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Abstracts

DIETRICH FÜRST, JÖRG KNELING, DANIELA GORSLER

Regional Governance: New Modes of Self-Government in the European Community

Summary of the results of the conference are: Introducing into the subject of regional governance by the key lectures. They analysed the basic models of governance and the logics they follow. Depending on its structural conditions each region chooses a specific form of self-regulation, so that is difficult to define regional governance (Voelzkow). Regional governance has various meanings in different countries and has to be seen in relationship to administrative reform (Toonen). One dimension of regional governance is place-making, the collective cognitive construction of places (Healey). Work groups underlined the difficulty of differentiating between government and governance on the regional level. However, they identified a few general characteristics of regional governance: it is an “intermediary” between government, civil society and the private sector; it is about coordinating actions of different actors and about regulating processes of common problem-solving; moreover, it is a hybrid mixture of hierarchical, institutional and negotiating/networking modes of acting. Further research topics that were included deal, e.g., with the legitimization of regional governance, the cultural dimension, and the relationship to regional planning.

PATSY HEALEY

Spatial Planning as a Mediator for Regional Governance - Conceptions of place in the formation of regional governance capacity

This paper is concerned with regional governance initiatives which aim to create new connections, re-configuring the policy communities which cluster around sectoral programmes and/or re-composing the relations between state, civil society and the economic sphere. Such initiatives inherently challenge the existing institutional landscape with its assemblage of policy agendas and policy relations. They therefore have to struggle to accumulate sufficient legitimacy and authority to act. This involves mobilisation, institutional design and routinisation. In this strategic effort, conceptions of ‘place’ can be powerful tools, to inspire, motivate, co-ordinate, translate and disseminate new ideas and new practices into the ‘public realm’ of collective action as it impacts on the evolving territorial dynamics and socio-spatial patterning of areas. Conceptions of ‘place’ as deployed in public realm contexts are however in no way neutral or decipherable from specific objective characteristics of areas. They are socially constructed through complex institutional processes. It matters what conceptions of ‘place’ are mobilised, and it matters how they are articulated. The practices of spatial planning systems have traditionally provided formal arenas for articulating spatial strategies, and the professional communities associated with them have provided a vocabulary for articulating ‘place conceptions’. However, across Europe, these have become bogged down in their traditions and are as much part of the landscape the new governance initiatives seek to reconfigure as opportunities for the emergence of new strategic conceptions of place. Spatial planning systems and practices can therefore only play a mediating role in the new regional governance initiatives if they are ‘released’ from their traditions and ‘refreshed’ with new conceptions of ‘place’ and new modes of practice.
RICHARD KÖTTER

Ecological Modernization and Regional Governance. What Compatibility of Two Fields of Theory, Policy Discourse and Practice?

The paper offers a preliminary investigation into the compatibility of two recent fields of theoretical enquiries and conceptual developments in the social sciences, namely ecological modernisation theory approaches and the recent paradigm of regional governance. Different concepts of governance (such as multi-level, associative, and network governance) are explored in their contribution to understand the dimensions of ecological restructuring and environmental management at the regional level. In terms of policy discourse and development, ecological modernisation is linked to structural (regional) policy. Institutional arrangements and players at the „regional“ level in Germany, in particular North-Rhine-Westphalia and Lower Saxony, are looked at as the organisational field for ecological restructuring is significantly changing, in the non-corporate sector but also often targeted at business performance (eco-efficiency).

FRANCESCA GELLI

Exploring governance – Suggestions from an Italian perspective

The first part of the statement aims at exploring, or nearing, the very notion of governance in its more general terms. The second part is dedicated to the discussion of a possible example of regional governance: the Veneto Regional Constitutional Chart, called of the “Veneto Autonomous” (Statuto del Veneto Autonomo), and its process of re-writing.

It is on one hand, a significant example of the effects of the new instruments introduced through the institutional reform process defining a federal system (and currently under debate in Italy). It also includes pivotal question of how to guarantee the most participation possible by involving citizens in the political institutions and providing for concrete opportunities to represent some bottom-up, locally organised, social and political demands.

On the other hand it offers the opportunity for a local political leadership to rethink of the Regional Chart, the local society and the various economic, political, and social networks that can converge to built a regional identity. That is the idea of the “Autonomous Veneto”, capable of representing itself towards external governmental actors at different levels, and towards public and private networks etc. as a unifying and collective dynamic.

IOANNIS CHORIANOPOULOS

Patterns of divergent competitive and networking orientation in urban Europe – Examples from the RECITE programme

This article is about Northern and Southern urban governance. It starts with a brief examination of the impact of European economic integration on cities, highlighting North-South differences in urban growth prospects. An insight into the reasons behind this divergence points to the different contexts of urban industrial restructuring in Northern and Southern Europe. This, in turn, leads the discussion to the examination of the EU urban programmes aiming to tackle disparities and promote cohesion. The extent to which the EU urban networks address the North-South local authority and urban governance differences is explored through examples from the RECITE programmes.
JAMES SENNERT

The new shape of regional planning in England – The case of the West Midlands

This paper outlines some interim findings of a research project looking at the changing process of Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) in England. New policy guidance from central government encourages the English regions to adopt a more inclusive and integrated approach to regional planning. The guidance may say there is a new system - but what is happening in practice during its key initial application? The research starts from and concentrates on the process of making RPG. But this is investigated within the overall evolving regional landscape, and continually related to that landscape. The paper will focus on the West Midlands region, one of three case studies being investigated in the project and the first region to put the new guidance into practice.

STEFAN PREUSS

Devolution, fragmented governance and strategy making in the English regions – A case study of the East Midlands

Over the past few years, a process of devolution has brought enhanced powers and responsibilities to the nations and regions of the UK. In England, a plethora of new regional agencies and institutions was established and numerous strategies and other policy documents emerged in the regions. The design of the devolution project in combination with a historically fragile standing of regions in England, however, has caused severe problems: The new structures of regional governance are fragmented and the level of coherence between the various strategies and policy making exercises is often low. The article examines the approach taken in the East Midlands to overcome these problems by introducing an Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS). This strategy has been prepared by a number of regional stakeholders and aims to provide a common framework for the development and implementation of strategies in the region.

THORSTEN WIECHMANN

How to promote regional networks? The German InnoRegio experience and its implications for the role of regional planners in shaping regional governance

Taking as its point of departure the current state of debate within industrial geography and regional economics on innovative regional development processes, this article sets out to address the question of how the creation of regional networks can be encouraged. It cites the example of the “InnoRegio” competition initiated by the Federal Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF), which has the objective of setting up regional innovation networks. The article concludes by looking into the extent to which regional planners could play a major role in innovation processes as an important aspect of regional governance strategies.

ANSGAR RUDOLPH

Bringing together innovation and decision-making – The influence-level problem of regional governance in the Hanover Region

The idea of regional governance says that innovation and decision-making in public and private bodies (and public participation) should be co-ordinated on a regional level. However, those people who push forward innovation usually are not the same as those who make the crucial decisions. A case study from the Hanover region shows that people who initiate and manage innovative projects
do not represent the highest level of influence. Due to their limited political power they are more open for new ideas and concepts and show a more strategic behaviour in forming networks. Contrary to that, the top decision-makers tend to concentrate on the interests of the organisation they represent and strategically to rely on direct, bilateral contacts.

As a consequence of this phenomenon, patterns of behaviour have to be analysed and strategies to link innovative potentials, managing skills and political power closer together, have to be found. It can be assumed that successful regional governance does not only require a set of powerful public and private bodies, but also a functioning system of interactions between actors with higher and lower influence.

Geir Tangen

Co-operation in Haram municipality – the Haram model

The collaboration between private and public institutions in Haram is an example where common challenges, facing both companies and community, were recognized. This process started as a concrete activity regarding recruitment of skilled workers with participation from a few but nevertheless important persons in the private and public sectors. The learning and confidence developed as a result of this co-operation lead to new and broader activities concerning the future of the community with many more participants. The process functioned almost like trying to set off an avalanche. The processes started with issues where success was most likely, the challenge was recognized and understood etc. and introduced more difficult issues when trust, self-confidence and personal understanding had been better developed.

Andrea Zenker

Innovation governance in the cross-border regions of Baden and Alsace

Despite existing opportunities in terms of co-operation partners, knowledge access and innovation support, empirical findings reveal weak innovation interactions between Baden and Alsace. Comparing some elements of the innovation support structure on both sides of the Rhine river reveals different governance structures and consequently different types of innovation systems in Baden and Alsace. It has been shown that the national context plays an important role for shaping regional innovation systems. Besides language and mentality differences, the respective institutional structures seem to hamper cross-border networking.
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Räumliche Planung als Mediator der ‘regional governance’ – ‘Standortpläne’ unter dem Einfluss der ‘regional governance’-Entwicklung
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**Ökologische Modernisierung und ‘regional governance’. Sind zwei Theoriebereiche wie politischer Diskurs und Praxis miteinander vereinbar?**
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**Prüfung der ‘governance’–Vorschläge aus italienischer Sicht**


Andererseits bietet dies für eine lokalpolitische Steuerung die Gelegenheit, die Regionalcharta zu überdenken, sodass die Gesellschaft vor Ort und die vielfältigen ökonomischen, politischen und sozialen Netzwerke zusammen kommen können, um eine regionale Identität aufzubauen. Die Idee des ‘autonomen Veneto’ ist, fähig zu sein, gegenüber externen Verwaltungen verschiedener Ebenen, gegenüber öffentlichen und privaten Netzwerken usw. als eine vereinte und kollektive Kraft aufzutreten.
IOANNIS CHORIANOPoulos

Verhaltensmuster europäischer Städte unter dem Einfluss von Wettbewerb und Netzwerkorientierung – Beispiele aus dem RECITE-Programm


James Sennett

Das neue Gesicht der Regionalplanung in England – Der Fall der West Midlands


Stefan Preuss

Dezentralisierung, bruchstückhafte ‘governance’ und Strategieentwicklung in den Regionen Englands - Fallstudie East Midlands

THORSTEN WIECHMANN

Wie können regionale Netzwerke befördert werden? Erfahrungen aus dem deutschen InnoRegio-Projekt und Auswirkungen auf die Rolle der Regionalplaner beim Aufgreifen der 'regional governance'

Als Ausgangspunkt für den gegenwärtigen Stand der Debatte zwischen Industriegeografie und Regionalentwicklung im Hinblick auf innovative regionale Entwicklungsprozesse stellt der Beitrag die Frage, wie zum Aufbau eines regionalen Netzwerkes ermutigt werden kann. Dabei wird auf das Beispiel von 'InnoRegio' zurückgegriffen, das durch einen Wettbewerb des Bundesministeriums für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) initiiert worden ist und zum Ziele hatte, regionale Innovationsnetzwerke ins Leben zu rufen. Der Beitrag schließt mit einem Ausblick, inwieweit Regionalplaner in diesem Zusammenhang eine zentrale Rolle bei Innovationsprozessen spielen und dabei einen wichtigen Aspekt für 'regional governance'-Strategien abgeben können.

ANSGAR RUDOLPH

Gemeinsames Handeln bei Fragen der Innovation und der Entscheidungsträger – Das Problem der Einflussnahme der 'regional governance' in der Region Hannover

Die Idee der 'regional governance' besagt, dass Innovation und Entscheidungsprozesse bei öffentlichen und privaten Einrichtungen (und Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligung) auf regionaler Ebene koordiniert werden sollten. Jedoch sind jene, die Innovationen aufbringen, gewöhnlich nicht jene, die die wesentlichen Entscheidungen treffen. Eine Fallstudie aus der Region Hannover zeigt, dass jene, die innovative Projekte initiieren und sie managen, nicht diejenigen sind, die den höchsten Einfluss ausüben. Gemäß ihrer begrenzten politischen Macht sind sie oft der für neue Ideen und Konzepte und zeigen eher ein strategisches Verhalten bei der Gestaltung von Netzwerken. Im Gegensatz dazu tendieren die Entscheidungsträger dazu, sich auf die Interessen der Organisation, die sie vertreten, zu konzentrieren und richten ihre Strategie auf direkte bilaterale Kontakte aus.

Als Konsequenz aus diesem Phänomen müssen Verhaltensmuster analysiert und Strategien gefunden werden, die innovative Potenziale, Managementfähigkeiten und politische Macht besser verbinden. Es ist zu vermuten, dass erfolgreiche 'regional governance' nicht allein den Aufbau von starken öffentlichen und privaten Einrichtungen erfordert, sondern ebenso ein funktionierendes System von Interaktionen zwischen Akteuren von höherem und niedrigerem Einfluss.

GEIR TANGEN

Kooperation in der Gemeinde Haram – Das Haram Modell

ANDREA ZENKER

‘Governance’ als Innovation in den Grenzregionen Baden und Elsass

Regional Governance: New Modes of Self-Government in the European Community
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5 General comments

The topic of a *High-Level Scientific EuroConference* held in Hannover/Germany, from April 19th to 21st 2001 was *Regional Governance - New Modes of Self-Government in the European Community*. The conference was subsidized by the European Commission. The following paper presents a short overview over the objectives, the organisation, the content and the results of the conference. Some of the papers presented at the conference were inserted into the available documentation.

1 Objectives

The objectives of the conference were:
- to get more insights into the present discussion on "regional governance"
- to identify open research questions concerning the general topic
- to organize an academic discourse between younger and senior researchers within Europe
- to mobilize young researchers of different member states of the EC to form research-networks on some of the identified research questions.

The background for organizing the venue refers to the fact that during the last ten years "regional governance" has become a topic of scientific discussion, fueled by the influence of globalization, the EC policies (structural funds, ESDP-process, Committee of the Regions etc.) and regionalization strategies of the member states. In addition, the EC organized a discourse on "government" in the wake of the "Nizza-process".

The topic of "regional governance" is dealt with in many universities and research organizations within the EC. But there are still few interchanges to support and foster the discussion on a broader basis. Therefore, the EuroConference was to instigate a broader discussion, not in the least with the ambition to link it to the broader EC discussion.

---

1 Research DG, Hum Potential Prrogramme, High-Level Scientific Conferences, Proposal No. HPCF-2000-00357
2 EU Working Paper "Developing New Modes of Governance" (NOTIS LEBESSIS, JOHN PATERSON) (2000); White Paper on European Governance
2 Organization of the EuroConference

The conference was organized by University of Hannover (Institute of Regional Planning and Regional Research (ILR)) in cooperation with KoRiS (Consultant on Communicative Urban and Regional Planning, Hannover). According to the agreement with the Commission 16 senior researchers1 and 43 young researchers of 17 European nationalities took part in the conference (including the scientific coordinators).

The 16 senior researches were chosen on the basis of outstanding research activities in the field of regional governance, while the young researchers were selected on the basis of an application containing a curriculum vitae, a list of publications regarding the topic and a summary of a statement to be given on the conference. A scientific committee was formed to support the selection process.4

The conference was organized in three parts:

a. Three introductory lectures on central issues of regional governance:

b. Six work groups to discuss the introductory key notes and to differentiate "regional governance" according to different regional contexts

c. Three parallel work groups to define topics of further research and an the organization of research networks accordingly

a. Three introductory lectures on central issues of regional governance:

- Helmut Voelzkow (Cologne): Regional governance defined: Relating regional governance to the milieu approach and the regulation approach


- Patsy Healey (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): Spatial planning as mediator for regional governance?

b. Six work groups to discuss the introductory key notes and to differentiate "regional governance" according to different regional contexts

Work Group 1 “What is the heuristical added value of regional governance?”

Chair Person: Dr. Patrick Le Galès, CEVIPOF, Paris

Statements:

- How do new modes of regional governance add value? – Findings of a European impact analysis of public-private partnerships (Johannes Lückenköttter, University of Dortmund)

- Ecological modernization linked to regional governance (Richard Andreas Kötter, University College Chichester)

---

1 Arthur Benz (Hagen/GE), Rainer Danielzyk (Dresden/GE), Andreas Diller (GE), Andreas Faludi (Nijmegen/NL), Enrico Gualdi (Amsterdam/NL), Patsy Healey (Newcastle/GB), Patrick Le Galès (Paris/F), João Seixas (Lisbon/PT), Lars-Inge Ström (Ostersund/S), Theo A. Toonen (Leiden/NL), Geoff J. Vigar (Newcastle/GB), Helmut Voelzkow (Cologne/GE)

4 Members of the committee were the Professors Arthur Benz (Hagen/Germany), Andreas Faludi (Nijmegen/Netherlands), Klaus Kunzmann (Dortmund/Germany) - Faludi and Kunzmann are members of AESOP, the European organization of planning schools.
Entrepreneurial Cities in a European Context – The debate over urban development as representation of the social struggle over urban culture in Vienna and Berlin (Monika De Frantz, European University Institute Florence)

Re-writing Italian Regional Constitutional Charts (Dr. Francesca Gelli, University of Padua)

Work Group 2 “What are the main characteristics of regional governance and how do they differ between European member states?”

Chair Person: Prof. Dr. Andreas Faludi, University of Nijmegen

Statements:

- Steadiness of regional cooperations and institutional forms (Christian Diller, Office for Urban Development/ Hamburg)
- The importance of local level governance differences: Examples from the RECITE networks (Dr. Ioannis Chorianopoulos, London School of Economics)
- The incompatibility between the European competition policy and the European Regional Policy (Maider Ensunza Arriën, European University Institute Florence)

Work Group 3 “Could regional planning play a dominant role in shaping regional governance?”

Chair Person: Dr. Geoff I. Vigar, University of Newcastle

Statements:

- The new shape of regional planning in England: The case of the West Midlands (Dr. James Sennett, Oxford Brookes University)
- Regional Planning and governance in the East Midlands (Stefan Preuss, Oxford Brookes University)
- How to promote regional networks? The German “InnoRegio” experience (Dr. Thorsten Wiechmann, Institute for Ecological and Regional Development, Dresden)

Work Group 4 “Regional governance patterns of urban areas”

Chair Person: Dr. João Seixas, Centro de Estudos Territoriais, Lisbon

Statements:

- The sustainable intermunicipal plan of Rome province (Luigi Mundula, University of Rome)
- The role of Regional Development Concepts in promoting regional cooperation in urban areas – experiences in Bremen and Magdeburg (Katrin Auel, University of Hagen/Germany)
- Bringing together innovation and decisionmaking: The influence-level problem of regional governance in the Hannover Region (Ansgar Rudolph, University of Hannover)
Introduction

Work Group 5  “Regional governance patterns of rural areas”

Chair Person: Prof. Dr. Lars-Inge Ström, Mid Sweden University

Statements:

- A regional identity as a framework for private public partnership: searching for an alternative development model in rural areas? The case of West-Brittanny (Yann Fournis, Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Rennes)
- Rural-urban partnerships: Finnish perspective (Kaia Schmidt-Thomé, Helsinki University of Technology)
- Managing and constructing development processes: The case of the social network programme in Grandola (Vanessa Duarte de Sousa, Institute for the Superior Studies of Litoral Alentejano, Grandola/ Portugal)
- Cooperation in Haram Commune (Geir Tangen, Moere Research Institute Volda/ Norway)

Work Group 6  “Regional governance patterns of cross-border regions”

Chair Person: Dr. Enrico Gualini, University of Amsterdam

Statements:

- The role of public institutions in cross-border network building (Gabor Novotny, University of Nijmegen)
- Cross-border governance in innovation: The case of Baden and Alsace (Andrea Zenker, Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research Karlsruhe)
- The ESDP and the Development of a Regional Spatial Planning Approach in North West England (Olivier Sykes, University of Liverpool)

c. Three parallel work groups to define topics of further research and the organization of research networks accordingly

The organization of networks was based on the "Open-Space-Concept", a method for organizing participatory arrangements via "voting by feet". The final work groups were organized in such a way that the participants of the work groups of the day before were deliberately mixed by the organizers in order to get a new personal setting and a creative milieu. Moderators were Dr. Tanja Borzel / Dr. Jörg Kneiling, Dr. Rainer Danielzyk / Sabine von Löwis, Prof. Dr. Dietrich Fürst / Daniela Gorsler.

Within the groups a three-step-approach was adopted: first the participants were to write down topics of research (brainstorming) which then were "clustered" according to common themes (integration) and finally the most promising topics were discussed in detail (differentiated into sub-themes, methodological approach). The topics then were presented to the general audience and the participants could choose which of the topics they would like to join. The groups thus found were asked to nominate a coordinator and to define their next activities ("next steps") to be taken.
3 Results

The three introductory lectures gave an introduction to the topic of regional governance within the European framework conditions.

Helmut Voelzkow put "regional governance" into the context of the general governance-discussion and identified five basic models of governance which could be combined into regional governance: Market, hierarchy, organization (enterprises), association (networks) and solidarity (communities). They follow different logics of action (competition, intervening directions, systems of rules, negotiation and socio-emotional relationships). Regional governance has to do with the production of collective goods to support regional competitiveness\(^5\). Which mode of governance a region will finally adopt depends on the type of collective good to be produced but also on paradigmatic perceptions of the "correct" governance and - last but not least - of specific context conditions. For each region is determined by specific structural conditions. Therefore, Voelzkow refused to define "regional governance", since regional governance was an elusive notion which in reality could take all forms of self-regulation which result from the combination of the five basic patterns.

Theo Toonen drew attention to the fact that regional governance means different things in different countries. He differentiated the European member states according to their degree of regionalization into "federalism, strong regionalism, weak regionalism and functional regionalism". Different regions can choose different modes of governance depending on their specific contexts (historical cleavages, institutional framework, hitherto preferred governance modes etc.) (path-dependency). Using the example of cultural cleavages in the Netherlands and Belgium he could show that equal basis issues ("cleavages") could be resolved differently by different nations: The Netherlands used a functional approach via the "pillarized" model of integrating different cultures, while Belgium adopted a territorial approach ("cultural communities"). Therefore, when doing international comparative research work it would be imperative to elaborate the equal-functional mechanisms to resolve identical problems.

In addition, Toonen argued that there is a close relationship between regional governance and administrative reform because both are directed towards transforming national governments. Regarding administrative reforms it seems that all member states tend towards polycentric systems of strategic action with regions becoming new coordinating systems. It is then of interest what political choices the different member states would make based on different historical legacies, different opportunities and constraints and on different paradigms (although there seems to be a convergence to the "managerial paradigm"). But regional governance could only be regarded as a societal mode of governance if it is controlled and responsible.

Patsy Healey finally introduced an additional dimension of regional governance: the collective cognitive construction of places. For, how regions are perceived, is socially construed. Therefore, regional governance is closely related to place-making by which Healey understands the social construction of a regional belongingness within a spatial system of relations. Place-making thus requires the mobilization of people to form collective actors, the corresponding capacity building via some kind of institutionalization and finally an enduring capacity to act by rutinization. Regional planning could contribute by fostering the perception of "place" and by identifying common goods (interdependencies) via strategic planning. Using examples of regional planning she clarified her ideas: Regional planning could mediate in the "conception of place", could support governance, but it would have to be freed from some of its institutional fetters and be materially re-freshed.

\(^5\) Examples: common vocational training, common venture capital, common regional marketing
Those general introductions had to concretise in the ensuing work groups which were enriched by papers based on actual research activities of the participants. The work groups produced the following findings:

**Work Group 1 (heuristic added value of regional governance)** was striving to get a clearer understanding of regional governance and reduced the notion to procedural modes (in contrast to structural modes as defined by the term "government"). Thus regional governance is related to norms, rules and logics of action, refers to concrete problems and is additional to existing institutional frames (flight from institutions). The regional level is particularly receptive to regional governance since it is least institutionalized (in comparison to the local and state level) but at the same time burdened with problems externalized by the local governments and the state where they either cannot be handled adequately or where they come out as un-accounted for spill-overs of problem-solutions (e.g. social disparities of a market driven growth policy). Regional governance could thus be the result of market or state failure. For the concept of regional governance self-binding decision-making is crucial which is the reason why intrinsic "self-steering" and the reflexivity of acting seem to be very important. This leads directly to the cultural dimension of regional governance.

The statements presented by participants showed that it is extremely difficult not only to define regional governance empirically because regional governance is always influenced by other centres of governance but also to relate regional governance to a particular outcome in a cause-effect relation. In the end it is also unclear whether regional governance might not be just a policy paradigm led by concepts of "social order" which might not be consistent with the existing complex fractal world. It should therefore be one of the research tasks to question the existing theoretical categories of governance whether they are sufficient to clarify and to describe the governance processes on the regional level (revisiting old notions of political science: Le Galès).

**Work Group 2 (main characteristics of regional governance)** was based on three statements which refer to governance between institutions and networks, to the context of governance and to capacity building in the process of the development of governance. They led to questions like:

- How does the cooperation between the private and public sector work effectively?
- How do different governance patterns emerge between institutions and networks?
- Which national differences could be distinguished?

The differences were traced back a) to the cultural dimension (governance embedded in culturally induced patterns of government), b) to influences of EU policies (in particular: EU regional policy) and c) to the different handling of the questions of democracy, legitimacy and identity building within the governance processes. There was a general feeling that the EU regional policy could contribute to a "Europeanisation" of the regional institutions which not necessarily would mean: a Europeanisation of regional governance styles. As to "identity building" the general opinion was that one should look for identification with problems and problem-solving processes (common interests) rather than ask for regional identity as such.

**Work Group 3 (interplay between governance and regional planning)** elaborated the role of planning in the process of governance building. Based on three presentations which dealt with strategic planning, planning processes and the interplay between water resource management and regional planning it was made clear that regional governance is an "in-between" category, namely between different government levels. But if planning can be influential then primarily as strategic
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6 The notion of "in-between" was criticized on behalf of its hierarchical connotation; a better expression would be "intermediary".
device and in particular via activities directed at "sustainable development". The influence of planning was supposed to increase

- with an improved integration of regional planning into the governance of regional development,
- with supporting endeavors to absorb societal risks of modern technologies and
- with developing tools to support governance (like monitoring).

It seemed to be essential that planning contributed to governance by increasing the options and networks of action, which necessarily raises the question who governs and how governance is democratically legitimized. Here, reference was made to the ESDP-process which was considered to be helpful but not going far enough. Although many participants favoured "weak" modes of regional planning, the German example showed that a more binding planning system could support the governance function by making use of the shadow of the hierarchy.

**Work Group 4** (*regional governance patterns in urban areas*) discussed the relationship between regional governance and regional development. Three presentations formed the basis of discussion: The first was about the new planning system in the province of Rome, based on a mode of governance that harnessed intergovernmental pacts, negotiating and contracts. However, at present (April 2001) there only exists the plan as such with implementation still being open. A second paper based on examples of Bremen and Magdeburg and looked into the governance patterns of regional conferences (German style). Regional conferences use networking, negotiating and even bargaining. One of the major findings was that the proficiency of regional governance could be reduced if the state gave financial incentives tied the implementation of regional development concepts. For then, the regional actors would choose out-sourcing the task on consultants thus reducing their "ownership" of the process with negative repercussion on the implementation of the concept. In addition, regional conferences could be frustrated if their intersectoral coordinating function was not met at the state level due to missing inter-sectoral arrangements.

A third presentation drew on an example of the Hannover region and examined "innovative economic networks" in their relation to regional development. In the example the governance function was restricted because the network was formed by members of lower status and had to struggle with competing institutions with higher appeal for its members and its members' employment of time. The ensuing discussion touched the following questions:

- such case studies should also display the institutional background and issues that dominate the political agendas thus shedding light upon options to be exploited for problem solving,
- one should be careful not to overvalue networks and regional cooperation because of their inherent tendency towards oligarchic structures and economic interests,
- territorial reforms were no general answer to regional governance since there is no single solution, rather that any solution would be path dependent (historical legacy), could have functional equivalents and has to be modelled according to the paradigmatic context in which "consolidation" takes place,
- local governments should get more leeway for experimenting with different modes of governance.
Work Group 5 (regional governance in rural areas) was based on four presentations that showed that regional governance could be initiated top down as well as bottom up but apparently the point of entry does not make a difference as long as the actors are willing to start the cooperation and accept the "ownership" of the process.\(^7\) In contrast, however, the objective or problem to be tackled by regional governance makes a difference. In particular rural areas seem to be motivated to develop new modes of regional governance because of fears of becoming "marginalized": Governance then could turn into a pro-active concept to overcome marginalization. But one should also look at the frame-conditions, as marginalization is a restriction to regional governance.

Work Group 6 (regional governance in cross-border regions) discussed the question of governance in cross-border interactions on the basis of three presentations, two of which addressed the international cross-border problems. One of the main findings of that group was that regional governance patterns were highly selective: They reacted primarily to the challenges of the EU programmes, dealt predominantly with cultural infrastructure, economic and environmental topics but were constrained by different national government (institutional) frameworks. Nonetheless, border regions have better chances for cooperation than regions within a nation-state since alternative modes of governance are absent and cooperation is the stepping stone for stronger modes of cross-border governance. However, to make progress within those institutional constraints cooperation across national borders needs more formalized structures in order to resolve conflicts better, to make the cooperation more enduring and to "institutionalize" learning. But which kind of institutionalization would be the most promising cannot be generalized. Again those regions need more leeway for experimenting with modes of governance.

To sum up, the work groups showed that regional governance is no easy concept to build theories upon. There are many different patterns of regional governance and it is difficult to draw the dividing line between government and governance on the regional level. That holds the more so if space and territory decline in importance while functional interrelationships get stronger and the region is constrained by many external dependencies. The different discussion groups therefore showed a wide range of notions of regional governance such as:

- regional governance as a territorially bound mode of governance with specifics that cannot be found beyond the region (at the state or local level). Such specifics could be the kind of issues to be dealt with, the institutional leeway, the specific combination of actors etc.,
- regional governance is the expression of regional interludes of functional modes of governance which elicit a particular need for coordination on the regional level,
- regional governance is a substitute for stronger institutional arrangements of a region (like consolidation),
- regional governance is an auxiliary to existing "strong" institutions,
- regional governance is a mode of producing collective goods to improve regional competitiveness,
- regional governance is a mode of collective problem-solving,
- regional governance is a mode of community building via place-making etc.

\(^7\) If those conditions are not met than the source of the initiative is important as shown in group 4: If the state initiates the cooperation "top down", the actors are willing to comply but they are not ready to accept the "ownership".
Hence, the term "regional governance" is a fluid and even elusive one with only a few generalized characteristics such as:

- it is an "intermediary" between government, civil society and the private sector with the prospect of raising the capacity of societal self-regulation beyond the already existing governments;
- it is about coordinating actions of different actors with interdependent resource and output-dependencies,
- it is about regulating processes of common problem-solving (not necessarily: conflict resolution) by distributing authority and resource disponability\(^8\).
- it is a hybrid mixture of hierarchical, institutional and negotiating/ networking modes of acting.

4 Further research topics

Within the framework of the final session the participants of the conference identified further research topics. The participants of each network plan to initiate research activities, to interchange their experiences and to cultivate the regional governance network. Here are the results of the Open-Space-session, assigned to nine main topics:

**ESDP/ European Policy**

- Framing conditions of regional governance
- How does the EU influence the shaping of "governance patterns"?
- How could ESDP be transformed into the national planning systems of member states?
- ESDP and regional governance
- How do national regional policies and EU structural funds influence the development and strategic acting of collective actors in terms of governance: Is there a tendency towards Europeanisation/ unity of policies?

**Legitimacy of Regional Governance**

- Value added of regional governance in terms of democratic legitimacy
- Criteria of democratic legitimacy of regional governance, shift from input- to merely output-oriented legitimacy?
- Can we still use the criteria of classic democratic theory when dealing with governance?
- How can we make accountability effective in [new] systems of governance?
- How do new modes of governance relate to the institutions of representative democracy?
- Does governance undermine democracy?
- Can regional governance mobilise civil society and thus enhance democracy?

**Metropolitan areas and Regional Governance**

- Role of cities and the business sector in regional governance
- Organisational devices and their proficiency within national contexts

---

\(^8\)"... a set of values, policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social affairs through interactions among the government, civil society and private sector" (UNDP/BMZ: The UNDP role in decentralization and local governance. A joint UNDP-Government of Germany Evaluation, New York 2000 (UNDP Evaluation Office), p.26).
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- Capacity building for regional governance
- Role of small and medium-sized towns in regional governance
- Rural-urban partnership as modes of governance?

**Cultural Dimension/ Identity/ Territory/ Mobilization**
- Mobilization of social actors in regional governance vis-a-vis economic actors
- Building consensus, negotiation/ conflicts and legitimacy
- Identity: territorial identity, cultural bases, economic bases, political bases; different meanings of identity in different European countries
- Place making: sense of place, mental maps, spatial imaginary

**Interrelationship of Planning & Regional Governance**
- Dealing with uncertainty in making strategies
- Democratic basis of planning
- Can regional planning promote new forms of governance? Can regional planning lead to more integration?
- Who are the actors shaping regional planning processes and outcomes?

**Regional Governance and sustainability**
- Which are the areas (issues) in which regional governance is the most competitive?
- What must be the contribution of regional governance to solve problems related to sustainable development?
- Positive and negative fiscal and political incentives of regional politicians to provide sustainable regional development

**Regional Governance in cross-border regions**
- Typology of border regions and governance modes
- Evolution of governance in border regions
- Transnational dimension of knowledge exchange and learning
- How to manage interactions in different cultural contexts

**Realisation of Regional Governance**
- Innovative concepts & processes
- Contextualisation
- Different socio-institutional infrastructure
- Management tools
- Towards a set of strategies that supports regional governance
- Realisation of regional governance in metropolitan regions?

**Levels and Dimensions of Governance (Networks)**
- Inter-issue-coordination: “Nodal actors” connecting several regional networks
5 General comments

The EuroConference was successful assessed against its goals and the feedback which the participants conveyed. The participants were highly motivated during the three days and showed their interest by lively discussions. The discussions ran at a high intellectual level spurred by interventions of the senior researchers.

But in order not to become complacent some critical remarks seem to be necessary:

a. Regarding organization

The concept of networking via international conferences which try to integrate different researches on the basis of issues seems to work in principle. In particular the concept of "Open Space"9 was helpful in integrating the participants issue-wise. But we also made the experience that:

- the researchers are not completely free in choosing topics of interest: Their existing research activities influence their choice;
- personal likings are considered very important: Not only the issue is important for joining networks but even more the "human chemistry";
- it would probably have been worth if after forming networks the groups would have had the opportunity to discuss their topics in detail and to structure the ensuing steps. That task is now left to the internet. But the internet is a constrained tool: It cannot substitute face-to-face-contacts and the quick verbal interplay which are vital for starting intense networks.

b. Regarding contents

Regional governance is a topic which is gaining importance in Europe. But it also became clear that there were very different approaches to it,

- depending on the country where participants came from: Participants from countries with more centralised government structures had more difficulties to develop a clearer notion of what regional governance could mean: In their countries the functional modes of governance are much stronger than the territorial ones. Conversely, members from more decentralized countries had little trouble to think "regionally";
- depending on the discipline: Sociological thinking is more functional oriented while planners and geographers are more territorially oriented. Hence, sociologists tend to see regional govern-

---

9 Open Space is a newly invented mode of organizing participatory processes by leaving it up to the participants on which issues and in what combination of actors they are willing to discuss common topics.
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ance more as a social construct and as a resultant of different functional horizontal and/or vertical systems of decision making. In contrast, planners and geographers relate regional governance more easily to territorially oriented modes of governance.

In general, therefore, there were two different basic approaches which could be contrasted as either functional or territorial. Sociologists and participants coming from centralized countries preferred a functional approach; geographers and planners as well as those from more decentralized countries tended towards a territorial approach.

But also the emphasis on what should be relevant in further research showed interesting differences. It is probably no coincidence that the different cultural backgrounds and paradigmatic shapings of the participants influenced their predilection for topics to be dealt with:

Representatives of political science of member states of North Europe were more interested in the "legitimization" of regional governance,

while representatives of member states of Southern Europe showed more interest in the cultural dimension of governance and questions of "identity".

Members of countries with stronger regional planning were particularly interested in the relationship between regional planning and regional governance.
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1 Building the capacity for regional governance

The contemporary interest in regional governance in Europe is focused on building an ‘in-between’ scale of governance, between strong municipalities and strong states (nation states or powerful sub-national bodies). In most countries, some form of intermediate level exists already, such as French provinces, Swedish and German counties, Italian regions, British counties. In countries such as Britain and Sweden, there have been re-organisations of municipalities to create larger units. In Sweden, there have been moves to create regions. In Denmark and Italy, creating regions has been linked to decentralisation initiatives. However, the contemporary interest in regional governance is not just about inserting a new level in a government hierarchy. It is about building new agendas and forms of governance. The motivation is to connect issues which have been treated within the separate policy regimes and policy communities developed around sectoral policies and to evolve new ways of linking state, economy and civil society.

In this context, developing new arenas at scales which were previously not articulated offers the chance of building new kinds of governance institution. The often-stated objective is to create arenas which involve new actors in different kinds of relationship, typically more interactive and less professionalised than in the past. The EU and national policy vocabularies speak of partnership and networks, stretching out beyond the confines of government bodies to draw in business and community representatives, and the diffuse not-for-profit and voluntary sector. The ambition is thus to configure the relations between state, economy and civil society in new ways. This means that it is not enough merely to decentralise government tasks down from one level to another or move them up from the municipal level to some larger scale. The new agenda moves beyond the old ‘top-down’ versus ‘bottom up’ debate. It involves developing what are often called ‘horizontal’ linkages, especially between the separate sectoral policy communities. But to survive in a well-

---
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populated and often complex governance landscape, such new ‘in between’ initiatives need to accumulate sufficient legitimacy and authority to act. Such agencies have to operate strategically, to position themselves within and potentially re-shape this landscape.

In this paper, I explore the role of concepts of ‘place’ in mobilising attention and developing ‘collective actor’ capacity in building ‘in-between’ governance capacity.

For many years, spatial spatial planning systems and practices have been ‘guardians’ of spatial organising ideas in urban and regional development policy. Twentieth century planning thought has been dominated by the concept of the city region, linked to analyses of integrated regional economies and societies. In the 1960s, these were revived in efforts to develop larger scale management of key infrastructures, notably water basin management and transport development, linked to the articulation of regional spatial strategies. But from the 1970s, these strategic spatial management initiatives faded as public sector budgets were reduced and all kinds of new economic and cultural pressures shifted the relations of cities and regions. We can analyse this failure in a broad way through general arguments about the relation between economic organisation and political arrangements. But more specifically, the spatial planning tradition has been criticised for its own conceptions, - of spatial dynamics, of the relation between policy specification and institutional design, and of how strategies get translated into actions.

As regards spatial dynamics, spatial planning thought purveyed images of city regions in the language of Christaller, underpinned with a Euclidean view of space. The intensity of relations varied with simple geographical distance. Always contestable, it is now widely recognised that new technologies over the past 150 years have rendered this conception highly problematic. Instead, contemporary conceptions emerging in geography and urban studies emphasise the multi-layering of all kinds of relational networks across the space of a city and region, each network with its own time-space relations, and with very variable connections between one network and another, even if co-existing in geographical space. As regards policy specification and institutional design, until the 1970s, spatial planning thought embodied the idea that institutional arrangements should be designed to fit the spatial conceptions which arose from the analyses and plans of the planning community. That strategies and policies might evolve through a complex interaction between local institutional histories and politics was obscured by a mixture of evangelism and naivety. A substantial literature of case studies has undermined this assumption, and provided the basis for a much more institutionally-aware and interactive understanding of the relation of policy-making to its wider environment. Finally, as regards how strategies influenced action, spatial planning thought traditionally embodied a simple linear idea that when strategies where articulated and approved, they would ‘build the future’ in unproblematic ways. This conception could not survive the reductions in public expenditure for investment in physical development and the diffusion of power arising from the increasing role of private actors in taking development initiatives and the expansion of local environmental politics. It became empirically obvious that strategic plans were highly variable in what they influenced, how and when.

With the Netherlands as the heartland of the spatial planning tradition, see Faludi and Van der Walk’s detailed study of what they refer to as ‘planning doctrine’ Faludi; Van der Walk (1994).

As in regulationist accounts, or Harvey’s analysis of the shift from managerialism to entrepreneurialism in city government (Harvey 1989).

See Graham; Healey (1999), MacLeod (1999), Massey (1994).


which is why the planning field has much to say to the current discussion of the new regional governance impetus, see Graham; Healey (1999), Innes; Booher (1999), Madanipour Hull et al. (2001).

See Healey, McNamara et al. (1988), for example.
These traditional spatial planning conceptions have been much criticised and hardly survive in academic planning thought. However, across Europe, echoes of them remain embedded in planning practices. They can be found in Swedish practices where planners still design housing layouts, in British land use regulations where it is assumed that restricting where houses are built will reduce the need to travel, in many transport planning models which assume that major travel flows are from home to work in city centres modelled according to gravity models, and in the ways in which planning documents speak of compact cities and the distinction between town and country, ‘grey’ (or brown) and ‘green’. They survive in modes of governance which speak of public participation and consultation but still typically act as if the planners are ‘in charge’. As a result, spatial planning practices are these days commonly seen as part of the old government, to be displaced and avoided by the new governance forms. Can the articulation of conceptions of place be released from this baggage to accommodate new and diverse ways of thinking about place, and become a powerful mobiliser of strategic policy attention in the new forms? To introduce this discussion, I review briefly what building new governance forms involves.

2 Building new institutional capacity at an ‘inbetween’ scale

It used to be thought in planning and public administration that new government institutions arose through formal measures to create them, - the passing of laws defining competences and areas, the procedures for acquiring and allocating resources, the election and appointment of personnel, etc. In Britain, where it is relatively easy to restructure subnational government bodies, national political administrations have repeatedly addressed governance failure by such reorganisations. But the contemporary analyses of governance processes recognise the power of informal arrangements through which people come together to manage their common affairs or to mobilise to transform their situation or their wider context. Many of the new regional initiatives are informal, created through the mutual agreement of a collection of municipalities, or an informal partnership between a range of public, private and not-for-profit entities. Even if formally set up, a new agency or a new level of government does not necessarily have sufficient legitimacy or capacity to use the formal powers it has. What then does it take to build the ‘capacity to act’ to make a difference?

Building such capacity involves three tasks. The first is mobilisation, generating the impetus and power to create new relations and alliances, and develop new policy agendas. The second is institutional design, creating new arenas, rules of engagement and modes of practice. The third is routinisation, or ‘mainstreaming’ in some form, in which the new relations and networks, and the new agendas, become normalised and embedded in the flow of governance activity. The result of the accomplishment of all these three tasks is that the new regional capacity significantly alters the way resources are allocated, the structure and practice of regulatory activity and the frames of reference that are deployed.

Any reflection on contemporary efforts at building governance capacity at the regional and sub-regional scale suggests that many do not achieve all these tasks. Nor does capacity-building effort flow in a linear way from mobilisation, to design and routinisation. Institutions may be formally created, but languish for lack of sufficient mobilisation and routinisation to give them the power to

8 see Amin, Hausner (1997), Cars, Healey et al. (2001), Stoker (2000)
9 see the many reviews of partnership experiences, for example, Bailey (1995), Elander; Blanc (2000), Hastings (1996), Healey, de Magalhães et al. (forthcoming), Pierre (1998)
10 Here, I draw and expand on Hajer’s discussion of discourse structuration and institutionalisation, in the context of the creation of a new arena for governance activity Hajer (1995).
11 This links to Giddens’ structuration theory, and his key structuring relations – allocative processes and authoritative processes, informed by frames of reference, Giddens (1984), see Barrett; Healey (1990)
change policy relations and policy agendas. (e.g.: Swedish regions, Norwegian regions\textsuperscript{12}). Initial mobilisation efforts at a regional scale may go no further than ‘refreshing’ the relations and agendas of established governance arenas, such as national governments and municipalities. Bottom-up efforts to create self-regulating and self-steering governance capacity, or creative initiatives in designing new forms of governance activity, may fail through lack of institutionalisation and routinisation, so that ‘mainstream’ government carries on ‘as usual’. Initiatives which generate an array of formal procedures may fail to innovate as they are filled out by existing policy networks with their established agendas\textsuperscript{13}, or new partnership agencies may merely become yet another arena where the various parties can pursue their existing conflicts\textsuperscript{14}.

To understand how far new governance initiatives are developing a ‘capacity to act’ of their own, it is helpful to evaluate them according to two criteria. The first relates to their ability, to their agency power. Do they attract sufficient legitimacy, authority and capability to affect the flow of resource allocation, of regulatory practices and of frames of reference? The second relates to their capacity for innovation. Do they establish new policy relations, new policy agendas and new modes of governance practice, that is new relational resources or social capital, new knowledge resources or intellectual capital and new mobilisation capacity or political capital\textsuperscript{15}? To perform well on these two criteria requires considerable effort in mobilising the support and ‘energy’ to carry the impetus of the new initiative into the routines of the ‘everyday life’ of governance practices. Such efforts in mobilisation and routinisation are critical to the capacity to create an enduring ‘collective actor’, which can both structure new discourses and institutionalise them into new practices\textsuperscript{16}. But this mobilisation work is not just about building coalitions and alliances around mutual interests, and beating off competitors for control of a political and policy territory. It is also about building new frames of reference, new discourses, new policy communities and ‘communities of practice’\textsuperscript{17}. It is about creating new perceptions of who the parties involved are and new assessments of what ‘interests’ each has. It involves the re-moulding of identity as well as engaging in new games on re-configured gameboards\textsuperscript{18}.

It is in this context that a focus on place qualities becomes significant. If a key objective of the new regional capacity building effort is to ‘integrate’ a policy landscape dominated by separate vertically-organised sectoral programmes and to identify and develop the specific qualities of particular places in the context of globalising economic processes and environmental/social obligations, then such a focus cuts across established policy agendas in potentially new ways. The activity of re-imagining and re-inventing images of place, space and territory can provide a momentum to explore meanings and identities as well as interconnections and relations as these play out across the space of an area being considered\textsuperscript{19}. Depending on the richness with which such images are explored, a focus on place quality has the potential to combine both an orienting imagery which can be inserted in the frames of reference of many parties, with an inspirational capacity to release creative ideas in all kinds of different fields of activity in which parties are engaged, giving multiple

\textsuperscript{12} Amdam 2001, cases in Danzon, Halkier et al. (2000).

