the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Regional</p> <p>PEL, the Strategic plan for metropolitan coast of Barcelona (10.1) is a voluntary agreement made by 27 municipalities along the coast. The non-mandatory plan has as its goal to define common development strategies and interact more efficiently with sectoral institutions, especially the National Ministries responsible for coastal management, road and rail infrastructures, and regional institutes responsible for environmental management.</p> <p>FUA/Metropolitan</p> <p>Within Pla Territorial Metropolità de Barcelona (PTMB) case study (10.3) a metropolitan master plan is established to cover issues such as natural protection, networks of transport infrastructures and urban growth. The spatial planning context is multi-level, with the national level having a role in sectoral, as well as strategic and mandatory planning and the regional level has a territorial planning, strategic and mandatory role. The role of the local/municipal level is in urban mandatory) planning, mandatory.</p>	<p>One of the main contributions of the initiative has been the positive impact on integration of actors and sectors within spatial planning, enhancing effectiveness.</p> <p>Effective in the way it integrates different sectors.</p> <p>Effective in the way it integrates different sectors.</p> <p>Effective in the way it integrates different sectors.</p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>Urban-rural</p> <p>The strategic planning process of Leoben (2.1) urban initiative, serves as a good practice example of the urban-regional cooperation, where a more long-term perspective is employed. The process called "Creating the Future" is a general framework of actions that includes forms of democratic participation as well as dynamic and creative elements. By developing short and long-term objectives, "Creating the Future" attempts to up-grade the image of this town and to accord Leoben national and international prestige.</p> <p>Intra-city</p> <p>Duisburg: The "Socially Integrative City" case (5.1) successful due to the development of integrated policy packages, the integration and participation of non-governmental stakeholders and the long-term focus of the project.</p>	<p>A more long-term strategic planning approach.</p> <p>The case comprises integrated policy packages and has a long-term focus.</p>

The 'best practice' identified in relation to improved policy effectiveness is in most cases of two types: it either promoted cross-sectoral and cross-thematic integration and co-ordination and by so doing contributes to improved effectiveness, or the inspirational aspects are related to a more long-term planning perspective.

Figure 30 Coherence

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
<p>Coherence</p> <p>Coherence is connected to the way in which broader policy-level themes and objectives (e.g. those incorporated in the ESDP, territorial cohesion, sustainability, Lisbon and Gothenburg themes etc.) are integrated into territorial initiatives. TIA and other impact assessment practices are also means in achieving better coherence.</p>	<p>Trans-national / cross-border</p> <p>The Slovenian trans-national case (8.1) has enabled the Governmental Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy, with the assistance of the University of Ljubljana and the Regional Development Agency Mura, to intensively study and analyze the factors influencing socio-economic change and spatial planning requirements on the regional level after Slovenia's accession to the EU, where special changes have been consider: the new Schengen border regime, improved transportation networks and declining industries.</p> <p>National</p> <p>In the Slovakian case (21.1), during KURS 2001 creation, new elements of governance were found in relation to the meeting system, where independent experts were used. The ESDP document was also analyzed during the process. All policy options were analyzed and simultaneously they were evaluated from a view of their applicability and ability to be up-to-date under the conditions in the Slovak Republic. By so doing, the policy options are selected, which can have an application also for KURS 2001 processing.</p> <p>Regional</p> <p>The Triangle area in Denmark (12.1): In 1997 the 8 municipalities agreed upon "The Planning Perspective for The Triangle Area 1996-2008". This planning perspective was inspired by the ideas presented in The National Planning Report 1997, where the Ministry of the Environment recommended the creation of sub-national polycentric urban networks – along the lines of the ESDP-document that was launched three months after the Danish National Planning Report. The participating municipalities considered the document as 'political binding' - although formally it was not.</p> <p>FUA/Metropolitan</p> <p>The more sustainable management of waste in the Dublin region (19.1) could be characterised as the prudent management of the urban ecosystem – one</p>	<p>An example of utilising expertise and academic community as a resource in order to formulate more 'evidence based' spatial policy and by so doing improving policy coherence</p> <p>An example of utilizing expertise to improve coherence of this national planning process with the objectives of the ESDP</p> <p>The initiative has a strong link to the ESDP, though at the same time pre-dating the ESDP document.</p> <p>The initiative is on the line with one of the ESDP principles</p>

Dimension of analysis	Type of case study region	Type of 'best practice', WHY seen as good example / source of inspiration?
	<p>of the policy aims of the ESDP.</p> <p>Urban-rural</p> <p>Universities in the example of the PPSP in Italy (3.2), '<i>facilitate the interaction and action of local actors</i>' (PPSP-Italy, p. 9) by advising these local actors to coordinate their governance efforts within the region. These experts play a role in underlining the importance of regional governance within the region, and consequently, in the establishment of bodies of regional governance</p> <p>Intra-city</p> <p>Vilnius city strategic plan 2002-2012 (18.2): The Lisbon strategy, ESDP, EU Regional policy, EU transport corridors - IX B; EU structural and cohesion funds strategies, "Eurocities" best practises for development strategies where taken into account</p>	<p>An example where experts and academics play a significant role.</p> <p>An example which is in the line with many EU strategies.</p>

Policy coherence is most often promoted through a more evidence-based approach, where academic or other professional expertise is more actively utilised as a means to improve coherence of interventions, or through a more conscious and targeted integration of policy interventions within the context of broader EU strategies of relevance for spatial and planning and territorial policy (e.g. Lisbon agenda or ESDP)

9 References

Brenner, Neil (2004) *New state spaces: urban governance and the rescaling of statehood*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.

Caffyn, Alison, and Margareta Dahlström (2005) "Urban-Rural Interdependencies: Joining up Policy in Practice." *Regional Studies* 39:283-296.

Council of Europe (2000): *Handbook on Trans-frontier Cooperation for Local and Regional Authorities in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council of Europe (2006) "What is a Euroregion?", Available at: http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Local_and_regional_Democracy/Trans_frontier_co-operation/Euroregions/2Definition.asp.

Daniels, Tom (1999) *When City and Country Collide*. Washington DC: Island Press.

Delsen, L. (2002): *Exit Polder Model? Socioeconomic Changes in The Netherlands*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Esparcia, Javier, and Almudena Buciega (2002) "New rural-urban relationships in Europe: a comparative analysis." Valencia: University of Valencia.

Jessop, Bob (1997) "Capitalism and its future: remarks on regulation, government and governance." *Review of International Political Economy* 4:561-581.

Jouve, Bernard (2005) "From Government to Urban Governance in Western Europe: a Critical Analysis." *Public administration and development* 25:285-294.

Lapping, Mark B., and Owen J. Furuseth (1999) *Contested Countryside: The Rural Urban Fringe in North America*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

LeGalès, Patrick Le (2002) *European cities: social conflicts and governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loughlin, John (2004): The "Transformation" of Governance: New Directions in Policy and Politics, *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 50 (1), 8-22.

Melucci, A. (1996): *Challenging Codes. Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perkmann, M. (2003): 'The rise of the Euroregion. A bird's eye perspective on European cross-border co-operation', published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YN, UK, at

<http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Perkmann-Rise-of-Euroregion.pdf>

Salet, W. G. M., Andy Thornley, and Anton Kreukels (2003) Metropolitan governance and spatial planning : comparative case studies of European city-regions. London ; New York: Spon Press.

Schreier, M. (in press): "Qualitative methods in studying text reception". In Dick Schram & Gerard Steen (Eds.): The psychology and sociology of literature. In honor of Elrud Ibsch (pp.35-56). Amsterdam: Benjamins. (Taken from Fielding, N. & Schreier, M. (2001): Introduction: On the Compatibility between Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods, Forum Qualitative Social Research, vol. 2, No. 1, 19 p. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/1-01/1-01hrsg-e.pdf>).

Scott Gissendanner (2003) Methodology problems in urban governance studies. Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, vol.21, pp.663-685.

Thierstein, A.; Held, T.; Gabi, S. (2003) City of regions. Glattal-Stadt as an Area of Complex Institutional Levels needs Reforms. In: Schneider, M.; Eisinger, A.: Urbanscape Switzerland. Investigations and Case Studies on Development in Switzerland; Basel: Birkhäuser, 273-306.

Trekantområdet (2004a) Hovedstruktur for Trekantområdet 2003 – 2014. Trekantområdet Danmark.

Ven, P.J.V.D (1998) "Urban Policies and the 'Polder Model': Two Sides of the Same Coin" , Source: Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie, Volume 89, Number 4, November 1998, pp. 467-473(7).

Appendix

Appendix 1: analytical framework

ESPON 232 : Case studies analytical framework
 Ref Country;

Type of territory Name of the case study

1 : context

Type of territory <i>Geographical (metropolitan area FUA, transnational, national, ... (cf matrix)</i> <i>And physical (rural, urban, coastal, ...)</i>	
Type of political and institutional framework	
<i>Federal</i>	
<i>Unitary :Regionalised</i>	
<i>Decentralised</i>	
<i>centralized</i>	
Regime maintenance <i>Or incremental change</i> <i>Or rapid change</i>	
Spatial planning framework <i>Strategic (level),mandatory (level)</i>	

2: Vertical relations (territories and actors) during processes of public decision making in the case study (coherence, accountability, subsidiarity)

see V1 and V2

A: Vertical multi-level (of territories) relations of governance (“MLG”) (V1)

B: Decentralisation, devolution, regionalisation (V2)

Federalism, Unitary : Decentralisation, Regionalisation, devolution, ...			
Dynamic of the process (maintenance, incremental changes, radical changes),			
Resources (Finances) : Who decides the allocation ?			
Who controls the allocation ?			
<u>Level of territories</u>			
Central (or federal) state	A role ?		
	Formal ?		
	Informal ? (<i>mainly ?</i>)		
Subnational			
X ('regional' or federated))	A role ?		
	Formal ?		
	Informal ? (<i>Mainly ?</i>)		
	Involvement ? (No, Yes strong, Yes a bit)		
	Autonomy ?		
	Competences (<i>no, yes a bit, yes a lot</i>)		
	Finances (<i>no, yes a bit, yes a lot</i>)		
	Negotiating power (<i>no, yes a bit, yes a lot</i>) ? (<i>with ?</i>)		
Y (Local)	A role ?		
	Formal ?		
	Informal ? (<i>Mainly ?</i>)		

	Involvement (<i>No, Yes strong, Yes a bit</i>)	
	Autonomy ?	
	Competences (<i>no, yes a bit, yes a lot</i>)	
	Finances (<i>no, yes a bit, yes a lot</i>)	
	Negotiating power (<i>no, yes a bit, yes a lot</i>) ? (<i>with ?</i>)	
<u>Relations between levels</u>		
Central (federal)/subnational (federated)x	Regulated and /or contractual ?	
	hierarchy, cooperation, coordination, OMC, conflictual ...	
	Overlap or competition of competences	
	Negotiations : needed to reach objectives ?	
Central (federal)/subnational y	Regulated and/ or contractual	
	hierarchy, cooperation, coordination, OMC, conflictual ...	
	Overlap or competition of competences	
	Negotiations : needed to reach objectives ?	
Subnational / subnational	Regulated and/or contractual	
	hierarchy, cooperation, coordination, OMC, conflictual ...	
	Overlap or competition of competences	
	Negotiations : needed to reach objectives ?	
<u>Are non public actors involved ?</u>		
	If yes, which kind (private sector /economic interest, NGOs, organised group, non organised citizens)	In which way
	h	
	i	
Between territorial levels, are they cooperating ? Or dialogue, or coordination, or conflict ?		

<u>Conflict</u>		
Are there mechanisms to deal with conflicts ?		
Formal ?		
Informal ?		
A main actor ?		
Possibility to contest the decision ?		
<u>Accountability</u>		
Is there one identified actor responsible/ accountable	If yes, which one ?	

3: Horizontal relations (actors) during processes of public decision-making in the case study (effectiveness, coherence, accountability, openness)

see H1

A: Horizontal “multi-channel” relations between actors, governmental and non-governmental (civil society, private sector), (H1)

<u>Actors involved</u>			
Which kind of role <i>(manager, investor, protestor, ...)</i>	Involved in which way ? <i>(formal, informal ?)</i>	Involved with which kind of tool ? <i>(institutional structures, legal constituted partnership, established lobby organisations... or ad hoc group, informal meetings...)</i>	Which part in the decision making process ?
v			
w			
z			
Specific actors to mention ? (due to specific policy)			
Actors appearing for the first time ?			
Actors which should be involved but are not ?	Kind of (type)	Why ?	
	c		
	d		
Actors mobilizing the territory ? <i>(protest group, political leader, planner...)</i>	Which kind ? (type)	How ?(project, spatial vision, ?)	
	e		
	f		
<u>Governance</u>	Actors coordinating their efforts ?		
	new mode of governance in the way the actors are involved ?		
<u>Decision</u>	Possibilities for non governmental actors to influence public decisions ?		

	Is there one actor which has the final say about the decision ?		
<u>Conflict</u>	Are there mechanisms to deal with conflicts ?		
	Formal ?		
	Informal ?		
	A main actor ?		
	Possibility to contest the decision ?		
accountability	Is there one identified actor responsible/ accountable	If yes, which one ?	

4 Integration, coordination (territories)

see H2

(horizontal and vertical) Relations among territories; coordination of territorially based policies, multisectoral or integrated policies approaches

<u>Relations among the territories involved ?</u>	integrated policies, coordination, cooperation, dialogue, conflict	Due to which type of factors ? (institutions, culture...)
...		
z/x/y		
x/x		
x/y		
yy		
Do some municipalities have specific relations (close)		
<u>Coordination</u>	Is there coordination in general	
	Is there coordination concerning spatial planning for the area ? (statutory or not)	
	If not, possible explanation ?	
<u>integration</u>	Is there territorial integration of policies, Or policy packages	
	If yes, which kind ?	
	What about conflict resolution. (formal or informal mechanisms, main actor... ?)	
	What about accountability (one actor responsible ?)	
<u>Thematic approach ?</u>	If yes, are all the territories concerned involved in the decision making process	
If yes	If yes, in which way (which process/cooperation, partnership, ..	For Which actors (public, private, ...)
	n	
	m	
	Specifically, is there supramunicipal cooperation for planning ?	
	What about conflict resolution. (formal or informal mechanisms, main actor... ?)	
	What about accountability (one actor responsible ?)	

If no	Is it a decision from top hierarchical level, which has to be implemented by subnational level ?	
	How is it going on, are there protest ?	
	What about conflict resolution. (formal or informal mechanisms, main actor... ?)	
	What about accountability (one actor responsible ?)	

5 Participation, openness

A: Public (non-governmental) participation in the processes of decision-making, and the implementation of decisions

Are there specific mechanisms or instruments to involve civil society or private sector in the decision making process,	If yes, what kind ? (consultation, public inquiries, ... ?)	Statutory ?	Binding results ?
g			
h			
Or/and in its implementation			
Effectiveness ?	Significant and representative number of people participating ?		
	Demands taken into account when making decision ?		
	Actors involved in the implementation ?		
	Possibilities for non governmental actors to influence public decision thanks to participation process		
	or participation is just a formality ? which part has the participation process in the decision making process ?		
participation	Who is participating ?		
	Which interest are best represented ? Are interest groups easy to identify (lobbies ?)		
	Are (some) actors coordinating their efforts ?		
	Actors appearing for the first time ?		
	Actors which should be involved but are not ?	Kind of (type)	Why ?

		i	
		j	
	Actors mobilizing the territory ? (protest group, political leader, planner...)	Which kind ? (type)	How ?(project, spatial vision, ?)
		k	
		l	

B: Openness

Is there a mechanism or instrument for openness ?	
If yes, What type ? (agencies for information, law on administrative transparency, ...)	
Are they known by the stakeholders ?	
Can they be used by them ?	
If yes, were they used by them ?	
If yes, with which results ?	
Is information accessible to the general public ?	
Is there communication with the general public ?	
Existence of mechanism to involve actors (socio economic profile if possible) which should be involved but are not participating ?	
Existence of ressources (financial, human) made available to those mechanism ?	
Have specific agencies been created for the management of a policy, including openness to the public ?	

6 Innovative and/ or interesting tools, practices and mechanisms

Are interesting tools or mechanism or practices of governance used ?	
What is it ?	
Which level of public power are involved ?	In which way ? (partnership, cooperation,
Which territories are involved ?	
Which actors are involved ? (experts ?, NGO ?, ...)	In which way are they involved ?
Do you think this is innovative ? Why ?	
What were the objectives of the governance process ?	
Could they be achieved with the tool, mechanism, practice presented ?	
Conflict ; how was it dealt with ?	
To which aseptct of territorial capital does this governance process contribute ?:	
Social ?	
Intellectual ?	
Political ?	
Material ?	
What kind of ressources does it need ? (human, legislative, finance,)	

7 Outcomes/ effectiveness

(policies, strategies, partly refer to matrix ‘integrated policies’):
decisions and implementation

Decision :

Was it possible to reach a decision ? If yes	
How was it reached ? (process) : A top down decision ?or more bottom-up (local actors active and influent in the elaboration of the decision ?	
Who took the final decision ?	
The decision : what kind ?	
Short term, sectoral ?or Plurisectoral approach, middle or long term vision ?	
What about the sustainability of the policy/strategy/decision taken ?	
Is it facing protest ?	
Was it possible to elaborate integrated policy package and/or spatial vision ?	
Was there any integrated planning or territorial policy coordination	
Was there a capacity to ‘integrate and shape (local) interest ... and to represent them to external actors ?	
What was developed in relation to spatial planning ?	
Is it helping EU territorial cohesion ?	
What relations are there to EU strategies, rules, policies, fundings, ...	
What relationship to ESDP in particular ?	
If no decision could be taken, what is a possible explanation,	
What are the consequences ?	

Implementation :

What decision on implementation was taken ?	
Which interests were best taken into account ?	
Which interest were the least taken into account ?	
Who is in charge of implementation ?	
Are there specific mode of governance ?	
Which group(s) benefit more from the	

implementation	
Which group(s) loose more from the implementation ?	
Who is financing the implementation ?	
Who is controlling the allocation of ressources ?	
Are there new problems arising from the implementation ?	

8: Governance problems (ref part III)

Based on interviews with expert, what is the general understanding of the case ? (success ? problems ? ...)	
Do you agree with that understanding ?	
It is an example of successful (territorial) governance, or is it a problematic case ?	
More concretely,	
Was it possible to reach a consensus ? on which basis ?	
Was it possible to agree on the contribution of each partner/stakeholder ?	
Could they achieve 'negotiated and shared rules' ?	
Was it possible to achieve an integration of the territorial action ? (sectors, actors, instruments, level.....)	
Was it possible to reach a common spatial vision for the area of the study ?	
Was it possible to go on with implementation ?	
If no consensual decision could be reached, what solution, if any, was found ?	
What were the main aspects of the (new) mode of territorial governance ?	
What were the main changes leading to the new territorial governance in the policy design and application phases ?	
How old are these changes ?	
What degree of relationship do they have with ESDP and/ or mainstream EU policies	
What about the 'rapport de force' ? (balance of power and power struggle) : were there obvious winners and losers from the decision taken ?	
Which group(s) benefitted from implementation ?	
Which group(s) lost from implementation ?	
Were there obstacles or barriers to use governance practices and tools (consensus, cooperation, partnership, openness...)	
Considering the processes and outcomes of governance, what were the main weakness and strengths ?	
Strength	Weakness

opportunities	threats
Was the balance of this SWOT changing over time ?	
What about possible future development ?	

9 : links with EU and ESDP :

ESPON project 2.3.2

Governance of Territorial and Urban
Policies From EU to Local Level

Annex Report D

**Multi-Level/Vertical Dimension of Territorial
Governance**

D

ESPON Project 2.3.2

GOVERNANCE OF TERRITORIAL AND URBAN POLICIES FROM EU TO LOCAL LEVEL

Annex Report D

Multi-Level/Vertical Dimension of Territorial Governance

Joaquín Farinós, Mauro Payá Abad & Jody Milder

Separate volumes

Project Report

Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level

Annex report A

Data & Indicators

Identifying Favourable Pre-Conditions for Territorial Governance
Actions

Annex report B

Synthesis of National Overviews

Annex report C

Case Study Synthesis

Annex report E

Horizontal Dimension of Territorial Governance

Annex report F

Spatial Planning Styles: A new Physiognomy for Europe



INSTITUTO INTER-UNIVERSITARIO de DESARROLLO LOCAL



Multi-Level/Vertical Dimension of Territorial Governance This report represents the final results of a research project conducted within the framework of the ESPON 2000-2006 programme, partly financed through the INTERREG programme.

The partnership behind the ESPON programme consists of the EU Commission and the Member States of the EU25, plus Norway and Switzerland. Each partner is represented in the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

This report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the members of the Monitoring Committee.

Information on the ESPON programme and projects can be found on www.espon.lu

The web side provides the possibility to download and examine the most recent document produced by finalised and ongoing ESPON projects.

ISBN number: 84-690-3088-4
This basic report exists only in an electronic version.

© The ESPON Monitoring Committee and the partners of the projects mentioned.

Printing, reproduction or quotation is authorized provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is forwarded to the ESPON Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.

Table of contents

	Foreword	8
1	Summary	9
1.1	Looking for criteria to group states according to multi-level governance features: selected indicators	9
1.2	Main Results	13
2	Analysis and methodology	21
2.1	Models of State	21
2.2	Typology of regionalisation	24
2.3	Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels	29
2.4	Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	31
2.5	New spatial planning powers (innovative)	33
2.6	National Territorial Chambers	34
2.7	Regular multi-level governmental meetings	37
2.8	Extent of financial dependence of local governments on central government	39
2.9	Constitutional regions	41
2.10	Devolution of powers to first tier local authorities	42
2.11	Analysis of multi-level relationships	44
<i>2.11.1</i>	<i>Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities.....</i>	44
<i>2.11.2</i>	<i>Approaches for vertical co-ordination and co-operation</i>	46
<i>2.11.3</i>	<i>Integrated Spatial Planning</i>	48
3	Country profiles	50
	Austria	50
	Belgium	51
	Bulgaria	53
	Cyprus	55
	Czech Republic	56

Denmark	58
Estonia	59
Finland	61
France	62
Germany	65
Greece	67
Hungary	68
Ireland	70
Italy	72
Latvia	74
Lithuania	76
Luxembourg	77
Malta	79
The Netherlands	80
Norway	82
Poland	84
Portugal	85
Romania	87
Slovakia	89
Slovenia	90
Spain	91
Sweden	94
Switzerland	96
United Kingdom	97
4. Sources	101
Appendix 1: Score Tables	103
Appendix 2: Data List	116

Figures

1	Selected indicators of multi-level dimension of territorial governance	10
2	Selected indicators of multi-level dimension of territorial governance relationships	12
3	Multi-level structure. Total scores by models of State	15
4	Performance of the countries for multi-level structure and relationships	18

Maps

1	Performance of the countries for multi-level structure and relationships	18
2	Models of State	22
3	Changes in State structures in ESPON 29 Space	23
4	Typology of Regionalisation	25
5	Constitutional guarantee for regional and/or local levels	30
6	National Territorial Chambers	36
7	Intergovernmental regular meetings	38
8	Local dependence of local governments on central government	40
9	Constitutional regions	41
10	Devolution of powers to 1st tier local authorities	43

Tables

1	Country Scores for indicators on multi-level dimension of territorial governance	13
2	Country Scores for indicators on multi-level dimension of territorial governance relationships	14
3	Models of State	104
4	Typology of Regionalisation	105
5	Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels	106
6	Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	107
7	New spatial planning powers at supra-local / sub-regional	108

	level	
8	National Territorial Chambers	109
9	Regular multi-level governmental meetings	110
10	Extent of financial dependence of local government on central government	111
11	Constitutional regions	112
12	Devolution of powers to 1st tier local authorities	113
13	Approaches for vertical co-operation and co-ordination	114
14	Co-ordination on spatial planning	115

Foreword

The issue of vertical structure and multi-level relations is a sensitive one. One of the most important questions for the definition of a territorial model is the vertical organization (structure) of each country and also the relationships between the different levels of authorities and stakeholders. Besides some conflicts between the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality (between competencies and financial resources), inherent to decentralisation processes, it is too simple to think of the devolution-decentralisation-regionalisation process, a general trend in many ESPON territories, as the only issue to explain the model of territorial governance in its vertical dimension. This is an important question to take into account as a point of departure, because the result of the analysis in this annex is not in fact an assessment of decentralisation initiatives. More than this, it refers to multi-level governance preconditions, among them, but not only of course, decentralisation or federalisation, without any previous assumption on the prevalence of the different constitutional models.

The objective is not at the end to present a ranking that leads to the conclusion that there is a best model to be followed. One can find a great diversity of processes and political systems in the ESPON Space, with their own particularities. In this sense it is not possible for governance, as has been said for technology, to be simply imported, but it needs to be adapted. In fact, a similar political system or degree of competency at sub-national levels does not work exactly the same everywhere. In each country the relationships between the different levels and the "day by day" work are unique. The main target in this annex of Final Report of ESPON Project 2.3.2 is the observation of the fields in which some countries show a best performance, according to the indicators selected, grouped in different categories as explained below, and to try to explain why. In this sense our objective is to characterize the vertical preconditions for territorial governance and then put them in relation to multi-level relations according to the information the ESPON 2.3.2 project collected through the 29 National Overviews.

Part 1. Summary

1.1. Looking for criteria to group states according to multi-level governance features: selected indicators

In order to synthesise which are the political and governmental systems of the States within the ESPON Space, and complementing all the work already realised in the Third Interim Report of ESPON Project 2.3.2 (2.3.2 TIR), a matrix table has been elaborated which includes some categories (see Figure 1) related to the powers, the regional and local financial systems, and the involvement of the regional governments in the decision-making process of the Central Government.

A classification of countries has been proposed according to this matrix (see tables in Appendix 1 of this annex). The key indicators taken into account for this purpose have been selected based on two previous works. The first one is the classification included in Chapter 7 of 2.3.2 TIR, realised by the authors responsible for Working Package 2 of the 2.3.2 ESPON project (Louis Wassenhoven -NTUA). The second one is a working paper by Hooghe and Marks (2001)¹. The last seven pages of this document present a classification and ranking of the regional governance in the European Union between 1950 and 2000 according to their level of decentralisation. We have used some of Hooghe and Marks' categories, while also adding new indicators and extending the territorial coverage to ESPON29 space. The next paragraphs explain the categories, sub-categories, indicators and values given for each indicator we have considered (see Figure 1). A more detailed explanation by category can be found in the following pages. Also a detailed ranking for each category by countries can be found at Appendix 1.

We have defined three categories. The first category, called the **'Political system of the State'**, is related to the current national frameworks through two points of view. The first sub-category, so-called **State Structure**, refers to the current status of a country, i.e. if a country is considered unitary or federal and, within these categories, of which kind. The second sub-category, **Typology of Regionalisation**, is focused on the process. In other words, what kind of decentralisation at the regional level exists in each country?

¹ Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks (2001): "Types of Multi-level Governance", *European Integration online Papers*, n° 5, available at: <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2001-011t.htm>

Figure 1: Selected Indicators of multi-level dimension of territorial governance

Category	Sub-category	Indicator		Value
Political system of the State	Model of State	Unitary States	Centralised	
			Decentralised	
			Regionalised	
			Composite	
		Federal States		
	Typology of Regionalisation	Administrative Regionalisation		0.5
		Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities		1
		Regional Decentralisation		1.25
		Regional Autonomy (Political Regionalization)	Regions without Special Status	1.5
			Regions with Special Status	1.75
	Regionalization through the Federal Authorities		2	
Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels	Local		1	
	Regional		1.5	
	Each region has its own Constitution		2	
Spatial planning powers	Allocation of spatial planning powers	Local level	Weak	0.25
			Strong	0.5
		Supra-local / sub-regional level	Weak	0.25
			Strong	0.5
		Regional level	Weak	0.25
			Strong	0.5
		National level	Weak	0.25
			Strong	0.5
	New spatial planning powers at supra-local / sub-regional level (innovative)	Indirectly elected Assembly		1
		Directly elected Assembly		2
Role of sub-national governments within the States	National Territorial Chambers	Existence of a Senate but not representing territories		0.5
		Existence of a partial Territorial Chamber		1
		Existence of a totally Territorial Chamber		2
	Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Existence of a Conference of Presidents without authority to reach binding decisions		0.5
		Existence of a Conference of Presidents with authority to reach binding decisions		1
		Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contracts		1
	Local financial dependence on central government	Dependent		0
		Fairly independent		1
		Very independent		2
	Constitutional regions	Existence		2
	Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Relatively powerless local authorities		0
Devolution expected or in process		1		
Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities		2		

The third sub-category is related to the national Basic Laws (Constitutions), specifically the **Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels**. In spite of any country considering its regional level, in practice it could be a mere branch of the Central Government. In other cases the opposite may also happen. This subject shows the disparities that could exist between the original

intention of a country and reality. As we comment in the section on this subject, in the countries where the Basic Laws take into account a true regional level, the local levels are considered too.

The second category refers to '**Spatial planning powers**'. The first of the two subjects in this category, **Allocation of spatial planning powers**, talks about the tiers of governments which have competencies in matters of spatial planning. The second category, **New spatial planning powers (innovative)** makes reference to the existing initiatives for co-operation or the creation of metropolitan areas as intermediate sub-regional levels, in order to elaborate spatial plans, schemes or strategies. As these initiatives work through the real mechanisms of governance, it has been decided to include them in this category.

The third category, '**Role of sub-national governments within the States**', tries to explain the real weight of the sub-national levels in the State. One of the subjects in this category is the existence in each country of **National Territorial Chambers** or Senates, where the territories or the regional governments are represented. The second subject, **Regular multi-level governmental meetings**, refers to the existence of Conferences of Presidents or permanent meetings between the Prime Minister and the Presidents of the regional governments. The third subject is the **Extent of financial dependence of local governments on central government**, that is, the degree of economic dependence of the local governments with regard to the central government. The fourth subject refers to the existence of **Constitutional regions**, regions with legislative powers. The last subject included in this category is related to the degree of power and competencies of the local levels. It is entitled **Devolution to 1st tier local authorities**.

We also tried to elaborate an analysis related to the financial resources of the sub-national levels: **amount of sub-national public expenditure** -in other words, the public expenditure that the regional and local levels have with regard to the overall national public expenditure- and **financial relations and incomes of sub-national governments**. We would have liked to show the degree of financial dependence of the local and regional levels among themselves and in relation to the central State. This is a strategic issue, probably more important than the adoption of powers and competencies, because financial independence allows sub-national governments to carry out and execute to a greater extent their competencies and powers. However, the lack of reliable statistical

data for all countries does not allow us the elaboration of this analysis.

Figure 2: Selected indicators of multi-level dimension of territorial governance relationships

Category	Indicator		Value
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Organisms that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels	2
		Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans	1
		Encouragement by central government to establish linkages between local and regional partners	0.25
	Problems with relationships between different government levels		-0.5*
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes or positive evolution of attitudes	0.5
		Weak attitude	0.25
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective		0.5
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships		1
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination		2
	Mainly vertical coordination...	...and weak horizontal coordination. But horizontal coordination exists at levels with the main planning competency	1.75
		...and weak or no horizontal coordination	1.5
	Mainly horizontal coordination...	...and weak vertical coordination. But vertical coordination exists between levels with the main planning competency	1
		...and weak or no vertical coordination	0.75
	Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination		0.25

* Only applicable to *Organisms that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels* and *Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans* (see section 2.12.1)

For the definition of the multi-level relationships, three categories were considered (Figure 2). The first one, **'Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities'** refers to the existence of initiatives or procedures related to multi-level governance. In this category a negative indicator related to the existence of **problems of relationships between different government levels** is included. This negative value is only applicable, however, to some of the indicators within this category. Secondly, the next category refers to the attitudes, wishes, emphasis and current progress towards the improvement of vertical relationships. This category has been named **'Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination'**. The last category, titled **'Integrated spatial planning'**, refers to multi-level co-ordination in the field of spatial planning using the indicators established for the

different degrees of integrated spatial planning developed in Annex F of this ESPON 2.3.2 Project Final Report.

1.2. Main Results

Table 1: Country Scores for indicators on multi-level dimension of territorial governance

Country	Typology of Regionalisation	Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels	Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	New Spatial Planning powers (innovative)	National Territorial Chambers	Executive power sharing	Local financial dependence on central government	Constitutional regions	Devolution of power to 1st tier local authorities	TOTAL
Austria	2	2	1	0	2	0	1	2	2	12,0
Belgium	2	1,5	1	0	1	0,5	1	2	2	11,0
Bulgaria	0,5	1,5	1,25	0	0	0	0	0	1	4,3
Cyprus	0	0	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,5
Czech Rep.	1,25	1,5	1	0	0,5	0	0	0	2	6,3
Denmark	1	1	1,25	0	0	0	2	0	2	7,3
Estonia	0,5	1	1,25	0	0	0	2	0	1	5,8
Finland	1,002	1	1,25	0	0	0	2	0,01	2	7,3
France	1,257	1,5	1,5	0,10	2	0	1	0	2	9,4
Germany	2	2	1,75	0,12	2	2	1	2	2	14,9
Greece	0,5	1	0,75	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,3
Hungary	1	1	1,5	0	0	1	0	0	2	6,5
Ireland	1	0	1,25	0	0,5	0	1	0	2	5,8
Italy	1,539	1,5	1,5	0,03	0,5	0,5	1	2	2	10,6
Latvia	0,5	0	1,25	0	0	0	0	0	2	3,8
Lithuania	0,5	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4,5
Luxembourg	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3,0
Malta	0	0	0,75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,8
Netherlands	1	1,5	1,25	0	2	0	2	0	2	9,8
Norway	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	5,0
Poland	1,25	1	1,25	0	0,5	0	1	0	2	7,0
Portugal	0,546	1,5	1,25	0	0	0	0	0,092	2	5,4
Romania	0,5	1	1	0	0,5	0	0	0	0	3,0
Slovakia	1,25	1	1,25	0	0	0	1	0	2	6,5
Slovenia	0,5	1	1	0	0,5	0	0	0	2	5,0
Spain	1,626	1,5	1	0	1	0,5	1	2	0	8,6
Sweden	1,075	1	0,75	0	0	0	2	0	2	6,8
Switzerland	2	2	1,5	0	2	1	2	2	2	14,5
UK	0,686	1,5	1	0,24	0,5	0	1	0,264	2	7,2

As is explained in the following sections of this annex, for each country is shown a performance (score) for every category or sub-category, sometimes as a result of a weighting according to the average population involved. The final accumulated score has been used to represent the relative situation of each country compared to the other ESPON 29 countries.


In this section only two synthetic tables and two figures are included, in order to visualize the results in an easily comprehensible way. More details of the analysis are presented in the following sections of this Annex. Tables 1 and 2 show respectively the scores obtained by each country with regard to the state of the multi-level dimension of territorial governance and the multi-level dimension of territorial governance relationships.

Table 2: Country Scores for indicators on multi-level dimension of territorial governance relationships

Country	Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Integrated Spatial Planning	Total
Austria	0	1,75	1,75	3,5
Belgium	0	0,5	0,25	0,75
Bulgaria	1	1,5	0,25	2,75
Cyprus	0	0	1	1
Czech Rep.	0,5	1,25	0,75	2,5
Denmark	1,5	1,5	2	5
Estonia	0	1	2	3
Finland	2	1	2	5
France	0	2	2	4
Germany	0	2	2	4
Greece	0	1,75	0,25	2
Hungary	1	0,5	1,75	3,25
Ireland	0	1,5	2	3,5
Italy	0,25	1,5	0,25	2
Latvia	0	0,5	2	2,5
Lithuania	0	0,5	2	2,5
Luxembourg	0	1,75	1	2,75
Malta	0	0	1	1
Netherlands	0,25	1,5	2	3,75
Norway	0,25	2	1,75	4
Poland	0	0,5	2	2,5
Portugal	1	1	0,25	2,25
Romania	0	0,5	1,75	2,25
Slovakia	2	0,5	2	4,5
Slovenia	2	1,5	1	4,5
Spain	1,5	1,5	0,25	3,25
Sweden	0	2	0,75	2,75
Switzerland	0	2	1,75	3,75
UK	1,5	1,25	0,75	3,5

In section 2.1 of this Annex an analysis has been elaborated with regard to the model of the State. This is the only category without a score to avoid defining any priority among the different models *a priori*. We refer to them *a posteriori*, in order to observe if any relationship between the final scores and the models of State can be found. As can be seen in figure 3 below, this relationship seems it exists in general terms, even though we can also recognize some exceptions. These results will be explained in more detail in the Chapter 2 as well as in the country profiles in chapter 3 of this Annex.

Figure 3: Multi-level structure. Total scores by models of State



© ESPON – Project 2.3.2



INSTITUTO INTER-UNIVERSITARIO de DESARROLLO LOCAL



It can be observed that there are some groups of countries with regard to the score obtained, while the countries gathered in each group belong in some cases to different models of state.

The two countries with the highest score, some distance above the following group, are both federal countries, Germany and Switzerland. They have this high score because they are both federal countries with a good multi-level structure and, although in these countries there are also problems related to the relationships between levels, all of the territorial authorities and governments have at their disposition a wide range of mechanisms for working together.

The next group of countries has a score between 12 and 8, and it can be divided into more sub-groups. A first attempt of sub-division would be between the three countries with the higher score (10-12)

and the other three with the lower (8-10). The countries scoring 10 to 12 are Austria, Belgium and Italy. The first two are countries with a federal model of state but, unlike Germany and Switzerland, they do not have as extensive a range of mechanisms of multi-level coordination as these two countries (i.e. having spatial planning powers at all territorial levels, or conferences of presidents with authority to reach binding decisions, or another innovative form of permanent multi-level territorial contracts). Furthermore, in Belgium, which scores lower than Austria, the regions and communities do not have their own Constitutions or Basic Law, in contrast to the other Federal countries. Scoring almost the same as Belgium is Italy, a regionalised unitary country but with a recent transformation that seems to be in the direction of functional federalism (as in the case of Spain), though in this case the regional level is less developed than the local. The relatively higher weight of the local level and the process of changes in the model of the state in which Italy is immersed result in Italy having a higher score.

Within the second group there is a second sub-division involving three countries each with a different model of the state. Even though the difference is only roughly one point, it is important to analyse this situation in detail. The Netherlands is a decentralised unitary state with a diffuse existence for the regional level, though the structure of the multi-level mechanisms and tools is one of the most developed within the ESPON Space. For example, there is in this country a territorial representative chamber and the local level is one of the most financially powerful and independent. France is a regionalised state that as been known for a long time as very centralised. However, the development of the regional level and the already established degree of multi-level governance at local and sub-regional level (procedures that started at the end of the 2nd World War) leads to this country being at the top of the group. The case of Spain can be said to be unique because the development and the degree of autonomy and independence of the regional level is in some cases higher than some federal countries. So high is the degree of competency of the Autonomous regions in Spain than it is considered as a Composite State, functionally federal but in fact unitary. However, this contrasts with the relative low weight of the sub-national levels within the state. Besides, the Senate of Spain is a partially territorial chamber, that does not represent all the sub-national territories. In Spain there exists a Conference of Presidents, but it does not have the power to reach binding decisions. Finally, the development of the regional level contrasts with the low autonomy, particularly financial, of the local/sub-regional levels.

The third group encompasses the majority of the countries, shared out amongst three different models of State. The regionalised unitary ones -UK and Poland- have the highest scores within this group, together with some decentralised unitary ones -as is the case of some of the Nordic countries, such as Finland or Sweden. The rest of the decentralised ones (Slovakia, Czech Republic, Denmark and Norway) are also included in this group, though Norway has a similar score to the majority of the centralised countries because of its absence of a regional level. Among the centralised countries Hungary has the highest score, mainly because in this country innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contracts have been established, similar to those existing in Germany and Switzerland. The rest of the countries (Estonia, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Luxembourg and Latvia) score between 4 and 6 points. Among these countries two should be noted. These are Slovenia and Luxembourg, because in spite of the absence of a regional level in these countries they score higher than other countries in other fields.


The last two groups, each with their own specific features, comprise two countries each. Romania and Greece are included in the fourth group, with a score between 2 and 3. In those countries the regional and sub-regional authorities are representatives of the central government and, in addition, the local level is very dependent on the central government, both financially as well as regarding competencies. The fifth group is made up of two small countries: Malta and Cyprus. In these countries, obviously, there is an absence of the regional level and in the field of spatial planning power is concentrated at the national level.

In conclusion it can be said that even though a particular model of the state is not the only factor in developing a multi-level structure, it is one of the main causes. In practice, however, the established structure has no value if the day-by-day working is not as good as is desired. Because of this issue, a comparative analysis with regard to multi-level structure and multi-level relationships has been carried out. The result is as shown in figure 4 below.

This scatter diagram locates each country according to its score on multi-level structure (on the vertical axis) and on multi-level relationships (the horizontal axis). The figure has been divided into four groups based on the arithmetic mean score, which are also divided into four further sub-groups. The red group contains countries with high scores both in multi-level structure and relationships. In the yellow group are countries with a relatively good multi-level structure but not so good relationship mechanisms, tools and attitudes.

Opposite to these are the countries within the green group. They are countries with a not very developed multi-level structure, but with good, established understandings between levels. Finally the blue group contains the countries with as yet undeveloped multi-level structure and relationships.

Figure 4: Performance of the countries for multi-level structure and relationships




© ESPON – Project 2.3.2



Two main facts can be observed - the agglomeration in the central area of the chart around the average, and that there is no experience of optimal performance. Other less clear evidence is the positive relationship between a more developed structure and good performance in multi-level governance relationships.


One can find some exceptions. There are five countries located outside of the central quadrants in the red group. The top three ones are federal countries (Germany, Switzerland and Austria) which have a very high performance in multi-level structure and a relatively good performance in multi-level relationships. The other two are both Nordic countries, Denmark and Finland, both with the best performance on multi-level relationships. A similar position is occupied by Slovenia and Slovakia, but those two countries have a

Map 1: Performance of the countries for multi-level structure and relationships



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Score Multi-level structure



The classification is based on the calculation of national scores ranging from 0-2 for each indicator in multi-level structure and each category in multi-level relationship.



Origin of the data: IIDL Synthetic Indicator

- Indicators of multi-level structure
- Typology of Regionalisation.
 - Constitutional guarantee of local and/or regional levels.
 - Allocation of spatial planning powers.
 - New spatial planning powers at supra-local / sub-regional level.
 - Existence of Constitutional regions and National Territorial Chambers or Senates.
 - Regular multi-level governmental meetings.
 - Local financial dependence on central government.
 - Devolution to 1st tier local authorities

- Indicators of multi-level relationship:
- Indicators were grouped in 3 categories.
- Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities.
 - Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination.
 - Integrated Spatial Planning.

Source: ESPON Project 2.3.2.

lower performance for structure, as has been noted in previous paragraphs.

Another exceptional case is Belgium, which due to its particular asymmetric model of federal State the relationships between the central government, regions, communities and municipalities are very difficult. Also, Italy presents a low performance in relationships compared to its relative highly score on multi-level structure.

Malta and Cyprus present low performances in both cases. The size of the country or non-presence of a regional level seem not to be crucial reasons because Luxembourg and Slovenia with similar conditions present a better performance.

Part 2. Analysis and methodology

2.1 Models of State

This section explains the structure of the political system of each State. It is divided into two groups, Federal States and Unitary States. Within the second group three sub-groups exist: Centralised, Decentralised and Regionalised. This typology is based on the Working Paper of A. Dubois for the ESPON Project 3.2 (p. 284-295). However, additional work has been necessary in order to include the New Member States. For this purpose two sources have been used: The *Progress Democracy* documents of the Committee of the Regions (http://www.cor.eu.int/en/documents/progress_democracy.htm) and the Constitutions (Basic Laws) for each country. All of the Basic Laws can be found at <http://confinder.richmond.edu/>.

Unitary States:

- Centralised*: Regional levels or authorities may exist for administrative reasons, but are subordinated to the Central Government. In these cases regional governments could be understood as a branch of Central Government. Within this sub-group are included most of the New Member States (and Candidate countries) of the EU, specifically Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania and Slovenia; as well as some traditionally centralised States (Portugal, Greece and Ireland) or States so small that a regional level does not exist, as in the case of Luxembourg.

- Decentralised*: In these countries a certain degree of decentralisation and of devolution of competencies and powers to sub-national authorities already exists, although this decentralisation is taking place through local authorities or inter-municipal co-operation bodies. This system of decentralisation occurs mainly in countries where the local authorities are very important and the process of regionalisation has been or is being carried out through the local authorities, as is explained in more detail in the next section, referring to the typologies of regionalisation. The States which have this system are the Nordic countries (Norway, Finland, Sweden and Denmark), as well as the Netherlands. The New Member States included in this category are the Czech Republic and Slovakia, which both have powerful local levels and governments.

Map 2: Models of State



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Source: ESPON Project 3.2.

- Centralised Unitary
- Decentralised Unitary
- Regionalised Unitary
- Federal



Map 2.1.2: Changes in State structures in ESPON 29 Space



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 2

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National
Overviews and ESPON Project 3.2.



