

The European Spatial Development Perspective Shaping the Agenda¹

Andreas Faludi

Contact details of the author:

Andreas Faludi: Delft University of Technology, OTB Research Institute for Housing, Urban and Mobility Studies, The Netherlands (A.K.F.Faludi@tudelft.nl), has been a chronicler of European spatial planning since the early-1990s. He has studied the ESDP and is continuing to do so with its various applications and follow-ups. Pointing out options for the further pursuit of the ESDP agenda, he has taken on the mantle of a self-appointed one-man pressure group. However, this pro-active stance does not imply favouring any one planning model or any one of the institutional actors involved over the others. Thus the author identifies neither with the European Commission nor with France, The Netherlands or Germany – being the Member States that have taken most of the initiatives during the ESDP process.

Abstract

The fact that they have created the European Union (EU) notwithstanding, Member States are suspicious of, and even hostile to it. This creates a dynamic that is often puzzling, and this is also true for spatial planning. The latter is not a competence of the European Community, but there is the inter-governmental European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) and INTERREG. Also, in this framework, the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) has been set up with the purpose of providing an analytical base for following through on the ESDP agenda. Meanwhile, the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe has identified territorial cohesion as an objective of the Union and a competence shared with the Member States. While waiting for its ratification, the European Commission formulated its proposals for cohesion policy for 2007-2013. Against this backdrop, Member States resumed their initiative to give them a presence in a future territorial cohesion policy led by the Commission. In the changed circumstances after the French and Dutch 'no' to the Constitution, their 'Territorial Agenda for the European Union', due to be adopted in May 2007, will be even more significant. The Slovenian Presidency of 2008 may put this document before the European Council, which would be the first time that territorial issues had been discussed at this level.

The fact that they themselves have created the European Union (EU) does not prevent the Member States from nurturing misgivings about European integration. This makes for an institutional dynamic that is often puzzling – with the present ‘reflection period’ in the wake of the rejection of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe at the hands of French and Dutch voters only the latest in a series of crises that the EU seems to periodically go through. In this complex field the EU has to keep on operating. Complexity has also been a salient feature of the process of making the European Spatial Development Perspective, or ESDP (CEC 1999). Arguably, the ESDP anticipated the agenda centred on the need to strengthen Europe’s competitiveness adopted one year later at Lisbon in 2000 and reaffirmed in 2005. Being in the service of the ‘Growth and Jobs’ agenda, EU cohesion policy – and with it whatever territorial cohesion policy there is or will be – has to square the circle of pursuing Europe’s competitiveness while at the same time compensating peripheral, or even ‘ultra-peripheral’ areas or areas suffering from geographical handicaps as well as others that are undergoing industrial restructuring. The very concept of territorial cohesion is thus complex, not to say ambivalent (Faludi 2005; forthcoming a). Nevertheless, for reasons to be outlined further below, the current label under which the ESDP agenda is being pursued is that of territorial cohesion. Materially though, the agenda has not changed much since the completion of the ESDP when it defined polycentrism and urban-rural partnership, parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge and sustainable development and the protection of natural and cultural heritage as the three ‘spheres of activity’ making up the European spatial planning agenda (CEC 1999, 11). This agenda is being pursued along various avenues. Originally, of course, it related to the EU15. For this and other reasons, like its weak analytical base, the makers of the ESDP have always assumed that the document would be revised. The European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) was thus set up for the express purpose of providing a base for this follow-up. In addition, there is the Community Initiative INTERREG, one strand of which specifically relates to the ESDP agenda.

Presently, the Commission is trying to salvage territorial cohesion policy, formulating requirements for the National Strategic Reference Frameworks and in particular for the Operational Programmes being produced under the brand new structural funds regulations. Against this backdrop, the Member States resumed their initiative. Originally this was meant to give them a presence in a future territorial cohesion policy led by the Commission. In the changed circumstances after the French and Dutch ‘no’ to the Constitution, the ‘Territorial Agenda for the European Union’ due to be completed in May 2007 will be significant. The idea is that the Slovenian Presidency of 2008 will put this document on the agenda of the European Council. The respective initiatives of the Commission and the Member States form parallel avenues for pursuing the ESDP agenda. One thing seems certain though: there will not be a renewed ESDP. Before disentangling these various strands it seems apposite then to explain the approach of this work.

This approach has been the standard one in qualitative research: assimilating published as well as unpublished sources and holding interviews with the soldiers in the European planning trenches. This kind of research implies however more than just the collection of information. One needs to interpret the strategies of various actors in terms of their ‘opportunity structures’, shaped as they are by organisational cultures, institutions and positions. The resulting account of the complex processes going on should ring true for the participants and in this sense represent an inter-subjective ac-

count of European spatial planning. Apparently, a previous work co-authored by the present author (Faludi, Waterhout 2002) has succeeded in achieving this aim, and much of his work since, including the present paper, has taken the story further towards the dawn of a new programming period – but note that there have also been attempts to position European spatial planning against the backdrop of theoretical debates about European integration (Faludi 2002a).

In addition to undertaking, the author has interacted with other academic observers of European planning. Vehicles have been joint projects, including the editing or co-editing of special issues (Faludi, Zonneveld 1997; Zonneveld, Faludi 1997; Böhme, Faludi 2000; Faludi 2001; 2003; 2005; 2006; Priemus, Zonneveld, Faludi 2004; Janin-Rivolin, Faludi 2005) and books (Faludi 2002b; forthcoming a). The other authors involved come from all corners of Europe, mostly, but not exclusively, the EU15. This is so for the simple reason that European planning is an idea that was hatched long before the recent enlargement. As indicated, the first major contribution to this agenda from a new Member State will come in 2008.

Also, the author has been a convenor, since the late-1990s, of a track of the annual congress of the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP) dedicated to European and transnational planning which has become a meeting place for interested academic researchers.

A welcome side-effect of engaging in discussions about European planning has been that the author has become more knowledgeable of European integration generally, becoming enthusiastic, not about a federal Europe – wrongly seen by many as the obvious alternative to Member States calling the shots – but about the EU as a ‘learning machine’ (Faludi forthcoming b). Its current crisis notwithstanding, European integration needs to proceed along its uncertain path, pursuing what Beck (2006) describes as the ‘cosmopolitan project’ of Europe.