\textsuperscript{13} There is a potential for this outcome in the new English initiatives in building Regional Development Agencies and Regional Assemblies

\textsuperscript{14} See Innes, Gruber (2001)

\textsuperscript{15} In our own work, we have used the first set of terms Healey (1998), as the term ‘capital’ carries too much other baggage. Innes and colleagues use the second set of terms Innes, Gruber et al. (1994), Innes; Bookser (1999)

\textsuperscript{16} See Hatter (1995)

\textsuperscript{17} Hatter, Wagenaar (forthcoming), Vigar, Healey et al. (2000), Wenger (1998)

\textsuperscript{18} Although I agree with Scharpf’s focus on actors, it is at this point that I part company with his heavy emphasis on the metaphor of games (Scharpf 1997)

\textsuperscript{19} See Dovey (1999), Faludi (1996), Neuman (1997)
meanings and enriching identities as it does so. A focus on place quality is thus both a potentially powerful, innovatory, and also possibly dangerous, means for building institutional capacity for regional governance.

3 Space, place and territory as mobilising concepts

Traditionally, spatial planners assumed that places were objectively ‘there’, either existing as artefacts or to be created by physical construction. These days, the relation between material presence and meaning is recognised as much more complex. While spatial analysts spend considerable effort measuring and analysing the dimensions and performance of particular geographical areas to provide useful information to researchers and policy-makers, such measurements are rarely what gives meaning to conceptions of place and territory, and have little mobilising force in themselves. Creating conceptions of place which have the power to mobilise, co-ordinate and inspire involves active work in calling up and generating imagery and language which carries a depth of meanings. Even where there has been no recent work to call up place imaginations, there are likely to be multiple conceptions and languages of place and space already existing in the institutional array into which a new regional governance initiative seeks to insert itself. (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture, milieux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlements in nested hierarchies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounded systems of relationships, within a ‘container’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open, multi-layered systems of relationships, in a ‘space of flows’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of ‘bits’ – assets, habitats, objects, ‘pieces of city’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured spatial patterns – elements (gateways, corridors, centres, compact cities, edge cities, and layers of infrastructure systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday life environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an old geographical tradition of ‘locale’ as culture, recently revived in the new regional economic geography of innovative regional ‘milieux’. This emphasises the way social and cultural relations infuse and structure economic conceptions and practices. Also originating in the nineteenth century is the imagery of a Christallerian landscape of large and small towns and villages, organised hierarchically, with nested catchment areas. In this model, the critical issue defining opportunity for places was a linear distance-decay function. A third model, linked to geographical analyses of regional economies in the 1960s and now revived in a number of models of environmental systems, is of a place as a ‘container’ of ‘bounded systems’, with inflows, outflows and internal transformation processes. The economic models of the 1960s aimed to maximise the outflows from the inflows. The environmental models of the 1990s seek to minimise both the inflows and outflows, i.e. self-containment. Both of these traditions emphasise the systemic interrelations between activities in places. These have been re-caste in the contemporary analysis of the ‘network society’ by a replacement of concepts of single, integrated systems operating within a place with ideas about ‘spaces of flows’, with the emphasis on the openness and fluidity of relations and their potential lack of connectivity despite co-existence in particular places. Then there are conceptions which treat places as collections of assets (for economic competitiveness), or of habitats (for wildlife), or of ‘pieces of city’, such as industrial parks, waterfront locations, city centres, neighbourhoods and gated communities. These allow debates on replacement, how loss due to development might be compensated. But they present ‘place’ as a ‘city of
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20 See Lopes (2000) for a discussion of what gives power to indicators
21 Putnam (1993) and Moulaert (2000) provide rather different ways of conceptualising these dynamics.
bits’, or a collage of co-located elements jostling about seeking position in a crowded and contested landscape. Recent environmental debate has added in some organising dimensions to these ‘collage’ conceptions, reviving old images of settlement patterns with new spatial concepts - ‘compact cities’, ‘corridors’ and ‘gateways’. This raises questions about the structuring forces which shape spatial patterns. Urban designers and landscape designers are confident that physical and natural structures carry this power, and also seek to characterise the ‘distinctive identities’ of different physical landscapes, but they do this largely through the lens of an external specialist observer. Finally, there are conceptions of the place of everyday life, the places through which people move in their daily, weekly, yearly and lifetime rhythms, and which businesses use as they obtain and distribute products and services and organise work situations. It is these which the spatial analysts seek to tie down through datasets, but such analyses neglect the dimensions of meaning and belonging which build up through the accumulated bodily practices and experiential understandings of daily life. These dimensions are emphasised in the language of music, art and culture within which qualities of place are manifest as emotive experiences encapsulated in creative products, - songs, paintings, sculptures, films, dance, poems, performance.

In any area in which a regional governance initiative gets underway, there are therefore likely to be not merely many parties with different ideas about what ‘place’ they are in and what it means to them. These ideas may link to many different frames of reference and languages with which to discuss them.

To get some idea of how these ideas have been surfacing in recent urban and regional strategies, I and colleagues have been examining a range of plans and strategies to identify the concepts of ‘place’ and spatial organisation being deployed. These only provide a partial view, as they are filtered through the spectacles of professional specialists and political authorities. They nevertheless give a flavour of the conceptions currently circulating in policy debate. What we have found so far is that there is a limited explicit attention to the spatial dimensions of policy and a weak imagery used to describe what is noticed. Traditional conceptions continue in different fields of policy, layered over with a new imagery of ‘visioning’, drawn largely from an international vocabulary of ‘economic competitiveness’ and ‘sustainable development’, sometimes complemented by a reference to ‘social inclusion’. There are few concepts which have the potential to inspire and mobilise across different existing policy and institutional boundaries.

This experience raises the question as to why the language of place and the place imagery being used in contemporary spatial strategies is so ‘thin’, with such limited power to mobilise and inspire? Why have there so far been few attempts to encourage discussion about what places mean to people and what they could mean? Why is the issue of identity and belonging being neglected in regional governance building initiatives except at a superficial level? There are many reasons which may be suggested. One is that explicit discussion of place qualities where this involves differentiation within a region can be politically highly contentious. Another is that the power of the sectoral agenda has stunted spatial imagination. There is also a continuing intellectual ambiguity as to whether ‘place’ matters, rather than people, products and flows. A fourth reason is that the policy communities who get drawn into capacity-building activities are uncertain about their legitimacy in mobilising and about their role in developing ‘identity-building resources’. Behind this is a real fear of releasing some old European forces of ‘identity politics’, played out for centuries in territorial warfare between competing ethnic groups and then nation states. Underpinning such a politics is a conception of Gemeinschaft, a homogeneous ‘folk’ with a right to control (that is, define the qualities of) a specific territory. A further reason, drawing on US experience, is that of local exclusionary practices and NIMBY politics, the defense of money and class as much as cultural identity. Such practices can continue unnoticed, causing considerable irritation, distress and injustice. In a European context which is becoming increasingly multi-cultural, not only in its ethnic
mix, but in the many different cultural communities generated by diversifying lifestyles, such a neglect is difficult to justify and sustain. The Derry case mentioned in Table 2 provides an example of the opposite strategy, where the different groups of the once-divided city have worked hard to generate a collective agenda for the city as a whole\textsuperscript{23}. But, as this case shows, such debate has to tread a delicate tightrope between connecting to and sustaining multiple images and vocabularies for discussing place and the need to gather sufficient force to carry mobilisation through to enduring routinisation of regional governance relations and discourses.

There are good examples where new conceptions of ‘place’ have been developed through complex collaborative processes which have aimed to build understanding of the multiple dimensions of the dynamics of urban and regional change, articulating strategic visions with some capacity to mobilise and inspire\textsuperscript{24}. These examples support the argument place conceptions will be richer and more robust to the extent that they are based on localised processes of debate which tap into multiple place conceptions. But are all the conceptions which could be developed so beneficial? Are place conceptions developed through collaborative processes necessarily benign? There is a real but necessary tension in the advocacy of localised processes of policy agenda formation and the promotion of knowledgability and specific values which those involved in wider policy, professional and academic communities may be aware of. There are also tensions in the attempt to combine the adoption of environmental sustainability as a key objective while at the same time empowering local communities to define their own agendas. In this context, place conceptions which invoke the past without any consideration of how past and future are to interact are likely to mobilise an agency around a narrow defensive agenda. Conceptions which revive unthinkingly a Euclidean geography, or a sectoral dimensioning of policy formation, or which borrow naively from contemporary ideas in general circulation, or which ignore the social diversity of areas or the adverse impacts which action in one place could have on another, deserve to be challenged. There is sufficient awareness of these dangers available to many of the most knowledgeable actors in most areas to avoid this. Does a place conception need to be unitary, expressing a common shared singular identity which can endure over the longterm? Again, given all the discussion of the importance of diversity and variety, such a singular identity should be resisted as potentially oppressive to many and limiting in its future adaptability. The alternative is to search for conceptions which are full of interpretive possibilities, to be filled in many ways. Rather than defining a specific identity or quality, such conceptions would cultivate a shared practice of ‘noticing’ place qualities. Noticing conflicts may be as important in such a practice as generating an agreed image.

My argument is then that building governance capacity at an ‘in between’ scale will not endure if it is based on the temporary mutual interests of a few key parties, or on the imperatives of nation states seeking to download some difficult tasks. It needs to generate a momentum which creates legitimacy and authority, in relation to the other already existing governance institutions. To do this, it needs to mobilise interest and support, and to become something more than its immediate agenda and organisational form. It needs to generate an aura of identity to which people can connect. Generating this aura is not just about presenting an external image to investors and funders around the world. It involves building up a ‘base’ of recognition within the area over which it extends. It needs to reach into the various sectoral policy communities, interest groups, municipalities, partnerships, agencies etc which already inhabit the governance landscape, as well as connect to the array of firms, groups, agencies and communities in the spheres of the economy and civil society. In this effort, developing debates on the qualities of place, on the shared experience of place - on the different ways it can be understood and valued, its different meanings to different

\textsuperscript{23} See MURTAGH (2001)

\textsuperscript{24} Vancouver and Seattle are regularly cited and visited in this context, see MALBERT (1998)
people in different contexts, the relations between what insiders and outsiders think, on qualities of place in the past, the present and the future - has the potential to release an imagery which can give enduring identity while embodying diversity and flexibility. But such debates cannot be fuelled by importing borrowed concepts or by conjuring them up within particular expert communities. They need to be locally grown in the process of creating a practice (Wenger 1998). They have to be nurtured, fertilised and noticed. This requires effort in institutional design. The generation of discourses of place identity cannot therefore be separated from the processes of their articulation. Further, and given the dangers referred to above, it matters what kinds of place conception emerge. If regional governance arenas are to have an enduring role in helping the multiple groups within the areas to which they relate to flourish, such conceptions must have the capacity to move from the past into the future, embody relational conceptions of space and reflect multiplicity and real conflict over place qualities and their meanings, rather than an artificial unitary consensus. The qualities of ‘place visions’ therefore matter.

4 Strategic spatial planning as a process of articulating and routinising conceptions of place

There is a great deal of discussion in Europe at the moment about what spatial planning and ‘spatial development’ is and could become. Some argue merely for a capacity to focus on the ‘spatial impacts’ of sectoral policies. But others, as in the new momentum for an ‘in-between scale’ of governance, search for policy perspectives which can cut across and integrate what is currently sectoral. The critical integrations of this re-awakening of interest in strategic spatial planning are to be found around the locales and nodes where the relational webs of economic, social and environmental activities co-incide, intersect, generate synergies and escalate into conflict. Their impetus is thus only partly an old planning pre-occupation with conceptualising an area in space as an exercise in its own right. It is much more to do with addressing real conflicts between activities and policies, as these play out across an area.

The momentum for getting involved in strategic spatial planning is thus linked to the momentum for building an ‘in-between’ governance capacity. I argued in the second part of this paper that building the ‘capacity to act’ involved such initiatives in three tasks: mobilisation, institutional design and routinisation. Mobilisation to create new forums and arenas for articulating strategies may occur because parties with mutual interests may have got mired in conflict with each other, as Innes and colleagues describe in their investigations of regional governance initiatives in California in relation to water and transport management. They may arise through recognition of neglected interests, as in alliances to address cross-border issues such as coastal zone management. They may also arise where municipalities within an urban region recognise that they are individually too weak to become an effective collective actor and mobilise to create a unit. Or they may arise where national government creates opportunities by decentralising to the ‘in-between’ scale, which then has to generate some kind of policy agenda and institutional presence. All these initiatives create arenas for collective actor formation.

Because they are ‘in-between’ and often informal institutional initiatives, they cannot lay claim to a strong role in all areas of policy articulation which could affect how an area develops and its place qualities and identities. The articulation of a comprehensive, spatially detailed and tempo-
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26 See Innes; Gruber et al. (1994), Innes; Gruber (2001)
rally programmed conception of the future, as envisaged in strategic spatial plans of the 1960s, is therefore unlikely to be either relevant or realisable. If such initiatives are to develop a capacity to 'make a difference', to influence the flow of resources, the practice of regulation and the frames of reference which are drawn upon among relevant actors, their most effective strategy is likely to be to focus on just those issues which are causing difficulties or creating opportunities. The agendas of such initiatives are thus selective and not comprehensive, informed by a spatial consciousness, not by an ambition to build a specified future. In this context, spatial conceptions and visions of place may serve merely to lift the sights of participants beyond the terrain of their present practices to allow them to see solutions to where they have 'got stuck' in new parameters.

However, the experience of engagement in such arenas itself produces learning which, if the initial mobilisation experiences have gone well, may enlarge the focus of policy attention and generate a wider policy agenda. For mobilisation to advance to a longer term institutional presence, there first has to be a real agenda of issues to address, that is, issues which key players feel affect their situation, now and in the future. But around this, the knowledge development and relational resources which build up in early stages needs to be consolidated at both the level of practices and as a store of principles and remembered perceptions. Planners used to assume that 'the plan' was a sufficient vehicle to perform this task, an 'artefact' with the strength to carry frames of reference into investment and regulatory practices. However, research on policy and plan implementation shows that plans as such are easily forgotten, or used merely as reference documents on some issues. What is remembered is what people learned - new perceptions, insights, facts, images - as they engaged in the policy articulation process. Place conceptions, if memorable, may be much more effective in sustaining reference frameworks in active use, and encouraging the clustering of new intellectual and social capital around what has already been built up. But this will only happen if sufficient attention has been given to developing the legitimacy and authority of the mobilisation initiative. This implies that 'in between' governance initiatives which seek to have more than a temporary institutional presence need to consider how they will build their political capital, as well as their intellectual and social capital. This will involve moving beyond mobilisation to institutional design, both of necessary formal procedures and arenas, but also and importantly, of discursive practices and organisational routines. Efforts in 'imagining places' and strategic visioning may thus play an important role, not merely in mobilising attention and knowledge resources, but in structuring practices, in translating new discourses into routinely performed practices. Strategic work undertaken in 'in between' levels of governance thus involves complex efforts in institutional design and capacity-building, in which strategic discourses and modes of governance co-develop.  

Such efforts may then suffer both from too little success and too much. It is relatively easy to articulate a new strategy and produce a strategic document to express it. It is much more difficult to develop a new strategic orientation which re-shapes perceptions and actions, and has expression in different ways of allocating resources, articulating regulatory principles and justifying decisions. It is only when strategic efforts reach and transform these practices that a strategic, 'in-between' scale initiative can be said to have had real effects, as it is only then that it has significant material expression. That is, success involves routinisation, incorporation into the 'mainstream' of the flow of whatever activity the strategy was focused on. In this situation, discourses become embodied in the practices they speak of, 'rhetorics' become 'realities'. But the very process of the embodying and embedding of discourses in practices carries the danger of entrapment. The refreshed and re-invigorated discourses and practices of one era become the inertia of the next. The spatial concepts

27 The cases of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan and the West Midlands Forum in our book on institutional capacity building provide good examples (CARS, HEALEY et al. 2002). See also the cases of North Jutland and Goteborg in Danson, Halkier et al. (2000).
of one era limit the adjustment capacity of the next. The challenge, much discussed in the literature on strategic management, is to routines reflexivity, that is, the capacity for identifying new conditions, for continual questioning of assumptions and frames of reference, for imagining new possibilities and responses and the capacity to adjust current practices as these get in the way of new ways of doing things.

The strategic spatial planning which has a value to the current initiatives in building ‘in between’ governance is therefore a different creature from the traditional comprehensive regional strategic plan. It is a practice which recognises that we can neither ‘know’ the future nor ‘make it happen’. The future is continually emerging and unfolding in and around us. Agencies involved in strategic planning, and especially in ‘in between’ governance levels, exist in an institutional terrain where the power to affect the future is dispersed and unevenly distributed, and probably also shifting in its distribution through time. In this context, the capacity to ‘read’ the emerging patterning of the future is a critical attribute of a strategic collective actor seeking to ‘make a difference’ to the evolving trajectory of the future. This ‘reading’ is not just a matter of technical analytical capability. It is also about tapping the ‘distributed intelligence’ of all those with a stake in an area, and who may affect or be affected by how the emergent future evolves. It involves thinking about an area in more than merely the dimensions given by traditional sectoral analysis - people, houses, jobs, transport, services, nature, the built environment. Instead, it involves an imagination which sees unfolding relations in space-time – the evolving rhythms of daily life and lifecycle in different social worlds, the flows of movement generated as people and firms shift themselves, their ideas and their goods across space and through time, the interrelations of the movements of wildlife and people’s conceptions of ‘wildlife’, ‘biodiversity’ etc.

This ‘reading’ of territorial dynamics connects to a kind of acting which is not premised on comprehensive system guidance, but on selective experimentation and risk-taking. Contemporary geographical analysis tells us that what will cause problems and create opportunities where and when can only sometimes be predicted, and then only as imaginative guesses, because of the continual invention and adjustment going on in all the relations which shape the future of an area. Strategic planning in ‘in between’ levels of governance thus needs not only the capacity for accessing distributed intelligence about emerging futures and their qualities. It needs to be capable of designing interventions which are specific to their circumstances and revisable. The value of developing place conceptions in this context is that, if richly developed, clothed in the language of culture as much as in the analytics of geographical description and themselves revisable, they provide some kind of overarching orientation to this experimentation, without entrapping resource allocation and regulatory practices in too strong a burden of temporarily-relevant spatial concepts which might be appropriate for one time and place but not another.

5 Questions for research and policy-making

In this paper, I have argued that concepts of place are potentially very powerful in constructing the discursive frames of the new ‘in between’ governance capacity-building initiatives. They act to mobilise, to ‘integrate’, to co-ordinate and to create a ‘collective actor’ voice and capacity to act. They do this through their role in structuring and diffusing discourses, and enrolling new participants into policy articulation and development. If this is so, then the question for research and for policy-making is: how to identify when, how, and in what arenas place conceptions are being mobilised in the new ‘in between’ governance arenas?
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38 See, for example, the story of the British greenbelt
I have also argued that place conceptions can be both liberating, creative, richly diverse, innovative and capable of opening minds to new possibilities, but they can also be narrow, owned by just a few players, unitary, and locked into cultural assumptions of powerful minorities. If this is so, then the research and policy question is: how to tell the difference? Such a question can probably only be answered situation by situation. This implies that place conceptions, though highly ‘portable’, do different institutional and cultural work in different contexts.

Nevertheless, it matters what types of place conception are mobilised in ‘in between’ governance. It is not just that they have a role in re-inforcing or challenging power relations in an area. Different place conceptions carry different potentials with them which may flow into the localised interpretations given to them. The old vocabularies of spatial planning, with their Euclidean geography and unitary conceptions of settlement hierarchy and local cultures, not only inhibit all kinds of ways of responding to new economic and social values. They also oppress social groups whose cultures and lifestyles come from different traditions. The new vocabularies of ‘competitive areas’ encourage conceptions of place as collections of material assets rather than places of culture and identity. This raises research and policy questions about the multiplicity of place conceptions which may be ‘lying about’ in an area, or ‘flying about’ in the discourses of academic and policy communities. How are these brought forward, discussed, and critiqued? How relevant are they to a specific area? Which conceptions have the capacity to mobilise, to take root and grow and what are just ephemeral imports?

I have also argued that re-considering the use of concepts of place in ‘in between’ governance initiatives is not enough by itself. It needs to be attached to new ways of thinking about what strategic planning and spatial strategy involves. If so, the research and policy questions are: what kinds of knowledge resources and relational resources, (intellectual and social capital) is building up around a new ‘in between’ governance initiative? What is the role of conceptions of place in framing how these resources develop and how strategies are translated into actions and material and mental effects?

Finally, to return to the two criteria for evaluating ‘in between’ governance institutions referred to in section 2 of this paper, I have argued that new governance forms which ‘make a difference’ do so by affecting resource allocation and regulatory practices, through the frames of reference through which both practices are embodied. So the research and policy questions are: do the new ‘in between’ governance initiatives have sufficient legitimacy and authority to affect resource allocation, regulatory practice and justifying frames of reference In doing so, are they generating new policy agendas and policy networks, or merely inserting old agendas and networks into new institutional niches?

In conclusion, and with respect to these questions, there now seems to be a considerable case study literature which shows successes and failures in the durability and short-term impact of ‘in between’ governance initiatives. There is less research on the nature of the place concepts mobilised in these initiatives and the institutional work they do or on the long-term shifts in the landscape of urban and regional governance produced by new initiatives.
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1 Ecological Modernisation and Regional Governance: Why attempt to link them?

There are a variety of value positions from which studies in environmental and economic transformations depart. Schnaebel (1996), for instance, starts from a mainly utilitarian and human welfare ecology position. Other forms of environmentalism, however, have substantially contrasting ideological foundations. Frequently, both at the national as well as at the regional and local level, these competing value systems related to environmentalism and socio-economic development encounter each other in a discursive field which has implications for strategy and policy development, such as in the field of sustainable regional development and regional governance which is explored in this paper. Hence, an overview of the value and normative foundations of environmental / ecological modernisation is first provided.

1.1 Sustainable Development and Ecological Modernisation

If one follows Michael Jacobs (1999: 6-7), environmentalism’s role in politics is special:

"For uniquely among political subjects the environment is not just an area of policy. It’s also the basis of an alternative political philosophy and accompanying social movement, that of the greens ...

The very existence of the single label ‘environmental’ to cover the huge range of diverse issues now so described is a product of green thinking … And in turn environmentalism has presented the solutions to environmental problems as part of a single economic and political project. Individual policy proposals to deal with particular issues are put forward as a seamless packet: indeed, as constituting a different model of economic and social development altogether. Even in its most moderate forms, environmentalism is constantly tempted into an ‘ideological’ approach, expressing a fundamental critique of industrial societies and proposing wholesale changes to their values and trajectories … It rejects the ‘reductionist’ basis of scientific and technological development and their consequences in the exploitation of nature for human ends. It sees globalised capitalism both as immoral, in its relentless destruction of nature, and as unsustainable, its required expansion on an inevitable collision course with finite resources. It regards the materialist ethic of consumer
society, demanding the constant creation and satisfaction of insatiable wants, as a profound failure to meet human needs."

It is through the concept and discourse of 'sustainable development' (SD) that the pragmatic wing of the environmental movement achieved an escape from utopian tradition with its widespread adoption in the mid-1980s. According to Jacobs (1999: 7), sustainable development embodies an acceptance that industrial capitalism is not going to be overtaken, and that modern science and technology can help to solve environmental problems. In particular, it emphasises that by increasing the efficiency with which industry uses resources it may be possible to offset the environmental impact of continued economic growth, as argued by Weizäcker (1998). Most mainstream political parties and even business organisations have now incorporated SD in their discourse. The flexible concept of sustainable development has in many ways been extremely successful: It has brought together a huge coalition of interests, ranging from international agencies and multinational corporations to pressure groups and local authorities, behind a related but not necessarily shared and identical discourse, with a more or less common agenda. Sustainable development can be viewed as an integrated world view, not simply a set of individual policy analyses and prescriptions (see Redclift in Kenny; Meadowcroft, eds, 1999). Originally a way of combining economic development with environmental protection, it has come to embrace a whole variety of the concerns, from the reduction of poverty and social exclusion to the good treatment of employees and local communities by business, from more participative democratic processes to a new definition of economic progress (see, for instance, LGMB, 1995; FUuE, 1997). At the same time, its champions are constantly arguing that what is needed is a fundamental change in the current patterns of economic and social development. Hence, even under the moderate discourse of sustainable development that some leading environmental organisations and analysts adopt (for at least parts of their operations; see Greenpeace's joint venture with multinational companies to design and manufacture greener products), environmental issues are almost always bound together into an ideological form, wrapped up either into a comprehensive and radically transformative view of the world (see, for instance, McLaren et. al., 1998) or optimistic extensions of the current system with the exploitation of technologies possibilities (Hawken et.al., 1999; Bleischwitz; von Weizäcker, 1999; von Weizäcker et.al, 1994).

Environmental modernisation is a new political discourse (Hajer, 1995; Dryzek, 1997 for a critical review). According to Jacobs (1999: 29), it displays five key features:

"First, it is intended to 'go with the grain' of globalisation: It seeks to pick up and promote the new knowledge-based economy towards environmental ends. Secondly, it acknowledges the trend for individualisation and understands the role of consumption in modern life, but seeks to encourage consumption towards environmentally benign forms. It argues that collective consumption can contribute as much to the overall quality of life as individual. Third, environmental modernisation gives a central place to the perception of risk and uncertainty, and makes risk management a key policy field. Fourth, it is firmly a modernist project, accepting the central role of science and technology in tackling as well as contributing towards environmental problems. It sees the future as essentially optimistic, and environmental problem as solvable."

According to Mol (1995: 3) a new phase of (third generation) environmentalism has initiated a fundamental reform of the modern institutions, moving ecological concerns to the centre of the social development of industrial societies. The notion of an 'ecological restructuring of industrial society' would then refer to the ecology-inspired and environment-induced processes of restructuring going on in the central institutions of modern society. Since the 1980s, Mol contents, the (natural) environment has been afforded an increasing importance in the institutional transformation process in industrial society. Ecological modernisation theorists argue that industrial society is in a
new era of 'reconstruction' that began in the 1980s (Spaargaren, 1997), affording the natural environment an increasing importance in the institutional transformation in industrial society (Mol, 1995). As in previous eras, this one has been marked by new technologies, innovative entrepreneurs, and farsighted financiers who are bringing about a "new wave of industrial innovation" (Spaargaren, 1997:17). Of course, the extent to which this has occurred, and the motivation for it, varies significantly across the largely national space but increasingly intergovernmental to supranational level across the industrialised countries. As does the timing of the emergence and acceleration of ecological concerns and their integration into the dynamic in institutional transformation.

Ecological modernisation theory purveys itself as comprehensive analytical approach. In the words of Mol (1995:4): "Theories on technological change have tried to describe and interpret environment-induced technological innovation environment-induced technological innovation and change; state theories have contributed to our understanding of the changing character of the nation state in dealing with environmental challenges from the 1980s onward; institutional economics and industrial sociology have theorised on the pace and direction of environment-informed change in industrial sectors, etc. None of these theories, however, have placed the totality of these institutional transformations in an overall perspective of an ecological transition of industrial society. The theory of ecological modernisation attempts to provide such a comprehensive framework for understanding the ecology-inspired reformation processes in contemporary industrial societies."

Ecological modernisation makes quite distinctive claims. As Mol (1995: 64) argues,

... Ecological modernisation theory focuses on the growing independence, 'emancipation' or empowerment of the ecological sphere from the basic three analytical spheres or perspectives in modern society: political, economic, and socio-ideological or societal."

Mol (1995: 63) proposes that there are three analytical spheres, each of which is really a network characterised as a social system, "in which actors engage in more or less permanent, institutionalized interactions". The three spheres are: 1) policy networks that concentrate on industry-government relations using a political-administrative perspective; 2) economic networks that concentrate on economic interactions via economic rules and resources between economic agents in and around an industrial actor; and 3) societal networks that concentrate on the relations between the economic sector and civil society organisation. Ecological modernisation theorists have sought to demonstrate that, within each network, there are significant environmentally-induced institutional transformations (Mol, 1995). Ecological modernisation theory has argued from a meso-level institutional analysis and gauges the extent to which the ecological sphere has become an independent sphere in corporate decision-making (Pellow et al., 2000: 109, in Mol; Sonnefeld, eds.). Ecological modernisation is both a theory of industrial change and a 'normative theory' or 'political program' (Mol, 1995; Spaargaren and Mol, 1992). As a theory of industrial change, ecological modernisation suggests that we have entered a new industrial revolution, one of radical restructuring of basic production processes along ecological lines. As a political programme, ecological modernisation advocates resolving environmental problems through 'harmonizing ecology and economy' (Simons, 1989), through 'superindustrialisation' rather than de-industrialisation (Spaargaren 1992). Some of the critics would argue that it is precisely a focus on capitalist practices that reveals the fundamental organisation of society, its social relations underlying issues of non-equity and political-economic power (Pellow et al., 2000: 111; Weible, A. et al., 1997; Harvey, 1996: 377-383). Hudson (1995), for instance, scrutinises the concept of sustainability along its various dimensions from the perspective of differing social interests which are involved in or otherwise experience the totality of the production process, considering social sustainability on the level and distribution of employment and of income, and from the perspective of the ecological sustainability of
the level and composition of output. The transition to new models of high volume production (for instance ‘lean production’), employing far less labour than either Fordist or small-scale batch craft production, implies a drastic reduction in jobs, unless aggregate demand is exploding.

Two of the conceptual tools of considering relations between economy and environment that have emerged in the 1980s are industrial ecology (see Klein, 1996: 92-94) and industrial metabolism (the latter being a narrower formulation in that it examines the inputs of energy and material into a specific facility / industry / sector and the waste products (heat and materials) released from it; whilst the former refers to the total extraction, transportation, manufacture, use and disposal of products and the interaction of these with the natural processes of the biosphere; Hudson, 1995). The distinction between ‘production pollution’ and ‘consumption pollution’ is only implicit within industrial metabolism, but is an important one to make both analytically and and in terms of exploring appropriate policy options (Taylor, 1995), especially if the latter is more pervasive and extensive than the former (Hudson, 1995). In industrial ecology, Hudson (1995 / 2000:295) argues, by ‘tracing through the ecological impacts of varying combinations of production and consumption of different levels and compositions of output, the macro-scale implications and micro-scale choices can be clarified .... [providing] a base point from which to review the various choices about the how and what of production. Moreover, it could in principle be extended to consider the where of production, for example in terms of companies’ attempts to find ‘spatial fixes’ for pollutant and environmentally noxious production.’

More ecologically sensitive approaches to production and consumption thus arrived at centre, for example, around the notion of ‘eco-restructuring’ (Weaver, 1993). In broad terms, this encapsulates the process of transforming modern capitalist society from one characterised by high levels of material consumption, and high emissions of wastes to one that is environmentally more benign. It could therefore be thought of as involving a transition to systems of ‘clean production’ (Allbert, 1994). ‘Eco-design’ is one materials-technological strategy being developed and applied in such a restructuring, whilst industrial ecology generally focuses on a greater degree of ecological closure in production and consumption through organisational and technological approaches (see Allenby, 1994; Ayres; Ayres, 1996; Weaver, 1994). Korhonen (2001) introduces a regional dimension from Finland in the case of forestry industry and urban energy supply, but pointing also to other isolated examples of eco-industrial parks in Denmark and The Netherlands as well as US strategic policy advice, with an emphasis on collaborative communities of companies. On the other hand, ‘eco-Keynesian’ styles of social, political and economic regulation, such as advanced by Hudson and Weaver (1997), seek to facilitate fuller employment and a more egalitarian distribution of waged and unwaged work., alongside enhanced environmental quality and environmentally more sustainable patterns of production and consumption through ‘valorisation’ strategies (valuing socially and environmentally useful work), which is reflected in some regional studies on the environmental protection industry (KNI, 1998). More politically mainstream, environmental technology and service industry is considered a growing economic sector and also a promising export market. Additionally, there is a debate on whether or not environmental policy and firms’ responses to it would increase their competitiveness, with many observers arguing that it does (see Hitchens, 1997). The now internationally pursued strategy of production integrated environmental protection (‘eco-efficiency’), rather than ‘end-of-pipe‘ technologies, are argued to increase firms’ competitiveness (EFA, 2001). Finally, some authors consider environmental protection and territorial environmental quality as a positive locational factor (Robinet; Lucas, 1994).
1.2 Governance issues in ecological modernization and ecological restructuring

HANF and JANSEN (1998: 3) define governance such: „The core of governance has to do with determining what ends and values should be chosen and the means by which those ends and values should be pursued, i.e. the direction of the social unit, e.g. society, community or organisation. Governance includes activities such as efforts to influence the social construction of shared beliefs about realities; the creation of identities and institutions; the allocation and regulation of rights and obligations among interested parties; and the distribution of economic menas and welfare services. Governance, in other words, is the shaping and sustaining of the arrangements of authority and power within which actors make decisions and frame policies that are binding on individual and collective actors within different territorial bounds, such as those of the state, county and municipality.“

According to KOHLER-KOCH’s (1999: 22-23) reasoning on the evolution and transformation of governance at the EU level „four modes of governance can be distinguished: first, „statism” based on majority rule and supported by a dedication to a „common purpose”, second, „corporatism” which includes competing social interests in consensus formation in order to achieve the common good, third, „pluralism” which combines majority rule and the individualistic pursuit of interests, and forth, „network governance” which also builds on self-interested actors and aims at „upgrading common interests” in the process of negotiations.“

The Federal Republic of Germany is considered to be typical example of a consociational democracy, i.e. a pluralist society marked by deep cleavages which can only be bridged by a coalescent policy style and allying grand coalitions. „Network governance”, as developed by KOHLER-KOCH (1999: 25) is first of all not just an academic analytical but also a political concept: „The core idea is that politics is about problem-solving and the setting of policy-making is defined by the existence of highly organised social sub-systems. It is evident that, in such as setting, efficient and effective governing has to recognise the specific rationality of the sub-systems. Governing is about fitting new regulatory mechanisms into an environment which is functioning according to its own regulatory logic and has so far been unwilling or unable to change ... Second, „network governance” may be constructed as an ideal type useful for heuristic purposes. In drawing up a general picture of „network governance”, four characteristics stand out: the role of the state, rules of behaviour, patterns of interaction and levels of political action. The „state”, in terms of the most relevant public actor within a political system, is no longer an actor in its own right. Its role has changed from authoritative allocation and regulation „from above” to the role of mediator and activator. Governing involves bringing together the relevant actors of society. Networking is a principle task and is best accomplished when offering institutional frameworks which reduce transaction costs and give stability to self-regulatory agreements. The public administration is an actor which mainly organises the arena for political exchange and agreement ... [It] is best compared to a „mixed-motive” constellation because parties involved have common as well as competing interests. Joint problem-solving is usually linked to the distribution of benefits. The commitment to a collective good, therefore, is as much part of the game as is the pursuit of partial interests. Distinct patterns of interaction evolve, too. Hierarchy and subordination give way to an interchange on a more equal footing. The once clear-cut border between the private and the public spheres become blurred. Multiple overlapping negotiating arenas emerge. The „state” is not a unitary actor but is divided into functionally differentiated sub-structures which are part of sector „policy communities” and drawn into various „issue networks”. The level of political action embraces higher levels of co-ordination and lower levels to include those who are affected by a policy and whose active support is needed for implementation. „Joint problem-solving” will by necessity be functionally more specific. Any policy that is geared to the „mobilisation of indigenous resources” and „joint learning” has to be
decentralised and carried out in smaller units at lower levels. 'Subsidiarity' is a core principle in network governance."

Although these are concepts developed at EC level, useful insights can also be drawn for multi-level governance operation within countries and at the regional level (see Benz et al., 1999), with the theme of regional environmental governance emerging recently (Bergmann, 2000; While et al., 2000). Hanf and Jansen (1998: 2) make clear that environmental policy - and therefore its contribution to governance - is obviously just one of many policy fields in which government is called upon to act: In European environmental governance, a transformation has taken place according to Lenshow (1999: 40, in Kohler-Koch; Eising, eds.) in terms of a general and a policy-specific governance debate which are distinct in the specificity of the observed problem-solving deficiency, but overlap in the types of governance structures and practices that are being identified as governance solutions, namely the shift from hierarchical to inclusive network structures and towards a cooperative, consensual and facilitating governing or regulatory style. Governance failures are identified by Lenshow (1999: 41-42), '...along two dimensions, one touching on intra-state and the other on state-society relations, with implications for governance structure, style and instruments. First, fragmented policy-making structures has led to 'insulated' environmental and economic governing activities, despite the inherently horizontal nature of the environmental policy field ... Second, the traditional choice of a legalistic, hierarchial policy style with corresponding top-down regulatory policy instruments, and the failure to systematically include a wide spectrum of societal actors in policy formulation and implementation, was based on the assumption of a smooth transition of policy objectives through legal imposition. Implementation failures have highlighted the fact that environmental protection ultimately depends on changes in attitudes and hence the behaviour of every member of society. Thus the limited problem-solving capacity of authoritative regulation (and technological solutions) suggests a more co-operative, consensual and inclusive policy style aimed at gaining the acceptance of business actors and ordinary citizens concerning environmental policy objectives and their responsibility for the collective (economic and environmental good). The perception that successful policy depends on economic and private actors, 'internalising' their responsibility has further consequences for the choice of policy instruments, implying a more limited role for top-down regulatory instruments and a more prominent role for market-oriented, self-regulatory as well as informational and communicative instruments."

According to Lenshow, Germany is displaying slow and selective application of new governance structures, styles and instruments in its approach to environmental policy. Weidner (1996) has named the resulting structure of state-society relations, 'ecological neo-corporatism' (ökologischer Neo-Korporatismus) or 'industrial-bureaucratic environmental policy network' (industriell-bürokratisches Umweltpolitiknetzwerk), in other words a relatively exclusive network structure which is innovative in its relative openness to environmental business interests as well as scientific experts, but offers only limited access to the interested public at large. The role of the state in this structure is that of an authoritarian facilitator; i.e. operating through network contacts on the basis of ever-present command- and control legislation. Janicke and Weidner (1997: 140), however, do detect changes in governance structure, style and instruments, finding 'changes in direction towards consensus building, a broader form of cooperation that includes scientists and members of environmental organisations critical of current environmental policy' as well as 'modernised ... instruments ... stressing the role of information and negotiation' (p. 139). For instance eco-auditing and eco-labelling being seen as potentially useful complements to top-down regulation, though not as alternative. The German cabinet has announced to afford EMAS-certified companies streamlined environmental regulation when administering applications for production and location of activities.
Some of the aspired changes along social and environmental lines are entailed in the Local Agenda 21 process (see BEuERMANN in O’RiORDAN & VoISLY, eds., 1998), which comes, in part, from a different tradition or is, at the very least, invested with people’s concerns and visions which far extend beyond what environmental modernisation has in mind. However, since the LA 21 is based on the UN Agenda document and is also subject to attempts to politically steer it from both sides of the environmental spectrum, the resulting declaration of the international congress „North-Rhine Westphalia in global responsibility“ (30.11- 01.12. 2000) makes explicit reference to the term ecological modernisation, and declares the fields of energy efficiency, climate protection, water technology, future compatible transport systems, environmental technology, production integrated environmental protection and environmental management as the most import fields of activity. It also calls for the strengthening of corporate level environmental protection in the firms through extension of contribution opportunities of environment- and health compatible production processes though participation opportunities, co-determination and qualification of employees. Further, however, the public administration at regional state and communal level institutional structures and procedures are to be altered and developed to ensure that in all decisions economic, ecological and social issues as well as international aspects are equally considered and are harmonised with the requirements of future communities (LÖBF-Newsletter 3/00, pp. 4-5). The developing field of sustainability indicators (BIRKMANN et. al, 1999; BLACH; IRMEN, 1999), from international to local but with a growing emphasis on regional ones (RENN et. al., 2000) cannot be covered here, but is clearly a field where civil society is partly prepared to challenged the state, although the local and regional state (BIRKMANN; FINKE, 2001) is actively pursuing the agenda itself.

1.3 Regionalisation, Regional Innovation Systems, Regional Governance

Another discourse from the 1980s and the early 1990s, stemming largely from political science and public administration, but in variants also from spatial planning, human geography and business studies is that of regionalisation and regional governance. BENZ et.al. (1999), focusing on Germany, understand regionalisation as a broader political development that involves a multitude of both public and private actors which pool their resources for problem solving within a certain area. They concern themselves with the changed functions and modalities of state action in the context of a discourse of steering and investigate the relevance of the regionalisation concepts in the context of globalisation of the economy and the development of regional networks and also the internationalisation and Europeanisation of politics. The political economy of regionalism, as state policy from above and as regional demands from below, is a complementary research field (KEATING; LOUGHLIN, eds, 1997).

In the sphere of economics and business, one of the arguments developed by authors such as PORTER (1990) is that regional orientation and global orientation are not mutually exclusive, but can be complimentary, for instance through the establishment of competitive clusters which may (but do not necessarily have to) be regionalised or localised (REHFELD, 1999b). Porter argues that the horizontal and vertical integration of firms is important for their competitiveness. Related and supporting industries that link different companies as well as the networking of firms with national and regional institutions, which improve the adaptation- and innovation efforts of firms, are invoked (LUCAS, 2000). REHFELD (1999b) stresses the importance of sectoral specialisation and functional differentiation in the global economy, which has a profound impact on the economic structure of regions and thinking and policy devoted to regional production clusters. A school of scholars (GREMI, eg. CAMAGNI, 1991) has argued that innovative milieu can result when, in particular, small- and medium-sized firms network within a territory (which can be a region), to the mutual benefit of the firms and the region (SCHAMP, 2000). The argued re-emergence of the region (see, for
instance, Storper, 1997) in times of increasing inter-state trade integration and economic globalisation makes for a fascinating discussion of discursive and conceptual development. Krippa (1996: 96) has developed a typology of steering potentials depending on production and transaction organisation in the regions, with functional relationships and spatial order of the economy being expressed in four basic (abstracted) types of regions: 1) the cartelised region, 2) the hierarchically integrated region, 3) the networked region, and 4) the fragmented region. It is the networked region, characterised by functional disintegration with a competitive and dynamic production network, that appeals most. In the hierarchically integrated region as the location of regional production compounds and as a economically dual space (that is to say some remaining ties of economic actors, firms and consumers, to social and cultural structures in the region, but also strong tendencies to a functionalised de-coupling from the region towards external links), the question is open as how the balance between endogenous development and external orientation is struck. A regional enterprise culture would be based on the enhancement of the relationships and contacts between enterprises and regional institutions, such as co-operation between suppliers and sourcers, R&D infrastructure and administration. An increasing importance of modern systemic hard and soft infrastructure (government business regulation, taxation and support, infrastructure provision, economic and innovation climate, co-operation ability, but also quality of life, including environmental) is to be nurtured, since traditional locational factors are not any longer sufficient in itself (Lucas, 2000). A dialogue readiness with regional interests groups and the regional political scene from industry, administration, associations, science and citizens groups can also contribute to a regional enterprise culture (Lucas, 2000), with government needing to adopt innovative, reflective and learning based approaches to extend knowledge and innovation (Blöcker; Reihfeld, 2001; Norhausen-Janz; Widmaier; 1999). Government-sponsored policy research and consultancy itself has to be reflective, programme based but also connected to regional interests and needs, rather than characterised by independent isolated projects (for the difficulties, see Reihfeld; Baum; Woelpel, 2001). The urgent action (vordringliche Aktion) des BMFB on products and processes with the aim of sustainability (Schirrmeister et.al., 2000; Ziegelha et.al., 2000) is perhaps such one attampt, as are the various joint projects (Verbundprojekte) of the Science Centre NRW and other institutions.

Adam and Putz (2000) name a number of reasons why a regional materials economy should be developed, even if in many cases the dynamics are developing towards international dimensions. In their view, water and waste disposal in particular are candidates for regional scaling, but they also argue for regionalisation potentials in the use of construction- and work materials, the recycling of production (e.g. chemicals) and consumption (e.g. furniture) waste and the expansion of regional markets (ecomAG, 2000). Material streams can be steered in the direction of resource-efficient materials economy, not just by cutting transport distances, but also by the development and establishment of materials- or resource conserving disposal- or recycling methods. Professional competencies can be regionally bundled and networked. Furthermore a innovation-supportive atmosphere can be created at the regional level. Institutionally and spatially, the term region is only loosely defined, but at institutional level it would display inter-communal character and spatially by sub-national/international materials path relationships. Regional governance is also intersecting with the topic of globalisation, in terms of the remit and scope of regional governance when economic processed of production and trade are increasingly operating at a global level, and the political regulation of the economic, social and environmental processes associated with it are arguably increasingly operating above (in a international and supranational political sense) or even outside the control or influence of the national political level. In environmental terms, it is clear that globalisation massively increases the scale of production, increases the dependencies of regional economies on external factors and also intensifies environmental impacts. Environmental regula-
tion (pollution control, environmental taxes and international environmental agreements) are conventional responses by international bodies and governments, but equally the environmental protection industry is considered to be an economic growth sector, which can be exported. Regionalisation of industrial production can be an option leading to increased sustainability in some circumstances (Graehl et al.; ecom.AG, 2000), including the concept of the 'virtual factory' (Schamp, 2000: 101) as developed in the Lake Constance area and in its infancy for the Rhein-Ruhr region (Remscheid area; ecomAG, 2000).