- Centralised Unitary
- Decentralised Unitary
- Regionalised Unitary
- Federal
- Federal Assymetric
- Composite
- Regionalised towards federal
- Decentralised towards regionalised
- Regions with special status
- Important changes

-Regionalised: These countries have a regional level clearly differentiated from the groups of local authorities and from being mere *subsidiaries* of the Central Government. All of these countries have regional governments with a certain degree of autonomy. Some of these States give legislative powers and/or constitutional status to their regional governments. France, United Kingdom and Italy are included in this sub-group, with Italy having wide legislative powers at regional scale for the whole of its territory. Poland is the only new accession country within the EU where a regionalised system is being established.

-Composite: In this group the only country which is included is Spain. The territorial system of Spain is a unique case, possibly in the whole world, because it is considered a Unitary State, but its structure and organisation is very similar to a Federal State (functionally federal). In some respects the Spanish autonomous regions have a higher degree of powers and competencies than some Federal States.

Federal States: The Federal States are federations of Länder (Germany and Austria), Cantons (Switzerland) and Regions / Communities (Belgium), as recognized in their Federal Constitutions.

2.2 Typology of regionalisation

In this section the process of regionalisation that is being carried out within the different States is studied. In many countries it is an asymmetric process, that is, the process is not the same for all regions. In this case we calculate the score by applying a multiplier, taking into account the relative population affected. As will be seen in the following pages, this multiplier is added in some categories, not only for the type of regionalisation. The population data (year 2001) have been extracted from the Eurostat database.

$$M = P_R / P_T$$

M: Multiplier

P_R : Population of the regions affected by the process within each State

P_T : Total population of each State

Following this methodology the value '1' refers to the situation where the same process of regionalisation occurs in all regions of a State.

This typology of regionalisation is based on the data provided by Figure 21 on page 297 of the 2nd Interim Report of the ESPON Project

3.2. Due to the introduction of the population multiplier value a number of changes have taken place. The necessary information to accurately refine the 3.2 typology has been extracted from the Committee of the Regions (CoR) *Progress Democracy* documents, from the respective national Constitutions and in the webpages referring to the local and regional structures of each Member State of the Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR, http://www.ccre.org/membres_en.htm).

The typology we have used is explained as follows:

Administrative regionalisation: Refers to the creation by the State of authorities at regional level which are subordinate to the Central Government, for the purpose of promoting regional economic development, as well as for the purpose of the political orientation of the European Community. In this case we are in the presence of a process of *forced* regionalisation, with a *top-down* character from Community to national level. This process is taking place in the whole of Bulgaria, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania and Slovenia; all of which belong to the category of Centralised Unitary States. Mainland Portugal (with 95% of the total Portuguese population) and England (with more than 83% of the total UK population) are also included in this category.

Regionalisation through the existing local authorities: This process of regionalisation takes place through the existing groups of local authorities, that were originally created for different purposes. Some functions connected with regionalisation are assumed, for example the establishment of regional authorities directly or indirectly elected. In this case the regionalisation is *voluntary* and has a *bottom-up* character because it is the local authorities which lead the process. Usually the countries included in this category are Decentralised Unitary States, such as the Nordic ones (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden) and the Netherlands. Hungary and Ireland are Centralised Unitary States, but are carrying out this kind of regionalisation. In Finland this regionalisation is not taking place in the whole country, but it occurs in the vast majority of the country (where 99.5% of the Finnish-speaking population lives). Only the Swedish-speaking Autonomous Province of Åland has another type of regionalisation, which we will discuss in the next paragraph. In Sweden the same is happening. The process of regionalisation through the existing local authorities covers almost 70% of the Swedish population, but there are some regions where a different process of regionalisation is taking place.

Regional Decentralisation: This category refers to the creation or substitution of a new regional authority differentiated from the local or supra-local authorities. This level is already classified as a region and is disassociated from the local level. The Czech Republic, Poland and the Slovak Republic are the only countries where this process of regionalisation in the whole of their territories is happening. Mainland France (97 % of the French population) is also included in this category, as well as the Swedish regions of Skåne and Västra Götaland, and the municipality of Gotland (classified within the regional level). These territories account for 30% of the Swedish population.

Regional Autonomy: This model is considered as the furthest that regional autonomy or self-government allows, without there being a Federal system. The characterisation of the regions included in this category is given by a regional electoral system based on direct universal suffrage, by legislative powers at the regional level, or by the constitutional guarantee of exclusive or authoritative competencies for the regions. Within this category there are some regions that have *Special Status*, with a degree of power that at times is similar or even higher than the Länder, Cantons or regions of Federal States. Italy and Spain are the only countries where there is regional autonomy in all of their regions, although some of them have a special status. In the Italian case, article 116 of its Constitution refers to the special forms and conditions of autonomy in Sicilia, Sardegna, Trentino-Alto Adige, Friuli-Venezia Giulia and Valle d'Aosta, which contain more than 15% of the Italian population.

In the case of Spain we have decided to include the regions to which the Spanish Constitution refers specifically as regions with special financial, fiscal and economic systems. The 3rd Additional Disposition refers to the fiscal and economic system of the Canary Islands, while the 4th Transitory Disposition refers to Navarra and its adoption of the Basque economic agreement. The population of these three Autonomous Communities represents 10.6% of the total Spanish population. Other regions could be added to the Special Status category because in Spain there are Historic Nationalities (Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country) which are considered by the Spanish Constitution in a very specific way with access to full autonomy (the 2nd Transitory Disposition, which in fact leads to an equivalent autonomy to that considered in article 151). The only autonomous region that follows the way established in art. 151 is Andalusia. The rest of the Spanish regions might have recourse to the dispositions in article 143.2, but the process of approval of the Comunidad

Valenciana Statute and the process (and timing) of devolution of powers, also as in the case of the Canary islands (also not included as historic nationalities), were atypical, and in fact were equivalent to those previously mentioned regions that followed the way of art. 151.


Other territories where regional autonomy exists are the following ones²:

- The Autonomous Province of Åland in Finland, which contains less than 0.5% of the Finnish population. It has its own legislative powers.
- The French ultra-peripheral regions, i.e. Guyanne, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Reunion, as well as the island of Corsica (which altogether contain almost 3% of the French population), have a higher degree of autonomy, although they have not got legislative powers. This autonomy is constitutionally guaranteed in the case of the ultra-peripheral regions, but not for Corsica.
- As we have seen above, Portugal is a Centralised Unitary State immersed in a process of Administrative Regionalisation, but there are two Autonomous Regions with legislative powers and their own political-administrative statutes, according to Article 6.2 of the Portuguese Constitution. These regions are the archipelagos of the Azores and Madeira, which enjoy Regional Autonomy. The population of these Autonomous Regions accounts for almost 5% of the total Portuguese population.
- Finally, in the United Kingdom the regionalisation is Administrative, though Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have a certain degree of autonomy. Scotland (8.6% of the UK's population) is the territory with the highest degree of autonomy, with primary (elaboration of its own statutes) and secondary (approbation of decrees, acts, etc.) legislative powers. Wales has only secondary legislative powers, while Northern Ireland is a semi-autonomous territory, though one where its devolved powers are currently suspended due to political problems. These territories contain almost 8% of the population of the UK.

Regionalisation through federal authorities: This section only concerns Federal States, where the process of regionalisation takes place through the respective Länder, Cantons and Regions.

² In Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands are also autonomous territories, but they are not included in this analysis because they do not belong to the EU nor to the ESPON Space.

Map 4. Typology of Regionalisation



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 2

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

- Regionalisation through federate authi
- Political regionalisation with special status
- Political regionalisation
- Regional decentralisation
- Decentralisation through local authorities
- Administrative decentralisation

Cyprus, Luxembourg and Malta are not scored in this section because they are not carrying out any process of regionalisation due to their small size. Giving a score of 0.5 to these countries in order to make up for their handicap with regard to the other larger countries was considered, but this score did not change significantly the position of those countries. Consequently, we decided to not include this value.

The value we have given to each category has been arranged as follows:

2 = Regionalisation through federal authorities

1.75 = Regional Autonomy (political regionalisation) with special status

1.5 = Regional Autonomy (political regionalisation)

1.25 = Regional Decentralisation

1 = Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities

0.5 = Administrative Regionalisation

2.3 Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels


If in the two first sections we have analysed the regional level and the process of regionalisation *de facto*, in this section what is studied is the regionalisation established by the respective Basic Laws. For the preparation of this section the main sources used have been the national Constitutions³ and, in the case of the UK, which does not have any Constitution, the appropriate Acts. In this section we expect to divide the countries among three categories:

Constitutional guarantee for local levels: The National Constitutions which take explicit account only of the local level are those from Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, Malta, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Sweden.

Constitutional guarantee for regional levels: The National Constitutions which explicitly consider the regional levels always consider the local levels too. It is the case for the National Constitutions of Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland (but only for the Autonomous Province of Åland), France, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and Spain.

³ All of the national Constitutions of the world can be found at:
<http://confinder.richmond.edu/>

Map 4: Constitutional guarantee for regional and/or local levels



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

- No constitutional guarantee
- Constitutional guarantee of local level
- Constitutional guarantee of local and regional levels
- Each region has its own constitution

Each region has its own Constitution: This category only involves some Federal States, i.e. Austria, Germany and Switzerland. In this case the respective Länder and Cantons have made their own Constitutions.

In the rest of the countries (Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania and Norway) there are some references to a public local body, but in their Constitutions they are not explicitly named as parts of their States.

The case of the UK is special because it is the only country which does not have a written Constitution, although in some cases the regional level is recognised in legislation. However, at the end of the 1990s referenda took place for the approval of the devolution of powers process for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (Young, 2001), and The Scotland Act, The Government of Wales Act and The Northern Ireland Act⁴ were all approved in 1998.

The values given for each category in this section are:

- 2 = Each region has its own Constitution
- 1.5 = Constitutional guarantee for regional levels
- 1 = Constitutional guarantee for local levels

2.4 Allocation of Spatial Planning powers

In this section we are referring only to the competencies of the national and sub-national levels in matters of spatial planning. The valuations for the realisation of this subject have been extracted from the National Overviews, all of which are compiled in Table 2 "Planning styles by level vs. competences by level") of the Annex F of this 232 Final Report written by Farinós & Milder, and titled *MIXTURE OF SPATIAL PLANNING STYLES; INTER-STATE BUT ALSO INTRA-STATE. General presence of Land Use; convergence towards the Comprehensive integrated approach and the Regional economic approach Style.*

Local level: There are a lot of countries with a powerful local level, and the countries which have not devolved some powers to the local levels are some of the most centralised ones with a dominant role for the Central State (i.e. Romania, Cyprus, Greece, Malta) or, as is the case of Belgium, because almost all the powers remain at the regional and national levels. The greater part (22) of the 29 ESPON Space countries have strong local level spatial planning powers.

⁴ See respectively: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980046.htm>, <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980038.htm> and <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980047.htm>.

Supra-local / sub-regional level: The countries which are included in this category are immersed in a process of “decentralisation within decentralisation”, where some powers of spatial planning are attributed to the 2nd tier of the local level, also known as supra-local or sub-regional level. All of these ten countries have devolved to their 2nd tier of local levels a weak range of powers. None of them has strong spatial planning powers at this level.

Regional level: Only 18 countries among the 28 analysed have competencies in the field of spatial planning at the regional level, and among these, only four have a strong regional level. These are the three Federal ones and Spain, where the regional level is where the main spatial planning powers remain.

National level: Almost all of the countries have some spatial planning powers at the national level, but, as we have already seen in the categories represented above, the spatial planning may be exclusive to the Central State, or shared with local levels (1st or 2nd tier of government), regional levels or with both.

There is a very high predominance of countries with a strong Central State (in terms of spatial planning) but there are some countries which the powers of the Central State are less than other sub-national levels. This is the case for Austria and Switzerland among the Federal States. In the first case the powers remain at the local level, while in Austria and Switzerland the Regions and the Cantons, respectively, play a more important role in spatial planning. Among the Unitary States, the countries where spatial planning powers are strongest at the local level are the Czech Republic, Finland and Sweden.

The only countries where the Central Government does not have any competence in spatial planning are Belgium and Spain. Those powers remain in both countries mainly at the regional level.

The value given to each category is as follows:

Level	Weak powers	Strong powers
Local	0.25	0.5
Sub-regional / supra-local	0.25	0.5
Regional	0.25	0.5
National	0.25	0.5

2.5 New spatial planning powers (innovative)

Approaches related to multi-level governance, mainly between sub-national levels, are used by the territories included in this section. These approaches and strategies are a step forward with regard to the formal mechanisms of spatial planning and they apply to the creation of territorial bodies (with directly or indirectly elected assemblies or councils) at the supra-local or metropolitan levels for the main purpose of the elaboration of spatial development plans, strategies or schemes⁵. Until now there have not been many examples of these characteristics in the European territory, but in the not very far future these initiatives will likely become more and more common. As there are not many territories involved we will briefly explain each of them.

First of all we have to state that we have decided to divide these initiatives depending on the democratic legitimacy that supports them. The divisions that have been chosen refers to the system of election of the assemblies or councils which co-ordinate the elaboration of the spatial planning documents at the 2nd tier of local level or metropolitan level. The initiatives are the following ones:

Indirectly elected Assembly:

Where assemblies are indirectly elected, the members are appointed by local governments, generally the city mayors or similar bodies. In France there are 14 *Communautés Urbaines* (Urban Communities) containing 9.7% of the French population. Those territories are the areas of urban influence for Brest, Bourdeaux, Cherbourg, Nancy, Lille, Dunkerke, Grand Alençon, Arras, Strasbourg, Lyon, Creusot, Montceau-Les-Mines, Le Mans, Nantes and Marseille. They are not elected by direct universal suffrage and their objective is the elaboration of Schemes of Spatial Coherence (SCOT: *Schémas de Cohérence Territoriale*) - planning documents that replace the old Director Schemes (SD: *Schémas Directeurs*) (Hildenbrand; 15).

In Germany the assembly of the *Ballungsraum Frankfurt – Rhein Main* region is composed of the mayors of the municipalities and the governors of the Rural Districts (*Landkreise*). This NUTS 3 territory is a metropolitan area focused on the strengthening of municipal co-

⁵ The information obtained for the realisation of this section has been extracted from an article by Andreas Hildenbrand titled *Tres propuestas para una relación efectiva entre las escalas regional y local en material de ordenación del territorio* (in English, *Three proposals for an effective relation between the regional and local tiers in the field of spatial planning*), where the existing initiatives of the creation of legal metropolitan bodies with responsibilities for planning are studied.

operation and planning (Hildenbrand; 32), and includes 2.6% of the German population.

Directly elected Assembly:

The legitimacy of these initiatives in this category is higher because their assemblies are composed of members elected by direct universal suffrage.

In Germany there are the cases of Stuttgart and Hannover, where metropolitan assemblies are directly elected. The region of Stuttgart (*Verband Region Stuttgart*) has obligatory competencies such as the elaboration of the Spatial Plan (*Regionalplan*), Landscape Framework Plan (*Landschaftsrahmenplan*) and Regional Transport Plan. The second initiative is the Hannover region, which like Stuttgart is a NUTS 3 level, and is currently elaborating a Spatial Plan. The two initiatives together include 4.5% of the German population.

The Province of Bologna (1.6% of the Italian population) approved the Provincial Co-ordination Spatial Plan (PTCP) in 2004, in which the joint elaboration of a Supra-municipal Director Scheme is foreseen.

The last initiative is Greater London, a NUTS 2 region from the United Kingdom which contains 12% of the UK population. The Greater London Authority, elected by direct universal suffrage, has as a responsibility for the elaboration of a Spatial Development Strategy (SDS), also known as *The London Plan*.

The values given to each category are:

2 = Directly elected Assembly

1 = Indirectly elected Assembly

2.6 National Territorial Chambers⁶

For the purpose of analysing the role of the regions in the management and decision-making process of Central Government, Hooghe & Marks include in their paper a classification based on the *Role of regions in Central Government*, and within this classification there are two categories: *legislative power sharing* and *Regular multi-level governmental meetings*. The first of these is related to the existence of a chamber in the national legislature composed of representatives of regional governments or parliaments. The second relates to the existence of regular intergovernmental meetings

⁶ More information about all the Senates of the World can be found at: <http://www.senat.fr/senatsdumonde/pays.html>

between Central State and regional executives. When scoring for this classification no distinction has been made between the two categories. We have included both categories in order to elaborate two different classifications of countries.

Territories are represented in National Territorial Chambers, called High Chambers or Senates, although in practice several countries have Senates where regions are not represented. In this section we analyze which of the Senates have completely or partially Territorial Chambers.

Non-existence of any Territorial Chamber or Senate: this category contains the countries where there is just a single national chamber or assembly. These are Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovakia and Sweden.

Existence of a Senate but not representing regions: These countries have two chambers, but the Upper Chamber does not represent regions. In this case all of their members are elected by direct universal suffrage by all the population, as is also the case for the national assemblies. These countries are Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and the UK.

In Belgium, 21 of the 71 members of the Senate are appointed by the Communities, but nobody is appointed by the Regions.

In France there are no elections, but the members of the Senate are appointed by local authorities.

In the cases of Slovenia and the UK there are no Senates, but there are two chambers. In Slovenia the *Upper Chamber* is named the National Council, and in the UK there is the House of Lords, but neither of these is a territorial chamber.

Existence of a partial Territorial Chamber: The only case of this is Spain. The Spanish Constitution says that the Senate is the Territorial Chamber, but only 51 of its 259 members are appointed by the Autonomous Communities. The rest of them are elected by direct universal suffrage.

Map 6. National Territorial Chambers



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

- No Senate
- Senate but not representing territories
- Partial territorial chamber
- Total territorial chamber

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews



Existence of a totally Territorial Chamber: The territorial chamber has the lead role. This only applies to several Federal States, i.e. Austria, Germany and Switzerland.

The values we have given for each category are:

2 = Existence of a totally Territorial Chamber

1 = Existence of a partial Territorial Chamber

0.5 = Existence of a Senate but not one representing regions

0 = Non-existence of a Territorial Chamber or Senate

2.7 Regular multi-level governmental meetings


As we have explained in the previous section, we have distinguished between the legislative and the executive roles of the regions in the Central Government. In this section the second issue is analysed. Executive power-sharing may be identified through the existence of a Conference of Regional Presidents, i.e. a gathering of the regional Presidents and the President or Prime Minister of the Central Government. In this case we have established three categories:

Non-existence of any Conference of Presidents: This includes the majority of the countries. These are Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and the UK.

Existence of a Conference of Presidents without authority to reach binding decisions: the countries included in this group have Conferences of Presidents, but their decisions are not binding. Essentially, it is merely a consultation body for Central Government decisions. The countries included in this category are Belgium, Italy, Spain and Switzerland.

Existence of a Conference of Presidents with authority to reach binding decisions: The only country where the Conference of Presidents has authority to reach binding decisions is Germany, where the Länder have a very active role in the decisions of the Central State.

Map 7. Intergovernmental regular meetings



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

- Any intergovernmental regular meeting
- Conferences of Presidents without authority to
- Conferences of Presidents with authority to reach binding decisions
- Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contacts
- Conferences of Presidents with authority to reach binding decisions and innovative forms of multi-level territorial contacts

Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contacts:

Besides the Conferences of Presidents there are other forms of contact between different levels, mainly the national and regional ones. The only countries where it happens are Germany, Switzerland and Hungary.

The values for each category are the following ones:

- 1 = Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contacts
- 1 = Existence of a Conference of Presidents with authority to reach binding decisions
- 0.5 = Existence of a Conference of Presidents without authority to reach binding decisions
- 0 = Non-existence of any Conference of Presidents

2.8 Extent of financial dependence of local governments on central government

These data have been obtained from the Synthesis Report elaborated by the NTUA and based on the National Overviews (Annex B of this ESPON 2.3.2 Project Final Report). A more detailed explanation by countries will be found in that report.

The main disparity between countries is the degree of self-financing and of fiscal autonomy.

Dependent: The central government imposes taxation, obtains the financial resources and share them out among the rest of the levels.


Fairly independent: The role of the central government in this case is not as important as in the previous category, but there is not economic independence and self-financing for local governments.

Very independent: In this case the degree of independence of the local governments in terms of financing and the taxation system is almost total. The local governments collect their own taxes and this is the main economic resource for them. This category involves some of the Nordic countries, as well as Estonia, Switzerland and the Netherlands.

The value for each category is as follows:

- 2 = Very independent
- 1 = Fairly independent
- 0 = Dependent

Map 8. Local dependence of local governments on central government



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews




Map 9. Constitutional regions



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0 and 2

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

 Constitutional regions

The 'constitutional regions' is the name given to regions with legislative powers or competencies. This is a very important issue because a territory with the competence to elaborate its own legislation in some fields has a high degree of self-government. The countries involved in this category are the Federal ones and those that are the most developed in terms of regionalisation (Spain and Italy), as well as some autonomous regions, as in the case of Åland, Madeira, the Azores, Scotland and Wales.


Because of the importance of this issue with regard to the degree of self-government and autonomy of the regions within the States, the existence of constitutional regions is scored with 2 points, and the absence with 0. As there are some regions with legislative powers within countries where not all the regions have this status, we have also applied in this case for them the multiplier value of the population.

2.10 Devolution of powers to first tier local authorities

The last category of the assessment and analysis of Multi-level territorial governance is an analysis of the degree of decentralisation of the local authorities in terms of competencies, mainly concerning the spatial planning field, but also concerning other local competencies. Finishing the theme of the *Role of the sub-national governments within the State*, the other category exclusively referred to the local authorities, together with the *Extent of financial dependence of local governments on central government*, is the *Devolution of powers to 1st tier local authorities*. The information for the elaboration of this section has been obtained from the Synthesis Report of the National Overviews, although in some cases the information available is not as complete as we would like. This issue has been divided into three indicators, as follows:

- *Countries in which substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities:* as it can be observed in the map 10 as well as in the table 12, related to this issue, the majority of the countries studied have a relatively powerful local level. In 21 of the 29 ESPON Space countries this is the case. But this issue contrasts with the small number of countries with a very high financial independence from central government (5 from 29). Therefore, we can affirm that there is no direct relationship between the power of competencies at local level and the economic resources to carry them out. This difference makes it very difficult for local authorities to execute their competencies in several cases.

Map 10. Devolution of powers to 1st tier local authorities



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

- No data
- Relatively powerless local authorities
- Expecting or in process to devolution
- Powerful local authorities

- *Countries which expect to devolve substantial powers to local authorities in the near future or are in the process of doing so:* this is the case of a group of countries with a relatively powerless local level but which are in a process of devolution and decentralisation of powers to benefit the local level. In this group there are Bulgaria, Estonia and Spain. Portugal and Denmark are also included, but the Synthesis Report does not explain clearly why they are classed in this group.
- *Countries with relatively powerless local authorities:* There are five countries with powerless local authorities and without any expectation for devolution of powers to local authorities. There are those very small countries where there is practically only one territorial level, which are Cyprus, Luxembourg and Malta. Greece and Romania are also classed in this group. The national level in these countries is very powerful and, as has been noted in previous sections, they are very centralised countries.

The scores given to each indicator are as follows:

2 = Substantial powers are allocated to local authorities

1 = Devolution expected or in process

0 = Relatively powerless local authorities

2.11 Analysis of multi-level relationships

In the previous sections we analysed the political systems, structures and legal procedures in each of the countries. But this analysis would not be complete without a complementary study of the relationships and the degree of co-ordination and co-operation between the different level authorities and stakeholders within a country.

It has been very difficult to find and to establish indicators that could give us a classification of countries for this field. We have tried to complement the information about the vertical relationships from the national overviews and the Synthesis Report (see Annex B) with other sources. The categories we have considered to be the most suitable to take in account are the ones in the next sub-sections.

2.11.1 Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities

The classification of the cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities is very complex because of, among other things, the

different models of States. The territorial structures of some countries lack institutions at the regional level, while in other cases the regional or local organizations have such a high degree of autonomy that there are difficulties in establishing optimal channels of cooperation, (the case of the federal countries, classic and asymmetric, e.g. Austria or Belgium). This classification of countries is extracted from table 7.5 of the second Interim Report of ESPON Project 2.3.2, but only those indicators which make reference to vertical relationships have been considered, not to horizontal ones. Therefore, the indicators included in our analysis are:

- Bodies that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels: this first group shows the countries where are currently bodies that act like frameworks for the coordination of relations at vertical and horizontal levels. To this group belong the Finnish regional councils, the Office for Structural Policy and Regional Development in Slovenia (which continues the work of the National Agency for Regional Development), and the Regional Government Offices in the United Kingdom. In the Slovakian case a key politician has been nominated to coordinate national regional development. In Spain the Network of Environmental Authorities is the body which organises cooperation and collaboration between environmental authorities and those that administer the Community funds of the three administrations (community, state and regional) for the basic purpose of combining criteria to integrate environmental protection into all actions financed with Community funds.

- Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans: in this second group of countries the cooperation takes place only at the time of elaborating plans, and a participative tradition or a culture of partnerships or associations does not exist. In the Czech Republic the efforts are focused on the National Development Plan. In Hungary it is the National Spatial Strategy, and in Bulgaria and Portugal the cooperation between agencies and associations with government departments takes place when it elaborates different plans and projects.

- Encouragement by central governments to establish linkages between local and regional partners: there are central governments which encourage private and public bodies to cooperate for different reasons. Italy, through the *Nuova Programmazione* (New Planning) prepares itself for applications under the Structural Funds for the period 2000-06 and 2007-13 and plans the Community Support

Framework. The coordination is the responsibility of the Department for Cohesion Policies of the Ministry of Economy. The case of the Netherlands consists of the creation of government reports and legislation to develop methods and principles to improve administrative relations. Norway gives priority to regional and local partnerships through its central government, but the regional governments also encourage the municipalities and the private sector to establish links and relations.

The score accorded for each indicator is as follows:

2 = Bodies that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels

1 = Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans

0.25 = Encouragement by central governments to establish linkages between local and regional partners

However, at the time of working together there could be some problems between the different levels. Therefore it has been decided to apply to the first two indicators a negative additional value (-0.5) if there are *Problems of relationships between different government levels*. This is only for the first two indicators because the total score cannot be negative. Information on the countries where these problems happen have been obtained from table 7.4 of the 2nd Interim Report ESPON Project 2.3.2, titled *Causes of the status of the relationships*, but they are only the ones referred to in the above indicator, *Problems of relationships between different government levels*. In this group are gathered countries such as Austria or Belgium due to problems in the relationships between the Länder and the national state. The Czech Republic and the United Kingdom have strong local governments and no tradition of a cooperative relationship between central and local authorities. Luxembourg has the handicap of its size and that the planning system is centralised.

2.11.2 Approaches for vertical co-ordination and co-operation

This is the most difficult section to analyze because this analysis is based on the attitudes of the governments, an intangible concept that is very difficult to typify. For this reason, it is limited to an indication of which countries fall in each category and, if there is any reference to an example in the Synthesis Report, including it in this section and in the *Country Profiles*.

This category is divided into three sub-categories:

- The first one refers explicitly to the attitudes regarding vertical relationships. There are two indicators by which the countries are classified: *Positive attitudes or positive evolution of attitudes* and *Weak attitude*. In some countries the evolution in the implementation of the relationships has been understood as negative. The data for the elaboration of this classification has been obtained from table 7.3 of the 2nd Interim Report of 2.3.2 ESPON Project, entitled *Attitudes related to relationships*, but only for the vertical cases. These indicators are for all governmental levels.
- For the national or federal level only, we can analyze the attitudes with regard to the vertical co-operation and co-ordination through the *Priority emphasis on governance objectives as indicated in national overview*, specifically from the cases focused on vertical co-ordination, as it is already analysed in the Synthesis Report, where a classification has been done.
- These two previous indicators make reference to static aspects, but the last one considers the trend. Here, we are referring to the *Direction of progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships*, specifically those related to *Vertical co-operation and partnerships, beyond the conventional hierarchical command structure of government*. In this case we can extract the conclusion from the Synthesis Report (see Annex B), from where information has been obtained too. The conclusion is that there are 'innovative tools and progressive arrangements in vertical co-operation in federal or highly regionalized countries with great regional autonomy', and some examples from some countries appear in the Report and are included below in the Country Profiles' section in this Annex.

The method for the valuation of these indicators has been quite difficult to establish, but finally it has been decided to assign 0.5 points to all the countries with *Positive attitudes or positive evolution of attitudes*, while the ones with *Weak attitudes* score 0.25. If there is a *Priority emphasis on governance objectives* in a national government, relating mainly to vertical co-ordination, that country scores an additional 0.5, and if the trend in a country is *progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships*, that country also

scores an additional 1. As in the rest of the sub-categories, no country can score more than 2 points.

2.11.3 Integrated Spatial Planning

In order to offer a more complete classification of countries with regard to the matter of vertical relationships, we have included in this analysis a previously made classification of countries related to horizontal and vertical co-ordination in the field of spatial planning. This classification is commented on, overall and country by country, in Annex F of this Final Report. The indicators are as follow:

- Countries in which there are both horizontal as well as vertical co-ordination on multiple levels and on levels with a strong planning competency (A): In this group appear the countries with a long and strong tradition with coordinated planning, as is the case of Finland, France, Germany and the Netherlands, among others.
- Mainly vertical co-ordination: in this case there are two sub-grouping of countries. First are the *Countries with mainly vertical coordination at all levels or those with a strong planning competency, and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency*, as is the case of Austria, Hungary, Norway, Romania and Switzerland. The second group is composed of the *Countries with mainly vertical coordination at all levels or those with a strong planning competency, and weak or no horizontal coordination*, which only happens in Latvia.
- Mainly horizontal co-ordination: As in the previous indicator, in this one there is a sub-division too. First are the *Countries with mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or those with strong planning competencies, and weak vertical coordination but between levels with the main planning competency* (Cyprus, Luxembourg, Malta and Slovenia) and the second sub-group is formed by the *Countries with mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or those with strong planning competencies and weak or no vertical coordination*, as the Czech Republic, Sweden and the UK.
- Countries in which there is either weak or no vertical and horizontal coordination: this group includes Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain.

The indicators are assigned a value as follows:

2 = Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

1.75 = mainly vertical coordination at all levels or those with a strong planning competency, and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency

1.5 = mainly vertical coordination at all levels or those with a strong planning competency and weak or no horizontal coordination

1 = with mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or those with strong planning competencies, and weak vertical coordination but between levels with the main planning competency

0.75 = mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or those with strong planning competencies and weak or no vertical coordination

0.25 = Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

Part 3. Country Profiles

The purpose of this chapter is the reviewing of the multi-level political structures processes and relationships studied in the chapter 2, but from the point of view of each country.

Austria

The Republic of Austria (*Republik Österreich*) is a Federal State composed by 9 Federate States (*Länder*), including the State-city of Vienna. The process of regionalisation has taken place through its federate authorities, where the members of their parliaments (*Landtage*) are directly elected by universal suffrage.

Each Austrian Land has its own Constitution.

The spatial planning powers remain at the three main territorial level (national, regional and local), but the main powerful level is the local one. Finally, the Austrian Senate is a real territorial representative chamber. All of its 62 members are appointed by the Länder Governments.

On all levels the authority normally has to bear all incurred costs on its own, but the national government makes an effort to subsidise weaker communities.

As all of the Federal States, the Austrian Länder Governments have legislative powers.

At local level, the range of competencies is very wide.

The vertical relationships in Austria are not so optimal at this moment. There is not any form of co-operation between agencies, departments and/or authorities, besides there are problems of relationships between different levels. The attitudes related to the vertical co-ordination are weak but one of the priority governance objective for the central government is the vertical one. The EU-principle of "partnership" has been accommodated through the foundation of 25 regional development organizations in Austria that also receive financial support from the office of the Federal Chancellor. The tasks of these regional managements are to improve the co-operation of regional actors (political and private), to develop bottom-up development strategies in co-ordination with the national and regional level, and to promote regional key projects in consensus with the most relevant actors of the region. In the spatial planning field, Austria has a strong vertical coordination and weak horizontal coordination.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Federal
Typology of regionalisation	“Regionalization” through the Federate Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Each region has an own Constitution
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional Weak national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Totally Territorial Chamber
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on federal government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	All Länder
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Weakness in the attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency

Belgium

The Kingdom of Belgium (*Koninkrijk België* in Dutch, *Royaume de Belgique* in french, and *Königreich Belgien* in german) is an assymetric Federal State with a complex political system of government. The revision of the Constitution established since the

1993 revision of the constitution, Belgium is officially a federal country, with:

- Three language based Communities (*Communautés*): Flemish Community (dutch-speaking), the French Community and the Dutch-speaking Community
- Three Regions: Wallonie, Brussels and Flanders

• **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Federal
Typology of regionalisation	“Regionalization” through the Federate Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local and Regional
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Weak local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Strong regional
	--
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Partially Territorial Chamber
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Conference of Presidents without authority to reach binding decisions
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	All Regions and Communities
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

• **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
Integrated Spatial Planning	Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

The Flemish Community is composed by the region of Flanders and the Dutch speaking inhabitants of Brussels. French speaking inhabitants of Brussels and all Wallonia Region except the territory of

the German speaking Community (several municipalities of the province of Liège) compose the French speaking Community.

As a Federal State, the process of regionalisation has been made through the federate authorities, whose parliamentary members are elected by direct universal suffrage.

Belgium is the only Federal States whose Regions and Communities do not have own Constitutions, but the Article 1 of the Belgian Basic Law reconnoitres the existence of the Regions and the Communities.

The main spatial planning powers remain at regional level, but all of the Belgian territorial levels, i.e. municipalities (*communes*), provinces, regions and the federation, have competencies over this field.

The Belgian Senate is a semi-territorial chamber because only 21 of its 71 members are appointed by the Community Councils. On the other hand there are mechanisms of co-operation between the Community Governments without power to reach binding decisions at national level.

There is a complex tax system as Regions have financial but not so much fiscal autonomy. The system has been under reform since federalization became operational and is still undergoing change, with contradictory interests between solidarity and further fiscal autonomy. The Communes have some financial autonomy, some fiscal competence, and some local taxes of their own, but around 80 % of their revenues come half from the additional percentage they can impose, within some limits, on the regional tax on real estate property and on the federal/regional tax on personal income, and half from grants.

All the Belgian Regions and Communities have legislative powers for the fields which they have competencies.

Due to the complexity of the territorial system in Belgium it is very difficult to reach good vertical relationships between all levels, mainly between communities, regions and central government. In spite of this the attitudes related to the vertical coordination are positive. The coordination is also very weak in this country with regard to spatial planning.

Bulgaria

The Republic of Bulgaria (*Republika Bulgariya*) is a Unitary Centralised State where an administrative regionalisation process is taking place. The 28 regions (*oblasti*), established by the reform of the Constitution at 1999, are a kind of a territorial de-concentration

of the central government, with a regional governor appointed by the Central Government.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Regional and local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Weak local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Expecting or in process to devolution

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

According to the chapter VII of the Bulgarian Constitution, Bulgaria is composed by municipalities and regions (Art. 135-146). Therefore, the existence of regional and local levels is constitutionally recognised.

Bulgaria has a very powerful local level on the field of spatial planning (this is the only country where the ESDP implementation is taking place at local level), but the national level has also important powers.

The local governments are highly financial dependents on central government.

The Bulgarian regions do not have legislative powers.

As stated in the overview, "it appears that Mayors of municipalities have the strongest involvement in the implementation of policies and the members of municipal councils a much weaker participation, although this is a summary conclusion and there are respectively exceptions in certain municipalities. The functions of District governors with respect to the implementation of the different policies on the area of the district need further strengthening".

Bulgaria has been placed in the second category, with regard to local authority powers, in the above table, because of the spatial planning powers of the municipalities, in fact the mayors.

In Bulgaria the cooperation between agencies and associations with departments of the government takes place when it elaborates different plans and projects. With regard to the vertical cooperation and coordination the attitudes are positive but the progress seems limited in both forms of co-operation (vertical and horizontal), given that the relative reforms are very recent. Finally, for the field of spatial planning there is in theory vertical and horizontal coordination in practice everything seems to slowly come out of a long sleep

Cyprus

The Republic of Cyprus (Kypriakí Dimokratía, in greek, and Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti, in turkish) is a Centralised Unitary State where there is not any process of regionalisation because its small size. But there are 6 District Officers which apply the Central government policies at regional level.

The Constitution of Cyprus recognises the existence of the respective Greek and Turkish Community Chambers, but within the Greek territory of Cyprus (part of the country which belongs to the ESPON Space) there is not any reconnaissance of a regional level.

The spatial planning powers remain only at national level.

The central government is the only public financial player in this country and there is not any region with legislative powers. The local authorities do not have many competencies.

Because the small size of this country the vertical relationships are almost inexistent.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	No regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	No
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	--
	--
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Relatively powerless local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	--
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak vertical coordination but between levels with the main planning competency

Czech Republic

The Czech Republic (*Česká republika*) is a Decentralised Unitary State immersed in a process of regional decentralisation, with the set up of 14 regions (*kraje*) since the adoption of the Constitutional Act 347/1997, which came into force on the 1st of January 2000. The members of the assemblies of the *kraje* are directly elected by universal suffrage. The regions and the municipalities (*obec*) were already recognised by the Constitution in its Chapter VII (Art. 99-105).

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Decentralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regional Decentralisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Regional and local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional
	Weak national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Senate but not representing territories
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans
	Problems of relationships between different government levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Weakness in the attitudes
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak or no vertical coordination

The spatial planning powers remain mainly at local level, but the Central Government has also some powers in this field.

Finally the Czech parliamentary system is bicameral, but the Senate does not represent the territories. Its members are elected by

universal suffrage and they are not appointed by the respective regional governments.

Financial resources are allocated within the context of national regional policy and other national policies with territorial impact.

There are not constitutional regions in Czech Republic

Physical planning in the Czech Republic is heavily decentralised with over 6,200 municipalities being the main and most powerful authorities responsible for physical planning.

In Czech Republic the efforts on vertical cooperation are focused in the National Development Plan, but there are problems of relationships between the different governmental levels. The attitudes are also weak but the trend seems to be the strengthening of the vertical cooperation and partnerships. Two examples of this are *Healthy Cities of the Czech Republic*, a national association of cities, towns and regions; and MATRA (*Quality Enhancement of Regional and Local Elected Councillors in the Czech Republic*) a common project of the Ministry of the Interior of the Netherlands, the Dutch Association of Municipalities, the Czech Union of Towns and Municipalities, the Association of Hetmen (CR), the Czech Ministers of the Interior and Regional Development and the Platform Habitat NL.

In spatial planning the coordination is weak in all directions, but mainly at the vertical one.

Denmark

The Kingdom of Denmark (*Kongeriget Danmark*) is a Decentralised Unitary State with a process of Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities. It is divided into 14 Counties (*Amtskommuner*) and the members of their County Councils are directly elected by universal suffrage.

The Danish Constitution recognises the self-governing territories of Greenland and Faroe Islands, but they are not members of the EU nor belong to the ESPON Space. At the other hand the Basic Law recognises the Local Autonomy in its Section 82 and the Local Governments in its Part IX (Art. 86-87).

Anyone of the Danish territories within the ESPON Space have legislative powers at regional level.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Decentralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Strong regional Weak national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Very independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Organisms that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels
	Problems of relationships between different government levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

Estonia

The Republic of Estonia (*Eesti Vabariik*) is a Centralised Unitary State with an Administrative Regionalisation process. The Governors of its 15 Counties (*Maakonnad*) are appointed by the Central Government.

The Estonian Local Governments are constitutionally recognised by the Basic Law through its Chapter XIV (Art. 154-160).

Estonia has a very powerful local level, also in the field of spatial planning, but the national level has a wide range of powers in this matter.

At central and county level planning is financed from the state budget, at municipality level – from local budgets. No appropriations from the state budget to municipalities for spatial planning are foreseen. Independence is combined with severe shortage of funds in many small municipalities that inhibits progress of comprehensive planning.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative Regionalization
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Very independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Expecting or in process to devolution

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

There are not Constitutional regions in Estonia.

The attitudes on vertical relationships are positive in this country and it is an objective for the national government to the improvement of the governance. The highest achievements have been reached in the field of spatial planning, where there is strong vertical and horizontal co-ordination.

Finland

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Decentralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities
	Political Regionalization (Åland)
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
	Regional (Åland)
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Weak regional
	Weak national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Very independent
Constitutional regions	Autonomous Province of Åland
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Organisms that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

The Republic of Finland (*Suomen tasavalta*) is a Decentralised Unitary State formed by 19 Regional Councils (*Maakunnan liitto*), which are structures of regional co-operation between local authorities (municipal federations), and by the Autonomous Province of Åland, where the official language is Swedish. The process of regionalisation in this country is asymmetric. While the regionalisation in almost the whole country (which involves 99.5 % of the Finnish population) is through the Local Authorities, in Åland (0.05 % of the population) there is a Regional Autonomy (political regionalisation). The members of the Provincial legislative assembly (*Lagting*) of Åland are elected by direct universal suffrage, meanwhile in the rest of the country the members of the Regional Councils are elected by the municipalities of the regions in question.

Constitutionally, some differences exist too. For Åland, the regional level is recognised in the Article 120, but for the rest of the country, the Basic Law only recognises in its Article 121 that Finland is territorially divided into municipalities.

On the field of spatial planning, there are two main levels where the powers are remaining. Those are the local and the national ones, although the Regional Councils act as regional development agencies.

In terms of budgetary resources the local level is exceptionally strong in Finland, since also the municipalities, beside the state, have the right to levy tax, i.e. between 16 and 21 per cent of people's personal income. Municipalities are also strong in with regard to the competencies and powers.

The only region with legislative powers in Finland is the Autonomous Province of Åland.

The organisms those acts as frameworks form vertical co-ordination and relationships are the Regional Councils. The trend is to income the vertical relationships mainly between central and local governments. Finland has a system with a strong vertical coordination, plans from the high level steer the plans on the lower levels.

France

The French Republic (*République française*) is a Regionalised Unitary State divided into 25 Regions: 21 metropolitan regions, 1 region with "special status" (Corsica) and 4 overseas regions. The metropolitan regions (97 % of the French population) are involved in a Regional Decentralisation process and the rest, i.e. Corsica and the overseas regions (Guiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion), which involve

almost 3 % of the population, are in a process of Regional Autonomy (political regionalisation).

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Regionalised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regional decentralisation
	Political Regionalisation (Corsica, Guiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion)
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Regional and local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	14 <i>Communautés Urbaines</i> (indirectly elected Assembly)
National territorial chambers	Totally Territorial Chamber
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

All of the French regional assemblies have their members elected by universal direct suffrage.

The French Constitution recognises in its Chapter XII (Art. 72-75) that *the territorial units of the Republic shall be the communes, the departments, the regions, the special-status areas and the overseas territories.*

The spatial planning powers remain at both four territorial levels, but are the municipalities and the Central Government which has more powerful competencies related to this matter. Besides, since 1999 fourteen Urban Communities (*Communautés Urbaines*) have been set up with the purpose of the elaboration of Spatial Planning Director Schemes (*Schémas Directeurs d'Amenagement du Territoire*). The Urban Communities, which represent the 9 % of the French population, are inter-municipal co-operation bodies at metropolitan level without political legitimacy because their assemblies are indirectly elected.

Finally, with regard to the existence of a territorial chamber, the French Senate is a unique case of chamber of representation of territories because its members are representing the local authorities (departments) and the French people living abroad. All of them are indirectly elected.

Local authorities depend more and more on the State budget. The whole situation could be summarized in the phrase: What is acknowledged is more freedom for local / regional authorities and more power but at the same time a more important financial burden for sub-national authorities necessitating increased taxes at the local level to allow activation of the new responsibilities.

Albeit there are some regions with a remarkable degree of autonomy, anyone of them has legislative powers.

The decentralization process has had a serious impact on the administration of spatial planning and on vertical relations across administrative levels. Evidence of this impact is provided by the multitude of local development methods which have become standard practice.

In France cooperation and the relations only take place between the central government and the other levels, but not between the regional levels and the local levels. The centralized model of the country does not allow that the relations settle down outside the reach of the (central) State. The attitudes in vertical relationships are positive and, albeit the role of the State remains on the whole dominant, the blending of the objective of maintenance of local diversity with that of equal treatment of citizens over the whole of the national territory implies an emphasis on bargaining and on a

partnership approach between the State and regional – local authorities. State policies must be brought together at a local level, through vertical co-ordination. In vertical cooperation, the overall trend is steadily towards a more partnership – oriented approach in spatial policy. Both vertical and horizontal coordination initiatives and processes in spatial planning are strong at this country.

Germany

The Federal Republic of Germany (*Bundesrepublik Deutschland*) is a Federal State made up of 16 Länder, including the 3 State Cities (*Stadtstaaten*): Berlin, Hamburg and Bremen. The process of regionalisation is going on through the Federate Authorities, all of them elected by universal direct suffrage. In the same way as the majority of the Federal States, the German Länder have their own Constitutions.