The ambitions of this paper are more modest though than exploring such avenues. The paper engages neither in any kind of causal analysis of the processes taking place nor in a holistic interpretation of European spatial planning in the 2000s. A ‘thick’ description of what is going on, giving an orientation to whoever is interested in the short- and medium term future of European planning is all that the paper aims for. For this purpose, the paper briefly discusses the formal issue of whether the EU has a competence in spatial planning. It then identifies various follow-ups to the ESDP. It thus homes in on the new objective of cohesion policy, European territorial cooperation, as the chief vehicle for these follow ups beyond 2006. The paper ends by discussing the initiative of the Member States to formulate the ‘Territorial Agenda for the European Union’. The conclusions expand upon the expected significance of this initiative for cohesion policy generally.

The formal issue

It is generally claimed that spatial planning is not a competence of the EU. Indeed, it is not to be found in the EU treaties, but what is often overlooked is that, other than the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, about which more below, the existing EU treaties, in particular the Treaty establishing the European Community (Official Journal 2002) do not talk about competences. Rather, the definition of competences is a new element in the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe. What the

current treaties do is stipulate objectives, and it is for the EU institutions to then outline the measures needed to achieve them. In the past, major, and now well-established areas of EU policy, like regional and environmental policy, have been opened up long before being formalised by including specific titles in the Single European Act. There would have been nothing to prevent spatial planning from taking the same path – except that in the 1990s, and thus post-Maastricht when weariness about European integration had set in – there was no agreement on the matter. So the competence issue was not a legal but a political issue.

Had there been agreement, it would have been possible to bring spatial planning under the umbrella of what is called the ‘Community method’. If so, then the Commission could have taken initiatives for the Council of Ministers and for the European Parliament to approve under what is called ‘co-decision-making’. Since this was not, however, the case, the ESDP was prepared by an *ad-hoc* ‘Committee on Spatial Development’ operating under the authority of the ministers responsible for spatial planning of the Member States of the EU12, and later EU15. The meetings of ministers sometimes styled, somewhat incongruously, as informal councils – a designation normally reserved for formations of the Council of Ministers meeting outside the official Council seats at Brussels or Luxembourg and thus unable to take formal decisions – had no status and could not, indeed did not wish to, impose anything on anybody. Significantly, the ESDP was thus never officially adopted. The German Presidency at the final meeting at Potsdam where the document was presented merely noted that the political discussions of ministers on the issues covered had come to an end.

The reason why the ESDP was kept informal was to keep it out of the clutches of the Commission. At the same time it is impossible to ignore the Commission’s commitment to the intergovernmental ESDP. However, this did not represent a considered and entrenched body of opinion within the Commission, let alone a policy that has ever been on the table of the College of Commissioners. Rather, where it says ‘Commission’, the paper is actually referring to a handful of officials at the Directorate-General Regional Policy involved in the process. Their commitment to the substantive policies notwithstanding, their reason for being sympathetic to the ESDP seems to have had a bureaupolitical *raison d’être*. They must have assumed that in the fullness of time responsibility for European spatial planning would come their way. In fact, and not unreasonably, the Commissioner for regional policy at the time argued before the ministers of spatial planning at their informal meeting in Madrid in 1995 that a mandate for spatial planning was implied in the twin treaty objective of economic and social cohesion. This came to nothing, but at least there was sufficient momentum for completing the ESDP, and the Commission continued to support this intergovernmental process (Faludi and Waterhout 2002).

No sooner than the ESDP was on the books, the Commission moved the agenda to a newly established sub-committee of the Committee on the Development and Conversion of Regions established under the regulations for the Structural Funds 2000-2006. It went by the name of ‘Spatial and Urban Development’ (SUD) and – other than with the Committee on Spatial Development – was chaired by a Commission representative. Some of the members were veterans of the ESDP process.

Not only had the ESDP machinery thus been dismantled – this being one of the reasons why the document has not been updated to take account of enlargement – the Commission embraced a new discourse. This was under a new Commissioner for re-

gional policy, the Frenchman Michel Barnier. Barnier embraced arguments advanced by French regional lobbies that there was a need to attend to territorial in addition to economic and social cohesion, the reason being to defend the position of so-called services of general interest against the onslaught of free-market ideologues. Barnier represented the Commission on the Presidium of the Convention on the Future of Europe. The Convention's proposal for a Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe identifies 'territorial cohesion' as an objective of the Union and a competence shared with the Member States. The version of the treaty adopted (at the second attempt) on 18 June 2004 and duly signed by the heads of state and government at a ceremony in Rome on 29 October 2004 incorporates this proposal. However, as is well known, French and Dutch voters opposing the ratification of the Constitution by a handsome margin have dealt the Constitutional Treaty a blow.

Had the Constitution been ratified, the Commission would undoubtedly have taken the initiative as regards territorial cohesion policy. In fact, only days before the French referendum, at an informal ministerial meeting, about which more below, in Luxembourg in May 2005 the Commission representative announced that there would be a White Paper on territorial cohesion. He would not have done so without at least an outline of such a White Paper having been discussed at higher levels within the Commission. Now, of course, whatever its shape, that outline is gathering dust on the shelves. For some time to come territorial cohesion policy will have to continue without a clear mandate.

What comes next in terms of the constitutional quagmire is anyone's guess. Lea (2005, 67) sees policy-making going ahead as if the Constitution had been ratified, showing the European elites' casually ignoring the will of the electorates. Is this true for territorial cohesion policy? Under the new Commissioner for regional policy, Danutu Hübner from Poland, the Commission appears to be soft-peddalling on territorial cohesion. However, various processes have already been set in motion, and so, albeit under a different label, on the shop floor the agenda is being followed through.

Follow-ups

Firstly we have INTERREG, a Community Initiative under the Commission's control, one strand of which (INTERREG IIC) was devoted to transnational planning in the period 1996-1999. This strand continued under the flag of 'transnational co-operation', code-named INTERREG IIIB, which came into operation in 2000 and will end in 2006. Under INTERREG IIC/IIIB, hundreds of collaborative, hands-on exercises were co-financed by the EU, with, according to Müller et al. (2005, 1), more than ten thousand people involved. This must have had a diffuse effect in terms of the Europeanisation of state, regional and urban planning as intended by the makers of the ESDP (CEC 1999, 45).

