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Summary

Initial Situation
After the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty in December 2009, territorial cohesion has become an objective of European policies equal to economic and social cohesion. In June 2010, the Europe 2020 Strategy was adopted by the European Council as a new economic policy framework replacing the Lisbon Strategy. Finally, in May 2011, the Territorial Agenda 2020 (TA2020) was agreed at an informal meeting of national ministers responsible for spatial planning and territorial development. The TA2020 replaces the Territorial Agenda of 2007 (TAEU) and provides the basis for the Member States’ cooperation in the field of spatial planning. It asks for stronger integration of territorial concerns in sector policies.

At the same time, the European Commission induced the debate about the formulation of the next programming period’s EU cohesion policy. The drafts of the respective regulation proposals were published in October 2011. The debate takes place referring to the above-mentioned strategies and objectives. So far, all regulation proposals, which are spatially relevant, have clear links to the Europe 2020 Strategy. Similar to the Lisbon Strategy, the Europe 2020 Strategy is highly sector-oriented and does not take sufficient account of the European territorial diversity. However, the experiences of the Lisbon Strategy have shown that growth objectives cannot be realized without taking the different regional development potentials and characteristics into account.

Thus, there is a need to identify starting points and opportunities for strengthening territorial objectives. It is important to indicate how sector policies may benefit from synergies and policy efficiency increases if territorial aspects are considered. This is the point of departure for the research project “The territorial dimension of future EU cohesion policy”. In the context of the project, different sector policies were analysed regarding possible options of action to integrate the objective of territorial cohesion adequately. In order to indicate these possible options of action, it is necessary to identify those policies for which an integration of territorial objectives is most promising. Besides the question whether a policy is of territorial relevance, the identification includes an assessment of potential mutual influence within the policy development process.

Understanding of Territorial Cohesion
In the course of discussions about the meaning of territorial cohesion, various interpretations have been developed over the last couple of years. For instance, in the Territorial Agenda (TAEU) it is pointed out that territorial cohesion is less an aspired situation but should involve various stakeholders relevant for territorial development in a permanent and cooperative process (TAEU 2007). In contrast to this, Battis and Kersten in their legal opinion understand territorial cohesion as a threedimensional concept aiming at territorial balance, horizontal and vertical integration of sector policies and networking of European stakeholders in the field of territorial development (Battis and Kersten 2008: 10 et seq.).

A survey of nearly 330 stakeholders working in the field of territorial development has made clear that territorial cohesion is predominantly understood as a balanced territorial development and as a process developing and utilizing a variety of endogenous regional potentials. In addition, German stakeholders consider issues of sustainable development and climate change to be crucial for realizing territorial cohesion.

The experts furthermore mentioned a number of policy themes they considered to be particularly relevant for realizing territorial cohesion. These were especially business promotion, providing basic services in rural areas, demographic change, climate change, access and improvement of transport infrastructures as well as deepening urban-rural-relations. The regional level was considered to play an important role for implementing territorial cohesion and the European level appears to be most important for providing the necessary financial means. These assessments further underline the indicated complexity of the objective of territorial cohesion.

Territorial Cohesion in the Context of Selected Policy Themes
By means of a stepwise process the cross-sector themes which appeared to be particularly useful for better integrating territorial cohesion were identified. All themes identified show strong links to both the TA2020 and the Europe 2020 Strategy:
- urban-rural relations
- providing basic services in rural areas
- transport core networks
• transport congestion in agglomerations
• adjusting infrastructures to climate change challenges and
• energy networks.

These themes were also confirmed by the experts in the aforementioned survey. With regard to the implementation of territorial cohesion they were considered to be particularly important.

For each of these themes not only their relation to the TA2020 and the Europe 2020 Strategy were analysed but also their general political context. Considering project examples allowed to stress potential starting points for territorial policies and policy recommendations for integrating territorial cohesion concerns. The project examples utilized indicate the prominent role of local and regional stakeholders and thereby illustrate the utility of the place-based approach. The theme-specific starting points for strengthening spatial concerns include pure moderation and information activities as well as to participate in the formulation of regulations, strategies and programmes. The experts assessed the development of documents and processes at a strategic level and for EU programmes to be particularly promising.

If the objective of territorial cohesion is to be strengthened, local stakeholders need to be aware that their activities affect European spatial development. In order to strengthen this self-assessment and to support their commitment it is essential to include these stakeholders in repeated dialogues. It becomes clear that the vertical collaboration of all territorial levels – from the European, national and regional levels to the local level – is crucial for implementing territorial objectives. For instance, the regional level is an important broker between local and national/European levels. At the same time, the regional level could be strengthened in terms of its shaping and coordinating responsibilities.

**Transnational Cooperation – INTERREG B**

Transnational cooperation is a specific instrument for implementing territorial cohesion, as it origins have a clear relation to spatial strategies and visions. In the course of the current programming period (2007-2013), various documents were prepared, which will represent a framework for transnational cooperation in the next programming period (2014-2020). These are especially the Europe 2020 Strategy, the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion, the TA2020 as well as documents of different EU Council Presidencies. In order to realize a contribution of future programmes to the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy and the TA2020, it is useful to identify related themes and contexts and to summarise them in key subjects.

The proposal on new EU cohesion policy regulations from October 2011 suggests a clear thematic focus for the cooperation areas. The Commission’s proposals have a strong sectoral orientation, which might weaken territorial concerns as it will be difficult to realize thematically integrating approaches. In order to strengthen territorial concerns and the integrated development approach, it is necessary to include an explicit reference to the TA2020 in the general ERDF regulation and the regulation for transnational cooperation. This approach would ensure that specific territorial development aspects are not excluded within the sector-oriented themes of the general ERDF regulation.

However, it is not sufficient to include territorial concerns in regulations and programme priorities. They also need to be referred to in the programme implementation, e.g. in calls and when evaluating project proposals.

**Territorial Cooperation – Macro-Regional Strategies**

Macro-Regional Strategies are a comparatively new EU instrument, which were born of different initiatives of regional profiling. At first glance, Macro-Regional Strategies and INTERREG B appear to follow similar approaches. However, they are based on different assumptions and have different objectives. For Macro-Regional Strategies, no additional funds or programmes are provided and no new institutions and EU legislation are developed. At the same time, the need for cooperation was recognized. Therefore, macro-regions shall not compete with existing instruments but offer a platform for coordination. Despite the apparent territorial relevance, most of the macro-regional themes are strongly sector-oriented. It is, nevertheless, reasonable to assume that INTERREG cooperation areas will continue to be crucial for the implementation of Macro-Regional Strategies and that they will close ranks. Possible approaches vary from a stronger orientation of territorial cooperation programmes along the macro-regions’ priorities to common secretariats of macro-regions and INTERREG cooperation areas. This, however, is not to be misunderstood as a combination or mixture of territorial areas and approaches.
**Recommendations**

Depending on the territorially relevant sector policies and themes, there is quite a number of potential approaches and options to take appropriate account of territorial objectives. In order to identify the most important activities out of this variety of options, it needs to be asked which approaches and options are most effective and particularly promising.

The development of strategies and programmes is of particular importance. Depending on the administrative level, different potential starting points for territorial policies are crucial. At the European level, it is currently of utmost importance to influence future programmes. This similarly goes for the federal state level. For the regional level, the strongest potentials were identified with respect to concrete cooperation activities.

In order to realize this kind of influence, it is necessary to take a number of cross-sector policy and multilevel measures. With regard to the cross-sector policy development, measures should concentrate on:

- dialogues with different relevant ministries and agencies
- strategically using European bodies
- integratively formulating framework documents
- influencing future EU programmes and regulations as well as
- continuous spatial monitoring of sector policies.

For a multilevel policy development as well, some specific measures can be identified:

- establishing multilevel governance;
- including ‘local elites’ in policy design processes
- developing references for exemplary cross-sector themes and
- running vertical dialogues with the federal states.
1 Introduction

Territorial cohesion has come on a par with the well-established objectives of social and economic cohesion. With the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty it has become an official objective of EU policies. As a result, the primarily academic debate about regional compensation measures, their objectives and effects was put on the political agenda of the European Union.

Negotiations on the budgets of EU policies and adjustments of Structural Funds for the budgetary period 2014-2020 are under way. These negotiations will be decisive for the prospective interpretation and relevance of territorial cohesion in EU policies. The Europe 2020 Strategy, which is basic for future EU policies, only focuses on economic growth. It fails to consider territorial diversity in Europe although the Lisbon Strategy has proven that ambitious growth objectives cannot be achieved without taking different potentials and characteristics of all regions into account. The Europe 2020 Strategy has obviously already affected many documents and proposals for regulations of the last years. Examples are the Common Strategic Framework (SWD(2012) 61 final 2012), the “Energy 2020” strategy (COM(2010) 639 final 2010), the explanations regarding the future Common Agricultural Policy (COM(2010) 672 final 2010), the White Paper on Transport (COM(2011) 144 final 2011) and the proposal for the Cohesion Fund regulation (COM(2011) 612 final 2011). Hence, there is good reason to explore the opportunities for considering territorial objectives increasingly in different EU policies.

The Territorial Agenda 2020 (TA2020) was agreed at an informal meeting of the Member States’ ministers responsible for territorial development in May 2011. The TA2020 is the common basis for intergovernmental cooperation in the field of territorial development. Like its predecessor, the Territorial Agenda of the European Union (TAEU), it calls for strengthening territorial objectives in sector policies. Experiences have so far indicated that the integration of territorial objectives into different EU policies is quite challenging. This will be complicated by the debate about cutting the EU budget, i.e. the budgets of different EU policies, which has started. Limited financial resources usually come along with focussing on the policies’ main topics. Thus, they hamper the consideration of cross-sectoral themes like territorial issues.

It is therefore important to show that taking territorial matters into account creates synergies and raises efficiency. Hence, the research project “The territorial dimension of future EU cohesion policy” identified possible courses of action for different sector policies for strengthening the role of territorial cohesion. In order to illustrate these possible courses of action, those policies, which seem to be most suitable for an integration of territorial issues, need to be identified first. Besides assessing the territorial relevance of these policies, this also includes to judge their mutual effects in the policy development process.