The territorial levels of Germany, besides the Federal State and the Länder, are the *Landkreise* at the 2nd tier of local level, and the municipalities (*Städte*). Spatial planning powers remain in all levels and in this country the crosscurrent effect (all the levels must being connected) has been established for the mechanisms with regard to spatial planning. Moreover, new spatial planning powers at supra-local or sub-regional level are taking place since the middle of the 90's. We are referring to the set up of metropolitan regions with powers in spatial planning and, in some cases, political legitimacy and own directly elected assembly. Three German urban agglomerations work in this way: Stuttgart (*Verband Region Stuttgart*), Hannover (*Region Hannover*) and Frankfurt (*Ballungsraum Frankfurt – Rhein Main*). The two first ones, involving 4.5 % of the German population, have directly elected by universal suffrage parliaments, and the latter (2.6 % of the population) composed by the majors of the municipalities and the governors of the Rural Districts involved.

The Länder play an important role in the national making decision process. Thus, the German Senate (*Bundesrat*) is a real territorial chamber where the Länder are represented. Furthermore, there are regular Conferences of Presidents, where the Prime Minister and the Presidents of the Länder meet, with authority to reach binding decisions at national level.

About 75% of the overall sources is collected centrally and distributed according to indicators.

All of the Länder have a wide range of legislative powers in the matters which they have competencies.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Federal
Typology of regionalisation	"Regionalisation" through the Federate Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Each region has its own Constitution
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Strong regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	Frankfurt (indirectly elected Assembly)
	Stuttgart, Hannover (directly elected Assembly)
National territorial chambers	Totally Territorial Chamber
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Conference of Presidents with authority to reach binding decisions
	Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contacts
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	All Länder
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

In order to make regional planning more effective and coherent with respect to the neighbouring municipalities, many agglomerations have established their own planning or municipal association.

In spatial planning the cooperation between federal level and Länder seems to be of great importance. "Furthermore, with the establishment of new institutional structures between Länder (e.g. Berlin-Brandenburg), regions (e.g. Hanover), and cities (Oberzentrale Kooperationsräume), with the current debate about abolishing the Regierungspräsidien (regional representatives of Land government, intermediate institution, Lower Saxony), or with the introduction of city networks new forms of co-operation and co-ordination are experimented with". Germany has an advanced system of vertical coordination, the counter current principle.

Greece

The Hellenic Republic (*Ellinikí Dhimokratía*) is a Centralised Unitary State where an Administrative Regionalisation process is taking place. This country is composed by 13 Regions (*Periphéria*), which are decentralised State bodies, and each of their Regional Councils (*Peripheriako Simvoulío*) comprise the prefects (*Normarchis*) of the Prefectures (*Nomoi*), a representative of the local unions of municipalities and communes and representatives of professional organisations or chambers. The chairman of each Regional Councils is the Secretary-general of the Region (*Genikos Grammateas*) who is appointed by the Central Government.

The local governments are recognised by the Basic Law as self-governmental territorial levels in its Section F, Chapter I, Article 102. Besides, a special self-administrative status is recognised for the peninsula of Athos which depends of the direct jurisdiction of the Oecumenical Patriarchy (Section F, Chapter II, Article 105).

A sort of spatial planning powers was transferred in the past to the prefectures (2nd tier of local government), but according to a recent decision of the Council of State (supreme administrative court) all planning powers have to remain in the domain of the central government.

The sub-national Greek governments have a relative lack of self-financing resources and competencies.

There are not Constitutional regions in Greece.

Decentralization is gradually happening, leading to better vertical co-ordination. Constitutional problems and the rulings of the supreme administrative court (Council of State) are serious obstacles. In all these areas progress is painfully slow, due to bureaucratic inertia, ineffectiveness, secretiveness and resistance to change. Although progress towards vertical or horizontal co-operation and partnerships

is slow, important steps have been made by strengthening regional authorities and enabling local development companies and municipal associations. The procedure for the spatial planning field is not an exception and the coordination is weak in both directions.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	--
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Relatively powerless local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Weakness in the attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

Hungary

The Republic of Hungary (*Magyar Köztársaság*) is a Centralised Unitary State with a powerful local level. The process of

regionalisation in this country is taking place through the existing Local Authorities. The creation of 7 administrative regions (*regiok*), as defined in 1999, is under process. These regions are administrated by Regional Development Council, composed by representatives of central and local governments.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contacts
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
Integrated Spatial Planning	<i>Mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency</i>

The Hungarian Constitution recognises a 1st and a 2nd tier of local governments in its Chapter IX (Art. 41-44). This 2nd tier of local

government is the county (*megyék*), and there are 19. The counties have some competencies on the field of spatial planning, but the really powerful levels in spatial planning matters are the local and, mainly the national one.

Despite several reforms, Hungary has remained an essentially monocentric state, where decision making is concentrated. So far the most important attempt to decentralize was carried out in 1990 with the Local Government Act, which substantially increased the number of local governments to as many as 3,200. These local governments are directly elected, have enormous responsibilities (basic health care, primary education, social services, maintenance of basic infrastructures, provision of services, like street lighting, etc.) and enjoy great freedom in almost all aspects of planning and decision making, with regard to their territory. Financially however they are dependent on central government and on its subsidy system. They have prompted many researchers to express the view that no real decentralization has taken place in the country.

Any region within Hungary has legislative powers.

The vertical cooperation in this country takes place main for the National Spatial Strategy. The attitudes are positive as it can be observed in the field of spatial planning, where there is a strong vertical coordination. This is emphasized in the *Act XXI of 1996 on Spatial Development and Planning*. The planning system laid down in the Act is hierarchical, with, however, feed-back from the lower levels. The institutional system is based on the effective co-operation of a range of ministries and government authorities.

Ireland

The Republic of Ireland (*Poblacht na Éireann*) is a Centralised Unitary State where there is a process of regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities. There are 8 regional bodies composed of councillors, who are elected members appointed by the constituent county councils and county boroughs. These bodies are responsible for the co-ordination and implementation of EU regional funding, but they do not have any legislative powers.

With regard to the field of spatial planning, competency is predominantly vested in Central Government, but the local level also has powers.

Finally, the Irish Parliament is made up of two chambers: the House of Representatives (*Dáil Éireann*) and the Senate (*Seanad Éireann*).

The latter chamber does not have a territorial chamber because none of its 60 members represents regional or local governments.

• **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities
Constitutional guarantee for Regional and/or local levels	No
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Existence of a Senate but not representing territories
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

• **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

Local governments in Ireland are fairly financially independent from central government and the Irish regions do not have Constitutional regions.

A predominant characteristic of Ireland is a strong, centralised system of government and administration, with a relatively narrow range of functions performed by local government. Nevertheless,

spatial planning is one of the functions that is mainly carried out at the local government level.

In Ireland there is a high level of vertical cooperation. The attitudes are positive, the trend is to improve these relationships and there is modestly strong coordination, as is explained in Annex F.

Italy

The Italian Republic (*Repubblica Italiana*) is a Regionalised Unitary State subdivided into 20 regions (*regioni*). All of them have adopted their own statutes and have legislative powers. Five of these regions (Valle d'Aosta, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Sardegna, Sicilia and Trentino-Alto Adige / Südtirol, this latter comprising the Autonomous Provinces of Bolzano and Trento) with 15.6 % of the Italian population, enjoy a special autonomous status that enables them to enact legislation on some of their specific local matters. Therefore, in Italy the process of Regionalisation has been Political.

Italy is one of the Unitary States with more powerful regions, as well as Spain, and it is reflected at the high degree of autonomy constitutionally guaranteed. The members of the regional chambers are elected by universal direct suffrage and the Constitution talks widely about the legislative, executive, administrative and financial functions of them in its Title V (Art. 114-133). Mainly, the Article 117 gives exclusive regional powers, but since the 2003 constitutional reform (Law 131/2003) those powers are more limited.

In the field of spatial planning the levels where the main powers remain are the local and the national ones, but the Regions and the Provinces have also competencies in this matter. Furthermore, a new planning framework is taking place in the Province of Bologna (1.6 % of the Italian population), where the members of its assembly are directly elected. It is the Spatial Plan of Provincial Coordination (PTCP, in Italian) and there is being put into practice Spatial Agreements signed by the Associations of Municipalities with the purpose of the elaboration jointly the Structural Plans.

The Italian Senate is not a Territorial Chamber because 315 of its 321 senators are directly elected by universal suffrage (from the others, 5 are appointed by the President of the Republic and the rest are former Presidents of the Republic, which are senators by right and for life). But there is an important structure in the field of intergovernmental permanent meetings. Since 1983 the State – Regions Conference was established by DPCM, the Permanent State – Cities and Local Autonomies was established by DPCM on 1996, and

the Joint Conference (State – Regions Conference plus Permanent State – Cities and Local Autonomies) was established by Legislative Decree 281/1997 under Article 9 of Law 59/1997. By anyone of these Conferences of Presidents have authority to reach binding decisions.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Regionalised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Political regionalisation
	Political regionalisation with special status (Valle d'Aosta, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Sardegna, Sicilia and Trentino-Alto Adige / Südtirol)
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Regional and local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	Province of Bologna (directly elected Assembly)
National territorial chambers	Existence of a Senate but not representing territories
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Conference of Presidents without authority to reach binding decisions
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	All Regions
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Encouraging by central governments to establish linkages between local and regional partners
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

The future of the State structure of Italy seems to be a Federal State, according to the approval, in November 2005, by the Italian Senate of the constitutional reform which will provide the regions with a system of competencies of federal kind and with a financial system inspired on fiscal federalism.

The financial autonomy of local authorities is based on the certainty of both their own and transferred resources. One of the most important forms of income for local authorities and provinces is central government transfers based on population size. There is also income from various revenues, which now accounts for a sizeable proportion of municipal budgets. This tax is levied directly by municipalities and may vary within a range decided by the central government.

As it is mentioned in the Italian Constitution, all the Italian regions have legislative powers.

Provinces and municipalities have autonomous constitutions, regulations, organisation and administration and laws for co-ordinating public sector funding.

Italian central government encourage to organisms and authorities to make contact among them with different reasons. Italy, through the *Nuova Programmazione* (New Planning) prepares itself for applications under the Structural Funds for the period 2000-06 and 2007-13 and plans the Community Support Framework. The coordination is the responsibility of the Department for Cohesion Policies of the Ministry of Economy. At sub-national level the municipality implements forms of co-operation with other municipalities and with the province to perform functions in specific geographical areas. Despite recent institutional and practical novelties, spatial planning policies still suffer from lack of co-ordination both in vertical and horizontal sense.

Latvia

The Republic of Latvia (*Latvijas Republika*) is a Centralised Unitary State with an Administrative process of Regionalisation. At regional level there are 26 Districts (*rajons*), and their District Councils are composed of all heads of municipal councils.

The Latvian Constitution makes reference to the local governments in its Articles 25 and 104, and to the regional courts in its Article 82, but does not dedicate any section, chapter or article to the territorial organisation nor the territorial levels of the country.

As the rest of the Nordic and Baltic States, in Latvia there is a powerful local level and in this level and in the national one the spatial planning powers are remaining.

Local governments in Latvia are economically dependent on central government and the regions do not have legislative powers.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	No
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

Decentralization has taken place at several levels. Competencies have been given to local governments and planning regions have been established as a way to improve cooperation and coordination.

The vertical coordination, mainly in the field of spatial planning, is strong and the attitudes are positive.

Lithuania

• Multi-level structure

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	No
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

• Multi-level relationships

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

The Republic of Lithuania (*Lietuvos Respublika*) is a Centralised Unitary State which is carrying out an Administrative Decentralisation process. The Councils of its 10 Counties (*Apskritis*) are composed of the mayors of the County municipalities and the deputy-governors, and chaired by the governors, appointed by the Central Government.

As the case of Latvia, the Constitution of Lithuania neither refers directly to the sub-national territorial levels, but establishes in its Article 111 the Regional Courts.

Lithuania is a country with a very powerful local level. Local governments, albeit they have not got legislative responsibilities, can exercise every task not explicitly reserved to the State. This is the case of the spatial planning, in which both local and national governments have strong powers.

The constitution gives local governments the right to draft and approve their own budgets, to establish local dues and to levy taxes and duties. Local governments also must have a reliable financial basis. Personal income tax is ascribed to the local government budget upon deduction of mandatory social insurance.

Any Lithuanian regions have legislative powers.

Now local government has the right to deal with the majority of local community affairs without interference from the central Government. Local government is responsible for municipal territorial planning. However, decentralization has led to a gap between the emerging national planning framework and local planning. County and local level comprehensive plans are now under preparation.

Luxembourg

The Great Duchy of Luxembourg (*Grand-Duché de Luxembourg*, in french; *Großherzogtum Luxemburg*, in german; *Groussherzogtum Lëtzebuerg*, in Luxembourgish) is a State with a Centralised Unitary structure. It is the unique country where there is not any regional level, therefore there is not any process of regionalisation.

The Constitution recognises the municipalities (*communes*) and their competencies in its Chapter IX (Art. 107-108). Those municipalities have high level of municipal autonomy, with wide-ranging powers in all fields relating to the municipal interest, such as in the field of spatial planning. The Central Government has also strong powers in this field.

Municipalities have a high degree of autonomy, both in general and in terms of resources, although central support is still quite important. They have a structure of co-operation (*syndicat de communes*) but not in a decentralised framework.

Due to the inexistence of a regional tier of government in Luxembourg, there are not Constitutional regions in this country.

In terms of vertical relationships Luxembourg has the handicap of its size and that the system of planning is centralised, but great part of the efforts are focused to the improvement and good achievement of this governance objective. Due to its size, this country is classed in a medium score with regard to the coordination on spatial planning field.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	No regional level
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Expecting or in process to devolution

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
	Problems of relationships between different government levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Weakness in the attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak vertical coordination but between levels with the main planning competency

Malta

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	No regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	No
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Weak local
	--
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Relatively powerless local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	--
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak vertical coordination but between levels with the main planning competency

The Republic of Malta (*Repubblika ta' Malta*) is a small-sized Centralised Unitary State. Because of its size (as Cyprus and Luxembourg) there is not any process of regionalisation, but is composed of three regions which are purely administrative territorial entities grouping a number of local districts. The members of the regions are the mayors of the local councils.

The Constitution does not recognise explicitly the local levels, although makes reference to the members of local governments in some of its articles.

Finally, with regard to the spatial planning powers, the Central State is the only body with competencies on this field.

Central Government allocates funds to local councils on the basis of a formula based on the number of inhabitants and the area within the confines of locality as stipulated by the Local Councils Act (1993).

Because of the small size of this country the regional level is inexistent and any sub-national territory has legislative powers.

As the other two smaller ESPON Space countries (Cyprus and Luxembourg), Malta is classed in a medium term for the coordination in spatial planning.

The Netherlands

The Kingdom of the Netherlands (*Koninkrijk der Nederlanden*) is a Decentralised Unitary State where the Regionalisation process is going on through the existing Local Authorities, due to the powerful local level within this country.

The country is divided into 12 Provinces and their assemblies are composed of members directly elected by universal suffrage, and chaired by a Queen's Commissioner (*Commissaris van de Koningin*), who is appointed by the Central Government.

The Provinces and the municipalities (as well as the Water Boards⁷, i.e. sub-regional bodies with authority in matters concerning water management) and their functions are explicitly recognised by the Dutch Constitution in its Chapter VII (Art. 123-136).

As a country with powerful local governments, the spatial planning powers remain both at local and national level, but the Provinces have also competencies in this field.

The Dutch Senate is the only among the Unitary States that represents territorially the regional level, since all of its 75 senators are elected by the members of the Regional Councils.

Municipalities are allowed to raise local property taxes and they have complete freedom to determine it. In addition they collect other local taxes and charges. Their revenues make them very independent, but

⁷ The Water Boards (*waterschap* or *hoogheemraadschap*) are one of the oldest democratic entities in the world still in existence. The creation of the first Water Board is dated at 1196.

their financial independence is influenced by the range of functions they have to perform.

There are not Constitutional regions in The Netherlands.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Decentralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Regional and local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Totally Territorial Chamber
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Very independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Encouraging by central governments to establish linkages between local and regional partners
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

The municipalities seem currently to be gaining ground in the field of spatial planning. Both provinces and municipalities have ample room for action, albeit within limits set by the central government.

The case of the Netherlands consists of the creation of government reports and legislation to develop methods and principles to improve administrative relations. Coordination is constantly present in all spatial policy making, both in terms of a tight cooperation between administrative levels (vertical cooperation) and in terms of allocating to spatial planning (characterized as a "facet policy") a role of binding together sectoral policies, considered as "line policies". Cooperation and policy coordination have been constantly present in the public debate since the 1970s and are promoted by a variety of national organs already mentioned while similar efforts exist at the provincial and local levels. The various planning instruments have cooperation as a central concern. E.g. Regional Plans aim specifically at both horizontal and vertical integration. Reference has been made already to the 1994 act which introduced the Framework Act Areas (see section 8). As recently as 2004 a new act has further expanded this procedure, following intense discussion between central government and unions of both provinces and municipalities.

Norway

The Kingdom of Norway (*Kongeriket Norge* or *Kongeriket Noreg*), as the rest of the Nordic countries, is a Decentralised Unitary State with a Regionalisation process through the existing Local Authorities. It is composed of 19 counties (*fylker*) where the main legislative bodies are the County Councils. Their members are directly elected by universal suffrage. The 19 *fylker* might be replaced with 5 - 9 larger regions by 2010.

In the field of spatial planning, both local and national levels have the powers.

"The municipalities and county municipalities are negatively limited in their activities, i.e. they may take on any function that the law does not forbid them to carry out, or that has not been specifically delegated to other institutions. At the same time, however, the municipalities are subject to general legislation and the rule of law, unless a special exception has been made". "The basic assumption (in the PBA) is that municipalities define the framework for all development, taking proper consideration of national guidelines and private interests; and then lead the development according to set goals and standards, utilizing the tools available in the PBA and outside of that Act".

There are not Constitutional regions in Norway.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Decentralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	No
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Encouraging by central governments to establish linkages between local and regional partners
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency

Norway gives priority to regional and local partnerships through its central government, but the regional governments also animate to the municipalities and to the private sector to establish links and relations. The partnership is seen between county councils and municipal councils as planning authorities. Even though the state and

the state's regional authorities also have tasks and authority in planning matters, it is here in an indirect way underlined that the state and other authorities are not involved in this type of partnership, institutionally linked to *de facto* planning authorities on regional and local levels. "The main changes in the proposal... is to achieve a planning system based on partnership between regional and local level first, to launch a new initial form of planning".

Poland

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Regionalised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regional decentralisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Senate but not representing territories
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

The Republic of Poland (*Rzeczpospolita Polska*) is the only New Member State with a Regionalised structure and a process of Regional Decentralisation. Since 1999 it is regionally divided into 16 Voivodships (*województwa*). The Voivodal Diet (*Sejmik Województwa*) is the regional assembly where its members are directly elected by universal suffrage. The *Voivod* is the representative of the Prime Minister in the region, but is not the chairman of the assembly.

The Polish Constitution recognises the local governments in its Chapter VII (Art. 163-172), but the regional level is not explicitly recognised in this Basic Law.

The spatial planning powers remain at local and national level, but the voivodships have also competencies in this field.

The Polish Senate is not a territorial chamber. Its 100 members are elected by universal direct suffrage.

The Polish local governments are fairly independent on central government in matter of economics. The regions of Poland do not have legislative powers.

The Municipalities in Poland have real “planning sovereignty”, a power which is expressed by means of legally granted freedom in planning policy formulation.

With regard to the vertical coordination and relationships a good example was the NDP at the national level which was a comprehensive plan that coordinated with the regional development strategies and the most important sectoral strategies.

Portugal

The Portuguese Republic (*República Portuguesa*) is a Centralised Unitary State. It is composed of 5 mainland regions and 2 Autonomous insular Regions (*regiões autónomas*). Those latter are Madeira and Azores. The mainland administrative regions (95.4 % of the population) are co-ordinated by the Regional Development Co-ordinating Commissions (*CCDR*, in Portuguese) and their members are appointed by the Central Government. The Autonomous Regions (4.6 % of the population) have high degree of self-government, legislative powers and own assemblies, and their members are elected by universal direct suffrage.

The Title VII (Art. 225-234) of the Portuguese Constitution is referred to the special status of the Autonomous Regions and the Title VIII (Art. 235-262) recognises explicitly the existence of local authorities,

parishes (*freguesias*), municipalities and administrative regions, in its Chapters I-IV, respectively.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
	Political Regionalisation (Azores and Madeira)
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Regional and local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	Autonomous regions of Madeira and Azores
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Cooperation only for making a plan or some plans
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
Integrated Spatial Planning	Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

The spatial planning powers remain only at local and national levels.

The local governments of Portugal depend financially on central government. The only Constitutional regions of this country are the Autonomous Regions on Azores and Madeira.

The municipality is the entity that ensures the representation of citizens at local level. It administers and guarantees the management of a vast set of services of local interest and channels local claims to the national administration. Apart from these classic functions, the City Halls also ensure the promotion of development, heading highly varied initiatives in this domain, and play a major role as organizers of social, economic and territorial relations. Under a 2002 law, local authorities possess wide-ranging responsibilities in the areas of planning and development.

In Portugal the cooperation between agencies and associations with departments of the government takes place when it elaborates different plans and projects. At the regional level, the Commissions for Regional Co-ordination and Development (CCDRs) have a special role in fostering the relation between central and local government, which is expected to be reinforced. The vertical coordination together with the horizontal coordination is laid down in the strategic framework has been defined for territorial planning, establishing a reference frame to be respected in spatial planning at the regional and local level and in land-use. It further guarantees the compatibility between the different sectoral policies with territorial impact, and creates special instruments when necessary. However all these factors did not really lead to real results yet, with the exception of the EXPO98 that was held in Portugal.

Romania

Romania (*România*) is a Centralised Unitary State with an Administrative Regionalisation process. Eight Development Regions were established in 1997, to create a NUTS 2 frame for regional policy in the sense of implementing pre-accession instruments as foregoers of the Structural and Cohesion Funds. Development Regions are not administrative entities and are not legal persons and their County Councils consisting of the chairs of county councils and representatives from each category of local county council.

The local authorities are recognized by the Romanian Constitution through its Section 2 (Art. 119-122).

The Central Government is the only level with spatial planning powers.

The Romanian Senate is not a territorial chamber. All of its 143 senators are elected by universal direct suffrage.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Weak local
	--
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Senate but not representing territories
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Dependent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Relatively powerless local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency

There is a great financial dependence of local governments on central government and there are a lot of problem in the transfer of the economical resources between both levels.

Any Romanian region has legislative powers.

There is a system of vertical coordination between the different levels in the sense that the different spatial documents need to comply with each other.

Slovakia

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Decentralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regional decentralisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Organisms that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
Integrated Spatial Planning	Strong Vertical and horizontal coordination

The Slovak Republic (*Slovenská republika*) is a Decentralised Unitary State in a process of Regional Decentralisation. Since 2002 the country is divided into 8 self-governing regional units (*samosprávne kraje*), territorially corresponding to the administratively decentralised and subordinated to the Central Government regions set up on 1996. The members of the assemblies of these new regional bodies are directly elected by universal suffrage.

The local level (*obec*) is explicitly recognized by the Constitution in its Chapter IV (Art. 64-71).

The spatial planning powers remain at three levels: local, regional and national, but in the regional one they are weaker.

Slovakia is promoting a tax reform to enable self-government bodies (especially the regional ones) to levy taxes. At the same time the law imposes on self-governments the duty to secure financial support for the formulation and implementation of plans.

Any Slovak region has legislative powers.

With regard to the vertical relationships, in the Slovakian case a key politician has been nominated to coordinate the national regional development. The Development of the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001 was made through a process of horizontal and vertical coordination. The regional self governance and the regional planning documents are made are in compliance with the national policy.

Slovenia

The Republic of Slovenia (*Republika Slovenija*) is a Centralised Unitary State with an Administrative Regionalisation process. As of May 2005, only statistical regions exist, and, as their name suggests, are only used for statistical purposes. There are 12 of these regions. Levels of government are divided on central government and local government. Regional authorities will be introduced in the future under the stronger role of governance.

The Constitution recognises the local self-government in is Chapter V (Art. 138-145).

The spatial planning powers remain at local and national levels.

The National Council of Slovenia is a sectoral chamber. It is a body representative of social, economic, occupational and local interest groups and comprises 40 indirectly elected members.

The local governments of Slovenia are financially dependent on central government and due to the current inexistence of Slovenian regions, there are not Constitutional ones.

The competencies of a municipality comprise local affairs which may be regulated by the municipality autonomously and which affect only the residents of the municipality.

The Office for Structural Policy and Regional Development in Slovenia (it continues the work of the National for Agency Regional Development) is the organism that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels. Slovenia is classed

in a medium place with regard to the vertical coordination for spatial planning because its absence of levels.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Centralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	--
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Senate but not representing territories
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Organisms that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak vertical coordination but between levels with the main planning competency

Spain

The Kingdom of Spain (*Reino de España*) has been usually recognised as a Regionalised Unitary State with a Political Regionalisation

process (Regional Autonomy). Nevertheless the Spanish Constitutional Court defined it as a "Composite State", more than regionalised, federal functionally⁸. This country is composed of 17 Autonomous Communities (*Comunidades Autónomas*) and 2 Autonomous cities (*Ciudades Autónomas*): Ceuta and Melilla. These regions have a very high degree of self-government, and own assemblies, whose members are directly elected by universal suffrage. Although the process of regionalisation made for all of the regions is classed as political, there have been some different processes gathered *ex ante* by the Spanish Constitution. The fiscal regime of Canary Islands and the economic agreements for the Basque Country and Navarra are explicitly reflected in the 3rd Additional Disposition and the 4th Transitory Disposition, respectively. These regions involve 10.6 % of the Spanish population. On the other hand, the 2nd Transitory Disposition gives a special status at the moment of the elaboration of their own statutes to the *Historic Nationalities* (Catalonia, Galicia and Basque Country). Another Historic Nationality is Andalusia, its statutory process have been made through the way of the article 151 of the Spanish Constitution.

The Title VIII of the Basic Law (Art. 137-158) recognises the municipalities, the Provinces and the Autonomous Communities. This Constitution establishes exclusive competencies for the regions in its Article 148.

Spain is the only Unitary State where the Central Government has not competencies with regard to the spatial planning powers (Ruling 61/1997 of Constitutional Court). This role is mainly for the regions and, secondly, for the municipalities. The Provinces have also some competencies on this field.

The Spanish Senate is a partially territorial chamber. 51 of its 259 members are appointed by the regional governments and the rest are directly elected by universal suffrage.

Since 2004 there is a permanent Conference of Presidents, a regular meeting between the Prime Minister and the regional Presidents. These Conferences of Presidents do not have authority to reach binding decisions.

⁸ Peces-Barba Martínez, G. (2002): "Una lectura de la Constitución Española", in Cucó, A.; Romero, J. & Farinós, J. (Eds.): *La organización territorial del Estado: España en Europa: un análisis comparado*. Service of Publications of University of Valencia, pp. 67-77, p. 73.

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Composite Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Political regionalisation
	Political regionalisation with special status (Andalusia, Canary Islands, Catalonia, Galicia, Navarra and Basque Country)
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Regional and local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Strong regional
	--
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Partially Territorial Chamber
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Conference of Presidents without authority to reach binding decisions
Dependence of local governments on central government	Fairly independent
Constitutional regions	All Autonomous Regions
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Relatively powerless local authorities

- **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Organisms that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels
	Problems of relationships between different government levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

It is not clear from the overview whether the resources granted by the Ministries of Housing and Infrastructure suffice for the implementation of spatial planning policies and whether regional,

endogenous financial resources are utilized for the purpose of spatial planning and what is their share in the budget addressed to spatial policies.

The Spanish basic Law gives legislative powers to the Spanish regions and Autonomous cities for their own competencies.

The Municipalities have an inherent drawback as regards territorial scope of competence because of their small size. However, the legal framework offers them the possibility to broaden their domain of competence by means of mutual cooperation and partnerships.

In Spain the Network of Environmental Authorities is the body which organises cooperation and collaboration between environmental authorities and those that administers the Community funds of the three administrations (community, state and regional) with the basic purpose of combining criteria to integrate environmental protection into all actions financed with Community funds. Because in practice there is a lack of co-ordination and co-operation, or maybe for this reason, horizontal and multi-level governance are considered as very important aspects for spatial development. So there is a clear recognition of the need of vertical and horizontal coordination, but because there are no clear steps or measures the situation remains at a standstill.

Sweden

The Kingdom of Sweden (*Konungariket Sverige*) is a Decentralised Unitary State. It is composed of 20 Counties (*Landsting*), 2 regions (*Skåne* and *Västra Götaland*) and an Autonomous Municipality (*Gotland*). For the first ones (69.8 % of the Swedish population) there is a Regionalisation process through the Local Authorities, meanwhile in the latter ones (30.2 % of the population) there is a Regional Decentralisation. The assemblies of all regional bodies are elected by universal direct suffrage.

The Article 7 of the Swedish Constitution explains that *the Kingdom is divided into municipalities and departmental collectivities*. Therefore, the local governments are recognised by it.

The main powerful spatial planning level is the local one. The national level has also competencies, but not as much as the local one.

The Local Authorities and County Councils / Regions have a considerable degree of autonomy and independent powers of taxation. "Local Self-government and its right to levy taxes are stipulated in the Swedish Constitution".

• **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Decentralised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities
	Regional decentralisation (Gotland, Skåne and Västra Götaland)
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Local
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	--
	Weak national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	No
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Very independent
Constitutional regions	No
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

• **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak or no vertical coordination

Any Swedish region has legislative powers.

It seems that the focus of relevant pilot efforts on governance objectives is on horizontal and vertical co-ordination and

effectiveness. Vertical coordination is weak due to the incomplete hierarchy of territorial levels.

Switzerland

• Multi-level structure

Category	Performance
Model of State	Federal
Typology of regionalisation	"Regionalisation" through the Federate Authorities
Constitutional reconnaissance of Regional and/or local levels	Each region has its own Constitution
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	Weak sub-regional / supra-local
	Strong regional
	Weak national
New Spatial Planning powers	No
National territorial chambers	Totally Territorial Chamber
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contacts
Dependence of local governments on central government	Very independent
Constitutional regions	All Cantons
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

• Multi-level relationships

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	--
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Positive attitudes
	Priority emphasis on vertical co-ordination objective
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency

The Swiss Confederation (*Confoederatio Helvetica*) is a Federal State consisting of 26 Cantons. The Regionalisation process is made through the Federate Authorities. The members of the cantonal assemblies are directly elected by universal suffrage. Cantons in Switzerland are sovereign, have legislative autonomy as well as their own Constitution.

The main powerful levels on spatial planning are, by order of importance, the Cantons, the Communes and the Federation. Regional Planning Associations have been created at sub-regional level with the purpose of the elaboration of Regional Structure Plans.

The Swiss Senate is composed of 46 representatives of the Cantons.

In Switzerland the involvement of the Cantons in the Central Government is very high. There not exist exactly Conferences of Presidents, but the multi-level co-operation and the jointly decision-making processes are taking place continuously.

The Swiss local governments have a high degree of self-government and it includes the fiscal and financial system.

All of the Cantons have legislative powers.

An upgraded tripartite agglomeration conference will allow the confederation to co-ordinate policies vertically across government levels. There is an advanced system of vertical coordination between the different levels.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a Regionalised Unitary State. It is divided into 9 English regions, as well as Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. The English regions (83.6% of the total UK population) are in a process of Administrative Regionalisation. The rest of the UK has a measure of Regional Autonomy (referred to as devolution). Northern Ireland and Wales (7.8% of total population) have a higher degree of autonomy than the English regions, but the part of the UK with the highest degree of autonomy is Scotland (8.6% of total population). The Welsh National Assembly does not have primary legislative power, while the Assembly of Northern Ireland has a semi-autonomous character (although its devolved powers are currently suspended due to political problems). On the other hand, the Scottish Parliament has primary and secondary legislative powers.

In these devolved areas, as well as in the English region of Greater London, the assemblies are elected by universal direct suffrage. The population covered by these regions amounts to 28.6% of the UK population. In the rest of the English regions the members of the regional bodies are appointed by Central Government (in the case of the Regional Development Agencies), but their operations are monitored by councillors appointed by local authorities (the Regional Assemblies).

- **Multi-level structure**

Category	Performance
Model of State	Regionalised Unitary
Typology of regionalisation	Administrative regionalisation
	Political regionalisation (Wales and Northern Ireland)
	Political regionalisation with special status (Scotland)
Constitutional guarantee for Regional and/or local levels	No written Constitution, but regional and local guarantees through Parliamentary Acts
Allocation of Spatial Planning powers	Strong local
	--
	Weak regional
	Strong national
New Spatial Planning powers	Greater London (directly elected Assembly) and Regional Assemblies
National territorial chambers	Senate but not representing territories
Regular multi-level governmental meetings	No
Dependence of local governments on central government	Financially fairly dependent
Constitutional regions	Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales
Devolution to 1 st tier local authorities	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities

The UK is the only country which does not have any Basic Law. However, a number of parliamentary Acts have been enacted in order

to recognise the regional level, mainly for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, but also for the English regions⁹.

The spatial planning powers mainly reside at the national and local levels, but the regions and the counties (2nd tier of local level) also have competencies. The Greater London Authority (12% of the UK population) is an institution that has been created for the purpose of the elaboration, among other things, of spatial planning documents, namely the Spatial Development Strategy (SDS) for the metropolitan region of London, also known as *The London Plan*.

• **Multi-level relationships**

Category	Performance
Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Bodies that act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels
	Problems of relationships between different government levels
Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination	Weak attitude
	Progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
Integrated Spatial Planning	Mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or at levels with strong planning competencies, and weak or no vertical coordination

The Upper Chamber of the UK, also known as *The House of Lords* is not a territorial chamber. Its members (peers) are now predominantly appointees, though there are still significant numbers of hereditary peers.

As explained in the UK overview, “local authorities in Great Britain raise revenue through the council tax; in England this meets about 25 per cent of their revenue expenditure. Their spending is, however, financed primarily by grants from central government or the devolved administrations and by the redistribution of revenue from national non-domestic rates, a property tax levied on businesses and other non-domestic properties. This probably makes the British local authorities fairly dependent on (rather than fairly independent from) central government. Capital expenditure is financed from several

⁹ Regional Assemblies (Preparation) Act 2003, Chapter 10: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/20030010.htm>. Regional Development Agencies Act 1998, Chapter 45: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980045.htm>. Greater London Authority Act 1999, Chapter 29: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts1999/19990029.htm>.

sources: central government capital grant; capital receipts from the disposal of land and buildings; and borrowing (including borrowing supported by the Government, and borrowing that is locally financed). The Government has powers to cap increases in local authority budgets and council tax”.

The only regions with legislative powers are Scotland, Wales (but not primary legislative powers) and Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland does not yet have all of the legislative powers accorded it at the *Good Friday Agreement*, their establishment is currently on-going. The autonomy of Northern Ireland has been suspended several times since its approval in 1998.

It is difficult to answer the question on local authority powers and place the UK in a definite category, because although local authorities have important powers, especially in comparison to some other countries, they have lost some powers in the last 25 years.

Regional Government Offices in United Kingdom act as frameworks for the co-ordination of the relationships at different levels. There is a strong tradition of departmental autonomy both in central and local government. There are few mechanisms which ensure integration and the lack of coordination of policy and spending programmes is commonly criticised.

4. Sources

HOOGHE, L. & MARKS, G. (2001): *Types of Multi-Level Governance*, in European Integration online Papers (EIoP), vol. 5, n° 11. Available at: <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2001-011t.htm>

EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATORY NETWORK (ESPON), (2005): *ESPON Project 2.3.2. Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level. Third Interim Report*. pp. 36-48. Available at: http://www.espon.lu/online/documentation/projects/policy_impact/3683/3.ir_2.3.2_final.pdf

EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATORY NETWORK (ESPON), (2005): *ESPON Project 3.2. Spatial Scenarios and Orientations in relation to the ESDP and Cohesion Policy. Second Interim Report*. Vol. 3. pp. 284-297. Available at: http://www.espon.lu/online/documentation/projects/cross_thematic/2913/sir-3.2_part2_15.04.2005.pdf

COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS (CoR), (2003): *Devolution process in the European Union and the candidate countries*. Available at: http://www.cor.eu.int/es/documents/progress_democracy.htm

COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS (CoR), (2004): *Strengthening regional and local democracy in the European Union*. Vols. I & II. Available at: http://www.cor.eu.int/document/documents/cdr171_2004_vol1_etu_en.pdf (vol. I) & http://www.cor.eu.int/document/documents/cdr171_2004_vol2_etu_en.pdf (vol. II)

HILDENBRAND SCHEID, A. (2006): *Tres propuestas para una relación efectiva entre las escalas regional y local en materia de ordenación del territorio (Three proposals for an effective relation between regional and local levels in spatial planning)*. Paper from the author's conference in the International Seminar "Governance of sustainable territorial development: state of the art in Europe and in Spain", Valencia, International University Menéndez Pelayo, 14-16 September 2005. Forthcoming.

Regional and local government systems of the CEMR Member States: http://www.ccre.org/membres_en.htm

Basic Laws of the world: <http://confinder.richmond.edu/>

Senates of the world: <http://www.senat.fr/senatsdumonde/pays.html>

YOUNG, S. (2001): *Devolution in the United Kingdom: A Revolution in Online Legal Research*. Available at: <http://www.llrx.com/features/devolution.htm>

PARLIAMENT OF UK (1998): *Scotland Act 1998 chapter 46*. Available at: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980046.htm>

PARLIAMENT OF UK (1998): *Government of Wales Act 1998 chapter 38*. Available at: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980038.htm>

PARLIAMENT OF UK (1998): *Northern Ireland Act 1998 chapter 47*. Available at: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980047.htm>

ANNEX 1

Score Tables

Table 3: Models of State

Country	Model of State				
	Unitary States				Federal States
	Centralised	Decentralised	Regionalised	Composite	
Austria					1
Belgium					1
Bulgaria	1				
Cyprus	1				
Czech Rep.		1			
Denmark		1			
Estonia	1				
Finland		1			
France			1		
Germany					1
Greece	1				
Hungary	1				
Ireland	1				
Italy			1		
Latvia	1				
Lithuania	1				
Luxembourg	1				
Malta	1				
Netherlands		1			
Norway		1			
Poland			1		
Portugal	1				
Romania	1				
Slovakia		1			
Slovenia	1				
Spain				1	
Sweden		1			
Switzerland					1
UK			1		

Table 4: Typology of Regionalisation

Country	Score	Typology of Regionalisation					
		Administrative Regionalization	Regionalisation through the existing Local Authorities	Regional Decentralisation	Regional Autonomy (Political Regionalization)	Regional Autonomy (Political Regionalization): <i>Special Status</i>	Regionalization through the Federal Authorities
		0,5	1	1,25	1,5	1,75	2
Austria	2,000						1
Belgium	2,000						1
Germany	2,000						1
Switzerland	2,000						1
Spain	1,626				0,494569395	0,505430605	
Italy	1,539				0,844353308	0,155646692	
France	1,257			0,972295369	0,027704631		
Czech Rep.	1,250			1			
Poland	1,250			1			
Slovakia	1,250			1			
Sweden	1,075		0,698137928	0,301862072			
Finland	1,002		0,995025009		0,004974991		
Denmark	1,000		1				
Hungary	1,000		1				
Ireland	1,000		1				
Netherlands	1,000		1				
Norway	1,000		1				
UK	0,686	0,835847464			0,078047873	0,086104663	
Portugal	0,546	0,953769379			0,046230621		
Bulgaria	0,500	1					
Estonia	0,500	1					
Greece	0,500	1					
Latvia	0,500	1					
Lithuania	0,500	1					
Romania	0,500	1					
Slovenia	0,500	1					
Cyprus	0,000						
Luxembourg	0,000						
Malta	0,000						

Table 5: Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels

Country	Score	Constitutional guarantee for local and/or regional levels		
		Local	Regional	Each region has its own Constitution
		1	1,5	2
Austria	2,00			1
Germany	2,00			1
Switzerland	2,00			1
Belgium	1,50		1	
Bulgaria	1,50		1	
Czech Rep.	1,50		1	
France	1,50		1	
Italy	1,50		1	
Netherlands	1,50		1	
Portugal	1,50		1	
Spain	1,50		1	
UK	1,50		1	
Finland	1,00	0,99503	0,00497	
Denmark	1,00	1		
Estonia	1,00	1		
Greece	1,00	1		
Hungary	1,00	1		
Luxembourg	1,00	1		
Poland	1,00	1		
Romania	1,00	1		
Slovakia	1,00	1		
Slovenia	1,00	1		
Sweden	1,00	1		
Cyprus	0,00			
Ireland	0,00			
Latvia	0,00			
Lithuania	0,00			
Malta	0,00			
Norway	0,00			

Table 6: Allocation of Spatial Planning powers

Country	Score	Allocation of Spatial planning powers							
		Local level		Supra-local / sub-regional level		Regional level		National level	
		Weak	Strong	Weak	Strong	Weak	Strong	Weak	Strong
		0,25	0,5	0,25	0,5	0,25	0,5	0,25	0,5
Germany	1,75		1	1			1		1
France	1,5		1	1		1			1
Hungary	1,5		1	1		1			1
Italy	1,5		1	1		1			1
Switzerland	1,5		1	1			1	1	
Bulgaria	1,25	1		1		1			1
Denmark	1,25		1				1	1	
Estonia	1,25		1			1			1
Finland	1,25		1	1		1		1	
Ireland	1,25		1	1					1
Latvia	1,25		1			1			1
Netherlands	1,25		1			1			1
Poland	1,25		1			1			1
Portugal	1,25		1			1			1
Slovakia	1,25		1			1			1
Austria	1		1			1		1	
Belgium	1	1		1			1		
Czech Rep.	1		1			1		1	
Lithuania	1		1						1
Luxembourg	1		1						1
Norway	1		1						1
Romania	1	1				1			1
Slovenia	1		1						1
Spain	1		1				1		
UK	1		1						1
Greece	0,75			1					1
Malta	0,75	1							1
Sweden	0,75		1					1	
Cyprus	0,5								1

Table 7: New spatial planning powers at supra-local / sub-regional level

Country	Score	New spatial planning powers at supra-local / sub-regional level (innovative)	
		Indirectly elected Assembly	Directly elected Assembly
		1	2
UK	0,24332		0,12166
Germany	0,11610	0,026371	0,04487
France	0,09740	0,097403	
Italy	0,03131		0,01565
Austria	0,00000		
Belgium	0,00000		
Bulgaria	0,00000		
Cyprus	0,00000		
Czech Rep.	0,00000		
Denmark	0,00000		
Estonia	0,00000		
Finland	0,00000		
Greece	0,00000		
Hungary	0,00000		
Ireland	0,00000		
Latvia	0,00000		
Lithuania	0,00000		
Luxembourg	0,00000		
Malta	0,00000		
Netherlands	0,00000		
Norway	0,00000		
Poland	0,00000		
Portugal	0,00000		
Romania	0,00000		
Slovakia	0,00000		
Slovenia	0,00000		
Spain	0,00000		
Sweden	0,00000		
Switzerland	0,00000		

Table 8: National Territorial Chambers

Country	Score	National Territorial Chambers		
		Existence of a Senate but not representing territories	Existence of a partial Territorial Chamber	Existence of a totally Territorial Chamber
		0,5	1	2
Austria	2			1
France	2			1
Germany	2			1
Netherlands	2			1
Switzerland	2			1
Belgium	1		1	
Spain	1		1	
Czech Rep.	0,5	1		
Ireland	0,5	1		
Italy	0,5	1		
Poland	0,5	1		
Romania	0,5	1		
Slovenia	0,5	1		
UK	0,5	1		
Bulgaria	0			
Cyprus	0			
Denmark	0			
Estonia	0			
Finland	0			
Greece	0			
Hungary	0			
Latvia	0			
Lithuania	0			
Luxembourg	0			
Malta	0			
Norway	0			
Portugal	0			
Slovakia	0			
Sweden	0			

Table 9: Regular multi-level governmental meetings

Country	Score	Executive power sharing		
		Existence of a Conference of Presidents without authority to reach binding decisions	Existence of a Conference of Presidents with authority to reach binding decisions	Innovative forms of permanent multi-level territorial contacts
		0,5	1	1
Germany	2		1	1
Hungary	1			1
Switzerland	1			1
Belgium	0,5	1		
Italy	0,5	1		
Spain	0,5	1		
Austria	0			
Bulgaria	0			
Cyprus	0			
Czech Rep.	0			
Denmark	0			
Estonia	0			
Finland	0			
France	0			
Greece	0			
Ireland	0			
Latvia	0			
Lithuania	0			
Luxembourg	0			
Malta	0			
Netherlands	0			
Norway	0			
Poland	0			
Portugal	0			
Romania	0			
Slovakia	0			
Slovenia	0			
Sweden	0			
UK	0			

Table 10. Extent of financial dependence of local government on central government