Concepts of network structures can also be found in new co-operative conception of planning, which are based on self-organisation in the regions (Fürst, 1996). Fürst (2001) considers whether 'regional governance' can be a new paradigm for the regional sciences. One of the questions that arise then is, to what extent are there similarities, conjunctions and perhaps even substantive relationships between the discourses on and around governance in these two fields? Lucas (2000) argues that 'innovative alliances', rather than corporatist policy formation, offers the most promising option for experimental development of ideas and concepts, even though the structural stabilisation of the innovation alliances are described as temporal and punctual. It is here that innovative regional management in 'in-between-spaces' (the regions) that are not as tightly governed as they used to be by the national level, which has handed over competencies to the supranational level, is called for in the form of regional modernisation discourses. These modernisation and innovation discourses could then encompass technological, institutional, ecological and social aspects. Furthermore, regional management expertise and capacity needs to be recruited (Lucas, 2000). In a more systematic and wider application of some of these notions in the sphere of business studies, Hakanssen and Johanson (1993) develop the concept of 'network governance'. Because individual firms cannot muster the required technological, organisational and skill capacity to meet specific challenges on their own, they enter co-operative alliances that are beyond the formal market exchange structures and also the vertical hierarchies that usually apply. The network then becomes the governance structure to resolve issues in the pursuit of the joint goal and enterprise for the duration of these co-operative and collaborative formations.

The now fashionable concept of 'regional innovation systems' has been linked by both academic and policy-makers with industrial restructuring and regional competitiveness, facilitated by new modes of co-operation and governance between the private and public sector. And there has been a mixed incorporation of environmental and ecological themes into the debate, along the lines of either offering positive impulses for the restructuring of Fordist production, its organisation and businesses in question, and perhaps even sustained growth fields of production, service and employment; or, alternatively, as a threat to competitiveness and over-regulation at, at least, an inappropriate scale and level of governance, in not sufficiently integrated markets and trade regimes internationally and globally. In Cooke's (1998: 10-11) summary of the writing on the systemic dimension of innovation, he refers to the what he calls an 'integrative governance arrangement'. Drawing on Hirst (1994) and Casson (1995), Cooke argues that the organizational forms of the club, forum, working party, consortium or partnership model typifies the 'associative' approach towards enhancing the commercial community. From such arrangements, Cooke contends, institutional learning and innovation gains may more readily be acquired. In his formulation (1995: 11), "associative governance involves something of a shift from state regulation of economic affairs to a degree of self-regulation by responsible groups in economy and society." Arguments have been developed on corporate, industry and sectoral governance, for instance concerning the development and interpretation industrial norms through industry associations and state-industry clubs (see Brennecke, 1996) or devolved self-regulation in professions so long as the negotiated parameters with the state are not violated.
2 Institutions and networks in regional environmental governance and innovation in Germany

CARLEY & CHRISTIE (2000: 26) argue for an corporatist action-network approach to environmental problems, where the

"process of discussion and debate gradually broadens and deepens into practical action on the issue of sustainable development. The process underpinning the action-networking approach seeks to promote would entail: active participation in conditions of equality, based on teamwork; a process of mutual, non-hierarchical learning by-doing or action learning intended to develop new perceptions, new skills and confidence; horizontal integration between sectors of human interest such as agriculture, health, transport, housing etc., and vertical integration between policy-making groups, including big business, and community levels; temporal integration - that is, between short-term action and long-term vision; and collective self-development and self-management."

They start from the basic assumption that environmental issues are quintessentially political, for they involve trade-off between different, sometimes mutually exclusive, option in society and choices which extend over long periods of time scales with far-reaching consequences. These trade-offs cannot be addressed within the market economy alone: they involve more than monetary values and are bound up with competing ethical and political viewpoints. The trade-off process invariably involves some level of social organisation which can mediate among the role of competing interests and objectives. This often involves the state, with the lead of its government, but may also increasingly involve other major political and social formations which bring interest together and networks of organisation at lower levels from the public, private and community sectors. State planning, though many of its forms are increasingly contentious in a capitalist economy, remains important (see MEADOWCROFT as well as JANICKE; JORGENS in KENNY; MEADOWCROFT, eds., 1999). CARLEY and CHRISTIE (2000) argue further that one major challenge to sustainable development is to understand the the history and alternatives for the relationship of the state to the private sector, and of both to the voluntary (NGO) sector, essentially a question of state-society relationships of the public interest and the private appetite as a salient problem for the polity of the coming decades. In their view, for environmental management the role of the consensus needs to be understood, which is a sharing of views and values by a broad constituency within a society. State action can be complemented by other organisations in civil society that are able to take on a role in mediation between the demands of human development and the protection of natural environments, and to foster the necessary drive towards consensus on sustainable development. The invoked action networks can include voluntary organisations or NGOs, citizens’ groups, representatives of the education system, firms and business groups, trade unions, church or any other combination of groups working together. In the ideal networking concept, government, business and community organisations of many kinds would become equal players in a broad partnership, but this clearly can also temper the power of the state or of business. In most LA 21 processes (perhaps with the exception of Ulm, Nürnberg and to a limited extent Wuppertal) business is not involved (but see While et.al, 2000), and a recent survey study of innovative sustainable business in NRW (ecomAG, 2000) concludes that there are hardly any interactions between business and LA 21, mainly because either the discourse or the motives are too divergent. PFISTER (1998) emphasizes the role of institutions in sustainable development and the role that political consultancy can play. PFISTER and REHN (1997) have latterly incorporated a human resource strand into the dimensions of sustainable development. One way of thinking about governance is by way of conceptualising and analysing institutions and networks in developing and diffusing different innovations in terms of ideas, approaches and practices. Policy design consultancy is being pursued at various types of institutes, but one major emphasis in the last decade has been the development of technology and environmental risk
assessment strategies, especially by sociologists, often in academies of technology assessment or applied interdisciplinary policy research institutes (Reifheld, 1999a). O. Benbrügge (1991) has researched the impact of environmental risk perceptions on regional economic restructuring.

German semi-public research and policy think-tanks often come from a tradition of technology and social science evaluation research but frequently display a focus of agenda setting at largely regional level. There is also a variety of working parties, concepts and proposals for ecological regional development. A SoTech (socially adept technology) project on the Bergisches Land (NRW) in the late 1980s argued for the orientation of technology policy on regional needs and a orientation away from export oriented regional development, an emphasis still evident in the LA 21 process in the Bergisches Land (IÖW, 1999). This was followed in the early 1990s by an EURES study on perspectives of ecological regional development in southern Baden in Baden-Württemberg (Schleicher-Trappeser et. al., 1992) which developed proposals for a state ecological model region based on development visions that invokes innovative and collective networking of regional actors in a number of highlighted branches (wood, energy management, solar energy, packaging, healthy food, tourism). Public funding was asked to underpin and orientate itself on the regional development visions, the vision is based on decentralisation and regional emphasis of production, trade and consumption. Conventional but also ecological agriculture and direct marketing, in some regions also coupled with tourism and/or employment creation, forms one of the major emphases of the „Regions of the Future“ project of the Federal Minstry of Construction and Spatial Planning, with further efforts in a second phase (see Pick, 2001). Other, more comprehensive, outlines for Baden-Württemberg have been developed by the Academy for Technology Impact Assessment at Stuttgart (Renn et al., 2000a) which has developed a series of proposals and visions for ecological restructuring and regional development in Baden-Württemberg (Renn et al., 2000b) with a strategic focus on selected sectors being developed such as food consumption, crafts and print media. In a similar mold, the NARET (1997) group and the research and publication programme at the University of Trier (Spehl, 1994; Spehl; Tischler, 1994) argues for a new ecological and regionalised conceptualisation of spatial planning and regional development.

The management of competition for land use, recycling of built space, ecological construction, and the development of intercommunal industrial estates has become a major topic in recent German spatial planning & management. Scientific expertise in engineering, systems development and innovation management is introduced by the Fraunhofer federation (Zielgahn et al., 2000; Schirmmeister et al., 2000), with institutes in working on energy, water, pollution control, chemical technology, and logistics, which frequently concern ecological issues. The contributions in Dally (ed.) (2000) point to a development where new management strategies are being developed from within the broad environmental movement, with the aim to build new ecological alliances with public and private actors, including businesses. Some of the initiative can come from federal or state ministries, such as the competition „Regions of the Future“ of the German Federal Ministry for Construction (BMBau), which ran from 1997 to 2000, with a follow on project (http://www.zukunftsregionen.de/main.htm; Adam; Wielchmann, eds., 1999). The „EXPO Region Hannover“ (EXPO-Citynet and Greater Hannover Association) was one of the federally selected regions for advancing sustainable regional development under the auspices of the competition. The Hannover regional reform, leading into the new established and legally institutionalised Hannover Region, and the regional Local Agenda 21 (see Mayer, ed., 1997) network for the EXPO region provided the impetus for land-use management issues to be discussed in a regional planning forum, a regional goods traffic concept development (following perhaps the lead of Bremen and Freiburg with their goods logistics centres (GVZs) and city goods traffic concepts that aims to steer goods traffic through nodes and onto rail where possible, pool deliveries and hence cut down on traffic and reduce environmental impacts), a regional climate protection and energy efficiency programme
(KLEX). In the RtfF-competition, the LS agglomeration region of Greater Braunschweig developed a project on the recycling of electronic waste and labour creation, and in the case of southern LS several sectoral and public policy fields were integrated: ecological approaches with environmental and public health as well as agri-structural and regional policy.

Some of the discursive and project-based co-operation that would include environmental issues in a wider notion of regional / local governance can be instigated by regional state government, such as in Lower Saxony (LS), in what MARSHALL (1998) calls ‘more environmentally intelligent forms of governance’. HARTKE (2000) refers to the 5-year preparatory debate (1988-1993) on the spatial design of territorial co-operation units in Lower Saxony and the regional conferences organised by the interior ministry of LS. Regional policy, he argues, has the experience to organise, without extensive administrative structures, an institutionalisation of informal interactions - a lesson on that environmental political network activities can build. The Regional Innovation and Technology Transfer Strategy (RiTTS) for the Government County of Lüneburg (with the Chamber of Industry and Commerce, since 1999) and the Regional Developments Concepts for South-East Lower Saxony and South-Saxony all build on the 1994 Spatial Planning Framework for Lower Saxony.

HARTKE also discusses the Regional Innovation Strategy (since 1998) for the Government County of Weser-Emns, supported by EU and Land, with environmental responsibilities in terms of waste disposal and water protection defined in the rural OBE (Osnabruck – Bad Bentheim – Emsland) region.. On the initiative of the rural districts of western LS with the inclusion of several regional conferences, the focus on Structural Fund acquisition from the EU, several „structural conferences“ are working, in a division of labour since 1997, on sub-themes in a unified network structure. Environmental aspects in economic policy are reflected in several fields, for instance sustainable production-integrated environmental protection, renewable resources, energy economy (wind power etc.), sustainable tourism (structural conference East-Friesland), economic- and environmentally adept transport logistics (Land Oldenburg). HARTKE observes that this complex network structure has real lobbying advantages, in that they develop cartel-like project networks’ which can potentially put pressure on fund administrators in various government departments, especially when the regional state government favours projects developed in regional consensus. However, with funds increasingly thin on the ground and the usual guidelines and practices of orthodox economic structural policy still in place, complex projects (such as ecologically-oriented industrial estates with energy concept and special waste water- and waste disposal structures) have to be broken down for administrative purposes of funding and promotion. Lower Saxony’s State Government Commission on Prevention and Reduction of Special and Toxic Waste (LS RkzVRS), now in its 5th parliamentary phase, is an example of a political institutionalisation which can underpin political support for developments, with for instance the first two LS RKzVRS focusing on narrow environmental industrial engineering topics to much wider working parties on environmental management and the circular economy. Environmental issues can also be integrated through technology- and innovation policy by way of organising and supporting innovation and technology transfer. The German Working Association of Technology Mediators and Innovation Promoters (AGTIF, founded in early 1989) has a federally unified network structure, but a plethora of over 100 individual institutions are in place at every federal state. An Expert Co-ordination Office LS, for instance, is integrated in the network but at the same time serves as the central port of call for enquiries of the environmental economy in LS.

In North-Rhine Westphalia (NRW) there is a close network of universities and technical colleges (FH) that co-ordinate, despite competition, their technology-transfer units, with some of the universities in the Ruhr area (e.g. Bochum) taking particular responsibility for environmental technology. Some of the technology centres funded by the Land NRW (see HUGGINS; THOMOLLA, 1995) have a
particular emphasis on some environmental fields, and also fulfill the role of mediators and extension promoters of good practice (e.g. Environmental Technology Centre Hamm, on ecological construction). However, it has not always been possible to fully or even mainly base the technology centers on environmental technology (such as the Science Centre Gelsenkirchen, which was initially planned to be a competence and incubation centre for solar technology), although in some cases the emphasis remains (e.g. industrial park for environmental technology production in Essen). Finally, the locally-regionally independently incorporated public-private Chamber of Industry and Commerce have in many German regions, such as in the Ruhr area, pooled their expertise and advice for enterprises and business together (on waste management, recycling and a „recycling basaar”), which is also replicated at the national level with the German Industrial and Commerce Forum (DIHT). The Institute of Labour and Technology (IAT) of the Science Centre North-Rhine Westphalia conducted a project „Chemical industry in the area Bergisches Land“ (1995-1996) on behalf of the regionalised state moderation agency for structural and regional policy, the Regionalbüro Bergisches Städtedreieck (Wuppertal), financially supported by the NRW Ministry of Economics, Technology and Traffic, as a regionally-based co-operation project concerning a specific branch. 19 companies from all branches of the chemical industry, analytics and waste management, but in particular coating and plastics firms, often small to medium-sized with giant Bayer AG in the middle, as well as the regional energy supplier participated and co-financed it. Five working groups on environmental and quality management can be considered at the heart of the project (Baumer, 1998), with a network of dense regional industrial contacts ensuing. The regional employer’s federation of the chemical industry, and the sectoral labour union IG chemicals, paper and ceramics, supported the project. Some momentum in the (potentially joint) cross-firm disposal of chemical waste (coating and paint residues) was achieved, despite the sensitivity of information on waste streams and also competition between the disposal companies for a share of the market, as well as the recycling of plastics, but only because the IAT acted as a confidential ‘broker’, handling anonymised data and only releasing it in multilateral or bilateral form when specifically asked to so by the firm. The other outcome of the project were quarterly discussion circle on environmental management and environmental law by the regional and NRW chemical employer’s federation (VCI NRW), a further such circle on technology and chemistry - problems in the application, processing and use of modern materials is open to the entire industry of the region. The coating factories in particular developed a follow-on project on further training of semi-skilled and unskilled production workers. Another example would be the co-operative project on waste prevention and waste processing in the galvano-firms of the Märkischer Kreis, co-ordinated by the waste disposal and contamination-treatment association of NRW (AAV), which is now followed by a larger project on eco-management of surface enhancement in conjunction with public authorities (district environment department) and agencies (economic promotion, eco-efficiency) and private research / consultancy institutes.

A team from the IAT had previously conducted a major empirical study of the environmental protection industry in North-Rhine-Westphalia (Nordhaus-Janz; Reffeld, 1995), concluding that there were core elements of this emergent sector which could be explained by environmental policy, with its laws and directives but also insistence on standards, which put pressure on traditional mining and steel concerns, which reacted with organisation change and specialisation in units, diversification (also of other engineering and utility companies) and together with a privatisation of communes infrastructure and the reinvention of tradition disposal companies to service and consultancy enterprises. Furthermore, because of the industrial history of the Ruhr area in particular, a concentration of these activities was noticeable. The study concluded that distinctive production and innovation interdependencies developed, with production chains and an above average innovation dynamics (measured by patents etc.). The wider team of the IAT working on a
conceptualisation of economic and organisation restructuring of the economy of the Ruhr area developed the notion of an integrated production cluster in the emerging, but now established and expanding branch (see Heinze et al., 1998), based on much of the thinking and writing on 'innovative milies', 'regional production clusters', 'systemic integration', 'regional production systems' or 'regional network' (see Rehfeld, 1995). There is some concern that the new integrated and to some extent co-operative structure might become potentially inflexible again, especially with many large and traditional players from all branches involved and as yet no real breakthrough for SMEs in the economic governance of these networks. Heinze et al. (1998: 274) argue that

"the NRW environmental protection industry can be regarded as a successful example of regionally based diversification. However, the rise of the environmental protection industry in the Ruhr area cannot be understood without considering the state's involvement in initiating, supporting and organising the formation of this new production chain, including crucially the expenditure by local authorities. Industrial investment in environmental technology is induced indirectly by state activities, because it is based on pollution control regulations. Most of these regulations are federal, but there are also NRW government activities, such as funds to recycle used soil, financial assistance in environmental investment, laws to organise waste management, and so on. Finally, state activities focus on implementing complimentary infrastructural preconditions. The state activities are mainly organised by the NRW administration and include: organisation and support of specific training programmes (e.g. the training of environmental protection advisors for small and medium-sized enterprises); the foundation of research and development institutes (e.g. university research institutes); the foundation of technology centres or industrial parks for environmental technology production (e.g. in Essen)."

Heinze et al. (1998) also point to the decentralisation of structural policy in NRW (see Heinze; Voelzkow, 1997; though NRW is not independent in its industrial or structural policy in that NRW has to act in terms of financial resources with the federal government and the European Commission) that should help, together with public funds and investment, to activate the economy, companies and employees. The sub-state level regional offices and agencies (Regionalbüros, Regionalagenturen) and other new institutions in the regional development scene in NRW (see Blaffert, 1996) are meant to act as a moderator and communicative institutions to facilitate self-steering (see Furst, 1996), where 'regional management' becomes a new instrument in regionalised structural policy (see Furst, 1998). Apart from the Environment / Technology Centres /Foundations with their respective specialisations (e.g. UZ Hamm; ZENIT), the Land has founded special Agencies for Energy and in 1998, for Eco-Efficiency. The NRW Efficiency Agency (EFA) is interesting as it typifies the combined services of publically-funded consultancy (applying a developed production-integrated environmental protection check with combines environmental process and business analysis (PTUS-check) in co-operation with external advisors), is a one-stop-shop for a diverse range of Land, Federal and EU promotion funds related to eco-efficiency, and runs project for a on a range of thematic and sectoral themes (from environmental cost accounting to specialised materials and technology clusters and industrial branches). Since 2000 a efficiency-prize competition is run in conjunction with a professional engineering journal. In 2001, the EFA called for submission for project ideas in a competition to develop eco-efficiency networks in production with local institutions and enterprises. In the spirit of the regionalised structural policy, the Efficiency Agency has, in March 2002, opened four regional offices (which had to be supported by regional institutions such as chambers of commerce and craft, communes and banks etc.) to develop their efforts to develop regionally-specific projects and foci with industry according to demand.
University and science establishments can also make local regional contributions, if they take their formulated mission to help local / regional communities and their economies seriously. One such example is reported by Ey er et al. (2000, in Dally, ed.) - the eco-industrial energy network of the Karlsruhe harbour area where under the national version of the UN’s „Zero Emission Vision“ university institutes in industrial economy, social analysis and refinery modelling, plastics testing and science as well as a Frauenhofer institute for chemical technology and a accounting and software engineering company join Germany’s largest refinery, some chemical and paper plants, the local city energy provider, as well as a waste depository and a waste incineration plant to built a network that is capable to supply energy in the various required formats in a economically more efficient and supply secure manner with simultaneously reduced environmental impact. Since new patterns in consumer behaviour are also the aim of ecological modernisation, trade in ecological products and the establishment of ecological and regional reuse department stores serving larger cities or rural regions is one of the foci (see Moll, 2000, in Dally, ed.). A number of environmental research and private partners were working from 1996-1999 in a NRW and EU funded QUATRO project to improve distribution networks of ecological products in retail and improve competitiveness of ecological suppliers, underpinned by advice and training of executive (marketing and event strategy, new services, finance, management and employment models, logistics and real estate concepts), and sales personnel. QUATRO is an employment and training programme, which builds on NRW’s tradition of the SoTech programme, which allows for innovative SME support. In the industrial sphere, one of the innovative strategies of realising the circular economy is to develop regional networks of service enterprises (based for instance in „eco-parks“ such as in Essen), which are based on co-operative networks of industrial firms, crafts and also service enterprises which are aiming to keep goods and materials intensively as long as possible in circulation (joint use, regional repair, processing and re-valueisation). For instance, five small- and medium-sized car recyclers in the Oberbergischer Kreis (NRW) came together with the district administration in a regional Agenda 21 forum to develop a consultancy and qualification QUATRO-project to re-organise the storage and sale of recycled car parts through the use of an electronic data bank on the internet (Lucas, 2000). The Aachen region is a successful example of regional co-operation in the field of electronic waste recycling and employment creation (G.I.B. / ISA-Consult 1999): public waste authorities co-operate with six independent companies and employment and training agencies to create a disposal network. The logistical co-ordination of the use of know-how and capacities (sourcing, qualification, controlling, re-use, disposal and transport) is economically and ecologically optimised and rights and duties of co-operation partners detailed in a co-operation contract. The certification of the training and quality standards through the chamber of industry and commerce was an important factor in the success of the training and employment side of the project.

However, there are limits to the success of these regional attempts to harness ecological sensitivity, qualification / training and employment employment creation with economic competitiveness. In the case of recycling, for instance, the establishment of systems of financial burden distribution which integrate at least a part of the disposal costs into the sale price of the new goods will give the producers more income share, and the producers -rather than independent (regional) recyclers - will then be in the position to organise re-distribution and material reuse to meet their needs and preferences (for instance through dealer networks, as is partially happening in the case of copy machines and computers). A more pronounced centralisation of the waste disposal economy, which can also be observed in the case of the Duales System Deutschland (DSD)-system, with a weakening of attempts to decentralise solutions in the waste disposal economy, can be the result. Furthermore, the exploitation economies of scale through spatial divisions of labour and specialisation leading to a centralisation of the waste disposal economy, the decreasing influence of communal enterprises, and too low raw material, energy and transport prices in comparison to the costs for the separation,
processing, repair and recycling lead to market prices for goods that are above the price for new goods whilst the expected incomes in the secondary materials markets are low. Some of the limits are also of an institutional nature. An ongoing project by the Frauenhofer institute of systems technology and innovation research (FhG-ISI), funded by the foundation of the Westdeutsche Landesbank, attempts to use the regional networks of the local savings banks in NRW to as mediators in these co-operative value-added networks, supported by co-operation manuals and training concepts. The project appears to struggle, as the savings banks appear reluctant to inject their own resources on a medium- to long term horizon in the context of market competition and thin layers of staffing. Much like in the case of chambers of industry and commerce, local savings and co-operative banks, which would be able to string together regional networks from which they themselves may benefit in terms of increased custom, client retention and image, but so far only in individual cases is there willingness to participate in ecological modernisation at local and regional level, even though their respective national academies (the ,think-(and training) tanks’ of the financial institutions have begun to address these issues. In the case of the regional strategies and project in the BMBau competition „Regions of the Future“, ADAM and PÖTZ (2001) argue that in very few cases were the regional waste disposal companies involved and integrated in projects on regional waste disposal. In the same competition, it was found (DOSCH, 2001) that it proves difficult to arrive at a joint regional planning with respect to resource-conserving land use, since the most important decision structures (and financial intetests) lie at communal level; nevertheless, inter-communal cooperation on the development of industrial spaces was advanced, with often a regional marketing concept in place. DOSCH (2001) concludes, however, that informal and moderational processes are not sufficient to produce success as solid financial underpinning and institutionalisation was required, nor was regional planning (Regionalplanung), as relatively recently introduced in Germany, considered to be ,strong’ enough for this purpose. However, a series of innovative projects including regional land management, activisation of derelict land, the establishment regional pools of replacement space, the protection of open space as well as trading platforms for building material and the use of GIS applications could be observed.

3 Conclusion

In conclusion, (environmental) regional governance can draw on national structures and resources (whether government, public or private, or a mixture of those) and construct networks at the regional level that can have the ability to shape public policy or organise alliances that help in delivering environmental policy goals. The key research agenda would be to explore the political and path dependencies on regional, national or even supra-national (EU competition law requiring open tenders above a minimum size of financial public investment expenditure, or European Structural Fund regulations) governance structures.

Whether the players in the regionalised structural policy in Lower Saxony and in NRW are incorporating environmental issues and ecological restructuring along programmatic meaningful paths, whether the ‘scaling’ of environmental governance is proceeding at the most appropriate levels and what forms of tensions, struggle and regulation emerge in discursive and material terms over economic and environmental issues is as yet an open question for further research. It seems clear that environmental, as well as other, NGOs are undertaking efforts to position themselves in the current institutional and discursive matrix to influence policy in the German (sub-)state regions. In Germany, the inclusion of the private business sector in ecological modernisation (despite, say, B.A.U.M.), appears as yet relatively restricted, with technology academies, research institutes and regional government agencies attempting to facilitate the expansion of networks and diffusion of innovative practices. From a survey and conceptualisation of some early tendencies of these new
institutional and organisational arrangements provisional attempts have been made to understand their relationship with ecological modernisation theory. For future work a perhaps more critical analytical approach in environmental industrial sociology, business and also administrative studies is needed as well as more empirical research into the precise arrangements and constellation both in the business and corporate sector as well as government policy and administration conduct at EU, national, regional and local level.
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1 The concept of governance

In regard to governance, we have not yet devised a truly comprehensive theoretic or methodological arrangement for reviewing this subject. However, despite the lack of a general theory, we can assert that there is a strong and significant attempt of examining and conceiving this topic, which is quite prompt in giving its first results.1

I would pose the question of governance in its more general terms, in the following manner:

1. The true turning point occurs at an analytical level: it consists in the maintenance of a new paradigm (of reference regarding the concept of governance) which proposes the premises for crisis of the preceding model (being the government) which, on that account, is understood in terms of opposition.2

2. The term governance also refers to an actual condition of local contemporary societies, or rather the situation of coexistence within a plurality that is both social and institutional, which the analyses of this topic describe.

3. In summary, there is reference to a new sensibility that has been produced by and among those who hold direct responsibilities of government, in following new learning processes that have been recently developed.

I believe that there is a certain consensus on the fact that when we falter with the catch phrase ‘from government to governance’ (and it seems to me that sooner or later we will have to deal more directly with this dilemma), there is in contrast the will and the need to communicate that we are experiencing a kind of paradigm transition or transformation. This relates to the sense of change and revision that is occurring in the different forms of government and their practices. Oftentimes this process develops a bit hastily, and hence imprecisely, in the typical enthusiasm that follows the announcement of an innovation. In view of the fact that this phenomenon is often perceived and viewed at an analytical level, one must hence be careful not to mix up the categories of analysis

---

1 This ascertainment emerged recently throughout the course of a workshop coordinated by Patrick Le Gales in occasion of the “High-Level Scientific Euro Conference Regional Governance” in Hanover (April 2001).

2 It is clear that the reasons for the crisis of the system that is indicated here as ‘of the government’ have persisted for a long while and these are of an exogenous and endogenous nature; there exists extensive literature on the topic matter, and in some parts, it is believed that this is a matter of a phase for the re-definition of forms of ‘government’; however, the attempt to build a true alternative to that model seems to be in act.
with the actual processes. This may be plain and obvious to some, but it is also one of the points that arises continuously in the debate on governance. The term governance is furthermore used quite frequently in a metaphoric sense by various groups out of different professions and academics which often have conflicts with each other or hold distant positions. This occurs in a phase where it is relevant for its capacity to hold together and to lead different and oftentimes divergent discussions. At the same time however, these different professional and academic fields are making an earnest attempt in the full comprehension of the concept and its innovative aspects, following quantitative methods in order to ‘translate’ it into ‘solid’ operations by distinguishing (and reducing) it in function of a complete apparatus of analytic categories, and also as a set of concrete practices.

In this manner, aside from their cognitive efforts for a better understanding of the subject matter, the fields of political science, economics and urban studies, each in their own way, are making governance and its discourse into a strategic or even political scheme.

The question remains, what is intended with this change in paradigm or paradigm shift.

On one hand the question, ‘from government to governance’ interprets and discusses the idea of a passing from a prospective and concept that is typically top-down of government actions and solutions and its construction of decision-making processes (which indicates the paradigm of government), to a more bottom-up approach (to which the new paradigm makes reference), which presents and focuses primarily on the capabilities and capacity of local societies for self-regulation and the consequent necessity to intervene and modify the institutional disposition and the distribution of power, duty and responsibility. Furthermore a process is engaged that gives a new meaning to the terms which previously perceived and managed the ‘social demand’.

On the other side, the question of the governing is intended to be the production of governmental effects, a mix of intentions and unexpected, unintended consequences (which will be examined subsequently), rather than in terms of its direct actions or in the even oftentimes limited manner, that is the result of specific intentions and deliberations. At this point, and in the light of the aforementioned considerations, it will no longer be necessary that the two terms play as a conceptual couple of opposites: they should rather be seen in relation to each other with the attempt to explain the current changes and to deal with new emerging problems, particularly, those that deal with the social and institutional pluralisation. To sum up, it can be said: “Goverance, in a true sense of the term, is the result and synthesis of two movements, based on the top-down tendency of the government and the bottom-up movement of empowerment” (Gangemi 2001).

In the starting of the analysis of local urban contexts, governance may seem conversely to be an ‘actual’ condition, that can be quite complex to describe, in Italian is often indicated and almost translated as an act of ‘local regulations’. This reference intends creating a plurality of regulations (social, political and economic; varied in forms and principles), that are seen in terms of their co-existence. Such is the result of the existing complexity of interaction and the types of relations that exist among a growing number of both public and private actors and subjects, who are more or less institutionalised in being involved in decision making processes. With their participation in the delineation of public policies, sometimes resulting as a by-product effect more then as the output of specific participatory forms and programmes (i.e. within processes of deliberative democracy), these subjects and actors comprehensively come up to re-define the very sense of the words ‘policy’ and ‘public’3. In such a context like this one, where any conclusive analysis would clearly not limit

3 This point is shown particularly detailed in the reflections and research carried out by Pier Luigi Crosta, regarding policies, which I here recall in its more general terms, for its very comprehension.
itself to simply describing operations, the main effort is to find new forms of co-ordination and to introduce a model of guidelines or principles within the processes of the system.

If the question remains 'which truly innovative factors indicate a transformation of paradigm and the assertion of a prospect for governance', then a possible answer could be, that these can be found in the new approaches for co-ordination, participation and the creating of new fields for effective exchange.

Furthermore in this progression, there is an apparent and substantial redefinition of programs and public policies, in terms of how they are devised and the roles that they attain; hence new tools for public policies are generated. A fundamental aspect of this contingency, for example, is the existing evidence and knowledge that the new forms of co-ordination and participation are not always the results of direct governmental actions (as it was believed under the governmental scheme) nor the 'packets' of finished solutions devised by public institutional actors. They are in contrast often generated as by-product effects obtained from processes of social interaction, collective negotiation, shared learning experiences, etc. Thus the concrete occasions are set up in such a way that one can readily intervene, gather, facilitate and strengthen such effects of government, which are not all produced intentionally. The persuasion and elaboration of knowledge regarding the unintentional and unexpected consequences in the meanwhile become a fundamental part of the analysis, besides the research of the possible ways of a strategic re-orientation of such effects, in order to achieve the capacities and capabilities of government.

This particularly pertains to those who hold governmental responsibilities and whose actions are firmly connected to the functioning of public institutions. In this respect it can be said with a certain level of satisfaction but also with a necessary degree of caution, that in many cases a new sensitivity had been made available, which allows a better understanding of the aforementioned processes. This occurs with the intervention in and modification of traditional governmental actions and practices, and by reassigning these experiences in a reformatory plan. Hence, the problem with government starts being comprehended once the knowledge and perception about the condition of a plurality as a resource, which is both social and public, are set going. This resource is represented by a co-presence of different forms of regulation and different visions, interests, value systems and beliefs, which are reciprocally respected and safeguarded. However, the subsequent question and challenge are on how to keep such a plurality together and how to find the ways by which an excessive fragmentation and dispersion can be avoided, while maintaining the differences as a true resource. Consequently, the methods for building consensus and for the management of conflicts, and more generally, for the implementation and evaluation of policies, which also imply active participant involvement within the processes, are set up quite differently. It can be said that effective participation takes place when there is an significant level of interaction among decision-makers, planners and recipients of political policies or when the traditionally seen distinction had been made between the two parts is abandoned. Participation is therefore the elaboration and implementation of policies on the part of involved and interested subjects and actors. And in order for such participation to transpire, the modes by which such a circumstance takes place should be sought out continuously, aside from the usual forms of traditionally institutional information and consultation which is still commonly practised.

In such a perspective, the policies and programs can gain a newly important dimension that is both political and public in nature.
2 Re-writing Veneto’s Regional Constitution

This is a very interesting case of a constitutional policy that at the very beginning has been characterized by a constitutional and legal discourse; as a by-product it embraced and advocated a discourse of participation and negotiation, constituting a new public place for political and social interaction.

Throughout the 1990’s the political debate in Italy was characterised by a new process of reinforcement of local and regional autonomies by laws of the State, which was quite different from the administrative decentralisation that occurred thirty years ago. The Italian Law No 59 of 1987 has received the principle of ‘vertical’ subsidiarity, which is an important issue of the Maastricht Treaty: here the debate about autonomy is directly related to the characters of intergovernmental relationships. This Law has generated conflicts in the reforming process of the Italian Constitution providing new competencies and responsibilities to the Region and other Local Entities. However, the Maastricht Treaty does not mention the ‘horizontal’ levels of subsidiarity (i.e., between citizens and institutions, and among the citizens themselves). After the ’96 National election won by the Centre-left Coalition, the issue of reforming the Constitution in a federalist sense was entrusted to the ‘Bicameral Commission’ which reflected the party’s balance. Throughout the works of the Bicameral Commission in 1997, reference was made to both of the principles of subsidiarity. A decisive innovation concerning the intergovernmental relationships was represented by the proposal of a ‘Second Camera’, meant to substitute the Senate, which would be formed by Representatives elected by the Regions over all matters that were not clearly reserved to the State. The Regions were also to obtain fiscal autonomy, and moreover, for the first time in Italian Laws, there was reference made to a ‘horizontal’ subsidiarity: “Public functions are attributed to Municipalities, Provinces, Regions and the State in regard to all the activities that can be effectively run within autonomous initiatives of citizens as individuals or are operated in organised social and civic groups.” The affirmation of both the principle of ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ subsidiarity caused great dissent among Italian political parties contributing to the definitive failure of the Bicameral (VANDELLI 1999, 46-50). Law No 265 of the 1999, reforming the Law 142 of the 1990, strongly introduces the principle of the ‘horizontal’ subsidiarity and presents it as the use and the activating of local community resources and social capital in public policy-making.

The declination of the local autonomy unfolding both aspects of subsidiarity is currently under debate in the Regions engaged in re-writing regional constitutional charts. In particular, the Veneto Region is the first in Italy that has initiated a process of re-writing its Constitutional Chart, according to a new State law. Made up of two proposals (one of the Centre-Right Coalition, and the other of the Centre-Left Coalition), it is quite relevant in its innovative character and it will constitute a model for Italian Regions that are expected to write their Constitutions in due time. An important issue that emerges in this process is the idea of sovereignty for the people of Veneto, as the key for a foundation of its autonomy. It should be noted that in the year 2000 in Italy, the first direct regional elections took place, where citizens could directly elect the President of the Region and the Regional Councilors. In the Region of Veneto the Centre-Right coalition won those elections.

In the past years, the Veneto Region was characterised by the complexity of different interwoven regulations; a strong economic regulation (a system focusing mainly on small to mid-sized enterprises and industries, emphasising the capabilities for self-regulation), a lively social regulation of informal and horizontal networks, ‘associationalism’, civic and Catholic traditions etc. and a lack

---

4 I discussed these aspects in further detail in “Planning Systems in Italy within the context of new Processes of Regionalisation” (2001)
of political leadership leading to the weakness of political and administrative public institutions. The first two of these forms of regulation (the economic and social regulations) were essential for each other in building the cohesion of a social and productive structure for the industrial districts. But at the same time they exacerbated the attributes of autonomy that were leading towards a separation from the national context. The apparent crisis of the last form of regulation (the political and administrative regulation) caused the fragmentation of the decision processes regarding issues of general interest, and the Veneto Region’s difficulty in representing itself as unified towards and in comparison to other Italian cities and regions, the central government, and even Europe for that matter. In any case, the general organisation of the local societies were understood and often viewed as horizontal, rather than inspired by hierarchical principles.

The re-writing of the Regional Constitutional Chart promoted by the Regional government can be seen as an excellent opportunity for reconstructing the fragmented public political arena, and it can attribute a new important role to the local political leadership which is to be developed in the regional context.

The first, by the Centre-Right coalition (i.e. the majority), emphasizes the local autonomy exclusively as a problem of ‘vertical’ subsidiarity: the Region is presented as the strongest political subject in the negotiation of powers and faculties with the Central government. The goal is to hide a real claim of independence under the name of a request for autonomy.

Therefore, the Region builds itself up as a State towards its Municipalities and Provinces by re-establishing a hierarchical system. In this case, local autonomy has been emphasised as a ‘freedom from’ higher authorities.

On the contrary, the second proposal by the Centre-Left coalition (i.e. the minority)\(^5\) emphasizes the local autonomy as the reinforcement of local municipalities: this means the overcoming of the hierarchical approach in establishing powers and in defining functions and roles among the Region, Provinces, and Municipalities. The proposal is intent on the institution of the “Council of Autonomies”, a new consultative body that could be provocatively expanded to certain legislative functions. The Council of Autonomies could become the effective forum for the participation of Local Entities such as the Municipalities and Provinces within the Regional context, and it could propose the premises under which the various government institutions exist at the same level in the decision-making processes. Even more so, however, it can be said to constitute a solution for the problems of a democratic representation, not only of local entities, but also of the local civic societies (the local autonomy being emphasised in terms of “freedom to”).

Moreover, as it can be read precisely in the first proposal drafted by the Centre-Left opposition, the Council of Autonomies is intended to be served by representatives of local entities, including the President of the Chamber of Commerce, representatives from the Universities, the service sector, etc. The definitive draft (dated 19.1.2001) makes a distinction between the Council of Autonomies (formed by local entities) and a new organ called The Regional Council for Economic and Social Planning (formed by the other entities), with only consultative functions. This last solution that reduces the number of the participants in the Council of Autonomies has been preferred to the former model, as to make the decision-making processes more effective. In any case, the effort has been to recognise the contribution of a wider range of public and private, less or more institutionalised actors and subjects, participating in public decision-making and in governing. A solution was thus attempted for giving them a kind of effective democratic political representation. In the Cen-

\(^5\) The group that has worked on the outline of this proposal was composed of regional advisors, political representatives, and technicians that were hired to develop certain points and to bring together ideas; furthermore, there were also representatives of enterprises and industries of the productive sectors, representatives of associations and (most importantly) citizens.
tre-Left proposal, an interesting interpretation of both the principle of the ‘vertical’ and the ‘horizontal’ subsidiarity can be found; and the participation of organised groups of citizens is no longer intended to be only of an informative or consultative nature, but also to take part in political decision-making or in the drafting and implementation of policy as well. This is quite significant in terms of the relationship between local autonomy and local democracy.

The proposal drafted by the Centre-Right coalition was based on the Law primacy. It can be argued that the underlying paradigm is the liberalist paradigm. Conversely, in the Centre-Left proposal, the predominant understanding recognises the concept of ‘differentiated citizenship’ and the existence of a plurality of forms of ‘local publics’ having a meaningful capacity in the construction of a local arena. It furthermore made attempts at activating new forms of these ‘local publics’ when working and becoming involved in collaborative efforts. For example, the debate on how the new bodies of the Council of Autonomies and The Regional Council for Economic and Social Planning are meant to be understood, who is in and who is out, how they will work, etc. has created a common commitment in finding solutions and in building consensus on those proposals.

The processes activated by the Centre-Left coalition propose re-writing the Chart as a devise to join the local public and private, governmental and non governmental subjects and actors, bringing them together to interact on the relevant issues that can be perceived as common interests. For the participants involved, this constitutes an experience of interaction that allows them to overcome individualistic positions in achieving an agreement for public commitment. As a by-product, it functions as a frame for action for a broader political and social decision-making arena, and it furthermore initiates a negotiation process among this multitude of actors and subjects as a collective sense-making process (conceptualising local autonomy as being “a bottom-up phenomenon”, and “constructing a sense of place”). The federalist paradigm underlying the Centre-Left proposal for re-writing the Veneto Regional Constitution can be understood with regards to two concepts: that of integrity, which means the whole in its entirety and at the same time the autonomy of the parts themselves; that of autonomy, as the capacity for self-government and, at the same time, the ability to work with the other levels that make up the system in a delicate co-existence of the principles of self- and shared-rule. It is therefore clear and persuasive in its claim for local autonomy and for the possibility of making choices independent from the central government. This hence raises the issue of granting responsibilities to the local autonomies, and of building up their effective ability for self-regulation, while still maintaining interaction with the other part of the system.

---

6 This definition of the public as a spectrum for the rules of confrontation, which acts in an all-inclusive manner, and hence impersonally and impartially (Benn 1998) can be referred to specifically as the liberalist paradigm, which makes a sharp distinction between the public and private realms. This model, finds its roots more precisely in the significant turning point brought about by the philosophy of Hobbes. As a matter of fact, Hobbes views man as conflictual by nature, a being that, in order to live with others and to build a political community, needs this particular kind of regulation that justice represents. By this assumption, those forms of social regulation that are the product of commonly used practices and processes of interactions, or more informal exchanges existing in the local communities, tend to fade into the background

7 The concept of a “differentiated citizenship” implies a condition of great differences and the fragmentation of interests, identities, and perspectives that can be found in local societies. This coexistence of a multitude of communities and their intrinsic diversities in some local societies possesses high levels of potential conflict, within which, it is very unlikely to distinguish a single governmental entity or any one specific form of responsibility or accountability. Ellision explains this paradigm shift in developing a theory of citizenship as a practice to be adopted in both political and social realms, one that is continuously reinvented and negotiated. (Ellision, quoted in Burns, 2000).

8 Quoting T. Bender, we can define these new participatory forms, which clearly explain the concept of “differentiated citizenship”, as the plurality of local publics and activities, viewed in the context of the metropolitan region. In fact, as Bender suggests, thinking at a metropolitan scale is essential to redefining the concept of urban democracy. “. Local publics are public spaces which offer greater opportunity for access, engagement, and voice. Their own quality is based on accessibility to networks of informal power and to institutions of formal politics. (Bender, 2001: 73).
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1 EU integration and polarised trends in urban Europe

Cities, as a result of economic integration lose their national protection and economic monopolies. What we observe is the gradual restructuring of the European urban system from a set of national systems towards a single integrated urban configuration. In this, cities rely more on their comparative advantages to attract investment and generate development. They rely less on their national role and assume (gradually) European economic functions (WEGENER and KUNZMANN 1996).

However, studies that assess the impact of EU economic integration on cities point to polarisation as the dominant trend. Cities which adjusted their economic functions and benefit most from the integration process are in the geographical centre of Europe. The area between London, Paris, Milan, Munich and Hamburg has 40% of the EU population, 50% of the EU GDP, more than half of the growing cities in the Community and only 20% of the surface area of Europe (CEC 1999: 8). So, there is a clearly defined emerging European urban core. That doesn’t mean that there aren’t cities outside this core that are doing well. It means that there is a difference in the current state and growth prospects of core and peripheral urban areas in Europe. In this context, the most prominent dimension of this core-periphery pattern is the North-South pattern of urban polarisation. All cities in Greece and Portugal, and the majority of cities in Spain are excluded from the emerging European urban centre.

The literature that examines the competitiveness of European cities sheds light on the reasons behind the comparatively lagging competitiveness of Southern urban areas. The relevant debates stress the key role of the local authorities in attracting investment and in ‘constructing’ locally-based growth trajectories (JESSOP 1994). Such a pro-active role, in turn, depends on: a) the financial and administrative capacity of the local authorities to fund and organise such policies; and, b) on the representation of local private and voluntary sector interests in local decision-making structures, facilitating growth oriented neo-corporatist arrangements (CHESHIRE and GORDON 1995; BEGG 1999). The comparative lagging economic and administrative position of the local state in Spain, Greece and Portugal with respect to the EU norm is apparent in any cross-European examination on the issues (see Figure 1; COUNCIL OF EUROPE 1997; CEC 2001).

If the pragmatic (economic/administrative) differences between Northern and Southern local authorities can be measured and understood, however, the social and political differences are less clear. Why don’t we see the involvement of interest groups in local growth partnerships in the
South? What is argued is that in order to understand the reasons behind the North-South urban governance differences, the different paths that local authorities in Europe followed since the post-war period have to be examined more closely. Some key points are going to be stressed to illustrate the argument.

In the post-war period, the local state in Northern Europe – even considering the major differences amongst Northern European states – acquired significant economic and social responsibilities. To start with, the local state was involved in the provision of infrastructure. Also, aspects of the welfare state and services such as education and policing were organised and delivered locally. Furthermore, the involvement of local authorities in collective bargaining is noted, either as a negotiator between the two sides of industry, or through its role as a public sector employer (Goodwin and Painter 1996).

In Spain, Greece and Portugal, the presence of highly centralised administrative systems and underdeveloped industrial economies alters the picture. The welfare state was not developed enough for local authorities to be entrusted with similar responsibilities. Also, the economy wasn’t developed adequately to demand collective bargaining (Lipietz 1987). More importantly, though, we have dictatorships in these counties until the mid-1970s, so the devolution of power was politically opposed. The local state was for decades under-funded and politically controlled (Maraval 1997).

This North-South contrast changed substantially the last 25 years with the transition to democracy in Spain, Greece and Portugal. Financially, though, as discussed, the local (municipal) level in the South still lags behind the EU norm. More importantly, the political background and institutional infrastructure is different in the South. The relationship between the local state and voluntary and private sector groups wasn’t developed in the post-war years. In that sense, it is more difficult to re-orient it now towards locally defined development policies.