Against this background, the following tasks were conducted from 2010 to 2012:

- reviewing the knowledge and understanding of territorial cohesion
- investigating chances of integrating territorial objectives, territorial potentials and challenges in selected EU policies
- showing opportunities to strengthen territorial cohesion in transnational cooperation
- developing recommendations for the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS) and the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR) for better considering territorial cohesion in the future.

The following chapter 2 gives an overview about the working steps taken and the methodology applied. The ambivalent term of territorial cohesion will be discussed in chapter 3; it is the key term for understanding and interpreting the recommendations developed. Possible courses of action and specific recommendations for selected policies and topics will be developed in chapter 4 and 5. Chapter 6 contains the synthesized and summarized recommendations.

(1) For the related academic debate see e.g. the summary by Storper (2011).
2 Working steps and methodology

Besides reviewing the understanding of territorial cohesion, for the project, it was crucial to identify the potentials for integrating territorial issues into EU sector policies and INTERREG. The understanding of territorial cohesion was investigated based on a broad analysis of literature and documents. It was updated during the project and particularly after the adoption of the TA2020. The analysis did not only concentrate on the understanding of the term ‘territorial cohesion’ but also focussed on its process-related dimension in order to find out which processes might provide an opportunity to integrate territorial matters into EU policies.

2.1 Opportunities for integrating territorial matters into EU policies

In order to select those EU sector policies, which might be interesting for considering territorial objectives, it was essential to identify territory-related policy fields first. For this purpose, literature concerning reports and studies of relevant EU policy fields was analysed. Territorial relevance was generally assumed, if a policy field affects territorial development, its preconditions or its obstacles. This for instance includes influences on demographic developments, socio-economic regional developments, transport or landscape changes (cf. Deutscher Verband für Wohnungswesen, Städtebau und Raumordnung e.V. 2009: 5).

The selection of EU policy fields does not yet provide any information about the degree to which an integration of territorial objectives would be useful. Therefore, two additional criteria were used as additional filters for identifying the most appropriate EU policies, in total leading to three succeeding selection steps (cf. figure 1). The first criterion was the above-mentioned degree of territorial relevance. The second criterion concerned the European territorial relevance. Since territorial cohesion deals with cohesion between cities and regions in Europe, this criterion focuses on the European dimension. Policies could be selected if they (a) affect European development disparities, (b) affect a city’s or region’s function and role in Europe or (c) require a certain degree of coordination between Member States. Such Europe-relevant impacts may e.g. comprise a change of the international accessibility or of the attractiveness of different places.

Only those sector policies, which fulfilled both the criterion of territorial and European relevance, were tested with regard to the third criterion. It can be associated with ‘manageability’. This criterion served to identify those types of European sector policy measures, which are suitable for integrating territorial objectives from a practical perspective, i.e. policies for which the costs and benefits of integration were balanced. This criterion was checked by means of two main questions. First of all, it was questioned, whether the sectoral policy issue matters for spatial planning and spatial development. Secondly, it was examined whether processes suitable for the integration of territorial aspects could be identified. Examples for such processes are consultations or other interactions.

Figure 1: Filter criteria for identifying EU sector policies most suitable for integrating territorial matters

In this way, a total of five policies was identified as being territorially relevant and most suitable for an integration of territorial objectives: regional, transport, agricultural, energy and climate policy. These EU policies represented the starting point for the following and more detailed analyses on how to integrate territorial objectives in sectoral concerns. Last but not least because of the variety of policy instruments within these sector policies, it was necessary to narrow down the policy field selection by selecting themes within these policies which most strongly influence territorial development. For certain themes it was furthermore realised that they are relevant for more than one EU sector policy. Important processes for future policy design were investigated to identify suitable dates and documents for which an integration of territorial objectives might be reasonable and realistic.
2.1.1 Detailed analysis of selected themes

Six themes were selected for further analysis. Most of these themes were to be cross-sectorally analysed for appropriately considering territorial issues. The selected themes are (a) urban-rural relationships, (b) services of general interest in rural areas, (c) transport core networks, (d) traffic congestion in agglomeration areas, (e) adaption of infrastructure to climate change and (f) energy networks.

In order to get access to these themes and to identify key characteristics of past successful integrations of territorial objectives, exemplary projects and measures, so-called practical examples, were analysed. Examples were considered to be ‘practical examples’ when they showed interesting and relevant features when implementing sector policies. Among these examples were policy documents, studies, investments, policy programmes and projects as well as political negotiations and they could be realised on different territorial levels. In either case, the analysis focused on considering territorial impacts in developing, planning and implementing spatially significant policies.

The practical examples were selected based on several criteria (figure 2). These criteria aimed at helping to identify precise starting points for an integration of territorial issues.

However, the examples did not have to be ‘ideal’ in terms of territorial cohesion. The following criteria were used:

- **Territorial relevance & European territorial relevance**: These criteria mainly correspond to the filter criteria mentioned above. They were included because the European territorial relevance of a policy field does not automatically imply a European territorial relevance of any of its instruments and measures.
- **Participation of stakeholders in the field of territorial development**: This criterion refers to the dimension of processes. It focuses on the participation of stakeholders in horizontal and vertical policy dialogues.
- **Explicit perception of territorial issues**: Regardless of the participation of relevant stakeholders, examples can be relevant. This is e.g. true if territorial issues have found their way into projects or policy documents and were made explicit.
- **Territorial impacts**: Practical examples were only considered to be relevant when territorial impacts were found or when territorial impacts were discussed during an evaluation, for example.

---

**Figure 2: Criteria for identifying and analysing practical examples**

Source: own illustration
• **Potential influence:** As this study focuses on whether and how territorial objectives can be strengthened in sector policies, practical examples were considered to be particularly interesting when they illustrated such potential influences.

• **Quality with regard to original sector policy objectives:** Finally, practical examples were to convince from the sector policy perspective. Ideally, they demonstrated synergies or added value for the sector policy by involving territorial objectives.

Results and knowledge gained in every thematic field were merged and structured along three aspects:

• relation to TA2020 priorities and Europe 2020 Strategy
• political context of the theme
• potential starting points for territorial policies and recommendations for better integrating territorial objectives.

This structure was kept during the further course of the project, and contents were adapted to new knowledge. Updates were mainly needed as a result of the regulation drafts published by the Commission in autumn 2011 and because of the outcome of a Delphi method survey conducted by the project team in summer 2011. The Delphi survey mainly aimed at having the identified starting points rated and evaluated by experts. The gained empirical results enabled the project team to adjust the recommendations, e.g. by a shift of emphasis, by amendments or further specifications.

The survey was sent to stakeholders in Germany as well as to stakeholders in all other EU countries. Hereby, the team could check in how far ratings and evaluations in Germany differ from the rest of Europe. Using a two-stage process, the participants were confronted with first round results and asked to answer the same questions in a second round.

Approximately 700 experts were asked to answer the German and the European survey, respectively. Return rates amounted to about 27% (Germany) respectively roughly 20% (other EU states). The experts were working on all territorial levels, ranging from the local to the EU and the international level. The majority was working on the levels of regional development (Regionalentwicklung) and spatial planning (Raumordnung) but experts working in other policy fields related to territorial development were also participating.

The survey was divided into four sections and contained questions concerning the understanding of territorial cohesion, opportunities identified to integrate territorial objectives and potentials and obstacles in realising the objective of territorial cohesion (cf. figure 3).

2.1.2 Ad-hoc papers and recommendations

Different types of recommendations were developed in the context of this research project. On the one hand, various options for action were derived from the sectoral and detailed theme-oriented analyses and the different starting points. These recommendations point...
out the sectorally and thematically important and process-oriented starting points, which can be used for better integrating territorial cohesion.

Secondly, process- and stakeholder-related recommendations were derived, based on and referring to different levels of horizontal and vertical policy integration. These recommendations might represent strategic starting points for an integration of territorial cohesion to the BBSR and the BMVBS. Most of them have an interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral character.

Additionally, other recommendations were developed regarding current questions of territorial cohesion. These recommendations met short-term counselling needs arising at the BBSR or the BMVBS. These short-term needs were satisfied by ad-hoc papers. In addition to internal needs for counselling, draft ad-hoc papers dealt with the institutionalisation of territorial cohesion and with the draft regulations published in October 2011. Recommendations resulting from these ad-hoc papers were in so far integrated into the general recommendations of this report (chapter 4 to 6) as they were relevant in the context of the overall project.

2.2 Transnational cooperation

A different approach for analysing opportunities for better integration of territorial issues was selected in the context of transnational cooperation (INTERREG B) because transnational cooperation is already based upon a territorial-oriented approach. However, the question for a more explicit integration of territorial objectives in the context of transnational cooperation is consistently raised. The analysis with regard to transnational cooperation was about

- developing useful supporting arguments for an integration of territorial references into INTERREG B programmes
- revealing the relation between INTERREG and the TA2020;
- operationalising the relevance of territorial problems in INTERREG and
- showing opportunities for developing strong roots of territorial objectives in macro-regions.

A multi-dimensional, actor-centred analysis of territorial aspects of transnational cooperation was conducted in order to fulfil these tasks. The analysis focussed on developing different starting points suitable for an explicit integration of territorial cohesion. For this purpose, the EU level (regulations) was distinguished from the programme and project levels. Considerations on the different analytical levels were based on the idea of added value which evolves from a territory-oriented approach in transnational cooperation. In other words, it was asked where, when and how territorial cohesion should be made more explicit in programmes and projects in order to optimise the strived objective also from a territorial point of view. Checklists containing territory-related questions for developing and evaluating projects were compiled in order to develop concrete references for the programme areas of transnational cooperation.

For the EU level, possible future developments of transnational cooperation were considered in the context of the European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) regulation draft. These considerations point out the parts of the draft which require a shift of emphasis towards better including territorial issues.