Country	Total Score	Dependent	Fairly independent	Very independent	Total Score
		0	1	2	
Denmark	2			1	2
Estonia	2			1	2
Finland	2			1	2
Sweden	2			1	2
Switzerland	2			1	2
Netherlands	2			1	2
Austria	1		1		1
Belgium	1		1		1
France	1		1		1
Germany	1		1		1
Ireland	1		1		1
Italy	1		1		1
Lithuania	1		1		1
Luxembourg	1		1		1
Poland	1		1		1
Slovakia	1		1		1
Spain	1		1		1
UK	1		1		1
Norway	1		1		1
Bulgaria	0	1			0
Cyprus	0	1			0
Czech Rep.	0	1			0
Greece	0	1			0
Hungary	0	1			0
Latvia	0	1			0
Malta	0	1			0
Portugal	0	1			0
Romania	0	1			0
Slovenia	0	0			0

Table 11. Constitutional regions

Country	Constitutional regions	Total Score
	2	
Austria	1	2
Belgium	1	2
Germany	1	2
Italy	1	2
Spain	1	2
Switzerland	1	2
UK	0,132155	0,2643
Portugal	0,046	0,0925
Finland	0,005	0,0099
Bulgaria		0
Cyprus		0
Czech Rep.		0
Denmark		0
Estonia		0
France		0
Greece		0
Hungary		0
Ireland		0
Latvia		0
Lithuania		0
Luxembourg		0
Malta		0
Netherlands		0
Norway		0
Poland		0
Romania		0
Slovakia		0
Slovenia		0
Sweden		0

Table 12. Devolution of powers to 1st tier local authorities

Country	Total	Substantial powers have been allocated to local authorities	Devolution expected or in process	Relatively powerless local authorities
		2	1	0
Austria	2	1		
Belgium	2	1		
Czech Rep.	2	1		
Denmark	2	1		
Finland	2	1		
France	2	1		
Germany	2	1		
Hungary	2	1		
Ireland	2	1		
Italy	2	1		
Latvia	2	1		
Lithuania	2	1		
Netherlands	2	1		
Norway	2	1		
Poland	2	1		
Portugal	2	1		
Slovakia	2	1		
Slovenia	2	1		
Sweden	2	1		
Switzerland	2	1		
UK	2	1		
Bulgaria	1		1	
Estonia	1		1	
Luxembourg	1		1	
Cyprus	0			1
Greece	0			1
Malta	0			1
Romania	0			1
Spain	0			1

Table 13. Approaches for vertical co-operation and co-ordination

Country	Total	Approaches for vertical cooperation and coordination		Priority emphasis on governance objectives as indicated in national overview	Direction of progress towards vertical co-operation and partnerships
		<i>(Static) At all levels</i>		<i>(St) Nat/Fed</i>	<i>Trend</i>
		Positive attitude or positive evolution of attitude	Weak attitude	Vertical co-ordination	Vertical co-operation and partnerships
		0,5	0,25	0,5	1
France	2	1		1	1
Germany	2	1		1	1
Norway	2	1		1	1
Sweden	2	1		1	1
Switzerland	2	1		1	1
Austria	1,75		1	1	1
Greece	1,75		1	1	1
Luxembourg	1,75		1	1	1
Bulgaria	1,5	1			1
Denmark	1,5	1			1
Ireland	1,5	1			1
Italy	1,5	1			1
Netherlands	1,5			1	1
Slovenia	1,5	1			1
Spain	1,5			1	1
Czech Rep.	1,25		1		1
UK	1,25		1		1
Estonia	1	1		1	
Finland	1				1
Portugal	1	1		1	
Belgium	0,5	1			
Hungary	0,5	1			
Latvia	0,5	1			
Lithuania	0,5			1	
Poland	0,5			1	
Romania	0,5			1	
Slovakia	0,5	1			
Cyprus	0				
Malta	0				

Table 14. Co-ordination on spatial planning

Country	Total	Integrated Spatial Planning					
		Strong coordination	Mainly vertical coordination		Mainly horizontal coordination		Both weak coordination
		A	B+	B-	C+	C-	D
		2	1,75	1,5	1	0,75	0,25
Denmark	2	1					
Estonia	2	1					
Finland	2	1					
France	2	1					
Germany	2	1					
Ireland	2	1					
Latvia	2	1					
Lithuania	2	1					
Netherlands	2	1					
Poland	2	1					
Slovakia	2	1					
Austria	1,75		1				
Hungary	1,75		1				
Norway	1,75		1				
Romania	1,75		1				
Switzerland	1,75		1				
Cyprus	1				1		
Luxembourg	1				1		
Malta	1				1		
Slovenia	1				1		
Czech Rep.	0,75					1	
Sweden	0,75					1	
UK	0,75					1	
Belgium	0,25						1
Bulgaria	0,25						1
Greece	0,25						1
Italy	0,25						1
Portugal	0,25						1
Spain	0,25						1

ANNEX 2

Data List

(Espon 2.3.2 Metadata)

	Model of State			Typology of Regionalisation		Constitutional reconnaissance of local and/or regional levels	
ESPON Project	3.2			3.2			
Source of data within the project	NORDREGIO	Committee of Regions	University of Richmond (USA)	NORDREGIO	Council of European Municipalities and Regions	University of Richmond (USA)	University of Texas Tarlton Law Library
Author	A. Dubois			A. Dubois			S. Young
Regional reference	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 2	NUTS 0	
Time reference	2005	2003	2005	2005	2006	2005	2001
Origin of data	http://www.espon.lu/online/documentation/projects/cross_the_matic/2913/sir-3.2_part2_15.04.2005.pdf	http://www.cor.eu.int/es/documents/progress_democracy.htm	http://confinder.richmond.edu/		http://www.ccre.org/members_en.htm	http://confinder.richmond.edu/	http://www.llrx.com/features/devolution.htm
Source of use	2nd I.R. ESPON Project 3.2 (p. 284-295)	Devolution process in the European Union and the candidate countries.	National Basic Laws	2nd I.R. ESPON Project 3.2 (p. 297)		National Basic Laws	Devolution in the United Kingdom: A Revolution in Online Legal Research
Calculation algorithm					Indicator * (NUTS 2 population / NUTS 0 population)		
NUTS Version	1999	1999		1999	1999		
Type of data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data

	Allocation of spatial planning powers	New spatial planning powers at supra-local / sub-regional level (innovative)	National Territorial Chambers	Regular multi-level governmental meetings	Extent of financial dependence of local governments on central government	Devolution of powers to 1st tier local authorities
ESPON Project	2,3,2				2.3.2	2.3.2
Source of data within the project	Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Local	UIMP-Valencia Territorial Governance International Seminar	Senát de France	Committee of Regions	National Technical University of Athens	National Technical University of Athens
Author	J. Farinós & J. Milder	A. Hildenbrand			Louis Wassenhoven et al.	Louis Wassenhoven et al.
Regional reference	NUTS 0	NUTS 3	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0
Time reference	2006	2006	2006	2003	2006	2006
Origin of data			http://www.senat.fr/senatsdumont/pays.html	http://www.cor.eu.int/es/documents/progress_democracy.htm		
Source of use	Mixture of spatial planning styles; inter-State but also intra-State. General presence of Land Use; convergence towards the Comprehensive integrated approach and the Regional economic approach Style	Tres propuestas para una relación efectiva entre las escalas regional y local en materia de ordenación del territorio.		Devolution process in the European Union and the candidate countries.	Synthesis of national overviews (p. 111-115)	Synthesis of national overviews (p. 116-121)
Calculation algorithm						
NUTS Version	1999			1999	2006	2006
Type of data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data

	Forms of cooperation between agencies, departments and authorities	Approaches for vertical co-ordination and co-operation		Integrated Spatial Planning
ESPON Project	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.3.2
Source of data within the project	Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Local	Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Local	National Technical University of Athens	Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Local
Author			Louis Wassenhoven et al.	Joaquin Farinos & Jody Milder
Regional reference	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0
Time reference	2006	2006	2006	2006
Origin of data	http://www.espon.lu/online/documentation/projects/policy_impact/2785/2.ir-2.3.2.pdf	http://www.espon.lu/online/documentation/projects/policy_impact/2785/2.ir-2.3.2.pdf		
Source of use	2 nd Interim Report (p. 90-92)	2 nd Interim Report (p.90)	Synthesis of national overviews (p. 27-33)	Annex F (p. 55-70)
Calculation algorithm				
NUTS Version	2006	2006	2006	2006
Type of data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data

ESPON project 2.3.2

Governance of Territorial and Urban
Policies From EU to Local Level

Annex Report E

Horizontal Dimension of Territorial Governance

E

ESPON Project 2.3.2

GOVERNANCE OF TERRITORIAL AND URBAN POLICIES FROM EU TO LOCAL LEVEL

Annex Report E

Horizontal Dimension of Territorial Governance

Joaquín Farinós, Mauro Payá Abad & Jody Milder

Separate volumes

Project Report

Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level

Annex report A

Data & Indicators

Identifying Favourable Pre-Conditions for Territorial Governance Actions

Annex report B

Synthesis of National Overviews

Annex report C

Case Study Synthesis

Annex report D

Multi-Level/Vertical Dimension of Territorial Governance

Annex report F

Spatial Planning Styles: A new Physiognomy for Europe



INSTITUTO INTER-UNIVERSITARIO de DESARROLLO LOCAL



This report represents the final results of a research project conducted within the framework of the ESPON 2000-2006 programme, partly financed through the INTERREG programme.

The partnership behind the ESPON programme consists of the EU Commission and the Member States of the EU25, plus Norway and Switzerland. Each partner is represented in the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

This report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the members of the Monitoring Committee.

Information on the ESPON programme and projects can be found on www.espon.lu

The web site provides the possibility to download and examine the most recent document produced by finalised and ongoing ESPON projects.

ISBN number: 84-690-3088-4
This basic report exists only in an electronic version.

© The ESPON Monitoring Committee and the partners of the projects mentioned.

Printing, reproduction or quotation is authorized provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is forwarded to the ESPON Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.

Table of contents

	Foreword	7
1	Summary	8
1.1	Classifying States on Horizontal governance: categories and indicators considered	8
1.2	Main Results	9
2	Analysis and methodology	15
2.1	Pre-conditions to horizontal coordination and cooperation	15
2.1.1	<i>Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective as indicated in National Overviews</i>	15
2.1.2	<i>Barriers for partnerships formation and co-operation</i>	15
2.1.3	<i>Catalysts for partnerships formation and co-operation</i> .	16
2.2	Multi-channel co-operation	19
2.2.1	<i>Experience in working with partnerships</i>	20
2.2.2	<i>Forms of co-operation</i>	20
2.2.3	<i>Specific direction in case of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships</i>	21
2.3	Territorial co-operation	22
2.3.1	<i>Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations</i>	22
2.3.2	<i>Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB</i>	23
2.4	Cross-sectoral policies	25
2.4.1	<i>National and/or federal agencies, councils and/or committees for spatial development</i>	25
2.4.2	<i>Policy packages</i>	27
3	Country profiles	29
	Austria	29
	Belgium	31
	Bulgaria	31
	Cyprus	32

Czech Republic	33
Denmark	33
Estonia	34
Finland	35
France	36
Germany	37
Greece	38
Hungary	39
Ireland	40
Italy	41
Latvia	42
Lithuania	43
Luxembourg	44
Malta	44
The Netherlands	45
Norway	46
Poland	47
Portugal	48
Romania	49
Slovakia	50
Slovenia	50
Spain	51
Sweden	52
Switzerland	53
United Kingdom	54
4. Sources	56
Annex 1: Tables of indicators	57
Annex 2: Data list	68

Figures

1	Total scores by models of State	11
2	Performance of countries for vertical and horizontal dimensions	12

Maps

1	Performance of the countries for horizontal and vertical dimensions of territorial governance	15
2	Score of countries for "Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation"	18
3	Score of countries for "Multi-channel co-operation"	19
4	Score of countries for "Territorial co-operation" ...	24
5	Score of countries for "Cross-sectoral policies"	26

Tables

1	Indicators of Horizontal dimension on territorial governance	9
2	Country Scores by category and Total Score	10
3	Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective	58
4	Barriers for partnerships formation and co-operation .	59
5	Catalysts for partnerships formation and co-operation	60
6	Experience in working with partnerships	61
7	Forms of co-operation	62
8	Specific direction of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships	63
9	Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	64
10	Participation in projects under Interreg IIIB	65
11	National / Federal agencies, councils and/or committees for spatial development	66
12	Policy packages	67

Foreword

The analysis of the horizontal dimension of governance in the countries has not been an easy task due to the currently informal character of this dimension in the major part of the countries analysed. In the opposite as happened with the vertical structure and relationships, the information available was not so clear. There are a lot of different mechanisms, tools and initiatives of horizontal co-operation and co-ordination and it is almost impossible to synthesise and gathering them in close groups due to their degree of complexity and individuality.

This Annex does not expect to be a final analysis for the horizontal governance procedures in the countries. Possibly at this moment is too early to make this task because the interest of the horizontal relationships at sub-national levels for a lot of researchers and national governments are aside. It is very clear the priority of the vertical co-ordination with respect to the horizontal one and the elaboration of a synthesis at European level shall follow to the preparation of compendiums at national level.

By these issues, this study only expects to be an introduction and a first step to more complete works related to the horizontal dimension.

Part 1. Summary

1.1. Looking for criteria to group states according to horizontal governance features: selected indicators

In the same way than in the Annex D, referred to the vertical structure and relationships of the 29 ESPON Space Member States, a classification of countries has been made in this Annex. Now, the main issue treated is the horizontal co-ordination and relationships between the different governmental levels among them and amongst the rest of the stakeholders within each country. For this purpose the horizontal relationships have been divided into four categories. Those categories are explained along the following paragraphs and deeper analysed along the chapter 2, which is referred to the analysis and methodology used for this study.

The first category, called *Pre-conditions to horizontal coordination and cooperation*, is a sort of general indicators which have relations with all of the other ones, but do not belong exclusively to anyone of them. The first indicator of this category is if there is an **Emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective** in the countries as indicated on National Overviews. The two next indicators are the **Barriers** and **Catalysts** existent in the countries for the partnership formation and co-operation.

Another category is related to the *Multi-channel co-ordination, cooperation and relationships*, mainly in relation with the establishment or the development of partnerships, but also the rest of forms of horizontal co-ordination and co-operation. The indicators used in order to analyze this category are, in first place, the **Experience in working with partnerships** of each country. In second place we analyze the different **Forms of horizontal co-operation** those take place in each country. And finally, the **Specific direction in case of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships**.

The third category tries to analyze the *Territorial co-operation*, that is, the initiatives of horizontal co-operation carried out by the different governmental levels within a country and with other stakeholders from other neighbour countries. The indicators used for this purpose are the **Reconnaissance by the national Basic Laws of the right of association between local, sub-regional and/or regional territorial bodies** and the **Participation on Interreg IIIB projects**.

Finally, the fourth category is referred to the *Cross-sectoral co-operation*. In this category there are two indicators used, the existence of **National and/or federal agencies, councils and/or committees for spatial development** and the **Policy packages**.

The following table 1 shows the value given to each indicator and, as in the case of the vertical analysis, a country may score a maximum of two points and a minimum of zero for each indicator.

Table 1. Indicators of Horizontal dimension on territorial governance

Category	Indicator	Performance	Value	
Pre-conditions to horizontal coordination and cooperation	Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective as indicated in national overview	Existence	2	
		0	2	
	Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Barriers	1 to 2	1	
		3 to 4	0.5	
		0	0	
	Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Catalysts	1 to 3	1	
4 to 6		2		
0		0		
Multi-channel	Experience in working with partnerships	Limited	1	
		Extensive	2	
	Forms of co-operation	0	0	
		1 to 2	1	
		3 to 5	2	
	Direction of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships	0	0	
1 to 2		1		
3 to 5		2		
Territorial co-operation	Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local level	0.67	
		Sub-regional level	0.67	
		Regional level	0.67	
		Explicit prohibition for some territorial horizontal association	-0.67	
	Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB (Number of Projects / 100.000 inhabitants)	0,01 to 1	0.25	
		1,01 to 4	0.75	
		4,01 to 8	1.25	
	8,01 and more	2		
Cross-sectoral co-operation	National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	Existence	2	
		Urban	0.4	
	Policy packages	Inter-sectoral	Transport	0.4
			R&D	0.4
			Economic	0.4
			Spatial Planning	0.4
			Elaborate system of policy packages	2
		No Policy Packages or missing info	0	
Working on creation of policy packages	0.25			

1.2 Main Results

In this study two kinds of results are presented, seizing also the analysis elaborated for the multi-level dimension on territorial


governance for the Annex D of this Final Report. The first of them is the conclusions obtained from the analysis made for the horizontal dimension of governance at the ESPON countries. The second one is the study of the possible relationships existent between the vertical and the horizontal dimensions in the countries.

As in the analysis of the vertical dimension, the main results are shown in the following pages through a table with the scores obtained by each country from each indicator and a graphic with the scores, gathering the countries by their model of State.

Table 2: Country Scores by category and Total Score

Country	Emphasis on horizontal co-ordination	Barriers	Catalysts	Experience in partnerships	Forms of co-operation	Specific direction	Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Interreg IIIB projects	agencies for spatial development	Policy packages	Total
Austria	0	1	1	1	1	1	1,33	1,25	0	0,8	8,38
Belgium	0	1	2	2	1	2	1,33	0,75	0	0	10,08
Bulgaria	2	1	1	1	0	0	0,67	0,25	0	0	5,92
Cyprus	0	0,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2,50
Czech Rep.	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0,25	0	0	6,25
Denmark	2	1	1	2	1	2	0	2	0	0,8	11,80
Estonia	0	1	1	1	0	0	1,33	2	0	0	6,33
Finland	0	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	0	1,2	11,20
France	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0,75	2	2	16,75
Germany	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	0,75	0	2	12,75
Greece	0	0,5	2	1	1	1	0,67	0,75	2	0,25	9,17
Hungary	0	1	1	1	1	1	0,67	0,75	2	0	8,42
Ireland	0	2	1	2	2	2	0	1,25	0	0,25	10,50
Italy	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	0,75	0	0,8	7,55
Latvia	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0,8	6,80
Lithuania	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	0,8	7,80
Luxembourg	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0,75	0	0,8	6,55
Malta	0	1	1	2	2	2	0	1,25	0	0	9,25
Netherlands	2	2	1	2	2	2	0	0,75	2	2	15,75
Norway	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	5,00
Poland	2	1	2	1	1	1	0,67	0,75	0	0	9,42
Portugal	0	1	1	1	2	0	1,33	2	0	0	8,33
Romania	2	0,5	1	1	2	2	0	0,25	0	0	8,75
Slovakia	0	1	2	1	1	2	0,67	0,75	0	0	8,42
Slovenia	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	0	0	9,00
Spain	2	1	2	2	0	2	0	1,25	0	0,4	10,65
Sweden	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	0,25	12,25
Switzerland	0	2	1	2	1	1	0,67	0,75	2	1,2	11,62
UK	0	2	1	2	1	2	0	0,75	0	0,4	9,15

Figure 1: Total scores by models of State



© ESPON – Project 2.3.2



First of all it must be commented that, except a small number of countries, the differences in the national performance for the horizontal dimension are not very great. Almost all countries are located between the central third of the graphic, that is, between 6 and 12 points. In this case the difference of the score of countries by models of state is practically imperceptible. Furthermore, there is not a clear ascendant line from the Centralised States to the Federal ones. This line might be almost horizontal.

Out of this great group of countries it must be remarkable the high performance of France and Netherlands. Those countries scores the maximum at almost all of the indicators and it is caused by the long and strong tradition and culture that it is being working there.


Another group of countries which must be commented to are the Nordic ones, especially Sweden, Denmark and Finland. In the same way than France and Netherlands, in those countries there is an extensive and strong culture of co-operation between stakeholders and territories and an example of it is the high number and the high degree of success of the initiatives of co-operation as euroregions or other territorial co-operation bodies.

It seems to be that the Decentralised countries show the relative best performance in comparison than *a priori* it would be expected. The power of the local authorities seems to be the cause. The local level is the most important and active one in the field of the horizontal co-ordination and co-operation. City networks and initiatives of co-operation between municipalities are present along and across the whole territory of the ESPON Space. And it is not a surprise that the countries with the most weighted local level would have the better performances for the horizontal co-operation and co-ordination.

Finally, and in order to conclude this presentation of results by countries, it is relevant to analyse the score obtained by two very small countries: Malta and Slovenia. Although the number of local governments in these countries is not quite high, it seems to be an important structure of horizontal co-operation and partnerships. Those countries must be analysed more deeply with the purpose to found the real and surprising causes of their performance.

The second kind of results is related to the performance of the countries for the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the governance. In order to have a clear image of the *status of the question* in Europe, a diagram of dispersion has been elaborated. The horizontal axis shows the score of each country for the horizontal dimension, meanwhile the vertical axis shows the performance by country for the vertical dimension, it mean structure and relationships. The result is as follows:

Figure 2: Performance of countries for vertical and horizontal dimensions



© ESPON – Project 2.3.2



Almost all the countries have a similar performance and are located close to the mean. But there are some exceptions and relevant questions to be commented.

The first one and probably the most important is that there is not any country located in the quadrant that symbolises the best performance. It means that there is not any example to be totally followed and there is not currently a perfect system of governance in Europe. As it is already commented there are some countries with high scores for vertical dimension and relative good horizontal governance system (Germany and Switzerland), and two more with good practices for the horizontal dimension and relative good performance for the vertical dimension (France and Netherlands). But anyone of them has very high scores at both dimensions.

Two groups of countries must be commented because their unbalance between their vertical and horizontal performance on governance dimensions. First of them is Austria. This country has good vertical structure and relationships, but the horizontal dimension is not as developed. In the opposite are located Greece and Malta. These countries do not have a developed vertical structure and relationships due to some factors, as the highly centralised system and, in the case

of Malta, the lack of a regional level because of this small size. But their performance for the horizontal dimension is relatively good.


The countries in the centre of the graphic have a clear positive correlation between their performance for the vertical dimension and for the horizontal one.

The following map 1 represents spatially the results obtained by diagram of dispersion commented above. In a further analysis by the four categories of the horizontal dimension, the intervals are similar for all of them. It means that for the categories which the maximum score is 4, the groups are divided by intervals of 1 point, meanwhile for the categories which the maximum can be 6, the intervals are of 1.5 points. This methodological question is relevant in order to prepare to the observer for the realisation of an analysis of the state within the whole ESPON 29 Space of each category. The better performed categories will be offered through a general and first view of the maps and the sensation that the map is quite "darker" than other maps.

Map 1. Performance of the countries for horizontal and vertical dimensions of territorial governance



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0



- Origin of the data:
IIDL Synthetic indicator
(See map 2.1.3.)
Categories for horizontal
governance (see maps 2.1.4 -
2.1.7.)



- Pre-conditions to horizontal coordination and cooperation.
- Multi-channel.
- Territorial co-operation.
- Cross-sectoral co-operation.

Part 2. Analysis and methodology

2.1 Pre-conditions to horizontal coordination and cooperation

In this section we are going to analyze the circumstances which avoid the degree of development of the horizontal co-ordination in a country. Those circumstances are the interest of the central governments for reaching the objective of the horizontal co-ordination, as well as the catalysts and barriers which allows or break the process of this development. The information for the realisation of this section has been obtained from the sections 4 and 11 of the Annex B of this Final Report.

2.1.1 Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective as indicated in National Overviews

According to the conclusions made by the Annex B related to the horizontal co-ordination, this governance objective has received minimum attention. In fact it is the objective in which are involved the least number of countries. This does not happen by chance. Several overviews have stressed the difficulties involved in horizontal coordination and the reasons why relevant attempts are likely to fail (territorial incompatibilities, administrative and professional barriers, introversion of individual policy agencies etc). Only 8 amongst the 29 ESPON Space countries are remarked to consider the horizontal co-ordination as a main governance objective. Those countries are Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain and Sweden.

The score given to those countries is 2, meanwhile the rest of the countries score 0 points for this indicator.

2.1.2 Barriers for partnerships formation and co-operation

This category, as well as the next one, are analysed from the section 11 of the Annex B of this Final Report. Here we are referring to the barriers which stop or break the process of the formation of partnerships and the horizontal co-operation. Although it is very difficult to synthesise all the barriers in a few groups, the Annex B has tried it. The barriers may be gathered into:

- Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership
- Lack of funds and external dependence

- Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions, etc. Undermining from external resources
- Complexity
- Undeveloped civil society and hierarchical decision-making
- Other

For our analysis we have only limited to list the number of barriers existent in each country and value them with respect to the quantity of barriers. As in the chapter 3, referred to the Country Profiles, as well at section 11 of the Annex B, those barriers are extensively analysed and explained.

For the number of barriers it has been decided to gather the countries into three groups, the ones where there is not any barrier, the countries where one or two barriers exist, and the ones with more than two barriers. In the first group are involved countries with a long co-operation tradition, as is the case of Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and UK. The second group gathers the greatest part of the countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain). Finally the third group includes three countries with three or more barriers. Actually the maximum number of barriers existent in the countries is three, although this group indicates that it can arrive until seven kinds of barriers. The countries gathered in this latter group are Cyprus, Greece and Romania.

The value given to each group is:

- Free of barriers = 2
- 1 up to 2 kinds of barriers = 1
- 3 or more kinds of barriers = 0.5

2.1.3 Catalysts for partnerships formation and co-operation

This category is very close to the previous one, but now it is being valued from a positive perspective, it means, the factors which are favouring the formation and establishment of partnerships and the horizontal co-operation. The kinds of factors have been gathered into six groups:

- EU policies and funding

- National or sub-national legislation and policy
- Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
- Political reasons (e.g. support for or opposition to central government)
- Public reaction to government policy and public projects
- Tradition / Culture / Past informal procedures

As with the previous indicator, the information has been obtained from the Annex B of the Final Report of 2.3.2 ESPON Project.

The groups of countries have been made in relation to the number of catalysts existent in each country. There is only a country where there is not any catalyst. This country is Cyprus. The greatest number of countries is included in the second group, with 1 up to 3 kinds of catalysts. In this group are gathered 21 among the 29 studies countries. Finally, seven countries have more than three factors favouring this process. They are Belgium, France, Greece, Poland, Slovakia, Spain and Sweden.



The major part of the countries have as catalysts EU policies and funding (26 among them) and National or sub-national legislation and policy (20 among them).

The value given to each group is:

- Any catalyst = 0
- 1 up to 3 = 1
- More than 3 = 2

The following map contains the countries by the score obtained for the category of Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation:

Map 2. Score of countries for "Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation"



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Origin of the data:
IIDL Qualitative Indicator





- Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective as indicated in national overview.
- Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Barriers
- Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Catalysts.

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

The classification is based on the calculation of national scores ranging from 0-2 for each indicator

2.2 Multi-channel co-operation

Map 3. Score of countries for "Multi-channel co-operation"



The classification is based on the calculation of national scores ranging from 0-2 for each indicator

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Origin of the data: IIDL Qualitative indicator

- Experience in working with partnerships of each country.

- Forms of co-operation.

- Direction of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships



Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

The multi-channel co-operation means that the co-operation is not only horizontal but also take part stakeholders from different levels. The main body where this kind of co-operation takes place is the partnership. In this section we are going to analyze this kind of co-operation through three indicators, the experience in partnerships, the forms of horizontal co-operation and the specific direction in case of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships.

2.2.1 Experience in working with partnerships

In this indicator it is only analysed if the experience is limited or extensive. The countries with a limited experience are 15 (Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia), meanwhile the countries with an extensive experience are 13 (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and UK).

The only country which is not included in any group is Luxembourg.

The value given to each group is as follows:

- Limited experience = 1
- Extensive experience = 2

2.2.2 Forms of co-operation

The Annex B of this Final Report, through its section 9, establishes several forms of co-operation related to the forms of agreements, pacts, contracts, etc. For our analysis we have only limited to classify the countries by the number of kinds of forms of co-operation registered at the National Overviews. Among the eight forms of co-operation established in the Annex B, we have choose five, because these ones are referred exactly to the multi-channel co-operation, while the others are referred to territorial, cross-sectoral or vertical co-operation. The forms used for this analysis are:

- Urban development contracts
- Specific urban regeneration contracts and/or partnerships
- Local development/planning agreements and/or frameworks
- Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies
- Public-private schemes for public works/construction

The general performance of the countries is the use of one or two forms of co-operation. In this group are included 14 countries (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovakia, Switzerland and UK). With any form of co-operation are classed Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Spain and Sweden. Finally with 3 to 5 forms of co-operation are France, Ireland, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania and Slovenia. The case of Malta is very singular because in this country all forms of co-operation studied take place.

The value given to each groups is as follows:

- Any form of co-operation = 0
- 1 or 2 forms of co-operation = 1
- 3 to 5 forms of co-operation = 2

2.2.3 Specific direction in case of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships

The information for this indicator has been obtained from the section 10 of the Annex B. In that section a first division is made, in which the direction is divided between if the progress is towards vertical or horizontal co-operation and partnerships. In the case of the horizontal co-operation almost all of the countries are involved, but there are different forms of co-operation for this purpose. They are the following ones:

- Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
- State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
- Private agreements (consortia)
- Public – Universities – research associations
- Other form of co-operation, e.g. cooperatives

As with other indicators, for this one the classification is made by the number of forms. Thus, the countries are classed into the inexistence of a specific form (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Norway and Portugal), the existence of 1 or 2 forms (Austria, Cyprus, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland and Switzerland) and the existence of 3 or more forms (Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and UK).

The value given for each group is:

- Any specific direction = 0
- 1 or 2 specific directions = 1
- More than 2 specific directions = 2

2.3 Territorial co-operation

The territorial co-operation means the horizontal (but also diagonal) co-operation between territorial governments of different territories. It is related to the associations or federations of territorial bodies. But also is referred to the territorial networks and joint participation in projects.

This category is divided into three indicators. The first one of them treats about the constitutional possibility of association of sub-national territories. The second talks about the establishment of city networks in the countries, but only within the countries. The third and last one is about the degree of involvement of each country in the Interreg IIIB Community Initiative, referred to the transnational co-operation in terms of spatial planning and following the guidelines of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP).

2.3.1 Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations

The information for this indicator has been obtained from the different National Basic Laws and in the next chapter of the Country Profiles the articles and paragraphs where the question is mentioned are included.

The territorial association can be at three levels, local, sub-regional and regional. At local level the National Basic Laws of ten countries allow explicitly associations (Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, France, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia and Spain). In Belgium, Estonia and France are also allowed the associations between sub-regional territorial bodies. France is the only country where the association is allowed at all levels. Austrian Basic Law allows the association between sub-regional bodies and between Länder. The association of Cantons is also allowed in Switzerland. In Portugal There is only allowed the association of the Autonomous regions at regional level. And, finally, in Spain there is the only Constitution which forbids explicitly the association of territorial bodies at the same level. There is forbidden in this country the association or federation between Autonomous Communities.

This does not mean that in the countries where the Basic Law does not mention the association of territories this association is forbidden, because the territorial co-operation take place in all countries at almost all levels.

The allowing of the association of territories has been valued as 0.66 for each territorial level. An in the case of the prohibition the value is -0.66.

2.3.2 Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB


One of the main forms of co-operation between European territories from different countries and aimed by the European Union is the Community Initiative Interreg III. Through its strand B, referred to the Transnational Co-operation, 13 great territorial areas have been established and converted in territorial programmes within this initiative. The main common target of the different programmes is that the European territories at all levels can reach the objectives of the guidelines of the European Spatial Development Perspective. All of the countries of the ESPON Space are included in one ore more programmes because the transnational co-operation overcomes the current EU external borders.

For this analysis it has been decided to classify the countries through the number of projects in which takes part an actor in each country. But the value is referred to the number of projects per 100.000 inhabitants, because the population and the size of the countries are very different. Furthermore, this calculation has already been made at NUTS 3 level for the Final Report of the 2.4.2 ESPON Project.

As in the 2.4.2 project, we have divided the countries into four groups, according to their relative weight, plus Cyprus, which does not take part in any project. The groups and the values given are the following:

- 0.01 up to 1 projects per 100.000 inh. =0.25
- 1.01 up to 4 projects per 100.000 inh. = 0.75
- 4.01 up to 8 projects per 100.000 inh. = 1.25
- More than 8 projects per 100.000 inh. =2

Map 4. Score of countries for "Territorial co-operation"




ESPOON
 NATIONAL COOPERATION
 © ESPON and Project 2.3.2. 2006

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
 Regional level: NUTS 0

Origin of the data: IIDL Qualitative Indicator
 - Constitutional guarantee for territorial associations
 - Number of Projects Interreg III-B Projects / 100.000 inhabitants



Source: ESPON Projects 2.3.2 National Overviews and 2.4.2



The group which gathers the greatest number of countries is the one between 1 and 4 projects, but the total number of projects varies between 2.036 in Italy and 15 in Luxembourg.

It must be remarked two important questions. The first is the prevalence of the Baltic and Nordic countries, where the culture of the territorial co-operation has been taking place much before than the existence of this Community Initiative. The Baltic Sea Region Programme –to which belong all of these countries- is considered as one of the most successful of this Initiative. The second issue is the good classification of Spain and Portugal. Besides these countries are included into four different Programmes, the peripheral territories of Canary Islands, in Spain, and Azores and Madeira, in Portugal, work together in a Programme (MAC: Madeira-Azores-Canarias) which is undergoing possibly the highest number of projects.

2.4 Cross-sectoral policies

In the previous sections it has been studied the co-operation between different actors through partnerships and arrangements in the case of the multi-channel co-operation and the co-operation between different territories through territorial associations and joint projects in the case of the territorial co-operation. In this section the analysis is focused on the co-operation in a determined territory and in a certain field, which gathers different sectors. This is the cross-sectoral policy.


It is not easy to analyze this issue because the information available is not very clear. The only indicators that have been used are two: the existence of agencies at national level which provide support to the administrative units and the existence in the countries of policy packages.

2.4.1 National and/or federal agencies, councils and/or committees for spatial development

According to the section 9 of the Annex B, there are some countries where a spatial development agency or committee exists at national level. For this analysis it has been given a value of two points to the countries where an agency has been created.

There are only five countries with agencies or committees of spatial development. Those ones are France, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands and Switzerland.

Map 5. Score of countries for "Cross-sectoral policies"




ESPON
 EUROPEAN COOPERATION IN POLICY
 © ESPON and Project 2.3.2. 2006

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
 Regional level: NUTS 0

Origin of the data: IIDL Qualitative Indicator

- National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development.
- Policy packages.



Source: ESPON Projects 2.3.2 National Overviews

This classification is based on the calculation of national scores ranging from 0-2 for each indicator

As examples it can be found DATAR in France, the National Spatial Planning Committee in Netherlands, and the Federal Committee for Spatial Development in Switzerland.

2.4.2 Policy packages

The policy packages are the previous step for the elaboration of a spatial vision in a territory. They are cross-sectoral policies focused to a field which is related to other sectors and with a spatial impact. In this analysis, whose information has been obtained from the different National Overviews, a classification of countries has been elaborated according to the fields which the policy packages are focused on.

The inter-sectoral policy packages can be focused on:

- Urban aspects
- Transport
- R&D
- Economy
- Spatial planning

There are ten countries with one or more inter-sectoral policy packages. Those countries are Austria, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Spain, Switzerland and UK. The field which the major part of policy packages are addressed to is spatial planning.

Almost the half of all the countries analysed do not have policy packages or there is not information available about it.

Three countries are working on creation of policy packages. They are Greece, Ireland and Sweden.

And finally there are three countries which have an elaborated and developed system of policy packages. Those countries are France, Germany and Netherlands.

The value given to each group is as follows:

- Inter-sectoral:
 - Urban = 0.4
 - Transport = 0.4
 - R&D = 0.4
 - Economy = 0.4

- Spatial planning = 0.4
- Elaborate system of policy packages = 2
- No policy packages or missing info = 0
- Working on creation of policy packages = 0.25

The maximum score that can obtain a country is 2 because or it has inter-sectoral policy packages, or has one of the others.

Part 3. Country Profiles

In this chapter the profile and performance of each country for the indicators analysed above is going to be shown. Due to the great difficulty encountered for the realisation of a more clear synthesis exercise than that made at the Annex B and in order to avoid a repetition of information, the comments for some indicators can be found in the following sections from this Annex B:

- Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective: Section 4 (pages 50-59)
- Partnerships formation and co-operation: Barriers and Catalysts: Section 11 (pages 122-130)
- Experience in working with partnerships: Section 8 (pages 91-98)
- Forms of co-operation: Section 9 (pages 99-108)
- Specific direction in the case of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships: Section 10 (pages 109-121)
- National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development: Section 9 (pages 99-108)

The rest of the indicators will be commented in the following pages.

Austria

“Agreements between the States can only be made about matters of their autonomous sphere of competence and must without delay be brought to the Federal Government's knowledge” (Art. 15a.2 of the Austrian Basic Law). “The formation of County Associations for specific purposes can be planned on the basis of the competent legislation [...]. In so far as such County Associations are to undertake matters within the County's own sphere of competence, the members of the County Association shall be accorded decisive influence upon the performance of the association's functions. The Counties concerned shall be given a hearing prior to the formation of County Associations by way of an executive measure” (Art. 116.4 of the Austrian Basic Law).

Austria participates in two Interreg III B Programmes (Alpine Space and CADSES). The Austrian territories work in a total of 589 projects.

Economic funds that subsidise different kind of projects and single companies exist in nearly every federal state. One regional example

of inter-sectoral policy packages is the Styrian Business Promotion Agency (SFG) which bases its work on four pillars:

- Skills Development.
- Entrepreneurial Spirit.
- Technology, Innovation, Research & Development
- Regions and Inter-regional Networking

SFG integrates existing regional structures and local strengths to achieve a consistent economic bottom-up development in Styria. With co-operation as the guiding principle, projects are initiated at a local level and then lead to regional cross-border partnerships such as the Impetus Centre Radkersburg.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		No
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
Direction of progress...		Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
		State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		Sub-regional and regional levels
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		7.19 per 100000 inhabitants (589 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development		--
Policy packages		Intersectoral: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R&D • Economic

Belgium

The Basic Law of Belgium allows the federation of municipalities and of provinces through their articles 41, 162, 165 and 166 –in the case of the municipalities- and 162 in the case of the provinces.

Belgian territories take part in 290 projects within two Interreg III B Programmes (North Sea Region and North-West Region).

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	No	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Other
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
	Public reaction to government policy and public projects	
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive	
Forms of cooperation	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships	
	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks	
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives	
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
	Private – private agreements (consortia)	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local and sub-regional levels	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	2.77 per 100000 inhabitants (290 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info	

Bulgaria

According to the Bulgarian Basic Law, “municipalities shall be free to associate in the solution of common matters” (article 137.1).

Bulgaria takes part in 51 Interreg III B projects within CADSES.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		Yes
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding National or sub-national legislation and policy
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		--
Direction of progress...		--
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		Local level
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		0.69 per 100000 inhabitants (51 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development		--
Policy packages		No Policy Packages or missing info

Cyprus

Cyprus does not take part in any project of the Interreg III B Initiative, although this country is included in Archimed Programme.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		No
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc. Undermining from external sources
	Catalysts	--
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		--
Direction of progress...		Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		0 per 100000 inhabitants (0 in total)

Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info

Czech Republic

Czech Republic is included in CADSES Programme within Interreg III B Initiative. It takes part in 99 projects.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	No	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Lack of funds and external dependence
		Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
		Public reaction to government policy and public projects
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Limited	
Forms of cooperation	Public – private schemes for public works / construction	
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives	
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	0.97 per 100000 inhabitants (99 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info	

Denmark

Denmark takes part in a total of 468 projects within two Interreg III B Programmes (Baltic Sea Region and North Sea Region).

It has since 1989 been a national strategy that the urban development and the use of transport infrastructures should be coordinated in the Copenhagen Region. New urban developments, which contain job intensive functions or regional services can only be developed near public transport hops (train stations with high frequency service).

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		Yes
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Other
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Extensive
Forms of cooperation		Urban development contracts
Direction of progress...		Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
		State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		8.59 per 100000 inhabitants (468 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development		--
Policy packages		Inter-sectoral: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban • Transport

Estonia

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		No
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		--
Direction of progress...		--

Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local and sub-regional levels
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	28.24 per 100000 (374 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info

1st and 2nd tier of local governments can form leagues and joint institutions together with other local governments, as it is written in article 159 of the Estonian Basic Law.

Estonia takes part in 374 projects within Baltic Sea Region Programme of Interreg III B Initiative.

Finland

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	No	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
	Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants	
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive	
Forms of cooperation	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks	
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives	
	Public – Universities – research associations	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	15.33 per 100000 inhabitants (802 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban • Transport • R&D 	

With regard to the Interreg III B Initiative, Finland takes part in 802 projects within Baltic Sea Region and Northern Periphery Programmes.

The Finnish Ministry of Transport and Communications, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Association of Finnish Local Authorities, Technological Development Centre, Finnish National Road Administration and Finnish Rail Administration launched in 1997 a 5-year-long research and development programme (LYYLI) which primarily concerns the largest built-up areas. The purpose was to provide communities with solutions by means of which necessary transport and travel can be operated with a minimum amount of traffic and by the most environment-friendly transport modes available.

France

According to the French Basic Law (art. 72 paragraph 5): "where the exercise of a power requires the combined action of several territorial units, one of those units or one of their associations may be authorised by statute to organise their joint action".

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	No	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
	Tradition / Culture / Past informal procedures	
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive	
Forms of cooperation	Urban development contracts	
	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships	
	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks	
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives	
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
	Public – Universities – research associations	

Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local, sub-regional and regional levels
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	2.54 per 100000 inhabitants (1549 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	Yes
Policy packages	Elaborate system of policy packages

The French territories take part in a total of seven Interreg III B Programmes (Alpine Space, Atlantic Space, SUDOE, North-West Europe, Western Mediterranean, Reunion and Caribbean Space), with 1549 projects.

Different policies packages with spatial contents are organised in such a way to promote intersectoral policies integration and to enhanced synergies.

Germany

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	Yes	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding National or sub-national legislation and policy
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive	
Forms of cooperation	Urban development contracts	
	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships	
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives	
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
	Public – Universities – research associations	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	1.99 per 100000 inhabitants (1639 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	Elaborate system of policy packages	

Germany takes part in 1639 projects of 5 Interreg III B Programmes (Alpine Space, Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North Sea Region and North West Europe).

Structural policy in the German States is a major example for a policy package, from the governance point of view as well as from the policy point of view.

Greece

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership
		Lack of funds and external dependence
		Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
		Political reasons (e.g. support for or opposition to central government)
		Public reaction to government policy and public projects
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
		Public – private schemes for public works / construction
Direction of progress...		Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		Local level
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		3.25 per 100000 inhabitants (347 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development		Yes
Policy packages		Working on creation of policy packages

With regard to the association of local governments, the Greek Basic Law establishes through its article 102.3 that “the law may provide for compulsory or voluntary associations of local government agencies to execute works or render services; they shall be governed by a board of elected representatives of each municipality or community participating therein in proportion to the population”.

Greece takes part in 347 projects of three Interreg III B Programmes (Archimed, Western Mediterranean and CADSES).

There has been some progress in sectoral policy integration through the management of Structural Funds, where synergies and inconsistencies have been explicitly recognized and acknowledged. However there is still a lot to be done to secure the implementation of these synergies through actual policy packages.

Hungary

One of the tasks of the Hungarian local representative bodies is that “may freely merge with other local representative bodies and create associations of local government for the representation of their interests, may co-operate with the local governments of other countries and may be a member of international associations of local government” (art. 44A h of the Hungarian Basic Law).

Hungary takes part in 161 projects of CADSES Interreg III B Programme.

In Hungary there is no real policy package for inter-sectoral integration. Only some legal background can be found in the Act XXI/1996 on Spatial Planning and Development, which is a piece of legislation launching (or declaring the need of) inter-sectoral policy integration. It stresses that spatial planning and development are inter-sectoral both in the decision making and implementation phase.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership
		Lack of funds and external dependence
		Undeveloped civil society and hierarchical decision-making
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants

Multi-channel	
Experience in working with partnerships	Limited
Forms of cooperation	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships
	Public – private schemes for public works / construction
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local level
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	1.61 per 100000 inhabitants (161 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	Yes
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info

Ireland

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	--	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
	Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants	
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive	
Forms of cooperation	Urban development contracts	
	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships	
	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks	
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives	
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	4.55 per 100000 inhabitants (185 in total)	

Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	Working on creation of policy packages

Ireland Takes part in 185 projects of two Interreg III B Programmes (Atlantic Area and North West Europe).

An inter-ministerial committee has been established at central government level to improve the coordination of different sectoral policies. The two regional development agencies of Shannon Development and Udaras Na Gaeltachta effectively coordinate different sectoral policies within their region, while Partnership for Investment is an initiative by the four local authorities of the Dublin region to promote economic development.

Italy

Italy takes part in 2036 projects of four Interreg III B Programmes (Alpine Space, Archimed, CADSES, and Western Mediterranean).