2 EU urban policies and North-South differences

The EU urban programmes aim to foster local development through local partnerships. They explicitly demand the participation of voluntary and private sector groups in local policies and they assign the key role to the local state. Regarding the North-South differences of European local authorities, the EU urban programmes do address the lagging financial capacity of cities in Spain, Greece and Portugal by reducing the co-financing share-out for Objective 1 cities. As discussed, though, the local socio-political infrastructure is equally important in determining the ability of local authorities to launch local development policies. The extent to which such North-South local authority differences are addressed in the EU urban programmes was examined in two RECITE programmes of the 1993-97 period: a) EUROSYNET, focusing on SMEs development and urban tourism; and, b) SCIENTIFIC CENTRES also aiming to assist SMEs but through the development of a telematics computer network linking the relevant universities/research centres of the partners (CEC 1996). EUROSYNET included two Catalan cities, Bayes and Bergueda (E), as well as Cork (IRL), Bethune (F), Charleroi (B) and Warrington (UK). The second network, SCIENTIFIC CEN-
TRES, comprised four urban-regional authorities - Midi-Pyrenees/Toulouse (Fr), Basque Government/Bilbao (E), Region Campania/Napoli (I), Valencia Generalitat (E) - and the city of Dafni (GR), a municipality of the Athens metropolitan area.

3 Analysis of governance responses and differences in the RECITE networks

Three differences amongst the participants conditioned their responses to the networks, illustrating the relevance of governance structures to the effectiveness with which the EU programmes advance endogenous development: a) the degree of centralisation of the national governmental system as a factor regulating access to information; b) the financial autonomy of local authorities to devote resources to the programme; c) the relationship (institutional interaction) between the local authorities and non-state local actors. The most prominent examples of these differences will be discussed.

a) The ability of the local level to access information about EU programmes

The comparatively higher degree of centralisation of the national governmental systems and the presence of centralised (national or regional) structures of information provision in Spain and Greece (Berg, Braun and Meek 1998), limited the ability of Bayes/Bergueda, and Dafni to promote local policies in the respective networks.

In the case of Bayes/Bergueda, it was a Catalan regional organisation (COPCA), specialising in SMEs and foreign trade that was first informed about EUROSYNET (GURI 27/03/2001). The original decision of Catalonia Generalitat was to participate as a region in the programme and to assist the two cities (Bayes/Bergueda) through it. This was not accepted by the EU due to the incompatibility of scale between Catalonia Generalitat and the other municipal network participants. In this light, the direct involvement of Bayes and Bergueda in the network was decided by the region (Farguell 31/03/1998). Co-operation between Bayes and Bergueda prior to EUROSYNET, however, was minimal. Thus, the two local authorities devoted a substantial amount of time to identify areas of common interest and working methods (Farguell 31/03/1998). Furthermore, cooperation problems between Bayes and Bergueda resulted in approximately a year’s delay in setting up the agenda and starting the programme (Costello 12/11/1997).

In the second network, SCIENTIFIC CENTRES, the involvement of Dafni in the programme was determined by the controlling position of the Ministry of Internal Affairs with regard to direct information received from the Commission. The Greek Ministry was the only administrative department in the country at that time (1993), that was negotiating directly with the Commission (Papageorgiou and Verney 1993). Information about the project was originally submitted by the Ministry to the local Prefecture (Region of Attiki) which – before the 1994 regional policy reform in Greece – was an administrative and not a political entity. EU regulations, however, demand the participation of local political authorities in networking programmes. Dafni was approached by the Prefecture on the grounds of its eligibility to participate in SCIENTIFIC CENTRES as a local political authority. The targets for local participation, however, were already established by the Prefecture in conjunction with the National Technical University of Athens (Psaros 09/05/1997). The presence of centralised structures of information provision, in this case, affected the capacity of the locality to promote endogenous development targets through the network.

The opposite example regarding access to information is offered by the rest of network participants. The involvement of Midi-Pyrenees, Valencia, the Basque Government and Campania regions in common EU (PACTE) networks prior to SCIENTIFIC CENTRES was key for the identification of areas of common interest. The policy-agenda of SCIENTIFIC CENTRES was negoti-
ated during this earlier co-operation period (Cros 09/10/1998). In this case, by actively forming a particular thematic area of collaboration and a dynamic for further co-operation the aforementioned local authorities were information generators rather than passive recipients.

b) The financial capacity of local authorities

The most contrasting examples in this area are from SCIENTIFIC CENTRES and involve Midi-Pyrenees and Dafni. The financial demands of SCIENTIFIC CENTRES were met by the participants through a variety of means, indicating both their dissimilar capacity to devote resources to the projects and the varying level of importance attached locally to the programme. Regarding the technical requirements of the network, these were addressed by the universities/research centres. The degree of collaboration between local authorities, research centres and SMEs was key to the generation of resources and, consequently, to the promotion of local targets through the programme.

Midi-Pyrenees, for example, has a close working relationship with the main technology institute of Toulouse, CERFACS. It was CERFACS that participated on behalf of the region in the PACTE networks prior to SCIENTIFIC CENTRES. Furthermore, the administration of SCIENTIFIC CENTRES was the sole responsibility of CERFACS. In this context, CERFACS obtained in 1991 approval for funding from the regional authorities in order to proceed with the development of a computer (telematics) network. The involvement of the region in SCIENTIFIC CENTRES was agreed on the basis of the extra resources that would accrue from EU funding. The financial commitment from the region to support the local telematics research, however, was to be maintained irrespective of the outcome of the application for SCIENTIFIC CENTRES (Cros 09/10/1998).

The opposite example is offered by Dafni. The city was not actively involved in the financial or administrative aspects of SCIENTIFIC CENTRES. The local financial requirements were met by the Prefecture, while the Community’s co-financing contributions to Dafni were sent directly to the Prefecture (Cros 09/10/1998). The local administrative duties in the network were sub-contracted by the municipality to a private company financed by the Prefecture (Psaros 09/05/1997).

The reasons for this limited involvement were relevant to the financial and technical incapacity of the municipality to accommodate the high requirements of the programme. A characteristic example involves the extra expenses required by the University of Athens for the organisation of a SCIENTIFIC CENTRES conference in Athens. In order for these costs to be covered and in the absence of assistance from the municipality, the University was forced to eliminate any form of publications related to the conference, depriving the network of a key medium for the diffusion of know-how.

c) Local institutional interaction

The (high) levels of interaction amongst local institutions has been stressed by the ‘flexible specialisation’, ‘territorial competition’ and ‘local economic initiatives’ literatures as a key factor for the advancement of endogenous development (Garofoli 1992; Amn and Thrift 1994; Sabel 1994; Chesher and Gordon 1995). The relevance of diffused governance structures regulating the performance of the case-study cities in the networks was also illustrated in the fieldwork through two contrasting examples. In the first category (Warrington, Midi-Pyrenees and Valencia), local targets were promoted as a consequence of the involvement of interest groups in the programme. In the second (Dafni and Bayes/Bergueda), the limited local institutional interaction hindered attempts of the respective cities to benefit from their involvement in the networks.

The participation of Warrington in EUROSYNET, for instance, was determined by the constructive collaboration between the local authority and interest groups. The planning and organisation of
network activities was organised in co-operation between the Council and interest groups. Moreover, most of local financial responsibilities to the network - particularly the ones regarding participation of SMEs in trade fairs and exhibitions - were initially met by the business community, while the council claimed subsequently the expenses from the Commission (Hoyle 02/10/1998).

Also, in Valencia, the local policy-agenda for SCIENTIFIC CENTRES was decided prior to application through a series of meetings between the regional authorities and the research institutes. Furthermore, the incorporation of SMEs from Valencia in the programme was organised on the basis of existing institutional links. The link between SMEs associations and the regional administration is provided by the Valencian Agency for Export Support (IVEX), a public sector corporation controlled by the region that focuses on business development. This institutional infrastructure provided a platform for the mapping and targeting of companies interested in telematics and for their subsequent involvement in the project (Perez-Antoli 22/09/1998).

In the cases of Bayes/Bergueda and Dafni, co-operation between the local authorities and interest groups was minimal (Farguell 31/03/1998; Psaros 09/05/1997). Together with the restricted local financial base and limited range of functions performed locally, the underdeveloped local institutional infrastructure relates to the distinct post-war urban economic and socio-political context of Southern Europe. A review of the literature on Portuguese local governance complements the Southern European picture and supports this argument (Silva et al. 1997; Pello Jr 1993; Syrett 1997).

In this light, the strong interaction noted in Valencia and Catalonia between the regional authorities and interest groups, seems contradictory. Regions in Spain, however, have been entrusted since the Constitutional and administrative reform (1978) with a substantial degree of autonomy that triggered and enabled the representation of interest groups in regional policy-making platforms. Yet the extent to which the devolution of power in Spain addressed the urban level depends on the status of autonomy of the regions, their governmental structures and therefore varies significantly across the country. While these variations are acknowledged, the centrifugal tendencies noted within the regional level in Spain suggest that since the 1978 reform, the urban administration has developed dependant relationships (constitutionally, financially) with both the national and the regional tier (Morata 1993).

The European orientation of Valencia and its participation in EU networking projects reflects this relationship. While the regional tier participated in 9 RECITE networks during the 1992-97 period, for instance, the urban level was absent (CEC 1996). Similarly, in Catalonia, the informal collaboration on improved communication links advanced since 1989 between Catalonia and the French regions of Midi-Pyrenees and Languedoc-Roussillon illustrates the cross-border networking orientation of the regional authorities (MazeY 1995). Yet, as noted elsewhere (Morata 1993) and in this study, such governance and networking attempts do not originate from or adequately incorporate the urban level.

4 Conclusion

Overall, therefore, there is an issue regarding the financial and administrative capacity of cities from Spain, Greece and Portugal to participate and benefit from the EU urban projects. More importantly, though, the EU urban networks in their attempt to trigger urban restructuring processes, assume a local social and political infrastructure that is different in Southern Europe. Unless these differences in urban Europe are examined and incorporated into the EU urban programmes, it's the cities or urban regions that are best equipped to use these programmes that will benefit most from them.
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Territorial systems in Sicily and its role in regional planning processes
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1 Context of local governance processes in the Sicilian case

In the last decade the dynamics of local governance in Sicily have been especially influenced by three interplaying processes:

Process of regionalisation of the EC funds

As an Italian objective 1 region, Sicily has been getting benefit from the growing financial resources available for the period 1989-99. Although regional government have reached a level of efficiency no later then the latest years, the financial support from the community have played a major role in stimulating the local planning forces. A great number of local networks have been formed to join Community Initiative as Leader, Urban, continuing working after the end of the official programmes.

Growth of “cultural tourism”

About two thirds of the world tourism fluxes is addressed to European territories. A growing part of this amount consists of “cultural tourists”, that is people not only interested in conventional property of the past (such arts, architecture, archaeology) but also in a complex mix of cultural heritage, traditions, local foods and products, etc. Following the example of success stories such as Tuscany, many territorial systems are now managing to address local development politics in the field of cultural and sustainable tourism, building a louder territorial and local identity and creating linkages with a global-international context.

Process of decentralisation of national programmes of local development

Starting by the middle of the ’90 a lot of programmes of urban and regional regeneration have been introduced into the national legal system. The aims was to promote a strong bottom-up approach according with the request of a more efficient way of spending public financial resources. Programmes for reinforcing local productive networks of SME such as Patti territorially (the model will be followed by the EU’s Territorial Employments Pacts), and for upgrading local infrastructures and services in a sustainable way have been introduced.

These policies – which stressed concepts such us “local networks”, “promotion of local milieu”, “partnership between public and private sectors” – have produced several new territorial communities, which now are performing in a positive way and implementing new integrated policies.
2 In progress experiences in local governance

The most remarkable outcomes in the field of integrated policies with bottom-up approach in Sicily are related to the following experience:

- **Patti territoriali (Territorial Pacts)**
  The financial programme have created 10 local networks (other 10 are still under evaluation), working together towards an economic and social vision of the concerning territory (see image I). At a local level each Pact involves local governments, consortiums of the productive sectors, unions, public associations, with a public start-up expenditure of 70-80 mucus on average. At a regional level the programmes on work are involving more then 130 communes (about one third of the regional total).

- **EU Initiative**
  During the period 1994-99 several Sicilian local government have been included in EU programmes such as Urban (Palermo, Catania, Siracusa), Life and Innovative Actions.
  The most wide and successful experience involving inter-municipal level probably was the Leader II Initiative operating in the field of rural development. After a process of selection (90 proposal were presented) 25 programmes were financed by the Commission (see image II). These programmes are still working particularly in the following fields:
  - supporting SME operating in the field of rural tourism;
  - conservation and improvement of local environment and cultural heritage;
  - exploitation of local products in the context of internationalisation.

  An important progress in the efficacy of local projects is expected from a new mechanism of of using the EU funds for the period 2000-6. Regional government decided to spend about one third of the total amount of the resources coming from the POR (Regional Operational Programme) prompting the implementation of PIT (Territorial Integrated Projects), that is an instrument to integrate in a locally-based vision the following sectors in which the total budget of the POR is divided:

1. Natural resources
2. Cultural resources
3. Human resources
4. Local systems of development
5. Cities
6. Networks of services

  The PIT process is going to start with a public announcement of competition which will be open at the end of April. On the basis of the projects produced by local networks and communities, the final decision about the financial support (1400 mucus, covering the period 2000-2) will be expressed about in September 2001. The approach followed by regional government for the PITs stresses in particular three main aspects: (a) clearness of the vision, especially compared with the regional spatial and economic strategy; (b) application of the principle of sustainable development; (c) quality and efficiency of financial processes (programming and monitoring issues).
Fig. 1: 19 Patti Territoriali

Fig. 2: 23 LEADER II Areas
3 The quest for regional and local strategic planning

The growing use of programmes of local development – which are increasing the political fragmentation of the region – underline the need of producing effective planning instruments. Like several regions in the of Europe is evident the lack of strategic plans which are able to produce an organic region-wide vision and facilitate the implementation of locally-based plans and programmes.

In Sicily, regional activity in the field of spatial planning at a regional level is producing two kinds of plans:

1. The Piano Paesistico Regionale, which is a sectoral plan concerning landscape, cultural and environmental aspects. The first guidelines of this plan have been produced in 1997, but the final version of the plan are still in progress.

2. The Piano Territoriale Urbanistico Regionale, which is a spatial plan containing outlines for the land use at a regional level and indications about local planning activities. The implementation of this plan appears at the moment very complex, with the process starting only in 2000.

As regards the regional goal of a more effective sustainable development, the main political problem then seems to be a lack of a strategic framework for the action at a regional level. If not solved rapidly that should introduce uncertainty in the regional-local interplay and creating weakness in the process of implementation of the EU expenditure for the period 2000-6.
ENSUNZA MAIDER

Discussion in work group 2

It has to be said that the whole discussion was, at every stage of its development, rather an open floor to further reflection on the implication of some concepts that seemed to be related to the national differences of regional organisation, than a statement of concepts or a definition of the main characteristics. This fact is a clear-cut proof that regional governance is about multi-layered articulation of strategy planning, where different levels of administration and different actors with different objectives and motivations are interacting.

During the second half of the Friday morning session, the group’s discussion turned over three key concepts related to the idea of governance, to our understanding: legitimacy, democracy and identity. But first, the group tried to establish the possibility of any pattern or any common features between different regional organisation modes, in national terms. The discussion approached was threefold, as it concentrated on the North-South influence, the possibility of the existence of different behaviours as a result of the East-West distinction, and even the question of the “continentalness” was commented. It was even suggested that perhaps be a “southernification” of the North had taken place, as politicians had realised that they were progressively further from their electors, and new forms of “clientelism” were perceived to be emerging. In an attempt to sum up what the discussion on East-West was about, it is necessary to remember the comments pointed out in relation with capitalism and communism, the existence or potential creation of a demanding civil society and the discovery of new values such as freedom, democracy and so on. Further, thirdly, the discussion focused on the continental-noncontinental issue, which for a long time has been considered to be a main factor for influencing the perception of politics in the different scenarios.

It could be concluded from this part of the discussion, that, on one hand, there was not one unique model of regional organisation influencing the other, but that it was more a question of interference of different models or types of organisation that could be appreciated. On the other hand, the influence and the effect that the European Commission and the ECJ have on the shaping were also discussed or what the group called the “Europeanisation” of the regional organisation which includes the understanding of the group, the common rules and laws as well as the requirements of policies on an European level, leading to a grade of uniformisation or homogenisation.

Although some different ideas were flowing during the whole discussion, the main concerns dealt first with the idea of the perception local and regional politicians have of themselves, wondering the ability to capacity building that these actors have and the resources they manage in order to pursue their goals and objectives. At this stage, another question was pointed out: has regional organisation or governance anything to do with agenda setting? Secondly, the idea of legitimisation was also raised, as for some of the participants, governance was also very much related to “accountability” matters, and some words were said about who carries the functions in the new organisational modes. Issues about the necessity of social capital and civil society were also on the discussion floor. The third, but not least important matter was that of identity: to the understanding of some of the participants, regional identity was not just a question of “cultural” identity. It was not only seen as anything dealing with a common language or habits, not even with the only fact of sharing a territory, but it was more the sharing of a “common interest”, very often related to economic affairs (macroeconomic environment, territorial and economic potentials, the awareness of the necessity to act and take part actively in the development of strategic actions in order to promote the regional economy).
In a short conclusion, as the group was running out of time and the discussion was vivid and increasingly interesting\(^1\), the group decided to mention and point out potential regions (city-regions, one new important concept finally introduced) emerging or likely to emerge as potential nuts: Barcelona, the Oresund region, Wien-Budapest corridor, Belfast, Northern Italy,... examples in which more or less all levels of regional/local organisation were represented, as a clue to follow the development of the regional governance and to perceive main characteristics, through the study of different cases.

\(^1\) It showed that many aspects about regional governance are unknown, not well-defined, and as a matter of facts, it is open to many different approaches and interpretations.
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1 Introduction

The UK government has recently encouraged the English regions to adopt a more inclusive and integrated approach to RPG. The intersection between the new guidance on regional planning and the recent changes in forms of governance at the regional level raises two areas of inquiry. The first is to what extent the guidance builds on recent changes in forms of governance by generating a renewed planning process and content. The second is whether the guidance enables the English regions to adopt genuinely divergent processes and policy outcomes.

The major development of government policy is that RPG must now provide a spatial context for the Regional Transport Strategies (RTS) and the Regional Economic Strategies (RESS) of the new Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) (DETR, 2000). The inclusion of a spatial strategy encourages the Regional Planning Bodies (RPBs) to avoid a simple reiteration of central government policy on land use and to identify areas of policy which are specific to their regions. The other development of interest in the context of this paper is that the preparation of draft RPG should now
involves the participation of non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The preparation of the draft RPG must be achieved within a streamlined timescale of 16 months. It is then tested by a Public Examination (PE) in front of a panel appointed by the Secretary of State.

The analysis covers the period in the West Midland review up to the publication of the “Moving Forward - Draft Spatial Strategy and Indicative Policies” document in Spring 2001, which is referred to as the “first draft” draft RPG. A consultation period follows the “first draft” draft leading to the final Draft RPG which is due to be published in Autumn 2001.

The methods employed in the case study of the West Midlands are continuing collection of relevant documentation, interviews with politicians, local government officers and representatives of government and NGOs involved in the regional plan making process as well as observation at key meetings during the process. Two rounds of interviews have been carried out at different stages of the process.

The remainder of the paper is divided into five sections. The second section provides a brief introduction to the regional context of the West Midlands. Next, the formal structure which has been put in place to deal with the RPG review is considered. The following section outlines the development of policy-making in the major substantive areas of RPG. An insight into the role and influence of organisations is then provided through a number of actor commentaries on the process. The implications of the commentaries in terms of the three themes of integration, inclusion and regional autonomy are then brought together in a concluding section.

2 Regional Context

The West Midlands region is situated at what is commonly referred to as the “crossroads of Britain”. The region is dominated by the West Midlands conurbation which has the city of Birmingham at its centre. Transport improvement to combat the severe congestion problems on the region’s motorway network is viewed by regional planners as a national priority as well as a local and regional issue.

The traditional strength of the economy is manufacturing including engineering and car production in the Birmingham conurbation and Coventry and the ceramics industry in North Staffordshire. 27% of the workforce is employed in the manufacturing sector, which is unusually high compared to other regions in the UK. However, the performance of the economy is below the national average and there are pockets of multiple deprivation in all districts of the conurbation. The districts of Birmingham and Sandwell are among the ten most deprived in the country.

3 Formal Organisational Structures

The formal organisational structure behind the RPG review is shown in figure 2. It can be seen from the diagram that formally, the Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM), the West Midlands Local Government Association (WMLGA) and Advantage West Midlands (AWM), which is the Regional Development Agency for the region are the main threads running through the structure of the process.

GO-WM is the government’s regional office which is responsible for ensuring that government policy is implemented at the regional level across a range of policy areas. The role of AWM, which was set up in 1999, is to harness economic success through the production of the RES. The government has encouraged the RDAs to work alongside the RPBs in the preparation of RPG in order to ensure that the two strategies are complementary in their approach.
The WMLGA was established in 1998 to enable the region’s local authorities to work together on regional policy matters. Its Regeneration and Environment “Conference”, which is made up of local councillors from the constituent authorities of the region, is currently the RPB for the region. In some regions preparation of RPG remains under the direction of the regional associations of local authorities while in others the new Regional Chambers have adopted the RPB role. The Regional Chambers were originally established by government to provide democratic oversight to the RESs and hold the RDAs to account. The majority of the Chamber’s members in the West Midlands are drawn from local government while the remainder consists of representatives from NGOs such as environment and business organisations. In the West Midlands the guidance and approval of RPG remains under the control of local government councillors through the WMLGA. However, the chamber has shown its commitment to the process by setting up a transport forum that now feeds directly into the preparation of the RTS.

Two full-time staff at the WMLGA’s secretariat headquarters in the centre of Birmingham are dedicated to the preparation of RPG. The role of the secretariat is to co-ordinate the process while the technical work is directed and carried out by full time planning officers from the constituent counties and unitary authorities. The majority of these are officers from the region’s larger authorities.

The function of the steering group is generally to manage the process and politics of the RPG review. The group contains the Chief Planning Officer of Warwickshire County Council who is the advisor to the Regeneration and Environment Conference and the Chief Executive of Staffordshire County Council who is the secretary for the regeneration conference. GOWM, AWM and the West Midlands Business Policy Group are also represented on this group. However, there is no seat on the steering group for any of the environment agencies or organisations to provide a counterweight to the influence of the business sector.

The technical work is carried out by a series of topic groups known as partnership technical groups which report to the RPG Task Team. The groups are led by local authority officers and reflect the traditional functional areas of policy - housing, economy, transport and the environment. The technical work therefore remains largely under the direction of the planning officers although there is more scope for NGOs to be involved in the formulation of policy through their involvement on the partnership reference groups.
The partnership reference groups, which are chaired by representatives of NGOs and open to all, are one of the key institutional innovations of the process. The purpose of the groups is to provide a platform for open debate on cross-cutting issues thereby fulfilling the objective of achieving a more “inclusive” RPG process. In formal terms the reference groups are provided with the opportunity to respond to the work of the technical groups at joint meetings which have been held at regular intervals during the process.

As figure 1 indicates, the Regional Chief Officers Group consisting of Planning and Transportation Officers from local authorities around the region also has an influential link into the process. One of its key points of intervention so far has been on the question of timing. There had been pressure from a number of key NGOs in the region to delay the publication of the draft RPG by a few months to allow time for consideration of some key background studies. However, there was a general consensus in the Chief Officers Group that the RPB should keep the September 2001 deadline in order “to maintain its credibility with government”.

4 Policy-making in the major fields of RPG policy

4.1 Spatial Strategy

Much of the early discussion on the RPG process have been devoted to the development of a spatial strategy. The overarching framework of the current document emerged from a consultation process on the spatial strategic choices facing the region. The main features of the framework are: to concentrate development and investment within the Major Urban Areas (MUAs) so that they can increasingly meet their own economic and social needs; to modernise and diversify the Region's economy while ensuring that opportunities for growth are linked to meeting needs and reducing social exclusion; to promote urban renaissance; to tackle rural deprivation; to modernise the transport infrastructure of the Region to enable these principles to be realised (WMLGA, 2000).

The five objectives reflect the responses to the consultation process which generally favoured emphasis on development in areas of need compared to current policies. However, a point of contention remains the timescale at which this objective can be achieved. There is some concern that focusing on areas of need in the vision overlooks the need for short to medium term development in areas of opportunity to sustain the competitiveness of the region. This view has been put across most vehemently by the business lobby and is reflected in some of the strategies and policies emerging from AWM.

4.2 Economy

The current document states that the RPB fully supports the aims of the RES and proposes that the Regeneration Zone and High Technology Growth Corridor proposals should now be incorporated as key elements of the RPG spatial strategy. The identification of three high-tech corridors in the strategy follows the recommendations of the government sponsored Rover Task Group, which was established in response to BMW’s disposal of interests in the Rover Group in Spring 2000. However, the spatial dimensions of the high-tech corridors do not always complement the overriding objective of the spatial strategy which is to concentrate development mainly in opportunities of need. This is particularly true of the A38 corridor stretching from Birmingham City Centre to Worcester which is situated largely in an area of opportunity.

It was evident in a recent RPG briefing session that the environmental lobby has yet to be convinced that the strategy is strong enough to resist decentralisation and that it was not clear on the degree to which the policies of diversification would lead to the release of greenfield sites. This
reflects the concern shown by environmental groups in the interviews that the RPG process has not devoted enough time to debating the spatial implications of AWM's strategic priorities.

4.3 Transport

The development of the RTS has been delayed by a number of external factors. The most important of these is the results of the regions' Multi-Modal Studies (MMSs). These are consultancy projects funded by government aiming to address problems of congestion by considering possible modal alternatives or road building or road widening. The WMLGA's view is that the RPB should seek to influence the results of the MMSs through policies developed in the RPG. Under this view, which has also gained the support of the business lobby, the regional allocation of resources resulting from the outcomes of the MMSs should take into account the spatial vision for the region incorporating the RTS. The view of the government office, however, is that the RTS should wait for the results of the MMSs, which are not due until shortly before the publication of the Draft RPG. The difficulty of these issues means that discussions surrounding the development of the transport strategy are not as far advanced as those on the economic and spatial side.

4.4 Housing

In previous RPG reviews the question of housing numbers was usually at the forefront of the debate. However, discussions at the last meeting of the Regeneration and Environment Conference (the RPB) in March 2001 suggest that in the early stages of the review the question of housing numbers has been pushed into the background by the need to reach a consensus on issues relating to urban regeneration. Three scenarios on the scale and distribution of housing numbers are put forward in the current document. These take into account different rates of population growth and rates of migration to the shire counties. The eventual decision on housing numbers will be related to the spatial strategy.

5 The role and influence of actors

5.1 Local government

Despite the rhetoric of greater stakeholder involvement local authority planning and transport officers have continued to play a dominant role in the formulation of policies. Officers from the large local authorities are involved in the RPG review on a day to day basis. Although a number of the smaller authorities do contribute to the process some officers were concerned that may be a "big ownership problem" over the strategy particularly if it leads to radical changes of direction. As one officer commented, "... the districts (smaller authorities) are just completely disenfranchised. We are moving so fast. There is no way you can engage the districts in what is going on. They are busy engaged in their local plans."

Observation at one of the conference sessions revealed an apparent willingness of councillors to adopt a regional perspective and look beyond their parochial interests. A leading councillor on the RPB suggested that a collective ethos had developed because of "a long history of collective working in the region." The broad political consensus over the need to reverse the decentralisation process and channel development back into the major conurbations may be unique amongst the English regions. Urban regeneration is generally supported by the shire councillors because it means that the green belt is more likely to be preserved and generally fits with the aspirations of the city councillors who would like to see increased levels of housing investment in the urban areas.
While broadly accepting the urban regeneration strategy there was some concern amongst the officers that the tight timetable would not allow sufficient time to address some technical issues relating to urban regeneration. This was echoed by a leading councillor who expressed some concern at the pace at which the process was moving: "... there may be a slight danger that because of that, we are not so collectively sure of where we are going and that there may be some difficult issues that, because we haven't seen them coming this time, are going to be more difficult for us to deal with."

5.2 Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM)

The role of GOWM is an important consideration in understanding the influence of central government and the degree of regional autonomy in the process. In the period between the launch and the publication of the "first draft" draft the role of GOWM has been largely to "support" the WMLGA. In terms of policy GOWM saw their role as "steering the process along to the sort of issues that the government are going to want to see dealt with at the public examination, what they would like to see coming along in the draft."

The GO has a seat on all of the key groups in the process. The deputy director of planning at the GOWM is on the steering group while the full-time RPG planner sits on the task group as well as the transport reference group. GOWM also sits on all of the project groups which are steering technical work, particularly the research projects which are taking place.

The local authority officers have generally looked favourably on the ability of GOWM to extract funding from the government for technical research. However, uncertainty was expressed over the role of GOWM in the RPG process and whether it should be viewed as a partner or a representative of government. This means that there is uncertainty over the role that the government office will play at the Public Examination. As one officer commented, "will it be wearing its WM hat or its government hat? We will have to wait and see." The GOWM also recognises that their role will change as RPG develops.

5.3 Governmental Agencies

5.3.1 Advantage West Midlands (Regional Development Agency) (AWM)

AWM sits on all of the key groups in the process including the steering group and the task group and plays an active role on the RPG's transport forum, which has now been adopted by the regional chamber. AWM saw this as an opportunity to get the key agencies of transport service delivery around the table. They have been happy to "share the spatial elements of the work on high technology corridors with the RPG process" and have developed strong links with the leading officer on the economy side.

AWM takes the views of the business sector into account when putting its own views across in the RPG arena. However, AWM recognises that the perspective which the AWM takes on the region does not always follow the general view of the business sector. There are three issues with spatial elements that AWM would like to see accepted by the RPB. The two priorities of clusters and high technology corridors are shared with the business sector while the business sector is less vocal on the implementation of AWM's regeneration priorities.
5.3.2 Environment Agency (EA)

Unlike the RDAs the Environment Agency is a national government agency with regional offices. In the past the agency has played more of a responsive role in relation to planning by submitting technical appraisals of planning applications. The agency is now moving beyond its traditional role of “robust, firm but fair regulator” by viewing the RPG process as an opportunity to influence or steer development in the direction of meeting sustainability objectives.

The EA have devoted more resources to the process this time around and have appointed an ex-local authority planner to concentrate on the agency’s input. It has seats on the sustainability partnership reference group, the rural-urban reference group and the quality of the environment technical group. The agency’s representative has also deputised for the Countryside Agency on the task group, which directs the technical work.

5.4 Development and business organisations

5.4.1 West Midlands Business Policy Group (WMBPG)

The West Midlands Business Policy Group (WMBPG), which was formed in early 1998 and sponsored by all the chambers of commerce in the West Midlands, the Confederation of British Industry (CBI), the Engineering Employers Federation and the Training and Enterprise Councils, was established in response to the creation of AWM. As well as having a seat on the RPG steering group, the chairman of the WMBPG chaired and put together the ‘Helping Business to Succeed’ reference group, which is effectively the business voice on the RPG process.

Beyond the RPG process the WMBPG has regular meetings with the directors of AWM. The chairman of the WMBPG said that the group had been pressing AWM quietly through these other meetings to get more involved in the RPG process. The WMBPG are aiming to persuade the board of AWM that “their vision for the region will not be fulfilled unless they champion the transport front”. The WMBPG have also been able to advise AWM on policies for cluster development.

5.4.2 Housebuilders Federation (HBF)

The HBF, which represents the interest of the housebuilding industry, sees the RPG process “as the starting point of everything” in terms of getting their message across on housing numbers. This is reflected in the their level of involvement. The HBF has been involved in all of the reference groups. The two full-time staff are involved in the ‘Helping Business to Succeed’ and ‘Communities for the Future’ groups while representatives from the house building industry sit on the other groups. The HBF also works very closely with the WMBPG in the organisation of the ‘Helping Business to Succeed’ reference group. The HBF is active outside the RPG arena and has regular meetings with other regional level organisations including the National Housing Federation, AWM, CBI and the Council for Protection of Rural England (CPRE).

As the process has developed the HBF have become increasingly aware that decisions on housing numbers will need to be woven into the spatial and economic strategies. The HBF have been working with other business organisations in an attempt to counteract the government’s policy of higher densities. Accordingly, they have focused on promoting rural regeneration and the growth of shire towns as a rationale for increasing housing provision in areas away from the MUAs.
5.5 Environmental Organisations

The West Midlands has been amongst the most innovative regions in terms of developing a partnership approach to sustainable development. This was consolidated by the establishment of the West Midlands Regional Sustainability Forum during the 1990s. The Forum has enabled the environmental groups to work together on the RPG process and therefore share the workload in terms of attending meetings. This is likely to be different from other regions where skill levels and networks are not as well developed.

The difference between Friends of the Earth (FOE) and CPRE is that the CPRE are more deeply involved in the process, particularly in relation to the technical work on housing. FOE is generally perceived to be more radical so it will tend to “push things” from the outside of the process. The FOE tends to comment on the main consultation documents and have a greater role in responding to the MMSs.

5.6 Regional Action West Midlands (RAWM)

RAWM is a government funded network which was set up to encourage the voluntary sector to operate strategically at the regional level. RAWM’s main involvement on the process is to lead on the ‘Social Inclusion’ reference group. It’s role is not to lobby on different areas of policy but to monitor the social inclusion implications and to facilitate specialist networks of voluntary organisations capable of responding to the policy debates. It is probably too early to say how effective RAWM has been at engaging voluntary groups in the RPG process although the early signs were that the “speed at which decisions were being made” had made this objective difficult to achieve.

6 Conclusions and emerging issues

6.1 Inclusion

A major difference between the new-style RPG and previous rounds is that the NGOs have had more of an insiders role through their involvement on the partnership reference groups. However, the meeting-intensive nature of the process along with the tight timescale seems to have had the effect of consolidating the effective participation of the best resourced groups such as the CPRE and the HBF. The WMBPG, which represents the powerful business interests, has utilised the reference groups to emerge as a key player in the process.

The majority of actors agreed that the partnership reference groups had been successful in terms of exposing the issues and engaging the relevant environmental and business interests. A representative of a prominent environmental organisation commented,

“without the participation of the environmental organisations there are a lot of issues that would have gone through by planners with business people exerting even more influence. It would have done behind closed doors. That is a great advantage over where we were a few years ago.”

While the environmental groups were positive about the openness and transparency of the process they did remain sceptical about their ability to influence the key decisions. This view was exacerbated by the perception that “policies from above” and background studies were dominating the process or “key decisions were being taken elsewhere”. As one NGO representative explained,

“there is a danger that some people who early on thought their agendas were being taken seriously but then find it all being whittled away behind their backs may actually become resentful of that.”
Moreover, it is difficult to come to any firm conclusions on the role of the reference groups in the actual formulation of policy. The ‘Rural - Urban Links’ group is the only genuinely spatially cross cutting topic and links to a number of the more traditional functional topics such as housing and transport which are dealt with in the technical groups. This group has been able to take lead on issues relating to the urban renaissance and has been responsible for much of the policy formulation in this area.

The greater openness and transparency also needs to be qualified with the general view of officers that “representation on the process is still poor”. Most of the organisations that address the social dimensions of sustainability have specific local remits in relation to planning which makes it difficult to engage them in the wider strategic agenda.

6.2 Integration

The formal structure of the process was set up to facilitate the integration of the three key substantive areas of policy - economy, housing and transport - with a spatial strategy. The early findings suggest that more time is needed for the institutional structures of local and central government to catch up with the rhetoric of integration that the new style process conveys.

This is shown by the difficulty of getting a strategic view that crosses all the different functional areas of policy. The original topics for the technical groups were chosen on practical grounds to fit the departmental structures of the local authorities and the particular expertise of officers. Many feel that the chosen subjects of the reference groups have not been sufficiently cross-cutting to counteract this functional split. The ‘Helping Business to Succeed’ reference group, for example, is seen by many as both a lobby group for the business sector and a “shadow group” for the ‘Prosperity for All’ technical group.

These factors have raised questions over the effectiveness of the spatial strategy as an integrating force for the other areas of policy. There is uncertainty over whether the development of high-tech corridors will lead to the release of greenfield sites and undermine the general thrust of urban regeneration. The challenge facing the RPB is to reconcile a policy of centralisation with the need to sustain economic growth in the region.

This relationship between the spatial strategy and the RTS has been affected by the timing of the results of the MMSs which has delayed the development of a coherent transport strategy. The problems of integration was summed up by an NGO representative on the transport forum:

“I don’t think we have got to the stage yet where you can see how they are interrelating. It is now when they are starting to bring the plan together that that will come through. At the moment they are all working on their own agenda.”

6.3 Regional autonomy

The extent to which decisions on spatial development in the West Midlands have been taken at the regional level will only come to light after the PE of the Draft RPG and the Secretary of State’s recommendations for modifications. The view amongst the officers is that the role of GOWM will be an important factor in resolving any conflicts between central government policy and policies in the draft RPG. However, there is a great deal of uncertainty over the role that GOWM will play at the PE.

A feature of the process so far is the way in which the spatial dimensions of national government policy are being played out in the RPG arena. The general shape of the spatial strategy will depend
on the extent to which a strategy of urban regeneration favoured by the government’s environment department can be reconciled with policies such as cluster development put forward by the trade and finance ministries. It will also be interesting to see if the environmental groups whose network is more advanced in the West Midlands can be effective in counteracting policies which may lead to the release of greenfield sites in areas of opportunity.

If regional policy is to operate in a truly integrated system the RPB must be able to identify areas where policy is specific to the region. An example of how this is working in practice is the region’s role in identifying the number and geographical scope of the regeneration zones and business clusters. This reflects the role of AWM, which although broadly directed by the government’s competitiveness agenda, has been asked to consider specific regional initiatives.

Perhaps the real test of regional autonomy will be the ability of RPG process to influence the results of the government-sponsored MMSs and the resulting regional allocation of resources for transport improvement. WMLGA argues that the West Midlands requires special treatment because of the congestion problems associated with being “at the crossroads of Britain”. The development of transport infrastructure will be crucial to the overall vision of the RPG and the integration of the spatial and economic strategic elements.
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1 Introduction

Unlike other European countries, the United Kingdom experienced an asymmetric process of devolution of powers and responsibilities. In Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland, elected Assemblies or Parliaments were formed and, especially in the Scottish case, equipped with significant autonomy in numerous policy fields. The English regions, in contrast, have no tier of regional government and are still under firm central government control. Over the last decade, however, a variety of new institutions and bodies had been set up in the English regions all of which being somehow involved in shaping the development of their territories. The design of the recent devolution process, in conjunction with a chequered tradition in policy making in the English regions, has created complex and fragmented structures of regional governance. Many stakeholders are now involved in developing policies and a diversity of strategies are in place each of these focusing on a particular policy sector. These exercises are undertaken often without reference to each other, with the result that the degree of coherence between the various strategies and activities tends to be low. One of the reasons for this is that no proper mechanisms were installed which could ensure a better co-ordinated and coherent approach to policy making in the regions.

The East Midlands was one of the first English regions that tried to address these problems. Its newly-formed voluntary Regional Assembly started a process of bringing together regional stakeholders in order to prepare an Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS). This strategy is intended to
provide a framework for all strategy making within the region in order to promote integration and coherence among the various policy making exercises. For a better understanding of the problems and challenges which led to the decision to produce the IRS, the topic is first placed into its historical context. Next, the approach taken in the East Midlands is analysed, focusing on the IRS document, the process of its preparation and the actors involved in this process. Finally, a first assessment of the IRS examines how the IRS is applied in practice and whether it brings about better coordinated and coherent strategies in the East Midlands.

2 Regionalism and Devolution in England

2.1 The Regional Level in England – Historical Background

The UK has traditionally been a highly centralised state. Powers and responsibilities for policy making have rested largely with central government which has been exercising firm control over local authorities. Even though a formal tier of (elected) regional government has never been in place in England, the regional level has experienced both periods of increased popularity and those in which it was broadly absent (an overview provide WANNOP 1995; ALLMENDINGER and TEWDWR-JONES 2000, TEWDWR-JONES and MCNEILL 2000).

Early initiatives of regional policy making were made in the wake of the two World Wars but the regional level got a real boost in the 1960s. Due to increasing disparities within the country regional policy and planning were promoted as means to achieving a more balanced distribution of growth, and various regional policy programmes emerged. The rise of regional policy making was followed by a massive fall from the late 1970s onwards when the Conservative government under Thatcher took office. Most of the previous moves towards greater decentralisation were reversed which, once again, left England behind without any regional tier of strategic planning institutions or regional plans. However, during the late 1980s and early 1990s efforts were made to bring back some degree of policy making at the regional level. This was caused, for instance, by persistently overheated development in the South East of England with which the fragmented government structures in the region could not cope. As a result, central government introduced Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) which ever since has been the main planning policy document in the English regions (see the article of SENNETT in this book). A further change was the establishment of Government Offices for the Regions (GORs) which are decentralised offices of central government aimed to integrate policies of central government departments in the regions.

These historical observations provide a valuable background for any attempt to evaluate policy making activities and governance structures as they presently exist in the English regions. First, the review demonstrates the chequered history of regional policy making in the country. Although first approaches were made very early there has not been a continuous tradition in regional policy making. The English regions rather saw a rapid turnover of institutions and short life spans of regional strategies and plans (BAKER, DEAS and WONG 1999). Secondly, most of the activities and arrangements that evolved at the regional level were not products of initiatives grown within the English regions themselves but were rather initiated and dominated strongly by the centre (MURDOCH and TEWDWR-JONES 1999; BAKER 2000). Thirdly, during the late 1980s a process of introducing various arrangements for strategy making began in the English regions. However, the new bodies were set up each being responsible for a specific task or policy sector, largely separated from one another and without sufficient mechanisms to ensure co-ordination between the different exercises. Thus, responsibilities and policy making activities were to be fairly fragmented, and little efforts were made to secure coherence among the strategies within the regional policy arena (ROBERTS and LLOYD 1999).
2.2 Recent Changes at the Regional Level

In 1997, the situation appeared to be set to change when the New Labour government came into power. The party committed itself to devolving powers, responsibilities and resources from the centre to the regions. In addition, New Labour promised to overcome fragmentation and sectoral policy making at the regional tier and rather achieve a higher level of co-ordination and integration of the various regional activities (Vigar et al. 2000). As far as the first point is concerned, the degree of decentralisation varies considerably between the different nations of the UK. Wales, Northern Ireland and particularly Scotland have been granted significant autonomy, embodied in elected (‘regional’) Assemblies or Parliaments. In contrast, devolution in England has been less far-reaching with control retained by the centre and has not brought a formal tier of regional government. Whereas the establishment of elected government in the Celtic nations, at least potentially, enables a more integrated approach to policy making and implementation, the situation in the English regions has raised some concern about the extent to which integration has been put forward (Baker, Deas and Wong 1999; Murdoch and Tewdwr-Jones 1999; Roberts and Lloyd 1999).

Instead of setting up arrangements, which could provide an integrating framework for the fragmented institutional landscape already existing in the English regions, New Labour’s reforms have added further fragmentation. A plethora of new agencies and arrangements has been installed, all of which having different remits and being involved in different policy fields. Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) have been established in all English regions to foster economic performance by producing and implementing Regional Economic Strategies (RESs). Elected representatives from local government and other regional players have formed voluntary Regional Chambers or Assemblies in order to scrutinise the RDAs’ work and to consider issues of shared interest. In addition, the arrangements for regional planning have been altered providing more ‘regional ownership’ and widening the scope of Regional Planning Guidance (DETR, 1998 and 2000a). RPG now includes, for instance, a Regional Transport Strategy. Finally, to name only some more examples, the English regions have been seeing the emergence of Regional Biodiversity Strategies, Regional Housing Statements, Regional Cultural Strategies and Regional Waste Strategies.

2.3 Emerging Problems and Challenges

In contrast with earlier periods, there is no ‘missing middle’ (Harding) in policy making and implementation in England nowadays. However, the existing arrangements are not embedded in a co-ordinating framework, such as regional government, but rather take place within a fairly fragmented institutional landscape. In the English regions, governance activities are spread among a multiplicity of agencies and arrangements, all of which holding different powers and responsibilities and producing a large variety of regional strategies and policy documents. A major characteristic of the devolution process in England has been the leading role performed by the centre. Regionalisation has been driven by central government priorities what did not always reflect regional needs. Rather, the process has been influenced, for example, by the political pressure resting on the new government to show early results of its work. Consequently, the timescale allowed for introducing the new arrangements has been very tight with the result that most of them have emerged in an ad-hoc manner (Roberts 2000). The different initiatives have evolved largely in isolation from each other and reflect the tradition of thinking in departmental ‘silos’ rather than co-ordinating and integrating policy making. Moreover, central government put the emphasis on ensuring the new activities and policies are in conformity with national policy (vertical integration) and to a much smaller extent on securing consistency among the various initiatives at the regional level (horizontal integration). This is embodied in the absence of an overall co-ordinating frame-
work which could help to achieve coherence between the numerous policy making exercises in the regions.

These concerns are not solely of academic nature since problems have also emerged in practice. A prominent example is the way in which the RDAs have produced their Regional Economic Strategies. The legislative guidelines require the Agencies to have regard to related policy work within the region and particularly to “operate within and alongside the long term spatial context for the region provided by RPGs” (DETR 2000a: 26). First evaluations of all RESs have shown that only few of these strategies explicitly refer to how they fit within the RPG framework or how they relate to other regional strategies (Nathan et al. 1999; Roberts and Lloyd 1998). However, a more fundamental problem is that the different regional strategies not only largely ‘ignore’ each other but that there are also differences and conflicts between the policy directions set out in the respective documents. Roberts (2000: 16) argues that “divisions of direction and content can be seen, for example, in the different spatial priorities contained in the various strategy documents that have been prepared in a single region and in the varying degree of emphasis that is places on crucial issues, such as environmental enhancement and the social justice agenda, by different strategies”.