There is also the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) set up originally to provide the analytical base for amplifying the ESDP agenda. The ESDP itself did not have such a base to draw on, at least not one that was consistent across the Member States. Indeed, for a long time, the makers of the ESDP were hoping for ESPON to be set up in time for results to feed into their final document. This was however an idle hope because the Commission argued that the lack of a specific competence in this field – always stressed by the Member States when it came to keeping

the Commission at bay – made it impossible to allocate a budget line for co-financing a permanent research network.

The Commission financed a two-year experimental Study Programme for European Spatial Planning instead. The evaluation was positive, and so ESPON got off the ground in 2002. It covers the territory of the EU as presently constituted, in addition to that of the two new members that will join on 1 January 2007 plus Norway and Switzerland. As such, ESPON proudly speaks of the ‘EU29’. ESPON 2006 is due to draw to a close at the end of the present programming period, but the reader should note that it will continue as ‘ESPON 2013’ to operate as a ‘European observation network for territorial development and cohesion’. Co-ordinated by a small unit situated in Luxembourg, ESPON is pursuing many relevant themes and brings together hundreds of researchers doing innovative work.

In addition, even while there was still the prospect of the Constitutional Treaty being ratified, the Commission proposed in the context of EU Cohesion Policy for 2007-2013 – the next programming period – to pursue ‘territorial co-operation’ as its third objective. This amounts to ‘mainstreaming’ the Community Initiative INTERREG (and also URBAN), thereby putting it on a more secure footing. It seems that this objective was also intended to provide a vehicle for an interim territorial cohesion policy preparing the ground for a more favourable situation after ratification of the Constitution. This would explain the substantial funding foreseen under this title for ‘structuring projects’. However, funding for territorial co-operation has been heavily curtailed during the negotiations over the ‘Financial Framework 2007-2013’, making the financing of structural projects illusory.

There is a less obvious option for pursuing an implicit territorial cohesion policy even in the absence of the Constitution being ratified. The requirements of obtaining structural funds include the formulation of bottom-up strategies. If handled well, this could become a vehicle for factoring territorial cohesion into the formulation of programmes. Indeed, the technical guidelines for *ex-ante* evaluations refer in Annex 4 specifically to a territorial dimension. (Directorate General Regional Policy 2006) This could give substance to an implicit EU territorial cohesion policy. Note though that the regulations for the Structural Funds for the current programming period 2000-2006 already stipulated that programmes should assimilate the ESDP agenda, but to little effect (Roney, Polverari 2002ab). Be that as it may, in the absence of the Constitution being ratified, this seems a way forward for the Commission to effectively pursue its territorial cohesion agenda.

While still anticipating ratification of the Constitution, Member States took another initiative. They started to formulate a document called ‘The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union’. Preparation is still ongoing. It is intended to be ‘evidence-based’, using ESPON results. The Member States, at least those from Northwest Europe that are now taking the initiative (Faludi, Waterhout 2005) have learned not to depend on the Commission. In so doing, they seem to have been driven by the expectation that, if and when the Constitutions were to be ratified, the Commission would invoke the Community method. Indeed, initially, the Commission in turn was unenthusiastic about this Member State initiative, sensing it to be in competition with its own intentions.

The work proceeds without active support from the Commission, and the intention is that it will be completed in time for an EU ministerial conference scheduled for May 2007 – ten years after the meeting of the spatial planning ministers of the EU15 in Noordwijk in 1997 gave its blessing to the first official draft of the ESDP. The venue, Leipzig, is also significant (Böhme, Schön 2006). The ‘Leipzig Principles’ adopted in 1994 laid the foundations for the ESDP. Albeit in a different form, Member States are thus once again the standard bearers of the ESDP agenda. As will become clear, in the changed circumstances of the present with little prospect of the Constitutional Treaty being ratified any time soon, the Commission should look upon this Member State initiative with more sympathy.

ESPON 2013 will be obtaining funds from the ‘territorial co-operation’ objective. So the networking of researchers around territorial themes and issues will continue, but it is recommended that there should be a stronger focus on informing practitioners rather than just academics (Rambøll Management 2006). ESPON is an instrument of the Commission, albeit one that it invokes as always in co-operation with the Member States represented on the Management Committee. There is however great potential here for the relationship between the Member State initiative and ESPON 2013 co-financed by the Commission to become a symbiotic one.

The remainder of this paper goes into more detail as regards territorial co-operation and ESPON on the one hand and the ‘Territorial Agenda’ on the other.

European territorial co-operation and ESPON

The Commission’s ‘Proposal for the New Structural Funds Regulations for the Period 2007-2013’ (CEC 2004) identified European territorial co-operation as the third objective of cohesion policy. Its follow-up was the Communication ‘Cohesion Policy in Support of Growth and Jobs: Community Strategic Guidelines, 2007-2013’ (CEC 2005). Coming out at a time when it had become clear that the Constitution – and with it EU territorial cohesion policy – was in trouble, this latter Communication fudged the distinction between cohesion policy as such – for which under the current EU treaty the Community had a mandate – and territorial cohesion policy, for which it did not. In any case, cohesion policy is now part of the attempt to revive the ‘Lisbon Strategy’ to turn Europe into the most competitive area of sustainable growth worldwide. In fact it is one of the most important instruments of the EU. For the rest, the Lisbon Strategy is for the Member States to pursue, albeit in conjunction with the Commission. For this reason, what is now called the ‘Growth and Jobs’ agenda is the overriding concern, also for cohesion policy.

The same cohesion policy is an important item in the EU budget. Unfortunately however it became embroiled in the conflict over the Financial Perspectives 2007-2013. The eventual agreement involves a reduction of the multi-annual package. Territorial co-operation is the big loser, with its allocation in percentage terms virtually halved. Within the objective, there has been a shift away from transnational cooperation towards cross-border cooperation (Bachtler, Wislade 2005, 55). However, recently the European Parliament has insisted, and the Council has accepted the need for more funding for European territorial co-operation, and this may entails, among other things, additional resources for ESPON.