If we consider the changes underway in programs for intervention in the city and in the territory, the most evident aspects are the multiplication of instruments and/or the new use of more traditional instruments. Two broad and distinct types of programs may be identified, as a function of the various administrations that have promoted their implementation. The first kind of instrument consists of the "complex urban programs" promoted by the Ministry of Public Works on the basis of a number of contracted urban-planning experiences conducted in several regional contexts during the preceding years. The second kind of program, promoted by the Ministry of the Treasury, of the Budget and of Economic Planning during the 1990s, consists of the so-called *programmazione negoziata*

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Complexity
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants

Multi-channel	
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive
Forms of cooperation	Urban development contracts Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	3.50 per 100000 inhabitants (2036 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban • Spatial Planning

Latvia

Latvia takes part in 383 projects of the Baltic Sea Region Programme of Interreg III B Initiative.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	--	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Limited	
Forms of cooperation	--	
Direction of progress...	--	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	16.84 per 100000 inhabitants (383 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic • Spatial Planning 	

Long term economic strategy for Latvia may as well serve as an example of policy package with spatial content, aimed at securing intersectoral policy integration and enhanced synergies.

Lithuania

Lithuania takes part in 384 projects of the Baltic Sea Region Programme of Interreg III B Initiative.

One of the most interesting examples of Lithuania is Vilnius city strategic plan. For Vilnius, a Knowledge Economy means seeking to attract and help establish an innovative, high added value industry in the city. Vilnius is working to create an environment that supports innovations with the participation of an advanced society, to build an appropriate information infrastructure. These steps will ensure a highly educated labour force and will stop the current flow of 'brain power' from the country.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	--	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Lack of funds and external dependence
		Complexity
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Limited	
Forms of cooperation	--	
Direction of progress...	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
	Public – Universities – research associations	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	10.71 per 100000 inhabitants (384 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R&D • Economic 	

Luxembourg

Luxembourg takes part in 15 projects of the North West Europe Programme of Interreg III B Initiative.

The IVL (Integratives Verkehrs- und Landesentwicklungskonzept) is integrating transport and territorial development in a general concept.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		n.d.
Forms of cooperation		Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
Direction of progress...		State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		3.16 per 100000 inhabitants (15 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development		--
Policy packages		Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport • Spatial Planning

Malta

Malta takes part in 18 projects of two Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Archimed and Western Mediterranean).

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership
		Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	Political reasons (e.g. support for or opposition to central government)
		Public reaction to government policy and public projects

Multi-channel	
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive
Forms of cooperation	Urban development contracts
	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships
	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
	Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies
Direction of progress...	Public – private schemes for public works / construction
	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
	Private – private agreements (consortia)
Other form of co-operation, e.g. cooperatives	
Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	4.50 per 100000 inhabitants (18 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info

Netherlands

The Netherlands take part in 481 projects of two Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (North Sea Region and North West Europe).

The ROM-Areas (ROM stands for Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu: Spatial Planning and Environment) form an experiment at regional level to integrate planning and environmental objectives. ABC policy has been introduced before the Vinex. The aim of the ABC-policy,

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		Yes
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Tradition / Culture / Past informal procedures

Multi-channel	
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive
Forms of cooperation	Urban development contracts
	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships
	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
	Private – private agreements (consortia)
Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	2.92 per 100000 inhabitants (481 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	Yes
Policy packages	Elaborate system of policy packages

which was introduced in 1989, has been to reduce commuting and congestion by providing development sites for companies at the right locations (A, B and C locations requiring different sets of features for different kinds of companies).

Norway

Norway takes part in 522 projects of three Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Baltic Sea Region, Northern Periphery and North Sea Region).

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership
	Catalysts	National or sub-national legislation and policy
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		--
Direction of progress...		--

Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	11.32 per 100000 inhabitants (522 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info

Poland

According to the article 172.1 of the Polish Basic Law, "Units of local self-government shall have the right to associate".

Poland takes part in 522 projects of two Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Baltic Sea Region and CADSES).

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		Yes
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Lack of funds and external dependence
		Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
		Political reasons (e.g. support for or opposition to central government)
	Public reaction to government policy and public projects	
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
		Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies
Direction of progress...		State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		Local level
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		1.35 per 100000 inhabitants (522 in total)

Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info

Portugal

The Portuguese Basic Law, through its article 229, establishes that at a regional level only the Autonomous Regions can cooperate between themselves. At local level "Parishes may form associations to administer common interests" (art. 247) and "in order to administer common interests, municipalities may form associations and federations, on which the law may confer specific powers and responsibilities" (art. 253).

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	--	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding Tradition / Culture / Past informal procedures
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Limited	
Forms of cooperation	Urban development contracts	
	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships	
	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks	
	Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies	
Direction of progress...	--	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local and regional level	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	13.13 per 100000 inhabitants (1393 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info	

Portugal takes part in 1393 projects of four Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Atlantic Area, South West Europe, Western Mediterranean and Açores-Madeira-Canarias).

Romania

Romania takes part in 55 projects of CADSES Programme of Interreg III B Initiative.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		Yes
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Limitations on powers and activity potential of partnership
		Lack of funds and external dependence
		Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Limited
Forms of cooperation		Urban development contracts
		Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
		Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies
Direction of progress...		Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives
		Public – Universities – research associations
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		0.25 per 100000 inhabitants (55 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development		--
Policy packages		No Policy Packages or missing info

Slovakia

“The community has the right to pool its resources with those of other communities in the interest of ensuring matters of common interest”, according to the article 66 of the Slovak Basic Law.

Slovakia takes part in 76 projects of CADSES Programme of Interreg III B Initiative.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	--	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Lack of funds and external dependence
		Undeveloped civil society and hierarchical decision-making
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
		Political reasons (e.g. support for or opposition to central government)
		Public reaction to government policy and public projects
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Limited	
Forms of cooperation	Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies	
Direction of progress...	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
	Public – Universities – research associations	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local level	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	1.40 per 100000 inhabitants (76 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info	

Slovenia

Slovenia takes part in 235 projects of two Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Alpine Space and CADSES).

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	--	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Lack of funds and external dependence
		Communication problems between participants, antagonisms, mutual suspicions etc.
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Limited	
Forms of cooperation	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks	
	Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies	
	Public – private schemes for public works / construction	
Direction of progress...	Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives	
	State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation	
	Private – private agreements (consortia)	
	Public – Universities – research associations	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	11.69 per 100000 inhabitants (235 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info	

Spain

With regard to the allowing associations of local governments by the Basic Law, "Groupings of different municipalities of the province may be created". Spain is the only country where an association of territorial governments is forbidden. It happens at regional level and is established in the article 145.1 of the Spanish Constitution.

Spain takes part in 2064 projects of four Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Atlantic Area, South West Europe, Western Mediterranean and Açores-Madeira-Canarias).

At Regional level, as the territorial competencies lie on the Autonomies, these kinds of policy packages with spatial content are specific for each of them. For example, in Catalunya, there is the General Territorial Plan.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	Yes	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	Complexity
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
	Tradition / Culture / Past informal procedures	
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive	
Forms of cooperation	--	
Direction of progress...	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships	
	Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks	
	Co-operation in the context of spatial planning studies	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	Local level Prohibition for regional level	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	4.78 per 100000 inhabitants (2064 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Planning 	

Sweden

Sweden takes part in 1479 projects of three Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Baltic Sea Region, Northern Periphery and North Sea Region).

A cross-sectoral policy that influences all Swedish governmental agencies' work and policymaking is that of sustainable development. The governmental policy on sustainable development is assembled in the national policy on sustainable development, as well as issues of sustainable development are reflected in several policy documents.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination	Yes	
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding
		National or sub-national legislation and policy
	Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants	
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships	Extensive	
Forms of cooperation	--	
Direction of progress...	Urban development contracts	
	Specific urban regeneration contracts and / or partnerships	
	Public – private schemes for public works / construction	
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--	
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	16.36 per 100000 inhabitants (1479 in total)	
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--	
Policy packages	Working on creation of policy packages	

Switzerland

According to the article 48 of the Swiss Basic Law, "The Cantons may enter into inter-cantonal treaties, and may create common organizations and institutions".

Switzerland takes part in 223 projects of three Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Alpine Space, North West Europe and Western Mediterranean).

An example for a policy package is the agglomeration policy. Another example is the policy package of New Regional Policy, which is currently an important issue in Swiss policy discussion.

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding National or sub-national legislation and policy
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Extensive
Forms of cooperation		Urban development contracts Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
		State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
Direction of progress...		State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation
Territorial co-operation		
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations		Regional level
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB		2.96 per 100000 inhabitants (223 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation		
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development		Yes
Policy packages		Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban • Economic • Spatial Planning

United Kingdom

Pre-conditions to horizontal co-ordination and co-operation		
Priority emphasis on horizontal coordination		--
Partnership formation and cooperation	Barriers	--
	Catalysts	EU policies and funding National or sub-national legislation and policy
		Pressures to gain access to EU or national funding sources and economic interests of participants
Multi-channel		
Experience in working with partnerships		Extensive
Forms of cooperation		Urban development contracts Local development / planning agreements and / or frameworks
		Public – private co-operation in economic initiatives State – civil society (NGOs, public) co-operation

Territorial co-operation	
Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations	--
Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	1.27 per 100000 inhabitants (763 in total)
Cross-sectoral co-operation	
National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	--
Policy packages	Intersectoral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Planning

United Kingdom takes part in 763 projects of four Programmes of Interreg III B Initiative (Atlantic Area, North West Europe, Northern Periphery and North Sea Region).

A good example of policy packages are Local Development Frameworks, which are part of the new planning system introduced in 2004. The local development documents will “involve linking strategies and programmes that exist at the local level together through the planning system”.

Part 4. Sources

EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATORY NETWORK (2006): *ESPON Project 2.3.2. Governance of territorial and urban policies from EU to local level. Final Report. Annex B: Synthesis of National Overviews.*

EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATORY NETWORK (2006): *ESPON Project 2.3.2. Integrated Analysis of Transnational and National Territories based on ESPON Results.* (pages 224-292).

ANNEX 1

Tables of indicators

Table 3: Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective

Country	Total	Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective
		2
Bulgaria	2	1
Denmark	2	1
Germany	2	1
Netherlands	2	1
Poland	2	1
Romania	2	1
Spain	2	1
Sweden	2	1
Austria	0	
Belgium	0	
Cyprus	0	
Czech Rep.	0	
Estonia	0	
Finland	0	
France	0	
Greece	0	
Hungary	0	
Ireland	0	
Italy	0	
Latvia	0	
Lithuania	0	
Luxembourg	0	
Malta	0	
Norway	0	
Portugal	0	
Slovakia	0	
Slovenia	0	
Switzerland	0	
UK	0	
		8

Table 4: Barriers for partnerships formation and co-operation

Country	Total	Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Barriers		
		0	1 to 2	3 to 7
		2	1	0,5
Finland	2	1		
France	2	1		
Germany	2	1		
Ireland	2	1		
Latvia	2	1		
Luxembourg	2	1		
Netherlands	2	1		
Sweden	2	1		
Switzerland	2	1		
UK	2	1		
Austria	1		1	
Belgium	1		1	
Bulgaria	1		1	
Czech Rep.	1		1	
Denmark	1		1	
Estonia	1		1	
Hungary	1		1	
Italy	1		1	
Lithuania	1		1	
Malta	1		1	
Norway	1		1	
Poland	1		1	
Portugal	1		1	
Slovakia	1		1	
Slovenia	1		1	
Spain	1		1	
Cyprus	0,5			1
Greece	0,5			1
Romania	0,5			1
		10	16	3

Table 5. Catalysts for partnerships formation and co-operation

Country	Total	Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Catalysts		
		0	1 to 3	4 to 6
		0	1	2
Belgium	2			1
France	2			1
Greece	2			1
Poland	2			1
Slovakia	2			1
Spain	2			1
Sweden	2			1
Austria	1		1	
Bulgaria	1		1	
Czech Rep.	1		1	
Denmark	1		1	
Estonia	1		1	
Finland	1		1	
Germany	1		1	
Hungary	1		1	
Ireland	1		1	
Italy	1		1	
Latvia	1		1	
Lithuania	1		1	
Luxembourg	1		1	
Malta	1		1	
Netherlands	1		1	
Norway	1		1	
Portugal	1		1	
Romania	1		1	
Slovenia	1		1	
Switzerland	1		1	
UK	1		1	
Cyprus	0	1		
		1	21	7

Table 6. Experience in working with partnerships

Country	Total	Experience in working with partnerships	
		Limited	Extensive
		1	2
Belgium	2		1
Denmark	2		1
Finland	2		1
France	2		1
Germany	2		1
Ireland	2		1
Italy	2		1
Malta	2		1
Netherlands	2		1
Spain	2		1
Sweden	2		1
Switzerland	2		1
UK	2		1
Austria	1	1	
Bulgaria	1	1	
Cyprus	1	1	
Czech Rep.	1	1	
Estonia	1	1	
Greece	1	1	
Hungary	1	1	
Latvia	1	1	
Lithuania	1	1	
Norway	1	1	
Poland	1	1	
Portugal	1	1	
Romania	1	1	
Slovakia	1	1	
Slovenia	1	1	
Luxembourg	0		
		15	13

Table 7. Forms of co-operation

Country	Total	Forms of co-operation		
		0	1 to 2	3 to 5
		0	1	2
France	2			1
Ireland	2			1
Malta	2			1
Netherlands	2			1
Portugal	2			1
Romania	2			1
Slovenia	2			1
Austria	1		1	
Belgium	1		1	
Czech Rep.	1		1	
Denmark	1		1	
Finland	1		1	
Germany	1		1	
Greece	1		1	
Hungary	1		1	
Italy	1		1	
Luxembourg	1		1	
Poland	1		1	
Slovakia	1		1	
Switzerland	1		1	
UK	1		1	
Bulgaria	0	1		
Cyprus	0	1		
Estonia	0	1		
Latvia	0	1		
Lithuania	0	1		
Norway	0	1		
Spain	0	1		
Sweden	0	1		
		8	14	7

Table 8. Specific direction of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships

Country	Total	Direction of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships		
		0	1 to 2	3 to 5
		0	1	2
Belgium	2			1
Czech Rep.	2			1
Denmark	2			1
Finland	2			1
France	2			1
Germany	2			1
Ireland	2			1
Lithuania	2			1
Malta	2			1
Netherlands	2			1
Romania	2			1
Slovakia	2			1
Slovenia	2			1
Spain	2			1
Sweden	2			1
UK	2			1
Austria	1		1	
Cyprus	1		1	
Greece	1		1	
Hungary	1		1	
Italy	1		1	
Luxembourg	1		1	
Poland	1		1	
Switzerland	1		1	
Bulgaria	0	1		
Estonia	0	1		
Latvia	0	1		
Norway	0	1		
Portugal	0	1		
		5	8	16

Table 9. Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations

Country	Total	Constitutional reconnaissance of territorial associations			
		Local level	Sub-regional level	Regional level	Prohibition of association for one or more levels
		0,67	0,67	0,67	-0,67
France	2	1	1	1	
Austria	1,33		1	1	
Belgium	1,33	1	1		
Estonia	1,33	1	1		
Portugal	1,33	1		1	
Bulgaria	1,33	1			
Greece	0,67	1			
Hungary	0,67	1			
Poland	0,67	1			
Slovakia	0,67	1			
Switzerland	0,67			1	
Cyprus	0				
Czech Rep.	0				
Denmark	0				
Finland	0				
Germany	0				
Ireland	0				
Italy	0				
Latvia	0				
Lithuania	0				
Luxembourg	0				
Malta	0				
Netherlands	0				
Norway	0				
Romania	0				
Slovenia	0				
Spain	0	1			1
Sweden	0				
UK	0				
		10	4	4	1

Table 10. Participation in projects under Interreg IIIB

Country	Total	Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB (projects / 100 000 inhabitants)			
		0,01 to 1	1,01 to 4	4,01 to 8	8,01 and more
		0,25	0,75	1,25	2
Denmark	2				1
Estonia	2				1
Finland	2				1
Latvia	2				1
Lithuania	2				1
Norway	2				1
Portugal	2				1
Slovenia	2				1
Sweden	2				1
Austria	1,25			1	
Ireland	1,25			1	
Malta	1,25			1	
Spain	1,25			1	
Belgium	0,75		1		
France	0,75		1		
Germany	0,75		1		
Greece	0,75		1		
Hungary	0,75		1		
Italy	0,75		1		
Luxembourg	0,75		1		
Netherlands	0,75		1		
Poland	0,75		1		
Slovakia	0,75		1		
Switzerland	0,75		1		
UK	0,75		1		
Bulgaria	0,25	1			
Czech Rep.	0,25	1			
Romania	0,25	1			
Cyprus	0				
		3	12	4	9

Table 11. National / Federal agencies, councils and/or committees for spatial development

Country	Total	National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development
		2
France	2	1
Greece	2	1
Hungary	2	1
Netherlands	2	1
Switzerland	2	1
Austria	0	
Belgium	0	
Bulgaria	0	
Cyprus	0	
Czech Rep.	0	
Denmark	0	
Estonia	0	
Finland	0	
Germany	0	
Ireland	0	
Italy	0	
Latvia	0	
Lithuania	0	
Luxembourg	0	
Malta	0	
Norway	0	
Poland	0	
Portugal	0	
Romania	0	
Slovakia	0	
Slovenia	0	
Spain	0	
Sweden	0	
UK	0	
		5

Table 12. Policy packages

Country	Total	Policy packages							
		Intersectoral					Elaborate system of policy packages	No Policy Packages or missing info	Working on creation of policy packages
		Urban	Transport	R&D	Economic	Spatial Planning			
		0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	2	0	0,25
France	2						1		
Germany	2						1		
Netherlands	2						1		
Finland	1,2	1	1	1					
Switzerland	1,2	1			1	1			
Austria	0,8			1	1				
Denmark	0,8	1	1						
Italy	0,8	1				1			
Latvia	0,8				1	1			
Lithuania	0,8			1	1				
Luxembourg	0,8		1			1			
Spain	0,4					1			
UK	0,4					1			
Greece	0,25								1
Ireland	0,25								1
Sweden	0,25								1
Belgium	0							1	
Bulgaria	0							1	
Cyprus	0							1	
Czech Rep.	0							1	
Estonia	0							1	
Hungary	0							1	
Malta	0							1	
Norway	0							1	
Poland	0							1	
Portugal	0							1	
Romania	0							1	
Slovakia	0							1	
Slovenia	0							1	

ANNEX 2

Data List

	Priority emphasis on horizontal co-ordination objective	Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Barriers	Partnership formation and co-operation: Number of Catalysts	Experience in working with partnerships	Forms of co-operation	Direction of progress towards horizontal co-operation and partnerships	Constitutional guarantee of territorial associations	Participation in projects under the Community Initiative Interreg IIIB	National and / or federal agencies / councils / committees for spatial development	Policy packages
ESPON Project	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.3.2	2.4.2	2.3.2	2.3.2
Source of data within the project	National Technical University of Athens	National Technical University of Athens	National Technical University of Athens	National Technical University of Athens	National Technical University of Athens	National Technical University of Athens			National Technical University of Athens	Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Local
Author										
Regional reference	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0	NUTS 0
Time reference	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2005	2005	2006	2006
Origin of data							http://confinder.richmond.edu/			
Source of use	Final Report Annex B (Section 4)	Final Report Annex B (Section 11)	Final Report Annex B (Section 11)	Final Report Annex B (Section 8)	Final Report Annex B (Section 9)	Final Report Annex B (Section 10)	National Basic Laws	ESPON Project 2.4.2 Final Report. (pp. 224-292)	Final Report Annex B (Section 9)	National overviews
Calculation algorithm								Number of projects / 100.000 inhabitants		
NUTS Version	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006
Type of data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data	Raw data

ESPON project 2.3.2

Governance of Territorial and Urban
Policies From EU to Local Level

Annex Report F

**Spatial Planning Styles: A new Physiognomy for
Europe**

F

ESPON Project 2.3.2

GOVERNANCE OF TERRITORIAL AND URBAN POLICIES FROM EU TO LOCAL LEVEL

Annex Report F

Spatial Planning Styles: A new Physiognomy for Europe

Evidence of convergence towards a common model of styles of planning in Europe: *General presence of land use; convergence towards the comprehensive integrated approach and the regional economic approach style, a clear mixture of styles intra-state*

Joaquín Farinós, Jody Milder & Mauro Payá Abad

Separate volumes

Project Report

Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level

Annex report A

Data & Indicators

Identifying Favourable Pre-Conditions for Territorial Governance
Actions

Annex report B

Synthesis of National Overviews

Annex report C

Case Study Synthesis

Annex report D

Multi-Level/Vertical Dimension of Territorial Governance

Annex report E

Horizontal Dimension of Territorial Governance



INSTITUTO INTER-UNIVERSITARIO de DESARROLLO LOCAL



This report represents the final results of a research project conducted within the framework of the ESPON 2000-2006 programme, partly financed through the INTERREG programme.

The partnership behind the ESPON programme consists of the EU Commission and the Member States of the EU25, plus Norway and Switzerland. Each partner is represented in the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

This report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the members of the Monitoring Committee.

Information on the ESPON programme and projects can be found on www.espon.lu

The web site provides the possibility to download and examine the most recent document produced by finalised and ongoing ESPON projects.

ISBN number: 84-690-3088-4
This basic report exists only in an electronic version.

© The ESPON Monitoring Committee and the partners of the projects mentioned.

Printing, reproduction or quotation is authorized provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is forwarded to the ESPON Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.

Table of contents

0	General introduction	7
1	Lessons from the ECSP	8
1.1	The heritage of a classification	8
1.2	Towards an operational definition on styles of spatial planning	11
2	Crossing borders; the mutual relations between the planning styles	12
2.1	As a succession of planning styles	12
2.2	The hypercube of spatial planning approach	14
2.3	The European influence: giving a framework for cross-pollination	16
3	Trends on Styles of spatial planning according to NOs	18
3.1	Identified movements within the EU of 15	20
3.1.1	Movement towards regional economic approach	22
3.1.2	Movement towards comprehensive planning	23
3.1.3	Movement towards comprehensive integrated approach, regional economic approach and land use planning	26
3.2	Shining a light on the classifications of the newly classified countries	30
3.2.1	Countries that adopted a Comprehensive integrated and/or Regional economic approach of planning	31
3.2.2	Other models than the comprehensive integrated approach planning	40
3.3	Synthesis of chapter 3	48
4.	Intra-State Mixture from a Multilevel point of view	52
4.1	Relation between overall planning style classification and classification by level	52

4.2	How comprehensiveness of planning styles is taking place in the 29 Espon countries	69
4.2.1	Countries that can be classified under the comprehensive integrated approach	73
4.2.2	Countries that cannot be classified under the comprehensive integrated approach	84
4.3	Regional economic approach	87
4.4	Land use planning and the urbanism tradition	89
4.5	Synthesis chapter 4	89
5	Final conclusions	91
Figures		
1	The four dimensional hypercube of territorial approach	14
2	Options for Spatial Development Planning	15
3	Movement within the EU 15 between the Styles of spatial planning	48
Tables		
1	Differences between overall planning style and planning style by level	53
2	Planning styles by level vs. competencies by level	55
3	Scores by planning styles by country	63
4	Classification of countries based on level of comprehensiveness	71
5	Division of planning powers	98

Sources		96
Maps		
1	Classification of the EU15 in the four traditions of spatial planning according to the Compendium	10
2	Movement within the EU 15 between the Styles of spatial planning and characterisation of New Member States + 2 +2	49
3	Presence of the urbanism tradition	65
4	Presence of land use planning	66
5	Presence of the regional economic approach	67
6	Level of importance of the comprehensive integrated approach	68
7	Level of development of the comprehensive integrated approach in spatial planning	72

Evidence of convergence towards a common model of styles of planning in Europe

General presence of Land Use; convergence towards the Comprehensive integrated approach and the Regional economic approach Style. Clear mixture of styles intra-state

General introduction

In the following annex an analysis will follow that focuses on the changes that have been taking place in the European field in terms of the styles of spatial planning. The starting point is the European Union Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies in which four systems were distinguished. The Compendium however is outdated in several ways. First of all it didn't include the New Member States (+ Switzerland + United Kingdom/+ Romania + Bulgaria). Furthermore the field is not static but dynamic, so there have been and still are changes taking place. The focus here is to map those changes and allow a first image of the New Member States (+2+2) to be drawn up. The four systems that were distinguished in the Compendium serve as the starting point of this analysis in order to make comparison possible and achieve a modest update of the Compendium. The Compendium speaks of planning traditions, so does this annex, however an additional comment has to be made here. In the old EU of 15 one could speak of "true" planning traditions in the sense that the Compendium distinguishes four categories, where the models that were used in the former Socialist countries do not fall into any of these. In the EU of 15 the countries have a long history in planning within the four Compendium categories, while in the New Member States many of the countries radically broke with their (shared communist) past and started setting up a new planning system, or at least drastically revised it. In those countries it would be better to speak of planning styles. In order to not speak in different terms throughout the document we choose to speak of *styles of spatial planning*. When one categorises there is always the risk of losing details, because one 'forces' individual cases into the classification boxes. The categories used in the Compendium might be somehow outdated for several reasons, such as for instance the fading of borders between the different styles of spatial planning, however they still provide a useful perspective from which to qualify

and compare the old and the new situation. In order not to lose too many details of individual cases the analysis will consist out of 4 parts. The first part is formed by a short overview of the starting point that is the compendium and the styles of spatial planning.

After this an analysis will follow that is based on the analysis of the National Overviews. Here the old situation in the times of the Compendium in the EU15 will be compared with the current situation and the movements that took place will be mapped. The New Member States +2+2 will also be classified for the first time within the four categories mentioned in the Compendium. This will lead to an image of the movements that took place within the EU of 15 and a classification of all 29 European countries within these styles.

The third part will move away from the general overview and will dive into the individual states in order to do draw up an image with more nuance and detail, an image on the intra-state level. Here the analysis will connect the styles of spatial planning on the different levels, to the overall classification and to level of competency per level. Also in this part the level of comprehensiveness will be analysed in order to get a realistic image of practice and not just of theory.

The final part will present the main conclusions and will refer to an alternative classification which is proposed in annex B.

1. Lessons from the ECSP

1.1 The heritage of a classification

In the middle of the 1990s a first attempt was made to categorize the styles of spatial planning and traditions of the European Union. This resulted in the European Union Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies in which four systems were distinguished:

1. The regional economic approach (French Model):

The aim of the regional economic approach is to let regional economic development conform to some overall idea formulated by a central agency, using powers and funds at its disposal. Under this approach spatial planning has a very broad meaning relating to the pursuit of wide social and economic objectives; especially in relation to disparities ... between different regions... Where this approach... is dominant, central government inevitably plays an important role (CEC, 1997, p. 36).

2. The comprehensive integrated approach (German Model):

The regional economic approach has a counterpart, called the 'comprehensive integrated approach'. This is an approach that is conducted through a very systematic and formal hierarchy of plans

from national to local level, which co-ordinate public sector activity across different sectors but focus more specifically on spatial co-ordination than economic development. ...This tradition is necessarily associated with mature systems. It requires responsive and sophisticated planning institutions and mechanisms and considerable political commitment ...Public sector investments in bringing about the realisation of the planning framework is also the norm (CEC, 1997, pp. 36–37).

3. Land use spatial planning (British Model):


The planning has the goal to control the change of land use. This focus has strong roots in the spatial planning of the United Kingdom. Here planning is closely associated with the narrower task of controlling the change of use of land at the strategic and local levels...., where regulation has been and is vigorously and effectively pursued with the objective of ensuring that development and growth are sustainable. In this situation, local authorities undertake most of the planning work, but the central administration is also able to exercise a degree of power, either through supervising the system and for setting central policy objectives.

4. Urbanism tradition (Mediterranean Model):

This is a style of spatial planning characteristic for the Mediterranean countries that takes place on the local level through building regulations. It has a strong architectural flavour and concern with urban design, townscape and building control....regulation has been undertaken through rigid zoning and codes. There is a multiplicity of laws and regulations but the systems are not so well established, and have not commanded great political priority or general public support. As a result they have been less effective in controlling development. Like the other traditions above, it is possible to recognize change here with government at all levels making considerable efforts to establish more firm planning control and to broaden the concerns of spatial planning.

The Compendium lead to map 1 as can be seen on the following page.

Map 1: Classification of the EU15 in the four traditions of spatial planning according to the Compendium



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

- Regional Economic
- Urbanism
- Land Use
- Comprehensive Integrated
- Non EU-15 Members

Source: European Compendium of Spatial Planning

Map 1 comments: The map shows the four styles of spatial planning as distinguished in the European Union Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies in the EU15. Furthermore it shows an additional category in which all non EU Members are classified which are analysed further on in this annex. These countries are the New Member States + Switzerland and Norway + Bulgaria and Romania.

1.2 Towards an operational definition on styles of spatial planning

The Compendium was however a first attempt and is already outdated in several ways. It was for instance made in the EU of 15 times and in the meantime several major changes took place. Nowadays the EU includes 10 New Member States for instance (this project also includes Norway and Switzerland next to Romania and Bulgaria). Furthermore the systems of spatial planning within the old Member States also have not been standing still but are subject to constant change. New problems arise or old problems are better understood and need to be dealt with, the EU through their Community Initiatives; guidelines, laws etc. also have their influence. ESPON project 2.3.2 has a unique inside view in the new developments that took and are currently taking place. It offers the possibility to compare the old with the new situation and provide a state of the art image of the current situation which will be drawn in the following paper.

On the other hand, when does something fall under the header 'Comprehensive Integrated Approach' or any of the other headers? In short what are the key characteristics that define the 4 planning styles?

First of all land use planning and urban planning could be seen as closely related. This is even more so when the demographic growth mainly takes place in the urban settlements, or even without correspondent demographic growth. Thus the local level and the urban level overlap, or simply which are not land use planning but only variable building regulations, which allows that the built environment is progressively increasing, especially in coastal areas, as is the case in some of the Mediterranean countries, and specially in Spain in recent times. For this reason, despite their close relation, it is necessary to maintain this distinction between the two. However, it would be possible and better at times to place urban planning under the umbrella of land use planning, with one of the main differences that the focus is more on the urban scale than on the more general local level. There are obviously more factors than scale that make the difference, but the geographical scale is an important one.

Urbanism tradition is the managing of space through the smallest geographical unit available, the manmade physical structure, through building regulations. Countries that can be classified under the urbanism tradition do usually not have spatial plans on a higher scale, but only have building regulations. In practice plans on a higher scale

are rare and limited. Many times they are also conflictive or hard to realize. If there are there they have a different focus, an urban focus.

Land use planning is the managing of space through the development of a local plan for the future use of land in accordance with the lands capabilities through zoning laws based on the regulation and control of land controlling the changes of use.

In the case a country has a land use planning style it has a land use plan in the form of a municipal or other plans at the local level such as for instance a land use designation plan. Furthermore plans on a higher scale are not common practice. All land use plans distinguish at least three categories of land use, namely: infrastructure, urban and open land.

Regional economic approach is the managing of space through the development of regional plans that are made by either the regions or the national level. Regional planning deals with the efficient placement of infrastructure and zoning of economic activities and population for the sustainable growth of a region, it addresses region-wide issues such as environment, social and economic concerns. It pursues a balanced spatial development in all fields (spatial justice). When a country can be categorized under the regional economic approach style it has regional plans, national plans with a regional focus and local plans that are there to execute the regional plans (usually because hierarchic relations among levels and spatial justice presuppose presence of a main tutorial level).

Comprehensive integrated approach is the managing of space through a hierarchical system of spatial plans on several geographical levels taking into account all relevant sectors that have an impact on the spatial development. It is related with land use and cross-sectoral coordination. Countries that fall under the comprehensive integrated approach planning always have a hierarchy of plans and institutions with a planning competency furthermore one can see vertical and horizontal coordination between the different sectors and levels taking place.

2. Crossing borders; the mutual relations between the planning styles

2.1 A succession of planning styles

If one sees the styles of spatial planning in a continuum one could see them as answers to the growing complexity of the environment

due to the interference of human action or the changed dynamics of the physical environment. The relation between the urban, land use and comprehensive integrated approaches could thus also be seen as a succession of planning styles; and those related with the regional economic. It does not mean that they are all in the same family and it also doesn't say that the consecutive styles of spatial planning are an evolution of planning styles. They are in a continuum, which is just one way of looking at it, with the main focus the dimension of geographical scale.

The urbanism tradition provides sufficient answers and grip on the urban environment when there is only build environment and non-build environment. One can manage everything on the municipal level through building permits. However the disadvantage is that space is managed through the smallest geographical unit available, the physical structures themselves. Also the dynamics of the system in case of changes cannot be intercepted and responded to in a proper way due the lack of a ore useful systemic approach.

Those limitations can be overcome to step up one geographical scale which can be found in the land use planning style. This made it possible to manage the land use on the local level through local plans that also included the relations between the different uses of land in order to be able to balance the functions and come to a more harmonious development. This system also makes it possible to deal with the change of land use, to intercept the dynamics.

It however still sees things on the local level and an overall context is lacking, an overall picture that can be found on once again a higher geographical scale, the regional scale.

The regional economic approach style provides an overall view and tries to deal with problems that can be dealt with more adequately on the regional level, such as social, economic and environmental problems. Due to the higher scale it also can detect unbalances and try to counteract as to promote economic, social and territorial cohesion. The problems that rise with this model though are that the plans that are developed are almost always sectoral causing cross sectoral coordination problems. Furthermore the hierarchy between the different levels of plans and institutions is mostly focussed on a rather one way communication, top down.

The comprehensive integrated approach however goes even further by adding all relevant sectors that have a spatial impact and by creating a complex hierarchy between levels and plans (more details


in section 4). There are many variants in the execution of this planning style, with terms such as counter current principle, subsidiarity, vertical and horizontal coordination, etc.

As can be seen above especially the urban, land use and comprehensive integrated approach are very much related and all have a similar background, while the regional economic approach style is less related to the others and also has different origins in France. Nevertheless all styles can be linked with the new spatial interrelations at the global level as a consequence of the economic globalisation process: it adds to the scale, which before only was a dimensional category, new functions (multilevel governance), and also leads territories to a need of cooperation and cross-sectoral focus when designing and implementing policies (double dimension – respectively French and German oriented- of the horizontal dimension of territorial governance).

2.2 The hypercube of spatial planning approach


Another way of relating the planning styles, between states but also between political-administrative levels within each one, is through a cube. In ESPON project 3.1 the so called ‘*The four-dimensional “hypercube” of territorial approach*’ is shown as a next step of the 3-level approach of ESPON. It makes it possible to assess results on three different geographical levels (macro, meso, micro). It was first introduced in the “Crete” Guidance Paper, and suggested to explore the 3 levels not just additively but simultaneously considering the upper level as a spatial context for the lower level (see the Fig. 1).

Figure 1: The four dimensional hypercube of territorial approach



If one takes this cube as reference and applies it to the options of spatial development the relations can be seen between the three different dimensions such as in figure 2. It would be very valuable if all the countries could be located in this cube, but this is currently not feasible without further research.

Figure 2: Options for Spatial Development Planning



Source: Farinós, J. (2006): from author presentation on 'Methods of Territorial Analysis' Workshop, Department of Geography, urbanism and Spatial Planning, University of Cantabria, Santander 18 February. Adapted.

The cube makes it possible to combine the different styles of spatial planning with different ways of governance. In this cube every possible mix between the three scales is possible offering a huge array of planning styles. This could be an answer to a way of classifying the many different planning styles and crossovers that exist nowadays. Over time the styles of spatial planning kept on developing which led to the fact that the lines separating cannot be drawn as sharp as in the past. The different planning families are not necessarily enemies of each other but very often exist next to one another and even exchange ideas and concepts between them and in doing so the borders between the different styles fade. The ESDP also played a role in this as a catalyst, and originally was supported by

several specific Member States that expected they could steer the process in certain direction, towards the comprehensive integrated approach spatial planning.

2.3 The European influence: giving a framework for cross-pollination

When it comes to the relation between the different planning styles and their development a parallel can be drawn with the political science on transplantation. In a discussion paper by K. Lalenis, M. de Jong and V. Mamadouh (2003 on families of nations and institutional transplantation, some very interesting basic principles are formulated that are applicable in our situation, as well related to the ESDP. It talks about the 'goodness of fit' argument which can predict the suitability of an institutional transplant. It states that *'A common application of the goodness of fit perspective lies on the assumption that: 1) families of countries can be distinguished, and 2) the characteristics of each of these families are influential to the suitability of any potential institutional transplant in such a way that transplants between members of the same family are less difficult than borrowing between family'*. Then the paper goes into more detail about the concept of 'families of nations' and distinguishes these families, but although parallels can still be drawn and lessons learned the complexity also grows substantially. So how does this relate to our story? It is here where the influence and the success of the ESDP as just one example come into view. The Structural Funds and other European instruments also play a role. The ESDP formulated ideas that very much coincide with the comprehensive integrated approach planning method. The ESDP and its ideas can thus be seen as the organ or joint of organs from which to choose that 'has to be' transplanted and one can use the goodness of fit argument in order to predict the suitability. Although it has to be said that it is easy to exaggerate the ESDP influence in two ways. It is easy to overestimate its importance as well as to underestimate its importance. The influence of the ESDP remains hard to measure as earlier papers, studies, etc also experienced. Here reference also has to be made to ESPON project 2.3.1 in relation to the influence of the ESDP, while ESPON project 2.3.2 doesn't have the influence of the ESDP as a goal. Of course it will be mentioned at times, but always as just one of the many factors that has influenced the changes in terms of governance and specifically in the field of spatial planning. The parallel with the transplantation theory is only useful to a certain extend. The ESDP is not really an organ which is transplanted directly into a system, but is more of a process and complex of ideas that can

or cannot be adopted by the new hosts on a voluntary base. One on one transplantations are usually not successful, especially not of concepts as complex as these, due to the fact that the local characteristics vary greatly from place to place and thus a measure can have completely different effects in the various countries. Therefore these local circumstances should be taken into account if a country decides to adopt some or the complete complex of concepts of the ESDP for one reason or the other.

In ESPON project 2.3.1 there are several interesting remarks concerning the ESDP and its impact. It can be read that the ESDP mainly was important and thus had an impact in the old Member States in the period from 1997 till 1999. It can also be seen that the impact in the countries that had the biggest contribution to drafting the ESDP (France, Germany and The Netherlands) is limited due to the fact that a lot of the concepts in the ESDP were formulated by them. This does however not mean there was no impact in those countries whatsoever. The ESDP was a team effort and the different planning families were already involved in a process of 10 year of cross-pollination leading to a common vision that was agreed upon by all member states. This means that in these 10 years elements from the different planning families were contributed to this report demonstrating that a body with different donors can be as vital as the ESDP was. Due to the fact that the ESDP was not legally binding its direct impact has been limited in these countries. However the ESDP inspired several national plans of countries that were in the process of making their national or regional spatial plans. A few examples here are the national plan of Luxembourg as well as the regional plan of Wallonie, several autonomous regions in Spain or some of the New Member States, like for instance Slovakia or Hungary.

Furthermore it is interesting to note that the ESDP became relevant in the New Member States after its publication in 1999 due to the fact that they were not involved in the drafting process. The result of this is that due to the fluid conditions of these future Member States the ESDP did have quite an impact on many of them. One does however need to keep in mind that there is no country in which the ESDP alone has led to changes; the ESDP almost always had an indirect impact making it hard to measure the true success of the ESDP. Although for example it can be said that the ESDP had no impact whatsoever in Cyprus, Malta and Estonia, while the influence in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia has been quite substantial. A very interesting point is that due to the increased amount of Member States the differences between European regions grew deeper and

the whole situation is more heterogeneous from the social-economic, governance and spatial point of view. However due to the convergence that is taking place within the planning families the differences slowly start to decrease again. The transplantation of the concepts of the ESDP under which the comprehensive planning style was in way easier in the New Member States in the case of the former socialist countries due to the fact that a lot of these countries abolished their old centralistic systems and started a new chapter in their history. Some concepts of the ESDP in several cases together with of course many other EU guidelines, programmes, etc. were embraced by the New Member States in order to fulfil the accession requirements and the requirements set by the Structural Funds in order to be able to apply to them.

3. Trends on Styles of spatial planning according to NOs

What movement can be seen? How has the EU of 15 been moving since the last time it was analysed by the European Compendium? What is the position of the New Member States within these styles of spatial planning? These questions will be answered in the next paragraphs based on information from the National Overviews for 2.3.2 ESPON project. However this movement can be seen from two perspectives. Chapter three tries to get a better insight on the level of the countries in general while chapter four will go more into the individual countries in order to overcome the problem of generalisation and to acquire a more accurate picture of reality.

In general it can be said that the classification of planning systems in Europe is not an easy task and the picture that will be drawn today will already be outdated by the developments of tomorrow, especially within Eastern Europe the changes are taking place incredibly fast. It can be seen as an iterative process.

In an attempt to make a next step after the qualification that was used in the European Compendium four distinctive perspectives on European spatial planning were developed in an article by Janin Rivolin and Faludi (2005)¹, namely the: North-Western, British, Nordic and Mediterranean. This qualification is relevant due to the fact that it also notes the relation of the comprehensive integrated approach and regional economic approach in one of the perspectives

¹ Janin, U. & Faludi, A. (2005): Regional perspectives on European spatial planning

and thus shines a little light on this issue. Furthermore it too recognises the special position the Nordic countries have in Europe.

In short the **North-Western perspective** has dominated the ESDP development. This perspective corresponds in one way or another to a combination of French, German and Dutch planning approaches. The French *aménagement du territoire*, a nonstatutory approach rooted in intervention by the central state in territorial development has been the main inspiration for the planning model embraced by the ESDP. The Germans succeeded in imposing an intergovernmental rather than a Community method on the whole ESDP process inspired by their federal constitution. The Dutch acted mainly as a proactive mediator between the two bigger EU Member States' intentions due to the fact that they were mainly interested in the development of the European dimension of planning.

The **British perspective** falls together with land use planning and is an exception among north-western European countries. In 1997 the biggest change could be observed in the countries' attitude towards the EU at the time the new government took seat, which indeed originates within the framework of EU territorial policy. Although spatial planning in the UK predominantly is a local activity now also the importance of the national level of planning policy making is seen as fundamental to the trajectory of the whole planning process. Even some progress has already been made in for instance the development of their own planning framework in Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Royal Town Planning Institute is advancing in a proposal for a UK spatial planning framework.

The **Nordic perspective** in which the planning systems are rooted in the municipal level and with the exception of Denmark, lack any comprehensive national planning. Because of this they encountered European spatial planning with a certain level of difficulty. A strong feeling 'eccentricity' exists in relation to the core of Europe which was also expressed in the homemade transnational initiative that was launched by them called Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea. In this region mutual learning and exchange play a prominent role.

The **Mediterranean perspective** has emerged only recently and was called 'the hidden face of European spatial planning' by Janin Rivolin and Faludi. The roots are at the local urban level. The relevance and innovations in the local planning practices mean that the urban regeneration and local development have got a full right to take a place in the European spatial planning domain. A very interesting issue is noticed in the article.

'It also means that innovation capacities do not end in the local outcomes of change, but extend and multiply themselves through the

propagation effects of cooperation and networking. Indeed, by participating in the different initiatives of the EU.....all south European countries are developing innovations in planning which seem not to have a precedent in their urbanist tradition. This affects not only the local level of planning as most directly concerned, but also the regional and national institutions, albeit different in forms'.

This new view on the spatial planning systems or families however still leaves the majority of the New Member States untouched, countries that are covered by this project.

3.1 Identified movements within the EU of 15

So how did the spatial development develop within the EU15 between the times of the Compendium and the present time? There has been a convergence towards primarily the comprehensive integrated planning approach and secondary the regional economic approach. In this sense it seems that the physical character of spatial planning is dominating even more than the economic, also because there are additional instruments, and responsible Ministries, to this purpose. But how does this move look like from up close? How strong was this movement in the different countries?

The countries where movements could be observed were presented in bold in Figure 3 (P. 41): Belgium, Germany, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, UK and Sweden. Other EU15 countries which are not mentioned are still in the same situation given in ECSP. Furthermore the classifications of the newly classified countries can be seen which 3.2 will deal with.

Movements in three directions can be seen in the table. First of all the movement towards *regional economic approach* which is characterized by the presence (apparition) of new guidelines, plans, laws that promote, social, economical and territorial balance in order to undo disparities.

Secondly a movement towards a *comprehensive integrated approach* can be observed in which the development of new institutions, plans, etc. that complete the hierarchy (vertical –multilevel- coordination) play a central role together with the emergence of new measures that promote cross-sectoral interaction (horizontal coordination).

The third movement that can be observed is towards land use planning which can be seen as either a step up from of the urbanism tradition or perhaps a step towards the comprehensive integrated

approach in the sense that it came forth out of the land use planning system. The movement towards the land use planning however is of a smaller proportion than the movements mentioned above.

Basically the moves observed towards a comprehensive integrated approach have to do with the *horizontal* and *vertical coordination* that was also mentioned in the Second Interim Report of ESPON Project 2.3.2 (p. 9). Key challenges for governance are creating horizontal and vertical cooperation/coordination between various levels of government (multilevel governance, vertical relations) and between sectoral policies in order to help territorial cohesion.

When it comes to vertical and horizontal coordination two processes take place within the EU of 15. The first process takes place within the domain of vertical coordination and focuses on the completion of the hierarchy in order to achieve a better coordination and/or cooperation. These two are very distinct concepts where coordination is seen as the harmonious adjustment or interaction of parts through regulating the diverse elements into an integrated and harmonious operation. Coordination thus means integrating or linking together different parts of an organization to accomplish a collective set of tasks following the rules and lead by the responsible with legal competencies (powers). Cooperation however is the joint work towards a common end goal or a mutual effort; in a more iterative way without any leading actor predefined.