The problem underlying this jumble is that the devolution of powers and responsibilities to the English regions has not been accompanied by the introduction of any mechanism to ensure co-ordination of devolved activities. Neither do comprehensive regulations exist outlining the relationship between different strategies and the numerous players, nor has the devolution brought a formal tier of regional government that could co-ordinate policy making and resolve conflicts. Central government’s attitude has been to avoid setting out more detailed guidelines and rather ‘hope’ that regional players would create a spirit of collaborative working through which coherence and integration would be attained (Baker, Deas and Wong 1999). However, many commentators – supported by the experience of the first few years of the devolution project – have been claiming for additional regulations or arrangements to be put in place (e.g. House of Commons 1999; Nathan et al. 1999; Roberts and Lloyd 1999; Baker 2000).

Probably in response to pressures groups and experience made in practice, the government introduced another regional strategy in early 2000 which, by some, has been seen as a means to address the above problems. Each region has been required to devise a Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF) in a joint effort of a wide range of regional players and agreed by the Regional Chamber (DETR 2000b). The Framework is to set out a “high-level vision” for the region, inform policy and decision makers and provide the context for other regional strategies. By providing an overall framework and identifying the relationships between different regional strategies and activities the RSDF is hoped to co-ordinate policy making and have the potential to resolve conflicts between regional strategies (UK Round Table 2000). However, since most RSDFs have been introduced after and not in advance of other regional strategies they can only have effect in future revisions of these strategies or while developing and implementing more detailed programmes and projects.
3 Regional Strategy Making in the East Midlands

3.1 Background – Strategy Making Arena in the Region

The design of New Labour’s devolution project in combination with the legacy inherited from previous eras have created complex structures of regional governance and a fragmented strategy landscape. Against the background of the above observations, the East Midlands\(^1\) appears to be a positive example of trying to achieve a more co-ordinated approach to regional strategy making. The region has been one of the first to address these issues and early assessments praised its attempt as being one of the most advanced and an example of good practice (DETR 2000a; Roberts 2000).

However, the situation in the East Midlands at the beginning of New Labour’s devolution project was basically the same as in the rest of England. Multiple actors were involved in policy development producing and implementing a variety of regional strategies. A study conducted in 1998 identified and analysed over thirty different documents which contained some kind of strategic policies at regional or sub-regional level (ECOTEC 1998). The results of this examination seem to be familiar: the majority of strategies reflected the ‘silo approach’ and covered a specific field of regional policy largely separated from other strategies; only a few documents were prepared by, and based on, regional partnerships; and, spatial priorities set out in strategies were often not consistent.

3.2 Co-ordinating Strategy Making Through an Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS)

In December 1998, a range of regional organisations and actors formed the voluntary East Midlands Regional Assembly. The Assembly comprises 70 nominated elected members from local authorities and 35 members from other regional players, such as business community, trade unions, further and higher education, environmental, cultural, voluntary and other sectors. Besides its function in relation to the East Midlands Development Agency (emda), the purpose for establishing the Assembly was to bring together regional stakeholders, provide a policy forum to consider matters of common concern and improve collaboration between regional actors. A priority of the Assembly’s work has been to develop an Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS) which now forms the Regional Sustainable Development Framework for the East Midlands (EMRA 2000a).

The idea of the IRS has been to involve the members of the Assembly and a wider range of actors with an interest in the region and agree a shared vision for sustainable development of the East Midlands. The strategy is intended to overcome sectoral separation and fragmentation of policy making, and to secure that all strategies and activities within the region consider and integrate the different dimensions of sustainability. Moreover the IRS is to promote greater coherence between the various strategy making exercises and foster collaborative working within the region. In order to achieve these objectives, the IRS aims to provide a common framework for strategy making within the region. It outlines key issues and challenges facing the East Midlands and sets out objectives for the region’s future. By doing this, the IRS is to guide the development of all other strategies at regional, sub-regional and local levels which have to demonstrate how they conform with and contribute to the implementation of the IRS. Furthermore, the strategy provides the regional context for more detailed programmes and individual projects at sub-regional and local levels. While developing and implementing these projects and programmes, policy and decision makers should take account of, and promote the principles and policies set out in, the IRS.

\(^1\) The East Midlands embraces the counties of Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire and includes the unitary authorities of Derby, Leicester, Nottingham and Rutland.
3.3 Structure and Content of the IRS

The actual strategy comprises a hierarchy of three tiers. At the highest tier, an overall vision sets out the intended future state of the region. This vision is defined fairly broadly and states that "The East Midlands will be the most progressive region in Europe, recognised for its high quality of life achieved through a vibrant economy, rich cultural and environmental diversity and sustainable communities..." (EMRA 2000a: 11). The vision is accompanied by eighteen sustainable development objectives which form the second tier of the IRS and distinguish between social, environmental, economic and spatial issues. The official reason for supplementing the traditional sustainability troika by a spatial component is that this should create better awareness of spatial issues and encourage policy makers to consider the spatial implications of their activities (Artschon forthcoming). However, a more practical reason might have been the nature of the IRS which draws upon, and tries to incorporate, other regional strategies, such as RPG (see below). In addition, vision and sustainable development objectives provide the framework by which all strategies and activities within the region are to be driven. Moreover they form the criteria for the appraisal of strategies, plans and projects at regional, sub-regional and local levels as these have to demonstrate how they conform with, and contribute to achieving, the vision and the sustainable development objectives.

The third tier of the IRS consists of four policy sections covering the social, environmental, economic and spatial themes. Each of these sections follows the same logic. First, key issues and challenges facing the East Midlands are identified. These are to indicate in which fields the need for action is most pressing and to build the basis from which policy responses are to be derived. Secondly, each section outlines the present state of regional strategy development in the respective field and sets out policies to address the identified issues and challenges.

The preparation of the IRS and particularly the four thematic sections was not preceded with a comprehensive analysis of the state of the region. Rather, various ‘viewpoints’ or position statements were devised for each theme which, if possible, drew on existing work undertaken by regional players. The viewpoint on the economy was prepared by the East Midlands Development Agency (emda) and, basically, reiterates in condensed form the content of emda’s Regional Economic Strategy (emda 1999). The spatial viewpoint was prepared by the Regional Local Government Association (EMRLGA) and is based largely on the work undertaken by EMRLGA in preparation of draft RPG. For the two remaining topics – environmental and social themes – little work was existent that could have been used as a basis for the IRS. The Regional Assembly initiated work on these themes which was still in progress when the IRS was finalised. The consultation draft of a Regional Environment Strategy, for example, was issued as late as February 2001 (EMRA 2001a). As a result, the viewpoints on environmental and social themes are less advanced compared to the economic and spatial ones as they only outline “the latest policy thinking” on these topics (EMRA 2000a: 19).

The same applies to the policies set out in the four sections. Where possible, they are based on existing work or, where such work was not available, newly developed. Thus, policy development was not at the same stage for each of the themes. Emda’s economic strategy was already in place and the preparation of RPG policies at an advanced stage. In contrast, environmental and social policies were still evolving. The way in which the thematic viewpoints and policies were developed has caused some concern (see also 3.6). On the one hand, the varying degree of maturity and detail of existing strategies, which were used as the basis for the IRS, has raised worries that economic and spatial themes would be dominant at the expense of environmental and social issues. On the other hand, since especially the economic and spatial components were put forward mainly by one organisation – economic part by emda and spatial component by EMRLGA – the question has
come up as to whether they reflect only the views and priorities of the respective organisation or are based upon the views of a broader spectrum of regional stakeholders.

3.4 Mechanisms for the Implementation of the IRS

A crucial point, particularly when fairly broad strategies at higher levels such as the IRS are concerned, is the issue of implementation. The IRS will not be implemented as a unified whole and by a single body. No institution, such as the Regional Assembly, possesses the powers or responsibilities to directly implement the IRS itself or to force other agencies or players to do so. The implementation will need to take place on a voluntary basis and depends entirely upon the willingness of policy and decision makers in the region to bring the IRS forward through their strategies, plans and projects at regional, sub-regional and local levels.

The IRS is to be implemented by providing a framework for the development of other strategies and policies within the region. Policy makers are urged to consider the key issues challenging the East Midlands and the proposed policy responses set out in the IRS. All policy development should also be driven by, and appraised against, the IRS vision and sustainable development objectives. Moreover the strategy is to guide and be delivered at sub-regional and local tiers, e.g. by setting the regional context for the development and implementation of plans and projects at the local level.

Several mechanisms have been established to foster application and implementation of the IRS. First, the Regional Assembly has prepared a Guidance Note for the Development of Regional Policies and Strategies within the IRS (EMRA 2000b). The Note is intended to assist policy and decision makers at all levels when producing their individual strategies and policies. It outlines how regional policies are to be developed within the framework of the IRS, for instance, by demonstrating how the regional sustainable development objectives can be used as a checklist throughout the preparation process. In addition, the Guidance Note encourages policy makers to consider more intensively the links between their own field of activity and other important policy areas in order to achieve better co-ordination and integration between different regional strategies.

Secondly, a methodology for conducting sustainability appraisals has been developed (EMRA 2000c). These appraisals are to be used as an integral part of producing strategies and plans at regional, sub-regional or local levels. Policy makers within the region are urged to assess their work against the sustainable development objectives set out in the IRS. The sustainability appraisals thus help to identify whether a strategy or plan is compatible with, and contributes to achieving, IRS vision and objectives.

Thirdly, more detailed plans at the regional, sub-regional or local levels and individual projects are to be appraised against a Regional Sustainability Checklist (EMRA 2001b). This Checklist is also based upon the eighteen sustainable development objectives and is to be applied, for example, to projects such as those being developed in the Delivery and Action Plans which follow emda’s Regional Economic Strategy. Finally, the IRS incorporates a monitoring scheme which will be used for evaluating the implementation of the strategy. This is to be done by using a set of regional indicators and targets which is also based upon the IRS sustainable development objectives.

3.5 The Process of Preparing the IRS

The preparation of the IRS has been initiated by the East Midlands Regional Assembly. However, an array of bodies and arrangements was set up to conduct the actual work on the strategy (Figure 1). All these bodies and arrangements were involved to a different extent – in terms of powers as well as continuity and intensity of their engagement – and included a different number and spec-
trum of regional players. Besides the ‘formal’ bodies and arrangements that were established to prepare the IRS, the strategy was also influenced by ‘informal’ arrangements which included only some key regional actors (see below). A Policy Forum was established to co-ordinate the production of the IRS. Its twenty members were drawn mainly from the Regional Assembly and were to represent “all key sectors” (EMRA 2000a: 15), such as representatives from local government, emda, the business community, trade unions, the voluntary, environment and cultural sectors, educational institutions etc. The Forum met on a regular basis (monthly or bimonthly) and consulted a group of advisors largely recruited from key players, particularly EMRLGA, emda and the Government Office for the East Midlands (GO-EM).

In addition, Task Groups for transport, housing, social inclusion and the environment were set up to work on these issues and give advise to the Policy Forum. Obviously, the Task Groups did not cover the whole spectrum of policy sectors. The reason for this limitation was to concentrate efforts on those sectors which had been least developed in the region. However, the restriction to these four topics meant in effect that the influence of regional players on the other themes of the IRS, i.e. economic and spatial components, was rather limited and, thus, the different parts of the IRS were prepared with a varying degree of inclusiveness (see also 3.6).

When forming the Task Groups the Assembly intended to “have inclusive membership” but also to keep them “relatively small in size in order to remain manageable” (ibid.). The Task Group on housing, for example, included representatives from housing associations, local government, the Housing Corporation, the health sector, private house builders, mortgage lenders, tenants representatives and others. Since membership of the Task Groups seemed to have not been inclusive enough four Reference Groups were set up also covering the transport, housing, social inclusion and environmental themes. These Reference Groups were open to the full spectrum of regional players and their remit was to discuss, and comment on, the work of the respective Task Group. Given their strongly advisory character – basically, they advised the Task Groups which themselves gave advice to the Policy Forum — and the low frequency with which they met (biannually), the level of involvement and, thus, actual influence of the Reference Groups was rather limited.

Finally, a draft of the IRS was subject to a public consultation exercise. Printed copies of the draft were distributed and an electronic version was placed on the Assembly’s website. Over a period of three month, respondents were asked to submit their comments on the IRS. By the end of the consultation period only 26 responses were received which came from a mixture of players and institutions from national, regional, sub-regional and local levels. Many responses were made by bodies with a remit in environmental or conservation issues, such as the Environment Agency, the East Midlands Biodiversity Forum and the East Midlands Wildlife Trust, as well as by county, district and borough councils. The comments made during the public consultation were considered by the Policy Forum and taken into account during the preparation of the final version of the IRS.

The above bodies and arrangements represent the ‘formal’ structures of the preparation process which are shown in the bottom half of the diagram (Figure 1). These were set up by the Regional Assembly and their work was made public, e.g. meetings of Policy Forum, Task and Reference Groups were announced in public and minutes of the meetings were made available. Besides these formal structures, informal arrangements existed between key players in the region, i.e. the Regional Assembly, EMRLGA, emda and GO-EM, which also exerted certain influence on the emerging IRS. Close working relationships between these institutions, e.g. regular meetings and informal contact between staff, early exchange of draft strategies and policies as well as joint commissioning of studies, characterised the day-to-day work on the strategy. These informal relationships are likely to have influenced, for example, the work of Policy Forum and Task Groups. As the timescale of the IRS preparation was very tight the time available in Forum and Task Groups to
digest and comment on reports, draft policies etc. was fairly short. Those key players who worked closely together and exchanged documents in advance had more time and, consequently, greater possibilities to comment on and influence the emerging strategy. However, further research is required to fully uncover the actual influence of these informal arrangements and whether they dominated the development of the IRS.

Figure 1: Formal and informal arrangements for preparation of the IRS

3.6 A First Assessment of the IRS

Since the IRS was finalised only a few months ago and, thus, its implementation is at an early stage, this section aims to give a first assessment of the approach chosen in the East Midlands.

Inclusiveness of the preparation process

One major issue concerns the degree of inclusiveness of the IRS process. The Regional Assembly has always been claiming to organise an inclusive process that involves all regional players in order to base the strategy upon broad consensus (EMRA 2000a). In practice, a variety of groupings and arrangements have been established to somehow contribute to the IRS. The Policy Forum, in particular, needs closer inspection as this was the most influential body which drew the fundamental decisions. At the beginning, the Forum was intended to be rather small in size and provide a ‘core membership’ that includes broad regional perspectives. The views of a wider spectrum of regional interests were to be drawn in only if necessary. As a result the initial Policy Forum comprised about ten members all of which were taken from the Regional Assembly. In the course of the preparation, however, membership was expanded constantly, e.g. by representatives for culture, housing and
transport, so that the Forum eventually included about twenty members. This might be an indication that this important body, at least at the earlier stages, was not inclusive enough.

There is further indication that the preparation of the IRS was, at least in parts, not inclusive enough. The composition of the Task Groups, for example, was criticised for not representing the whole spectrum of views related to the respective topic. Size of these Groups tended to be kept rather small in order to remain manageable with the establishment of the Reference Groups intended to compensate for this. The actual influence of the Reference Groups, however, can be questioned as they met only a few times during the process. Furthermore, the public consultation exercise was probably only of limited value. The number of respondents was rather low and many responses came from organisations which were members of the Policy Forum or Task Groups. In contrast, there were no responses made by individuals from the public. In addition, some respondents, such as the Countryside Agency, expressed concern that they would have liked to be involved more fully and at an earlier stage.

Finally, the level of inclusiveness varied between the different thematic components of the IRS. Analyses and development of policies for the environmental and social components were conducted as part of the IRS process with Task and Reference Groups on these topics. In contrast, no Task or Reference Groups were set up on economic and spatial issues and these components of the IRS were dominated by work undertaken by emda and EMRLGA. The possibilities for other parties to influence the economic and spatial parts therefore seem to have been limited which raises some concern as to whether these components reflect a similar spectrum of views as those on environmental and social issues.

Content of the IRS

As regards the content of the IRS, overall conception, regional vision and sustainable development objectives were a genuine result of the process which found wide support among most regional stakeholders. The four thematic components, however, were subject to greater criticism. Instead of conducting a comprehensive analysis of the state of the region to identify key issues for action, these components were, where possible, based upon existing work of regional players. Whereas both economic and spatial regional strategies (RES and RPG) were very advanced, little work existed on environmental and social topics. As a result, the level of detail and maturity varies considerably between the component parts of the IRS. Some respondents to the public consultation were worried that spatial and, in particular, economic themes would be dominant as they were the most fully developed and would, therefore, drive the regional policy agenda. Conversely, further work was thought to be necessary on the environmental and social parts of the IRS to reduce the threat these issues would be sidelined. Moreover, some respondents expressed the need to address controversial and contradictory issues more comprehensively, e.g. tensions between economic development and environmental issues such as the development around the East Midlands Airport.

Provisions for conflict resolution

The aim of the IRS is to avoid conflicts like this, for example, by using sustainability appraisals which help to identify possible tensions at an early stage and find ways to reconcile diverging interests (ATCHISON forthcoming). However, even if the IRS may help to reduce the likelihood of conflicts these cannot be avoided completely. Claims have therefore been made to introduce stronger mechanisms for conflict resolution. One option that came up in the public consultation was to enhance the power of the IRS in relation to other regional strategies, that is, to make it the dominant regional strategy which has the final say when deciding contentious issues.
On the other hand, other regional players such as the Regional Assembly and EMRLGA have insisted that there should not be a hierarchical relationship between different regional strategies. In their view, emphasis should be put on bringing together regional stakeholder in order to create an atmosphere of collaborative working through which tensions and conflicts are resolved. According to EMRLGA’s strategy director, the new arrangements at the regional level have “created a climate within which new regional organisations can see the value of working to an agreed vision and set of objectives and of working collaboratively” (ibid.). However, although collaborative working can contribute to better co-ordinate fragmented governance structures in the region, concern remains about the level of inclusiveness of these regional networks.

**Application of the IRS**

The timing of the production of IRS and other regional strategies is another important issue. Ideally, the IRS as the overarching framework should be in place before other regional strategies are developed. In practice, the IRS has evolved simultaneously with new Regional Planning Guidance and the Regional Economic Strategy which raises concern whether the IRS was able to provide this framework. Following from this, two fundamental questions come up which lie at the heart of this article: First, whether the IRS has contributed to achieving integration of different policy fields within regional strategies and, second, whether it has also ensured coherence among the various regional strategies.

Some answers to the first question can be found by examining the relationship between IRS objectives on the one hand, and policies contained in draft RPG and RES on the other hand. The sustainability appraisals conducted for both RES and draft RPG assessed whether the two strategies conform to the eighteen sustainable development objectives of the IRS (Entec 1999; EMRLGA and GO-EM 1999). According to these appraisals both strategies are generally consistent with the sustainable development objectives set out in the IRS and no incompatible policies were identified. In relation to the RES the appraisal concluded that “The implementation of many of the policies will make a direct and valuable contribution to the achievement of sustainable development in the East Midlands” (Entec 1999). With respect to draft RPG there was “a good fit between the national and IRS objectives and the objectives in the Guidance” (EMRLGA and GO-EM 1999: 2). On the other hand, the appraisal of the RES also found that only few policies directly supported the environmental objectives of the IRS and that “There is greater scope for such objectives to be reflected more widely in the document” (Entec 1999). With regard to both RES and RPG a number of policies were identified where the impact and, thus, the compatibility with IRS sustainable development objectives was uncertain, for example, because of the general nature of these policies. With regard to the first question the answer therefore must be that integration has been achieved in so far as the policies in RES and RPG generally conform with the IRS objectives and contribute to sustainable development. However, in the case of the RES, for example, integration is only partial since the environmental objectives of the IRS are not reflected sufficiently.

The second question – whether the IRS has promoted coherence between regional strategies – shall be clarified by investigating the relationship between draft RPG and the RES. As stated above, both strategies were prepared at the same time as the IRS. The production of all three strategies was characterised by close working relationships between the key regional players – the Assembly, emda, EMRLGA and GO-EM – which included regular meetings of staff, joint studies and working groups. The relation between draft RPG and emda’s RES was discussed, amongst other things, in the Public Examination into draft RPG. The report of the Panel which followed the Public Examination identified a relatively high degree of compatibility between draft RPG and the economic strategy (Public Examination Panel 2000). The report notes, for instance, that “EMDA is satisfied that the policies of the draft Guidance will allow the Agency to implement it’s Economic Develop-
ment Strategy" (ibid.: 6). According to many comments made during the Public Examination, environmental issues were the area in which incompatibilities between the two strategies would be most likely to occur. In the view of many respondents, draft RPG was led by the economic strategy with the result of unacceptable consequences for the environment. The Panel, however, concluded they could not detect "any inherent conflict in environmental terms between the draft Guidance and the Economic Development Strategy" (ibid.). All in all, at least the evidence from the Panel report suggests that there are no significant inconsistencies between draft RPG and emda's economic strategy, and that the degree of coherence is relatively high. This, key players such as EMRLGA, emda and the Regional Assembly claim, is the result of the policy framework provided by the IRS and the collaborative working relationships which have been created and promoted through the IRS preparation (EMRA 2000a; Aitchison forthcoming).

4 Conclusions

In times when regional governance is increasingly important in shaping the development of regions, the question arises whether these arrangements bring about a more coherent and integrated practice in regional strategy making. This applies in particular to England with its capricious attitude towards the standing regions enjoy in terms of developing strategies for their territory. The historical review reveals three principal characteristics of the English case: first, the varying emphasis put on the regional level in different periods; second, the high degree of central government control over extent, content and way of policy making in the regions; and third, the absence of a formal tier of regional government or administration. As a result of this, fragmented governance structures have evolved which left the English regions without any coherent and co-ordinated system of policy making. The reforms introduced by the New Labour government from 1997 onwards were intended to change this situation by devolving powers to the regions. However, a number of additional institutions has been established all being somehow involved in a diversity of regional strategy making exercises. Consequently, governance structures in the English regions appear to be even more fragmented than before, with a wide range of regional strategies put in place which show only a low degree of coherence. This situation has resulted from the neglect of setting up appropriate arrangements, such as elected regional government, which could ensure greater coherence.

The recently introduced requirement to prepare Regional Sustainable Development Frameworks has been seen as a means to overcome these problems. Some time before this requirement was brought in, the East Midlands had already initiated the preparation of an Integrated Regional Strategy which now forms the region's Sustainable Development Framework. The aim has been to bring together a broad range of regional stakeholders and agree a high-level strategy for sustainable development of the region. This strategy is to build the framework for the development of all policies and projects in the East Midlands and, thus, promote policy integration and coherence between the plethora of regional strategies.

The analysis has shown that the IRS in its current form can only have provisional character. Work needs to be done, in particular, on the environmental and social themes of the strategy in order to achieve better balance with the presently dominating spatial and economic components. Nevertheless, already in its current format the IRS represents a unique attempt to bringing together different strands of policy making under the framework of sustainable development. This has been achieved through the work of a number of regional stakeholders involved in a diversity of bodies and arrangements set up to produce the IRS. However, these bodies and arrangements were characterised by different levels of inclusiveness and influence. Generally speaking, the influence on shaping the IRS tended to be lower when a larger number of regional players was involved and, conversely, the most influential bodies had a more exclusive membership. On the other hand, two of the key play-
ers in preparing the IRS – the Regional Assembly and the Regional Local Government Association (EMRLGA) – already represent a wide spectrum of regional interests so that, from this perspective, a certain degree of inclusiveness was ensured during the whole production process.

Another positive feature of the approach in the East Midlands is that not only a shared strategy has been agreed but efforts have also been made to promote its implementation. Guidance Note, sustainability appraisals and checks as well as a comprehensive monitoring scheme can, if applied properly, all make a contribution to putting forward vision and objectives of the IRS. The first results of these efforts appear to be promising, in particular, the relatively high degree of coherence between Regional Planning Guidance and emda’s Regional Economic Strategy as well as the conformity of both strategies with the IRS. This has been achieved through both the strategic framework provided by the IRS and an atmosphere of collaborative working which has been created and promoted by the process of preparing the IRS. The above examples have shown, however, that coherence and integration have been achieved at the strategic level. The question is whether the objectives and policies set out by the IRS will be eventually implemented at the more detailed levels. In other words, whether individual actions plans and projects will consider and deliver the IRS. Emda, for example, has expressed its commitment to use the sustainability checklist when carrying out projects or funding decisions. However, this more serious test ‘on the ground’ is still to come.
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1 State of the theoretical debate on innovation-driven regional development

For some years, there has been broad consensus within the debate on regional economics and industrial geography as regards central regional-policy assumptions. The prevailing view is that globalisation leads to global competition in the regions, that the competitiveness of these regions in high-wage countries is increasingly based on knowledge and innovation, and that "networking" regions, i.e. those with intensive reciprocal links between the regional players, are more competitive than others.

In contrast to the models of the 1960s and 70s, almost all moves to explain or influence regional development nowadays focus centrally on the networking concept. Thus it is justifiable to speak of a paradigm shift or, as Cooke and Morgan put it, a "network paradigm".

The key terms used in the relevant debate are industrial districts (Marshall), industrial clusters (Porter), creative milieus (Camagni, Maillet), learning region (Morgan), institutional thickness (Amin, Thrift), social capital (Coleman, Putnam, Ostrom) and regional innovation systems

---

1 Central ideas in this paper are based on a research project under the stewardship of the Institute of Ecological and Regional Development (IÖR) in Dresden. In this project the communication and co-operation processes in 25 innovation networks in the German InnoRegio initiative were studied by a research team. Persons involved in the research undertaking commissioned by the BMBF (funding code 01 HI 9905) were Prof. Dr. B. Müller (Project Leader), Dr. Th. Wiechmann (Project Co-ordinator), J. Rückerl-Just and M. Beier from IÖR, Dresden, Prof. Dr. W. Scholl, Dr. Th. Bachmann, P. Witzlack from the artop Institute at the Humboldt University in Berlin and Prof. Dr. A. Habich and R. Schmidpeter from the Centre for Corporate Citizenship at the Catholic University in Eichstätt.
(COOKE, BRACZYK). Regardless of semantic and subject-related differences, the concepts underpinning these terms reveal a high degree of unanimity:

- they all emphasize the region as a key socioculturally determined plane of action;
- they champion wide-ranging network-style link-ups between economic players that go beyond traditional market-defined relations, and
- they attach strategic importance to collective learning processes.

1.1 Technology-centred regional policy of the 1970s and 80s

The current focus on innovation-led regional development has its roots in the late 1970s and early 1980s. It was then assumed generally, that technological innovation or the ability of a region to attract hi-tech industries would determine whether that region thrived or declined. New technologies were viewed as fountains of economic hope and their nurturing was accorded high priority in regional policy. Considerable funds were invested consequently in the setting-up of technology parks in which the coveted hi-tech firms could locate. Theoretical substantiations of this technology-centred urban and regional policy drew on KONDRIATIEV's theory of "long waves" and the concept of innovation cycles.

This holds that, due to specified locational requirements, cyclically occurring basic innovations are concentrated in certain regions, ideally such as have hitherto "been quiet", i.e. where spatial structures can focus wholly on the new industrial sectors. With their creaking old-industry structures, traditional economic locations are deprived of their economic foundations through the emergence of dynamic growth centres. But the new centres, too, are subject to phases of growth, stagnation and contraction; they also go through "regional growth cycles". This growth momentum is sustained until such time as regions adapt to technological progress (SCHÄTZL 1992: 201). Such considerations lead to the concept of "innovation cycles" being extended and to the superimposed existence of "spatial cycles" being postulated. In that case it is perfectly reasonable to gear regional spatial-planning and structural policy towards the provision of favourable development conditions for the coming hi-tech sectors.

Empirical examination unearthed weaknesses in the concept, however, with regard both to the "theory of long waves" and to its refinement by the regional sciences. It was not possible to demonstrate either a cyclical pattern or its purported localisation in new "unused" regions. The outcome of technology-centred regional policy was not always satisfactory either. Japan was forced through its "technopoles" concept to concede that the anticipated dissemination effect of grant-assisted hi-tech centres did not materialise automatically. On the contrary, the "hi-tech cathedrals in the desert" that had shot up pointed out the need to channel efforts more extensively towards intraregional networking (KRÄTKE 1995: 66).

1.2 The network paradigm of the 1990s: from industrial districts to learning regions

Numerous scientific studies in the 1990s highlighted how the technology-centred regional policy of the 80s had critically neglected the sociocultural prerequisites of the individual regions. Experiences from regions that had little hi-tech but were otherwise economically successful constituted a compelling case, furthermore, for working with a broader concept of innovation and not reducing it to its technological significance. The most well-known example of this was a study by PIORE and SABLE (1984) on the adaptability of flexibly specialised production structures in the consumer-goods industry of "third Italy" (the textile, clothing, furniture, ceramics, shoe and leather-goods industries in Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany and Veneto). The California School headed by SCOTT and
STORPER (1993) went on to distinguish three types of competitive regional economy ("worlds of production"): besides hi-tech industries these also include craft-based, designer-intensive consumer-goods production and business-oriented services.

Innovation-driven regional policy today, therefore, is no longer one-sidedly directed towards technical and technological innovation but also addresses social or process-related innovation. There has been the important realisation that innovations today do not come about solely due to the creativity of a solo inventor but rather as a result of co-operation between diverse institutions and persons. Concerning the question as to how to co-ordinate the various players in the innovation process, decisive significance is attached to the model of the regional network between enterprises and other institutions (research and training centres, further State and private players).

Here is not enough space to point out the thinking behind the various concepts and the differences between them. It remains to be stated that the network paradigm became a galvanising force in a wide variety of moves towards a new regional policy in the early 1990s. As far as Germany is concerned, this relates both to economically oriented regional and structural policy and to spatially-based regional planning. DANIELZYK (1998: 212) distinguishes by analogy between two areas of application for the new network concept: innovation networks in the context of economic structural change and policy networks as new forms of regional policy and spatial planning between "market and hierarchy".

Parallel developments in the state and the economy could let one suppose "that the emergence of interorganisational networks is a general symptom of structural change in modern societies; it appears to be a fundamental feature of social modernisation" (MAYNTZ 1992: 21). Consequently, there is a need to enquire into what characterises networks and how they function. According to FORST and SCHUBERT (1998), networks differ from other groups of players on account of the following:

- they are loosely bound systems of persons with broad ramifications,
- they are characterized by horizontal communication directed to factual questions without marked hierarchy and centre,
- they are motivated and governed by partnership and trust among the persons involved,
- their continuance is based on negotiated results as well as on a "purpose-open" permanence of relations.

Despite extensive consensus between a large number of schools and approaches, deficits in the theoretical debate on innovation-driven regional development are undeniable. For one thing, there are complaints of the debate being excessively normative. Empirical studies of regional networks frequently reach rather sobering conclusions. KREMMEN (1994) even speaks of the "region myth": empirically, it is possible at best to speak of a municipalisation of economic networks as opposed to their systematic regionalisation.

Regional networks are still poorly understood, moreover. We know very little about how cooperation and communication function in networks, or about how decisions are arrived at. Net-

---


3 Original quotation in German language: "dass das Aufkommen von interorganisatorischen Netzwerken eine allgemeine Begleiterscheinung des Strukturwandels in modernen Gesellschaften ist; es scheint ein Grundmerkmal gesellschaftlicher Modernisierung zu sein." (MAYNTZ 1992: 21)
works are often regarded as “black boxes” into which certain inputs flow without it being possible to know beforehand what sort of output will emerge. More precise knowledge on this is crucial, however, since various studies - e.g. GRABIER (1993) with reference to the Ruhr - have proved that it is wrong to assume that networks have positive effects on regional development per se. According to FÜRST and SCHUBERT (1998), structurally conservative networks in the form of “sclerotic milieus” may, under certain conditions, actually block innovation and impede change. External restrictions and disproportionately high transaction costs for players may likewise jeopardise the viability of networks.

In the second half of the 1990s, the regional science debate focused on innovative milieus as the outcome of regional learning processes. The key advance in the concept of the “learning region” related to the meshing of policy-planning, economic and social networks as the basis for participative regional learning and planning processes.

Regional innovation strategies are becoming a central point of focus for regional policy. At the same time, though, regional milieus cannot for the most part be brought about by the State. They cannot be planned but are, instead, the upshot of historically unique regional development patterns. According to COOKE and MORGAN (1998), knowledge and trust are the decisive resources of regional development. If that is true, the dilemma confronting regional policy is made manifest: neither knowledge nor trust can be brought about through State or market regulation. At most, the State can establish conditions conducive to the emergence of creative milieus. Thus, for instance, it can complement private investment by building up an innovation-friendly infrastructure (e.g. technology transfer centres to improve regional communication), stimulate new forms of development through deregulation, and promote intellectual competition within and between regions with the aid of competition schemes. By means of legal safeguards, the State can, in addition, establish the foundations for trust-based co-operation in regional networks. But regional development is “made” by people in the regions: by committedly creative parties, bold entrepreneurs and innumerable other players organised in extensively ramified networks that are as yet difficult to capture empirically.

Given the fact that we still know very little about networks, the question presents itself as to how - if at all - such “soft” institutions can be supported by the State. What incentives do networks require to be productive? To whom is State backing to be addressed? Who is liable in the event of abuse? How do funding programmes need to be designed if they are to meet stringent, legally enshrined Directives at national and European level as well as being suited to the soft informal structures and flexible action logic of networks?

The following provides a synoptical presentation of one attempt to promote regional innovation networks, namely the InnoRegio scheme being run by the Federal Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF). We then go on to ask what role regional planning is playing or could play in this process.
2 The German InnoRegio competition

The BMBF launched its InnoRegio competition in April 1999. It aims, by initiating processes of dialogue at regional level, to develop concepts and projects for tapping innovation potential in eastern Germany. InnoRegio thus echoes a very topical trend of co-operative competitions given over to urban and regional development in Germany.

A total of 250 million euro has been earmarked as funding for InnoRegio over a six-year period. A precondition for the award of funds is that players set up regional innovation networks and, in a joint process, develop measures and projects and ultimately put these to effect.

2.1 Goals of InnoRegio

According to the InnoRegio funding guidelines - and these concur with theoretical approaches to regional development currently being debated - the scheme essentially intends to improve regional competitiveness by improving regional scope for innovation. The main factors enabling innovation - motivation, creativity and expertise - should unfold particularly well given close co-operation between the most diverse parties from education and research institutes, businesses, politics, administration, societies and associations plus the two sides of industry. The regional level, it is posited, is eminently conducive to such groupings of players from different spheres, facilitating as it does rapid and effective exchanges of information as well as joint learning. The objective, therefore, was to create networks in which different persons and institutions came together to develop technical, economic and social forms of renewal that have hitherto been put to effect within the region or even beyond its borders. This enabled the InnoRegio competition to contemplate a broad swathe of regional networks ranging from privately-backed enterprise networks to publicly-backed policy networks.

The principal aim of the competition in eastern Germany was to

- improve the employment situation,
- strengthen regional competitiveness, and
- raise regional value-added.

Over and beyond the competition itself, InnoRegio also acted as a provider of stimuli: accompanying scientific research set about treating and analysing the approaches to innovation submitted so they could be adopted for other regions.

2.2 Rules and course of the competition

The funding guidelines for the InnoRegio competition were consciously open-ended. They did not address themselves to specific groups neither were stipulations made regarding spatial delimitation or the organisational constitution of the region. Criteria for the definition of a region were to be spatial and functional cohesion. Whole federal states, however, were not to be considered as regions for the purposes of InnoRegio.

For a region to receive competition funding it had to be self-organised. Eligible to apply were corporate enterprises, partnerships, registered societies and co-operatives together with public-law corporations that, by way of a legally signed agreement, had been authorised by the region’s “innovation-bearers” to co-ordinate the drawing-up of an InnoRegio concept.

---

4 Further details of the competition are available on the competition website: http://www.innoregio.de
The main incentives to take part were
- image enhancement as innovative region
- the formation of strategic alliances in key regional economic spheres, and
- overall funding totalling approx. 250 million euro.

This funding is shared out over a total of six years (1999-2005) amongst 25 networks selected by an independent jury. It takes the form of non-repayable grants and can only be used to implement pre-competition measures and projects such as undertakings for the establishment of regional communication platforms, pre-competition research and development for new products, manufacturing processes and services or else the development and implementation of a strategy for regional marketing. Construction measures and major investments cannot be considered.

The competition breaks down into three phases (cf. Fig. 1). The qualification phase began in April 1999 with an invitation for entries in the "Bundesanzeiger" (Federal Gazette). By the time the deadline for entries arrived just four months later, 444 applications had been submitted. Entrants had the task of defining their region’s innovation potential and development options. An independent jury of experts from commerce, science and politics decided on the 25 winning regions in November 1999. These were then to take part in the second phase and in the process receive funding amounting to 150,000 euro for the purpose of setting up regional innovation networks and elaborate measures and projects serving to enhance a region’s capacity for innovation.

**Figure 1: Phase of the competition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Phase (I)</th>
<th>Development Phase (II)</th>
<th>Implementation Phase (III)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Announcement of competition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deadline for applications</strong></td>
<td><strong>Realization of concepts and projects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1999</td>
<td>Regional Innovation Forums: “Kick off”</td>
<td>End 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative project development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jury decision: selection of concepts and projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 8-month development phase, the 25 regional networks drew up detailed innovation concepts ("InnoRegio concepts"). Measures and projects were elaborated in the course of regional innovation discourses. As a means of co-ordinating input, networks were permitted to establish special “offices” and install a co-ordinator who is also to have responsibility for monitoring implementation of the InnoRegio concept. The BMBF additionally offered the option of professional outside moderators for the management and moderation of fora and networks. No cost is incurred by the regions for this. The second phase of the competition came to a close in October 2000, when the jury again went into action (cf. Box 1 for the criteria underpinning the selections made). 19 of the 25 networks were awarded sums of between 4 and 20 million euro.

In the implementation phase lasting from autumn 2000 to year-end 2005, the concepts and projects developed in the second phase are to be put into practice at local level by their initiators. This is to occur on the basis of the structures arrived at in the previous phases. Even then, though, the process of network development will not have been concluded, and further players can and are to be involved.
Box 1: InnoRegio criteria for the selection of concepts, measures and projects

- Newness of approaches for the region
- Significance and specific benefit of undertakings for the region, notably for its competitiveness, economic development and employment situation
- Dynamic potential of measures and projects for the region (incl. degree to which they remove impediments to innovation)
- Sustainability of the development that commences with concept implementation
- Plausibility and implementability of the concept and of measures and projects
- Quality of the co-operation achieved
- Involvement and interworking of players in the region
- Region’s own input
- Degree to which approaches can be applied to other regions

2.3 Participants

Grouping the 25 regional networks in the competition (cf. Fig. 2) by sector or subject-matter, it is possible, without ignoring the individual differences that obtain, to make out five coherent focus areas (IÖR; ARTOP; CCC 2001: 28):

- producing sector, mechanical engineering, production-centred services (9 networks)
- new value-added chains on a vegetable basis, renewable raw materials, material cycles (5 networks)
- biotechnology, medical technology (5 networks)
- social welfare, health, rehabilitation, convalescence (4 networks)
- new materials (2 networks)

Since, by definition, networks do not have clear boundaries, it is difficult to make pronouncements on the number of players in each network. They can be assumed to average between 50 and 70 however. Besides numerically dominant small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), key players included research and training institutions, authorities and politicians. Structural-policy players (promoters of trade in government administrations, district councils or cities, private-law trade-promotion companies, regional managers, regional development agencies) were for the most part involved in the networks via concrete project work or consultancy and support services, but did not play a prominent part.

It is now intended to provide a brief exposition of 4 of the 25 InnoRegio networks (cf. Fig. 3):

a) Maritime Alliance for the Baltic Sea Region

This network embraces shipbuilders, shipyards, companies in the offshore technology sector, SME suppliers, science and education establishments and public bodies from along the Baltic Coast in East Germany. It has a “global player” in its midst, the Anglo-Norwegian Kvaerner Group. By means of concrete R&D projects on innovative maritime systems products and services, this network aims to set a lasting innovation process in train and thus be better placed on the world
Figure 2: The InnoRegio Networks
market. (http://www.wismar.net/innoregionmaritim)

b) Musicon Valley

Located in the south-west Saxon region of Vogtland, the “Musicon Valley” network is building on a long tradition of musical instrument production that is unparalleled in its degree of concentration. Small family businesses have been making virtually all the instruments in the orchestra here for around 350 years. Just as “Silicon Valley” has come to epitomise the microelectronics industry, so the idea is to make the term “Musicon Valley” synonymous with superlative musical instrument making and related services. Building upon new co-operative arrangements in the fields of medicine, education, R&D, tourism, employment and marketing, the aim is to tap new markets and groups of customer as well as to develop and market innovative services and products more effectively. (http://www.musiconvalley.de)

c) BioMeT Dresden

Through the “BioMeT” innovation network initiated by Dresden’s Technical University it is intended to forge optimum links between the natural sciences, the engineering sciences, informatics and medicine with a view to becoming a world leader in (red) biotechnology and thus establish a second major hi-tech base in Dresden alongside microelectronics. To this end, existing innovation potential is to be drawn upon through co-operation between companies and scientific establishments, business start-ups from the science sector are to be specifically encouraged, and further enterprises are to be persuaded to locate in the area. (http://www.biomet.de)

d) Naturstoffinnovationsnetzwerk Altmark

The Altmark region in northern Saxony-Anhalt is the largest hemp-growing area in Germany. 25% of German production of the crop is concentrated on approx. 2,500 acres of land here. The aim of the “Naturstoffinnovationsnetzwerk Altmark” (“Altmark Natural Material Innovation Network”) scheme is to build upon traditional agricultural structures so as to develop the region into a technology, production and demonstration centre for the utilisation of renewable raw materials in the industry. In the long-term, the goal is to see renewable raw materials incorporated into industrial mass production and hi-tech sectors. (http://www.nina-innoregio.de)

2.4 Accompanying research

The competition is accompanied by research activity whose aim it is, through analysis of the processes in the 25 competing regional networks, to identify factors favouring or militating against innovative regional development being initiated.

Communication and co-operation processes in the 25 InnoRegio networks chosen were studied by a research team under the stewardship of the Institute of Ecological and Regional Development (IÖR) in Dresden. By attending some 240 events locally and interviewing 200 regional players, it was possible to acquire a comprehensive database covering the following three groups of topics: players and interests, organisational set-ups and communication structures.
On the strength of this database, it is possible to specify factors conducive to or impeding the operation of networks. Thus pronouncements can be made on, for instance, the importance of player composition and organisational structures for communication and co-operation processes in networks. Particular significance attaches to communication structures where the establishment of latent networks is concerned. The role and significance of outside moderators has likewise been gone into in depth in this context. Furthermore, attention is drawn to the importance for communication processes within a network of long-standing ties of co-operation and communication ("old networks") between some of its players.

The findings from the accompanying research are being published shortly in full. Of particular relevance to the questions at issue here are the following findings (IÖR / ARTOP / CCC 2001: 151):

- Regional networks do not spring up out of "thin air"; instead, they emerge from existing elements of co-operation and networking between players and groups thereof. Despite the fraught situation since the political turmoil of 1989, this also applies for what was East Germany. In the InnoRegio competition, long-standing personal relations formed the basis for reciprocal trust and the emergence of new types of co-operation and organisation in all the networks. Nevertheless, new players were decisive in taking networks further forward and injecting fresh momentum into their processes. This enabled drawbacks associated with long-standing co-operation processes such as a lack of self-criticism, openness, flexibility and creativity to be overcome.

- Innovation networks are advanced by an inner circle of key players that exerts great influence on creativity and the production of innovative new ideas. These key players may exercise either overt or covert leadership. Whereas overt leaders are involved in network management for the most part, covert leaders often take on special tasks within the network. The innovative force within a network is very profoundly determined by the quality of these leaders' management skills. The widely propagated view, notably in literature on the subject, that networks are non-hierarchical or at least only minimally hierarchical structures was not borne out by the study. On the contrary: elements of hierarchical and authoritarian structures were to be found in almost all networks. These manifested themselves in, for instance, the emergence of centralised control, heavy regimentation, targeted surveillance, one-sided flows of information and constraints placed on players' scope for action and decision-making. In many instances this was regarded as necessary and beneficial by players. Quite a few players voiced a desire for firm network management with clear powers. This was motivated by the fact that most players were extremely pressed for time and were thus somewhat relieved if network management dealt with the majority of tasks itself and assumed responsibility for them. Hierarchical structures in networks are not, therefore, to be adjudged as being negative per se. They simplify organised, motivating management and the alignment of networks. On the other hand, authoritarian leadership is at odds with the guiding principle of networks if individual interests predominate and the innovative spirit of players is stunted. In such a case, hierarchies become barriers to co-operation and innovation.

- As analysis of communication processes in the InnoRegio networks shows, professional moderation can positively influence the thrust of the innovation process. Both the qualitative and quantitative findings from this study indicate that moderation can actually be a central determinant in the success of target-driven innovation discourse in networks. The moderator's ability, with the aid of suitable methods, to structure, to activate and hence to support the attainment of targets allows participants to focus on content-related work and is conducive to constructive dealings between players.
3 The role of regional planners in regional innovation processes

3.1 The role of regional planners in the German InnoRegio competition

Amongst the ranks of regional-policy players, a whole series of institutions are not competing in InnoRegio at all or are only marginally involved. This also applies for regional planners at the various federal levels. Neither federal-state planning, regional planning nor urban planning were amongst the 25 successful networks. Regional planners were merely represented in a smattering of the 419 unsuccessful applications (probably no more than six).

It can, of course, be argued that the forging of regional innovation networks does not form part of the classical regional planner’s remit. In Germany, it continues to be the case that a planner’s duties primarily involve producing and updating plans and producing positions to plans and projects of municipalities and sectoral policies. Given the “communicative turn in planning theory” (Healey 1996) and the mooted inclusion of the network paradigm in policy and planning, the absence of planners in the InnoRegio competition cannot be explained by the nature of their remit, however. With regional planners so thin on the ground in the InnoRegio competition, a question-mark hangs over their capacity for shaping regional innovation processes at all. They haven’t played much of a role to date, but could they in fact ever? What preconditions would need to be in place?