The relation between transnational cooperation and the new approach of macro-regional strategies was additionally analysed. This analysis aimed to identify similarities and differences of the two approaches and was meant to show in how far each approach might be independent and how they might complement one another in terms of territorial questions.

www.bbsr.bund.de/BBSR/DE/FP/ReFo/Raumordnung/2010/TerrDimensionEU/05_Veroeffentlichungen.html
3 Territorial cohesion – understanding and processes

The European Union and its member states can only achieve their economic objectives in the long term if the territorial diversity of Europe, i.e. the regions’ different potentials and bottlenecks, are taken into account. Local and regional characteristics are important potentials for future development, and all potentials have to be capitalised for achieving the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy.

Territorial cohesion is an important instrument for capitalising the territorial diversity of Europe to realise development objectives as stated in the Europe 2020 Strategy. For that purpose, actors of relevant sector policies need to be aware of the territorial relevance and impacts of their policies. A standard definition of territorial cohesion does not exist so far: The understanding of its concrete objectives varies between the authors and especially changes over time (cf. Faludi 2010, Böhme and Gloersen 2011).

3.1 Understanding of territorial cohesion

Numerous documents discuss territorial cohesion and state diverse and complementing objectives. This variety stresses that there is no unambiguous understanding of territorial cohesion in Europe. In contrast, these documents illustrate that territorial cohesion is a concept which needs to merge several territorial elements and has to cope with territorial disparities.

The development of the objective of territorial cohesion started ten years ago in the course of developing the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) (cf. European Commission 1999), even though the term territorial cohesion was not explicitly used at that time. However, implicitly it has already been part of the Treaty Establishing the European Community: “Territorial cohesion, meaning the balanced distribution of human activities across the Union, is complementary to economic and social cohesion. Hence it translates the goal of sustainable and balanced development assigned to the Union (Article 2 of the Treaty) into territorial terms. Territorial cohesion includes fair access for citizens and economic operators to Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI), irrespective of the territory to which they belong (Article 16 of the Treaty).” (DG REGIO 2004: 3)

The Territorial Agenda of the European Union (TAEU) is one of the first core documents towards a political implementation of territorial cohesion: Against the background of several challenges, the ministers responsible for spatial development of the Member States identified territorial cohesion as the main future challenge. In the TAEU, territorial cohesion is described “as a permanent and cooperative process involving the various actors and stakeholders of territorial development at political, administrative and technical levels” (TAEU 2007: 1). In doing so, they realised that all stakeholders relevant for territorial development have to contribute to the success of the process “through an intensive and continuous dialogue” (TAEU 2007: 2). It also pointed out that spatially relevant policies of different territorial levels have to become more interlocked for achieving the objective of territorial cohesion. Thus, the Territorial Agenda addresses European institutions, EU member states and their cities and regions and invites them to work more closely with each other. This closer collaboration should be supplemented by intergovernmental cooperation. Thereby, territorial cohesion can be considered to be three-dimensional both in the Lisbon Treaty and in the TAEU: It aims to (1) balance territorial disparities, (2) integrate sector policies horizontally and vertically and
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(3) enhance the networking of relevant stakeholders on all territorial levels (governance) (cf. Battis and Kersten 2008: 10). The objective of territorial cohesion was furthermore specified by six priorities in the TAEU and specified in the Action Programme for the implementation of the Territorial Agenda (cf. Böhme and Zillmer 2010: 568).

Additionally, the European Commission initiated a debate on territorial cohesion when publishing the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion in 2008 (European Commission 2008). Unlike the Territorial Agenda, the Commission’s discussion did not focus on specific geographical features but emphasized three spatial dimensions: (1) a density dimension acknowledging that economic activities concentrate in spatial clusters; (2) a distance dimension dealing with infrastructures which aim to improve the connectivity between regions; (3) a dimension of differentiation which asks to reduce disparities through cooperation; and (4) a dimension of specific geographical features emphasizing that regions differ because of different strengths and weaknesses and dissimilar geographical features (cf. European Commission 2008). The last dimension is also part of the DG REGIO Working Paper on Territories with specific geographical features mentioned above (Monfort 2009).

The Territorial Agenda 2020 (TA2020) was adopted at an informal meeting of ministers responsible for territorial development of the Member States in Gödöllő (Hungary) in May 2011. The thematic orientation of the TA2020 priorities is strongly linked to territorial cohesion. According to the TA2020 territorial cohesion comprises a harmonious, balanced, efficient and sustainable territorial development. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of territorial diversity, of the place-based approach, and of territorial specifics, potentials and identities for strengthening territorial cohesion. The TA2020 states that a “better use of territory can contribute positively to the development of economies; fair access to services of general interest; infrastructures and public goods; and wise management of natural and cultural assets.” (TA2020: 3).

The TA2020 does not only refer to territorial cohesion but also to the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy. Hence, the TA2020 is establishing a relationship between territorial cohesion and the objectives of intelligent, sustainable and integrative growth. The TA2020 emphasizes hereby that it wants to contribute to attaining the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy.

The Polish Presidency of the European Council has presented a roadmap to implement the priorities of the TA2020 and the Europe 2020 objectives simultaneously. Based on the background report of the Presidency (Böhme et al. 2011), the roadmap focuses on the implementation of the TA2020 priorities by supporting the objectives of other sector policies. The place-based approach (Barca 2009) and initiating a dialogue with relevant stakeholders is particularly important in this context.

The complexity of territorial cohesion became apparent in the context of discussing the documents mentioned above (Green Paper, TAEU, TA2020, roadmaps). Different authors suggested different categories to specify this objective (cf. Dühr, Colomb, and Nadin 2010; Faludi 2010; Evers et al. 2009). Discursive categories of the objective of territorial cohesion, as presented by Servillo (2010: 404ff.), again provide another basis for discussion. Communication and governance processes which contribute to the development of strategic objectives and long-term modifications of the conceptual understanding of territorial cohesion are especially interesting for integrating territorial cohesion into EU sector policies: The focus of territorial cohesion has shifted from balancing to growth and development. Both approaches take the importance of territorial disparities into account.

In addition to these different approaches, an ARL working group discussed the reasons for considering territorial cohesion in politics. The group developed four reasons (Böhme et al. 2008: 2-3): (1) reducing costs of uncoordinated and (partially) inconsistent measures of EU policies; (2) using territorial diversity for

### TA2020 - Territorial Priorities for the Development of the European Union

1. Promote polycentric and balanced territorial development
2. Encouraging integrated development in cities, rural and specific regions
3. Territorial integration in cross-border and transnational functional regions
4. Ensuring global competitiveness of the regions based on strong local economies
5. Improving territorial connectivity for individuals, communities and enterprises
6. Managing and connecting ecological, landscape and cultural values of regions

(3) The ARL (Academy for Spatial Research and Planning) is a German research institute.
contributing to the fundamental objectives of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Agenda; (3) assuring a balanced development of the Single Market in order to reduce unintentional, negative social, economic and spatial side effects of the Single Market; (4) enhancing solidarity between the EU member states for promoting and defending the European idea and common achievements. Such lines of reasoning, which provide rationales for territorial cohesion policies, may be useful as a starting point for integrating territorial objectives into EU sector policies. Therefore, these rationales are taken up in the following chapters.

In line with this wide understanding of territorial cohesion, the European Commission in its Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion emphasizes that the integration of EU policies needs to be improved for implementing the Europe 2020 Strategy. This wide understanding can be systemised along six storylines focusing on different facets of territorial cohesion (Böhme and Gløersen 2011). These storylines were used in the survey (Delphi technique) in order to test which storylines dominate in the perception of territorial cohesion.

192 German experts and 135 experts from other EU member states participated in the survey. Territorial cohesion is primarily understood in the sense of balanced territorial development and the utilisation of endogenous potentials. For the experts from other EU countries, the latter is more important than for the German experts (figure 4). For the German experts “Sustainable development, environment and climate change” is the next most important understanding. Surprisingly, growth policy in a competitive and polycentric Europe and new modes of governance are not very important – neither for the German nor the other European experts.

3.2 Processes for implementing territorial cohesion

The evolution of the understanding of territorial cohesion over time reveals the role of processes for defining the territorial cohesion objective: “The hypothesis is that (...) the TC [Territorial Cohesion] objective circulates through the diffusion of discursive chains that feed into the theoretical and methodological framework of ESP [European Spatial Planning]. Through these discursive chains, the TC policy concept can shape spatial policies across Europe despite their different national/regional contexts” (Servillo 2010: 398). These discursive chains can influence the actions of stakeholders and organisations coming from different levels and different sectors. The territorial cohesion objective is, therefore, placed in a multilevel and multi-sector system.

A European network of executive administrative officials in the field of spatial planning and territorial development has been established. This is yet another proof of the role of processes. Formalisation of this network has

Figure 4: Relevance* of six storylines for understanding territorial cohesion

![Diagram showing the relevance of six storylines for territorial cohesion]

(*) The percentages illustrate the share of points of each storyline in total points. Participants had to rank three of six storylines. The ranking was weighted (Position 1 = 3 points, position 2 = 2 points, position 3 = 1 point) to calculate the sum for each storyline.

Source: own calculations, based on an online survey among various sector policy experts
changed over time. The Committee on Spatial Development (CSD) was very important during the ESDP process. This committee gradually merged into other committees later on. Currently, the Network of Territorial Cohesion Contact Points (NTCCP) is the main network taking care of implementing the TA2020. Various committees and networks have and had different degrees of formalisation. The corresponding adjustments of formalisation indicate areas of conflict in the field of European spatial development policy (Böhme and Zillmer 2010) because well-established and non-controversial structures are not likely to undergo such adjustments.

Besides the activities of the European Commission, intergovernmental cooperation of the Member States has traditionally been the main driving power for territorial objectives on the European level. There are, however, different and partially diverging opinions on the relationship between intergovernmental cooperation of the Member States and the European Commission. The Lisbon treaty strengthened the EU Commission’s influence in the field of territorial cohesion. This was also confirmed in the Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion. The Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion reflects the current debate of the EU Commission’s position in this field, i.e. how the EU Commission intends to interpret and to shape its new competence (cf. Böhme and Zillmer 2010).

