

applied to spatial planning in general and, specifically to European spatial planning –, of the methodology – lexical analysis, strengths and limitations – and of the tool used – lexical analysis software –, a test will be presented using, at least, one of the key ESPON 2013 project: the one dealing with scenarios for Europe titled ET2050 – Territorial Scenarios and Visions for Europe. This choice as a test of our proposal can be justified by its status in the corpus of ESPON projects as both a diagnosis of present and future trends of the EU space and a foresight document aiming to influence the vision and, potentially, the actions of the various spatial planning actors at various scales. It will be thus a question of establishing by which “means of the discourse” this objective is realised and the way in which the produced discourse “consolidates” itself (or not) in a specific language or, even, a common language (storylines).

Erblin Berisha, Giancarlo Cotella, Alys Solly

### **The long arm of the EU? Evidence of Europeanization of spatial planning in Albania and Switzerland**

The Europeanization of the spatial planning systems of the EU Member States has been extensively investigated in the literature since 2000 with numerous studies focusing on understanding how, where and when the EU may have an impact on domestic spatial planning systems (Nadin, 2012; Stead & Cotella, 2011 etc.). Whilst the previous studies explore the Europeanization of spatial planning system in Member States, this contribution investigates the impact of the Europeanization on non-EU countries, analysing the cases of Switzerland and Albania. Despite their different relations with the EU – while Switzerland is not interested in joining the EU, Albania is currently facing the process of integration, – in both cases their spatial planning systems are indirectly influenced by Europeanization. Adopting a comparative approach, the authors aim to highlight how Europeanization mechanisms may affect spatial planning systems in a non-UE countries and how each domestic context adapts its spatial planning system as a response to direct or indirect EU influences. Theoretically and methodologically speaking, the study assumes that (i) Europeanization is an iterative cycle of uploading and downloading influences that links the EU-level territorial governance with domestic territorial governance and spatial planning system and (ii) as suggested by the institutional technology concept (Janin Rivolin, 2012), a spatial planning system should be investigated through a multiply dimension (i.e. structure, tools, practice and discourse) and a dynamic perspective. In order to appreciate the complex interplay among spatial planning system dimensions and EU influences, the proposed conceptual framework identifies different types of influences (i.e. structural, instrumental, dialogic, practical and horizontal) that depend on the influence’s direction (top-down, bottom-up, horizontal) (Cotella & Janin Rivolin, 2015). Moreover, the contribution will focus on scrutinizing potential drivers of change (such as rules, resources, and expert knowledge) and mechanisms of change (legal, economic and cognitive) that may guide Europeanization. The contribution is therefore structured in three sections. Section one focuses on theoretical and methodological conceptualization – highlighting the concept of the Europeanization of spatial planning systems and potential misunderstandings present in the literature. Section two illustrates this with evidence from analysing the contexts of Albania and Switzerland. While section three discusses comparative findings of the Europeanization of the spatial planning system in both countries.

Ledio Allkja, Marjan Marjankovic

### **Europeanization of Spatial Planning Systems. Comparative Study between Albania and Serbia**

After the fall of socialism, as part of restructuring and transition towards the democratic and market economy South European Countries have had the objective of joining the European Union. Albania and Serbia have been going through similar processes of reformation towards European Integration. The first achieved the status of a candidate country in 2014 and now is waiting for opening negotiations (EC 2016a), while the latter has been a candidate country since 2012 and has already opened negotiations for integration (EC 2016b). The EU has played, and still plays, an important role in the reforms undergoing in these countries. Through the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance the EU supports different reforms. Meanwhile, Albania and Serbia have also gone through various changes in the spatial planning system. Both countries inherited a centralized physical planning system which after the fall of socialism became inappropriate for the new societal situations. Due to path dependency and the societal situation in both countries the institutional capacities were not ready yet to take a spatial planning approach. Although spatial planning it is not a direct competence of the EU, its policies, directives and legislation do have a direct impact in spatial planning (Faludi, 2008). However, recent developments show that the planning systems are changing and trying to emulate a comprehensive and integrated approach of spatial planning characteristic of most Northern European countries. Europeanization is seen as a term of “many faces” according to Olsen (2002). However, the wide variety of definitions is also the strength of the term, by using it as a multi-faceted phenomenon “in search of explanation, not the explanation itself” (Radaelli, 2004: 2). In Radaelli’s work (2004:6) Europeanization impacts in different ways such as governance, discourse and institutionalization. On the other side, when analyzing the evolution and conceptualization of planning systems, the culturalised model by Reimer and Othengrafen (2013) offer a similar conceptual