Secondly in the field of horizontal coordination cross sectoral efforts can be observed (mainly in France though) through policy packages and other forms of cross sectoral efforts.

When speaking about devolution, devolving power, decentralisation and decentralising power these terms should not be interchangeably used because they might refer to very similar things, but there are some important differences. Where devolving means the passing on or delegating/transferring to another, devolution is the political process of dispersal of power from a superior to an inferior political entity, political and constitutional in its nature (thus can be overturned by a similar decision), Devolution thus is the delegation of central government powers to subordinate units, these powers being exercised with some degree of autonomy though ultimate power remains at the central government. Decentralisation refers to a less constitutional and deep-going functional process of delegating power to lower levels in a territorial hierarchy.

France as mentioned before is the main country which not only is moving towards comprehensive integrated approach planning in terms of completing the multilevel vertical tiers, (that we have called the 'hierarchy') but also in cross sectoral policy efforts. In all other countries only an effort can be seen in the direction of completing the 'hierarchy' with the goal to achieve a better coordination between the different levels. There were and are some points on the agenda that should promote the cross sectoral coordination and cooperation in other countries, but the results were or are expected to be feeble. In every country the movements are explained by first going back to the current law or act that is in force concerning spatial planning laying down the institutional structure. In most cases there are some recent updates or changes in these laws or acts that changed or redefined the institutional structure by adding another institutional layer or changing the responsibilities of the institutions.

3.1.1 Movement towards regional economic approach

Germany: Movement towards regional economic approach

Germany is a federal state in which the regions have a high level of autonomy. The region is the main level of planning, although the state level releases guidelines (through a complex of interaction). Germany falls into the comprehensive integrated approach however in the past a strong regional economic approach style could also be observed related to former eastern Germany in order for them to catch up economically. This policy will continue and can be seen in the NO in points like:

'The main goals resulting in actions of federal spatial relevant policies are (cf. BBR 2001: 47):

- the reduction of discrepancies in living standards between East and West Germany;*
- the improvement of development potentials of structurally weak rural areas;*
- the solution of employment and housing market problems;....'*

'The guidelines for spatial planning adopted in 1993 and the operational framework for spatial planning adopted in 1995 provide a general outline for spatial development in Germany, the latter concretizing the former. Both cover the following contents:

- Planning and development, including regions in need of development and regions in need of containment and development control." (European Commission 1999: 58)...'*

The points that were quoted above are confirmed further on in the NO. There are several maps, for example a map with the infrastructural policy till 2012 in which it can be seen that the vast majority of the projects is taking place in eastern Germany. So besides the comprehensive integrated approach model we can also see the regional economical model that really took root in the unification of Germany. The enormous imbalance all of a sudden now was within the new borders and had to be re-balanced. Regional economic approach seemed to be the logical answer.

3.1.2 Movement towards comprehensive planning

Belgium: *Movements towards comprehensive integrated approach (hierarchy).*

When Belgium transformed from a unitary state to a federal state one of the first major competencies in spatial planning were given to the regions. *'Regions progressively adopted their own legislation in this domain, mainly through the elaboration of more strategic plans.*

The "plans de secteur" remain nevertheless the statutory land allocation plan, except in the Region de Bruxelles- Capitale, where a new Plan Régional d'Affectation du Sol (PRAS) has been adopted in 2001'. The vertical coordination within the regions is strong, while the vertical coordination between the national and regional level is existent but weak. There are more and more strategic plans to be found where there is a certain amount of vertical coordination, this varies per region, but as could be read from the above quote, the land allocation plans remain the statutory plan in most regions. However because Belgium is a federal state with very autonomous regions it is hard to give a general classification. The Flemish region for instance is the only region with a provincial level, making the vertical coordination more deep. The same goes for the horizontal coordination between regions, where only the Walloon region has a regional structure plan which is open to its neighbours.

Ireland: *Movements towards comprehensive integrated approach (mainly through hierarchy with a small role yet for the cross sectoral aspect) and regional economic approach.*

In Ireland a comprehensive planning system was set up in 1964. The Irish planning style can however be classified as one of land use planning. Planning was mainly a local activity; the regional level is weak, consisting of 8 regional authorities in 1994. Above them 2 regional assemblies were created in 1999 largely as a framework to coordinate EU funding. Since 2002 the national level is responsible for producing the National Spatial Strategy, an important step indicating

a slight move towards the comprehensive integrated approach planning in terms of hierarchy. Regional assemblies are now involved in the implementation of the National Development Plan. The local planning authorities are responsible for making statutory development plans and for giving consent for development.

So it can be seen that the system of plans is now completed, all levels are present and a hierarchy between them is established. As can be read below.

'Arrangements were also put in place for wide-ranging consultation with regional bodies, local authorities, local development bodies and the social partners'.

However there are still some issues that do not fit in a comprehensive system at all. For instance the following:

'One distinguishing feature of the Irish planning system is the management system that exists in the local authority. Under the system all functions are separated into reserved and executive functions. The former are performed by resolution by the elected members, the latter are performed by the manager. The making of a development plan and any variation thereof is a reserved function. Making decisions on planning applications is an executive function. Decisions are made by the manager on the advice of technical and administrative staff. Consultations on planning applications usually take place between the applicant and technical staff'.

There are also efforts in order to achieve a better cross-sectoral coordination as the following quote proves

'In recognition of the need for effective coordination across Departments and State-sponsored agencies, both at strategic and operational levels, an Interdepartmental Steering Committee was established to oversee development of the strategy'.

Luxembourg: *Movement towards comprehensive integrated approach planning (hierarchy).*

Luxembourg can be classified within the system of land use planning, but a lot of progress has been made in the direction of integrating spatial planning and territorial development. The new law on spatial planning of 1999 consisted of organising the spatial planning from the national level through a system of hierarchical plans (national framework, regional plans, municipal land occupation plans).

'The 1999 law put the frame for the general spatial planning, which will be organized from the national level with

- *One « programme directeur » (national level), strategic, giving the frame for all the other plans, orientating actions and*

decisions of the government and the local authorities, but nevertheless « non binding » for citizens.

- *Several « plans sectoriels » (national level) (for instance Lyceum)*
- *6 regional plans (regional level) : they integrate at regional level strategies from programme directeur, sectorial policies and municipalities development plan.*
- *Finally, at local level (municipal) land occupation plans, and development plans´.*

However ´ as Luxembourg is a unitary, non decentralised state, there is no other level of government. Municipalities are a political level with some autonomy, but it is not a "government" level´.

So in short Luxembourg has very much a land use planning system, but due to the recent changes in the organisation of spatial planning it can also be said that elements of the comprehensive integrated approach planning can be found through the hierarchical system of plans. All plans however remain sectoral, although sectoral plans are made through the cooperation of ministers.

France: *Movement towards comprehensive integrated approach planning (hierarchy and cross-sectoral).*

The French model stands model for the regional economic model and it still does. However nowadays there are also elements of the comprehensive integrated approach approach. There was already a hierarchy of planning institutions, but a very special central decentralisation directed by the strong national level, but in most cases there is vertical coordination to be found: *´most of planning policies in France are elaborated through a co-operative process between State agencies from national to local level and regional and local authorities´.*

In terms of cross sectoral issues one can see a stronger movement towards the comprehensive integrated approach as can be seen in the quotes below.

´By nature, spatial planning is a global action that concerns many different sectoral policies. That is why the role of the CIADT (cf. supra point 4.2.) is to coordinate the actions of the different government departments. Nevertheless, most of them have a specific action in the field of spatial planning. For instance, the Ministry of Industry is in charge of industrial re-conversions. The ministry of Equipment is in charge of the national roads system and motorways, etc. Naturally, what is at stake, in spite of the CIADT, is the coherence of these territorial actions.´

'As far as spatial planning can be considered as inter-sectoral by nature, it seems necessary to think about pragmatic ways of vertical, horizontal and transversal coordination. Then, as an example, the Ministry of Agriculture, which is in charge of the development of equipment in rural areas has very tight links with the Prefect of Department and the Department Council (cf. supra point 2). The same can be said about the relation between the ministry of Equipment and local administrative and elected bodies. Planning instruments are general, integrated, and intersectoral except the "contrat de ville", the GPV and the PDU.'

3.1.3 Movement towards comprehensive integrated approach, regional economic approach and land use planning

Sweden: Movement towards regional economic approach

The Swedish case is a special due to the contradictory characteristics that can be found in the Swedish planning system. There are elements of 2 styles of spatial planning: comprehensive integrated and the regional economic approach.

In the National Overview it can be read that *'According to PBA 1987:10 there are only one compulsory planning level, the municipal level and two planning instruments, both used at the municipal level, i.e. municipal comprehensive plans (översiktsplaner) and detailed plans (detaljplaner).'* This is not in line at all with the classification the Compendium gave to *'The Nordic Countries'* being comprehensive integrated approach planning countries, but clearly falls into the urbanism tradition. The plan itself at the local level is comprehensive and there is indeed a certain hierarchy between the different levels, however this is not laid down in any law.

There is a shift in responsibilities for spatial planning as in terms of regional development strategies and programmes from the state at the regional level (the county administrative boards) to the regions in the pilot cases. The planning and building law does not constitute the obligation of national plan production. However, there are at the *national level policy statements*, which provide guidance and are legally binding in relation to areas of national significance

In the Planning and Building Act there is a provision for regional planning that can be carried out at a voluntary basis. The regional plans mainly serve as a framework documents and are non-binding.

In the field of economic development, the regional level has traditionally held a key role. Both the Regional growth agreements and the Regional Development Programmes have a territorial relevance. There is no national planning in Sweden or comprehensive urban policies at the national level. However, at the regional level there are policies that have explicit territorial relevance.

Below follows a lengthy quote that shows that there is not really a comprehensive system in terms of cross sectoral policy outside the municipal level, but that there are some developments towards a more comprehensive approach.

'Swedish planning or spatial development policy system is characterised by a high degree of sector orientation. Accordingly, there are no overall policy documents, neither at national nor at regional level. The only level having a clear strategic spatial approach is the local level....Several sectoral policies have clear spatial impact. Among the sectors that are developing towards a clear comprehensive view are transport, environmental policies and regional policies.....Sweden is a decentralised central state with considerable power at central governmental level. In the case of spatial development policies, these powers are mainly related to regional policies and environmental policies, as physical planning is mainly a municipal responsibility. Apart from the responsibility of the ministries, a number of national boards carry out important tasks'.

Another example of cooperation is the following: *'There are a number of different examples of horizontal and vertical cooperation and coordination with regards to the wide field of spatial planning. Some such arrangements are mandatory, like the regional growth agreements that were introduced by the government as a new regional policy initiative in 1998'.*

United Kingdom: *Movement towards comprehensive integrated/and regional economic approach planning.*

The UK stands model for the land use planning style and has a matured systems of land use planning. However in 1997 a new government took seat and the Blair Labour government started with the strengthening (creating) of the regional layer of government. In Scotland and Wales a similar development took place through referendums that enabled a significant devolution of powers to the elected national parliaments. In North Ireland a semi-autonomous assembly was established in 1998, but it experienced problems related to the province's sectarian division. However the central government, except from some limited cases in Scotland retains the

final power. More can be read in the quote below on the establishment of the regional level.

'In the case of England, following on from the establishment of Regional Development Agencies in 1998, regional chambers were created. This was followed by legislation allowing for elected regional assemblies in the eight English regions (excluding London) in 2003. Unlike devolution in Scotland and Wales, the regionalisation process in England has not been forced on the government by nationalist or regionalist pressure from below, other than perhaps in the case of the North East. However, with the establishment of an elected regional assembly overwhelmingly rejected in a referendum in the North East in November 2004, the future of regional government in England is far from clear, and is likely to be shelved for the time being. Be that as it may, whether the moves that have been made towards regionalism represent decentralisation or simply the drawing up of responsibilities from the local level remains a contested issue'.

The figure above very clearly shows that there is an increasing number of countries that have elements of the regional economic and the comprehensive integrated approach and that are thus growing towards either of these styles, while the land use planning and urban planning do not undergo any growth. When a country for instance moves from land use planning to comprehensive integrated approach planning it does not mean that the country ceases to have a land use planning system. It only means that the country in question is including more and more elements of the comprehensive integrated approach. In the future the countries might fully change planning style, but for the moment that has not occurred yet in any of the EU15 countries. For a more detailed image go to Annex x.

Spain: Movement towards land use planning

Spain was classified under the countries with an urbanism tradition, but nowadays it can be seen that it is also moving towards the closely related land use planning. In the Spanish case the national level has the power to legislate with respect to property rights and land economic assessment, while the autonomous regions each have their own rules concerning territorial planning and thus there are big differences between the autonomous regions.

They are involved in a spatial planning that can more and more be classified as land use planning. The municipal level plays its own very dominant role making use of the municipal master plan, partial plan and special plans that use to have a strong urbanism tradition

signature but now seems to be moving to the land use planning as can be read below.

'The Master Plan is an integral Plan that establishes:

- The Land Classification (Urban, Land to develop, and Land not to develop)*
- The regulation of the uses of the land and the intensities of the edification.*
- The general and organisational structure of the territory (System of communications).*
- The General System of open spaces (parks and green spaces), and community services (educational, cultural, health assistance, sports, churches, cemeteries, etc).*
- The programming for the development of the Plan '.*

This mixing of land use planning and the urbanism tradition represents a step up, to complement the urbanism tradition with the land use planning for some parts of the territory with no urban plan, towards a level that is just above the city scale.

Portugal: Movement towards land use planning

'The spatial and urban planning policy currently in force was established in August 1998 (Act 48/98) '. It defines the basis for urban and territorial planning policies, established the territorial management system and regulates the interrelations between the different levels of Public Administration, and their relations with the populations and representatives of the different economic and social sectors. Act 48/98 and Law 380/99 define the processes and responsibilities. This act rolled out a list of plans and the institutions that are responsible, have decision powers, etc. as can be seen below.

'Most of the planning legislation is embodied in a single document, Law no. 48/98, and set out in greater detail in the subsequent Decree Laws (no. 380/99 for territorial management plans promoted by the public administration and no. 555/99 for general construction and urbanisation). Planning laws establish the general principles for the structure of the territorial planning legislation, and define the objectives, the content and the formulation and approval procedures for each plan. They define a hierarchy of planning instruments, giving the local municipal, level the task of promoting and implementing most of the statutory plans and regulations, which are binding on individuals and the public administration. Land use plans are administrative regulations empowering the administration to impose sanctions '.

It speaks of land use plans instead of urban regulations and other measures that used to be typical within the urbanism tradition.

3.2. Shining a light on the classifications of the newly classified countries

In the case of the New Member States or other European countries that are involved in the ESPON 232 project there is no movement that can be measured, however these countries were, due to various reasons, never classified before within this system of planning styles. The classification took place making use of the information of the NOs with all its limitations. However this classification that can be seen in figure 3 could prove useful.

The New Member States have some very unique features. In the majority of the cases the countries came from a much centralised communistic system and now are going through a transition phase that has no equal. The new developments in institutional structures is being influenced heavily by the European Union through the Structural Funds and pre-accession funds such as PHARE, etc, regions had to be formed in order to apply to them. So their style of planning had to be in tune with the European Unions requirements. In some countries, like in the Czech Republic, this lead to the complete abolishment of the old system and a total fragmentation that so far has not been overcome. In other countries the transition is dealt with less rigorous and the old system is being adapted with new parts like the regional level being integrated. The current systems that are operational in the New Member States are far from being settled. In most cases there are still changes in the pipeline, because the current systems turn out not to work properly, etc.. These countries still have a very fluid character which makes influencing their institutional structure easier. A guiding hand in these matters could be welcome for those countries in order for them to learn from experiences and best practices of the EU of 15 in order to leapfrog towards a more stable future.

3.2.1 Countries that adopted a Comprehensive integrated and/or Regional economic approach of planning

Hungary: Comprehensive integrated and Regional economic approach

Hungary is another complex case. What is very obvious that they are trying hard and that their system is still in motion. Many changes have been following each other up very fast in order to deal with the situation at hand, however a 'final' form has not be found yet. A

development that can be seen in the majority of the Eastern European countries.

The legal framework of spatial planning was laid out in act XXI of 1996 (amended and standardized in 2004) on Spatial Development and Planning, which set off substantial reforms in the institutions and tools.

It can be said that there is a hierarchy between the different levels and plans, although this hierarchy is also still moving as can be concluded from the quotes below.

'The Act specifies the tasks of spatial development and planning, and identifies the tools and the system of institutions to perform them. By the adoption of the Act, Hungary has been the first among the accession countries that created the necessary legal framework in line with the EU's spatial development criteria.

The Act creates a new institutional system at national, regional, county and micro-regional levels. The new institutions, the Development Councils are made up of the representatives of the local governments, based on the principle of partnership. These councils are responsible for resource allocation, based on the principle of subsidiarity. The funds are allocated to projects that contribute, in a concentrated way, to the implementation of the national and regional development objectives (formulated up in national and regional development concepts). The projects form the parts of programmes, and show how the different projects are related, how they can be implemented and assessed'.

The micro-regions system already has gone through a series of complex changes that has led to optional micro-regions

'For a country of 10 million population five territorial layers are indeed too many, it complicates decision making and multiplies the administrative staff. The debate, how to simplify this system, is going on for long, without any result yet.

There is no cross-sectoral policy yet, however there are two acts that recognize the need of crossing sectors and try to move towards this.

'In Hungary there is no real policy package for inter-sectoral integration. Only some legal background can be found in the Act XXI/1996 on Spatial Planning and Development, which is a piece of legislation launching (or declaring the need of) inter-sectoral policy integration. It stresses that spatial planning and development are inter-sectoral both in the decision making and implementation phase'.

'In accordance with the Government Decree No. 184/1996, issued as a follow-up to the Act, on the approval process of spatial

development programmes and spatial plans, the sectoral ministries must take part in the consultation process and are required to give comments´.

The above is somewhat strange because below it can be read that Hungary has a long history in terms of horizontal and vertical coordination.

In principle, spatial planning has always been regarded as an interdisciplinary process with strong horizontal and vertical relationships. This is emphasized in the Act XXI of 1996 on Spatial Development and Planning. The planning system laid down in the Act is hierarchical, with, however, feed-back from the lower levels. The institutional system is based on the effective co-operation of a range of ministries and government authorities´.

The system in the current stage could thus be seen as a comprehensive integrated approach planning system in progress. However there are also some very clear indications in the direction of the regional economic approach in terms of territorial and economical balance as can be seen in the quotes below.

´It was under the impact of the EU sponsored PHARE programs that a spatial planning reform was initiated with the purpose to promote balanced economic development´.

´This national concept is an expression of the need for balanced, polycentric spatial development. It was not developed into a strategy, but has remained a symbolic statement. Implementation was thought to happen through various governmental measures´.

´In reality the territorial policy of the government focused on the support of the most deprived (eastern) regions.....From the late 1990s the EU Phare programmes were extended to regional scale both in the Northern Region where economic revival has been the main objective, and the North Plains Region where the focus has been on the upgrading of both the economy and infrastructure. Later the Southern Regions were also included in the Phare programme´.

Also the regional and local focus of the national level point in this direction.

Poland: Comprehensive integrated approach

In Poland spatial planning is carried out at three levels: national, regional (voivodship) and communal through the Act on spatial planning and spatial development (*Dziennik Ustaw [Legal Journal]*

No. 80 of 2003). The counties (poviat's) have a very limited role of self-government, they however do carry out public tasks of supra-communal character, conform to the act on the poviat selfgovernment of 5 June 1998, but they are not obliged to elaborate this in planning documents. The *Concept of the spatial development of the country* does indicate the need to conducting the studies and preparing other planning elaborates at the level of counties. Besides the absence of plans on the county level there are plans on all other levels so the hierarchy is more or less complete.

When taking a look at the comprehensive part it can be seen that the National Development Plan for the years 2007-2013 for instance makes a comprehensive endeavor. It does not only refer to the socio-economic character, whose solution could be secured with the support from the structural funds or the cohesion fund, but also to other development related undertakings, which remain outside the sphere of the EU cohesion policies. The NDP will therefore constitute a supreme program document in Poland, to coordinate with the regional development strategies and the most important sectoral strategies. A little further in the NO it can be read that

'The NDP is a strategic planning document, associating the horizontal, sectoral and regional solutions at the national level, indicating the directions of the development of Poland in the first years after the accession'.

All plans seem to more or less point in the direction of sectoral plans, but as states above there also is eye for the horizontal solutions at the national level. The question however is to what part of the horizontal coordination is referred to in the above quote; it could also be a reference to the multichannel governance. The NO never really uses the words cross sectoral, policy package etc. it is thus very hard to measure the level of comprehensiveness.

An interesting point is that *'The basic problem of spatial development and spatial policy in Poland is the increase of interregional, as well as intraregional economic and social disparities'* and although this is the situation it does not seem that a movement towards the regional economic model seems to take. The cause for this can probably lie in the fact that Poland just created the regions and the regional levels.

Slovakia: Comprehensive integrated and Regional economic approach

Slovakia also does not have a fully crystallized system yet and the responsibilities in the fields of territorial planning and regional policy have just been put under the control of the Ministry of Construction

and Regional Development of the Slovak Republic this year. It can thus be said that Slovakia has two systems of planning that exist next to each other and compliment each other; at least that is the goal.

Slovakia suffers from inadequate coordination between the individual sectoral concepts and documents. In other words there is not much cross sectoral policy to be found in the Slovak Republic. Certain coordination efforts in this direction can already be seen in the preparation and implementation of the sectional documents such as the territorial plans. The central government already authorized one of its vice chairmen to coordinate the regional development on the national level.

'The coordination tendencies in sectoral planning can also be evidenced in the preparation of the regional policy documents. In spite of all efforts in this area, especially from the point of view of the sectional policies, there is much to be improved in the coordination of the sectoral policy. The problem of coordination of individual policies rests especially with the relatively strong sectoral orientation of the laws and of other legislative measures. Many subjective reasons which make difficult mutual coordination of individual policies are related to this fact'.

However due to the fact that in for instance the territorial plan many sectors are involved, environmental, building, social, economical, cultural heritage, etc. the plans carry a multiple sector character in which the coordination between the sectors has somehow been lacking.

Due to the special position of regional policy it seems that there are also elements of the regional economic approach style. Although it only speaks about an imbalance related to the transport system. But the general focus of the regional policy is the socio-economic dimension as can be read below.

'The regional policy since 1990 was developed gradually in accordance with the new economic and social conditions on the basis of new legislative regulations, organizational support etc. Currently the new basic organizational and management system was created with hierarchical division on national and regional levels. The planning documents on these levels are processed in accordance with the requirements of the European Union so that they can be used in support of the application for the funds of the European Union'.

There are also elements of the land use planning to be found still, which make sense as the Land use planning model is indeed the classical model that evolved into the comprehensive integrated approach planning.

Slovenia: Comprehensive integrated approach

Slovenia also has a very new foundation of the spatial planning system 'on December 2002 National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia adopted modern SPATIAL PLANNING ACT'. In Slovenia there is a hierarchy to be found, however it is not completed yet. There is no regional level or it only exists statistically and at the level of NUTS3, but this level is work in progress and it is just a matter of time before this level will be institutionalised and takes its place between the already existing municipal and national level as can be read below.

'"National Development Plan (NDP) 2000 – 2006" which is next year to be upgraded by new one has provided some horizontal coordinations and openness required for good governance. Vertical coordination will be improved after regionalization will be determined in details. Regionalization in Slovenia is still in development and not finally accepted. The shortage of Slovenian spatial hierarchy is especially uncompleted regionalization which could well support the way towards governance'.

An integrated approach can be noted in for instance the Spatial Development Strategy of Slovenia that is in force since July 2004. The fragment below makes it very clear that we can speak of a comprehensive integrated approach approach.

'The Spatial Strategy is the basic strategic spatial development document and an integrated planning document which implements the concept of sustainability, supported by the procedures, which have had the characteristics of governance.

Together with the "Strategy for Economic Development of Slovenia", it forms the basis for the harmonization of sectoral policies. It can be consider as the umbrella document for all sectors. During preparation of this document in this process all ministries and services, whose work is of relevance to the implementation of spatial development documents, have been involved'.

However there are still some remarks to be made as can be found in the NO: *'Horizontal relationships on central government level have been weak in the past but they are improving. Vertical coordination have been started to improve when Regional Development Agencies started their activities. They also enable better horizontal cooperation*

on the level of NUTS 3. Required legislation, which is needed to complete the procedure of regionalization in Slovenia will enable better vertical and horizontal cooperation´.

Bulgaria: Comprehensive integrated approach

In Bulgaria again a fairly new planning system can be found based on the Spatial Planning Act (SPA) 2001 which is linked to many other laws. Again the importance of or the focus on the regional development level becomes clear, there even is a special law on regional development for instance. There are four levels that can be distinguished: national, regional (NUTS 2), district (NUTS 3) and the local level.

´As far as the hierarchy in the planning process in Bulgaria is concerned, the authorities at all levels possess rights and liabilities in respect to the initiation of design of the plans envisaged by the law´.

There are several planning instruments that are or promote cross sectoral coordination such as the National Development Plan which was a strategic integral document, the spatial development schemes, etc.

´Bulgaria is already beginning to accumulate experience on the application of the strategic planning approach and utilization of the EU Pre-accession Funds. A National Development Plan till 2006 and the operative programmes to it have been worked out. Currently, work has started on the process of design of the new strategic document and operational programmes for the period 2007-2013´.

The current state of art is that in *´the present experience in recent years shows the need for and the availability of coordination, both vertical and horizontal, in the design of the planning tools. A large number of experts, as well as representatives of state agencies and consultants, are involved in their elaboration´.*

Romania: Comprehensive integrated approach

Romania also has a renewed basis of spatial planning laid down in the Law of Territorial and Urban Planning (no 350/2001), although the key institution responsible will most likely change again when the new government takes seat. There is now only one public planning agency left which is the Institute for Territorial and Urban Planning, founded in 1948, the other planning institutes have gone private.

It is financed by partly by the Ministry of Transportation, Construction and Tourism. The institute also prepare spatial development plans required by the Law upon order from county and local authorities.

'The Government Programme includes a dedicated chapter on territorial development policies. The Programme reads as follows: „The major objectives of spatial development policies of the government are:

- a balanced and polycentric development of the urban system, and the achievement of partnerships between urban and rural areas.*
- the development of an integrated transport and communication system as a support for the formation and expansion of the urban system of the polycentric type, and a way to achieve the integration of the economic development regions into the economic and political European Space*
- the preservation and the development of the cultural and natural heritage '.*

In the description of tasks and responsibilities there seems to be a lot of horizontal and vertical coordination at and between the different levels.

'The Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing shall be the specialized body of the Government in the field of the town and country planning and city planning having, in this capacity, the following duties:

- the elaboration of the Plan of the national town and country planning;*
- the elaboration of the Plan of the regional town and country planning, which shall substantiate the regional development plans;*
- the elaboration of the general city planning Regulations;*
- the endorsement of the drafts of normative documents referring to the activity of the town and country planning and city planning;*
- the collaboration with the ministries, as well as with the other bodies of the central public administration, for the substantiation, from the point of view of the town and country planning and city planning, of the sectorial strategic programmes;*
- the collaboration with the councils for regional development, the county councils and the local councils, as well as the follow up of the way in which the governmental programmes and the guiding lines in the field of the town and country planning and city planning at regional, county and local level are applied;..... The Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing may request the local public administration authorities to elaborate or to modify a documentation of city planning or of town and country planning with a view to*

deepening, detailing or applying of certain provisions included in the sectoral strategic programmes of the Government, as well as for the observance of the State's general interests.....The county council shall coordinate the activity of the town and country planning and city planning at county level, according to law.....The local council shall coordinate and shall be responsible for the entire activity of city planning carried on in the territorial-administrative unit and shall ensure the observance of the provisions included in the approved documentation of town and country and city planning for the carrying out of the programme of urban development of the component localities of the commune or town.

The local council shall cooperate with the county council and shall be supported by it in the activity of town and country and city planning....' etc. .

There is a whole set of obligations and rules that try to achieve this coordination and cooperation that is even put more clearly below

'Relationships between different agencies at one and /or different government levels in the frame of the spatial planning process are established by the Law of Territorial and Urban Planning and the Government Decision for the Establishment and Functioning of The Ministry (see above).

Inter-sectoral /inter-departmental communication in every field of activity occurs as a rule in the frame provided by various Committees and Commissions co-ordinated each ministry'.

Norway: Comprehensive integrated and Regional economic approach

Norway belongs to the Nordic countries and should therefore have a comprehensive integrated approach. Reality however shows a conflicting picture that comes much closer to the urbanism tradition. The next quote doesn't leave much room for interpretation.

'The current Planning and Building Act (PBA) was established in 1985 and has been subject to a range of revisions. The Norwegian Planning and Building Act (PBA) is constructed around certain given roles for municipalities (their politicians and professional planners), developers and their professionals, neighbors of initiatives and citizens at large. Also the roles of the county and the state are defined in the PBA. The basic assumption is that municipalities define the framework for all development, taking proper consideration of national guidelines and private interests; and then lead the development according to set goals and standards, utilizing the tools available in the PBA and outside of that Act'.

There is however a white paper on the table in which there two main changes are proposed according to Higdem (2001), namely:

- to achieve a planning system based on partnership between regional and municipal level. This is to be done also for planning of areas, especially where the area concerns several municipalities.
- Flexibility both in choosing planning type for different matters and in choosing 'how comprehensive' i.e.: on what scale and what areas a revision of existing countries is needed.

There are still many problems in terms of horizontal and vertical coordination as *'Much of the initiative in terms of territorial planning remains with the local municipalities. To make these issues even more complex, much of the physical planning and -administration is currently influenced by sectoral interests. National instructions and regulations are not all consistent'*. As in this stage of the analysis it is not yet clear where to classify Norway it will be kept under the comprehensive integrated and the regional economic approach, while the analysis in chapter 4 should provide a better insight.

Switzerland: Comprehensive integrated approach

The Swiss system can be classified under the comprehensive integrated approaches. There is a clear hierarchy in institutional levels and plans and the cantons are the most characteristic units in the Swiss planning system. In the description below the hierarchy is described in the Swiss system

'The Swiss administrative system consists of three layers, the confederation, 26 cantons and about 3000 municipalities, each having its own spatial planning responsibilities. The emphasis is at the cantons "...whose task is to integrate spatial claims by means of structure plans and to collaborate with their neighbours in Switzerland and abroad. The communes are generally responsible for land use planning. Lastly, under the constitution, the confederation is responsible for the legislative framework, for formulating planning principles, for co-ordinating formal spatial policies both internally and with the cantons, for promoting and co-ordinating the efforts of the cantons, and for international relations. The confederation works closely with the cantons and the cantons in turn with the communes" (Wegelin 2001)'

In terms of cross sectoral measures the quote below makes it clear that there is enough attention for this issue.

'An upgraded tripartite agglomeration conference will allow the

confederation to co-ordinate policies vertically across government levels, whereas the Raumordnungskonferenz (ROK) would continue to coordinate policies horizontally across ministries (OECD 2002: 143-144)´.

Another interesting phenomenon is the counter current principle as explained below that can be seen as a strong way of vertical coordination.

´The relationship between the different administrative layers is controlled by the so-called ´counter-current principle´. According to this principle the cantonal structure plans are binding for the confederation, while at the same time cantons must take the federal sector plans into account. All spatial plans are subject to the aims and principles of the Federal Spatial Planning Law. Sectoral as well as cantonal plans have to be approved by the Federal Council, which guarantees co-ordination and a similar application of planning principles throughout the country. The same regulations apply between cantons and communities (Wegelin 2001)´.

3.2.2 Other models than the comprehensive integrated approach planning

Cyprus: Urbanism tradition and land use planning

Cyprus finds itself, due to their size, specific geographical and political situation in a very particular position. There is a sort of hierarchy of governmental levels; however the central government has a very strong position as follows from a quote below:

´Regional, Local and all other levels and aspects of planning, are assigned to the Minister of the Interior´. This can also be seen in the paragraph about the roles and responsibilities of government layers and agencies where mainly ministries are mentioned.

However planning takes place at the local level as in the land use planning and urbanism tradition through building permits as can be read in the following quotes:

´The Ministry of the Interior through the Town Planning Department is the instrument for the physical implementation of overall planning decisions´.

´No development of land is allowed without a permit. "Development" as specified by the Law, to be effective, must secure a "Planning Permit" prior to a "Building Permit", being issued´.

Czech Republic: land use planning

The Czech Republic was first classified under the comprehensive integrated approach planning in the TIR, however taking a closer look at the NO gives a different picture. Reading *'Physical plans are the major instrument for local and regional governments to control the territorial development, including the location of new developments, types of constructed building, relations between different function, main infrastructure, etc.'*, makes it clear that the Czech system should be classified under the land use planning style.

Reading the NO causes some confusion which has led to the wrong classification. The Czech situation is very special due to the fact that instead of decentralisation and devolution of powers there seems to be a fragmentation into a large number (6200) of planning municipals. *'And, last but not least, there is no territorial planning at the national level. The territorial hierarchy in planning that existed during centrally planned system was totally dismantled after 1989 and now is being only slowly built from the bottom up. Provided the new planning bill is approved national Spatial Development policy will be prepared'*.

Furthermore a conflictive or wrong statement can be found that also causes some confusion: *'At the national level, Ministry of Regional Development is responsible for planning legislation. The Institute for Spatial Development, established by the Ministry is in charge of monitoring existing physical plans of municipalities and large territorial units (regions). At present, there is no national planning institution or agency as well as there is no plan at national level'*. When this quote is put next to the following that also can be found in the NO it makes no sense: *'Since the accession, the Structural Funds programmes are implemented via the National Development Plan of the Czech Republic for 2004-2006'*.

So the hierarchy within the different levels is still far from being settled and things are still in motion. In the other field of cross-sectoral efforts more problems can be distinguished. *'The main problem of policies towards urban and regional issues in the Czech Republic is the lack of a common and coherent framework that would identify problem areas and attempt to formulate integrated, nationwide, cross-sectoral policies and programmes targeting urban, regional and territorial development questions. There are various sectoral policies with an impact on territorial development in cities and regions. However, their outcomes have not been assessed or discussed within any coherent framework. Their organization and financing is organized through ministerial and sectoral divisions and these sometimes contradict each other'*.

Many problems are identified and recognized but a real solution has not been found yet.

Estonia: Comprehensive integrated approach

Estonia was categorized under the header of land use planning in the TIR, but now the new insight is adopted that it belongs more under the header of comprehensive integrated approach planning strengthening the convergence towards this style. The Planning and Building Act of 1995 has been replaced by two separate acts for building and planning in January 2003. The main differences between the new and the old act is that, firstly in the new act the objectives of the National Spatial Plan have changed to focus more on the sustainable and balanced spatial development. Secondly now a comprehensive plan can be prepared as a thematic plan to specify or amend the comprehensive plan in force, new objectives are added. A change in a different field has been that in 1995 the allocation of responsibilities at the central level of the spatial planning department has been transferred from the Ministry of Environment to the Ministry of Internal affairs.

Estonia also is working towards and already progressed strongly in the direction of a hierarchy in comprehensive plans as can be read below.

'Presently Estonia has an adopted national plan – Estonia 2010, adopted county plans for all 15 counties and about 50% comprehensive plans of cities and rural municipalities. Local governments are required to ensure:

- 1) that comprehensive plans are adopted for cities not later than by 1 January 2006;*
- 2) that comprehensive plans are established for rural municipalities not later than by 1 July 2007 (Planning Act, §45) '..*

Furthermore adopted national, county and comprehensive plans are only legally binding for the authority that adopts them additionally for compilers of plans of a more detailed type.

'The emphasis of planning varies at different levels. The detailed plan is the only type of plan that deals with plots. The county plan is the last type of plan that deals with land use. The most important part of a detailed plan, a comprehensive plan and a county plan is a land use map and the text is, in fact an explanatory note. On contrary, the most important part of a national plan is the text and figures (schemes) play an illustrative role.

Also some efforts can be found in terms of cross sectoral policies as the ministries whose areas cover the matters treated in the planning (see below). The level in which this happens however cannot be read in the NO.

'A national spatial plan shall be prepared in co-operation between the county governors, county local government associations and ministries. A county plan shall be prepared in co-operation between the local governments of the planning area, the county governors of counties neighbouring on the planning area, the Ministry of the Environment and other ministries whose area of government covers matters treated in the planning. A comprehensive plan shall be prepared in co-operation between the local governments neighbouring on the planning area and the county governor concerned (Planning Act, §16 (4))'.

Latvia: Regional economic approach and less towards the comprehensive integrated approach

The focus of spatial planning is very much concentrated on the regional level. The National Development Plan and the Development Plan are of essential importance. The NDP is no longer operational and the DP is the follow up plan which is currently being developed. The NDP was a very clear regional economic approach document as can be understood from the quote below:

'The National Development Plan (NDP) is a middle term regional policy planning document, where the social and the economical situations is analyzed, the regional development goals and priorities, support measures for reaching the stated goals and the necessary financial resources are set. The NDP has been coordinated with the Long-term Development Economical Strategy of Latvia and features its priorities, objectives and plans of the State, which would promote the socio-economical development of Latvia'.

The NDP was an instrument for the distribution of State investment and EU pre-accession financial assistance and programming and is currently being used as a base for the Development Plan for the programming period 2007-2013 for receiving support from the EU structural Funds and for using it after Latvia joins the EU.

Below it can be read again that the NDP could be classified within the regional economic development with its focus on the elimination of the territorial imbalance.

National Development Plan goals are:

- *‘To promote a sustainable development of Latvia increasing welfare and social security of every inhabitant;*
- *To promote the regional development, decreasing and eliminating the undesirable regional disparities and developing the favorable differences’.*

A big difference between the NDP and the DP is the following:

‘Unlike the National Development Plan, the Development Plan (DP) does not cover all spheres of the national economy but only those measures, which correspond to the terms for receiving financing from the EU Structural Funds (SF)’.

‘The following priorities are defined and included in the Development Plan:

- 1. Promotion of balanced development;*
- 2. Promotion of entrepreneurship and innovations;*
- 3. Development of human resources and promotion of employment;*
- 4. Promotion of agriculture and rural development;*
- 5. Promotion of sustainable fishing industry development;*
- 6. Technical assistance.*

The Development Plan describes the existing socio-economical situation, gives analysis, as well as justifies the defined priorities and the actions’.

The Law on Regional Development that was adopted in 2002 established the five planning regions in Latvia. The main spatial planning institution is the Ministry of Regional Development and Local Governments.

There however also is a hierarchy of plans in Latvia and they are mutually coordinated spatial plans and spatial planning is implemented at the national level, regional level, district local government level and the territorial government level. However the cross sector coordination in reality remains weak.

In general, national and sectoral development programmes must be prepared and implemented in accordance with the Regional Policy Guidelines, the National Spatial Plan and the National Development Plan. However, the link between development of sectors and regional development and development of regions in Latvia is rather weak. In general the vertical and horizontal coordination still has a lot of room to improve as can be read below.

'Regional development in the country is implemented through regional policy tools. The experience of other countries shows that very important tools are sectoral development policies in regard to different parts of the country.

Sectoral policies drafted by respective line ministries have been produced in accordance with sectoral priorities, thus territorial aspect often is inadequate. Sectoral ministries often use their own territorial breakdown of regions, which are not coinciding with territories specified in planning regions, but rather reflect specifics of each sector in question....Long term economic strategy for Latvia may as well serve as an example of policy package with spatial content, aimed at securing intersectoral policy integration and enhanced synergies'.

Lithuania: Regional economic approach and less towards the secondary comprehensive integrated approach

In 1995 the Law on Territorial planning was adopted by the *Seimas*, a new version of the Law was approved in January 2004. According to the Law territorial planning shall have the following objectives:

'1) to balance the social, economic and environmental development of the territory of Lithuania;

2) to create healthy and harmonious environment for living, work and recreation with the aim of creating better living conditions of equal value on the whole territory of Lithuania;

3) to form a policy of development of residential areas and infrastructure systems;

4) to reserve (define) territories for the development of infrastructure of residential areas, other spheres of activity, and different types of land;

5) to protect, use rationally and recover natural resources, natural and cultural heritage, recreational resources among them;

6) to maintain an ecological framework or to restore it;

7) to harmonise the interests of natural and legal entities or their groups, also the interests of the public, municipalities and the State regarding the conditions for the use of a territory and land plots also with regard to the type of activity in the territory;

8) to promote investments for the social and economic development.

The Law on Territorial Planning according to the size of planned territory and level of specification of planning solutions defines such levels of planning: national, regional (the county), municipalities and local and three types of territorial plans: comprehensive, special and detailed plans'.

There are 5 types of spatial plans that can be found in Lithuania

- Comprehensive plan of the territory of the Republic of Lithuania
- Comprehensive plan of the county (*apskritis*)
- Comprehensive plan of municipality or its parts (towns)
- Special plans, prepared at all levels
- Detailed plans in order to distinguish and legalise the territory

Lithuania has a Comprehensive general plan of the territory of development conditions considering its geographical situation, ecological and monument protection demands and requirements of the third entities.

Both Latvia and Lithuania have a comprehensive national plan, and a hierarchy of plans and levels below that, but their focus nonetheless is on the regional economical level. That is due to the fact that both countries also have an Economic Development Strategy that has a very strong relationship with the spatial planning

Malta: Urbanism tradition and land use planning

Planning in Malta is regulated by the Development Planning Act (1992), revised 1997. This does not mean however that planning commenced by then, however it was almost inexistent before then.

'The Development Planning Act provides for all types of lands and sea development and also land use. The Act also has sections dealing with enforcement and penalties in case of breach of the same Act, and provisions for the statutory protection of natural and cultural immovable heritage assets.....The Act controls not only building development, but for the first time it also controlled land use..... Planning in Malta is regulated by the MEPA Board (Malta Environment and Planning Authority). Planning occurs only at the national level.'

There however are also indicators that could indicate or justify a secondary classification under the comprehensive integrated approach in the future. Although planning occurs only at the national level there is a hierarchy of plans though in which there is also room for cross-sectoral policy. *'The Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands (1990) and the Local Plans already provide a form of integrated policy packages'*.

The Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands (1990) functions as secondary legislation and provides detailed policies for all types of development and land use, such as, urban, rural, marine, infrastructural works, as well as policies targeting sustainable development, conservation of urban centres, monuments and archaeological sites and areas of scientific and ecological significance.

Another factor that is identified from literature on the operation of planning procedures is that there is the need for more collaboration between Governmental departments in order to make strategic decisions regarding land use.


There are stages where the various authorities and departments are brought together to implement planning procedures

On another level, there is the Interdepartmental Committee of MEPA. It is intended that, in future, the remit of this committee will be widened, to bring together and co-ordinate the necessary inputs into planning from Government departments and other relevant agencies to provide a basis for collaboration and for integrating the plans of those agencies for development in the various sectors.


3.3. Synthesis of chapter 3

The analysis of the National Overviews lead to a pretty good first impression of the movements that took place within the EU of 15 and of the first characterisation of the New Member States +2 +2 which is shown in figure 3.

Figure 3: Movement within the EU 15 between the Styles of spatial planning and characterisation of New Member States + 2 +2



Map 2: Movement within the EU 15 between the Styles of spatial planning and characterisation of New Member States + 2 +2



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

- Comprehensive Integrated approach
- Regional Economic approach
- Land Use planning
- Urbanism tradition

Map 2 comments: The map represents two things. First of all it shows the movements that took place within the EU15 between the four styles of planning. Secondly it offers a first characterisation of the New Member States +Switzerland and Norway + Bulgaria and Romania

Figure 3 can be read as a provisional conclusion of the first part of the analysis. Map 2 is the visual translation of figure 3.

So in the end is Europe moving towards the same planning style? Or are there different movements that can be seen? Or even the emergence of new planning styles? As seen above the movements in the EU of 15 take place at a very different pace and with its own dynamics. In the EU15 the movement is much more like a convergence of planning styles, where the comprehensive integrated planning and the regional economic approach seem to be the big winners. The Nordic countries however seem to show a very different background in which the local level was in most cases the planning level of real importance. In countries like Norway a whitepaper opened the discussion on creating for instance a regional level, but so far the municipal level remains the main level of planning. In chapter 4 the analysis takes a closer look at the individual Member States and this first preliminary conclusion relating to the Nordic countries can be explored further.

Concretely there are three movements taking place. The first movement is the movement towards the comprehensive integrated approach. Here we see the United Kingdom, Ireland, Belgium and Luxembourg coming from the land use planning style whereas France is coming from the regional economic approach. The second movement that is taking place is towards the regional economic approach, where again the United Kingdom and Ireland are now also incorporating the regional economic approach. Furthermore Sweden and Germany came from the comprehensive integrated approach. The last movement that is taking place is towards the land use planning with Spain coming from the urbanism tradition and Portugal from the regional economic approach. In all cases the countries did not abandon their previous dominant style of spatial planning but they expanded their previous model.

