



Second Workshop

“New territorial development model: macro-regions and cross-border cooperation”

15 MARCH 2012

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND RESEARCH, SCIENCES PO
PARIS

Synthesis

The proceedings were opened by Didier Michal from the French Ministry Delegation, DATAR, who hosted the workshop. Then John Bachtler (European Policies Research Centre, University of Strathclyde), François Bafail (CNRS-CERI-Sciences Po, Paris) and Marcin Dąbrowski (Institute for European Integration Research, Vienna) made a short introduction to the workshop.

The programme of the workshop was slightly revised in order to give more time for the discussion. Instead of four discussion sessions, the first two sessions on the theoretical approach of macro-regions and the evaluation of the macro-region were grouped together in the morning. Then the afternoon papers were again discussed together: both the regulatory tools of the cooperation and two illustrations of cross border cooperations.

The morning session focused on a more theoretical approach of macro-regional strategies. Dominic Stead (Delft University of Technology) presented a paper on “*The strategy for the Baltic Sea Region: new arenas for cooperation, for integration at EU, national and subnational level*”. His paper focused on the meaning of the Europeanisation process in the case of the macro-regions especially at subnational level and on the governance of the process. He concluded that macro-regions are promoting more soft spaces and that they lead to spatial rescaling in many fields such as practices and operation, interaction and actors. Then Kristine Kern (Potsdam University) presented the paper co-authored by Stefan Gänzle (University of Agder) on “*EU macro-regional strategies: a new mode of European governance?*” This paper complemented the first presentation and emphasized the tensions between regionalisation and Europeanisation. Both papers underlined the rule of the “3nos” affecting the macro-regional process: no new legislation, no new institution, no new

financial resources. The third paper on *“Macro-regional strategies: a recipe for success?”* co-authored by Irene McMaster, was presented by Arno van der Zwet (European Policies Research Centre, University of Strathclyde). It compared INTERREG and macro-regional strategy in terms of policy development and concluded that policy initiation, management, programme implementation and animation differed especially regarding the role of the Central state and subnational actors and that it represents a mix of governance dimensions with more flexibility for the macro-regional process. The paper concluding this first session - *“Wither a North-Sea macro-region?”* - was presented by Mike Danson (University of the West of Scotland). In his presentation Professor Danson showed that despite the rule of the “3nos”, some regions and countries, especially when they are peripheral but sharing a long history, may have common issues and common interests to share in order to promote changes. The North Sea region illustrates this situation and is promoting a bottom up approach of the cross border cooperation that needs to evolve towards more strategy. But until now the European member States have not really engaged with the idea of a North Sea Strategy. After all four presentations the discussants reacted to the papers and launched the debate.

The afternoon session began with the presentation of Richard Hummelbrunner (OEAR Regionalberatung, Vienna) on *“European territorial cooperation as a vehicle for European integration”*. He discussed the shortcomings and challenges of European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) and the way this tool could represent a framework to incorporate macro-regional strategies provided the strategic focus and profile of ETC programmes are strengthened and simplified to improve visibility and capitalisation. Then Alice Engl (University of Innsbruck) focused on EGTC, presenting her paper entitled *“EGTC regulation as tool to enhance cross-border cooperation in Europe: a functional spill over in EU cohesion policy?”* She showed how the EGTC regulation depended on the decision making process between the different EU institutions and how necessary it was to facilitate the use of this instrument concluding that territorial cooperation has evolved from a counter-balancing instrument to the establishment of a common market to a key objective in cohesion policy. The last two papers presented analyses of two cases studies of cross border cooperation. Urszula Roman-Kamphaus (University of the West of Scotland) presented an analysis written together with Katja Sarmiento-Mirwaldt (London School of Economics and Political Science) on *“A comparison of culture and policy effectiveness in the Polish-German and Polish-Slovak border regions”*. This comparison concluded that governance of cross-border cooperation is influenced by different factors among which the type of local and regional self-government, the legal background, socio-economic factors, funding (or lack of it) and culture. These factors influence the policy definition, implementation and innovation as regards cross-border cooperation in the two cases presented with policy innovation more present in the case of the Polish-German border. Finally Cyril Blondel (Tours University) presented his paper entitled *“The European institutionalization of the Serbia-Croatia borderland from local perspective: discussing reinterpretations and real effects”* focusing his approach on the conditions under which the power is institutionalized in regions by paying attention to the interactions between the actors. His analysis on the Serbian-Croatian border shows that the use of EU cross-border programme illustrates the pacification of the relations, while at the same time reinforcing the respective regions at the expense of mutual collaboration. But at least, the Europeanisation supports a discourse of tolerance of both sides of the borders but some European policy approaches are not well adapted to a post-ethnic war context and

therefore the EU cross-border programme is rather considered as a project stimulating enthusiasm, but also opportunism and disillusionment. Despite these drawbacks, it enabled the slow and fragile building and remobilization of cross-border intra-regional networks as well as the creation of new institutional intra-regional spaces of cooperation. However, the lever effect of cross-border cooperation on the population is very weak and still faces post-war distrust.

All four papers were then commented upon by the discussants who launched the debate. The presentations resulted in many questions from all the participants mainly focusing on the conditions of emergence of cross-border cooperation, on the added value of those programmes, on the results of existing experiences and the way those experiences might be transferable.