In the meantime, the structural funds regulation has been duly adopted (Official Journal 2006), but not before the Financial Perspectives 2007-2013 had been sorted out (European Parliament, Council, Commission 2006). With all of this out of the way, the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament could approve the definite Community Strategic Guidelines. This all had to be done under the existing EU treaty that defines territorial cohesion neither as an objective nor as a shared competence of the Union. The Community Strategic Guidelines address territorial cohesion even so. They say that one

‘...of the features of cohesion policy – in contrast to sectoral policies – lies in its capacity to adapt to the particular needs and characteristics of specific geographical challenges and opportunities. Under cohesion policy, geography matters. Accordingly, when developing their programmes and concentrating resources on key priorities, Member States and regions should pay particular attention to these specific geographical circumstances.’ (Council of the European Union 2006, 40)

This is where the Commission has been trying to inject territorial cohesion concerns into mainstream cohesion policy. Comprehensive territorial strategies are of course the hallmark of the ‘spatial planning approach’ as advocated in the ESDP. Taken seriously, the requirement to formulate comprehensive strategies would inject an element of spatial or territorial planning into cohesion policy. An implicit territorial cohesion policy of this kind is a possibility, although whether this will become a reality in the face of opposition from sector interests at the national and EU levels remains to be seen.

Another issue centres on how the shared development strategies are to be formulated. National Strategic Reference Frameworks and Operational Programmes should pay regard to territorial cohesion. How this needs to be done can be gleaned from a technical paper. As usual, programmes submitted to the Commission need to be subjected to *ex-ante* evaluation, and it is here that the Commission’s implicit territorial cohesion policy may come to fruition. Evaluation should focus on ‘Community added value’ defined on the basis of a range of criteria, says the recent Working Paper No 1 on the subject. The criteria do not refer to territorial cohesion (Directorate-General Regional Policy 2006, 5), but there is an Annex 4: ‘Territorial dimension within the *ex ante* evaluation of NSRF and OPs’ (NRSP for National Strategic Reference Framework, i.e. what the Member States have to produce, and OPs for Operational Programmes). After recalling relevant positions in Article 158 (on economic and social cohesion and the harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of the Community by the reduction of disparities between regions) and Article 16 of the EC Treaty (on the place occupied by services of general economic interest in the shared values of the Union as well as their role in promoting social and territorial cohesion, being the only mention of territorial cohesion in the existing treaties), Annex 4 invokes the structural funds regulation where it says that the territorial characteristics must be taken into account. It also points out that the Community Strategic Guidelines recall the main rationale for any type of spatial or territorial policy at the level of the EU, which is to attend to ‘...the needs and to the specific characteristics of the territories, according to the problems or the opportunities resulting from their geographical situation.’ Annex 4 concludes from this that the profile of territorial cohesion during *ex-ante* evaluation needs to be raised, suggesting that a ‘territorial cohesion’ heading should be inserted into National

Strategic Reference Frameworks and/or operational programmes' presentation. This implies identifying the specific characteristics and the territorial needs of the region or area concerned; checking the consistency of the strategy regarding these needs and characteristics, and discussing the relevant implementation system. Each of these items is further specified, up to and including the indicators to be used, drawing among others on the work of ESPON.

Significantly, the need for territorial strategies as described is stipulated to exist at all levels, but with the exception of that of the EU. The European Commission is highly compartmentalised, and formulating a strategic framework taking account of all policy sectors would stretch it, presumably beyond its present limits. As Healey (2006, 539) signals, the '...struggle to establish a territorial focus in a government landscape traditionally organized around functional "sectors" ... lies at the core of episodes in strategic spatial planning in Europe. For policy communities in specific sectors, territory may be conceived merely as a container... In effect, the search for "territorial" or "area" "integration" means a "disintegration" from some sector priorities, in order to be able to "see" an issue from the angle of the interrelations of activities in particular places'. It is not surprising that this is a process riddled with conflict. Indeed, where it comes to horizontal co-ordination the Commission is said to be notoriously weak. Hooghe (2001, 39) identifies fragmentation as the unintended outcome of the particular political-bureaucratic system of the Commission: "In fact, report after report... has recommended strengthening central political control over 'local fiefdoms' or cosy networks. Coordination across units and directorate-generals is perceived to be an endemic problem in the Commission." Since the White Paper on European Governance (CEC 2001) moreover this has been described as the problem of policy 'coherence'. Without making specific reference to territorial cohesion, the present Secretary-General of the European Commission, Catherine Day, has identified 'policy coherence' as one of her greatest challenges and one to which the Commission is looking for answers in developing various forms of quality assessment involving different parts of the Commission (EuActive 2006).

Having explored the opportunities for implicit territorial cohesion policy, the paper returns to discussing European territorial co-operation as such, being the third objective of cohesion policy 2007-2013. The Community Strategic Guidelines distinguish between cross-border, transnational, and interregional co-operation, this being the same as the distinction between the three strands of INTERREG. Generally speaking, co-operation

'should help speed up economic development and the achievement of higher growth. National borders are often an obstacle to the development of European territory as a whole, and can restrict its potential for full competitiveness. In the cross-border and transnational context, transport, water management and environment protection are clear examples of challenges requiring a focused and integrated approach that goes beyond national boundaries....' (Council of the European Union 2006, 47).

The objective of cross-border co-operation more particularly '...is to integrate areas divided by national borders that face common problems requiring common solutions. Such challenges are faced by all border regions in the Union as a result of the fragmentation of markets for labour and capital, infrastructure networks, fiscal capacity and institutions' (Council of the European Union 2006, 48). In addition, cross-border

co-operation should focus on strengthening the competitiveness of the border regions. Clearly, what Delanty and Rumford (2005, 133) define as borderlands where the local, regional, national and supra-national come together, are the darlings of the Commission.

Transnational – as against cross-border – co-operation relates to so-called macro-regions where there is a need to increase economic and social integration and cohesion. As indicated, transnational co-operation as practiced under INTERREG IIC and subsequently under IIIB has been the strand most directly related to the ESDP agenda.

‘Transnational cooperation programmes seek to increase cooperation across Member States on matters of strategic importance.

Support should therefore be given to actions which seek to improve the physical interconnection of territories (e.g. investments in sustainable transport) as well as intangible connections (networks, exchanges between regions and between the parties involved).

The actions envisaged include the creation of European transport corridors (particularly cross-border sections) and action for the prevention of natural risks (e.g. fire, drought and flood), water management at river basin level, integrated maritime cooperation, promotion of sustainable urban development and R&D/innovation networks’ (Council of the European Union 2006, 49-50).

This is where the strategic projects for which the European Council refused the funding would have come in.