In the New Member States there are several movements that take place. In some countries the land use planning system or urban planning system is very well established and in those countries, like for instance Cyprus, do not seem to be developing towards a more comprehensive style of planning. This might also be due to their relatively small size. The New Member States however that share a common socialist past are developing in a very different way. In the first place the developments here take place at a very high pace. Secondly due to the fact that in the past the countries were highly centralized they are now all struggling to create the different planning

levels. In doing so they borrow ingredients from the comprehensive integrated the regional economic and the land use planning style.

In fact the comprehensive integrated approach can be seen as an evolution of the land use planning style. The urbanism tradition, land use planning² and the comprehensive integrated approach can be put (in a continuum, although we recognize their different nature in the strict sense) on one side while the other side is formed by the regional economic approach which is very different from the first three styles of spatial planning. In many cases the countries are moving towards comprehensive integrated approach planning, but due to the fact that the systems are still young and not settled down yet they are in many cases still somewhere in the land use planning style with elements of vertical and horizontal coordination combined with regional economic approach elements. Slovenia is a special case, which has a longer history in participating in the comprehensive integrated approach.

So in general the majority of Europe is moving towards the comprehensive integrated approach and regional economic approach. The main element from the regional economic approach that finds a lot of resonance is a balanced economic, territorial and social development. The comprehensive integrated approach elements that contribute to the new mixture are the hierarchical system of institutions and plans in which there is special attention for the vertical (multi-level) and horizontal (cross-sectoral) coordination. The term comprehensive integrated approach planning cannot be more comprehensive, it already encompasses everything and thus the only way to refer to this new mixture of the comprehensive integrated and regional economic approach under a new is calling is the *Neo-comprehensive integrated planning approach*. The neo-comprehensive integrated planning approach exists of the combination of the regional economic and the comprehensive integrated approach; this last in turn is an evolution of the land use planning through coordination.

An additional question is how different or homogeneous are the styles of planning within each State that is at different political-administrative levels, each one with their own competences and weight in spatial planning. An analysis of this situation for ESPON 29

² Where traditionally the land use planning used to be the softer type of planning with more flexible plans for the built and not built environment the urbanism tradition was only about the built environment through binding plans. Nowadays however in the Mediterranean countries the two planning styles seem to combine in the form of more flexible guidelines, presenting a more flexible form of urban planning that now not just applies to the built environment but also the not built environment, for the areas that don't have an urban plan.

space is presented in next section 4. This also should give a better insight in the real level of comprehensiveness in order to give a more accurate and real picture of the practice.

4. Intra-State Mixture an analysis by political/administrative levels

After treating the mix between countries in the previous steps it is now time to take a look at the mix that can be found within the countries. Chapter three provided a first image of the current situation, but this image however still contains some generalisations. Many things exist on the higher levels or in the constitutions of countries that say spatial planning is a comprehensive endeavour, but practice can show that theory and practice do not necessarily coincide. Therefore in this chapter each individual country will be analysed, starting with an analysis of styles of spatial planning by level, after which this will be linked to the competencies in spatial planning by level. After this an analysis will follow of all countries focussing only on the level of comprehensiveness of the comprehensive integrated approach. This level of comprehensiveness refers to the extend in which vertical and horizontal coordination takes place. This will be followed by a short comment concerning the other planning styles ending with conclusions.

4.1 Relation between overall planning style classification and classification by level

When connecting the overall planning style of a country, to the styles of spatial planning per level and the competences in spatial planning, like in table 1, it enables us to pick out irregularities easier. In 13 countries the classification of countries within one of the four European Compendium styles of spatial planning and the classification of various levels within these styles of spatial planning show differences or discrepancies, while in the remaining cases these classifications coincide. These 13 countries are: Austria, Belgium, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia and Switzerland. These countries and their differences between the overall planning style and style by level can also be found in table 1 below.

Table 1: Differences between overall planning style and planning style by level

Countries	Planning style	Local level	Regional level	National level
Austria	Comprehensive integrated approach	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Regional economic approach	Regional economic approach
Belgium	Land use planning	Land use planning/urbanism tradition	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach	
Greece	Urbanism tradition	Land use planning / Urbanism tradition.	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
Ireland	Regional economic approach	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Comprehensive integrated approach	Comprehensive integrated approach
Italy	Urbanism tradition	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach	Regional economic approach
Portugal	Regional economic approach Land use planning	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Regional economic approach	Comprehensive integrated approach
Spain	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Regional economic approach	Regional economic approach
United Kingdom	Comprehensive integrated approach	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Comprehensive integrated approach	Comprehensive integrated approach
			Regional economic approach	
Czech Republic	Land use planning	Regional economic approach	Regional economic approach	Regional economic approach
		Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Land use planning (legislation)	Land use planning (legislation)
Hungary	Regional economic	Land use planning/Urbanism	Regional economic	Land use planning

	approach Comprehensive integrated approach	tradition	approach	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
Slovakia	Regional economic approach Comprehensive integrated approach	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Comprehensive integrated approach	Comprehensive integrated approach
Slovenia	Comprehensive integrated approach	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition	Regional economic approach	Comprehensive integral approach
			Comprehensive integral approach	
Switzerland	Comprehensive integrated approach	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning	Comprehensive integrated approach	Regional economic approach
				Comprehensive integrated approach

The above table shows in light blue the countries in which other planning styles can be found beside the one mentioned in the 2nd column as the overall planning style. In for instance Switzerland which is classified as a country with a comprehensive integrated approach, at the national level also the regional economic approach can be found. The fact that land use planning and the urbanism tradition are often to be found on the local level is not considered as conflicting, because it can be found in almost all countries. The table furthermore shows one country, Slovakia that differs in a different way. It can be classified under the regional economic and comprehensive integrated approach, but there is no trace of the regional economic approach on neither level.

A big part of the analysis in this chapter is based on table 2 which connects the competencies the different levels have with the styles of spatial planning by adding scores in order to value their significance. When in a country for instance the regional level has a weak planning competency the score on this level has to be valued lower, which is what the table does. In the appendix of this annex the roles and responsibilities of the different levels can be found. The table has been made based on the national overviews and was reviewed by the national experts.

Table 2: Planning styles by level vs. competencies by level

Country	Planning style ³	Local	Regional	National	Total
Austria	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	2	1	6
	Regional economic approach	0	2	2	4
	Land use planning	3	2	0	5
	Urbanism tradition	3	2	0	5
Belgium	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	3	0	3
	Regional economic approach	0	3	0	3
	Land use planning	2	3	0	5
	Urbanism tradition	2	3	0	5
Denmark	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	3	1	7
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	3	3	1	7
	Urbanism tradition	0	0	0	0
Finland	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	3	1	7
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
France	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	2	3	5
	Regional economic approach	0	2	3	5
	Land use planning	2	0	0	2
	Urbanism tradition	2	0	0	2
Germany	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	3	3	6
	Regional economic approach	0	3	3	6
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Greece	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	2	3	5
	Regional economic approach	0	2	3	5
	Land use planning	1	2	3	6
	Urbanism tradition	1	2	3	6

³ In bold dominant planning style of the country in conformance with figure 3

Ireland	Comprehensive integrated approach		1	3	4
	Regional economic approach		1	3	4
	Land use planning	3			3
	Urbanism tradition	3			3
Italy*	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	2	0	2
	Regional economic approach	0	1	1	2
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Luxembourg	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	No political level only a delimitation for planning	3	3
	Regional economic approach	0		3	3
	Land use planning	3		3	6
	Urbanism tradition	3		3	6
Netherlands	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	2	3	8
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	0	0	0	0
Portugal	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	0	3	3
	Regional economic approach	0	2	3	5
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Spain	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	0	0	0
	Regional economic approach	0	3	1	4
	Land use planning	2	3	0	5
	Urbanism tradition	3	2	0	5
Sweden	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	0	0	3
	Regional economic approach	0	2	0	2
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
United Kingdom	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	2	3	8

	Regional economic approach	0	2	0	2
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Cyprus	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	0	0	0
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	0	0	3	3
	Urbanism tradition	0	0	3	3
Czech Republic	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	0	0	0
	Regional economic approach	3	2	2	7
	Land use planning	3	2	2	7
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Estonia	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	0	3	6
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	3	2	0	5
	Urbanism tradition	3	2	0	5
Hungary	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	0	2	5
	Regional economic approach	0	2	2	4
	Land use planning	3	0	2	5
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Latvia	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	2	3	5
	Regional economic approach	0	2	3	5
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Lithuania	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	2	3	8
	Regional economic approach	0	2	3	5
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Malta	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	0	3	3
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	2	2	3	7
	Urbanism tradition	2	2	3	7
Poland	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	1	3	7

	Regional economic approach	0	1	3	4
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Slovakia	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	3	3	6
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Slovenia	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	2	3	5
	Regional economic approach	0	2	0	2
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Bulgaria	Comprehensive integrated approach	2	2	3	7
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	1	0	0	1
	Urbanism tradition	1	0	0	1
Romania	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	0	3	3
	Regional economic approach	0	0	0	0
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Norway	Comprehensive integrated approach	0	0	3	3
	Regional economic approach	0	3	0	3
	Land use planning	0	0	0	0
	Urbanism tradition	3	0	0	3
Switzerland	Comprehensive integrated approach	3	3	2	8
	Regional economic approach	0	0	2	2
	Land use planning	3	0	0	3
	Urbanism tradition	0	0	0	0

174 100 133 407
348 50% 29% 38%

*= Italy is specific case which will be explained in the text

	Strong competencies in spatial planning
	Medium competencies in spatial planning
	Weak competencies in spatial planning
	Overall planning style

In a previous version this table also included the supra-local/sub-regional level, but this level was taken out. One of the reasons was that this level was not the same level in all countries, in a small country the supra-local/sub-regional level was very different from in a big country. Furthermore it didn't really add that much, because in the majority of the countries this level was non-existent or only in a few occasions so that it could not be generalised to the whole country.

So what does this table show? First of all the competencies the different levels have, from a strong competency in spatial planning showing as dark grey, to a weak competency showing as white. In order to be able to value these competencies scores have been added where 3 marks a strong spatial planning competency, 1 marks a weak competency. The 0 means a country doesn't score within that box and non-existent means that that level does obviously not exist. Furthermore the overall classification of a country is marked by bold lettering in the second column. This table is also based on the analysis in chapter three and will be used as a base of further analysis in chapter 4. After adding scores to the table still 10 countries remain attracting attention. These countries are:

1. Czech Republic
2. Denmark
3. Greece
4. Italy
5. Luxembourg
6. Sweden
7. Hungary
8. Slovakia
9. Norway
10. Romania

An interesting thing is that only 6 of these countries coincide with the 13 countries that showed discrepancies in table 1 (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia). In the 10 countries that are mentioned above the overall planning style is not the planning style that has the highest score. There are several explanations for that, which will follow below.

First of all a general comment can be made that in all but one, Italy, of the above countries the discrepancy is caused by a high score of the land use planning or urbanism tradition. This can partially be explained by the strong competencies in many cases of the local level combined with the importance of land use planning and the urbanism tradition on this local level. One could say that this 'pollutes' the

scores in the table a little bit, by attaching a high score to something that is the same in almost all countries.

In the Czech Republic score of the regional economic approach is equal to the land use planning score, but the Czech Republic however is classified under only the land use planning style. In the original table which included the supra-local/sub-regional level the difference was made by the fact that at that level, which has a weak planning competency, land use planning could be found. Therefore land use planning has the small edge over the regional economic approach.

In Denmark there is no national overview available so the table is preliminary as well as the comments that can be made related to Denmark. What can be seen though is that Denmark has a comprehensive integrated approach, which indeed scores very high, but the land use planning however scores a little bit higher. This can be called peculiar to say the least. Part of it can be explained by the strong competencies of the local level and thus the high score of the land use planning on this level. This then leaves the weak national level and the strong regional level as levels on which land use planning occurs.

Greece is classified within the urbanism tradition and this also scores very high; the land use planning style however scores just as high. Greece is very much in motion and there are some legal uncertainties. This also reflects in the general high scores of Greece also in the other planning styles. Greece however can fall into either category of land use planning or the urbanism tradition, but the national expert classified it in the urbanism tradition as the main planning style.

In Italy the score tables is different than in the rest of the countries as the national expert holds on to this score for good reasons. At the regional level the scores are different because although now the regional planning has a bigger national framework to refer to it mainly is actively practiced in some regions in the south which is the poorest part of Italy. The imbalance exists between the rich north and the poor south that needs to be balanced. In general it is especially applied at the national level as a weaker planning power and is only sometimes visible at the regional level. The score of the comprehensive integrated approach at the regional level is different because Italy has a strong regional competency but the practice of the comprehensive integrated approach is not of the same level in all regions.

In Luxembourg the high score of the urbanism tradition can be explained, due to the fact that it is present at the local level which is almost always the case. The equal score of the regional economic and the comprehensive integrated approach could be explained from the fact that in many countries a mix between the comprehensive integrated and regional economic approach can be found.

In Sweden the strong scores of the land use planning and urbanism tradition can be explained due to the fact that these are almost always present at the local level. Combined with the fact that the municipalities have a monopoly in spatial planning this makes those planning styles weigh very heavy. However the fact that the comprehensive integrated approach only scores on the local level contradicts the theory that usually if a country has a comprehensive integrated approach it can be found on at least 2 levels. Although this is not the case the comprehensive integrated approach is the most important planning style on the local level. The regional economic approach still scores relatively weak due to the fact that the regional level used to be a weak level but with the 'regional growth programmes' under development this should change. More on the comprehensive integrated approach related to Sweden can be found in 4.2.

The Hungarian case has a high score in the category land use planning which is partly made up by again the local level like in the cases above. However there is also land use planning at the national level which leaves a question mark. Most likely this can be explained by the fact that Hungary is moving towards a comprehensive integrated approach, but there are still many traces of the step that usually goes before this transition, the land use planning. However the importance of the comprehensive integrated approach is increasing.

Slovakia is classified under the comprehensive integrated approach and the regional economic approach, but does not score on the regional economic approach on either of the levels. No real explanation for this can be found yet.

In Norway all levels have a big competency in spatial planning and at each level a different style of spatial planning can be found. However Norway is classified under the comprehensive integrated approach and the regional economic approach. On urbanism tradition Norway has the same score as the others countries.

Romania scores strong in land use planning and urbanism tradition at the local and supra-local/sub-regional level, which is not out of the ordinary. However the peculiar part is that the comprehensive can only be found on the national level instead of at least 2 levels.

These are all individual explanations to see if the differences originate in the limitations of the table or if the problems are really more profound. However some problems still are still left unexplained satisfactory. There are also some more general explanations that are less country specific. For instance the field is very much a moving field many countries are sort of phasing in and out of the classification boxes. Countries are moving towards a planning style and incorporate elements of this planning style, but they however cannot be classified under that planning style. First of all it could be because it for instance only took some ingredients. Another reason could be that the incorporation of elements took place just recently and real results have not yet been able to express and so on. Many of the differences could also be explained by the strong local level and the importance of the urbanism tradition and land use planning on this level.

From the table it can also be seen that the local level is most strongly represented. One can calculate this by taking the maximum score, 3, and multiplying it by the number of planning styles, 4. This leads to a maximum score of a 12 in a column. This score is then multiplied by the amount of countries involved, 29, and one gets the total maximum score of 348. Based on this number the percentages can be calculated, where the local level comes to a score of 50%, followed by the national level scoring 38%, after which the regional level follows with 29%. This coincides with the fact that in 15 countries: Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania and Norway in which the local and national level have strong planning competencies.

What also can be said is that in general in case of the comprehensive planning style usually more than one level has strong spatial planning competencies, with exception of Austria and Bulgaria

When one transforms this table into a table in which the countries are ranked one gets a very interesting picture, which has to be read and interpreted with care though related to the addition of A,B,C and D, more on this will follow in the next paragraph. What can be seen is that in the land use planning and urbanism planning tradition there is a big group of New Member States+2+2 which is located in the middle or lower scores, while they seem to overall score rather high

in the comprehensive integrated approach and in a less obvious way in the regional economic approach. This confirms the assumption that they take the comprehensive integrated and regional economic approach as their example model.

Table 3: Scores by planning styles by country

Comprehensive integrated		Regional economic		Land use		Urbanism tradition	
Country	Total	Country	Total	Country	Total	Country	Total
Switzerland(B+)	8	Czech Republic	7	Denmark	7	Malta	7
Netherlands(A)	8	Germany	6	Czech Republic	7	Greece	6
United Kingdom (C-)	8	France	5	Malta	7	Luxembourg	6
Lithuania(A)	8	Greece	5	Greece	6	Austria	5
Finland(A)	7	Portugal	5	Luxembourg	6	Belgium	5
Poland(A)	7	Latvia	5	Belgium	5	Spain	5
Bulgaria(D)	7	Lithuania	5	Spain	5	Estonia	5
Denmark(A)	7	Austria	4	Estonia	5	Finland	3
Germany(A)	6	Hungary	4	Hungary	5	Germany	3
Estonia(A)	6	Poland	4	Ireland	3	Ireland	3
Slovakia(A)	6	Spain	4	United Kingdom	3	Italy	3
Austria(B+)	6	Ireland	3	Austria	3	Portugal	3
France(A)	5	Belgium	3	Finland	3	Sweden	3
Hungary(B+)	5	Luxembourg	3	Germany	3	United Kingdom	3
Latvia(B-)	5	Norway	3	Italy	3	Cyprus	3
Greece(D)	5	Italy	2	Netherlands	3	Czech Republic	3
Slovenia(C+)	5	United Kingdom	2	Portugal	3	Hungary	3
Ireland(A)	4	Sweden	2	Sweden	3	Latvia	3
Belgium(B+)	3	Slovenia	2	Cyprus	3	Lithuania	3
Luxembourg(C+)		Switzerland	2	Latvia	3	Poland	3
Portugal(D)	3	Denmark	0	Lithuania	3	Slovakia	3
Sweden (C-)	3	Finland	0	Poland	3	Slovenia	3
Malta(C-)	3	Netherlands	0	Slovakia	3	Romania	3
Romania(B+)	3	Cyprus	0	Slovenia	3	Switzerland	3
Norway(D)	3	Estonia	0	Romania	3	France	2
Italy(D)	2	Malta	0	Switzerland	3	Bulgaria	1
Spain(D)	0	Slovakia	0	France	2	Denmark	0
Cyprus (C+)	0	Bulgaria	0	Bulgaria	1	Netherlands	0
Czech Republic(C-)	0	Romania	0	Norway	0	Norway	0

 Countries that can be overall classified within the style of planning as can

be found in the column header

*No National Overview

(A) Countries in which there is both horizontal as well as vertical coordination on multiple levels and on levels with a strong planning competency

(B+) Countries with mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak horizontal coordination but horizontal coordination exists at levels with the main planning competency

(B-) Countries with mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak or no horizontal coordination


(C+) Countries with mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak vertical coordination but vertical coordination exists between levels with the main planning competency

(C-) Countries with mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak or no vertical coordination

(D) Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination

The above table can also be visualised in maps. The following 4 pages will therefore contain maps of each of the four columns. The additional A till D classification will be dealt with in a different map (map 7) further on in this analysis.

Map 3: Presence of the urbanism tradition




ESPON
 EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING
 OBSERVATORY

© ESPON and Project 2.3.2. 2006

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
 Regional level: NUTS 0


Origin of the data: IIDL Qualitative indicator

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews



Map 3 comments: The map presents the presence of the urbanism tradition based on the scores on each level on the urbanism tradition in *table 2: planning styles by level vs. competencies by level p. 54*.

Map 4: Presence of land use planning




© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
 Regional level: NUTS 0
 Origin of the data: IIDL Qualitative indicator
 Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

Low
 High

Map 4 comments: The map presents the presence of the land use planning based on the scores on each level on the land use planning in *table 2: planning styles by level vs. competencies by level p. 54*.

Map 5: Presence of the regional economic approach




ESPON
 EUROPEAN REGIONAL PLANNING
 COOPERATION OPTIMISATION
 © ESPON and Project 2.3.2. 2006

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
 Regional level: NUTS 0


Origin of the data: IIDL Qualitative indicator

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews



Map 5 comments: The map presents the presence of the regional economic approach based on the scores on each level on the regional economic approach in *table 2: planning styles by level vs. competencies by level p. 54*.


Map 6: Presence of the comprehensive integrated approach



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Origin of the data: IIDL Qualitative indicator

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews



Map 6 comments: The map presents the presence of the comprehensive integrated approach based on the scores on each level on the comprehensive integrated approach in *table 2: planning styles by level vs. competencies by level p. 54.*

4.2 How comprehensiveness of planning styles is taking place in the 29 Espon countries

The movement that took place and is still ongoing towards the comprehensive and integrated approach (and the regional economic approach, but that movement has less gradations) has to be seen with a little bit more nuance than one might take into account in the first place. So is the movement that is taking place really that big or does reality show a different picture? In the following analysis a closer look is taken on the countries with a comprehensive integrated approach one by one comparing it with the operational definition as defined before in order to get a better insight. Also the countries that could not be classified are analysed on their level of comprehensiveness in order to come to a complete picture.

‘Comprehensive integrated approach is the managing of space through a hierarchical system of spatial plans on several geographical levels taking into account all relevant sectors that have an impact on the spatial development. It is related with land use and cross-sectoral coordination. Countries that fall under the comprehensive integrated approach planning always have a hierarchy of plans and institutions with a planning competency furthermore one can see vertical and horizontal coordination between the different sectors and levels taking place’.

One cannot just say this movement is taking place, without taking into account the level of comprehensiveness. Horizontal and vertical coordination play an important role in the comprehensive integrated approach. As seen above in a lot of the cases when a country can be qualified within the comprehensive integrated approach it does not necessarily have both horizontal as well as vertical coordination. Even if this is the case the level of coordination varies, the horizontal coordination can for instance only take place at one level, or the vertical coordination just between two levels.

Generally four groups of countries can be distinguished in the table:

1. Countries in which there is both horizontal as well as vertical coordination (Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia) (A)
2. Countries with mainly vertical coordination and weak or no horizontal coordination (Austria, Belgium, Hungary, Romania, Switzerland) (B)
3. Countries with mainly horizontal coordination and weak or no vertical coordination (Sweden, UK, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovenia) (C)

4. Countries with a weak horizontal and vertical coordination (Bulgaria, Norway) (D)

Within these groups an additional distinction can be made based on the different competencies in spatial planning by adding (+) or (-) to the classifications.

In case of both good and vertical and horizontal coordination (A) or either weak or no vertical and horizontal coordination (D), there is no addition of a plus or minus value, because if one of the two would have been weak it would not have been classified within A or D in the first place.

The (+) and (-) can be explained best by an example. In the case of UK which is classified under the countries with mainly horizontal coordination and weak or no vertical coordination the (-) basically refers to the level of vertical coordination. In the case of the UK there is no vertical coordination due to the strong tradition of departmental autonomy both in central and local government, while in the case of Luxembourg there is horizontal coordination taking place at the levels with the main planning powers, however Luxembourg could not be classified under A, because not all levels are to be in place. An extra comment has to be made regarding Luxembourg, Slovenia and in a lesser way Malta and Cyprus. All these countries are relatively small and thus do not have the national, regional and local political-administrative levels in place. However especially in the case of Luxembourg and Slovenia which can be qualified under the comprehensive integrated approach all levels that could be in place given the size of the country are there. This is the only reasons why they cannot be placed under A, they do have a proper vertical coordination, it only is less profound.


When the above way of qualifying is combined with the ranking scores table it leads to table 4.

Table 4: classification of countries based on level of comprehensiveness

Strong vertical and horizontal coordination (A)	Mainly vertical coordination (B)		Mainly horizontal coordination (C)		Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination (D)
	(A)	(B+)	(B-)	(C+)	
Countries that ARE classified in the comprehensive integrated approach					
Netherlands8	Switzerland8		Slovenia5	UK8	Bulgaria7
Lithuania8	Austria6		Luxembourg3	Sweden3	Norway3
Denmark7	Hungary5		Malta3		
Finland7	Romania3				
Poland7	Belgium3				
Germany6					
Estonia6					
Slovakia6					
France5					
Latvia5					
Ireland4					
Countries that are NOT classified in the comprehensive integrated approach					
			Cyprus0	Czech Republic0	Greece5
					Italy3
					Portugal3
					Spain0

When taking a look at the table several comments can be made. First of all a comment has to be made considering the smaller countries such as Luxembourg, Malta and Slovenia, where there is vertical coordination, but due to relative small size of the countries not all levels are in place. The case of Bulgaria is rather interesting because both types of coordination should be taking place also reflected in the high score within the comprehensive integrated approach. However due to the rather unique situation that everything exists in theory, but that in reality all plans are already very outdated, Bulgaria's theory and practice could not be farther apart. The position of the countries that cannot be classified under the comprehensive integrated approach confirms their classification as the majority falls into the D box. The relative high score of Greece however can be called surprising, but this has to do with similar factors as in Bulgaria. In Greece there are many elements that exist in theory, but in reality real results have not yet been seen. Besides Greece is in a phase of transition and thus already contains several elements of the comprehensive integrated approach but these are not yet really working. The table was also transformed to a map as shown on the next page.

Map 7: Level of development of the comprehensive integrated approach in spatial planning



© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Regional level: NUTS 0

Origin of the data: IIDL Synthetic Indicator



- Strong vertical and horizontal coordination (A)
- Mainly vertical coordination (B+)
- Mainly vertical coordination (B-)
- Mainly horizontal coordination (C+)
- Mainly horizontal coordination (C-)
- Both weak vertical and horizontal coordination
- Not classified in the comprehensive integrated approach

Source: ESPON 2.3.2. National Overviews

Map 7 comments: The map presents the level of comprehensiveness based on *table 4: classification of countries based on level of comprehensiveness* on p. 70. An elaboration on the A till D classifications can be found on page 63 of this annex.

4.2.1 Countries that can be classified under the comprehensive integrated approach

A Both vertical and horizontal coordination

(A) Countries in which there is both horizontal as well as vertical coordination on multiple levels and on levels with a strong planning competency

Denmark: horizontal and vertical coordination (A)

In Denmark the local and regional level have strong competencies in spatial planning, while the national level has a weak competency. The comprehensive integrated approach can be found on all levels, although at the national level due to the weak national competencies the score is low. The Danish planning system is founded in a comprehensive land use oriented style and in 2001 the Planning Act was amended in a more strategic/spatial oriented way. Vertical coordination has been insured by the so called framework guidance principle where a plan at one level may not contradict a plan at a higher level. Only where national interests are important the national level has been in power. A good example of horizontal coordination is the National Planning Report that was coordinated with all national interesting 'belonging' to other ministries. From 2007 a new administrative structure will come into action representing big changes. The regions will lose their power as (land use) planning authorities and most of the planning responsibilities will be moved to the municipalities while a few often very technical duties will be moved to the national level. The new regions have to take care of a new sort of spatial planning, regional development plans, but which formal power according to the municipalities will be very limited.

Finland: horizontal and vertical coordination (A)

In Finland the local and regional level are the levels with the main planning competencies. The comprehensive integrated approach can be found on all levels, although at the national level due to the weak competencies in spatial planning of the national level the score here is low. Finland has a system with a strong vertical coordination, plans from the high level steer the plans on the lower levels. Since 2001 the national level set up guidelines which completed the hierarchy. The new Land Use and Building Act that came into use in 2000 furthermore devolved powers to the local level and stimulated horizontal coordination in terms of public participation. The land use legislation law of 1999 introduced the cross-sectoral aspect in the spatial planning. The integration of policy aims and activities between different policy sectors is generally seen to be easier on the regional and local level, rather than on the national level. On the national level

the current governance system is organised in a way that reflects both the concerns for sector-specific integration, focus on certain chosen key areas of strategic importance as well as the management by programmes.

France: vertical and horizontal coordination (A)

The national level is the level with the main planning competencies while the other levels have a medium competency in spatial planning. The Comprehensive integrated approach can be found on both the national and regional level. In France the vertical coordination is centralised, new laws however devoluted more powers to the lower echelons. Vertical coordination takes place in a co-operative way from state to local level. Furthermore spatial planning is seen as inherently cross sectoral and thus almost all but two planning instruments are comprehensive.

Germany: vertical coordination and horizontal coordination (A)

In Germany the national, regional and local level all have strong competencies in spatial planning and on national and regional level the comprehensive integrated approach can be found. Germany has an advanced system of vertical coordination, the counter current principle. In terms of horizontal coordination this is hard to measure due to the fact that the States each have their own autonomy; however it can be read that policy instruments and sectoral policies influence each other in a reciprocal.

Ireland: modest vertical and horizontal coordination (A)

The local and national level are the level with the main planning competencies in Ireland and only on the national level and regional level (the latter has a weak competency) the comprehensive integrated approach can be found. The Irish planning style is very modestly involved in horizontal and vertical coordination. Just recently the national level became responsible for making a National Plan that steers the lower levels. Furthermore an Interdepartmental Steering Committee was established to improve the horizontal coordination. Also arrangements were also put in place for wide-ranging consultation with regional bodies, local authorities, local development bodies and the social partners (because of the importance in the country of the regional economic approach). So in theory the right elements seem to be in place, but the level of success cannot be read from the national overview therefore the changes have been too recent.

Netherlands: horizontal and vertical coordination (A)

The national and local levels have the main competencies in spatial planning and the comprehensive integrated approach can be found on all levels in the Netherlands. The Netherlands has a great level of vertical as well as horizontal coordination. In the Netherlands spatial planning is also not called a sectoral field but a facet field in order to underline the importance of cross-sectoral coordination. In the field of vertical coordination the system is pretty centralized, however there are laws underway that should give the provincial level a more prominent role in spatial planning in order to improve the vertical coordination more.

Estonia: Strong vertical and horizontal coordination (A)

In Estonia the local and national level are the levels with the main planning competencies which coincide with the levels on which the comprehensive integrated approach can be found. On the horizontal and vertical level many safeguards are been build in to ensure harmony as can be read below. For ensuring mutual compliance of plans the following is foreseen:

A supervisory authority shall approve a plan after the plan is brought into compliance with the requirements prescribed in the process of supervision and the written objections are resolved or after providing an opinion concerning such objections, and shall make a proposal to the county governor or local government for the plan to be adopted (Planning Act, §23 (6)).

In the event of justified need, a supervisory authority may make a proposal for a plan submitted for supervision to be adopted partially (Planning Act, §23 (7)).

If an adopted comprehensive plan includes a proposal to amend an adopted county plan and the county governor has given his or her consent to the amendments in the course of supervision, the county governor shall enter the corresponding amendments in the county plan. A decision to adopt a comprehensive plan which includes a proposal to amend an adopted county plan enters into force after the amendments made to the comprehensive plan are entered in the county plan (Planning Act, §24 (4)).

If a detailed plan to be adopted includes a proposal to amend an adopted comprehensive plan and the county governor has given his or her consent to the amendments in the course of supervision, the local government shall enter the corresponding amendments in the comprehensive plan and adopt the plan (Planning Act, §24 (5)).

Lithuania: vertical and horizontal coordination (A)

In Lithuania the national and local level have the main planning competencies and the comprehensive integrated approach can be

found on the national, regional and local level. The comprehensiveness in Lithuania reflects itself very well in for example the making of the National Development plan which was the first effort in this area. In this complex process all sorts of relevant actors as well horizontally as vertically were involved, consulted etc; it was a true process of open partnership. Also development strategies in other sectoral fields have to fit in the spatial plans. At the local level not all municipalities have a comprehensive plan; some have other less comprehensive land managing schemes. So all in all there is vertical and horizontal coordination taking place, but it has to be said that Lithuania doesn't have a long tradition yet.

Latvia: vertical coordination, horizontal coordination at the national and regional level (A)

In Latvia the local and national level have the main competencies in spatial planning where the comprehensive integrated approach can be found on the national and regional level as well. Spatial plans are made therefore made on all levels. There seems to proper vertical coordination. Also horizontal coordination seems to be taking place at the national and regional level. The regional level however has medium competencies in spatial planning. Each Planning Region Development Agency performs the following function in co-operation with local governments and territorial offices of State institutions develops a development programme and territorial spatial plan of the planning region, ensures co-ordination thereof with the National Spatial Plan, the National Development Plan and sectoral development programmes, as well as ensures the management of implementation thereof.

Poland: vertical coordination, horizontal coordination (A)

In Poland the national and local level have the main planning competencies and the comprehensive integrated approach can be found at the national, regional level. There is a good system of vertical coordination between national, sectoral and regional levels of government. A good example was the NDP at the national level which was a comprehensive plan that coordinated with the regional development strategies and the most important sectoral strategies. Furthermore the plans and studies on the different levels bear a strong socio-economic focus but there is also attention for the environment. They seem to contain the relevant sectors in the area of spatial planning. Coordination between regional and local level is much more difficult. One of the reasons is the low coordinating power of Voivodship Spatial Development Plan and lack (so far) of the Metropolitan Areas plans. Good examples here are the difficulties with the location of motorways and expressways on the suburban

communities' territories (Warsaw Metropolitan Area). Coordination of Plans between neighboring communes (gmina's) is obligatory. Good examples are the Gmina's' association (among others for nature protection or tourism development) and euroregions. Negative examples are the co-operation concerning road investment. Presently the weakest is the horizontal co-ordination inside metropolitan areas.

Slovakia: horizontal and vertical coordination (A)

In Slovakia the local, regional and national level all have a competency in planning and the comprehensive integrated approach can be found on the national and regional level. The Development of the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001 was made through a process of horizontal and vertical coordination. The regional self governance and the regional planning documents are made are in compliance with the national policy. However the level of horizontal coordination is hard to read from the national overview.

Horizontal co-ordination is only made possible in accordance with the possibilities given by law, thus in accordance with the spatial planning law. It states that all sectoral policies with territorial impact shall accept the obligatory part of the spatial/ territorial plans.

With the preparation of spatial/territorial plans the coordination and cooperation with the relevant bodies which are responsible for several sectoral policies on each hierarchical levels is very important. These bodies are the direct participants of the negotiations as well as by hear the case before the approval.

B Mainly vertical coordination

(B+) Countries with mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak horizontal coordination but at levels with the main planning competency

(B-) Countries with mainly vertical coordination at all or at levels with a strong planning competency and weak or no horizontal coordination

Austria: vertical coordination, weak horizontal coordination (B+)

In Austria the main planning competencies lie at the local level. In Austria the comprehensiveness does not exist in terms of horizontal coordination on the national and regional level, this only takes place at the local level. Furthermore there is a strong level of vertical coordination as all plans comply with each other. The local level however remains the level with the main planning competency.

Belgium: vertical coordination and weak horizontal coordination (B+)

In Belgium the situation is rather hard to describe. Belgium is a federal state with 3 regions that have complete autonomy. The national level is not really relevant, but the regional level is very relevant and has a strong competency. The local level has a medium competency in spatial planning. The vertical coordination within the region is good. Vertical coordination between the regional and national level is existent but not very strong. On the issue of horizontal coordination it seems that there is a low level of horizontal coordination, mainly sectoral plans can be found. However more and more strategic integrative plans can be found since the regions took over the planning competency.

Hungary: variable horizontal coordination, vertical coordination (B+)

In Hungary the comprehensive integrated approach takes place at the local and national level, where the local level is the level with the main competencies in spatial planning. In principle, spatial planning has always been regarded as an inter-disciplinary process with strong horizontal and vertical relationships. This is emphasized in the *Act XXI of 1996 on Spatial Development and Planning*. The planning system laid down in the Act is hierarchical, with, however, feed-back from the lower levels. The institutional system is based on the effective co-operation of a range of ministries and government authorities.

In accordance with the Government Decree No. 184/1996, issued as a follow-up to the Act, on the approval process of spatial development programmes and spatial plans, the sectoral ministries must take part in the consultation process and are required to give comments.

Horizontal (inter-departmental) co-operation takes place throughout the elaboration of spatial plans. The effectiveness of inter-departmental co-operation is, however, dependent on the participants. It has happened several times that the delegated officials were selected on an ad hoc manner, were not prepared for active participation. Sometimes, especially in the consultation period, political preferences or differences confused the process.

In spatial planning vertical co-operation takes place between layers of governments and their officials in the elaboration of spatial plans partly the form of mutual provision of information, and partly by way of consultation and debate.

In terms of vertical coordination related to the elaboration of the National Spatial Plan already in the first stage the fundamental concepts and proposals of the plan were presented to the county and local authorities, and their responses were taken into account. Later, when the elaboration of the spatial plans of the counties had also

begun, a real working relation was established between the planning agencies. In the ongoing (current) process of elaboration of the National Spatial Strategy there is an experiment of a cyclical planning process of the central government and regional development councils.

Romania: horizontal coordination only taking place at the national level, vertical coordination (B+)

In Romania the comprehensive integrated approach can be found on the national level only and the national and local level have the main competencies in spatial planning. Furthermore there is a system of vertical coordination between the different levels in the sense that the different spatial documents need to comply with each other.

Switzerland: strong vertical coordination and less strong horizontal coordination (B+)

The comprehensive integrated approach can be found on all levels where the local and regional levels have the main competencies in spatial planning. There is an advanced system of vertical coordination between the different levels. Furthermore there is also horizontal coordination taking place, but the focus seems to be mainly on the coordination between cantons, municipalities, etc. and less between the different sectors. Good examples are the sectoral plans and strategies made by the Confederation. However there are also cross-sectoral technical groups as in for instance a project that is meant to create cooperation between three core cities (RUN) as a best practice example, but in general there is still a lot to be improved in this area. Another good example in this direction is the ROK which has been founded within the federal administration for the horizontal coordination of spatially relevant tasks with representatives of all institutions of the federal level. The starting point was the realisation of the Federal Council, that an effective Coordination between Regional Policy and Sectoral Policies can only become possible, when the spatial dimension is added to sectoral policies.

C Mainly horizontal coordination

(C+) Countries with mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak vertical coordination but between levels with the main planning competency

(C-) Countries with mainly horizontal coordination at all levels or levels with strong planning competencies and weak or no vertical coordination

Sweden: horizontal coordination at the local level, vertical coordination weak (C-)

In Sweden there is only one level that holds the main planning competency and that is the local level, this is also the level where the comprehensive integrated approach can be found. Vertical coordination is weak due to the incomplete hierarchy; horizontal coordination only takes place at the local level. In Sweden the hierarchy in planning levels is pretty weak. The national level is not obliged to make a national plan, but does however set out guidelines. Regional planning is carried out voluntarily and so far has only been carried out by the region of Stockholm. Furthermore the regional plan is sectoral. On the local level a comprehensive municipal plan is obligatory.

UK: Horizontal coordination, weak vertical coordination (C-)

The national and local level are the levels with the main competencies in spatial planning and in the UK the comprehensive integrated approach takes place at the regional and national level and there are now also spatial plans at these levels. At the regional level there is Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) is prepared by the Regional Planning Bodies (which are now the Regional Assemblies), and seeks to integrate a wide range of sectoral policies, such as transport and economic development, and their implication for land use policies. RPG is now being replaced by Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) which, unlike RPG, will be statutory. At the national level the Secretary of State has overall responsibility for shaping and guiding national planning policy. His/her task is to coordinate the work of individual local authorities and to ensure that their development plans and development control procedures are in harmony with broad planning policies. As one can see there is mainly horizontal coordination taking place between sectors. There is a strong tradition of departmental autonomy both in central and local government. There are few mechanisms which ensure integration and the lack of coordination of policy and spending programmes is commonly criticised.

Luxembourg: horizontal and vertical coordination (C+) (due to the absence of all levels)

In Luxembourg there are only two levels, the local and national, which both have a big competency in spatial planning. Only on the national level however the comprehensive integrated approach can be found. Luxembourg is moving in the direction of integration of spatial planning and territorial development. The comprehensive integrated approach mainly takes place at the national level due to the small

size of the country. The 1999 law put the frame for the general spatial planning, which will be organized from the national level with:

- One « programme directeur » (national level), strategic, giving the frame for all the other plans, orientating actions and decisions of the government and the local authorities, but nevertheless « non binding » for citizens.
- Several « plans sectoriels » (national level) (for instance Lyceum)
- 6 regional plans (regional level): they integrate at regional level strategies from programme director, sectoral policies and municipalities' development plan.
- Finally, at local level (municipal) land occupation plans, and development plans

The fact that those different tasks, at different level, are gathered under the same department will help a better coordination and integration. Within the plans there is a lot of room for vertical as well as horizontal coordination.

Malta: horizontal and vertical coordination (C+) (due to the absence of all levels)

The national level is the level with the main planning competency and only at the national level the comprehensive integrated approach can be found. The national level is also the only level on which spatial planning takes place, also due to the size of the country. At the local levels you may have local councils who make suggestions how their localities can be improved and these are put forward to the MEPA through the respective authorities.

Planning in Malta is regulated by the MEPA Board (Malta Environment and Planning Authority). All projects of both a public and private nature have to be vetted by the MEPA board. The Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands (1990) and the Local Plans provide a form of integrated policy packages. As can be read there is horizontal coordination taking place. There is however also vertical coordination but only two levels are of importance, of which the national level has the main and only competency in spatial planning. The seven local plans are based on research, data collection, surveys, public and stakeholder consultation, projections and policy formulation for seven distinct areas in Malta and Gozo in order to address and respond to issues and demands in each Local Plan area. So vertical coordination also takes place, although is limited due to the general absence of levels and the absence of a planning competency for the other level.

Slovenia: horizontal and vertical coordination (C+) (due to the absence of all levels)

In Slovenia the comprehensive integrated approach can be found on the national and regional level with a competency in spatial planning on the national and local level. It however has to be said that in Slovenia the regional level has not yet established formally the regional administrative level. On the national level there is horizontal and vertical coordination however some things need to be said here. The horizontal coordination at the national level used to be weak but recently changes are taking place towards a sound horizontal coordination of which the National Development Plan was the first result. The vertical coordination however can go less deep due to the fact that Slovenia does not yet have all levels established. As a result for instance the only spatial planning instrument at the regional level is the »Regional Conception of Spatial Development«, which has been prepared jointly by the state and the municipalities according to the principle of partnership and governance. The National Agency for Regional Development (NARD for short) was established in January 2000 in order to set up Regional Development Agencies. The NARD plays an important role in the improvement of horizontal and vertical coordination.

D Both weak or no vertical and horizontal coordination

(D) Countries in which there is either weak or no vertical and horizontal coordination

Bulgaria: In theory vertical and horizontal coordination in practice everything seems to slowly come out of a long sleep. (D)

In Bulgaria the comprehensive integrated method can be found on all levels, while only the national level has a strong competency in spatial planning. There is a wide range of plans, strategies and other documents of spatial relevance that all are linked and coordinated vertically as well as horizontally. However the reality shows that things are less rosy. Bulgaria has accumulated negligent experience with respect to spatial planning under the new socio-economic conditions. In the recent fifteen years almost no new spatial plans have been developed and only partial amendments were processed. The Master Plans of the human settlements and their central urban areas are obsolete and no more up-to-date after the processes of restitution. Their partial amendments piece by piece are a vicious practice, which gives rise to serious problems in the management of the processes in the municipalities and human settlements. Design of new cadastral plan and new spatial plans is an urgent necessity.

The number of designed new spatial plans is extremely low. Out of the total of 264 municipalities new spatial plans have been worked out and approved for only about 3 or 4 municipalities. The number of worked out new spatial plans of cities is almost identical, whereat some of them have not even been officially approved. We may point out in terms of example the draft for a new General Spatial Development Plan of the city of Sofia, which has been worked out during the period 1999-2002 and has not been officially approved. In recent years, however, an ever-growing number of municipalities begin to appreciate that spatial planning is a key element to the good governance of the municipality and the human settlements. They begin to orient themselves to the development of new spatial plans and alone during the current year preparation of 5-6 new plans will start. The delay in the spatial planning process is due to a number of reasons, some of which are connected with financial problems.

Although the Spatial Planning Act (2001) regulates the development of spatial planning schemes at the national and regional levels, this process has not started yet. A certain element of spatial planning is now being integrated in the development strategies of the districts (in compliance with the provisions of the two laws – the Regional Development Act of 2004 and the Spatial Development Act). The 28 district development strategies for the period up to 2013 whereat a combination of the regional development planning and the spatial development planning is aimed at in the process of their compilation.

Norway: weak vertical coordination and weak horizontal coordination only at the national level (D)

The comprehensive integrated approach can only be found at the national level where all levels have a strong competency in spatial planning. The Ministry of the Environment was established in 1972 and once it was established, obtained the task of physical planning from the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development (MLGRD). Through policy guidelines and by monitoring the planning processes at county and municipality levels. The Ministry for Local Government and Regional Development controls certain instruments for regional policy implementation, and also bears the responsibility for co-ordinating overall governmental activities influencing regional development. With respect to spatial development, two ministry departments are of particular interest, the Department of Regional Development (Regionalavdelingen) and the Department of Local Government (Kommuneavdelingen). So there seems to be a lot of vertical coordination in theory, however there are also many problems in practice. Ideally, the county planning process has a role to play as a sectoral integrative tool. The counties seek to involve municipalities, economic and private interest in the planning process

leading towards the various thematic plans that constitute the complete county plan. However, many of the smaller municipalities that possess only a small organisation and few administrative resources feel themselves to be somewhat marginalised in this regional planning process (Knudsen et al. 2005: 24-25). Many of these participants also note that the regional planning process itself, and the documents being produced, are of little relevance locally. This is particularly notable on the issues of territorial, environmental and resource planning, so the thematic county plans are somewhat lacking in terms of local legitimacy (Langeland 2001). Much of the initiative in terms of territorial planning remains with the local municipalities. To make these issues even more complex, much of the physical planning and –administration is currently influenced by sectoral interests. National instructions and regulations are not all consistent.