Both the Lisbon treaty and the TAEU call for an interdisciplinary dialogue. This dialogue aims at convincing stakeholders of sector policies that territory matters and stresses that sector policies affect territories. Hence, this dialogue is a starting point for integrating territorial objectives into sector policies.

Cooperation on different territorial levels and these interdisciplinary dialogues primarily serve to balance interests: The more precise the wording and the objectives, the more obvious potential conflicts of interests.

Thus, the processes turn out to be the key to implement and achieve territorial objectives. It is obviously crucial who is involved in the discussion on territorial cohesion by whom and how. Balancing interests may cause different specifications (in terms of the Fifth Cohesion Report), depending on precise actor relations. This applies in territorial and interdisciplinary terms among sector policies.

For drawing conclusions on the relevance of different processes, the Delphi survey also asked the experts from Germany and the other EU member states for the most important topics and policies. In doing so, the aim of the survey was to specify territorial cohesion in different policies fields.

According to the survey, regional development is the most relevant policy for implementing territorial cohesion, although this result might be due to the high share of experts working in this field who participated in the survey. Sorted in descending order, other relevant topics are: economic development and services of public interest in rural areas, demographic change, climate change, expansion of and accessibility to transport infrastructures and rural-urban relationships. Thus, the experts considered almost all sector policies discussed.

Figure 5: Relevance* of potential starting points for territorial policies in Germany and other European countries

(*) Respondents were asked to sort the potential starting points in descending order (Position 1 = 6 points, …, position 6 = 1 point). As a consequence of this weighting, each starting point received an individual amount of points. The figure shows the share of points of each starting point in total points.

The European survey only includes experts from EU countries other than Germany.
Territorial cohesion in future EU cohesion policy

The respondents identified subnational levels as being most important for implementing territorial cohesion. Besides the national level, which still has the main competencies and can therefore take principal initiatives, it is indispensable to strengthen the stakeholders, instruments and policy approaches at subnational, regional and local levels for implementing territorial cohesion.

Considering the relevance of processes for integrating territorial objectives, the online survey inquired the relevance of different instruments and starting points. The respondents rated “Integration of territorial issues into policy aims and strategies” and “Development of programmes and financial instruments to realise territorial cohesion in different sector policies” higher than other starting points (cf. figure 5). Summing up the survey results and above discussion of the understanding of territorial cohesion, one can conclude that political strategies, programmes and financial instruments should be used to promote balanced territorial development and the development of endogenous potentials.

“Legal instruments for the implementation of territorial issues”, do not seem to be very promising according to the survey’s respondents. This is probably due to the fact, that it would be very complicated to translate a rather unspecific and vague concept like territorial cohesion into well-defined legal terms. Communication and moderation processes were not rated to be very important either. This result indicates that these processes alone are not sufficiently promising and effective. However, they seem to be useful as a means to support the success of other starting points and may therefore support territorial cohesion indirectly quite efficiently.

More detailed questions about different territorial levels show that financial instruments at European level are considered to be more important than those from national or regional levels. Nevertheless, the European level is not similarly important for translating territorial issues into policy objectives and strategies, though. In fact the subnational levels seem to be more important in this context. Hence, an area of conflicts arises between the most important territorial levels for financing, on the one hand, and implementing territorial cohesion, on the other hand.

The above-presented thoughts show that programme development processes of European financial instruments are rated to be particularly promising. It is, thus, useful to have a closer look into this starting point to clarify, on which financial instruments and processes the efforts for integrating territorial objectives should concentrate. The expert opinion reveals that the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) are most suitable as starting points for territorial development issues (cf. figure 6). This finding is taken into account when identifying and developing starting points and recommendations for sector policies in the following chapters.

(*) The bar shows the share of points of each financial instrument/programme in the total amount of points. Weighting scheme: highest relevance, i.e. position 1 = 6 points, ..., very low relevance, i.e. position 6 = 1 point.
4 Integrating territorial cohesion in selected thematic fields

For six thematic fields we investigated how territorial issues could be integrated into relevant sector policies. The six fields were identified following the methodology presented in chapter 2: (a) urban-rural relations, (b) services of general interest in rural areas, (c) transport networks, (d) transport congestions in agglomerations, (e) adaptation of infrastructure to climate change challenges and (f) energy networks.

Some of these fields are linked with several sector policies. Taken together, these thematic fields cover all policy areas, apart from maritime and fishery policies, which are classified as highly relevant for territorial development (see Deutscher Verband für Wohnungswesen, Städtebau und Raumordnung e.V. 2009). The TA2020 represents the analytical framework for the analysis of these fields. In addition, EU Structural Funds are considered to be an important aspect of the analysis. However, the analysis is not limited to Structural Funds, but for each thematic field also addresses other relevant aspects and policies.

The current discussion about the future EU cohesion policy for the period 2014-2020 takes place in the area of conflict between the debates about the EU budget, the ‘best’ future regional policy (in terms of objectives, strategies, governance mechanisms, Europe 2020 Strategy, etc.) and claims of various sector policies, which aim for a stronger integration of their objectives in the future cohesion policy. The timetable for the development of the basic documents is as follows:

- Multi-annual financial framework 2014-2020: A proposal was presented in June 2011, a revision was presented in July 2012 and the final decision is expected by the end of 2012.
- Structural Funds regulations: The Commission’s proposals were presented in October 2011, the consultation processes are ongoing, and the formal decision on the final regulations is expected by the end of 2013 at the latest.
- A Commission staff working document on the Common Strategic Framework was presented in March 2012.
- Negotiation of Partnership Contracts (follow-up document of the national strategic reference frameworks) between the EU Commission and the Member States will start in spring 2013.

Approx. EUR 350 billion are available for EU cohesion policy in the current programme period 2007-2013. Following the proposal for the multi-annual framework 2014-2020, EUR 276 billion are envisaged for the next programme period (see COM(2011) 500 final 2011). Compared to the current period, the future cohesion policy shall focus on a smaller number of priorities and a clearer strategic approach shall be implemented. The themes of EU regional policy after 2014 shall be guided by the Europe 2020 Strategy and will have to support smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

In Germany, the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWi) is responsible for the coordination processes of the future ERDF. Accordingly, the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (BMAS) coordinates the processes related to the European Social Funds (ESF), and the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV) is in charge of the processes concerning the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).

A systematic look at the programmes’ design reveals that particularly two steps in the development of the funding mechanisms are suitable for strengthening territorial issues: Firstly, the development of the legal basis (development of regulations and guidelines) which defines the funding conditions at EU level and, secondly, the process of strategy development (Partnership Contract and operational programmes), which outlines the funding priorities at national and regional level. All processes following these two steps will contribute to specifying the objectives and priorities defined by the first two steps. Later integration or strengthening of territorial issues in any of these following processes is thus rather unlikely.

For each of the thematic field identified above, we will discuss its relation to the TA2020, the Europe 2020 Strategy and the policy context including relevant sector policies. This introductory discussion aims to support a better understanding of the potential starting points for territorial policies developed in the following sections. These starting points for territorial policies provide the basis for the policy recommendations presented in chapter 6.
4.1 Urban-rural relations

Following the definition of ESPON project 1.1.2 “Urban-rural relations in Europe”, approx. 70% of the European population live in urban areas, the remaining 30% in rural areas (Bengs und Schmidt-Thomé 2006: 455f.). In addition to the considerably different population shares, urban and rural areas differ structurally as well. Some of these differences are evident characteristics of either type of area and unchangeable, e.g. population density (Bengs und Schmidt-Thomé 2006: 465). Other differences are economic and political consequences, such as unemployment rates. Obviously, urban-rural settings and relations deserve particular political attention at EU level. This has already been acknowledged by the TA2020. The TA2020 highlights the manifold relations between urban and rural areas and encourages regional planning actors to support urban-rural partnerships. Furthermore, the TA2020 underlines the necessity of efficient transport links to enhance economic relations such as increased commuting (TA2020 2011: 9). The Europe 2020 Strategy does not formulate any objectives with regard to urban-rural relations.

4.1.1 Policy context

The functional area of urban and rural spaces

The precise differentiation between urban and rural areas is rather complex, because of manifold structural differences. Urban and rural areas differ traditionally; however, various past developments contributed to blurring these differences and changed the borderlines between urban and rural areas. Suburbanisation is the main contributor to these changes. As a consequence of increasing motorisation, borders of urban areas have moved toward their rural hinterland. This process is supported by an ever more improved communication infrastructure, which – in combination with good transport networks – offers land consuming enterprises the possibility to locate themselves virtually anywhere. Consequently, urban and rural areas should be considered as integrated functional areas, with varying degrees of urban influence (see Bengs und Schmidt-Thomé 2006: 455f).

Furthermore, discussions at European level stress that urban-rural relations need to be considered beyond administrative borders (ESPON 2010a: 16). The Urban Audit e.g. differentiates between a city as an administrative unit and a city as a functionally integrated area (FUA: Functional Urban Area). This perception becomes increasingly established within the EU Commission as well:

“Whereas most policies focus on a single administrative geographic level, the pursuit of territorial cohesion implies a more functional and flexible approach. Depending on the issue, the appropriate geographical dimension ranges from a macro region, such as the Baltic Sea or the Danube region, to metropolitan and cross-border regions or a group of rural areas and market towns. Such a flexible geography can better capture the positive and negative externalities of concentration, improve connections and facilitate cooperation and so be more effective in furthering territorial cohesion.” (European Commission 2010: 24)

Urban-rural relations are understood as the links within these functional areas, which are extremely manifold both in terms of geography and themes. They range from the joint use of services, e.g. in the field of public administration or education, via regional production chains to more complex regional development processes, e.g. commuting patterns or intra-regional migration. The number of such functional links increases, simultaneously enlarging the involved territory slowly but steadily. Globalisation processes also contribute to these developments, e.g. by enlarging market areas for internationally traded products. At local level, the variety of offered products and services and labour market areas is growing and, as a result of increasing mobility, the consumer basis is growing as well (Bengs und Schmidt-Thomé 2006: 21).