Finally, interregional co-operation refers to programmes focusing on ‘Growth and Jobs’: strengthening innovation, small-and-medium enterprises and entrepreneurship, the environment and risk prevention. “In addition, exchange of experiences and best practices regarding urban development, social inclusion, relationship between cities and rural areas, and the implementation of cooperation programmes will be encouraged” (Council of the European Union 2006, 50). ESPON will thus be financed out of funds devoted to interregional co-operation.

ESPON has already provided a tremendous learning experience for researchers from all corners of Europe (Van Gestel, Faludi 2005). As indicated, ESPON owes its existence to the desire to remedy shortcomings in terms of the availability of comparative data relating to the ESDP process. The notion originally held by its progenitors that this might lead to a revision of the ESDP to take account of, among other things, the expected enlargement of the EU (CEC 1999, 12) is however currently being forgotten. However, it is clear that, originally at least, ESPON had the pursuit of the ESDP agenda as its aim. The Mid-Term Evaluation is unequivocal about this. It identifies the aim of the programme as that of providing a common platform for applied research in the policy fields related to the ESDP. The socio-economic impact of the programme is said to lie in improving the scientific basis for ESDP policy determination at different levels and in providing methods for territorial impact analysis that can be used for both *ex-ante* analysis of programmes and for evaluation of outcomes. Recommendations 8 and 12 of the Mid-Term Review refer to ‘...a continued overall need for a territorial analysis framework to update the ESDP and the spatial policy development in which ESPON is a key support structure’. However, the Mid-Term evaluation recognises that such recommendations ‘...fall within a political arena and

are not considered by the MC (Monitoring Committee – AF) to be something that requires direct programme activity” (MVA 2005, 6). Further down, the report amplifies that the Monitoring Committee ‘...has taken the view that further development of a policy document like the ESDP is not the task of the ESPON programme. ESPON is only supposed to provide knowledge and information for policy development based on ESDP objectives’ (MVA 2005, 10). One of these policy developments, though perhaps the most significant, is discussed in the following section.

The ‘Territorial Agenda of the European Union’

On 29 November 2004 the Dutch Presidency of the EU hosted an informal ministerial meeting on territorial cohesion in Rotterdam. This initiative did not however materialise ‘out of the blue’. The ESDP-process had already seen the Member States of the old EU co-operating. However, it will be remembered that in the early 2000s the intergovernmental process was in the doldrums. Originally a side-show, the preparation of the ‘Guiding Principles for the Sustainable Development of the European Continent’ (Council of Europe 2002) came into its place as a vehicle, not only for the Member States of the EU15, but also the accession countries to co-operate on matters related to the ESDP agenda. The Guiding Principles represented a simplified and generalised version of the ESDP. Under a rotation system similar to that operating in the EU, Slovenia took turns to preside over the follow-up of this process, focusing on the application of the Guiding Principles. As will become evident, Slovenia has taken an active interest in the further promotion of the ESDP agenda in its current shape.

Meanwhile, experts from the EU15 involved in the ESDP process continued to meet on the subcommittee of the Committee on the Development and Convergence of Regions called Spatial and Urban Development (SUD). These old hands formed the ‘Mermaid Group’ (after the venue at Copenhagen where they met in 2002 under the Danish Presidency) and explored options for continuing their work. The result was a so-called ‘expert document’, which was discussed by the subcommittee (SUD 2003). This gave the Dutch confidence to organise the meeting.

Ministerial meetings require careful preparation and good co-operation with the preceding and proceeding Presidencies. For such efforts to be undertaken, a Member State must feel strongly about the issues concerned, which the Dutch do. The key-stakeholder is the Directorate-General for Spatial Policy. Its strategy is to relate spatial planning more to the mainstream structural funds (Martin 2000). This dovetails with French thinking, and so the French were brought in to help organise a meeting of the relevant directors-general from the 25 Member States in Paris immediately after enlargement. This was preceded by a conference on 3-4 May 2004 – the first working days after enlargement had taken effect – on regional policy hosted by the French. The directors-general met again in October 2004 at Haarlem.

From then on, the process involved the EU25. However, with the scheme of rotating EU Presidencies being what it is, the initiative necessarily remained in the hands of old member states and will continue to do so until the end of 2007 when the Portuguese will hand over to Slovenia – a country that happens to be the paragon of virtue in more respect than one as it is also due to introduce the euro at the same time. As indicated, this pioneering position is also true in the spatial planning field.

It just so happens that the group of old Member States now at the helm includes those that have been most active in developing the ESDP, such as The Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Germany. So this is why the agenda continues to be dominated by the initiators of the ESDP.

To ensure that it would see ministers agreeing at Rotterdam, a preliminary discussion document (Dutch Presidency 2004a) and the draft Conclusions of the Presidency (2004b) were discussed at Haarlem. So Rotterdam took note of demographic, economic, social and environmental problems, including the effects of climate change, global competitiveness and high energy prices. Ministers stressed that territorial cohesion entailed strengthening competitiveness and reducing disparities, and as such this became the main plank of the ESDP agenda in its current shape. They observed that the Lisbon Strategy took insufficient account of the diversified potentials of EU regions. Integrated spatial development approaches, enabling regions to exploit their endogenous potentials, can, they argued, improve on the delivery of the Lisbon Strategy – which dovetails neatly with the thinking of Directorate-General Regional Policy as explained above. Ministers highlighted the increasingly territorial impact of EU policies on Member States and their regions. Obviously, inconsistencies between them reduce their effectiveness.

The document identified territorial cohesion as both a multi-sectoral and a multi-level concept. It recognised the need for regions and Member States to identify their unique development potential – what is increasingly being discussed as ‘territorial capital’ (Zonneveld, Waterhout 2005) – and their position in the European territory. They saw a need also to place spatial development strategies in a transnational and European context.

Clearly, Ministers hoped that territorial cohesion could be moved closer to the centre of EU discourse. They also fixed the political agenda until 2007. It was to focus on territorial cohesion in relation to the Lisbon Strategy. At the time though they expected progress on the EU Constitution, so they agreed on the need for a short ‘evidence-based synthesis document’ of the Member States, drawing on the results of ESPON and other research. This should offer the EU institutions, Member States, regions and other stakeholders insights into the ‘territorial state of the Union’. It is now clear however that this was a bid to retain a foothold in a process that appeared to be set to be dominated by the Commission exercising its prerogative under the Community method.