4.2.2 Countries that cannot be classified under the comprehensive integrated approach

Greece: weak vertical coordination and horizontal coordination (D)

In Greece there is only one level with the main planning competency and that is the national level. At the national level a whole range of planning functions (spatial, environmental, construction of transport infrastructure etc.) are under the roof of a single ministry, the Ministry for the Environment, Spatial Planning and Public Works (YPECHODE). One would say that this would lead to good horizontal coordination, however departmental antagonisms even within YPECHODE can be blamed for poor integration of transport, environmental, housing and urban policies within the framework of spatial plans. Inter-ministerial antagonisms are much more serious. It is evident that these barriers cut across all levels of the administrative pyramid down to local government, especially 2nd tier local authorities. So in theory there are many things in place that should make horizontal coordination work, committees, etc, however in practice it does not work at all. In terms of vertical coordination the same can be seen. There is a clear hierarchic system which however is highly centralised. The recent law (L.2742/1999) for "Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development" can be positive because it strengthens the capability of the system for vertical coordination, although in so doing it enhances the vertical logic of the system. It introduced a hierarchy of plans (see subsection 6.1), to connect the national, regional and urban levels, and attempts to harmonize spatial and economic development plans. However any real results of the new law have not yet been observed.

Italy: weak vertical and horizontal coordination (D)

In Italy the main planning competencies can be found at the local and regional level, while the comprehensive integrated approach can only be found at the regional level. Despite recent institutional and practical novelties, policies still suffer from lack of co-ordination both in vertical and horizontal sense. First and foremost, current legislative framework in the domain of public works does not resolve the problem of projects "localisation". So, conflicts may usually emerge between national or regional choices of land transformation (for instance, the localisation of main infrastructures) and local plans. Since Italy is a country where traditionally institutional disagreements between are submitted to judicial review, one may understand the traditional difficulties of an effective planning and territorial governance in Italy. However, some recent legislative provisions, with the introduction of new tools for inter-institutional co-operation and agreement (§ 3.3), have certainly improved the framework. Even if horizontal relations in planning are usually seen as a matter of co-ordinating sector policies, which is certainly a problem also in Italy, the major problem appears to be still constituted by the relations between public and non-public actors. The recent addition of the provincial level and the new central awareness however add to the hierarchy.

Portugal: weak vertical and horizontal coordination (D)

In Portugal the main planning competencies are located at the national and local level where only on the national level the comprehensive integrated approach can be found. The horizontal coordination at the national level is reflected in the fact that currently, the Government's Organization Chart comprises three Ministries which are deeply involved in issues of spatial planning: the Ministry of Cities, Local Administration, Housing and Regional Development; the Ministry of Public Works, Transportation and Communication; and the Ministry of the Environment and Land Planning. The Directorate-General for Spatial Planning and Urban Development is the department of central administration responsible for the implementation of spatial and urban planning policies and it is chiefly responsible for promoting, preparing, supervising, reviewing and assessing the national spatial programme. The vertical coordination together with the horizontal coordination is laid down in the strategic framework has been defined for territorial planning, establishing a reference frame to be respected in spatial planning at the regional and local level and in land-use. It further guarantees the compatibility between the different sectoral policies with territorial impact, and creates special instruments when necessary. However all

these factors did not really lead to real results yet, with the exception of the EXPO98 that was held in Portugal.

Spain: weak vertical and horizontal coordination (D)

In Spain the main planning competencies are located at the regional level, however there is a conflict between the local and the regional level, where the local level has the main competencies in the urban plans. The comprehensive integrated approach cannot be found on either of the levels. Because in practice there is a lack of coordination and co-operation, or maybe for this reason, horizontal and multi-level governance are considered as very important aspects for spatial development. However things are very vague about the ways to proceed in order to come to more concrete steps. This task seems to belong to other spheres as legislation on public administration. So there is a clear recognition of the need of vertical and horizontal coordination, but because there are no clear steps or measures the situation remains at a standstill. Only real progress of coordination among levels especially regional and national, has taken place in the regional economic approach (for the preparation of national and regional development plans for objective 1 and 2 regions). More recently another interesting initiative of coordination from a vertical and horizontal point of view (between levels and sectoral policies) is the Strategic Plan of Infrastructure and Transport (already elaborated but still to be discussed and approved by the Spanish Parliament).

Cyprus: horizontal and vertical coordination (C+) (due to the absence of all levels)

The national and local levels have the main competencies in planning and the comprehensive integrated approach cannot be found on any of the levels. In Cyprus in the base there is good vertical coordination taking place, but this takes place within the ministry (of Interior) so it cannot really be seen as vertical coordination. Cyprus is a small island and as such only has the local and regional level as relevant levels with the planning competencies. There is a strong horizontal coordination, a good example are the Local plans in which the cooperation is not confined among the various government departments but it is extended also to include people representing other interests. The cooperation in this case included all departments related to the collection of relevant data which involved maps (land and surveys department) and subsequently population changes and structure (department of statistics), existing development (department of town planning, municipalities and District Officer), main road pattern (public works department), main infrastructure network (semi-government organizations), environmental issues (environmental service), etc.

Czech Republic: weak vertical and horizontal coordination (C-)

In the Czech Republic the local level is the level with the main planning competency. The comprehensive integrated approach cannot be found on any of the levels. This is reflected in the weak vertical coordination. Vertical coordination took place with for instance the making of the National Development Plan, but on a daily base it is rather weak, the municipal level plays the main role. In terms of horizontal coordination this is also reflected in the micro regions can be found. This means as much as multiple municipalities that usually make up a city and its hinterland, in the case of Prague 171 municipalities make up the hinterland of Prague, working together. Another good example of horizontal coordination is the National Development Plan of the Czech Republic. The National Development Plan includes four sectoral (industry, infrastructure, human resources, countryside and agriculture) and one joined regional operational programme. The National Development Plan includes four horizontal priorities applied in all operational programmes: equal opportunities, sustainable development, balanced regional development and development of informational society. The National Development Plan is a unique outcome of concentrated effort of national and regional governments and sectoral, cross-sectoral and territorially based interests.

Unfortunately, such co-operations do not exist as spontaneous locally based strategies and they emerged only as a response to the external impacts and are dominantly stimulated by the possibility to draw funds from external sources. One of the negative consequences is that only these topics of territorial development that can receive external funding are included and issues that are not eligible are omitted from the cooperation. Possibilities to get finance and not the objective needs are the main driving force behind such collaborations. So as can be seen the vertical coordination is rather weak and temporary as well as the horizontal coordination.

4.3 Regional economic approach

After analysing the comprehensive integrated approach extensively the regional economic planning and what changes could be noted in this area. What can be said that the regional economic planning that originated in France can now be found in many of the European countries and thus has spread and gained in influence. The European influence here cannot be denied in the establishment of the regional level in many of the (New) Member States, because of the functioning of the Structural Funds through the regional level. With the establishments of the regional level and the Structural Funds soon

the regional economic approach was adopted in many countries, either on the regional or national level or in the overall classification of a country. The main characteristics are the balancing of disparities in the socio-economic field between regions. In most countries there is an imbalance, a good example is Germany, where the former East Germany cannot be compared to the former west of Germany in socio-economic terms. The central government formulates ideas to grant the wish to balance this inequity using the powers and funds at its disposal in order to let the regional economic development take place in conformance with these ideas. The central government always plays an important role in the regional economic approach. The regional economic approach cannot be found in only 9 (Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Cyprus, Estonia, Malta, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania) of the ESPON29 countries at one of the levels. As could already be seen in figure 3 it also increased in importance as the overall planning style, almost always linked to the comprehensive integrated approach as is the case in: Germany, Ireland, Sweden, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia and Norway. Portugal is the only country in which the regional planning is linked to the land use planning. Besides the countries that have the regional economic planning as one of the overall planning styles, also some other countries have high scores; caused by the high scores by level as can be found in table 3, mainly: Czech Republic, Greece, Austria, Italy, Poland and Spain. Which can be called strange is that the regional economic approach can be found on the local level in the Czech Republic (it can also be found on the other levels), where in all other countries it can be found on either the national, regional or both levels, which makes more sense.

A further increase of countries that adapt the regional economic approach can be expected as almost all countries have socio-economic imbalances and in terms of spatial justice it would be very unjust not to even try to balance it, also benefiting themselves of EU Structural Funds. Furthermore the growing importance of the cohesion policy would only strengthen the importance of the regional economic approach. However the traditional focus on only the economic and social aspect is currently be broadened by the addition of the territorial (and environmental) dimension, pulling it even deeper into the field of spatial planning.

4.4 Land use planning and the urbanism tradition

Besides the comprehensive integrated and regional economic approach also developments took place in the urbanism tradition and land use planning.

In the concluding figure 3 of the analysis in chapter 3 there it could already be seen that also a small number of countries moved towards the land use planning and the urbanism tradition. Portugal moved from just being classified under the regional economic approach to being classified under the regional economic approach as well as the land use planning style. Spain was first qualified under the urbanism tradition, while now it can be qualified under the urbanism tradition and the land use planning. So it can be seen that the groups of countries that can be classified under the urbanism tradition is stable, while the group and thus the importance too of the land use planning has grown. In the case of Portugal that came from the regional economic approach it could perhaps be seen as a step towards the comprehensive integrated approach. Where in the Spanish case is could represent a step up from the urbanism tradition towards the land use planning to complement the urbanism tradition with the land use planning for some parts of the territory with no urban plan, towards a level that is just above the city scale. Figure 3 only shows the crossing over of Spain from the urbanism tradition to the land use planning; however in the further analysis in chapter 4 it became clear that there is something more going on. The analysis per level showed that the urbanism tradition never exists on its own anymore and can always be found in combination with land use planning, while before the urbanism tradition used to be THE model while currently it is no longer an isolated model, but gets more and more mixed with the land use planning style to become a more integrated approach. In almost all countries the combination of both planning styles is restricted to the local. Furthermore in Belgium, Austria, Greece, Spain and Estonia this combination of planning styles can also be found on the regional level besides the local level. In Greece, Luxembourg, Cyprus and Malta the both planning styles are even to be found as far up as the national level. Except for Greece the other countries can all three be classified as small countries. Land use planning can also be found on the national level in combination with other planning styles as is the case in Denmark, Hungary and the Czech Republic. As one can see the urbanism tradition and the land use planning style became more and more intertwined and seem to converge.

4.5 Synthesis chapter 4

What did this analysis of the individual states bring to light? It confirmed the convergence that was already noted in chapter three,

but it also toned down some of the initial enthusiasm. The movement that took and is still taking place is like already concluded in chapter 3 far from settled down, but already some first conclusions can be drawn.

Table 2 showed that although a country can be qualified under the regional integrated approach for instance and still have a comprehensive integrated approach on the regional level. After adding scores based on the competencies found on the different levels there were still 10 countries that attracted attention. A list of explanation has been given, that explained most of the discrepancies, however not in all cases. What can also be said in general to explain these differences is that due to the fact that the situation is not settled down yet many countries are still classified under one overall planning style, but already elements of other styles of spatial planning have entered the system. In many cases this means that a country contains elements of a planning style but that it cannot yet be fully classified under that style yet.

The countries were also ranked per planning style based on their scores in table 2. Here again it was confirmed that the New Member States embraced the comprehensive integrated and in a less strong way the regional integrated approach.

The focus of this chapter was mainly on the movement towards the comprehensive integrated and the regional economic approach. Due to the fact that the movement towards the regional economic approach has less gradation, less of it could be said than that this movement took and is still taking place. A general spread of this concept is taking place where the European influence functions as a catalyst, through for instance the Structural Funds in order to fight territorial disparities and due just to spatial justice. When it comes to the movement towards the comprehensive integrated approach the style of spatial planning could be broken down into several sub-issues and thus the movement too. Vertical and horizontal coordination together make up the level of comprehensiveness. This allowed a classification of the different countries which showed more details of the actual situation. In many cases in which a country is classified under the comprehensive integrated approach it still is lacking vertical or horizontal coordination. In terms of the level of comprehensiveness the countries in the Baltic Sea Region such as Finland, Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia seem to be doing particularly well. Many of the countries that could not be classified under the comprehensive integrated approach were Mediterranean (table 4): Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Cyprus with additional countries

the Czech Republic. Besides the Czech Republic and Cyprus, they all lacked vertical as well as horizontal coordination. It has to be said though that in several cases like Greece and Portugal the institutional structure seems to be there, but without any real results so far. Also the position of the small countries, such as: Slovenia, Luxembourg, Malta and Cyprus in the category of countries with mainly horizontal coordination can be called special. However a very logical explanation can be given which lies in their size and that because of this simply not all levels are in place.

5. Final Conclusions

What can really be learned from the analysis that leads to these conclusions? The idea was to take the European Compendium as a starting point and from there on update it making use of the unique position of the ESPON 2.3.2 project and the richness of information that can be extracted from National Overviews. Taking the Compendium as the starting point also meant accepting some of the limitations that came forth out of this. From the beginning on the analysis has been confined to the four main planning traditions that were distinguished in the Compendium. This was however also necessary to make comparison possible, one simply cannot compare apples to oranges. Here a reference has to be made to a new way of classifying as can be found under Annex B chapter 20. Here a reference has to be made to a new way of classifying as can be found under Annex B (section 20, ch. 2 of the annex) where a new system of classification is proposed. In this alternative classification, it is recognized that state structures, decentralization processes and devolution of powers are crucial parameters in determining the style of planning of any particular country. The classification of styles of planning suggested in Annex B is based on a combination of the taxonomies produced by NORDREGIO for ESPON 3.2 project and the categorization of cases in terms of devolution of spatial planning powers produced for ESPON 2.3.2.

NORDREGIO had developed a typology of State Structures (Federal States, Regionalized Unitary States, Decentralized Unitary States, Centralized Unitary States and New EU Member-States and candidate countries) and a typology of Regionalization (Administrative Regionalization, Regional Decentralization, Regionalization through existing Local Authorities, Regional autonomy or Political Regionalization, and Regionalization through Federate Authorities). In the context of ESPON 2.3.2, a classification was put forward in terms

of Devolution of Powers to the regional level, which distinguished between basically Unitary and Federal states, with three sub-categories within each: Unitary states (Devolution to regions / real power in central state, Devolution to regions / real power in regions, and Centralization / Dominant central state) and Federal states (Devolution to regions / strong central state and regions, Devolution to regions / weak central state and regions, and Devolution to regions / weak central state - strong regions). A further categorization was made of states with a strong local – municipal level, into cases with a strong or weak national state. Additional parameters were also taken into account, related to the existence of interaction and negotiation (national – regional), contracts (national – regional or regional – subregional), devolution to sub-regions within regions, regional – metropolitan authorities, and regional planning through inter-municipal cooperation.

The result is shown in Annex B in two tables. In the first we showed the characteristics of all countries in terms of parameters used in the above taxonomies. In the second we attempted a cross-tabulation, which leads to a new grouping of countries, with certain countries appearing inevitably twice.

A conclusion arrived at towards the end of Annex B is that the adoption of similar models of planning and action, largely under the impact of the EU, may create a semblance of uniformity and of a trend towards a style of comprehensive planning. To some extent this is true, but only partly. It would be nearer the truth to admit that real planning, as opposed to that described in national planning legislation and documents, presents a wide range of variations, due to the co-existence of methods of action, particular to each country. Besides, it is not totally certain that specific models describe accurately the present, often fluid, situation even in the countries traditionally associated with them. In addition, the question has to be asked if “comprehensiveness” is compatible with notions like “openness” and “communicative – collaborative rationality”, advocated now as essential ingredients of a more “governance” – oriented planning. Contradictions are likely to be nearer reality than uniformity.

The current situation is very different from the situation described in the Compendium. The changes that took place mainly have to do with the fact that the planning systems in the countries are not static, but borrow and mix elements from the other styles of spatial planning and thus are dynamic. The dynamics within the system are caused by several reasons like for instance the development of the ESDP and

other European policies such as the Structural Funds. In the old Member States the ESDP had an impact during the process of making it. The movement that took place is mainly towards the comprehensive integrated and regional economic approach. However this mixing and moving towards different planning styles makes the borders between the planning styles fade and creates a cross over planning style that was already noted by Janin Rivolin and Faludi (2005) and named as the North-Western perspective. This general trend could be accepted as an overall pattern as, also including the New Member States as explained below, even though in some specific areas as the Mediterranean combine the regional economic approach with land use planning which in turn is mixed with the urbanism tradition. We can interpret this as an intermediate step through a more effective coordination towards a more integral approach.

The other European countries that were not treated by the Compendium are or were also in the process of redefining their style of spatial planning. It can be seen that again due to the ESDP, here in the sense of the report itself and not its making, and other European policies in the form of Structural Funds seemed to have played and still are playing an important role in this. The New Member States for example needed to fulfil certain requirements to be able to apply for funding. A good example of this is the creation of the regional level in Poland. The development in many of the New Member States however has not settled down yet and is still ongoing. What seems to become visible nonetheless is that a big part of these countries seem to take the comprehensive integrated and regional economic approach as their inspiration. Concerning the comprehensive integrated approach the level in which the countries progressed towards this planning style varies greatly. Some have already achieved significant achievements in this direction while others in their quest still seem to be closer to land use planning than to the comprehensive integrated approach.

One might think the movements mentioned above can be seen as a great success, but a little less optimism would be appropriate especially concerning the comprehensive integrated approach. As the analysis showed the movement is taking place, but in many cases countries only have some elements of the comprehensive integrated approach, which does not mean the country has a complete ideal working comprehensive integrated system. It could for instance be that within a country only a good system of vertical coordination could be found and the horizontal coordination is absent or weak. Of course it can also be that a country indeed does have both horizontal and vertical coordination. So far a lot has been achieved already, but

it has to be repeated that the situation in almost all countries is still in motion. This fluid situation is also emphasized in the conclusions of Annex B. In former Eastern Europe changes are taking place at a higher pace and the situation is more fragile, while in the old EU of 15 the motion is taking place in rather different way.

Where many of the New Member States changed their old institutional structure rather radically and adopted different elements from the various planning styles, in the old Member States it is more about a convergence of planning styles and integrating certain elements into an already existing planning system. These steps in progressing towards a different style of spatial planning can be best seen by looking at the style of planning by level combined with the competencies by level. Here it becomes clear that in many countries already some elements were added to the old system, but that it is still far from being able to be qualified under a new header. Most changes were also implemented quite recently and mainly exist on paper or in theory, where practice didn't show any concrete results yet. Also one cannot expect that after one round of changes the system will work properly; it takes some time and fine tuning to find the best way.

On the other planning styles, the urbanism tradition and the land use planning, it can be said that the urbanism tradition seems to be mixing with the land use planning style. Nowadays the urbanism tradition can never be found anymore alone. On the local level for instance it is always coupled to the land use planning or one of the other planning styles. What also can be said is that the land use planning and the urbanism tradition can be found in almost all countries on the local level. In the U.K however the local level is something different and much bigger than the local level in Spain where it coincides with the municipal level.

The regional economic approach has also gained in importance. Here the European influence is undeniable in speeding up the spread and acceptance of this concept through for instance the mechanisms of the Structural Funds. Due to the fact that almost every country has territorial disparities it can be expected that the regional economic approach will become a common feature, where spatial justice plays a key role.

Nothing points out that in the near future the situation will stabilize anywhere quickly; many countries have just taken a first step in the direction of a sound system of spatial planning and all the institutional requirements etc. that are needed for that. The first

results of the many changes have to be awaited and for sure in many countries another new round of changes will have to be made as a reply to the results of the previous changes. It can pretty safely be said that the future planning style or model of spatial planning contains a great deal of elements from the comprehensive integrated and regional economic approach and that the next phase of European policy can have a certain amount of influence in shaping or guiding the developments that are currently taking place. Financial incentives have always played a big role and will continue playing an important one.

The importance of the land use planning and urbanism tradition should not be forgotten though, because it will remain playing an important role on the local level. It can be said that the urbanism tradition seems to be progressively combined with the land use planning style in multi level spatial coordination experiences. This does not happen without serious conflicts in some areas in the Mediterranean countries. On the local level for instance it is always coupled to the land use planning or one of the other planning styles. What can also be said is that the land use planning and the urbanism tradition can be found in almost all countries on the local level.

The regional economic approach has also gained in importance. Here the European influence is undeniable in speeding up the spread and acceptance of this concept through for instance the mechanisms of the Structural Funds. Due to the fact that almost every country has territorial disparities it can be expected that the regional economic approach will become a common feature, where spatial justice plays a key role.

For all these reasons it is necessary to continue research in this field in order to check and confront the detected trends. This could be done in the form of a new ECSP this time for all EU Members.

6. Sources

European Commission 1997, *Compendium of European Spatial Planning Systems*

Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems in the Baltic Sea region, <http://vasab.leontief.net/introduction.htm>

EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATORY NETWORK (ESPON), (2005): *ESPON Project 2.3.2. Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level.*

Available at: http://www.espon.lu/online/documentation/projects/policy_impact/policy_impact_146.html

EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATORY NETWORK (ESPON), (2005): *ESPON Project 2.3.1. Application and effects of the ESDP in member states (2004-06)*

Available at: http://www.espon.lu/online/documentation/projects/policy_impact/policy_impact_145.html

Farinós, J. (2006): from author presentation on 'Methods of Territorial Analysis' Workshop, Department of Geography, urbanism and Spatial Planning, University of Cantabria, Santander 18 February. Adapted.

Janin, U. & Faludi, A. (2005): Regional perspectives on European spatial planning, *The Future of the ESDP in the Framework of Territorial Cohesion*, disP 161 · 2/2005 19

Janin Rivolin, U. (2005): Cohesion and Subsidiarity, Towards good territorial governance in Europe, *Town Planning Review*, 76 (1): pp. 93–106.

Janin Rivolin, U. (ed.) (2002): L'innovazione comunitaria/ Community innovation, *Urbanistica*, special issue, 119, pp. 25–55.

Janin Rivolin, U.; Faludi, A. (2005): The Hidden Face of European Spatial Planning: Innovations in Governance, *European Planning Studies*, 13 (2): pp. 195–215.

Janin Rivolin, U.; Faludi, A. (eds.) (2005): Southern Perspectives on European Spatial Planning, *European Planning Studies*, special issue, 13 (2), pp. 195–331.

29 National Overviews

Email correspondence with the National Experts

APPENDIX 1

Table 5: Division of planning powers

Country	Planning style	Level with the main competency in spatial planning	Level with medium competency in spatial planning	Level with the least planning powers	Tasks by level	Planning style by level
					1. Local	1. Local
					2. Supra-local / sub-regional level	2. Supra-local / sub-regional level
					3. Regional level	3. Regional level
					4. National level	4. National level
1. Austria	Comprehensive Integrated approach	Local I	Regional	sub-regional level national Level (except transport planning)	<p>1. The local level is the main key player concerning spatial planning and has great powers in terms of self governance and is responsible for land use and building plans</p> <p>2. Exhaustive plans or programs, which concern the supra-local or regional level are generally missing</p> <p>3. The (provincial)/regional level does not develop exhaustive plans or programs, which concern the supra-local or regional level, but they do develop special plans and programmes that deal with geographical and sectoral issues. Responsible for developing the planning regional/local legislation, regional development concept a state development plan.</p> <p>4. Spatial planning on national level does not exist in the strict sense. It resembles a regional development policy with sectoral government aid rather than a planning activity. Governmental layers and the division of competencies are closely connected with each other</p>	<p>Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning/Urbanism tradition</p> <p>Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach (urbanism tradition, depends per region)</p> <p>Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach (sectoral plans)</p>
2. Belgium	Comprehensive	Regional	Local	National level	1. All regions have one or more plans	Land use planning/Urbanism

					on the municipal level that deal with the land designation	tradition
					2.Flanders has an additional Provincial level	
	Integrated approach Land Use Planning				3.Every regions makes it own Regional Development Plan, furthermore due to the regional autonomy the system of plans is different in every region, but all regions have two levels, the region and the commune whereas Flanders has a third level with the Provinces	Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach Urbanism tradition
					4. ---	
					1. ---Municipal structural plan and local detailed plan, binding.	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning
					2. ---Regional plan, binding.	
					3. ---	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning
	Comprehensive integrated approach	Regional Local	Supra- local/sub- regional	National level	4. ---National planning report. Framework for physical planning. Provides national level policy statements, which provide guidance and are legally binding in relation to areas of national significance	Land use planning
3. Denmark					1. Central role of the municipal level in regional development, provide service, maintain infrastructure, compile land use plans. More emphasis on cooperation between public and private sector. Develop a Master Plan and a Detailed Plan	Land use planning/urbanism tradition Comprehensive integrated approach
	Comprehensive integrated approach	Local		Regional level National level	2. Joint business strategies have been developed by urban region and local actors	Regional economic approach
4. Finland					3. Regional plan and a regional strategic programme and voluntary drawing up of land use plans	Comprehensive integrated approach

			Supra-local/sub-regional		4. National land use guidelines and National regional development objectives as advisory guidelines	Comprehensive integrated approach
5. France	Regional economic approach Comprehensive integrated approach	National	Local Regional	Sub-regional level (Departement)	1. Definition and execution of priorities in spatial planning and objectives	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					2. Only supra-local. Definition and execution of priorities in spatial planning and objectives	Comprehensive integrated approach
					3. Definition and execution of priorities in spatial planning and objectives through Contrat de Plan Etat Region	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
					4. Formulates and defines several national plans and plans with a regional focus, furthermore many studies are done	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
6. Germany	Regional economic approach Comprehensive Integrated approach	Local Regional National		Supra-local / sub-regional level	1. Procedures of spatial planning at the local level are regulated in the Federal Building Act but must take into account the aims and regulations of the respective regional plan	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					2. The Federal Spatial Planning Act regulates supra-local spatial planning.	Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach
					3. Each region has its own State regional planning act fulfilling the provisions of the Regional Planning Act. Each state provides a spatial development programme and a regional development plan but are free in how to proceed in organising their regional planning	Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach
					4. The Federal Spatial Planning Act regulates supra-local spatial planning. The state Formulates guidelines for spatial planning formulate the operational framework for spatial development objectives on federal level	Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach

7. Greece (Ellada)	Urbanism tradition	National	Supra-local / sub-regional level Regional	Local (municipal) level.	1. Advisory role, with the exception of minor urbanism tradition environmental interventions and certain implementation powers delegated to major municipalities. Some are empowered to grant building permits. Further devolution of powers to the local (municipal) level, especially powers to approve or amend town plans, encountered objections of supreme administrative court (Council of State) on constitutional grounds.	Land use planning / Urbanism tradition.
					2. Advisory role, but also implementation and building permission powers delegated to elected Prefectural Self – Governments (2 nd tier local government). Various powers to grant permissions on economic activity and environmental issues. Further devolution of powers to prefectural level, especially powers to approve or amend town plans, encountered objections of supreme administrative court (Council of State) on constitutional grounds.	Land use planning / Urbanism tradition.

			<p>3. Centrally-appointed Regional Secretariats (RSs) submit to the central government proposals for inclusion in the national, CSF-related medium – term development plan and formulate, in the context of the national development plan medium –term regional operational plans. The importance of these plans increasingly reflects a Regional economic approach style, which however is mostly divorced from statutory spatial planning. RSs have advisory role in the production of regional spatial planning frameworks and can produce special studies. They have delegated powers for special cases of town plan approval or amendment.</p> <p>Other delegated powers include the compulsory acquisition of land for agricultural land improvement projects and regional industrial development, the licensing of industrial development, the designation of land in seaport zones to be used for public purposes etc.</p>	<p>Comprehensive Integrated approach, Regional economic approach (but without powers of final approval). Land use planning / Urbanism tradition.</p>
			<p>4. Planning activity of all types and final approval powers are concentrated at this level, with relatively minor exceptions of devolved powers. Parliament draws up framework-acts and approves national spatial framework. All special and regional spatial frameworks and the great majority of town plans are approved by central government. Spatial local plans retain a physical planning emphasis, but</p>	<p>Comprehensive Integrated approach, Regional economic approach. Land use planning / Urbanism tradition.</p>

				<p>certain instruments are now accompanied by a land use management approach (e.g. industrial areas). The Ministry for the Environment, Spatial Planning and Public Works is the main policy institution which formulates government policy on the environment, Urbanism tradition and housing and the elaboration of regional spatial plans and environmental protection programmes. Its role is overshadowed by Ministry of Economy and Finance, responsible for strategic development planning, which adopts a fairly comprehensive integrated approach.</p>	
8. Ireland	Land Use Planning Regional economic approach Comprehensive Integrated approach	National Local		1. To prepare and revise development plans to make recommendations on and to enforce decisions on individual applications for planning permission	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
				2. ---	
				3. Preparation of regional planning guidelines	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
				4. The Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government's is the main planning authority and is responsible for a range of services, most of which are provided through the local government system, particularly the county councils. It is now also responsible for preparing and overseeing the National Spatial Strategy	Land use planning Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
9. Italy	Urbanism tradition	Local Regional	National Supra-local / sub-regional	1. Municipalities are obliged to prepare a master plan, the PRG ("piano regolatore generale"), in order to	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition

				establish the land use regulation and the main locations of public services. The PRG effectiveness is based on a zoning map (“zonizzazione”), covering the full municipal territory, and on a set of implementation rules (“norme di attuazione”)		
				2. Provinces received an effective planning power only in the last years (law no. 142/1990). They are supposed to prepare a territorial coordination plan regarding their own territory (“piano territoriale di coordinamento”), also taking into consideration the respective regional planplans.	Comprehensive Integrated approach	
				3. Regions are allowed to establish their own planning laws since the ‘70s (albeit not contrasting with the national planning law). Regional territorial plans have mostly an orientative role for provincial and local policies and establish rules as for the environmental preservation.	Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach	
				4. Guidance and general coordination, including economic planning. Promotion of urbanism tradition or local development programmes, providing the general objectives, guidelines, financial resources and other incentives to local actors. The state has formally the power of direct intervention as for great projects of national interest (eg. main infrastructures), also if these have to be agreed with regional and local authorities in practice.	Regional economic approach	
10.Luxembourg	Comprehensive Integrated	National Local		Supra-local / sub-regional	1. Municipalities have to make development plans and precise land	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition

					occupation plans as well as to elaborate a strategic development plan, which is implementing the national strategies at local level.	
					2. ---	
					3. There are regional plans but they however do not correspond with a administrative or political delimitation	
	approach Land Use Planning			level	4. The frame for general spatial development is arranged by a specially created department within the Ministry of the Interior through one programme plan (national), several sectoral plans (national), six regional plans (regional) and land occupation and land development plans (municipal).	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					1. The policy laid down in the regional spatial structuring plan is being further operationalised by local authorities in zoning plans. Zoning plans are the only spatial plan, which is legal binding for citizens as well as public government.	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning
					2. 'In 7 'WGR-areas' municipal spatial planning issues are co-ordinated at a city-regional scale	Comprehensive integrated approach
					3. Provinces elaborate on the National Planning Strategy through an obligatory Regional Spatial Structure Plan	Comprehensive Integrated approach (land use planning too from 2007 on)
11.Netherlands ⁴	Comprehensive Integrated approach	National Local	Regional	Supra-local / sub-regional level	4. Key planning decision are laid down in the National Planning Strategy which provide a framework for the lower levels	Comprehensive Integrated approach (land use planning too from 2007 on)
12.Portugal	Regional Economic Planning	National Local		Supra-local / sub-regional level	1. Defining a land occupation regime in accordance with the regional and national reference frames and the	Land use planning/urbanism tradition

⁴ In 2007 the New Spatial Planning Act will come into force, changing the competencies of the different levels

					strategic development options	
					2. ---	
					3. Defining a strategic framework for the regions' spatial planning, in accordance with economic and social development policies, establishing the reference frame for spatial planning and land-use planning at the municipal level. Very few regions have a regional plan that is now mandatory for all NUT II.	Regional economic planning
	Land Use Urbanism tradition		Regional		4. Defining a strategic framework and as such creating a reference frame to be respected in spatial planning at the regional and local level and in land-use. It further guarantees the compatibility between the different sectoral policies with territorial impact, and creates special instruments when necessary.	Comprehensive integral planning Regional economic planning
					1.Responsible for land use and Urbanism tradition through Municipal Master Plans, Partial Plans and Special Plans	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					2. --	
					3. Each Region is autonomous to develops their own urban law, taking into account Spanish land law	Land use planning/urbanism tradition Regional economic approach
13. Spain	Land use and Urbanism tradition	Local	Regional	Supra-local / sub-regional level National level	4. Main infrastructure network depends on National Level (airports, some highways, waterfronts, etc.)	
	Regional economic approach Comprehensive integrated approach				1. Creation of a comprehensive municipal plan is obligatory which is not legally binding. Furthermore they need to develop a detailed development plan which is legally binding	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning/urbanism tradition
14. Sweden		Local		National level	2. ---	
					3. Regional planning is carried out on a	Regional economic approach

				voluntary basis. The regional plans serves mainly as a framework document and it non-binding, physical planning at the regional level is mainly developed in the form of sector planning	
			Regional	4. Provides <i>national level policy statements</i> , which provide guidance and are legally binding in relation to areas of national significance	
15. United Kingdom	Land Use Planning Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach	National Local	Regional level	Supra-local / sub-regional level	1. Local planning authorities are the main agency for the operation of spatial planning on the ground. Where the two-tier system of government is in operation, the planning function is split between the tiers. The county has responsibility for adoption of the structure plan, minerals plans and waste local plans (except in Wales) and for limited 'county matters' regulation. The district council is responsible for adoption of the district-wide local plan, most regulation of development, and other matters such as listed building control. In areas where there is a unitary planning authority, it has responsibility for all planning functions. Since The Enactment Of The Town And Country Planning Act 2004 Structure Plans And Unitary Development Plans Are In The Process Of Being Replaced By Local Development Frameworks
				2. ---	
				3. <i>Regional Planning Guidance (RPG)</i> is prepared by the Regional Planning Bodies (which are now the Regional Assemblies), and seeks to integrate a wide range of sectoral policies, such as	Land use planning Urbanism tradition
					Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach

				transport and economic development, and their implication for land use policies. RPG is now being replaced by Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) which, unlike RPG, will be statutory.		
				4. The Secretary of State has overall responsibility for shaping and guiding national planning policy. His/her task is to coordinate the work of individual local authorities and to ensure that their development plans and development control procedures are in harmony with broad planning policies	Land use planning Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach	
				1. --- 2. --- 3. ---		
16. Cyprus KYPROS	Urbanism tradition Land Use planning	National Local		Supra-local / sub-regional Regional	4. The Ministry of Interior, through the department of town planning has the role of collecting, recording and classifying, all data necessary and relative to the preparation of, and prepares the Local Plan for Nicosia and other urbanism tradition areas, Area Schemes, Preservation Orders and other plans in Cyprus.	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
17. Czech Republic	Land use planning	Local	Regional National	Supra-local / sub-regional level	1. Municipalities are responsible for the procurement of local planning documents. They include physical plans in the form of general land use plan and detailed regulation plans and strategic planning documents, i.e. municipal development programmes often called strategic plan. Actual plans are made by private agencies and approved by municipal councils. 2. At supra-local level, there are	Land use planning / Urbanism tradition Regional economic approach (large cities) Land use planning (administrative)

				building offices responsible for issuing planning and building permits. Each development / construction proposal is assessed against binding land use plan for given locality.	development control)	
				3. Regions are responsible for the procurement of regional planning documentation. It includes physical plans for large territorial units / regions and regional development strategies. The actual documents are made by private agencies and approved by regional councils. In physical planning, the regional level has the role of supervisor of the municipalities and their planning documents.	Land use planning Regional economic approach	
				4. There is no national planning institution or agency. Ministry for Regional Development is responsible for physical planning (planning legislation) and regional policy (Strategy of Regional Development). Ministry monitors existing physical plans of municipalities and large territorial units (regions). Nation-wide Policy of Territorial Development Is currently under preparation.	Land use planning (legislation) Regional economic approach (national regional policy)	
18. Estonia	Comprehensive integrated approach	National Local	Regional	Supra-local / sub-regional	1. Making of comprehensive spatial plans and of detailed plans	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning/urbanism tradition
					2. ---	
					3. Responsible of county physical planning and supervision of municipal planning	Land use planning/urbanism tradition
					4. Making of nationwide plans and developing, guidelines, methodological documents in cooperation with the	Comprehensive integrated approach

					county level. Adopted national plans, county plans and comprehensive plans are legally binding only for the authority that adopts them, and, additionally, for compilers of plans of a more detailed type.	
19. Hungary	Regional economic approach Comprehensive integrated approach	Local	Regional National	County level (sub-regional)	1. Local plans (structure plans + regulation zoning plans) as well as detailed physical plans are prepared by all planning and design agencies as well as several small private companies. In matters of spatial planning, local governments enjoy very wide powers. Local governments have the responsibility for the procurements of local planning documents.	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition At city level there is often Comprehensive integrated approach
					2. Plans for both the micro region level (NUTS4) and the regional (NUTS) are under preparation. County level (NUTS3) spatial and development plans already exist.	Regional economic approach land use planning (however, with much weaker powers than in case of the local governments)
					3. At sub-national in the current planning period the Regional Development Councils and particularly their Agencies have been given major role in development programming and resource allocation. Elaboration of the regional development programmes in co-operation with the national regional development authority. Private companies undertake regional planning tasks as well	Regional economic approach
					4. Many institutes and even private companies are responsible for giving the national spatial planning shape with a focus on the regional and metropolitan level	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach Land use planning

20. Latvia	Regional economic approach Comprehensive integrated approach	National Local	Regional	Supra-local / sub-regional	1. Municipalities are responsible for development of spatial plans on a local level, and district municipalities are in charge of district level	Land use planning/urbanism tradition
					2. ---	
					3. Region Development Agency 's prepare in co-operation with local governments and territorial offices of State institutions a development programme and territorial spatial plan of the planning region, ensures co-ordination thereof with the National Spatial Plan, the National Development Plan and sectoral development programmes, as well as ensures the management of implementation thereof	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
					4. Developing the National Spatial Plan. The Ministry of Regional Development and Local Governments is the main institution in charge of spatial planning, regional policy, and local government affairs	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
21. Lithuania	Regional economic approach Comprehensive integrated approach	National Local		Supra-local / sub-regional non existant	1. The task of municipalities is planning and development of their territories, organising preparation of comprehensive, special and detailed plans, securing their implementation. In the role of partners they are expected to take part in the planning process of the county territory. Within the municipalities the chief architect offices are charged with all territorial planning issues.	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning/urbanism tradition
					2. ---	
					3. County is a state institution, not regional self-government. County government is responsible for planning	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach

					and development of the county territory, supervision of the planning activities of local governments and participation in national planning, as well as implementing national policies.	
			Regional		4. Responsible for the national comprehensive plan	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
	Urbanism tradition Land use planning Comprehensive Integrated approach		Regional Local		1. Local councils can make recommendations to authorized authorities on spatial planning issues	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					2. ---	
					3. ---	
22. Malta		National		Supra-local / sub-regional	4. Planning is centrally arranged through a structural plan by the Malta Environment and Planning Authority	Comprehensive Integrated approach Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					1. Creation of a Local Spatial Development Plan. The local Plan is an act of local law; creation of the study of the conditions for and the directions of the spatial development	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					2. Studies and analyses only	---
					3. Obligatory development of regional plans of spatial development and spatial development plans for metropolitan areas. Creation of reports on the state of spatial development of the provinces and regional programmes. Creation of Spatial development strategy	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach
23. Poland	Comprehensive integrated approach	National Local		Regional level (small competency in planning) Supra-local / sub-regional level (no competency)	4. Creation of the Concept for the Spatial Development of the Country. Developing of programmes of governmental tasks serving the realization of public purpose of national importance, periodical reports on the state of spatial development of the	Comprehensive integrated approach Regional economic approach

					country	
24. Slovakia	Regional economic approach Comprehensive integrated approach	National Regional Local		Supra-local / sub-regional level no existant	1. Local self governance that follows the perspectives of the higher levels leading to similar documents on the local level.	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					2. ---	
					3. Regional self governance within the framework provided by the national level leads to Regional planning documents that follows the national development perspective	Comprehensive integrated approach
					4. Development of the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001	Comprehensive integrated approach
25. Slovenia	Comprehensive Integrated approach	National Local	Regional	Supra-local / sub-regional level	1. Lays down the land use and spatial arrangements of local significance in compliance with the basic provision of the Planning Act and the guidelines of strategic spatial planning documents. Municipalities specify the conditions for spatial planning and location of facilities, provided by the regimes of environmental protection, natural conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, protection of cultural monuments of local significance and other cultural heritage, as well as the protection against natural and other disaster at the local level. The local governments prepare Municipal Spatial Development Strategy and a Local Detailed Plan	Land use planning/Urbanism tradition
					2. ---	
					3. Slovenia has not yet established formally the regional administrative level. There exist 12 statistical regions only, and some associations on the level of NUTS3 are established for	Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach

				<p>chosen activities. The only spatial planning instrument at the regional level is the »Regional Conception of Spatial Development«, which have been prepared jointly by the state and the municipalities according to the principle of partnership and governance. The National Agency for Regional Development (NARD for short) was established in January 2000 in order to set up Regional Development Agencies</p>	
				<p>4. Lays down the land use and spatial arrangements of National Significance. It sets out the conditions of spatial planning and location of facilities as dictated by the prescribed regime of environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources, conservation of cultural monuments and other cultural heritage of national significance.</p> <p>Providing a framework for spatial planning at the regional and local levels through laws and other strategic documents, for example "The Detailed Plan of National Importance" is implementing document related to the spatial development activities. It determines planning conditions for making design on the way to obtain building permits. "The Spatial Report" is the review of the spatial development goals, and an instrument for monitoring the implementation of spatial planning guidelines. And more documents</p>	Comprehensive Integrated approach
26. Bulgaria	Comprehensive Integrated	National		1. Preparation of the Municipal Development plans	Comprehensive Integrated approach Land use planning

	approach		Local Supra- local/sub- regional Regional	Preparation of spatial/urbanism tradition plans	Urbanism tradition
				2. Making of District development strategies Making of Spatial planning schemes	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning Urbanism tradition
				3. Preparation of Regional Development Plans Preparation of Regional Spatial planning schemes	Comprehensive integrated approach
				4. Preparation of the National Development Plan serves as national planning guidelines. A National Spatial Development Scheme shall provide for harmonization between spatial planning and the social-economic development, with guaranteed environmental protection. Furthermore the national level is responsible for Sectoral Operational Programmes and the Regional Development Operational Programme	Comprehensive Integrated approach
27. Romania	Comprehensive Integrated approach	National Supra- local/sub- regional (county) Local	Regional level	1. The local council shall coordinate and shall be responsible for the entire activity of city planning carried on in the territorial-administrative unit and shall ensure the observance of the provisions included in the approved documentation of town and country and city planning for the carrying out of the programme of urban development of the component localities of the commune or town.	Land use planning /Urbanism tradition
				2. The county council coordinates the spatial planning including urbanism tradition activities at county level.	Land use planning/urbanism tradition
				3. - - -	
				4. Elaboration of the National Spatial Development Plan (which substantiates	Comprehensive Integrated approach

				the regional spatial development plans) in co-ordination with the National Development Plan and the National Strategic Development Framework. Except for the Ministry responsible for spatial planning, no other governmental body has spatial planning competencies.	
28. Norway	Urbanism tradition Comprehensive integrated approach	National Regional Local		1. The basic assumption is that municipalities define the framework for all development, taking proper consideration of national guidelines and private interests; and then lead the development according to set goals and standards, utilizing the tools available in the PBA and outside of that Act.	Land use planning
				2. ---	
				3.	Regional economic approach
				4. The Ministry of the Environment is responsible for ensuring that planning at the local level takes place within the framework of national priorities preparing National Policy Guidelines, National Policy Provisions and Developing land-use policies for instance.	Comprehensive integrated approach
29. Switzerland	Comprehensive Integrated approach	Regional Local	National	Supra-local / sub-regional / land use plan	Comprehensive integrated approach Land use planning
				2. The Regional Planning Associations prepare a Regional structure plan	Comprehensive Integrated approach
				3. The Planning Departments of the Cantons prepare a Cantonal structure plan. The cantons are responsible for the actual «creation» of spatial planning. The tasks of cantonal	Comprehensive Integrated approach

				structure planning and municipal land use planning are interlinked in a variety of ways	
				4. The Federal Office for Spatial Development is responsible for the legislative framework on spatial and physical planning, for formulation planning principles, for co-ordinating formal spatial policies both internally and with the cantons, for promoting and co-ordinating the efforts of the cantons and for formulating sectoral plans.	Comprehensive Integrated approach Regional economic approach