Improving urban-rural relations through interregional cooperation

Rural areas in close proximity to cities benefit the most from links between urban and rural areas. In these areas, commuting is most intensive and they are often popular among the urban population who uses neighbouring rural areas e.g. for recreation. With increasing distance from rural areas to the next city, it becomes more challenging for them to benefit from related links in economic terms, as these areas often lack the necessary consumers. However, rural areas in close proximity to cities may enormously benefit from a close functional integration, even though often at the expense of their sustainable development. Reasons lie especially in the faster expansion of road networks compared to public transport services. This implies that individual (car)
transport dominates in suburban and rural areas close to cities (Bengs und Schmidt-Thomé 2006: 22). The authors of the ESPON project METROBORDER - Cross-border Polycentric Metropolitan Regions – identified related development potentials also for the case of cross-border metropolitan areas (see ESPON 2010b). The functional integration of urban and rural areas, thus, is not necessarily only an issue within single countries, but in many cases also a topic for cross-border areas.

The discussion about the TA2020 implies proposals to address urban-rural relations as follows:

“Urban-rural interdependence should be tackled through multilevel governance including integrated planning based on a broad-based partnership. Within these frameworks there is much potential in place-based strategies developed locally to address local conditions. Small and medium-sized centres might have a crucial role in this field in rural areas; therefore it is important to improve the accessibility of urban centres from rural territories and so enhance people’s access to job opportunities and services of general interest.” (Ministry of National Development Hungary 2011: 81)

As urban-rural relations are manifold, different aspects of them are addressed by the following sector policies: agriculture, regional policy (e.g. in the fields of economic development, tourism, regional marketing), transport, energy, health and social policies (e.g. demographic change, services of general interest).

According to ESPON, the awareness of urban-rural relations within many sector policies is rather poorly developed (Bengs und Schmidt-Thomé 2006: 17).

Urban-rural relations in EU Structural Funds

During the current programme period 2007-2013, the “European Territorial Cooperation” priority within the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) addresses the improvement of urban-rural relations:

“1. the development of cross-border economic, social and environmental activities through joint strategies for sustainable territorial development, and primarily (…) c) by supporting links between urban and rural areas” (Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006: 5).

The proposal for the next programme period’s regulations, 2014-2020, however, does not address urban-rural relations at all. The explicit focus on urban development (see COM(2011) 614 final 2011: 16) could even oppose the strengthening of urban-rural cooperation.

At the same time, urban-rural cooperation is implicitly mentioned in the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD). Within Axis 4 (LEADER), transnational and interregional cooperation is funded (DG Agriculture 2009: 25). This also comprises supraregional partnerships. Urban regions of varying size and rural areas shall identify their joint potentials and elaborate joint development strategies as equal partners (see TAEU 2007: 5). A direct establishment of urban-rural relations in EU transport policies could not be found. This finding is congruent with the results of the ESPON work by Bengs and Schmidt-Thomé (2006: 17). Furthermore, urban-rural relations have neither played a direct role in EU energy policies so far.

4.1.2 Starting points for territorial policies and recommendations

Local initiatives substantially contribute to functional urban-rural relations. Local actors have the best knowledge of local potentials and needs. They are often involved in horizontal networks and through their cooperation they contribute to regional solidarity. In the field of urban-rural relations, the ‘place-based approach’ appears to be useful. Two examples of already established initiatives addressing inter-communal cooperation at local level are “Europäische Metropolregion Nürnberg” (European Metropolitan Region of Nuremberg) and “Vision Rheintal” (Rhine Valley Vision). However, also less successful examples could be identified, such as the supraregional partnership “Wissen, Kooperation, Innovation” (Knowledge, Cooperation, Innovation).

**Europäische Metropolregion Nürnberg** (European Metropolitan Region of Nuremberg) (see BBSR 2010) offers regional stakeholders a platform for intercommunal cooperation. It is structured along seven thematic fields and guided by representatives from the private sector and local politicians. The marketing portal “Original Regional” (Of Regional Origin), which offers SMEs from the city and its hinterland a platform for jointly marketing their products, is a central initiative.

29 urban and rural municipalities in the Austrian region of Vorarlberg have developed a joint **Vision Rheintal** (Rhine Valley Vision). It represents a regional development concept, to better shape and structure economic growth in the region (see Assmann und Burtscher 2009). In this context, many thematically differing projects have been supported and guided by regional and supraregional representatives.
In the field of EU regional policy, especially the Structural Funds ERDF and ESF provide starting points for territorial interventions focussing on urban-rural relations. This was confirmed by the experts questioned during the Delphi survey. The majority of the respondents consider a balanced territorial development and the connectivity of all regions as particularly important for territorial cohesion. Regional policy is the starting point most often mentioned in this context. Furthermore, about one third of the respondents consider the European level to provide the highest potential for the implementation of territorial cohesion.

Regional policy regulations
For the programme period 2007-2013, urban-rural relations have only been implicitly addressed in the general regulation 1083/2006: “In view of the importance of sustainable urban development and the contribution of towns and cities, particularly medium-sized ones, to regional development, greater account should be taken of them by developing their role in programming to promote urban regeneration” (Council Regulation (EC) 1083/2006: 13). The ERDF regulation is a little more explicit: “Article 3 Scope of assistance (…) (2) The ERDF shall contribute towards the financing of: (…) c) (... cooperation and exchange of experience between regions, towns, and relevant social, economic and environmental actors” (Council Regulation (EC) 1080/2006: 3). For the objective of European Territorial Cooperation, the objective is even explicitly mentioned: “Article 6 European territorial cooperation (…) c) by supporting links between urban and rural areas” (Council Regulation (EC) 1080/2006: 5). The regulation proposals for the new programme period do not address urban-rural relations, while urban development is mentioned in Article 7 of the proposed ERDF regulation. This is outlined prominently in financial terms, as at least 5% of the ERDF funds shall be used for urban development.

The ESF regulation 1081/2006 does not take urban-rural relations into consideration (see Council Regulation (EC) 1081/2006 2006). This also holds for the proposal for the next programme period (see COM(2011) 607 final 2011). However, urban-rural relation aspects, which overlap with services of general interest (e.g. dealing with demographic change, organisation of fostering, medical services, day care, education), are ESF-specific themes.

Within the German interdepartmental consultations, the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS) should campaign for including urban-rural relations in the regulations. Useful starting points could be:

• Article 7 “Sustainable urban development” of the new ERDF regulation
• Article 9 “Thematic objectives” of the new general regulation and related to that Article 5 of the new ERDF regulation and Article 3 of the new ESF regulation
• Article 14 “Content of the Partnership Contract” of the new general regulation.

The German interdepartmental coordination process for the general regulation and the ERDF regulation are led by the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWi). The related process for the ESF regulation is coordinated by the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (BMAS).

Strategic development in regional policies
The proposal for the new general regulation outlines the planned process of development of strategies for the next programme period. The Common Strategic Framework (CSF) and the Partnership Contracts are meant to be key documents within this process. The CSF will be a framework document formulated by the Commission. It translates the objectives and ambitions of the Europe 2020 Strategy into central actions for the CSF Funds. The approach is to support a stronger coordination of funds towards the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy. The Partnership Contracts will be agreed between the EU Commission and the individual Member States. They are to ensure that the CSF funds will be implemented in accordance with the Europe 2020 Strategy. They are to build on an integrated approach towards territorial development supported by relevant Structural Funds (see Article 14 b), and contain objectives building on jointly
developed indicators, strategic investments and a series of conditionalities. Both documents, the CSF and the Partnership Contracts, offer starting points for a better integration of urban-rural relations in the strategic framework for the next Structural Funding period (COM(2011) 615 final 2011: 39-43).

In the context of the discussion about the German Partnership Contract, the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS) may argue for an integration of rural-urban relationships. Relevant starting points are the discussions about the urban dimension in the Structural Funds as well as the approach to functional geographical areas underlined in the Fifth Cohesion Report.

With regard to the regulations and guidelines concerning the programme period 2014-2020, the BMVBS – within the aforementioned negotiation processes – may work towards an integration of the objectives of the TA2020, and thus implicitly also include urban-rural relations in the socio-economic analysis, the SWOT^4 analysis, in ex-ante evaluations (especially the coherence check) and in strategy development.

In order to strengthen the topic of urban-rural relations in the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), the third Axis of the EAFRD “Quality of life in rural areas and diversification of the rural economy” is of special interest. Further information concerning the CAP and EAFRD will be provided in chapter 4.2 dealing with the services of general interest in rural areas.

Integration at regional level

Apart from establishing urban-rural relations in the EU Structural Funds, there is also a need for integration at regional level. With the “Demonstration Projects of Spatial Planning (MORO)” programme, the BMVBS and the BBSR e.g. provide information on how local and regional authorities may approach their particular challenges. Very interesting examples are the finalised MORO project on supra-regional partnerships – innovative projects for cooperation in city regions, networking and sharing regional responsibilities as well as the current MORO field of research on supra-regional partnerships in cross-border functional areas – innovative projects for cooperation in city regions, networking and sharing regional responsibilities”.

To enhance the integration of urban-rural relations at regional level, the BBSR might further improve the accessibility of MORO results in this field for local and regional authorities. Existing results illustrating cooperation possibilities could be presented to interested regions in the context of information events. This may even include the presentation of good-practice projects or a public discussion of the theme in the context of publishing the national spatial planning report. It is, however, more important, to support initiatives of local stakeholders to use the local ‘tacit knowledge’.

4.2 Services of general interest in rural areas

Even though Pillar 1 of the CAP has territorial impacts (Deutscher Verband für Wohnungswesen, Städtebau und Raumordnung e.V. 2009: 33), from a territorial point of view, the provision of services of general interest in rural areas addressed by Pillar 2 is of higher territorial relevance at European level. This becomes particularly clear when looking at the TA2020 in the context of the challenges caused by a territorially differentiated demographic development: “Ageing and depopulation will bring about changes in many regions including rural and peripheral regions and lead to severe impacts for social and territorial cohesion, public service provision, labour market and housing” (TA2020 2011: 6).