Means of supporting regional innovation processes at the disposal of regional planning fall into three categories:

- Material/content-related means. The drawing-up of regional innovation strategies requires well-founded analysis of the regional situation obtaining at the outset and of options for action. Providing a solid basis for this are the wide-ranging regional knowledge already available and an accessible regional-planning database. Innovation-specific know-how that planners do not generally possess is nevertheless needed in addition. Hence the material/content-related means at regional planning’s disposal are limited.

- Tool-related means. The success of innovation-centred approaches to regional development depends on strategies finding expression in concrete projects. With their focus on land use, the classical tools of regional planning are not of much use here.

- Institutional/organisational means. Regional planning centres potentially have the staff and equipment to act as indispensable institutional enablers of on-going work. It needs to be borne in mind, though, that both staffing and equipment levels in regional planning centres in Germany vary greatly. Capacity currently available merely suffices to carry out basic duties at some planning centres. There is virtually no additional scope in such regions for parallel involvement in informal processes (Wiechmann 1998). Hence institutional means, too, are currently limited in many regions.

If German regional planning is to play a more active part in initiating and supporting regional innovation processes, it is accordingly necessary to quantitatively upgrade the staffing and organisational infrastructure. Furthermore, planners need to acquire the ability to meet new requirements. Drawing on experiences from the InnoRegio competition, the following spheres can be cited in this respect:

- Regional planners have got to learn how to assume leadership functions in network management. The management qualities required to control and shape networks involve expertise in managing human resources as well as processes and projects.

- Innovations are developed in communicative processes of learning and exchange. To achieve the desired results, it makes sense to actively channel communication in groups from a certain size
upwards and to subject it to suitable rules. Regional planners ought therefore to have moderating skills. It should be noted here, though, that the standard moderation techniques are comparatively easy to learn. Nevertheless, a great deal of empathy and experience is needed in selecting and applying them properly.

To conclude, the experience gained from the InnoRegio competition teaches us how important long-standing personal relations are in networks. This implies that regional planners will only have any likelihood of establishing lastingly successful network processes if they manage to achieve a certain “standing” in the regional environment and to be perceived and accepted as a players by others.

These deliberations underline that, in the short term, regional planners in Germany will not be in a very good position to support regional innovation processes. In the medium to long term, however, they could well acquire the means to do so. This presupposes the political will to provide regional planning with the additional resources required. Regional planning needs to be given greater scope to acquire the requisite experience, moreover. It would need to be encouraged to experiment with new tools and methods and to tread new paths. Significantly aiding its cause is the fact that it is practically the only entity in the German political system that puts the regional case without any partial interest. Thus, it is viewed as an impartial advocate of regional interests and is well suited to carrying out co-ordination and moderation tasks in regional networks.

3.2 Regional governance and regional networks

Judging by the main stream of regional-science debate, networks are the key to new forms of governance at regional level. It needs to be remembered, however, firstly that networks are not a cure-all but rather one possible form of organisation with specific opportunities and risks and, secondly, that the innovative milieu pursued by regional policy are largely immune to State regulation given their complex long-term nature.

Hence the role of the State can only be to create a framework conducive to productive networks. Knowledge of the specific form these should take continues to be poor though. The intention underpinning InnoRegio can be portrayed as an effort to extend this knowledge and test out new forms of governance at regional level in Germany. The Federal Ministry for Transport, Building and Housing, which is also responsible for regional planning, has trod similar paths. 25 regional Agenda-21 processes were initiated through the “Regions of the Future” competition (1997-2000) (WIECHMANN 2000). Here it has likewise been demonstrated that regional planning is but one player amongst many in regional processes: occasionally central as an initiator, it is nevertheless considered by other players to be dispensable as an involved party (ADAM; WIECHMANN 1999). This and further analysis findings show that German regional planning does not generally play a leading part in regional governance processes. One major reason for this appears to be that it is not sufficiently accepted by many regional and municipal players.

The question as to how regional networks can be effectively nurtured through structural policy and regional planning has clearly yet to be answered satisfactorily. Further research efforts and practical experiments are needed to translate theoretically consensual notions on innovative regional development into success people can see.
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Discussion in work group 3

Instead of speaking of the “role” of spatial planning in shaping regional governance, the debates pointed out the necessity of trying to characterize governance through the practice of regional and spatial planning.

Therefore, the report is based on key-words and remarks which could be a start for some sort of shared characterization of governance, for all the actors who act in the “planning field”, at a regional scale.

1) Talking about governance reveals, on a European level, a shift from spatial planning in the strictly spatial meaning of it in practice, to the double idea of:

- spatial development,
- and development process.

2) Governance modifies the perception of the strategic level and questions us about what is strategic:

- one stage of a regional process, doomed to remain quite abstract by only giving orientations (English example of guidances),
- a schedule for a strategic approach of specific problems, such as technical risks (German example about natural risks: IKONE framework concept)
- a new schedule to resolve lacks of development by creating active networks such as specialised networks given in example by the German Innoregio action, or the examples developed in France of “networks of cities” (réseaux de villes), introducing new forms of practice, and specially managerial practice in regional, spatial planning, generating new processes of development.

3) This involves that we have to discuss about what are tools for governance in the panel of spatial planning documents.

These tools seem to be recent and could be defined as:

- “monitoring scheme” if you’re German,
- IRS drafts if you’re English,
- transactional monitoring (“pilotage contractuel”) if you’re French.

4) To active these tools, beside traditional spatial planning which produced documents are well known, governance leads us to ask ourselves what could be the incentives to invite actors to enter these new development processes described above.

European structural funds obviously seem to be one of the incentives (example given by Innoregio in Germany), but not only: the necessity of cooperation between so many levels of local and regional stages of practice and different institutions or agencies involved in the characterization of a strategic plan, in all the European countries, seems in itself to be a major incentive.

---

1 That scale remaining undefined precisely, as far as it can change from one country to another: the meaning of it was referring to institutional scale, opposite the national or local one.
In France, this is completed with the transactional practice, since 2000 lead in the same time as the European "agenda".

5) But, the lack of knowledge about the new visions of territories proposed by the ESPD document has driven the discussions to an embarrassing point of view.

Considering that all the European countries are already largely provided with many institutions, discussion about to which extent new forms of self-government in regional/spatial planning should be nowadays required, can't be justified without considerations for the ESPD document goals.

Therefore, European questioning on practice and coming out of new forms of regional governance is linked with the raise of new spatial objectives which are named integration and cohesion, and should be analysed in that framework. Otherwise, there is a great risk of interfering with national institutions and of misunderstanding the ESDP objectives.

6) This was confirmed by the very few remarks made upon the part which could be played by the local politicians in monitoring any governance process in itself or for itself.

7) Confirming that this stage of defining – or not completely defining – governance remained unachieved, it was observed that a European shared point of view upon what could be the democratical criteria which would define a spatial development process had still to be assessed.

The ESDP document is silent about it, and the different States try to manage with their own criteria. But, in no way the practice of local or regional information of the inhabitants about goals followed by regional planning, usually presented as a democratical criteria, was considered in the debates as a sufficient proof to confirm that the new forms of self-government described by the discussed examples, could define a democratical process, and, perhaps furtherly, a European shared democratical process, in the political meaning of the term.

So the question remains opened about how can a set of strategies such as described: regional planning, cooperation between different levels of strategic or spatial planning, monitoring scheme, development process, transactional approaches...could evolve towards a democratical process, with the identification of clear responsibilities, and opportunities for citizens to vote for or against the decisions taken throughout the governance process.

As an opened conclusion to that difficult subject, was reminded the definition proposed by Mr. Deetman, Maire of The Hague, in a French congress about Europe and cities: You can tell that you adopted right governance when you’re able to offer good collective services to the inhabitants, and when everywhere in a country or city people are ensured to find the same quality of collective services.

Discussion

Stefan Preuss noted that regional planning bodies were often weak because of a lack of staff and resources, although Marion Unal noted that a small staff and a flexible organisational structure could also help effectiveness. Stefan Preuss asked the question how the influence of planning could be increased and wondered whether increased financial resources might help. Marion Unal felt that Governance was not about creating structure but a dynamic and evolutionary process. A too strict view of Governance was not necessarily helpful. Geoff Vigar asked if Governance had fluid boundaries, and Marion Unal agreed stating that the question was how to characterise regional planning within regional Governance. For Arthur Benz there was a need to clarify what was meant by regional planning in the cases of the UK and Germany. In the UK there was a land use and
strategic planning emphasis whilst in Germany regional planning is more ‘traditional’ land use planning and other strategies evolve in parallel to the land use plans. Ansgar Rudolf asked how the process of planning was managed, for example in terms of timing, and what role institutionalised planning policy plays in the process. The key issues relate to process and content. For Marion Unal it was important to define the area to be planned for and also to consider sectoral policies. Geoff Vigar felt that a definition of planning and of the region was needed and recalled Patsy Healy’s definition of regional Governance as anything ‘in-between’ the Central Government and the local level. Ansgar Rudolf mentioned Federal systems and regions and Arthur Benz noted that in such systems the regions were in effect ‘in-between’ and that the definition of ‘in-betweeness’ was adequate. Geoff Vigar similarly noted that the wooliness ‘in-between’ also suited the English situation. For Thorsten Wiechmann the region is a social construct, so ‘in-betweeness’ is adequate. Geoff Vigar asked whether there were other examples. Marion Unal noted that the French system of contractualisation involved three elements: a project, a contract for its realisation and the territory to which it applied. Ansgar Rudolf noted that the situation in Germany was different due to the tradition of multi-level Government and administration which would raise the question of ‘who do you conclude contracts with?’. Marion Unal noted that the contracts were concluded by a ‘document unique’. Geoff Vigar wanted to know what was mobilising the French and German experience and about the role of regional planning in the past and in the present and what it would be in the future. Marion Unal noted that in France an incentive existed in the form of the ‘Contrat de Plan Etat Région’ which was the tool for delivering development and change at the regional level. There is a need to co-ordinate the process with the European funding process and with the lower administrative level. It was also noted that in the UK the process of contracting with the EU was also well established on the basis of commonly identified priorities. Arthur Benz noted that internal crisis and external competition were also significant drivers and referred to the cases of Hanover and Stuttgart. European competition in general and a best practice competition did a lot in mobilising networks and opening up new approaches. Geoff Vigar described the system in the UK as messy and as having evolved organically. Ansgar Rudolf noted that there had been a crisis in municipalities in terms of resources and the ability to counter this crisis. Sustainable development has illustrated the interaction between different actors and how each has wider responsibilities. There has been a realisation of the complexity of the issues. Geoff Vigar noted that there has also been a realisation of the ‘spatiality’ of many of the issues attached to sustainability. Thorsten Wiechmann suggested that new areas have emerged for regional Government and that the traditional units of Governance are no longer accepted. Regional Governance can be characterised as an “open field” or something ‘in-between’ and there is an opportunity for experimentation. Geoff Vigar posed the question of “What is the present role of regional planning?”. The regulatory role impacts on Governance issues and there is also a co-ordination role. James Sennett cited the example of the English West Midlands region where has been an emphasis on the spatial side of development, and following on from the Urban White Paper, on the regeneration process. Actors from different policy areas are being brought into the regional planning process, which can be seen as the ‘driving force’ bringing together different strategies. Stefan Preuss noted that in the English East Midlands, the regional planning process involved many actors, but that the drafts of the Integrated Regional Strategy were prepared by the Regional Planning Guidance team. This therefore had a co-ordinating and collaborative role, which although not a leading role, was an important one. Geoff Vigar wondered if the influence of the regional planning strategy was flowing down the spatial scales. Stefan Preuss noted that the Action Plans of the Regional Development Agency’s strategy may reflect the Integrated Regional Strategy. Collaboration between agencies may be the outcome of the IRS process. For Thorsten Wiechmann, competition is leading to the regions of the future, and there is potential for the planner to do more than land use planning. The example of InnoRegio in Germany is an
example but regional planners were not involved. Geoff Vigar suggested that overall regional planning was moving from land use regulation to an agenda of shaping places. Stefan Greiving noted that planning had an important role not only in regulating development, but also in mediating at the regional level.

**Definition adopted of the regional level of Governance: an in-between level of government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Role of Regional Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use regulation role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy co-ordination role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers of Change:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development and recognition of interaction of different actors and policy areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the 'spatiality' of many of the issues attached to sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding incentives (Contrat de Plan État Région - France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal regional economic crisis and external economic competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution of regional governance with opportunities for experimentation and for planners and planning to do more than land use planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future issues:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of focus of regional planning - Land use regulation or ‘shaping places’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If regional planning has a co-ordination role, what are the policy arenas that it should influence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LUIGI MUNDULA

The intermunicipal plan of Rome Province

In the Italian context the actual normative (Law regional n. 38/99) attributes to the Province assignments of planning in subject of planning of the territory as intermediary subsidiary corporate body between the Regions and the Communes and redefines the assignments of the three levels of local government delineating a system of relationships not hierarchical but based on the participation.

In the model of unified order of the European Space, the systems of intermediary vast area have a clear role as: place of cohesion and development equipotential; experimental motor for a model of shared sustainable development; place of verification for the clarification of tools of integration. In this optics in the first months of 2000 the Councillorship to Territorial Planning and Urbanism has become the place of the meeting on the Plans of Urban Restructuring for the Sustainable Development of the Territory (PRUSST) in a shut dialogue with the promoting communes and of which the Province is done proponent but also with those other territorial realities that have seen in this tool of complex action and in the Accords of Program and in the Territorial Pacts the beginning of a verification on the proper model of local socio-economic development. The success got by the PRUSSTs among the Ministry of the Public Jobs (culminated with the admission to the financing of the planning) it is also owed to the firm proposition of guide principles and of preventive technical verifications—what the real resources were, to what input the political, economic and territorial planning of vast area had to answer and to what rules it had to undergo—not only wanted by the Province in Rome to guarantee of the interventions and of the provincial support, but also to make operationally governable the share of the private investments to a level of co-planning.

The Province in Rome is intended to set in action a model of territorial and metropolitan governance meant as that system of rules, towards which to direct the shared planning base for the best-practice of the economy and the programs towards the local governments (Communes) and of vast area (circle of economic co-operation, mountain community, etc.). It is intended to not only make reference to the governance for the functional aspects of the contracts and the accords with subjects public and privates, but also to control the competition between these, for the achievement of the maximum collective benefit, of profits of efficiency and effectiveness in the respect of the pact State–citizen. Intending therefore to re-establish this pact the Province is hocked to work on the request of regulation and planning “from the bottom” (programs for the amelioration of the mobility and the traffic, of retraining, application of the principles of the sustainability) in the circle of the choices of the public arena and the local politics in comparison to the social and economic structure of reference and to widen the base of the subjects of reference to all the actors of the local development.

Governance means therefore for the Rome Province decision of policies, which are translated to regional level in politics, to provincial level in programs and to town level in projects.

Both the Planning 2000–2006 of the European union and the Planning of the single Italian Ministries (Ministry of the Budget and the Treasury, of the Environment, of the Public Jobs), enact unequivocally the acquisition of the principle of the sustainability as ethical orientation of the Pact State - citizen to the different levels: national, regional, provincial.

At the base of the Roman governance provincial and metropolitan there will be the subsidiarity, that is a system of government and local development able to make operational the territorial com-
petition, making lever on the transfer of the powers put in action from the process of decentralisation.

The Province encourages and sustains the partnership of the actors to the development through forms of negotiation participated inside the same system. Just for this the Province not wants to involve the public subjects only (province, commune, region) but wants to activate relationships inter-locals with the privates for the realisation of programs complexes of level over-local.

The problem of the provincial governance is set as new terms of the relationship between Public Administration with itself or with the private subjects.

The private subjects involved in this process will be, in the different levels, the global enterprises, the managers of services, the local investors.

The only model that can direct the organisation of this relationship will be that bottom-up, consequently the problem of the governance is set as structure of the coherence between finality, general objectives, objective specific, tools, projects / politics / programs (according to the level), realisation, management. In this optics the Public Administration, having ends of general character, has to govern the process that makes possible the accord dictating the rules and the guide principles and verifying the coherence of it in the different phases.

General objectives (almost coincident with the tools) they will be: sustainability, subsidiarity, equalisation, absence of predestined standard, congruence and conformity with the tools to the other levels, verification on the reliability of the times of realisation and the desired effects for the maintenance of the expected result, co-planning, continuous consultation.

The Provincial General Territorial Plan (PTGP) becomes therefore the applied part of the model of governance that the Province intends to set in action. The Plan will be therefore the plan of the rules that put in prominence the identity of the places and the relative potential of resources, the plan “from the bottom” what makes sustainable the relationship of equilibrium (economic) between the different territorial identities facing themes of complex planning level: the infrastructures to support of the new installations foreseen by the communes, the decentralisation of the big metropolitan services, the exploitation of the provincial patrimony (cultural good).

The Plan (that it will be done) has as theme of background the cohesion beginning from the concept of environmental sustainability, that is from an objective of preventive measure of the admissible projects to realise social and economic growth without exhausting the potential (the reserves) able to guarantee equal growth to the future generations.

The PTGP is proposed to measure the level of cohesion of the subsystem and their socio-economic identity in terms of sustainability, intending with the term a limit of threshold over which the factors of the interaction would be lost irremediably (the local resources) those have made possible to identify the subsystem and its potential (projects) of development.

Looking then at the competition on the territory the Province has looked at the position of our cities in the international context, appraising the scale over national, over that Mediterranean, in the circle of the debate in progress on the functions of service international (logistic bases, airports, nodes multifunctional, centres of excellence, areas of integration for the management of the cultural patrimony, etc.).

The PTGP owes on one side to decline the general lines of order of the provincial territory and the tools of planning and programming and from the other one it has to act on the base of the proposals of the communes and the local corporate body. It owes therefore to allow the link and the functional connection with the choices contained in different levels of planning and decision, in a
picture of functionality, coherence and interdependence between the varied programmatic levels. It has to accompany the evolution of the area of reference and of the external context flexibly (in the different component social, economic, social, institutional and administrative) introducing progressive calibrations of the interventions and of the objectives.

It is founded prioritily on the share to the realisation of the local Administrations, of the public subjects or with public finality working on the territory, of the enterprises, of the organisations bearers of affairs and finality linked to the environment, to the job, to the big social themes. Of such subjects the PTGP has the assignment to arouse, to direct, to qualify and to co-ordinate the planning foreseeing transparent and effective mechanisms.

The PTGP constituting the action of general planning with which the Province manages the coherence with the politics, the programs, the projects of levels superior and subordinate it will have value of agreement on a packet of options shared from the subjects that they are recognised in the idea of sustainable and “from the bottom” development;

unitary corpus of the action of planning between institutions of local government and different levels of the Public Administration, operating economic, subjects carriers of affairs collective and diffused, cultural institutions, citizen/electors, consumers and temporary users also, extra-community with or without fixed abode; tool of primer and management for a cohesive economic and social development; guarantee of the partnership public / private, attributing to the Province the role of glue of the pact subsidiary state / citizen on the feasibility of the level of reached accord; place of the exercise of the subsidiary powers.

Through the PTGP the Province intends to open the discussion and the verification of admissibility on themes of big collective interest for the competition trans–local as the big projects of location of metropolitan functions; location and integrated re-location of the productive systems and recovery of the socio-economic values and productivity; the nets and the infrastructures of transport, the carrying capacity of the territory, the verification of the environmental and social impacts; their dimension and transformation’s ability in comparison to the resources inter-generational; the continuos control of quality on the changes of the standards of life and the income ability of the places from which to let derive the choice of the settlement’s weights for the financial economic planning; the appropriateness of the levels of intervention and the demolition of coercive methods in the individualisation of the programmatic and planning social reason, favouring the role of transparent manager of the strategic program and the dialogue with the citizens.

In this optics useful tools to the attainment of the purpose are considered the pacts of bargaining; the pacts of co-planning; the fiscal and tributary instrumentation; the preventive environmental and strategic evaluation of the place; the employment and the diffusion of an appropriate Territorial and Geographical Informative System; the certification of the process of Plan.

The Plan allows to satisfy besides the responsibilities of which the Province is made object: the Civil Protection; the control and the environmental protection (ISO 14000 -EMASs); diffusion of a culture cohesive for the development and the growth aware of the local corporate body (Communes); the control of the expense and of the investments to give temporal certainty to the entrepreneurial base; the certification of process for the recognition of the effectiveness and the efficiency of the provincial management (ISO 9000); the Territorial Informative System for the management and the transparent knowledge of the territory and the economy; the regulation and the adjustment of the tools of share and co-operation (PRUSST, Territorial Pacts, Accords of area, Pacts of Planning, etc.); the matter of the Roman Metropolitan area as application at level of vast area of the principles of the federalism.
The methodology hypothesises to treat the territorial plan as a project of work, therefore premising to it the analysis of environmental compatibility, the impact of it on the environment will be esteemed in terms of scenery potential *ex ante* of the endogenous mutations at which would be subjects the local systems facing the insertion of new occasions of economic development. Will be esteemed the degree or the ability of the territorial context of to back down in partial equilibrium regenerating resources to employ in the future after the intervention of plan, coherently with the level of the study, to simulate corrective hypothesis.

The procedure able to appraise the environmental compatibility of plans and programs call comes fluently strategic (V.A.S.) and is considered the fundamental base for the politics of sustainable development. It consists, in fact, in a systematic process for the evaluation of the environmental consequences of politics, programs and plans, in way to assure that such consequences enter together first possible in the decisional process, and with equal dignity, to the considerations of social and economic order. The integration of the V.A.S. with procedures of V.I.A., of economic and social evaluation constitutes the base for the evaluation of congruence with the sustainable development.

So that the planning is identified in a dynamic process, able to let converge through a dialectical iterate the process, is necessary a procedure able to optimise the relationship between the possible and probable objectives and the desired objectives and optimal, realising that necessary equilibrium between optimization of the offer and satisfaction of the demand; to think to a planning as to a dialectical procedure of following refinements and verifications, confirming it as a dynamics repetition of moments of analysis and synthesis where every component, articulated internally to itself in the elements that compose it, is correlated in a most complex structure in the search of the level of synthesis adjusted to the decisional moment of which is part.

The PTGP is found to face problem list to duty type economic–managerial, idro geomorphologic, but also deepen sectorial analysis like naturalistic, landscape, linked to the naturalistic, to the public health or to the risks echo–toxicological. All this has underlined the necessity of the individualisation of systems of analysis that allows to check the whole process. It derives of it therefore the necessity of the construction of an approach for systems to the problem list of the provincial territorial planning.

The planning takes place inside a macro system (meant as the system environmental composed of natural and human elements that moved by an only process have the tendency to reach a same purpose–conventionally in phase of start the environmental macro system of reference coincides with the provincial territory) fruit of the aggregation of the subsystems interested by the actions foreseen from the plan, founding on the presupposition that every information modifies or alters its meaning in the moment in which is not treated in its generating context. Facing of every intervention it has to be possible, in the moments of synthesis, to face all the elements that compose the real context of action, and that these have to make part of the structure of the system to which the project makes reference. The environmental components have to assume the correct relief in the planning since the first formulation of the job. From the dialectical dynamism of the process is drawn the opportunity to consider the environmental reality not anymore as part of the context with which to verify the objectives of plan, but as real planning element, generating of demands and expectations.

In the procedure of formulation of the Plan the problem list that interest can be brought back to two specific systems of reference. The first one concerns, with the methods and the most suitable criterions, the search of the intrinsic functionalities and the physical-techniques characteristics necessary to the formulation of the interventions for the attainment of the desired objectives. The second will interest all the realities that it is foreseen will have to sustain the transformations pro-
duced by the proposed interventions. It will take an interest of the environmental reality that will have to welcome the work, articulating each other inside the varied disciplines that, in their whole, allow to give its enough and exhaustive definition in relationship to the peculiarity of the interested context, read independently however by the type of intervention for which the solution is being formulated. A logic type sequential it would not allow to treat problem list in suitable manner, therefore must be possible to treat the two systems in such way to underline their interrelations using the one as planning element of the other. The normative European and national (from 1985 to today) has as end the realisation of politics, programs and sustainable projects and it foresees to extend the articulation to the plan of vast area in three pictures: programmatic, planning and environmental. This type of approach is at the base of the methodological choice that accompanies the revision of the General Provincial Territorial Plan in Rome.

The first phase of a systemic procedural iter consists in defining and representing the situation of reference *ante-operam*, sight both under the qualitative aspect and of the existing interrelations inside the varied components and between components.

**Environmental picture**

Premised fundamental it is the interpretation of the environment as interrelation of component belonging to the physical reality: atmosphere, water environment, geology, morphology, flora and fauna, natural landscape, landscape human, socio economy, public health, noise and vibrations, radiations. Through one interpretation of it, through a procedure of modelling, it is arrived to the definition of a series of systems: water, geo morphologic, of the natural landscape, historical and of the landscape, human settlement, naturalistic of the protected areas; reported among them, that reflect the same reality and its relationships.

Analysing therefore the single systems and reporting each other to a predetermined historical moment (time t0), are noticed for all the environmental components both the last state and the possible tendency to the variation, in such way that, supposing the congruence between behaviour future and behaviour passed of a component date, can be determined its progress in terms of variation. It appears evident that every component will be susceptible to acquire aspects and different values according to the analysed system and will be characterised therefore through of the specific indicators that will be measured in operation of their location, those “spokesman” that, having the ability to reassume in values or limited judgements complex and impossible to formalise situations, are also able to activate themself modifying their state in the moment in which they had to receive an impact: indicators (receivers). The analysis of the territory for systems conducts, apiece of them, to the individualisation of parts of territory with characteristics of congruity: territorial unity; parts of territory characterised by the same level of quality or of attitude to the relations towards the system in examination. Two types of territorial unity have been defined: *micro areas*, represent that punctual elements or those areas of small dimension that inside the system assume some aspects of particular criticality; *macro areas*, are parts of territory wider than are characterised by the presence at the same time to their inside of critical areas, of prevailing characteristics and of synergetic relationships between the varied used indicators. The application of this procedure implicates the realisation of a System Informative Territorial S.I.T. for the harvest, elaboration and communication of the information, departing from the acquisition of the data on the existing environmental reality. The use of thematic papers, their overlap (overlay mapping) and the analysis of the correlations between the varied examined sectors are finalised to the creation of a cognitive picture of the initial situation, starting point of following elaborations aiming to a continuous control of the territorial and planning variables. The structure of the S.I.T. it has to be first of all realised related to an ampest environment of which the analysed one is part, keeping track of the possible geo-economic
differences that will compete to define its sensibility, function of the level of vulnerability and criticity, intending for vulnerability the ability to contain or not a pressure practised by the outside on a macro-system of which is not known previously the way of answer and for criticity the values and the way of answer suggested by the behaviour of the indicators. Other character is the duration of the control: a project can have effects of brief, middle, long period, from which comes down the necessity of an architecture of continuous updating of the system.

Programmatic picture

Is developed the analysis of the aspects that bring to the definition of the actuality and the motivations of the project of plan. The environmental vision of the problems is including in the optics of the planning and the territorial economic planning, and it acquires one space in the case in which the local government owns technical tools and of environmental planning. The Picture of reference programmatic furnishes the cognitive elements on relationships between the capacity of planning of the plan and the actions of programming and territorial and sectorial planning in action and of verification relational and of coherence. The contents of the picture concern description of the plan in relationship to the states of realisation of the tools territorial planners and of sector; description of the relationships of coherence of the plan with the objectives pursued by other tools planners; indication of the times of realisation of the intervention and the possible infrastructures to service and complementary. The picture describes besides actuality of the plan and motivation of the possible changes brought after its aboriginal conception; possible discords of forecast contained in the separate programmatic tools interested from the plan and from the interventions.

Projectual picture

Individualise the relationship between the anticipated and projected work inside the territory of reference and the planning address of the PTGP: individualisation of the actions of planning and planning that foresee the works; description of the relationships of coherence of the project with the objectives pursued from the plan; precise definition of possible discords; realisation feasibility of the projects; evaluation (technical parameters, economic parameters, environmental parameters).

The second phase of a systemic procedural iter consists in defining and representing the situation of reference post – operam

Programmatic picture

Definition of the intervention: analysis of existing sector plans; individualisation and position of the programs of intervention in comparison to the aforesaid plans; verification in comparison to the planning of superior order; verification of the actuality, of the motivations of the intervention and the effects for the missed realisation; verification of the technical-economic feasibility; economic analysis costs – benefits; formulation of the technical standards; individualisation of the technical and economic parameters for the comparison of the alternatives;

The objectives of this phase can be reasserted in the identification of the purposes and of planning characteristics of the intervention, and of the different possible alternatives related to the location.
Environmental picture

Construction of the environmental scenery: individualisation of the environmental components involved in the project; definition for every components aforesaid of the criterions and of the parameters from to assign to the functionalities and the objectives; individualisation of the micro-areas; definition of the macro-areas for every component individualised; definition of the sensibility of the macros areas and of the relative risk of alteration related to the plan;

Projectual picture

It will be necessary to individualise the actions of project and to correlate them with the phases of construction and the constructive typologies that produce them through the technical analysis of the intervention. This last is particularly important for the definition of the effects on the environment, there are certain impacts and potential impacts: the first are function of the environmental parameter that individualises it, the character of criticity already expresses enough information to quantify the impact because inside the definition of criticity stays defined the level of preclusion or incompatibility to the use of the area for other purposes; the second it is reported to areas of territory rather ample and from the point of view of the environmental characteristics it is object of aggregations that express its propensity to the risk. The impact can be quantified through a matrix of correlation between the degree of propensity to the risk and the generating typologies of actions foreseen by the intervention. The final choice could be realised or with logical and deductive criterions using descriptive systems of the considerations effected on the different problem list that determine it, or with decisional procedures more technical than can give rather rigid results and therefore not suited for the negotiation.

The hypothesis of zero degree

This way of progress allows to include besides, as case limit of the equilibrium between optimisation and satisfaction, the hypothesis of not intervention, meant not only from the protectionist or conservative point of view, but as a real solution of better equilibrium between the considered factors. The procedure will be able to guarantee this choice in the measure in which the presuppositions of capacity of run the whole process through again will be respected (transparency).
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1 Introduction

The growing need for regional governance for cities and their surrounding areas has been discussed for some time (ARL 1998; ARL 1999; JÄHNKE 2000). Extensive urbanization, increasing traffic density and other ecological problems are classic challenges cities and their surrounding areas face. Economic globalization and a regionalization through the transformation of “fordist” into “postfordist” production systems additionally generate a growing dependence of urban areas on economic decisions with great spatial impacts. Due to the „re-emergence of regional economies“ (SABEL 1989), it is less the single town or community that is the focus of entrepreneurial decisions but the region. Last but not least, European integration has further contributed to the need for cooperation and new forms of governance.

Regional cooperation or governance, however, is readily demanded, but often only hesitantly practiced. The reason is that regional cooperation is costly. Individual costs in form of time, personnel, money and especially restrictions in the scope of autonomous decision-making are often regarded as higher than the expected future and rather diffuse common gains of cooperation (SCHARPF; BENZ 1991). Thus, even if all regional partners will gain from cooperation, the willingness to cooperate cannot automatically be expected. Even if they engage in cooperation, they also favor decisions, which maximize their individual advantages. To overcome this “negotiator’s dilemma” (LAX; SEBENIUS 1986), the actors have to adopt cooperative strategies and evaluate issues not only from a local point of view but also from a regional perspective. Therefore, the approach to organize regional governance across local borders by setting up regional institutions often fails. A common regional identity cannot be taken for granted but has to emerge out of a long-term and costly process of cooperation. This is even more the case when it comes to cooperation between a city and its surrounding area, a relationship that is often characterized by severe conflict of interests, by supposedly one-sided need for cooperation and mutual distrust. Since the restraint of local selfish action orientation for the benefit of a cooperative regional development can hardly be enforced against the resistance of the local actors involved, a trend towards softer forms of regional governance and the organization of learning processes can be observed.

\(^1\) Regionale Entwicklungskonzepte (REK)
One important approach to stimulate this cooperation are Regional Development Concepts (RDC) (ARL 1997; HENZER/VOELZKOW 1996; DANIELZYK; LILIENBECKER-HECHT; PRIEBS 1998). These regional Development Concepts normally consist of two sections: A first part analyzes the problems, potentials, and future objectives of the respective region. It consists of a regional corporate identity (Leitbild), featuring the basic and commonly shared “development philosophy”, and an “orientation-frame” presenting specific, sectorally and - if necessary - spatially differentiated and substantiated development goals and objectives (STÖHNER/WERNER 1991). The main function of this section of the RDC (for the sake of simplicity it will from now on be called “orientation-frame”) lies in creating a common regional identity, developing a regional “common knowledge” and detecting “isles of consent” within the region to enhance regional capacity and willingness to cooperate. Thus, it does not create a legally binding frame for regional cooperation, but rather relies on the development of voluntary self-commitment of the actors involved. Once the orientation frame is completed, work on the second part of the RDC starts, often called “action-frame”. Ideally, in this phase of the cooperation process the regional actors are able to agree on a number of spatially relevant activities and projects. The function of the action-frame is therefore to develop a limited list of projects to be realized and financed in regional cooperation.

All in all, the value of Regional Development Concepts lies not so much in realizing substantial policies. More important is their alleged usefulness in terms of making regional actors realize the value of cooperation independently of the specific content of decisions (BENZ 1994: 110). Thus, RDC are supposed to kill two birds with one stone: hopes are that with the elaboration of the concepts a regional identity will emerge and that on that basis lasting cooperation will develop, allowing the supporting organizational structures (usually a coordinating committee or regional conference aided by sectoral workgroups) to be gradually transformed into more stable institutions of regional governance.

2 Experiences with Regional Development Concepts in the regions of Bremen/ Lower Saxony and Magdeburg

I would like to draw attention to some of the experiences the Regions of Bremen/Lower Saxony and Magdeburg in Saxe-Anhalt made with these forms of regional governance.

The example of Bremen/Lower Saxony

Cooperative Regional planning in Bremen/Lower Saxony goes way back in time. The Common Planning Agency Bremen/Lower Saxony (Gemeinsame Landesplanung Bremen/Niedersachsen, GLP) had already been created as early as 1963 by the two Länder. Until the beginning of the 80ties cooperation within the region worked fairly well on that basis. Then, however, it became apparent that the Länder played a too dominant role in the development process. Due to conflicts between the conservative Government in Lower Saxony and the Social Democrats in Bremen, the regional cooperation process was put on hold for several years.

Only in 1990, under the new coalition government formed by Social Democrats and The Greens under GERHARD SCHRÖDER that had come into office in Lower Saxony, cooperation between the two Länder could be revived. An expert report suggested the elaboration of a Regional Development Concept as a first step and the setting up of a regional association (Regionalverband) of Bremen

2 The following is based on my Master Thesis on „Cooperation in the Region Bremen/ Lower Saxony — The Contribution of the Regional Development Concept“ and my contribution for an expertise on the process of regionalization of structural policies in Saxe-Anhalt, Germany (conducted by ARTHUR BENZ and DIETRICH FürST).
and its surrounding counties and municipalities in the second step to secure a legally binding and long term form of regional governance (Fürst; Müller; Schefold 1994). However, times had changed by now. Bremen had undergone serious changes in its economic structure and suffered from economic crisis. The surrounding counties, on the other hand, had prospered and profited from sub-urbanization processes at the expense of Bremen. Thus, now the need for cooperation seemed to be very much one sided. In addition to already existing conflicts of interest, rather clumsy regional diplomacy on the side of Bremen had caused the counties to develop a feeling of deep distrust towards the large city. An institutional solution (e.g. a Regionalverband) was therefore out of the question. The regional actors could only agree on setting up a Regional Development Concept. Although the RDC presented a very soft form of cooperation, the surrounding counties could only be motivated to participate by the promise that the RDC would not be legally binding and thus undermine their planning competencies, but that on the other hand the projects from the RDC would be financed preferentially by Lower Saxony.

As regards the organizational structure, a steering committee and several sectoral work groups consisting of Länder and county representatives were set up in addition to a planning council and a regional consortium. Furthermore, an external research institute was charged with the mediation of the process (Baumheier 1997).

Regional Conference Magdeburg

In the Region of Magdeburg classic sub-urbanization problems soon emerged after the German reunification. Around Magdeburg a belt of attractive residential estates, commercial areas and industrial sites emerged, a development the city could not keep up with. As in Bremen, the surrounding counties and municipalities were skeptical towards cooperation with the city, because they feared - not without reason - that the city might try to expand its boundaries, but also because inapt regional diplomacy had created tensions and distrust. While Magdeburg criticized the egocentric unwillingness of the counties to cooperate, the counties in their turn reproached the city for not fulfilling its role in the region for not developing a regional identity.

Although first rather informal steps were taken from 1992 on, regional cooperation could not be accomplished until the local government reform in Saxe-Anhalt had been completed. As in Bremen, it had ultimately been the Land government that triggered regional cooperation. Its policy of a “regionalization of structural policies” was based on initiating regional governance through the elaboration of Regional Development Concepts. At the same time the Land government also relied on financial incentives. Although the setting up of RDC was voluntary, the promise – or threat – to finance RDC-projects preferentially had been decisive.

The Regional Conference of the Magdeburg Region (RKM) was set up in 1994. It consisted of a steering group, a coordinating committee and several sectoral workgroups. While the steering group comprised political actors of the city and the counties, the coordination committee consisted of the heads of the workgroups and representatives of the land government. As in Bremen, the RKM engaged an external consultant agency to mediate the process and provide expertise.

3 Problems connected with the RDC approach

There are obvious differences between the two cities. The most important difference is that Bremen is a city-state. Cooperation not only has to cross Land-borders, furthermore Bremen as a city-state cannot rely on a Länder level to provide additional funds to finance regional cooperation. In addition, its autonomy as a Land had been questioned for a long time, due to its disastrous financial situation. This puts Bremen in an ambivalent and delicate situation. On one hand, the city depends
on a cooperation with the surrounding counties "to create a degree of integration that will render the discussion on restructuring the Länder obsolete" (Wedermeyer 1991: 10, transl. K.A.), on the other hand, fears are that too visible a dependence on cooperation will weaken its position by signaling its incapacity of acting autonomously.

Still, despite their differences, Bremen and Magdeburg share a lot of problems. Both cities underwent serious changes in their economic structure and suffer from economic crisis, while the surrounding areas prosper, or in the example of Magdeburg, are at least a lot better off than the city. Thus, the need for cooperation not only seems to be mainly one-sided, both cities also lack the financial means to generously finance regional cooperation and thus keep the surrounding area motivated. In addition, rather clumsy regional diplomacy on the side of the cities has led to deeply rooted mutual distrust in both regions.

It would lead too far to recall the whole cooperation processes in Bremen and Magdeburg. I would rather like to point out some of the basic problems connected with the Regional Development Concept approach in both regions that can - in tendency - be generalized.

The main problem of regional development concepts is that they induce regional actors to concentrate much time and resources on the rather short term process of setting up the Concept. For the actors involved this had been connected with a considerable work load. On the administrative level, the workgroups in both regions met on a monthly or even more frequent basis, as did the political actors in the steering groups. Regional conferences were held to inform a broader regional public. Additional mail surveys had been organized by the external mediators in both regions to enable the smaller municipalities to become involved in the process. This approach, however, led actors to regard the goal as accomplished and the task as completed once the RDC were written and published. Instead of a starting point for regional cooperation the glossy RDC brochures were seen as its endpoint or result. Attention in both regions was soon refocused on local problems and the process of regional cooperation began to stagnate.

This main problem is partly induced, partly accompanied by related problems. Regional cooperation processes often depend on development agencies or consultants to mediate the process and provide expert advice. The problem is, and experience in both regions clearly illustrates this, that external mediators often not only mediate the processes but play or are asked to play too dominant a role. One reason is that externally initiated regional cooperation may lead to an insufficient motivation and an unassertively assumed responsibility for the cooperation by the regional actors. The RDC is seen as a technical instrument, rather that as an instrument for cooperative "self-steering" (Selbststeuerung) and mobilization of endogenous regional potentials. A second and more important reason is a dilemma inherent in the process. RDC rely on intensive deliberation processes between the regional actors that are time consuming and costly. At the same time, result are expected in due time, exactly because the process is time consuming and costly and thus has to be justified by an acceptable outcome. Both reasons often induce actors to implicitly or explicitly handing over the elaboration process to the external mediators.

In Magdeburg, the regional actors relied on the external expertise from the beginning and charged the external mediator with the elaboration of the concept. The coordinating committee as well as the workgroups acted as the support structure accompanying the process. Support for the process, however, was very diverse. While some of the actors, especially on the administrative level, were very motivated and actively participated in the formulation of the RDC, many of the political actors seemed to have developed something of an "let's get this thing over with" attitude.

In Bremen the regional and local actors had at first been highly motivated to be engaged in the process. This had been especially due to the fact that the counties were not willing to lose any
influence on the RDC. Regional problems, strengths and weaknesses were therefore intensively discussed in the sectoral workgroups. As it became increasingly clear, however, that the workgroups would not be able to produce results in due time, the strategy was changed, too. Instead of setting up the concept in regional deliberation, the external mediator was asked to formulate the regional development concept. Once the orientation frame had been elaborated by the external consultant, it was deliberated ex-post by the workgroups and the steering group and then presented to the regional public.

As both mediators possess extensive expertise and know-how, the regional development concepts for the regions of Bremen and Magdeburg are - as far as I can judge - thorough and good descriptions of the respective regions' potentials and future tasks. The problem is, however, that they had not been elaborated by the regional actors themselves. As a result, the concepts represented expert reports, rather than an integrative regional consensus that regional actors identified with. Thus, a regional identity and an awareness of common regional problems and potential solutions could not or only to a limited extent be developed in both regions. As a second and maybe possibly even more important consequence the regional actors did not develop their own conflict-solving mechanisms during the process, as the external mediators managed all regional conflicts during the elaboration of the concepts.

Both of these shortcomings had a direct impact on the setting up of the second part of the RDC, the action-frame. Due to the lack of identification with the concept, most actors in both regions were much more concerned with getting their own local and (sometimes "bottom drawer") projects on the respective lists of the action-frame than with identifying and implementing regional projects. Due to the lack of conflict-solving mechanisms, it became impossible to restrict the action-frame to a small number of projects - as initially intended. In the region of Bremen/Lower Saxony for example, the only "rule of the game" the region could agree on was that the share of projects in the action-frame should be evenly distributed between Bremen and the surrounding counties. Therefore, the action-frame finally covered a wide range of over 230 projects that were mainly local and mostly bilateral in character. In Magdeburg, the problem had been solved by completely handing over the process of selecting the projects to the external mediator. The local actors submitted their project proposals that were evaluated and selected by the consultant. Here regional actors even developed something of a consumer's attitude, criticizing that the external moderator had not developed regional cooperative projects himself.

A third problem had been the non-binding character of the concepts. In both regions the cooperation process met serious obstacles due to conflicting interests and deeply rooted distrust. The process therefore aimed at developing mutual voluntary commitment instead of reaching binding decisions. If regional awareness is not or only insufficiently developed through the process, however, and salience of the cooperative goals declines once the concepts have been set up, the non-binding character of the concepts becomes problematic. As far as the concrete implementation is concerned, about half of the 230 projects from the action-frame in Bremen/Lower Saxony have been realized. A closer look, however, reveals that there are only a few truly cooperative projects between Bremen and surrounding counties among them. Pressing distributive problems as a common structural policy including measures for allocating commercial space and industrial areas could not be solved. Many of the cooperative projects that were implemented are projects planned and realized bi- or trilaterally between counties or local municipalities in Lower Saxony. On the local level in Lower Saxony, however, cooperation had already worked fairly well before the RDC process had been launched. Thus, at a regional conference on "Five Years of Cooperative Planning in the Region of Bremen/Lower Saxony: Accomplishments and Future Aspirations", there was - still - much talk of future aspirations and objectives - that is on "what could be done and how it could be done"
but only very little was said about goals that had already been reached - or "what has been done so far".

In Magdeburg, the action-frame set up by the external consultant consisted of 26 project proposals. While this approach could guarantee a concentration on a few regionally important projects, it soon became clear that the region lacked the necessary conflict-solving mechanisms for the implementation of the projects. Although the action-frame had been approved of by the "steering group", the projects selected for implementation were either projects in the context of tasks legally assigned to the counties like the development of a waste disposal concept or projects that had already been started before the RDC process as the foundation of a trade fair association by Magdeburg. A proposed project for reducing conflicts in the domain of commercial area development (Vorhaben zur Minderung von Konflikten bei der Gewerbeflächenentwicklung), however, could not be agreed on (Wegener 2000).

The last problem to be mentioned here is that the concepts are not binding for the Länder governments either. The willingness to engage in regional cooperation especially on the part of the surrounding counties often has to be bought with promises of financial gratification that is the promise to finance projects from the action-frame preferentially. Länder governments, however, often are not willing to restrict their own scope of autonomous decision-making in the area of subsidies after all. In addition, a lack of inter-ministerial coordination on the Länder level hampers an integrated subsidies policy approach with the effect that the inter-sectoral coordination function of the RDC is not met at the Land level. Insufficient gratification will then lead to frustrations and further stagnation of the cooperation process. This had especially been the case in the region of Magdeburg. In the region of Bremen/Lower Saxony this problem could partly be overcome by reviving a regional fund financed by the Länder level.

4 Conclusion

To summarize, in both regions the cooperation process via the RDC did indeed further communication in the regions, especially on the administrative level. Although the regions did not develop something of a regional identity, intensified communication and information led to a better understanding of individual and commonly shared problems. It also led to a certain stabilization of the regional cooperation process. Even if concrete outcomes are scarce, the RDC process at least resulted in a general commitment of the regional actors to pursue the cooperation process. Although the cooperation is still voluntary and not based on legally binding decisions, a credible exit-option seems to be no longer given. Even if a lasting institutional solution could not (and probably will not in the near future) be agreed on, at least some form of institutional stabilization had been accomplished by setting up, in addition to the existing structures, permanent regional offices in both regions to coordinate activities.