Preparation of what came to be known as the ‘Territorial Agenda for the European Union’ entailed a series of further informal ministerial meetings. Thus, in May 2005, the EU Informal Ministerial Meeting on Regional Policy and Territorial Cohesion took place in Luxembourg (Luxembourg Presidency 2005a). It endorsed a scoping document on ‘The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union - towards a stronger European territorial cohesion in the light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg ambitions’ (Luxembourg Presidency 2005b). The scoping document was based on the outcomes of the previous ministerial meeting in Rotterdam and on analyses of the territorial development of the EU and the spatial impact of its policies. ESPON was said to have provided the analytical basis for this. The document argued for territorial development policies to help areas to develop their territorial capital as part of the overall effort to increase Europe's competitiveness. The substantive priorities were to

strengthen polycentrism and urban-rural partnership, promote clusters of competitive and innovative activities, strengthen trans-European networks, promote trans-European risk management and strengthen trans-European ecological structures and cultural resources. These priorities were to be worked out between then and the German Presidency in 2007. Intervening Presidencies agreed to support this agenda.

The UK followed Luxembourg in the EU Presidency chair. The UK is not wildly enthusiastic about cohesion policy generally. Indeed, like the *Sapir Report* (Sapir et al. 2004) attacking cohesion policy, the UK wished for cohesion policy to be restricted to providing direct financial support, mostly for the new Member States. For the rest, the ‘pumping around of money’ – Member States paying into the Community coffers and then obtaining some of the same funds in return for observing priorities set by the EU – should come to an end. Since the territorial cohesion agenda is embedded in this form of ‘multi-level governance’, and although the UK did not get its way during the negotiations over the Financial Framework 2007-2013, it is reasonable to assume that the UK Presidency felt disinclined to take major initiatives as regards the Territorial Agenda process. However, it did call an informal ministerial meeting on ‘Sustainable Communities’ (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 2006). This related to what is being called the ‘urban *acquis*’, the topic of the discussion on the second day at Rotterdam meeting.

The Austrian Presidency did not take the document further either. An expert meeting – not a meeting of ministers – held in June 2006 considered the ‘Governance of Territorial Strategies: Going Beyond Strategy Documents’ instead (Austrian Federal Chancellery 2006). Meanwhile, the Germans are gearing up for the informal ministerial meeting scheduled for May 2007 in Leipzig. The intervening Finnish Presidency has scheduled the important directors-general meeting to discuss the draft prepared by a small group representing The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Germany and the ESPON Co-ordination Unit.

Coordination of this process is in the hands of a Coming Presidencies Group, including the Portuguese and the Slovenians. The ‘Territorial Agenda for the European Union’ is to be a strategic document with concrete proposals for contributing to the EU agenda of promoting jobs and growth. Priorities continue to be to strengthen polycentrism and urban-rural partnership, promote clusters of competitive and innovative activities, strengthen the trans-European networks, promote trans-European risk management and strengthen trans-European ecological structures and cultural resources, themes that have mostly been formulated in the ESDP context.

The Commission has reason to be gratified. The drafts of the ‘Territorial Agenda’ and the background document based on ESPON research, ‘The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union’, available at the time of writing for consideration by the meeting of Directors General on Territorial Cohesion on 15-16 November 2006 (<http://www.bmvbs.de/territorial-agenda>; last accessed on 6 November 2006) bear the hallmark of the intergovernmental process which made it. The new aspect is that Member States have apparently come to accept that the EU – and thus the Commission – needs to have a territorial cohesion policy and this irrespective of whether or not the Constitution in its present or amended form is ratified. The draft also suggests that the Territorial Agenda should be discussed at the European Council during the Slovenian Presidency in 2008, which would be the first time that territorial issues

would receive attention from this elevated body. As indicated, Slovenia commands much good will and would be an ideal partner to do so.

The impression of Member States wanting to do business with the Commission, this time not only as a source of funding for their cooperation on territorial matters, but also as an actor in its own right is enforced by the request for measures to ensure in-depth dialogue on territorial cohesion within the structures of EU ‘comitology’ – the system of official committees advising the Commission. The request to establish a territorial cohesion contact point in the Commission only serves to further re-enforce this impression. The inadequate level of Commission resources available to deal with territorial cohesion policy is a problem not often appreciated.

The November draft invites the Commission also to publish a Communication on territorial cohesion, an intention that the Commission has shelved in the wake of the negative referenda on the Constitution. It also expresses the hope that territorial cohesion will be included in whatever form the Treaty on establishing a Constitution for Europe will take. Finally, the draft asks for measures to be taken to ensure that the territorial impact of EU and national policies is taken into account in policy-making, amounting to a form of Territorial Impact Assessment. ESPON has produced interesting outcomes relating TIA to various dimensions of territorial cohesion (Camagni 2006), so this is a timely recommendation. In this respect, the reader should note that impact assessments of various kinds are the favoured new instrument for the Commission to achieve policy coherence.

Conclusions

So then the chances are that territorial cohesion policy, although still implicit, will gain in importance, in particular since Member States propose to continue pursuing their Territorial Agenda, and in particular to relate it to the mid-term review of cohesion policy scheduled for the end of the 2000s. This needs to be qualified, though. The authors of the Territorial Agenda and the handful of Commission officials responsible for territorial cohesion policy do not carry enormous weight. So whether National Strategic Reference Frameworks and Operational Programmes will in fact pay attention is a moot point. Those in sector ministries and/or the directorates-general of the Commission viewing territorial cohesion as unhelpful to the growth-and-jobs agenda will have to be won over.

Another conclusion seems clear: the ESDP agenda as modified under the flag of territorial cohesion will continue to be pursued. To reiterate, this could happen through technical requirements in cohesion policy, by way of projects co-financed by the EU under ‘European territorial co-operation’ and by way of the Member States pursuing the ‘Territorial Agenda for the European Union’ beyond the ministerial meeting in May 2007. There is of course also the ‘ESPON 2013 Programme’ for what is now being described – eschewing any mention of what the acronym stands for, i.e. ‘European Spatial Planning Observation Network’ – as a ‘European observation network on territorial development and cohesion’. ESPON 2013 will continue to support whatever comes from the other strands of activity. The outcome of the whole process may however be rather different from that which the authors of the ESDP anticipated, but the fact that ‘the show goes on’ testifies to their success in shaping the agenda. It is to be hoped that some of this will come to ultimate fruition during the debate, scheduled to

start in 2008, concerning the comprehensive review of the EU budget, as foreseen in the budget agreement of December 2005.