This challenge is tackled in the fifth priority of the TA2020. It underlines the importance of material infrastructure and public services for enhancing competitiveness, sustainable development and territorial cohesion. The formulation of this priority shows, that it comprises various dimensions of everyday life of any EU citizen regardless of the region they live in (TA2020 2011: 10).

The Europe 2020 Strategy addresses the issue of services of general interest in rural areas rather implicitly. Under the objective of inclusive growth it refers to territorial cohesion. However, there are only punctual references to the integration of rural areas or the outmost peripheries by stating that in those areas, just as in the rest of the EU, all people shall have access and opportunities for participating in economic growth (COM(2010) 2020 final 2010: 16).

4.2.1 Policy context

In Germany, services of general interest are derived from the welfare state principle (Art. 20 I German Basic Law) and mean that various kinds of infrastructure and services, which are of public interest, are provided. This task is

---

4 SWOT means Strengths, Weaknesses/Limitations, Opportunities and Threats.
fulfilled by various public and private bodies and includes both the provision of social and technical infrastructure. Services of general interest comprise infrastructure in different areas:

- education and research
- health and social affairs
- culture and recreation
- administration and public services
- transport and telecommunication
- energy, water and waste supply and disposal.

Services of general interest in areas facing demographic decline

Over the past years, discussions on services of general interests focused on the costs of providing them in rural areas. The increasingly important issue concentrates on how infrastructure – meeting the needs of citizens and enterprises – can be provided when public budgets become more limited as a result of demographic decline (i.e. reduced number of tax payers) (see e.g. Siedentop et al. 2006: 31). This concerns many aspects of the aforementioned infrastructures (BMVBW/BBR 2005). Already in 2003, the German Standing Conference of Ministers Responsible for Spatial Planning (MKRO) asked for a review of concepts, strategies and instruments to provide services of general interest, in order to ensure equal living conditions in all parts of Germany in future. The discussion of recent years has shown that the provision of services of general interest in rural areas requires extensive adaptations. Apart of new spatial development concepts, this also includes a new interpretation and understanding of the principle of equal living conditions. This has induced discussions on the principal functions of public infrastructure and the need for regional, tailor-made solutions (BMVBW/BBR 2005: 21). Further complementary discussions focus on increasing the flexibility of infrastructure supply in areas facing demographic decline and in particular in sparsely populated areas (Beirat für Raumordnung 2009: 9pp).

Presently, the guiding principle of “securing the provision of services of general interest”, which explicitly addresses areas between urban centres and rural areas, also covers rural areas. In particular in the context of demographic change including an aging and in rural areas often also declining population, the network of central places needs to be intensified. This goes hand in hand with the above-mentioned increased flexibility of services provided (Spangenberg 2010: 2).

Services of general interest in CAP

The development of rural areas is part of Pillar 2 of the CAP and thus financed via the EAFRD. Especially Axis 3 on improving the quality of life in rural areas and diversifying the rural economy as well as the LEADER initiative (previously LEADER+) on local strategies for the development of rural areas through local public-private partnerships create a link between the EAFRD and services of general interest in rural areas (DG Agriculture 2009: 17p). Apart from offering public services, these initiatives focus on supporting the elaboration of development strategies for securing good living conditions. Furthermore, services of general interest also matter in Pillar 2 of the CAP, as the EAFRD also supports diversified rural economics in order to strengthen rural development (COM(2010) 672 final 2010; Council of the European Union 2006). These measures also aim to secure the possibilities for providing services of general interest.

The draft regulations for the EAFRD after 2013 as well explicitly address services of general interest. They can be funded via the last of six EU priorities on the development of rural areas. This priority focuses on “promoting social inclusion, poverty reduction and economic development in rural areas” (COM(2011) 627 final/2 2011: 32). Analogous to the present regulations on support for rural development by the EAFRD (Regulation (EC) 1698/2005 2005), the new proposal also contains measures on “basic services and village renewal in rural areas” (COM(2011) 627 final/2 2011: 46) and “LEADER local action groups” (COM(2011) 627 final/2 2011: 64).

4.2.2 Starting points for territorial policies and recommendations

Already in the ESPON 2006 Programme, mobilisation and empowerment at local level were identified as a decisive factor for a successful implementation of sector policies. The active involvement of the local level and the transfer of responsibilities to this level allow for a better capitalisation of territorial potentials. In doing so, immaterial resources gain higher importance and the development of local competences and entrepreneurship are promoted (ESPON 2006 Programme 2006: 54; 78). The two projects illustrated in the text boxes serve as examples for such a local bottom-up approach. However, such approaches – with a high number of participating local stakeholders – often find it challenging to ensure continuous partaking (Neumeier and Pollermann 2011: 38).
The second example illustrates furthermore, how important it is to acknowledge the territorial context. If needed, such integrated approaches should go beyond administrative borders, following the idea of the place-based approach, and should thereby contribute to considering territorial issues adequately. This approach was last but not least confirmed by the results of the pilot action “REGIONEN AKTIV” (Active Regions) of the German Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV). This pilot action found that policies for the development of rural areas need to be extensively reoriented: A cross-sector support of regions, based on tailor-made development concepts, has proved to be more efficient and successful than traditional sectoral funding instruments. As for the future, national funding should aim at activating local stakeholders to become more proactive, take over responsibilities and work cooperatively in partnerships in order to mobilise innovation and investments (BMELV 2008: 12).

These findings produce various starting points for integrating territorial objectives in other sector policies. They especially build on cooperation between the BMVBS and the BMELF or the BBSR and the Federal Office of Agriculture and Food (BLE), respectively.

EU regulations and programmes

Especially the future strategic orientation of Pillar 2 of the CAP is to be mentioned as a starting point. Currently, the future CAP regulations are negotiated at EU level and a first proposal was presented in October 2011 (COM(2011) 627 final/2 2011). The CAP options of actions published so far indicate a continued shift of agricultural policies towards Pillar 2 – even if this shift might not be as big as originally expected. Furthermore, the two Pillars shall become more closely linked, which might allow for a stronger support of rural areas under the CAP (Grajewski 2011: 39). It is important to use this shift strategically for strengthening the role services of general interest in rural areas in the future CAP. This is especially true as the future funding shall amongst others contribute to balanced territorial development in rural areas (COM(2010) 672 final 2010). At the same time, one needs to recognise that the use of funds of the measure “basic services for rural economy and population” has so far been below average in the present period (BMELV 2011: 42p). The current strategy plan will be replaced by a multifund Partnership Contract in the next period. This change requires a vertical and horizontal coor-

dination of all responsible federal and federal state (“Länder”) ministries (Grajewski 2011: 10p). The BMVBS might use the formal interdepartmental consultation processes as well as informal dialogues among equal partners to argue for inserting the place-based approach as an integrative method for further elaborating regulations and the Partnership Contract. This would allow establishing a broader platform for the previously successful LEADER initiative. This may include measures addressing explicitly services of general interest as well as measures addressing economic diversification thus contributing to a balanced rural development. On the one hand, the present proposal for the new regulations offers a substantial degree of freedom for programme development in favour of a territorial approach and balanced rural development (Grajewski 2011: 116). On the other hand, the EAFRD contribution to a territorially balanced development has not yet become sufficiently clear (Grajewski 2011: 114). The BMVBS might want to argue for strengthening territorial awareness in the future negotiation process, e.g. by inserting a direct reference to territorial cohesion as part of the development programmes in Article 9 of

Taxibus (www.leaderplus.ec.europa.eu/cpdb/public/gpdb/Gp-dbSearchFS.aspx?language=en) is a project, where a network of integrated transport systems was developed for the association of local authorities in Alto Oltrepo Pavese in the north Italian province Pavia (Region Lombardy). The project lasted from 2003 to 2008 and aimed at securing and developing sustainable transport options in a rural region facing aging and declining population. In doing so, the project was supposed to improve the quality of life of non-motorised citizens in the region by facilitating access to medical care and cultural sites. The implementation built on an extensive participation of local stakeholders that remained stable throughout the lifetime of the project and an analysis of local needs for public transport. The implementation of the project utilised innovative organisational approaches. Based on a pilot action, the network could be enlarged across the entire region. It was proved that the developed transport network works and can run on a permanent basis.

The regional Leader Action Group Eichsfeld (www.eichsfeldaktiv.de) builds on earlier regional development processes and elaborates a new regional development concept taking into account previous experiences from a bottom-up process. The regional action group aims to develop projects which contribute to making the region (“Lebensraum Eichsfeld”) liveable for current and future generations. This among others includes a comprehensive improvement of the local conditions, i.e. ensuring futurewise technical and social infrastructure and regional energy supply. It is worth mentioning that this approach covers a rural area with a natural and cultural homogenous landscape which stretches across regional and state borders.
the draft regulations (COM(2011) 627 final/2 2011: 30pp). In the same way, a contribution to territorial cohesion might be integrated as an explicit quality criteria in the development programmes for rural areas by European and national networks for rural development (COM(2011) 627 final/2 2011: 69, 71). Furthermore, experiences with integrated maritime policies of the European Maritime and Fisheries Funds may serve as positive examples for the discussion of future regulations and programmes (see COM(2007) 575 final 2007, COM(2010) 494 final 2010). These suggestions are in accordance with the results of the Delphi survey carried out as part of the present study. Following the Delphi study, more than 40% of respondents consider the development of policy strategies and objectives in the field of services of general interest in rural areas to be promising.

Following the Delphi survey, programme development is another key area for promoting services of general interest in rural areas under consideration of territorial cohesion. This opportunity was highlighted by 25% of the respondents. With regard to programme development, there are two major access points: integration (a) in the transnational territorial cooperation programmes with German participation, and (b) in regional programmes for rural development. Various already existing experiences may be considered within the programming work:

- programme development and implementation of the ongoing LEADER initiative
- experiences of the BMELV pilot project “REGIONEN AKTIV” (Active Regions)
- BBSR experiences concerning rural development in Germany linked to the latest national spatial planning report.