Still, the most urgent problems within the two regions have not been solved or even approached yet. From my point of view, the problem of RDC is that they try to do too much and not enough at the same time. With respect to their contents, they cover to vast an area by trying to aim at regional development and cooperation in all its aspects from environmental policies to economic development, thus often remaining diffuse and unspecific. On the other hand, their non-binding character makes it too easy for all actors involved to evade any obligation imposed by the concepts. Maybe a more effective way of initiating regional cooperation or governance would lie in establishing more sectoral forms of cooperation. As the well established and functioning example of the common public transportation association (ZVBN/VBN) in Bremen and Lower Saxony shows, complementary sectoral interests might be more easily detected and individual costs and benefits for the coop-
erating partners can be calculated in more detail. As Dian Schefold argued in a lecture given at the University of Bremen earlier this year, RDC include useful suggestions, but suggestions are not decisions and they are especially not decisions entailing negative effects. Suggestions do not force actors to commit themselves.
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1 Introduction

The concept of regional governance refers to a new role of the public sector in processes of regional development: It means the co-ordination of decision-making by institutions of the public sector in an environment of market and hierarchical regulation systems. The concept aims at more efficient development processes and at increasing a region’s capacity in problem-solving. Another key issue of regional governance is sustainable development. The integration of processes in public planning and the economic sector along with the behaviour of public households are intended to safeguard a long-term stability of development.

The regional governance idea has brought with itself a new perspective on the way how regions stabilize or strengthen their innovative capacity, as they find themselves in a world-wide competition as business locations. In contrast to the traditional view, where technological and management innovation were the job of the private enterprises, whereas the public sector was in charge of the educational infrastructure and of unguided basic research, regions are nowadays more and more being seen as systems of innovation, laying emphasis on the interaction between the public and private sector - their research and educational efforts ideally following common strategies -, and of an increasing number of strategic co-operations within the private sector.

The number of scientific publications following the theories of „industrial districts“ or „regional production clusters“ and trying to explain economic development by region-based systems of specialisation, mutual exchange and public promotion, can hardly be overlooked. Many regions have been described to be more successful in their economic development because their functional interdependencies are stronger and their innovative networks are better woven than in other regions. However, it is questionable if the good performance of these regions can be reproduced in less successful places by simply imitating them. Following Putnam’s (1993) thesis, many scientists say that the interaction systems of those regions cannot be transferred elsewhere because of their historically grown complexity. However, another school following Saxenian (1994) relates innovative success more to the functional disintegration and management style of enterprises, laying emphasis on the social competence of stakeholders, and on flexible support by the public sector.
Both schools have in common that they emphasise the importance of a relative autonomy of the actors, and of the social character of relationships. Public-private relations are defined as a governance concept, with the public sector's role being more that of a network-builder and animator than that of a supplier of "hard" infrastructure.

The regional level, however, is not by nature the level that is most suitable to co-ordinate research and development activities and their implementation. Most enterprises, even those of smaller and medium size, are today oriented to the world market, for the sale of their products as well as for acquiring research and development services. Empirical studies show that enterprises with a relatively high share of research and development staff have more external contacts and therefore have a better economical performance. But their networks are not necessarily organised on a regional level (Sternberg 1998). Further, a great deal of the public research usually is financed and organised on the national level\(^1\). Thus, the promotion of innovation on a regional level should not only be seen as a problem of horizontal, but also of vertical co-ordination.

Following Piore's and Sabel's (1984) theory of the growing importance of the region for economic development in a globalised economy characterised by flexible specialisation, many regions have started activities to promote and improve their education and innovation systems. Their activities are often marked by the keyword "network", that serves as a metaphor for the desired cross-sector orientation and flexibility. The idea is that bringing together decision-makers from science-centres, economy, politics and public administration is expected to result in better co-ordinated activities and, thus, in more innovation.

However, it has to be kept in mind that those who make the crucial decisions usually are not those who also produce the innovation itself. In innovation networks, emphasis should not only be laid to the horizontal co-ordination on the top-level of decision-making, but also to vertical integration of the networks and horizontal linkages between sectors on lower levels of influence. The following case study from the Hanover region, which has been part of a major research project on regional actor networks (Schubert et al., 2001), will illustrate this.

2 Economical Dynamics and Innovation in the Hanover Region

The metropolitan region of Hanover is situated in the north of Germany, at the crossing point of some of Europe's most important railway and motorway connections. The City of Hanover is the capital of the "Land" of Lower Saxony. Evaluating potentials like centrality, physical and scientific infrastructure, experts have considered the Hanover region as one of the best business locations in Europe, but, compared to other metropolitan regions in Germany, its economic performance is only average (Empirica 1993).

Several aspects are put forward to explain this discrepancy. One of them is said to be the mentality of the Hanoverians. With Hanover having been an administrative centre for centuries, but having lost the status as the capital of a kingdom in the 19th century and being integrated into the Prussian state, the Hanoverians are often characterised as obedient, unwilling to take risks and little self-confident. Despite its vivid cultural life and rich cultural and natural heritage, the Hanover region has in other parts of Germany the image of being dull and provincial. Economically, Hanover had been characterised in the past by its strong industries, such as the production of cars and railway vehicles, arms, building machines, chemical products and food. Due to dramatic structural

\(^{1}\) Examples from Germany are the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), a nationwide research financing pool of the German universities, and the big research societies (e.g. Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Helmholtz-Gesellschaft, Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft) that are financed by the federal government.
change in the second half of the 20th century, the industrial sector has lost much of its importance for regional economy. The present situation is characterised by the absence of a “leading sector” in the regional economy. There are still several big industrial plants, but these are controlled by headquarters from outside the region.

To sum it up, the Hanover region faces several challenges to create successful and sustainable economical structures. These are:

- to co-ordinate regional resources,
- to promote the exchange of information, especially between business and public Research and Development institutions,
- to bring together politics and economy,
- to promote small and medium enterprises,
- to shape a positive image both within and outside of the region by regional marketing.

Due to a rapidly growing consciousness about these problems and about the need for co-operation on a regional level, many initiatives have been established by both the public and the private sector. A leading role is played by the Greater Hanover Association, the KGH\(^2\), and its daughter company, the Technologiezentrum Hannover (TCH) Ltd., an agency for the promotion of new technologies and start-up enterprises.

3 The Future Factory for Communications

A very interesting initiative from the region with a most innovative approach is the “Zukunftsfabrik Kommunikation” ("Future Factory for Communications")\(^3\). It was established in the mid 1990’s, after the Norddeutsche Landesbank (NordLB), the investment bank of several "Länder" from northern Germany had made a study on the potentials of information and communications business in the region (Nord/LB 1996). The study had been ordered by the KGH and had been given the strong assistance of the TCH Ltd., that also manages the regional internet homepage (http://www.hannover.de). The study found out that considerable potentials for the development of multimedia solutions could be found in research facilities and small and medium enterprises in the region. It proposed a network-style structure of promoting multimedia business: Public and private actors should co-operate in several workgroups to intensify the dialogue between public and private sector, and to initiate new projects. The workgroups should be co-ordinated by a committee that consisted of TCH, KGH and NordLB executives.

The idea found the support of the KGH and several important politicians of the region. Financial grants by the KGH and the sponsorship of the NordLB and several other enterprises from the region made it possible to establish an office for the Zukunftsfabrik at the TCH Ltd., to create six workgroups, to organise public events and to give out prizes for the most innovative young enterprises in the multimedia sector.

The performance of the Zukunftsfabrik as a network and its internal communication and decision-making structures were studied by a research team as part of an overall survey on the networks between stakeholders in the Hanover Region (Schubert et al., 2001, 149ff.). This study enabled to

---

\(^2\) There will be a considerable change in the administrative structure of the Hanover region in autumn 2001: The KGH (Komunalverband Großraum Hannover) will be fusioned with the Hanover County to the Hanover region. The City of Hanover, presently a county on its own, will be integrated into the Region, keeping some special competencies for itself.

\(^3\) Internet address: http://www.zukunftsfabrik.hannover.de
interpret the results of qualitative interviews with Zukunftsfabrik actors against the background of an overall analysis of the network of contacts and mutual interdependencies of the 179 most influential people in the region, following the methodology of Social Network Analysis (Scott 1991; Wasserman and Faust, 1994). Most of the contents of this paper are based on the results of this study and its empirical data.

The research showed that the Zukunftsfabrik had been quite successful in several fields: The very well organised events with interesting lectures followed by informal meetings had become widely accepted as information platforms for the public research institutions and promotion agencies as well as for a great number of small and medium enterprises. Their identification with the region and their knowledge about its potentials could be increased remarkably. The world-wide leading position of regional research institutes and companies from the region in some fields of multimedia technology were illustrated effectively. Several new projects, e.g. in the medical sector or in education, were established. On the other hand, some problems could be identified:

- The different workgroups showed quite different ways of managing themselves. This can mainly be contributed to the different professional backgrounds the participants came from. Two of the groups were led by NordLB executives who had also taken part at the initial study. Whereas the workgroups functioned relatively well independent from their style of self-management, there were problems with the central co-ordination. As the central office had to find common criteria and concrete projects to legitimise its work against the KGH's and the sponsors' financial efforts, some conflicts arose with workgroups that concentrated more on networking and mutual learning than on concrete results.

- Some of the workgroups were paralleled by other initiatives in the region, so that many discussions and activities took place twice and resources were not bundled with the highest possible efficiency. Especially striking was the fact that some actors in very central and influential positions took part in several parallel initiatives, did not know the details of any initiative and thus were not able to co-ordinate their activities.

4 The influence level problem

Analysing the socio-political structure of the initiative it was found that the actors of the initiative could be divided into three subgroups relating to their political power and influence, who had quite specific social environments:

- On the lowest level of influence there were the experts who participated in a workgroup and had been recruited by the chairman or -woman of the respective workgroup. Their interests usually related to only one subject and therefore to only one of the workgroups. They had small personal networks and took little effort to expand them. Their commitment to a workgroup usually based on personal relationships with the chairman or -woman. From this circle, considerable work was done to fill the work of the Zukunftsfabrik with contents.

- A group of people with medium influence formed the driving force of the initiative. These, mostly the chairmen and -women of the workgroups and some executives from the supporting institutions, where characterized by career ambitions, widespread interests for issues from different subjects, and by a high and somewhat idealistic commitment to the regions. Some of them held important functions in political parties. They were interested in new forms of management and maintained extensive personal networks, having good contacts both to specific experts and to some of the most influential stakeholders in the region. They developed the idea of the project, designed its structure and took over central management tasks.
The last group consisted of a very small number of administrative and political stakeholders with very high influence. They had little knowledge about the contents that were dealt with in the Zukunftsfabrik, but the project could not do without them, having to find political support for the project and thus having a guarantee for its financial basis. Their system of contacts referred mostly to other actors with very high influence. There were few direct contacts to specific experts, and they mainly used their political party backgrounds to find indirect access to them.

Some of the problems of the initiative can be contributed to this division of the Zukunftsfabrik’s into subgroups with specific social environments: Whereas the managers on the medium level of influence showed a lot of creativity, flexibility, commitment and management skills, they did not have the influence to convince all of the actors in the information and communication technology sector to follow their ideas and organisational structure and not to initiate projects on their own. The different members of this subgroup also preferred different management styles, which led to some conflicts. There wasn’t any instance of higher influence that could implement a solution of these problems on them. On the other hand, the top-level stakeholders from the region partly failed to approach the information and communication technology issue systematically and to co-ordinate the activities taking place in the region. Being generalists in their positions, they were not able to understand completely the sometimes very specific contents of the projects and to initiate adequate strategies from the top.

Nevertheless, it has to be pointed out that the Zukunftsfabrik has made a very valuable contribution to regional development by promoting the multimedia business in the regions, initiating a region wide discussion on the issue, creating networks between small and medium enterprises and helping to give the region a more progressive image. The above criticism refers to improving the already good performance of the project.

5 Conclusions

Drawing conclusions from the aspect of regional governance, it can be stated that a region’s economic performance is the result of a more or less co-ordinated set of strategies of different institutions. Co-ordination does not only take place on a strategic level between a region’s leading stakeholders. Strategies have to be filled with contents, so special emphasis has to be laid on the role of experts and their network connections to the region’s leading people. Regional governance can be negatively affected by the gap in the regional interaction system between medium-influence managers and high-influence stakeholders. But there seems to be a group of “gate-keepers”: people with multiple interests, creativity and good contacts to experts as well as access to those who have the power. Their role seems to be crucial for regional development. So they should be identified and integrated into regional networks and other governance structures.

The management of regional networks requires awareness of the specific regulation structures of networks: the complexity of network regulation structures, the role of social capital (Lin 2001), the redundancy of network relationships (Grabher 1994) and the dialectic relationship between networks and institutions (Benz 1995). Creativity, positive thinking and self-reflection seem to be crucial elements of network management.

In the case of the Hanover region, it is important that the region overcomes its traditional corporatist regulation scheme towards a more network-shaped structure with the region as focus for identification and integration. Pointing out the good aspects the region’s geographical, economical and political structures is an essential need, because it is the positive expectations that make actors getting involved into networks.
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Co-operation in Haram municipality – the Haram model

The communicative and co-operative process

Haram municipality, which is located on the periphery of the labour marked of Ålesund in the north-western region of Norway, has a population of 8700 inhabitants. Haram municipality is one of the most important manufacturing municipalities in the north-west region. Almost 40 percent of the labour force works in manufacturing industries. As in other parts of the region, the self-developed manufacturing industry operates in the fields of fisheries, shipbuilding and furniture. Production and development activities are recognized as advanced technically and are competing successfully on the world marked. The knowledge and flexible specialization of enterprises in the municipality has lead to a situation where most of the larger factories have been bought by companies, from the region or nationally, during the 1980s and 1990s.

During the entrepreneurial period where these enterprises were established, local entrepreneurs that were active in local politics and other local activities owned them. New ownership from outside the municipality and a focus on internal structures lead to a low level of co-operation between these companies and the local community in the 1980s. This was a new situation that is essential to understand in relation to the co-operative process late in the 1990s. The communicative and co-operative process can be described in these stages (see TANGEN 1999a, 1999b, AMDAM 2000):

1) Introduction of new knowledge

In the beginning of the 1990s strategic planning based on Michael E. Porters theories (PORTER 1990) was introduced in branch companies in Haram. Haram municipality took the initiative in establishing an arena between business leaders in Haram and local political and administrative leaders (the Haram Industry Organisation). This was the first time that many of these local leaders had met each others in a discussion related to local development. They recognized that the municipality had a dynamic and expanding manufacturing industry, but also that the local community had not been able to use this in its own strategic planning and development.

2) Crises – new understanding

In 1995 the labour market situation changed into a positive crisis with regard to the recruitment of skilled workers. Each enterprise tried a number of strategies to recruit skilled workers locally but without success. A local study showed a need for more than 200 skilled workers. At the same time the unemployment rate was under 3 % in the municipality and labour region. It was not possible to recruit the necessary workers locally. A study showed that only 25 % of those who had out-migrated from the municipality were motivated to move back and that the municipality was not recognized as a suitable place to move to and live in for unemployed skilled workers living in other regions in Norway. This situation presents both municipality and the local industry with tough challenges:

- Future growth - including economic growth - depends on people establishing themselves in the municipality.
- The industry winners of the future will be those with access to the necessary human resources and competence.
3) **New strategy and actio.**

In co-operation between enterprises, Haram municipality and the job center, a new recruitment strategy was developed. A national consultant company was engaged to plan and implement a national recruitment strategy involving the national press. This strategy was very successful and set the focus on the remarkable situation in Haram municipality on national television, in newspapers nationwide etc. From all over the country more than 2000 skilled workers applied for work and the short-term crisis was solved.

4) **Experience, learning and new confidence**

Through these actions local leaders learned that co-operation was very efficient and had created a win-win situation of high benefits for all involved. But a new crisis evolved related to the lack of housing and the quality of the local infrastructure and services. To ensure a more permanent development and recruitment of workers the total local community had to be engaged in a local development process.

5) **Development of new long-term visions and strategies**

The success of the implemented strategy and actions gave new confidence in the idea of co-operative planning. A new planning process started whose main goal was to "put Haram on the national map" (which also was the name of the joint effort). A common vision was formulated – to develop Haram to be the most important maritime-related manufacturing municipality in Norway and one of the best municipality in Norway in which to live. The strategic plan for Haram municipality 1999-2010 is based on the vision from the Haram model.

To fulfil the vision they developed three main strategies:

1) **Development of competence and skills**

A strong co-operation was developed between the local State schools, enterprises and the municipality with a view to motivating students to apply for manufacturing related education, higher quality in education and the training of workers and the introduction of new technology. Children, teachers and parents are introduced to modern advanced manufacturing activities by the enterprises themselves. Partnerships were established with the major national Telecommunication Company (Telenor) and the national branch of IBM. The municipality is today connected to the high-speed telecommunication network in Norway and IBM is setting up an experimental computer network, which integrates enterprises, schools, public institutions and private homes - giving all of them high-speed access to the Internet.

The municipalities participation in the project originated from the idea of the total economy in the municipality. Neither could one focus solely on industry growth, nor could one focus solely on the municipality economy. They became motivated to develop the society as a whole, in accordance with the development of the municipality and local industry.

The local industry have concluded that there will be a shift towards more advanced production of components among their main products. This creates a need for another kind of competence, a competence on average a higher level than that of today. Furthermore, a global division of work task is forecasted where production which require less competence will be located in countries where labour costs are lower. Through there business policy development the local industry has concluded that they need more focus on the development of competence.

The common factor was defined to be the development of competence and knowledge. Another interested party was revealed: the school in Haram. Within specific parts of the competence chal-
lengae they found clear overlapping fields. A third overlapping circle entered the arena. As a result, rather than focus on the interface between municipality and local industry there was a shift toward this third party to solve the competence challenge. In this process the model was beginning shape itself. At this point they had three strong entities with common interests or interface on one topic: the development of competence. The intentions of the model is to develop synergies through tying municipality, industry and school together.

Another motivating element has been the focus on Information Technology in the school. Both school and industry found common interests through focus on Information Technology. The huge challenges created by the lack of funds in the educational system and the goals of the same system in the latest (national) reforms revealed grounds for common interest. The local industry saw the possibility to work together - interact - with their target group which was youth in Haram school, by the means of Information Technology. At the same time the school was in a position with limited resources to invest in technology. They had a win/win situation which also was of great interest to the municipality. The municipality had initiated thoughts of the virtual municipality; extended services to its population based on Information Technology.

2) Development of private business

Not only manufacturing industries but all kind of private business activities needed by a modern community to supply goods and services and to give inhabitants access to demanding jobs in accordance with their education.

3) Development of the municipality and local communities

Development of the municipality and local communities both related to infrastructure such as houses, roads etc. but also the development of social and cultural activities suitable for all groups of inhabitants. Such activities can create stronger local identity and confidence that the municipality and the local community have a good and prosperous future.

These strategies have now been planned and implemented in detail involving more than 150 inhabitants in various activities.

The Haram-model and partnerships

When describing the development work in Haram one will, for obvious reasons, describe general partnership models. Or to be more precise, the development process which the participants have been through up until today. In short, one could say that there has been co-operation or partnership among entities representing different parts of society. The motivating factor for this co-operation is described earlier. It is of great interest to note that the outcome of this co-operation is that the relations or the bonds between the participants have evolved in a manner that one has achieved lasting partnerships and a common understanding that it is in the interest of all parties involved to commit themselves to work closely with one another and co-operate.

The Haram-model as continuous development

The Haram-model is an effort to improve and advance the local community by tying important players in that community together to participate in a task that none of the players bears responsibility for. The steering committee has expressed that they want to focus on Haram as a community at present and in the future. Representatives from the private sector in the steering committee have expressed that with the ambition of being the leading maritime industrial municipality it is critical to work with the challenges regarding framework for the establishment of industry and increasing
the level of competence on a higher level. The challenges have to be met by the way of the Haram-model, regardless of business cycles and need for workers.

**Involvement of the civilian society**

When involving the civilian society one affronts certain challenges (Friedmann 1992). In this case one can divide the Haram society into four groups or spheres. These parts tie into each other. Specifically, in this model the Haram society will consist of the following spheres: Public administration ("State"), Political Community, Corporate Economy, and the Civilian society. This model illustrates that there is overlapping among the various steering groups in society, and that there is a harmonious combination of forces between life space (territory) and the global economic space.

**Outcomes of the Haram-model**

The most important outcomes of the Haram-model is that it has tied bonds between public administration (municipality and school), public elected officials, and the private sector. This is the result of the desire to make lasting changes in Haram. These partnerships have yet to find their final form, but through dialog and creating relations the foundation on which a common understanding of future development and the problems ahead has been found. The mobilization processes and the strong co-operation that has been developed between the local schools, enterprises and the municipality can be viewed as a positive result in itself and the Haram case can be an example that local confidence building and co-operation can strengthen local communities and have a positive influence on local development.

In the period ahead the focus will be on informing and involving the civilian society, that is, the inhabitants of Haram who have not been active in the Haram model. In this phase, the Haram model will be based on active participation through mobilizing and voluntary work. The condition for a successful mobilization is increased involvement of committed participants who can achieve the goals set out in the project. Of great importance will be the attitude of Harms youth towards their own local community and their future choices with regards to education, occupation and settling.

**The Haram model**

*Vision*

- Haram is to be the leading maritime industrial municipality in Norway. It shall be known by its focus on quality of life, and at any time be among the best municipalities to live in.

*Main goals*

- Within year 2000 change from being a municipality of net emigration to become a municipality with net immigration in the age group 20-49.
- The industry shall have access to necessary human resources and competence.
- The school in Haram shall have the best Information Technology education in Europe.

*Target groups*

- The municipalities own population.
- Youth who chooses education or moves away in order to study.
People from Haram who have moved outside the municipality/region, especially families with small children.

Pupils, students or other persons who have the competence that the industry in Haram needs.

**Strategy**

- Strategy for development of competence: Through tight cooperation between industry and school give the industry access to the necessary human resources and competence.
- Strategy for development of the municipality: Execute actions which will make Haram one of the best municipalities in Norway to live in for the target group.
- Strategy for industry development: Execute actions which will make Haram the municipality with the best framework for the establishment of new business, and make sure that existing business can develop in the best possible way.
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Discussion in work group 5

Work Group 5 “Regional governance in rural areas” was based on four presentations from Brittany (France), Finland, Norway and Portugal which showed that regional governance can be initiated top down as well as bottom up but apparently the point of entry does not make a difference as long as the actors are willing to start the cooperation and accept its "ownership". (If these conditions are not met, then the source of the initiative is important as was shown in group 4: If the state initiates the cooperation "top down" then the actors are willing to comply but they are not ready to accept the "ownership".) However, the objective or problem to be tackled by regional governance makes a difference. In general it could be said that the rural area is motivated to develop new modes of regional governance because of being "marginalized"; Governance then becomes a pro-active concept to surpass marginalization. But at the same time marginalization is a restriction to regional governance.

![Diagram of rural governance](image-url)
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The role of public institutions in cross-border network building
Some preliminary research results
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1 Introduction

The politically forced central orientation (and peripheral situation) of border regions is supposed to change in the process of European integration, assuming that the economies and societies of border regions are benefiting from the cross-border network construction, the European Commission supports the formation of cross-border institutional co-operation contacts with significant amounts through its Interreg and Phare CBC programmes. The aim is to provide support for the foundation and development of co-operative networks across borders and to link these networks to larger community networks (European Commission, 1994).

In the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) there is also significant emphasis on cross-border network co-operation, however, of course more focused on an integrated planning approach (co-operation between clusters of towns, improving the links between regional public transport and major transport networks and the management of environmentally sensitive areas are examples with a particular significance in cross-border areas). Interreg and ESDP aims are then echoed in transnational and cross-border working documents, visions, development plans.

Hungary, from local to government level, also seems to be in a "Euroregion and networking fever" at the beginning of the new Millennium. In the Széchenyi Plan, an ambitious development plan of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, economic network building between big (mostly multi-national) firms and local enterprises (mostly SMEs) is a central priority complemented by the development of R&D and technology transfer institutions, while in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a new department has been established lately which deals with regional co-operation issues and tries to manage and co-ordinate the growing complexity of cross-border co-operation initiatives.

No surprise that plans and visions are getting overloaded by the notion of transnationalism and the network concept since the theoretical literature in social sciences got more and more concerned about a "borderless world" (or better Europe) and the "strength of week ties" during the last two decades.
"Transnational regimes and networks, often defined primarily in functional rather than territorial terms, are becoming more important as political and economic powers strive to overcome or at least manage the increasing contradictions of exclusive territoriality" (ANDERSON, 1995, 145.)

"Networks, virtual spaces and fuzzy borderlands are constructions that challenge the modern mode of spatiality (i.e. territoriality)" (JUKARAINEN, 1998, 57.).

Is this modern, network-like, mode of spatiality a reality in cross-border settings? What is (or might be) the role of public institutions in cross-border network building?1

In the first part of the paper some theoretical considerations will be briefly summarised. In the second chapter some preliminary research results will be presented focusing on some networking initiatives along the Austrian–Hungarian border. Finally some limitations and challenges of cross-border networking will be addressed.

2 The role of network strategy in cross-border context

REMIGIO RATTI (1993) delivers the first attempt to include both borders and networks in the same theoretical, neo-classical microeconomic model. He uses the theory of industrial organisation (transaction cost approach) to prove that uncertainty situations, high transaction costs caused by the border-barrier situation can be managed, lowered by either vertical integration or by creating intermediate organisation forms between market and hierarchy, such as a co-operation network strategy supported by functional synergies (RATTI, 1993, 49.).

In the case of an open border, „the theoretical analysis advocates that the economic development of the border areas will not be determined by the political-institutional differential and therefore by the differentiated positions of profits, positive and negative, due to the effect of belonging to one or to the other nation, but more likely, by the compared real advantages of both border areas”. The border area economy turns into a transborder economy (RATTI, 1993, 45.). In both cases (border barrier and open border) the strategic behaviour of partners is particularly crucial.

Exactly what RATTI mentions as political-institutional differential complemented by the very significant identity (‘we-they’) differences makes us accept SCHMITT-EGNER’s critical remarks on RATTI’s concept (SCHMITT-EGNER, 1998).

Agreeing with SCHMITT-EGNER (1998) and VAN HOUTUM (1998), even if we consider the borders intentionally from a narrow economic aspect we should not forget the role of culture, history, mental structures, maps, since these are very much influencing the behaviour of economic actors especially if we consider the role of small and medium sized enterprises. Proximity in itself is necessary but not enough as a condition for successful co-operation2.

Using labels like neo-liberalism or neo-functionalism in his evaluation, SCHMITT-EGNER (1998, 30-36.) finds the negligence of the collective actor (regions, policy networks), being a crucial one in cross-border co-operation, as a major shortcoming of RATTI’s approach3.

---

1 With regard to the overall theme of the conference, here the emphasis will be on policy networks, while in the research attention is paid to the role of policy networks in the establishment of business networks as well.


3 Furthermore, one of the biggest overall problem of SMEs and small municipalities in most of the cases is the lack of strategic thinking and behaviour due to financial and personal limitations.
According to Veggeland (1999), intergovernmental and network co-operation targets principally at producing a new path towards regional integration, as an alternative to both top-down model of regional policy and a total absence of regulation in the field of cross-border regionalisation.

This is in line with the view that emphasises the institutional embeddedness in regional development, networks being in the focal point of attention.

In the following chapter some preliminary research results will be presented on some institutional aspects of cross-border regional development issues.

3 Experiences

Cross-border institutions (mostly Euroregions) along the Dutch-German border (some with "historical" traditions), though developing in more favourable conditions, received some critical remarks, stating that they did not achieve the desired level of economic cohesion (Schwab, 1997; Hamm, 1996), and that the institution is too bureaucratic to be able to manage projects with real cross-border effects (Keller; Stamm, 1997; Perkmann, 1997; Rodeman, 1997). There is intensive co-operation in the public domain because Interreg money is behind, but it is rarely complemented by private sector relations such as co-operation networks between SMEs (Scott, 1999a,b). Furthermore, the lack of legitimacy, accountability, democratic control is mentioned as key issues (Denters; Schobben; Van der Veen, 1998).

In spite of the mentioned problems at least potentially Dutch-German Euroregions can play the co-ordinating and framework role for local initiatives. This potential in most of the cases is hampered by objective reasons at EU external borders in Central-Eastern Europe, like in the Austrian-Hungarian border region.

At the beginning of the eighties, parallel to the political détente some promising processes had begun along the Iron Curtain. The Austrian-Hungarian Spatial and Land-use Planning Committee, established in 1985 on governmental level, played a significant role. One of the subcommittees, the Cross-border Co-operation Work-Group (where Burgenland, and the Hungarian Gyor-Moson-Sopron and Vas counties were represented on the highest level) served later as a basis for the Interreg-Phare CBC programmes and the establishment (1998) of the West-Pannon EuRegion.

Due to the favourable conditions some 400 community level co-operatives (between municipalities) could be regenerated between Hungary and Austria (the number of relations before 1920, the Versailles or Trianon Treaty; Haddú, 1999), and the historical agglomerations are about to revive (especially in the case of Sopron and Szombathely).

---

4 Most of the representatives of Eu- or Euroregions are realistic and critical themselves. What has been achieved is the good neighbourhood relations ("Gute Nachbarschaft") and gradual abolishment of prejudices but the cross-border (euroregional) identity is "Kwatsch".

Another opinion on economic co-operation: if there was an interest, enterprises would form cross-border networks themselves. Since this economic interest does not really exist, we cannot expect any spectacular achievements. "There are no networks from problems and needs" (aus der Not entstehen keine Netzwerke).

5 The Trianon Treaty (1920) made organic, former inner spaces with Hungarian majority into peripheries, divided traditional or emerging regions, often farmlands, families; the railway network was characterised by dead-ends (51 end stations of the bisected tracks were on the territories of neighbouring states after the Treaty). This of course meant the split up of agglomerations. The Austrian case is exceptional not only because this is the only border section where all the significant centres remained on Hungarian side, but also because of the smaller significance of the minority issue. According to estimations, population with Hungarian nationality is 15 thousand in Burgenland, 750 thousand in Slovakia, 200 thousand in Sub-Carpathia (Ukraine), 2.2 million in Romania, 330 thousand in Yugoslavia, 30 thousand in Croatia and 12 thousand in Slovenia.
Of course, differences in administrative competencies are and will be a tough problem to overcome by partners. One of the arguments for the joining of Zala county to the West-Pannon EuRegion was that with the enlargement a Hungarian region (the West-Transdanubian Region comprising Gyor-Moson-Sopron, Vas and Zala counties) and not two counties would co-operate with the adequate territorial administrative level (the Land Burgenland) in Austria. Still competencies are far from being in balance. A next significant step is on the agenda: Euroregional tasks would be taken over from the counties by the West-Transdanubian Regional Development Agency (implementing and management unit of the regional council), so that latter is no more just an umbrella organisation, but the single co-ordinator on the Hungarian side and the main partner for Burgenland.

Similar to other sections of the EU external border, differing interests are characteristic due to the differences in the standard of living, though the gap is significantly lower on regional level than on country level (see Table 1.) since the least developed Austrian and second most developed Hungarian region meet here. Furthermore, the development dynamic is higher on the Hungarian side, while Burgenland also showed a relevant growth dynamic in the previous decade. Both processes were initiated by the fall of the Iron Curtain and oiled by European money (Burgenland) and foreign direct investment (West-Transdanubia).

Table 1: Economic performance (GDP/inhabitant) and unemployment in the Austrian-Hungarian border region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany (Mecklenburg-</td>
<td>Germany (Mecklenburg-</td>
<td>30,7 Poland (Szczecin, Gorzów Wielkopolski, Zielona Góra, Jelenia Góra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorpommern, Brandenburg, Sachsen, Thüringen)</td>
<td>Vorpommern, Brandenburg, Sachsen, Nieder Bayern)</td>
<td>90,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425,4</td>
<td>28,9</td>
<td>Czech Republic (Northern and Western Bohemia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria (Burgenland)</td>
<td>Austria (Ober and</td>
<td>1 48 Czech Republic (South-Bohemia - South Moravia, Jiheseky)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Niederösterreich, Wien, Burgenland, Steiermark)</td>
<td>1,6 16,1 Slovakia (Bratislava city and county, Senica, Tnava, Galanta, Dunaj ska Sreda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austria (Burgenland)</td>
<td>40 35,3 Hungary (Győr-Moson-Sopron, Vas, Zala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austria (Steiermark, Kärnten)</td>
<td>5,1 15,3 Slovenia (Gorenjska Gornja Savinjska Koroska Podravje Poreurje)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Veneto - 97-99)</td>
<td>Italy (Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Veneto - 97-99)</td>
<td>9 48 Slovenia (Gorenjska, Goritse Cost and Karst region)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Network initiatives - Money talks

There are significant differences though regarding the financial possibilities of the public actors (regarding especially EU but also national support). As Schwab (1997, 12.) suggested Interreg II is a “regional luxury programme” while Phare CBC is a “national basic infrastructure programme”. Table 2 illustrates the differences.

Table 2: EU funding related to population along the EU eastern border

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional unit</th>
<th>GDP/inh. (1996)</th>
<th>Unemployment rate in %</th>
<th>% change in the number of unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nordburgenland</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittelburgenland</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Südburgenland</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiener Umland Südteil</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niederösterreich Süd</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>166.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyor-Moson-Sopron</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vas</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zala</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No wonder that we found different engagement and interests at the external EU borders depending on the Objective-I status of the EU region.

Furthermore the Phare CBC programme works according to a different mechanism. The Phare CBC process is more centrally oriented and slower and the programming periods are still incongruent, though there are continuous and significant efforts for adjustment.

Realising and secretly applying the “money talks” principle there are increased sums available for and more focused programmes on network building (policy and socio-economic networks) and institution building.

---

6 The comparison would be more correct if we were able to give the figures of the share from the general Phare programme for the concerning border regions.

7 Of course there are many other influencing factors (like the management skills and personal long-term engagement of the local and regional stakeholders) but finances are and will remain the most important influence for network and institution development. Lower Austria (Niederösterreich) can be regarded as one of the strongest flagships of cross-border networking in the area. Since regional averages sometimes hide quite big internal differences in development level, those regions left out from European and/or national funding are trying to focus their efforts on those funds still available for them, Interreg in the case of Lower Austria, Phare CBC in West-Transdanubia. Seeing Burgenland’s dynamic however, with a strategic eye on potential withdrawal of Objective-I status, the regional management is getting more and more interested in Interreg and cross-border co-operation as well.
In the 2000-2002 period there will be 6.11 million Euros (15.1% of total budget, national and European money together) available for cross-border organisational structures and networks, while 6.04 million Euros (14.2%) on the Austrian side for the 2000-2006 programming period (in the previous programming period there was no such explicit priority, on Hungarian side the regional planning priority was slightly underperformed - 3.5% instead of 3.7%).

However, money is never enough and of course we should not forget that “money is an unsuitable means to develop an atmosphere of trust” (Gerling; Schmidt, 1998, 29). It will not substitute the patience and time needed in order to get to know each other’s culture and tolerate each other’s interests.

Bearing this in mind however, the manager of the Hungarian West-Transdanubian regional development agency suggests:

“We cannot break out of the copied and mostly political, hierarchical rigid model of Euroregions unless Central Governments support cross-border co-operation beside the Interreg-Phare CBC moneys”.

3.2 Network initiatives, initiators and their embeddedness in the administrative sector

In the administrative sphere in the EU less formal cross-border city networks were established beside the Euroregions, mainly with more pragmatic, bigger scale (grossträumige) land use and infrastructure planning objectives. They are pillars of the policentricity principle promoted in the ESDP⁸.

The Vienna-Bratislava-Győr-Brno city-region is often characterised as the most promising macroregion in Central-Europe. After some initial difficulties now there are quite a few co-operation projects in this very dynamic, though indeed imbalanced, potential network-space.

VITECC - Vienna Tele Co-operation Centre. As an interface between private and public sector, VITECC aims at providing a flexible roundtable for the interests and needs of municipalities and private companies in the form of workshops and Internet communication.

Planning The Gateway is a project to provide the Vienna-Bratislava-Győr-Brno region with systematic and up-to-date spatial planning and regional development information.

EREG (Endogenous Regional Development in Border Regions) is an initiative to get the hinterland of these big cities (500 municipalities East of Vienna along the Danube) into network activities, workshops, information exchange⁹. The main fields of co-operation are agriculture, tourism and the protection of environment.

⁸ There is no widespread consensus about this. The department for co-ordinating regional co-operation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs proposed a budget for supporting Euroregions but it was not accepted. When a county official received this news, the county suddenly gave up its Euroregional plans...

⁹ Just to name some: MHAL: Maastricht (NL)-Hasselt (B/VL)-Aachen (D)-Liège (B/Wall.); Saar-Lor-Lux; ANKE - Arnhem Nijmegen, Kleve, Emmerich; Hengelo - Enchede - Münster - Osnabrück quadrangle. Whether the cross-border city-networks are competitors for the euroregional co-operation is a problematic point. Smaller communities not involved are worried to get into a sole transit position without any local benefits (tunnel effect; this is however not a special cross-border phenomenon, the problem is usual in almost all rural-urban conflicts on different spatial scales). However, the tension is somewhat reduced nowadays, since communities start to realise the benefits delivered by the network of upper-centres (while earlier they did not want to sit to a common table with the representatives of the latter) and there are programmes covering lower scale municipal networking as well. This is the case of the Austrian-Czech-Slovakian-Hungarian border quadrangle.

¹⁰ The role of working communities and workshops as network forums is significant both to initiate policy networks and economic networks with the main purpose of opening dialogue outside the usual frameworks (no matter whether it is a firm or a municipality), which sometimes prove to be too formal and rigid. Examples are regular informal firm contact days, municipal workshops, business meetings, though the results are hard to measure and the cross-border added value is sometimes doubtful. Along the Austrian-Hungarian border, however, there were Austrian firms, entrepreneurs, that were closed and not interested in their own, but on workshops they were opened for co-operation.
Based on the EREG process a new initiative, called Euregio Forum Lower Austria, is launched in the new programming period. It aims at forming a network to strengthen the co-operation between Lower Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary.

In the project of “Cross-border impulse centres” 8 cities will be involved in an information network, where every event organised in any of the cities will be presented.

Not only the Austrian central space is delivering impulses. With the slogan “Old neighbour - new partner” the EU - Future Region initiated from Styria aims at network co-operation between partners knowing each other already from the Alps-Adria Working Community (Veneto, Friuli-Venezia-Giulia in Italy, Baranya, Zala, Somogy, Vas, Veszprém, Gyor-Moson-Sopron in Hungary, Kärnten, Burgenland, Steiermark in Austria, and Slovenia and Croatia).

The West-Pannon EuRegion does not want to lose the chance to get switched to these networks. The West Transdanubian Region starts to market itself as “region possibly woven by open co-operation networks” and indeed the region is getting more and more active in strategic networking11. This may bring positive and negative side effects as well. Through the EREG initiative there is now a forum for dialogue between the city of Gyor and the surrounding municipal associations, while there are new tensions between the counties of the region and between the counties and the region itself because of the West-Pannon EuRegion.

Summarising the experiences we can conclude that Euroregions are in most of the cases far away from having a “macro-organisational management”. A “meta strategy” in the form of a “euroregional super-network” (SOETERS, 1993, 653.) is still science fiction. Rather regional development agencies function as network hubs. Indeed one can regard these cross-border regions as pseudo territories (PERKMANN, 1997, 23.), since final decision making power remains with the local, regional, national and EU territories involved, and cross-border politics is regional foreign politics rather than conventional territorial politics. As we saw from western examples there is a danger however that sometimes these public sector elites get away from private sector and citizens (SCOTT, 1999ab).

If we are realistic though, we should be happy with a competent and effective regional development agency system in Hungary and in Central-Eastern Europe (in this consideration the Interreg IIC CEDA project - network for Central European Development Agencies - in the CADSES macrospace has a special relevance).

4 Some problems of cross-border network building

“Economic networking (in innovative regional milieux)... cannot be forced by outside parties. It can be encouraged, but essentially it has taken place spontaneously on the basis of existing social networks ... that generate and reinforce milieux where there are high levels of mutual trust and reciprocity.” (HANSEN, 1992, 101-102, as cited by SCOTT, 1996, 130; emphasis added). We think that in establishing this atmosphere of mutual trust policy networks mostly oiled by European money can play a significant role especially in the Central European macro- and Austrian-Hungarian border region, since there is a certain common cultural heritage stemming from the era of the Habsburg Monarchy.

---

11 This activity is stretching from culture through business to infrastructure, both in small and large scale. For the latter a good example is the planned North-South railway line between Vienna and Graz. Here intensive common lobby forces were and are in action in favour of the cheaper and from a regional development aspect more advantageous project proposal. Of course (compared to the Semmering base tunnel under the Alps) the potential line zigzagging back and force across the border would be of crucial importance for the border region being in a shadow of significant transport corridors.
There are other problems though. "Network boundaries can be extremely imprecise, partly because they are conditioned by formal and informal linkages, so the network form of organisation is neither easy nor costless to manage." (Cooke and Morgan, 1993, 544.) As a third factor of the pseudo territory character of Euroregions, Perkmann (1997, 23.) mentions spatial flexibility. Cooperative coalitions are rather unstable, there are many overlapping coalitions leading to entangled identities. The patchwork pattern of administrative structures may cause enormous decision-making costs due to co-ordination problems, problems of externalities, missing economies of scale.

The network structure is rather insecure. This may stem from inside (trust can easily be disturbed) and outside (because of the changing environment, Fürst, 1994, Rodemann, 1997).

Border areas usually lack institutional structures and local capacity to form partnerships and networks that could support socio-economic revitalisation of these areas, so in the initial phase internal network building is preferred, which may paradoxically mean closed networks. This is a paradox because networks are almost by definition open structures and closing them is extremely difficult and can cause problems. It may push towards more institutionalised structures in networks, so more hierarchy (more transparency, controllability, legitimacy of decisions, decreasing transaction costs). On the other hand it mostly means less intensive interaction, less creativity and alternative impulses. Impulses are more and more awaited from the initiator, the institution (Rodemann, 1997).

Institutionalising networks may make them static, causing a certain sclerosis multiplex. According to Rodemann (1997, 20.) the solution might be the quasi-institutionalisation (institutional frameworks on minimum only: implementation and management rules).

The same paradox may arise when after connecting the networks on the two sides of the border the temptation arises to put Euroregions (or whatever form of cross-border institution we talk about) into a hierarchical system of laws and orders, destroying the borderless, horizontal and networking character of those specific regions (Veggeland, 1999).

Here territorial governments, instead of regional governance institutions are taking the scene. Dinter, Schobben and van der Veen (1998), addressing the issue of functional federalism with popular elections, suggest that the costs of such a system will outweigh the advantages in terms of efficiency in allocation and democratic control (for example when the importance of relevant issues for citizens is relatively low).

However, at the moment we still seem to be quite far from having to face this paradox, if it is really a paradox.

What we might say is that cross-border networks, as open horizontal structures with active and wide public and private participation seem to be more innovative in abolishing prejudices and stereotypes, than the institutional model or Euroregions. Euroregions, as most formalised networks, almost hierarchies, can and should play an important co-ordinating role across borders but they should be build upon dynamic, looser policy networks. We should see that the network strategy has its limitations and paradoxes as well (in the limited frames of this paper we could not discuss for example the significant democratic deficits, exclusion and power related questions of networks). However we do think that in purely technocratic terms it has much wider implications and potential in addressing development and planning issues crossing the border, including the much awaited formulation of cross-border economic networks.

---

12 Veggeland further analyses the symptoms of the sclerosis multiplex: the loss of the ability of the euroregional regimes to adapt to changing markets, technology and culture, and less power to generate targeted development projects and to negotiate strategic planning actions (Veggeland, 1999, 2.).
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1 Innovation and Innovation Policy on the Regional Level

Evolutionary economics views innovation – new products or services, new processes, or new organisational structures – as a dynamic and cumulative process, involving interactions between different phases of the innovation process and continuous access to knowledge. Innovation can thus be described as the transfer of information and knowledge into new products or processes. Since knowledge is distributed within and outside firms as well as between further actors, innovation is considered as a systemic process with specific relevance to knowledge and learning processes. Consequently, innovation policy focuses on the creation of knowledge, diffusion and exploitation. This includes the exploitation of technological knowledge as well as measures to increase the economic absorptive capacities actors'. Innovation policy is also engaged in building awareness for innovation matters and in supporting the whole innovation process, including among others consulting, financing, marketing, research and development, innovation co-operations.

Specific innovation patterns occur below the level of nation states. Concepts like networks, innovative milieux and knowledge economics refer to the regional level, since spatial and cultural proximity favours information exchange, learning processes, trust building, innovation co-operations, etc. The region is the immediate context of activity of economic actors and rather complements than substitutes further relationships on the global scale. The regional level facilitates the search for co-operation partners (due to close geographical distance and “cultural distance” comprising for instance language, mentality, socio-economic development, political environment), the possibilities of tacit knowledge exchange, easy access to innovation support organisations, support of trust and consensus building, whereas networks on a global level have a rather formalised character and are to a higher extent oriented towards codified knowledge exchanges (Lundvall; Borrás 1997: 105).

1 The concept of national innovation systems is for instance discussed by Freeman (1987), Edquist (1997), Lundvall (1992a), Dosi et al. (1988), whereas Cooke (1992) and Braczyk; Cooke; Heidenreich (1998) refer to the regional innovation system concept.
2 The Concept of Regional Innovation Systems

The concept of regional innovation systems refers to the systemic and interactive character of innovation. It considers specific characteristics on the regional level and points at identity, communication and cohesion aspects.\(^1\) Generally spoken, a system of innovation "... is constituted by elements and relationships which interact in the production, diffusion and use of new, and economically useful, knowledge..." (Lundvall 1992b, p. 2), which focuses on the interactive and thus social character of innovation and the importance of knowledge. Figure 1 shows a model of a regional innovation system developed by Cooke; Boekholt; Tödtling.\(^2\)

Figure 1: Model of a Regional Innovation System

![Diagram of Regional Innovation System](image)

RTO: Research and Technology Organisation
HEI: Higher Education Institution

Source: Cooke; Boekholt; Tödtling 2000: 121.