The discussion of cohesion policy after 2013 will be no minor matter. Since publication of the *Sapir Report* fundamental reform of cohesion policy is on the agenda. True, the compromise reached in December 2005 over the Financial Perspectives for 2007-2013 allows cohesion policy to continue, with funding being made available throughout the EU, and not just, as has been the position of the so-called 'net contributors' to the budget, to least favoured regions, mainly in the new member states. However, and this must count as a major victory for the reformers, a fundamental review, not only of cohesion policy but also of the Common Agricultural Policy, is scheduled to start in 2008 with a view to the period after 2013. (In return the UK has put its budget rebate on the table.) This will be the supreme moment for European territorial cohesion policy to demonstrate that it can make an essential contribution in that it can generate, to invoke the relevant jargon, 'Community added value'. In other words, it must demonstrate that territorial cohesion is an asset for European integration generally and the revamped Lisbon Strategy in particular. If successful, this will no doubt be used as an additional argument for cohesion policy, in albeit modified form, to continue.

European planners come to this debate with a well-developed set of substantive ideas and relevant procedures developed in the ESDP and taken further under the umbrella of territorial cohesion policy. Fulfilling the requirements as defined for the delivery of the cohesion funds, planners can invoke the tools of their trade – spatial or territorial analysis and spatial visions – in the context of the exciting, but oh so difficult process of European integration. This appears to be the implication of the requirement to add territorial cohesion paragraphs to National Spatial Reference Frameworks and Operational Programmes. Whether this will be done for the EU as a whole remains however a moot question. The ESDP has of course tried this, and as far as spatial analysis is concerned, ESPON is doing the same for many facets of spatial or territorial development. An overall spatial vision of the EU territory is not, however, a priority. Such a vision is implied in all that is being suggested about EU territorial cohesion policy. However, perhaps the failure to make serious efforts in this direction is due to the fact that formulating such a vision defeats the imagination.

Note

¹ Based on a paper 'The King is Dead – Long Live the King: Why there is no renewed European Spatial Development Perspective and what happens to the ESDP agenda anyhow' given at the Regional Studies Association International Conference 'Shaping EU Regional Policy: Economic, Social and Political Pressures', Leuven, Belgium 8th and 9th June 2006. The paper reports on further developments up to and including October 2006.

Literature

Austrian Federal Chancellery (2006) *Governance of Territorial Strategies: Going Beyond Strategy Documents*, Issue Paper for the Seminar of the Austrian Presidency 2006 prepared by the Austrian Federal Chancellery, Division IV/4 (Co-ordination of Spatial and Regional Policies), Baden near Wien, 8-9 June.

Bachtler, J., Wislade, F. (2005) *From Building Blocks to Negotiating Boxes: The Reform of EU Cohesion Policy*, European Policy Research Paper Number 57, European Policy Research Centre, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow (http://www.eprc.strath.ac.uk/eprc/documents/PDF_files/EPRP_57_From_Building_Blocks_to_Negotiating_Boxes.pdf); last accessed 6 November 2006).

Beck, U. (2006) *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Böhme, K., Faludi, A. (Eds.) (2000) *Nordic Planning Meets Europe* (Special Issue): 'Built Environment,' Vol. 26, No. 1, Alexander Press, Oxford.

Böhme, K., Schön, P. (2006) 'From Leipzig to Leipzig: Territorial research delivers evidence for the new Territorial Agenda of the European Union', in: A. Faludi (ed.) *Evidence-based Planning* (Special Issue), *disP* 165, 42(2), 61-70.

Camagni, R. (2006) 'Territorial Impact Assessment – TIA: a methodological proposal', *Scienze Regionali - Italian Journal of Regional Science*, 5(2), 135-146.

CEC – Commission of the European Communities (1999) *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the EU*, Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC – Commission of the European Communities (2001) *European Governance: A White Paper*, Communication from the Commission, COM(2001) 428. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC – Commission of the European Communities (2004) *Proposal for a Council Regulation Laying down General Provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund* (Presented by the Commission) Com(2004)492 Final, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC – Commission of the European Communities (2005) *Communication to the Spring European Council: Working Together on Growth and Jobs – A New Start for the Lisbon Strategy* (Communication from President Barroso in agreement with Vice-president Verheugen) Com(2005)24 Final, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Council of Europe (2002) *Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent* adopted on 30 January, Strasbourg.

Council of the European Union (2006) Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion, 2006/0131 of 18 Augustus 2006; approved by the European Parliament on 27 September 2006) (<http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/06/st11/st11807.en06.pdf>; last accessed 6 November 2006).

Delanty, G., Rumford, C. (2005) *Rethinking Europe: Social Theory and the Implications of Europeanization*, Routledge, London, New York.

Directorate-General Regional Policy (2006) Working Paper No. 1 on Ex Ante Evaluation: The New Programming Period, 2007-2013 – Methodological Working Papers. August 2006, Brussels.

Dutch Presidency (2004a) Exploiting Europe's territorial diversity for sustainable economic growth – Discussion paper for the EU Informal Ministerial Meeting on Territorial Cohesion, Rotterdam, November 29 2004, (<http://www2.vrom.nl/docs/internationaal/discussion%20paper.pdf>; last accessed 6 November 2006).

Dutch Presidency (2004b) EU Informal Ministerial Meeting on Territorial Cohesion – Presidency Conclusions, 29th November.

(http://www.vrom.nl/get.asp?file=docs/291104_presidency_conclusions_EU_informal_ministrial_meeting_on_territorial_cohesion.pdf; last accessed 6 November 2006).

EuActive (2006) 'Interview with European Commission Secretary-General Day' (Monday 25 September; (<http://www.euractiv.com/en/agenda2004/interview-european-commission-secretary-general-catherine-day/article-158149>; last accessed 6 November 2006).

European Parliament, Council, Commission (2006) Inter-institutional agreement on budgetary discipline and sound management (2006/C 139/01); (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/c_139/c_13920060614en00010017.pdf, last accessed 6 November 2006).