**Horizontal and vertical dialogues**

Territorial objectives can be implemented into future programme development, inter alia by promoting various forms of dialogue. Even if the results of the Delphi survey do not focus on moderation and mediation for promoting interdisciplinary cooperation, we do recommend testing different dialogue formats for influencing future strategies and programmes as described above. Besides different formal and informal means of interdepartmental cooperation, the new national spatial planning report offers an opportunity to invite for a dialogue on services of general interest in rural areas. This may involve stakeholders from the federal, federal state, regional and local levels and should cover a range of different sector policies. Such a dialogue might sharpen the understanding of territorial cohesion among German key stakeholders of different levels and policies. A joint workshop of the BBSR and BLE addressing the efficient use of resources might be a first step for such a dialogue. At the same time, the BMVBS may want to intensify the contact concerning territorial cohesion with the BMELV. First starting points might be the interdepartmental working group on the development of rural areas and the MORO Programme of Action for the Regional Provision of Public Services. Such an approach would correspond to the results of the Delphi survey, which identified a lack of awareness concerning territorial cohesion as an important obstacle.

**4.3 Transport core networks**

The trans-European transport network (TEN-T) policies have direct European territorial relevance. Efficient trans-European transport networks are of high importance for improving accessibility and contributing to regional development (Deutscher Verband für Wohnungswesen, Städtebau und Raumordnung e.V. 2009: 23). The TA2020 points to a variety of links between transport networks and territorial development challenges: Gateways are of crucial importance in a globalised economy and increasing integration and interdependencies between regions require better connectivity. Uncoordinated transport infrastructure development is, among others, a threat for biodiversity and cultural landscapes (TA2020 2011: 6). Furthermore, transport contributes to climate change, and more effective and energy-efficient networks could help to mitigate these effects.

Last but not least because of the variety of challenges linked to transport networks, the second paragraph of priority 6 of the TA2020 concerning the improvement of connectivity states: “Further development of Trans-European networks (TEN-T) linking the main European centres, such as capitals, metropolitan regions and TEN-nodes and improving linkages between primary and secondary systems should be an essential component of the integrated network.” (TA2020 2011: 9)

The Europe 2020 Strategy addresses the importance of transport networks in relation to the objective of sustainable growth. The flagship initiative for a resource-efficient Europe refers to the development of transport networks in the context of an extensive develop-
ment of trans-European networks enhancing a low-carbon economy. Furthermore, the flagship initiative "An industrial policy for the globalisation era" underlines that transport networks deserve special attention, as they are crucial for securing access to international markets for all businesses (COM(2010) final 2010).

4.3.1 Policy context
A smooth functioning transport of people and goods is a precondition for economic, social and territorial integration. Consequently, the EU transport policy aims at developing clean, safe and efficient transport systems. In doing so, the debate increasingly focuses on resource efficiency issues (COM(2010) 2020 final 2010).

Both the different transport modes addressed by EU transport policies (road, rail, air, maritime, inland waterways) and the objective of enhancing intermodal networks (COM(2011) 144 final 2011; TA2020 2011) demonstrate the importance of funding European transport networks. Furthermore, the future role of transport core networks is widely emphasised. The White Paper on Transport 2011 describes transport core networks as "a 'core network' of corridors, carrying large and consolidated volumes of freight and passengers traffic with high efficiency and low emissions" (COM(2011) 144 final 2011: 13).

Understanding of 'core networks'
A study on planning methods for European transport networks shows that, to this day, there has been no Europe-wide methodological approach for defining transport core networks beyond policy discussions (De Ceuster u. a. 2010: 8). Following the definition of transport core networks, in the White Paper on Transport (COM(2011) 144 final 2011), territorial relevance is twofold and regards (a) route planning, and (b) the role of cities and nodes in the transport system.

The EU Commission’s Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport (DG MOVE) has not addressed the topic so far. The understanding is that transport core networks have to serve clear European objectives and that they should be of highest priority for transport and other EU sector policies including EU cohesion policy (COM(2009) 44 final 2009). Furthermore, an adequate involvement of all relevant stakeholders is needed to implement the transport core network approach ('corridor coordination approach'). This allows to ensure that transport core networks can be developed which are acceptable for all parties concerned and at the same are reasonable in technological, economic and financial terms (COM(2009) 44 final).

Consequently, the development of starting points and recommendations for territorial policies stresses different possibilities to involve relevant stakeholders. This appears to be even more important, as some of the illustrating examples show how the involvement of relevant stakeholders contributes to success or failure.

Multi-dimensional sector policy relevance of core networks
So far, we have shown that transport core networks and transport networks in general have territorial effects. They e.g. affect regional economies, environment and social developments. At the same time, transport networks are considered to be of particular importance for regional development options. Thus, it is hardly surprising that different funding sources for planning and implementing transport core networks are already in place. In addition to the TEN-T budget, the Cohesion Funds and the ERDF provide funds for financing transport core networks. Thus, the instruments of the EU cohesion and regional policies also serve the development of transport (core) networks. As a consequence, transport core networks are multi-dimensionally established in the EU transport, cohesion and regional policies.

4.3.2 Starting points for territorial policies and recommendations
The direct effects of transport infrastructure planning and investments concern all geographical levels. The same is true for transport core networks. Even if core networks are often perceived as somewhat abstract and high-flying, the final infrastructure intervention affects the local level. The example of Stuttgart 21 shows that the implications at local level cannot always be foreseen.

Other examples illustrate, that both horizontal and vertical integration of all concerned stakeholders as well as a comprehensive analysis of territorial impacts may prevent delays in planning and building processes. In addition, the need for later adaptation measures can be minimised. At the same time, such an integrated approach is no guarantee preventing such problems; but it should reduce the risks.
To come to a conclusion, there are three critical aspects, which are crucial for planning transport core networks:

- territorial analyses to formulate territorially relevant objectives that takes territorial impacts into account
- integrative planning of transport core networks, i.e. planning needs to be seen in relation to other (infrastructure) projects at different geographical levels, where appropriate, also including local public transport services (de Meer und Ribalaygua 2011: 177f)
- integrative horizontal and vertical consultation processes to build broad consensus and to gain efficiency in the long run.

Vertical and horizontal dialogues

The publication of the German national planning report (ROB), the plans for the next period of the EU Structural Funds and the upcoming revision of the national transport plan offer good possibilities for contacting the stakeholders responsible for transport core networks and for including territorial interests in the development of the ERDF programmes of the federal states.

At EU, national and federal state levels, there are different starting points for possible dialogues, e.g. as regards the development of guidelines for transport planning and programme development or the programme development itself. At EU level, the newly created Connecting Europe Facility offers good dialogue opportunities. It shall complement the current ERDF cohesion policy and explicitly aims at developing modern and highly efficient trans-European energy, transport and communication networks (COM(2011) 665 2011: 55). Consequently, explicitly linking the ERDF transport programme with this Facility would be desirable, as far as it is launched for Germany. In the TEN-Committee of the Member States this could be realised by means of a dialogue focusing on territorial objectives.

EU programmes and the national transport plan

INTERREG B programmes offer additional options to intensify the link between territorial policy objectives and transport networks when developing the programmes for the next period. There are already a number of positive examples in this area, which should be more systematically implemented in developing and formulating programmes. The interdisciplinary experience of INTERREG should be used to
advocate interdisciplinary policy approaches. Furthermore, at federal and “Länder” levels, it should be pointed out how INTERREG projects may contribute to appropriately consider current needs in the regions. This can be achieved by means of various dialogues apart from the BMVBS (including relevant departments) involving the transport ministries of the federal states involved, environmental authorities at federal and “Länder” levels, DB Netz AG (the company owning the national railroad system) as well as stakeholders from the private sector and from social and environmental organisations. Such a broad approach would help to include a large variety of territorially relevant interests.

At national level, the development of the national transportation plan implies a conceptual advancement of German transport policies. It should include the territorial oriented approaches of the Transport White Paper taking the revised TEN-T guidelines (see COM(2011) 650/2 2011) into account. The implementation of such approaches should be reflected in the federal states’ transport planning and in the sections of the ERDF programmes of the federal states devoted to transport issues. This implementation should be realised in cooperation with the BMWI. As already mentioned with regard to INTERREG, the horizontal and vertical involvement of territorially relevant stakeholders is also crucial for the development of the ERDF programmes of the “Länder”.

This approach corresponds to the results of the Delphi survey concerning the starting points for integrating territorial issues in infrastructure measures: These measures, aiming to influence future programmes, were mentioned second most, directly after the concrete cooperation on territorial development. According to the Delphi survey, their integration has failed so far mainly because of a lack of coordination and consultation among sector policies and a lack of information (20-25% of the respondents of the German respectively European survey indicated these reasons with regard to infrastructure developments). Consequently, the presented approaches require better coordination between transport policies and transport issues in cohesion and regional policy.

The Brittany-Loire Valley High-Speed Line (www.rff.fr and www.lgv-bpl.org) involves the construction of a new railway route. It is an expansion of the existing high-speed railway route between Paris and Le Mans. The project aims at improving the accessibility of western France and is integrated in additional railroad development measures in Brittany. It was developed by involving stakeholders horizontally, i.e. by involving various national ministries (ministries of state, energy, environment, development and Réseau Ferré de France RFF), and vertically, i.e. by involving stakeholders from the national level to the local population. Vertical stakeholder participation is a result of the French division of competences for high-speed railway networks (de Meer und Ribalaygua 2011: 176). Furthermore, different possible routes have been analysed and compared as regards different effects and special interests, in order to find a solution which meets the regional needs – indicating that territorial effects have been adequately taken on board.

4.4 Congestions in metropolitan areas
Transport system developments have direct territorial effects, as already shown in the discussion on transport core networks. Developing trans-European transport networks and secondary transport networks, however, is not sufficient for improving connectivity in Europe. Local accessibility within cities – of airports, railway stations etc. – also needs to become more efficient to avoid congestion and enhance intermodal transport solutions (Deutscher Verband für Wohnungswesen, Städtebau und Raumordnung e.V. 2009: 23). As presented in chapter 4.3 above, the TA2020 stresses a series of relations between transport systems and territorial challenges, which are also relevant with regard to congestion in metropolitan areas.