It is obvious that the regional system is embedded in the national institutional structure. Regional companies – large and small manufacturing and business service firms – and organisations with the supply of information and knowledge – universities, research and technology transfer organisations as well as higher educational institutes – are connected either directly or via interfaces. Scientific, technological and educational institutions are shaped by national, regional and European policies with the national level having the highest impact on regional innovation systems (Cooke; Boekholt; Tödtling 2000: 120). Figure 1 emphasises again the importance of (i) different "elements" in an innovation system, (ii) their inter-relationships and (iii) the impact of knowledge on an innovation system. A functioning regional innovation system requires efficient elements, their connection by efficient flows of information and knowledge and interactions on a supra-regional level.

In this context, innovation governance relates to the way in which innovation processes are shaped. The structure of the regional innovation governance covers organisations of the public domain that have an impact on regional production and innovation (activities of European bodies, the national and regional governments, local actors). Further private and intermediary organisations such as chambers of commerce, business and trade associations, consultancy firms or technology transfer organisations are influenced. Considering the different levels of governance for innovation support, a region might for instance have links to the European Union through support

\(^2\)These authors (2000: 149) view regional innovation systems as "... geographically proximate private and public governance arrangements facilitating the flow of appropriate innovation knowledge and information around a region to the advantage of its innovators."
by the Structural Funds or by a RIS or RITTS project. Further scientific and technological policies on the national level and additional regional innovation policies are focusing on innovation matters in regional firms (Cooke; Boekholt; Tödtling 2000: 97 ff.).

Cooke identifies the governance infrastructure and the business super-structure as key dimensions for innovative activities and uses these dimensions as a typology of regional innovation systems. The governance dimension analyses the initiation process of technology transfer, the structure of innovation funding, the level of co-ordination, the research competence, specialisation and the degree of supra-local co-ordination. Based on these indications, Cooke distinguishes between grassroots, network and dirigiste innovation systems.

In a grassroots regional innovation system technology transfer is organised locally. Innovation funding is more over organised regionally and might be provided by different regional finance institutes. The competencies of the Regional research are rather applied than basic and the level of supra-local co-ordination is low. Grassroots innovation systems dispose of a relatively low level technical specialisation.

Technology transfer in network innovation systems is characterised by a multi-level structure, and innovation funding is also provided by diverse actors. Besides applied research, innovation systems of this type also provide basic research capabilities. Networking requires a certain degree of co-ordination. Relating to the industrial fabric and its specific demand, the level of technical specialisation has a flexible character.

In dirigiste regional innovation systems, the initiative for technology transfer originates from a supra-local level, often from the central state. Technology transfer is initiated externally and innovation funding is equally organised by the central administration, even though provided via decentralised organisations in the region. This structure leads to a high level of co-ordination with supra-regional bodies and the level of specialisation is generally high. We find rather basic than applied research activities in dirigiste innovation systems (Cooke 1992: 368 ff. and Cooke 1998: 19 ff.).

3 Regional Innovation in Baden and Alsace

In the following, some innovation characteristics in Baden and Alsace (cf. figure 2) are presented.

On the base of the European Regional Innovation Survey (ERIS) data, Figure 3 shows some innovation characteristics for manufacturing small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and knowledge-intensive business services (KIBS) in both regions. The share of

---

3 The second dimension, Cooke uses as a typology of regional innovation systems, refers to the business structure in the region. Here, it is focused on firms’ situations in the regional economy, interrelationships between firms and external actors, their research and development activities, their innovation resources, their scope of research and the quality of their associations. In this respect he identifies local, interactive and globalised regional innovation systems.

4 5 See next page.
innovating manufacturing SMEs and KIBS is higher in Baden than in Alsace. This corresponds to a higher share of interacting firms\(^6\) and higher shares of R&D-intensive firms\(^7\) on the German side of the border. The share of manufacturing SMEs that had relationships to research institutions\(^8\) is quite similar in both regions, but a lower share of French KIBS showed interactions with research and transfer organisations. The share of growing firms, i.e. firms that increased the number of their employees within a three-year period, seems to be similar in both regions. It is higher for both KIBS samples which can be explained by the simple fact that knowledge-intensive business firms are generally smaller than manufacturing firms so that growth is more easily achieved.

Concerning innovation-related indicators, figure 3 shows some differences between the Alsatian and the Baden regions. Even though growth indicators seem to be comparable, interaction and internal R&D structures show differences in both regions. Innovation performance indicators show slightly higher results in Baden. In both regions, a higher share of KIBS spends more than 8 % of their turnover for innovations. Generally, a higher share of Baden firms belong to this “high-tech” group.

In the following, some elements of innovation governance in Baden and Alsace will be shortly described, referring to the typology of regional innovation systems by Cooke.\(^9\) Technology transfer in Alsace is supported by diverse institutions such as CRITT (Centres Régionaux d’Innovation et de Transfert de Technologies) or ANVAR (Agence Nationale pour la Valorisation de la Recherche). These are oriented specifically towards SMEs. Created in 1982, CRITT aim at creating and

---

**Figure 3: Some innovation characteristics in Alsace and Baden**

![Diagram showing innovation characteristics in Alsace and Baden](image)

---

\(^6\) ERIS in Baden and Alsace has been performed by the Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research Karlsruhe and the *Bureau d’Economie Théorique et Appliquée (BETA)*, Université Louis Pasteur, Strasbourg. Performed between 1995 and 1997, the survey covers innovation and co-operation characteristics of manufacturing and business service firms, as well as research institutions. ERIS was carried out in eleven European regions by the University of Hanover, the University of Cologne, the Technical University Bergakademie Freiberg and the Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research Karlsruhe on behalf of the German Research Association.

\(^7\) The sectoral distribution of the sample firms represent the respective regional structures without grave deviations. Further information concerning the samples and the surveys, innovation characteristics in Baden and Alsace and cross-border linkages are given by Koschatzky (2000, 1997), Koschatzky; Traxel (1997), Muller (2001), Muller; Traxel (1997), Muller; Schneider (1997), Muller; Zenker (2001) and Goriacci; Koschatzky (1998).

\(^8\) Interaction in this respect is defined as innovation-related co-operations of manufacturing SMEs with knowledge-intensive business services and innovation-related co-operations of KIBS with manufacturing SMEs.

\(^9\) Firms that spent more than 8 % of their turnover on innovation activities.

\(^{9}\) Figure 3 summarises these co-operations under the heading “Interaction with ITI” (Institutions of the Technological Infrastructure). The concept of ITI is elaborated in Koschatzky; Heraud 1996.

\(^{9}\) This descriptive list cannot be exhaustive, but aims at pointing at some facets of innovation governance in both regions.
supporting regional innovation networks between research laboratories, private firms and local governments. They govern private and public (mainly regional) financial contributions and are either specialised (for instance in new materials in Alsace\(^\text{10}\)) or have a more general character. ANVAR is an agency for the transfer of technology from governmental and university research laboratories to industry. The goal of regional ANVAR offices is to support and accompany innovation projects in firms, notably by financial and consultancy support.\(^\text{11}\) Both CRITT and ANVAR offices are regional agencies of the national innovation support infrastructure (cf. Cooke 1998: 21, Chesnais 1993: 205, Quéré 1999: 11).\(^\text{12}\)

In Baden, technology transfer centres are related to the regional research infrastructure. Universities and research institutes have technology transfer centres. Additionally, the transfer centres of the Steinbeis Foundation – often close to a Fachhochschule – connect research organisations with industry and give advice to SMEs. Different institutions grant credits.\(^\text{13}\) The research infrastructure can be described as providing basic and applied research. As is the case in Alsace, Baden has further research institutes besides universities, for instance the Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, institutes of the Fraunhofer Gesellschaft or industrial research institutes.\(^\text{14}\) The TechnologieRegion Karlsruhe is a regional marketing concept under whose umbrella regional firms present themselves.\(^\text{15}\)

In the terminology of Cooke, the Baden innovation system should rather be described as a network type, whereas in Alsace, innovation governance shows elements of a dirigiste structure. It can thus be assumed that Baden firms get innovation support by accessing regional networks. In the French region, innovation support governance has a regional/national character, i.e. regional support organisations are connected to the national infrastructure. Consequently, French firms are oriented towards the national level via regional offices. This is different in Baden; here, firms seem to be rather oriented towards the home region and the Bundesland. This corresponds to the structure and position of regional governments in both nations: French regions handle functions that have been decentralised from the central government, whereas German Bundesländer are part of the federal system and have specific powers (Cooke; Boehkolt; Tödtling 2000: 2/3). Below this level of Länder, smaller-scale regions have further competencies in innovation support. Consequently, the hypotheses, that national level has the highest impact on regional innovation systems (Cooke; Boehkolt; Tödtling 2000: 120) can be supported.

These different structures seem to be one obstacle for innovation co-operations across the border. As empirical evidence has shown, a certain share of co-operations between research organisations could be observed, but cross-border linkages between firms were rather weak (cf. Koschatzky 2000: 439 ff., Gürich; Koschatzky 1998: 29 ff.). Thus, although cross-border co-operation between Baden and Alsatian firms and research institutes may be an opportunity for knowledge inputs, regional actors on both sides have difficulties to approach innovative actors on the other side.

\(^{10}\) CRITT materials Alsace is active in R&D, analyses, consultancy, training and pilot productions. Further information is given at http://www.critt.fr.

\(^{11}\) ANVAR has 14 regional offices. Further information: http://www.anvar.fr.

\(^{12}\) ANVAR is a public body under the authority of the Ministries of Industry, Small Businesses and Research. CRITT have been established in the frame of a contrat de plan Etat-Région, i.e. of negotiations between the central government and the regions.

\(^{13}\) An overview of the Baden-Württemberg financing sector is given by Heidenreich; Krauss (1998: 236 ff.) in the frame of their analysis of the Baden-Württemberg innovation regime.

\(^{14}\) Detailed insight into the French and German education and research infrastructures are given by Keck (1993) and Chesnais (1993).

\(^{15}\) Further indications on the role of institutions and regional innovation capabilities in Alsace and Baden are given by Héraud et al. (2000).
of the border. This leads to the conclusion that besides different languages and cultures, governance structures in Baden and Alsace shape different types of innovation systems that result in different innovation patterns. This seems to hamper cross-border linkages. The introduction of a cross-border Steinbeis office and the work of the PAMINA office might change this situation.\textsuperscript{16}
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\textsuperscript{16}PAMINA engages in cross-border technology transfer between the Southern Palatinate, the Central Upper Rhine area and North Alsace. Acting as secretariat of the community programme INTERREG PAMINA, the office gives information on cross-border issues. Further information: http://www.pamina.org. The French-German innovation agency of the Steinbeis Foundation offers services for SMEs in order to support technological co-operation between German and French firms. The German-French Steinbeis Foundation has offices in Strasbourg, Karlsruhe, Stuttgart, Freiburg and Paris and is embedded in the network of Steinbeis transfer centres (http://www.steinbeis-europa.de/).


The treatment of cross-border issues in regional planning documents in the UK – The case of North West England

European Policy Background

- ESDP – Importance of action at the local and regional levels, and of cross-border actions to resolve spatial development issues:
  
  The regional and local authorities realise the objectives of the Community through their co-operation with each other and in line with the "bottom-up" approach. (p. 42)
  
  In their spatially relevant planning, local and regional government and administrative authorities should, therefore overcome any insular way of looking at their territory and take into consideration European aspects and interdependencies right from the outset. (p. 45)

- Promotion of cross-border co-operation through INTERREG

National Policy in the UK

- Planning Policy Guidance Note 11 - Regional Planning (2000):
  
  Widening the spatial planning scope of Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) is in keeping with trends elsewhere in Europe. Moreover, both the European Spatial Development Perspective and the Community Initiative on Transnational Co-operation on Spatial Planning - INTERREG IIC and IIB - programmes will provide a European context for the preparation of RPG

- Other issues with a cross-border dimension:

  Sub-Regional Guidance / Migration and Housing / Transport

  Bio-Diversity & Nature Conservation / Coastal Issues

- Devolution - Potential for more fragmentation?

  Scottish Parliament / Welsh National Assembly

  Regional Development Agencies (Economic Development)

  Regional Assemblies (Regional Planning Guidance - RPG)

The North West of England

- Population of 6.9 million people:
  
  1 in 8 of UK pop. / 1 in 50 of the EU pop.

- Urban Core ‘Mersey Belt’ has a population of 4.5 million

- Key Planning Issues for ‘Regional Planning Guidance’:
  
  - Falling population in large urban areas
  
  - Regeneration of core urban areas
  
  - More diverse rural economy
- Need for a poly-centric balance of development
- Need to develop sectors with potential for future growth
- Legacy of past industrial development - 25% of derelict land in UK
- Cross-boundary links to other regions and countries

**Cross Boundary Issues for North West England**

  The challenge faced by RPG is to plan for the needs of the North West while recognising the importance, and the implications, of its links with neighbouring regions. (p. 3)

- **Spatial Scale 1: Inter-regional (UK) and National:**
  - North Wales, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Isle of Man, West Yorkshire, Humberside, Midlands, and the North East

- **Spatial Scale 2: Inter-regional (European) and Transnational:**
  - Republic of Ireland - Yorkshire and Humberside - North East - Northern European Ports important as part of a future North European Trade Axis from Ireland to the Baltic

**Spatial Scale 1: Cross-border Issues with North Wales**

- Issues: Difference in planning systems / Physical Linkages / Housing Greenbelts / Economic / Retail / Transport / Previous NW RPG

- Mechanisms for consideration of these issues:
  - Local Authority Liaison Group (4 LAs - 390,000 population)

**Joint actions and representations on Draft RPG**

- Comments on Draft RPG for the North West of England:
  - Need for: ‘...more explicit reference to the close economic, social, and environmental interrelationship between Chester and North East Wales’
  - Support for the development of a cross-border sub-regional strategy
  - However, differences of opinion on the issues of housing and Greenbelt

**Spatial Scale 2: A North European Trade Axis?**

- Important East-West links recognised by Transnational
  (4 member states) INTERREG IIC NETA project:

  - East-West Euro-Corridor to balance North-South orientation of Europe
  - Ireland-North West England-Yorkshire Humberside-Netherlands-Germany-Accession countries
  - Core project led by North West England
  - UK sector - polycentric global gateway (Liverpool-Manchester-Leeds and Sheffield)
  - ‘Spatial Vision for North West Europe’ (2000) identifies NETA corridor and includes Birmingham
Comments on draft RPG document: ‘Need for RPG to set within the wider inter-regional inter-member state context’

Bottom-up local authority led and supported

**Are cross-boundary issues well covered in RPG?**

- Cross-border co-operation has occurred: *North Wales / Transport studies / NETA* but little evidence of this in the text of Draft RPG (Trans-Pennine Strategic Environmental Assessment and TEN)

- The Government Office for the North West assessment:

  *There is a need to consider cross-boundary issues more explicitly in the review of RPG. This may lead to the need to establish sub-regional policy planning frameworks for areas within the North West which have close functional linkages with cross boundary areas. Such frameworks will support the achievement of sustainable development and regeneration priorities.*

  Statement to Examination in Public of North West RPG (2001)

- Overall the cross-border and European contexts for RPG need to be more fully recognised

**Conclusion**

- In North West there seems to be ‘bottom-up’ pressure for more effective consideration of national and European cross-border issues

- A concept largely developed at the European level, but which has value at all the spatial scales.

- Particular UK situation and North West situation illustrates this well given the links with Wales and across to Eire and Yorkshire and Humber as well as Scotland.

- Cross-border idea is a useful concept at all spatial scales (like poly-centricity?)
RHICHARD KÖTTER, OLIVIER SYKES
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1 Cross border regions

Borders and cross border relationships and issues have clearly been significant throughout Eu-

dope’s history and its political, economic and spatial development. GABOR NOVOTNY observed in his

contribution that the current interest in borders and border areas could be situated in a broader

historical context, with the move from a medieval pattern of less rigidly defined borders to the more

defined border of the Nation State and perhaps now a move back to a more fluid kind of border (see

also MALCOM ANDERSON, 1996; and JAMES ANDERSON, 1996).

PETER SCHMITT-EGNER (1998) starts with three departing questions on cross-border co-operation:

1) theoretical explanation and empirical analysis; 2) scientific-systematic incorporation into the

various disciplines (interdisciplinarity) and 3) the relationship between academia and praxis. The

spread and application of disciplines can be divided into two strands: a) regional science in the

wider sense, i.e. spatial planning, regional economics, human geography, history, sociology and

regional cultural studies and political science research on regionalism (see for example HENK VAN

HOUTUM, 2000; G. BRUNN et. al., eds., 1998; and R. CAPPELLIN & P.W. BATEY, 1993) and b) research on

integration as a European phenomena (see for example BERND GROSS and PETER SCHMITT-EGNER,

1994, LIAM O’DOWD et al., 1995; INGRID GROM, 1995; RUDOLF HRBECK and SABINE WEINARD, 1995).

Even before the last EU enlargement in 1995, there were ca. 10.000 km of state borders (60 %

internal borders, 40 % external borders). Hence even before 1995 15 % of the total EU space could

be considered as ‘border region’ in the wider sense, in which 10 % of the total EU population lived.

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1996) counted 70 of 235 registered regions as transfrontier regions within

its them 38 member countries. The political geographer MICHEL FOUCHER (1998) has calculated that at

the beginning of the 1990s over 12.000 km of new borders were created, hence many new border

regions.

Frontier regions between two cultures might not necessarily be border regions in sharing or

having spatial proximity to an international border in a Europe were border have shifted and states

have been reconstituted, a case that WANDA DRESSLER HOLOHAN and MARIA CIECHOCINSKA (1996)

make for Upper Silesia in Poland and others for Transylvania in Romania with respect to German

or Saxon culture. It is clear that with new wave of eastern enlargement, a new set of cultural frontier

zones will come into a wider Europe, where often issues of conciliation and respect for minorities

is not as developed as in western Europe (see for instance MALCOLM ANDERSON and EBERHARD BORT,

1996; and G. EGER and J. LANGER, eds., 1996; and JOACHIM BURDACK, FRANK-DIETER GRIMM and LEO
Re-integrating the central Europe in terms of trans-border spatial development is a major challenge that has to be faced (Peter Dostal, 2000), indeed as Gerhard Brunn and Peter Schmitt-Egner (1998: 13) argue: ‘Even deeper [than the previous ones] will be the fifth phase of EU enlargement. This is because it does in any case new internal- and external borders with Belo-Russia, the Ukraine or Serbia, which on the one hand do entail political, economic, cultural and social conflict issues, but on the other hand also offer chances for conflict resolution. It is here that it will prove, whether cross-border co-operation really does provide a inner-European model of communication and fruitful accord’. Annegret Haase and Irina Hudsiejak (2000) argue that with the integration of Poland into the EU Poland could build cultural, social and economic bridges for European interests in the Ukraine, but that in contrast the potential erection of a ‘new iron curtain’, which would in fact accord with a new wealth-, integration- and interest border where also historical-ethnic-cultural fault lines run in the Europe.

It is also worth noting the trend towards ‘regionalisation’ of institutional structures at European level through both top-down and bottom-up processes (Gerhard Brunn & Peter Schmitt-Egner, 1998: 15; Alexander Murphy, 1993) and the growing ‘European competence’ of regions in Europe in the spirit and praxis of ‘transnational regionalism’, that is transfrontier interaction between neighbouring and non-adjacent regions and their actors without gate-keeping by the respective Nation states (see Peter Schmitt-Egner, 1996: 16) and finally the dimension of institutionalisation and networking structures in the spheres of administration and business, with public sector and public-private institutions involved in cross-border projects and tentative co-ordination and extension of services across borders (chambers of commerce and industry, environmental and nature protection, waste management, emergency and ambulance services etc.). European border regions are also collectively organised as an interest group in the Association of European Border Regions (AEBR; preceded by a longstanding ‘working group’), with support from the EU in the form of the LACE / ARFE / UE project for the scientific and technical support of the AEBR / AEGE border regions (AEBR, 1997).

Most of the literature (but see Moll, 2000) does not distinguish between general problems of border areas and special problems, which depend on the quality and nature of the (state) border. Hence results which, for instance, concern internal border areas ca not be simply generalised or even transported to regions on the external borders. Also, the legal and institutional organisational forms in cross-border border interaction and governance differ widely, from public-legal incorporation (Euregio Rhein-Waal) to private law associations (Arge Alp). At the administrative level though there often all levels of territorial communities involved, from the central state, through to the regional to the local level. Methodologically then, the organisational praxis of institutionalised reform can be explored through three questions: 1) Which authorities agree to co-operate at which level? Are they state treaties, or government commissions etc.? 2) At which level – region, commune – does the co-operation actually happen? 3) Which level – central state, and/or the regional, and/or the communal – does the co-operation actually benefit? (Brunn & Schmitt-Egner, 1998).

The continuing importance of the ‘border’ as a phenomenon in Europe is reflected by documents such as the Madrid Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation (Council of Europe, May 1980) and the continuing development of European policies such as the INTERREG initiative, but also through other transnational programmes such as RECITE (Regions and Cities of Europe) and EEP (European Exchange programme). INTERREG IIC was designed to develop concepts that were transnational, whilst INTEREG IIA sought to develop cross-border solutions and networks. Finally, the PHARE (Poland-Hungary Assistance for Restructuring the Economy) initiative contained a cross-border sub-programme (PHARE CBC) (see for instance Reinhard Klein, 1995) as did the TACIS programme of assistance to countries of central and eastern Europe (TACIS CBC).
Many observers, however, deplore the incompatibility of the INTERREG and PHARE and TACIS programmes since PHARE CBC can not be used as a straightforward supplement to INTERREG on the eastern side of the EU borders as INTERREG or any EU Structural Funds can not be spend outside the territory of the EU and only non-profit organisations can apply for PHARE money, which often supports basic infrastructure projects which are usually much larger than INTERREG projects. Lacking match funding from say the Czech or Polish side for projects on their territory is a real problem then, especially in the case of those with a socio-cultural character, e.g. tourism and training, as the PHARE regulations are not tailored to fund such projects (see for instance Eiko Thilemann, 2000).

Borders and border regions are clearly important in terms of the EU’s view of integration. Agenda 2000 had as its aim the enhancement and facilitation of the process of integration and transnational policies and discourses are now framing the cross border debate. The discussion also considered the language used to debate cross border issues and it was noted that the European policy discourse adopts a specific terminology on the subject of cross boundary and cross border issues:

- **Cross-border**: co-operation between geographically contiguous border regions – including maritime
- **Intra-regional**: co-operation amongst non-contiguous regions
- **Transnational**: co-operation across large multinational regions

The participants felt that ‘cross border’ issues were more narrow and local in their focus and were to be addressed by the relevant (local/regional) authorities whilst ‘transnational’ issues (as defined by INTERREG III B) were seen as a way for the EU to get involved in the process. The requirement for partners from three Member States to be involved in INTERREG projects was felt to transform the issue of defining cross border issues and cross border working into a more fluid and less rigid but publicically less easily understood state.

Peter Schmitt-Egner (1998) reviews some of the central research concepts, such as the “boundary view” (Anderson, Blake), the ”border area view” (Ratti / Martinez) and the “bottom up regionalism view” (Raich, Grom, Gross / Schmitt-Egner) and comes to the conclusion that very different theoretical concepts and definitions of ‘border’ and ‘region’ were at the basis of those, which makes interdisciplinary communication difficult and comparability of results tricky. Our working group discussion attempted to deal with this but faced the very same difficulties. Schmitt-Egner (1998) develops the notion of a “double-nature” of the region as an action space but also as an action unit. He invokes the Saar-Lor-Lux example (see also Peter Moll, 2000, 1994; Christian Schulz, 1997; Academy of Regional Research and Spatial Planning 2000, 1999, 1992) to argue that neo-functionalist theories explain perhaps the early origins (with in-built locational competition), but not current co-operation, which he views as a variant of transnational regionalism and hence represents a new ‘bottom-up’ dimension of European integration politics. Despite this, the ‘school’ of bottom-up regionalist invoked above are as yet rather sceptical and unconvinced by the praxis of cross-border co-operation so far. The REGE-Project chaired by the Mannheim Centre for European Research is the most detailed empirical analysis on European regionalism from a political science perspective based on networking models (see Beate Kohle-Koch et. al., eds., 1998). J. Beck (1997) documents that cross-border co-operation is not necessarily dealt within specialised administrative units in higher authorities, but rather as part of the overall Structural Funds. Also, it proves very difficult to change / adapt projects once underway, since a (financial and benefit) balance has to be preserved between the partners. Malcolm Anderson (1998, in Brunn & Schmitt-Egner, eds.), in what you might call ‘top-down realism’, is rather sceptical about the political abili-
ties of border region when evaluating the problem solving abilities of cross-border regions in eastern, central, and western Europe in the context of INTERREG I, arguing that "... the states still have the real financial, administrative, legal and political authority".

2 The problems of barriers in a ‘Europe without Borders’

A key question was felt to be: What are the problems of borders in a Europe ‘without borders’? It was noted that the transaction cost approach sees borders as barriers, and that some border regions can be characterised as lagging regions (see, for instance, Elisabeth Liberta (1996) on the Bavarian-Austrian “Inn-Salzach-Euregio” or Thomas Student (1998) on the German-Dutch “Ems-Dollart-Region” (EDR).

Even after the development of “open” state borders (see Joachim Blatter, 2000) there can still exist access- and interaction barriers through social, economic and cultural systems (see Schmitt-Egner, 1998) but also through physical isolation and distance say in Scandinavia where trade and labour markets have long been institutionally integrated (see for instance Marie-Louise von Bergmann-Winberg, 1998 in G. Brunn & Schmitt-Egner). Moll (2000) stresses language barriers (which would raise interaction costs by an estimated 20-25% in the Saar-Lor-Lux region) and traditionally administrative structures. In some respects, as Andreas Faludi pointed out, joint spatial planning co-ordination in say the Benelux contributes to the effective vanishing of borders in Europe and cross-border co-operation is inevitable, even if “there will always be positive, as well as negative effects from reaching across borders. No effort at rearranging borders will ever achieve more than a tolerable fit between spatial problems and the institutions designed to cope with them. So it is impossible, as they saying goes, to ‘internalise’ all problems.” (Wil Zonneveeld and Andreas Faludi, 1997, 12). But what is possible, as Paul Drewe (1998, in G. Brunn et. al., eds.) shows, is that knowledge can shared cross-border fashion through an institutional design, in this case the International Scheltt Faculty in a cross-border network between centres of higher education and research, companies and regional and local authorities between Zeeland and Flanders in the Netherlands and Belgium.

All of the presented papers (Andrea Zenker, Gabor Novotny and Olivier Sykes) started with a consideration of characteristics and typologies of barriers and borders: since any border by its very nature is a barrier that causes discontinuities in market networks, price gradients and service provision, as Caroline Brown pointed out in a brief paper in Regions in 1996, a typology can be developed based on networks and network barriers (Giatoutzi, Suarez-Villa & Stratigea, 1993; Remigio Ratti, 1993, in Ratti & S. Reichmann, eds., 1993; Oscar Martinez, 1994) leading to a conceptualisation of boundary barriers in three basic form: isolated, interconnected and jointly controlled. In Brown’s argument, then, influence on the border depends not on its character (national, regional, etc.) but on the links across it. Joachim Burdock (2000) advocates a distinction between the terms territorial border and system border (such as tax system, education system, language barriers). In terms of generic characteristics of border regions, members of the working group felt that the ‘difference’ in the sense of political, legal, economic/fiscal, cultural etc. rather than physical characteristics of each side of the border was the key, defining feature, often largely defined by national systems. Social integration, furthermore, was a topic discussed and has been argued by Milan Befon (1996) to be related to cultural affinity in his study of an the Gorizia Italian-Slovene transborder region. Also noted were the effects of imperfect economic integration. This is to be observed, for instance in the still rather limited mobility of (even highly educated) labour across Europe’s internal borders (see Peter de Gusel & Manfred Janssen, 2000; P. de Gusel et al., eds, 1999, IMIS, 1998). That other, virtual networks and services could transform border areas in some aspects is shown by Andreas Koch’s (1997) study into the development of cross-border
presence and expanding take-up of electronic banking in the “EUREGIO Maas-Rhein” whilst simultaneous branches of financial institutions are being closed.

The network strategy (Ratti, 1993; Kamann, 1993; Capelin, 1998 and Schmitt-Egner, 1998; both in G. Brun et al.) was invoked by the first two paper presenters, albeit with a different analysis as to what the characters is of these networks in the spheres of corporate R & D, business interaction in innovation, and entrepreneurial networks (Andrea Zenker; but see also Robert Hassink et. al., 1995, on limited evidence technology networking in the Maas-Rhine Euroregion; Van Houtum, 1997, on cross-border relations between firms in the border regions of the Netherlands and Belgium; and Marina van Gennuizen et. al., 1995 on cororate transborder networks) as well as public administration is concerned (Gabor Novotny). Olivier Sykes presented an internal border in the UK, where tow different planning systems and modes of delivery and needs assessment in Wales and England lead to a discontinuous provision of the population in a wider North-West region of the UK. He argued that observing and internalising the principles underlying the European Spatial Development Perspective into the UK central government’s Regional Planning guidance and planning formulation across administrative and planning system fault lines within a multi-nation state would make for a substantial improvement.

In terms of the scope and effectiveness of governance, constraints on the development of catchment areas could be a problem. However, Ole B. Jensen noted that the differences on each side of a border might be a motivating factor. Although reference is frequently made to cross border issues or ‘problems’ and the complexities of governance in such regions, borders can also be viewed as ‘areas of hope’, as the location of opportunities, or as ‘opportunity structures’ (and the “Europe 2000” document of 1994 and the “Europe 2000 +” document of 2000 by the European Commission clearly argue for the catalysing dynamic of the integration along the internal and external border of the EU to provided momentum for European integration at large). The motivating influence of border ‘difficulties’ and the complementary interests of regions on each side of the border are examples of these. The concept of cross border social capital is a potential structuring theme for the investigation of the problems and opportunities of border regions. Andreas Faludi for instance referred to the spontaneous help of German fire service and ambulances in the case of a major disaster in a Dutch border town when a fireworks factory exploded. It is interesting to note that just recently (2001) the Dutch-German EUREGIO has announced that bilingual manuals and dictionaries specifically targeted at ambulance crews have been completed in a project.

A cautioning note was introduced by Richard Köttter with reference to studies in economic geography that postulate and empirically test the notion that there is an uneven economic division of labour connected with flexible specialisation. Stefan Kraetke (1999, 1998, 1996) and Kraetke et. al., (1997) argue that the persistence of (especially wage level) economic differences between the German to the Polish side of the border has so far often led to a ‘low road’ to regional development, with weak one often rather one-sided levels of co-operation between regional firms across the border, exacerbated and partly explained by a ‘low trust environment’ which is rooted in the development of the region., and under such conditions the region being increasingly exposed to supra-regional strategies of external firms. Kraetke argues that an integrated economic region with more even and higher quality economic interaction must be the target. Haase and Hudsliak (2000) also express caution that there is an increasing mismatch due to the socio-economic transformation and disparate wealth levels between the Polish and Ukrainian border territories. Whilst this offers new chances (perhaps EU funds, e.g. for the Euroregion “Carpathia”, investment location advantages, extension of cross-border infrastructure, increasing attractiveness of the labour market in southeast Poland for Ukrainian labour migrants) there are also difficulties for transregional co-operation (increase of socio-economic disparities, dependence on bilateral co-operation on “European” inter-
ests of the Ukraine, decrease in cross-border contacts with further economic integration, competition on the south-eastern Polish labour market due to increasing numbers of seasonal Ukrainian labour migrants). The development and implementation of Schengen I and II will provide the framework for whether the ‘soft’ internal borders of the EU will be complemented by ‘hard’ and perhaps even fully closed fully external borders (c.f. Brunn & Schmitt-Egner, 1998: 12).

3 Regional Governance in Cross Border Regions

Notwithstanding developments at the European level designed to encourage the consideration of cross border issues and promote cross border co-operation, regional governance in the border regions has a key role to play. Changes of mentality in the border areas themselves were felt to be essential to European integration. It was noted that the attitude of local politicians in cross border regions is very important in this respect. Generally, in this respect it should prove fruitful to revisit the theme of social construction and communication of boundaries within a critical multidimensional, multidisciplinary social science framework as suggested by David Newman and Anssi Paasi (1998).

It was argued in the working group that relatively little money so far has been available through the INTERREG programme to addressing the problems of such regions and that such inputs have so far had limited results, although there is a plethora of studies on different border regions and the (limited) impact that EU programmes have made. Raimondo Strasoldo (1998, in G. Brunn et. al., eds.) is arguing for a real momentum of cross-border co-operation evident even though the ARGE Alpe-Adria ‘working community’ in north-central Europe (Italy, Bavaria, Austria, Slovenia, Croatia) has not yet achieved the recipient status of EU grants. Andrew Church and Peter Reid (1999, 1996, 1995) have studied the Anglo-French “Arc Manche” in terms of local urban authority transfrontier maritime co-operation, partly underpinned by EU-programming for Atlantic Arc (ARANTEL and FINATLANTIC funds / projects) and then under INTERREG I and INTERREG II to widen the participation to county and region level. They diagnose a substantial amount of competition and lack of co-ordination in cross-border co-operation in the maritime border areas of England and France. This is mirrored by Morata’s (1996) observation (see Perkmann, 1999) who notes the competition between the Catalonia comunidad autonoma and the city of Barcelona, which concern cross-border co-operation (with the former in the Euroregion, and the latter in the C-6 network - a collaborative arrangement between cities close to the French-Spanish border) as well as interregional co-operation (Catanunia in the Four Motors, Barcelona in the Eurocities).

In terms of regional governance, institutional design is the main problem, and some participants felt that institutional convergence was not possible or probable. In contrast, others felt that institutions and approaches might evolve in a pluralist, bottom-up, local / regional way in keeping with the principle of subsidiarity. It was felt that there is a need for some level of formalisation of relationships to overcome cross border problems. There might, however, be issues relating to hierarchies and the transformation of relationships and ensuring that the needs of both regions are considered. As Peter Moll (2000, 1994), Christian Schulz (1997) and the ARL (1999, 1992) have documented in a series of publications on the German-French-Belgian-Luxemburgian “Saar-Lor-Lux” region, it is only the development of bilateral or multilateral legal agreements (that have partly been achieved in, for instance, the “Isselburg-Anholt Accord” between the German Land of NorthRhine-Westphalia, the Land of Lower Saxony, the Federal Republic of Germany and The Netherlands which came into force on 1st of January of 1993, the “Karlsruhe Accord” of 23rd January 1996 between the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Luxemburg and Switzerland and the Mainz Accord between the German Länder of North-Rhine Westphalia, Rhine-Palatinate and the region of Wallonia and German Community in Belgium of the 8th of March 1996 that allow subnational
regional and local authorities to directly negotiate with each other on territorial services, share financial provision and found cross-border institutions without and also with a independent legal incorporation as well as cross-border local 'instrumental associations' (for this; see Ulrich Beyerlin, 1998, in G. Brunn & Schmitt-Egner, eds.) that can provide the platform for a breakthrough in the quality and depth of the interaction and co-operation across international borders.

Transborder regions that have often been studied in the above respects are in particular the Dutch-German border regions (see for instance Thomas Student, 1998; Heinz Heineberg and Klaus Temlitz, eds., 1998; Jens Gabbe, 1997; M. Schack, 1997; James Scott, 1996; IMIS, 1998; Raich, S., 1994) and the Polish-German and Czech-German Euroregions (see for example Eiko Thielemann, 2000; Peter Jurzsek, ed., 1996; Ewa Bojar, 1996; Frank-Dieter Grimm, 1998, 1996; James Scott, 1998 a and b; J. Scott and K. Collins, 1997; Stefan Kraetke, 1999, 1998, 1996; Anne Kennard, 1995).

Some authors, such as Markus Perkmann (1999), or Nues Gomez-Matardin on the Catalunya/ Languedoc Roussillon / Midi Pyrénées Euroregion (1998, in G. Brunn et. al, eds.), have argued that there is the emergence of a specific form of governance based on cross border co-operation (CBC) in European border regions where the EU has had a substantial organisational input through its programmes. Perkmann locates CBC within the emerging EU polity, arguing that it represents an example of the building of multi-level governance networks. Cross-border regions (CBR), although loosely articulated, are then are seen as terrains for producing new transnational actors and new opportunities for existing actors. De facto, Perkmann (1996: 659) argues, "CBC is governed by a twin structure: the CBR organizations with their representative and administrative bodies, and the supra-local structures constituted by the INTERREG committees and the authorities involved". What emerges is a "process of institution building involving a complex network of networks that simultaneously constrains and empowers participating actors, with two types of sub-networks being identified: 'horizontal' networks among the local actors; and 'vertical' networks linking local actors with higher level state and European administrations ... CBC has to regarded as state action, although, at the same time, it points to the changing nature of statehood resulting from European integration and the relative hanges in the modalities of public action" (Perkmann, 1996: 665). Bas Denters, Rob Schobben and Anne van der Veen (1998, in G. Brunn et. al., eds.) observe that cross-border co-operation along the Dutch-German and Dutch-Belgian border, more often than not, 'is still in its infancy' but that 'the targets euregions are setting themselves are becoming progressively more ambitious' with being 'the target for often generous EU subsidies'. They conclude that under these circumstances these cross-border public authorities require a more solid legal foundation providing safeguards for democratic control and efficiency in allocation – effectively arguing for governance structures which 'meet the criterion of legitimacy', display 'allocative efficiency or effectiveness' when concerning regional collective and quasi-collective goods and 'meet elementary criteria of democratic control over public policies and funds'.

It's was agreed and insisted on at some length in the working group that one of the prospects that border regions offer is one of 'spaces of experimentation', including institutional experimentation. It was argued that one of the continuing research needs was to study and evaluate the performance and potential of different manifestations of this experimental approach of public policy in Europe.

In a much wider sense, but perhaps building on these achievements which can make a material difference to peoples’ lives in the essential services they receive, Marion Unal stressed that the creation of 'European public space' should be the ultimate goal when addressing the problems of borders in a Europe without borders. Richard Kotter argued that the 'Europeanisation' of public administration that is being observed by many scholars (see ARENA group, Oslo University) may help in that undertaking.
4 Next Steps

It was felt that a research strategy was needed to investigate the issues discussed. There was a need for further empirical research including case studies and evaluation to highlight best practice. However, the lack of an established theoretical background for researching border regions and governance in such regions also needed to be addressed. It was felt that another key area where there was a need for more research was institutional design for cross-border regions, and that there is a need to ask ‘What institutional inputs are necessary?’ It was important to make use of the network of border research institutes that exist across Europe (for instance Uni of Nijmegen, Hochschule Flensburg, Institut for Grensregionsforsknings, Abenraa) and to share knowledge and best practice. Mention was made of the Journal of Borderlands Studies (JBS) edited at the Nijmegen Centre for Border Research as a useful reference point for research and debate. The European Sociological Association (ESA) also has a standing working group on ‘State Borders and Border Regions’.

In summary, it was felt that future research on cross-border regions and governance should consider the following questions and themes:

- What is the nature of borders, boundaries and barriers in a ‘Europe without borders’?
- Governance in cross border regions
  - What are the different types of regional Governance in cross-border regions?
  - What are the restraints and restrictions for Governance in border areas?
  - The Effectiveness of cross border governance
  - Institutional design for, and experimentation in, cross border regions
- Borders as sources of opportunity
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The conference is limited to 50 persons and addresses especially to young researchers on post-graduate level, not older than 35. The participants should come from the member states or associated states of the EC and have research experience in regional governance or regional development. Since the topic requires an interdisciplinary approach researchers of different scientific disciplines are welcome (sociology, political science, geography, spatial planning etc.).

Young researchers will receive financial support covering travel expenses, accommodation and participation fees. If the number of applications exceeds the number of participants allowed the organizers will have to select the participants according to the following criteria: research experience, actual involvement in the topic and national quota. The selection will be made by an international panel of senior researchers.

Organization and registration
The official language of the conference is English. Persons interested to participate should send the enclosed application form until February 28, 2001, to the conference office (see next column). Applicants should attach a curriculum vitae, a list of publications and information to what extent the researcher is involved in the topic of regional governance.
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**Regional governance - New modes of self-government in the European Community**

**Why new modes of regional governance?**
In the wake of globalization and European integration, the importance of regions is growing. As the research field of regional governance still is rather diffuse, the conference aims to clarify which forms of regional governance develop in the European member states, what the basic logic of the different patterns of regional governance is, and what makes governance effective.

**What is a High Level Scientific Conference?**
High Level Scientific Conferences are supported by the EC to promote scientific and technological excellence.

Therefore, the conference aims at contributing to the advancement of science through exchanges between senior researchers and young researchers and to create research networks on an international level.

**What are the key topics of the conference?**
The four main objectives of the conference are:
- Interchange between young and experienced researchers.
- Discussion about state-of-the-art regional governance in the EC based on different examples.
- Identification of the most important research questions.
- Creation of networks for further research.

---

**Thursday, 19.04.01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Arrival and check-in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13.00-13.20 | Welcome Address  
Ludwig Schätzl, President of the  
University of Hanover  
Dietrich Furst, Institute of Regional  
Planning and Research (IRL)  
University of Hanover  
Axel Plies, Vice President of the Academy  
for Regional Research (ARR), Hanover |
| 13.20-13.30 | Topics of the Conference  
Jørg Knøeberg, KoRIS, Hanover |
| 13.30-14.30 | Statement I: Regional governance defined:  
Relating regional governance to the milieu  
approach and the regulation approach  
Helmint Voelkow, Max-Planck-Institute for  
the Study of Societies, Cologne |
| 14.30-15.30 | Statement II: National differences influencing  
regional governance styles  
Theo A.J. Toussen, Faculty of Social Science,  
University of Leiden |
| 15.30-16.15 | Coffee break |
| 16.15-17.15 | Statement III: Spatial planning as mediator for  
regional governance  
Patty Heesley, Centre for Research in  
European Urban Environment, Department of  
Town and Country Planning, University of  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne |
| 17.15 | General discussion |
| 18.30 | Reception at the State Capital of Hanover  
Welcome Address  
Herbert Schmalsieg, Lord Mayor of Hanover |

---

**Friday, 20.04.01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00-12.30</td>
<td>Parallel work groups (part I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | What is the heuristic added value of regional governance?  
Moderation: Patrick Le Gaët, CEVIPOF, Paris |
| 2 | What are the main characteristics of regional governance and how do they differ between European member states?  
Moderation: Andreas Fakult, Faculty of Policy Sciences, University of Nijmegen |
| 3 | Could regional planning play a dominant role in shaping regional governance?  
Moderation: Geoff Wigan, Centre for Research in European Urban Environment, Department of  
Town and Country Planning, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne |
| 12.30-13.45 | Lunch break |
| 13.45-15.00 | Guided Tour: City of Hanover |
| 15.00-18.00 | Parallel work groups (part II) |
| 4 | Regional governance patterns of urban areas  
Moderation: Joo Seok, University of Lisbon |
| 5 | Regional governance patterns of rural areas  
Moderation: Lars-Inge Strom, Mid Sweden  
University, Sundsvall |
| 6 | Regional governance patterns of cross-border regions  
Moderation: Enrico Gusla, Department of Spatial Planning in Europe, University of Dortmund |
| 19.00 | Dinner in the city of Hanover |

---

**Saturday, 21.04.01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00-10.00</td>
<td>Plenary session: Presentation of work groups’ results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.30-12.30 | Three parallel final work groups:  
Identification of topics for further research |
| 12.30-14.00 | Plenary session: Presentation of work groups’ results |
| 14.00-15.00 | Concluding lunch |
The topic of a Scientific EuroConference held in Hanover/Germany, from April 19th to 21st 2001, was Regional Governance. The conference was subsidized by the European Commission, DG Research, Human Potential Programme. The publication presents an overview over the objectives, the organization, the content and the results of the conference.

The background of organizing the venue refers to the fact that during the last ten years "regional governance" has become a topic of scientific discussion, fueled by the influence of globalization, the EC policies (structural funds, ESDP-process, Committee of the Regions etc.) and regionalization strategies of the member states. In addition, the EC organized a discourse on "governance" in the wake of the "Nizza-process".

The objectives of the conference were: to get more insights into the present discussion on "regional governance", to identify open research questions concerning the general topic, to organize an academic discourse between younger and senior researchers within Europe and to mobilize young researchers of different European states to form research-networks on some of the identified research questions.


Der Hintergrund für die Organisation des Treffens war die Tatsache, dass in den letzten 10 Jahren 'regional governance' ein Gegenstand wissenschaftlicher Diskussion geworden ist, angetrieben durch den Einfluss der Globalisierung, durch die EU-Politiken (Strukturfonds, EUREK-Prozess, Ausschuss der Regionen usw.) und durch die regionalen Strategien der Mitgliedsstaaten. Darüber hinaus hat die EU einen Gedankenaustausch über 'governance' im Zusammenhang mit dem 'Nizza-Prozess' organisiert.

Die Ziele der Konferenz waren, mehr Einsicht in die gegenwärtige Diskussion über die 'regional governance' zu gewinnen, offene wissenschaftliche Fragestellungen, die die generelle Thematik betreffen, herauszuarbeiten, einen akademischen Gedankenaustausch zwischen jüngeren und älteren Wissenschaftlern innerhalb Europas zu organisieren und junge Wissenschaftler aus verschiedenen europäischen Staaten zu ermutigen, Forschungsnetzwerke zu bilden, die sich mit einigen der herausgestellten Forschungsfragen befassen.