Faludi, A. (Ed.) (2001) 'Regulatory Conflict and Co-operation in European Spatial Planning' (Special Issue): *Built Environment*, Vol. 27, No. 4, Alexander Press, Oxford.

Faludi, A. (2002a) 'Positioning European spatial planning', *European Planning Studies*, 10(7), 897-909.

Faludi, A. (Ed.) (2002b) *European Spatial Planning, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy*, Cambridge MA.

Faludi, A. (Ed.) (2003) 'Special Issue on the Application of the European Spatial Development Perspective', *Town Planning Review*, 74(1), 1-140.

Faludi, A. (Ed.) (2005) Special Issue 'Territorial Cohesion: An Unidentified Political Objective?', *Town Planning Review*, 76(1), 1-118.

Faludi, A. (Ed.) (2006a) Evidence-based Planning'' (Special Issue), *disP* 165, 42(2), 3-72.

Faludi, A. (2006b) 'From spatial development to EU territorial cohesion policy', *Regional Studies*, 40/6, 667-678.

Faludi, A. (Ed.) (forthcoming a) *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge MA.

Faludi, A. (forthcoming b) 'The learning machine: European integration in the planning mirror', *Environment & Planning A*.

Faludi, A., Waterhout, B. (2002) *The Making of the European Spatial Development Perspective: No Masterplan* (The RTPi Library Series), London, Routledge.

Faludi, A., Waterhout, B. (2005) 'The usual suspects: The Rotterdam informal ministerial meeting on territorial cohesion', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96(3), 338-342.

Faludi, A., Zonneveld, W. (Eds.) (1997) 'Shaping Europe: The European Spatial Development Perspective in the Making' (Special Issue), *Built Environment*, Vol 32, No. 4, Alexander Press, Oxford.

Gestel, T. van, Faludi, A. (2005) 'Towards a European Territorial Cohesion Assessment Network: A bright future for ESPON?', in A. Faludi (Ed.) *Territorial Cohesion: An Unidentified Political Objective* (Special Issue), *Town Planning Review*, 76(1), 69-80.

Healey, P. (2006) 'Relational complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning', *European Planning Studies*, 14(4), 525-546.

Hooghe, L. (2001) *The European Commission and the Integration of Europe: Images of Government*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Janin-Rivolin, U., Faludi, A. (Eds.) (2005) Special issue 'Southern Perspectives on European Spatial Planning', *European Planning Studies*, 13(2), 195-332.

Lea, R. (2005) 'À la carte Europe: the future of the EU', in: P. Jervis (Ed.) *Resolving the European Crisis: Perspectives on the Future of the European Union*, Middlesex University Press, London, 67-76.

Luxembourg Presidency (2005a) Conclusions of the Informal EU-Ministerial Meeting on Territorial Cohesion – 20 and 21 May 2005 in Luxembourg, (http://www.eu2005.lu/en/actualites/documents_travail/2005/05/20regio/Min_DOC_2_MinConcl_fin.pdf); last accessed 6 November 2006).

Luxembourg Presidency (2005b) Scoping Document and Summary of Political Messages for an Assessment of the Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union: Towards a stronger European territorial cohesion in the light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg ambitions,

(http://www.eu2005.lu/en/actualites/documents_travail/2005/05/20regio/Min_DOC_1_fin.pdf); last accessed 6 November 2006).

Martin, D. (2000) 'Les Pays-Bas dans le territoire européen: un petit pays central face à l'internationalisation de l'aménagement du territoire', *Territoires 2020: Revue d'études et de prospective*, Nr.1, 80-91.

Müller, A., with Dosch, F., Görmar, W., Hachmann, V., Schäfer, N. (2005) *Bericht 2005 Transnationale Zusammenarbeit/TransCoop 05 Report*, Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, Bonn.

MVA (2005) ESPON Mid-Term Evaluation Update, Final Report (http://www.espon.eu/mmp/online/website/content/programme/125/file_354/mte_finale-report_26-9-2005.pdf); last accessed 6 November 2006).

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2006) UK Presidency - EU Ministerial Informal on Sustainable Communities: Policy Papers, London) (http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/523/PolicyPapersUKPresidencyEUMinisterialInformalOnSustainableCommunities_id1162523.pdf); last accessed 6 November 2006).

Official Journal of the European Union (2006) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999. 31.7.2006 ([http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/regulation/pdf/2007/feder/ce_1080\(2006\)_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/regulation/pdf/2007/feder/ce_1080(2006)_en.pdf)); last accessed 6 November 2006).

Priemus, H., Zonneveld, W., Faludi, A. (Eds.) (2004) 'Territorial Governance in Polynuclear Urban Regions in North-west Europe' (Special Issue), *European Planning Studies*, 12(3), 282-408.

Rambøll Management (2006) Study on "territorial cohesion, lessons learned from the ESPON programme projects and strategy for the future"- Final Report, On behalf of the European Commission, Regional Policy, Brussels (http://www.espon.eu/mmp/online/website/content/programme/1186/index_EN.html), last accessed 6 November

Rooney, M.L., Polverari, L. (2002a) *The Spatial and Urban Dimensions in the 2000-06 Objective 1 Overview*, Urban Policies Research Centre, University of Strathclyde, Nordregio, Stockholm.

Rooney, M.L., Polverari, L. (2002b) *The Spatial and Urban Dimensions in the 2000-06 Objective 2 Programmes*, Urban Policies Research Centre, University of Strathclyde, Nordregio, Stockholm.

Sapir, A., Aghion, P., Bertola, G., Hellwig, M., Pisani-Ferry, J., Rosati, D., Viñals, J., and Wallace, H., with Butti, M., Nava, M., Smith, P.M. (2004) *An Agenda for a Growing Europe: The Sapir Report*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

SUD – Spatial and Urban Development subcommittee (2003) *Managing the Territorial Dimension of EU Policies after Enlargement - Expert Document*, Brussels.

Zonneveld, W., Faludi, A. (Eds.) (1997) 'Vanishing Borders: The Second Benelux Structural Outline' (Special Issue): *Built Environment*, Vol. 23, No. 1, Alexander Press, Oxford.

Zonneveld, W., Waterhout, B. (2005) 'Visions on territorial cohesion', in: A. Faludi (Ed.) *Territorial Cohesion: An Unidentified political objective* (Special Issue), *Town Planning Review*, 76(1), 15-27.