Congestion in metropolitan areas refers to two priorities of the TA 2020, mainly because of the combination of different challenges which cities face and the different functions of cities. Priority 2 i.a. supports an integrated development of cities and endorses all measures “which help to make cities motors of smart, sustainable and inclusive development and attractive places to live, work, visit and invest in. Accordingly, we recommend applying an integrated and multilevel approach in urban development and regeneration policies” (TA2020 2011: 7). In addition, the second paragraph of Priority 5 includes an explicit request for multimodality: “We support effective inter-modal transport solutions especially within city-regions; sea-overland connections and efficient airport-railway relationships” (TA2020 2011: 9).
Combining these two priorities, the TA2020 thus promotes measures reducing the burden caused by transport and at the same time improving intermodal transport solutions. This is in line with the flagship initiative for a resource-efficient Europe of the Europe 2020 Strategy, which asks for an intelligent transport management linked to the objectives of sustainable growth (COM(2010) 2020 final 2010). However, this does not explicitly address the urban dimension, but it generally puts the issue of transport management on the agenda.

4.4.1 Policy context

Congestion in metropolitan areas has many dimensions. Different forms of traffics caused by a variety of travel motivations meet in metropolitan areas. They all use available transport solutions ranging from bikes, various motorised transport means and local public transport to long-distance rail connections and aircrafts. In metropolitan areas traffic is very dense with temporary congestion implying stop-and-go traffic and traffic jams (see e.g. Beckers et al. 2007: 33ff.). Traffic density and the danger of congestion increases in cities with gateway functions (see e.g. Hoppe 2006).

Congestion goes hand in hand with air and noise pollution. They reduce the quality of life for the population in metropolitan areas and lead to additional transport costs (see Beckers et al. 2007: 38). Structural developments as regards settlement patterns and new living and working styles, which have led to more and/or longer trips, have intensified these tendencies during the last decades. People have become more mobile, they relocate more often, and partly there is no alternative to using cars. Different aspects of urban mobility, reasons for congestion and possible cause-effect relations have been intensively discussed by a number of authors in recent years (see e.g. Dalkmann, Lanzendorf, und Scheiner 2004; Hesse and Kaltenbrunner 2005; Holz-Rau and Scheiner 2005; Kutter 2005; Topp 2003).

Approaches to reduce congestion

The above-mentioned studies on cause-effect relations of congestion in metropolitan areas are complemented by analyses of traffic-handling. Within such analyses, e.g. the use of telematics for more efficient and environmentally friendly transport solutions (Halbritter et al. 2002) is investigated. Other themes of these analyses are transport management, which involves transport steering, control, direction and information (Rapp 2008: 111pp.), and new transport services, which e.g. promote intermodality (see e.g. Stölzle and Hoffmann 2006).

Infrastructure development and adaptation, measures for improving intermodality and for reducing transport emissions, developing incentives and soft measures are important within relevant policy discussions. The EU White Paper on Transport formulates three main objectives for competitive and resource-efficient transport. These objectives i.a. aim at reducing congestions in metropolitan areas and consider several of the measures mentioned above (COM(2011) 144 final 2011: 9):

- developing and deploying new and sustainable fuels and propulsion systems
- optimising the performance of multimodal logistic chains, i.a. by making greater use of more energy-efficient transport modes
- increasing the efficiency of transport and of infrastructure use by means of information systems and market-based incentives.

Congestions in transport and regional policies

At European level, the Directorates General for Mobility and Transport and for Regional Policy are principally in charge for issues related to congestion in metropolitan areas. The CIVITAS Initiative (City-VITALity-Sustainability) is a programme of the Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport (DG MOVE). With this initiative, the EU Commission intends to solve pressing transport problems in cities, which are laid down in a total of 20 actions within the Action Plan on Urban Mobility (COM(2009) 409 final 2009). Its implementation is to be evaluated in 2012. CIVITAS supports and assesses the implementation of integrated strategies to solve pressing urban transport problems. These strategies aim at sustainable urban transport and serve integrated transport solutions. They include technical solutions, energy-related and transport policy aspects (see www.civitas-initiative.eu).

At EU level, URBACT II offers another option for solving transport challenges and congestion in metropolitan areas. This programme promotes the exchange of experiences and mutual learning related to sustainable urban development. It is funded by the ERDF and contributions from the Member States. The programme assists cities in developing pragmatic solutions which bring together different dimensions of urban development and are innovative and sustainable (see www.urbact.eu).
Even though some priority areas of URBACT II allow for links to (inner-)urban transport, there are currently no relevant projects.

The present formulation of the draft regulations concerning future ERDF and territorial cooperation programmes suggests that, even in future, EU Structural Funds will provide funding possibilities like those presented above. The proposal for the ERDF regulations envisages “an increased focus on sustainable urban development (...) to be achieved through the earmarking of a minimum of 5% ERDF resources” (COM(2011) 614 final 2011: 4). The investment priorities explicitly mention measures for “developing environment-friendly and low-carbon transport systems and promoting sustainable urban mobility” (COM(2011) 614 final 13).

In addition, there are local initiatives, which are made possible by municipal government measures, but do not receive any specific sector policy funding. This proves that urban transport is mainly perceived as a local issue, which - following the vertical distribution of competences - is to be addressed at municipal level. Nevertheless, European cooperation may help to develop and disseminate innovative solutions, especially through mutual learning.

4.4.2 Starting points for territorial policies and recommendations

The management of inner-urban congestion principally asks for an integrative approach at municipal level, as the example of the transport development plan of Munich shows. The local conditions are decisive for the related approach to reducing traffic congestion. Not only the size of an agglomeration, but also infrastructure measures implemented so far, the perception of the congestion, urban functions, public readiness for behavioural change etc. are important.

The importance of possible behavioural changes can be illustrated by a second example, ‘Cycle and Win’, which explicitly aims at changing the behaviour of the local population.

Vertical dialogues with municipalities

To reduce urban congestion, innovative solutions based on the above definition of territorial objectives and needs-analyses are needed – a place-based approach. Accordingly, identifying potentials of interventions has to start at the local level. The national level can mainly take the role of a moderator or communication centre. In addition to the BMVBS, such a process on the political level could include e.g. the German Association of Cities. On the academic level, i.a. the BBSR and the German Institute of Urban Affairs (Difu) could be involved. This would bring together national experience and knowledge making it available for cities.

In this context, the national urban development policy platform is especially useful. Even though the platform i.a. funds projects in the areas of climate change and economic development, it so far has not had an (explicit) link to inner-urban transport issues. Integrating a transport focus in the national urban development policy framework would be suitable, as transport planning is fundamental for developing liveable and innovative cities in the future. This integration would be in line with the success factors mentioned in the examples. It would combine local and national experiences following the idea of an integrated and place-based approach. Because of the division of competences, intra-ministerial cooperation would have to be informal but could spread the understanding of territorial cohesion within the BMVBS. Related pilot projects could deal with different urban structures, which are suitable for different measures.

The example Cycle and Win (www.fietsberaad.nl and www.fiets-en-win.nl) is a pricing-system for the use of bicycles for trips in the inner city and has so far been established in three Dutch cities. Using the bicycle instead of the car shall contribute to improving both the downtown traffic situation and the air quality. This is a project based on cooperation between the involved municipalities and the Dutch Cycling Embassy. The project combines the knowledge of the Dutch Cycling Embassy, generally available at national level and based on market analyses, with locally adapted concepts.

The Transport Development Plan 2006 of Munich (Landeshauptstadt München 2006: 8) was developed as a guiding framework for sustainable and environment-friendly transport development in Munich, in order to facilitate foresighted planning taking future development needs into account. Following the idea of an integrated approach, the transport development objectives were developed in line with urban and regional development objectives. In doing so, measures for reducing transport and enhancing the modal shift towards environment-friendly transport modes received the highest priority. They were supplemented by measures for improving transport conditions for businesses and an agreeable organisation of non-avoidable car traffic. On this basis, a series of recommendations and fields of action were formulated. They comprise infrastructure adaptations, soft measures and financial incentives. A broad variety of local stakeholders participated in the development of the plan and contributed to horizontal integration. Besides local administrations and politicians, other public bodies and various institutions and associations as well as the general public were involved in the process.
**ERDF programmes of the federal states**

In addition, the conceptual transport policy of the federal states should explicitly integrate an urban dimension by addressing urban congestion in the discussion about sustainable transport and possible mobility scenarios. This could e.g. be taken on board in the formulation of the next generation of ERDF programmes of the federal states. The “Länder” ministers are important contact persons for this. In this way, experiences and knowledge available at different administrative levels could also be brought together.

Cooperation between the ministries for transport at federal and “Länder” levels is especially needed with regard to “the adoption of a list of cities where integrated actions for sustainable urban development will be implemented” (COM(2011) 614 final 2011: 5). This should also take the objective of territorial cohesion into account, in particular as the list shall be prepared in accordance with the current proposal for the new ERDF regulation and future Partnership Contracts (COM(2011) 614 final 2011: 14).

Accordingly, at national level, both formal (Partnership Contract) and informal (forum for national urban policy) approaches for addressing congestion in metropolitan areas are needed. Vertical integration should comprise all levels from the national and the federal states to the local level. At the same time, horizontal (cross-sectoral) integration is also needed. In this way, territorial cohesion in the context of the urban quality of life would gain more attention.

**4.5 Adaptation of infrastructure to climate change challenges**

In the context of trans-European risk management, climate change and the adaptation to it have considerable weight in the TAEU. However, hardly any explicit territorial objectives for climate policy have been formulated so far. The objectives focus on integrative policy approaches going across sectors and regions in order to deal with the – regionally differentiated – effects of climate change (TAEU 2007). Even in the TA2020, the theme is not concretely addressed. It just demands a territorial coordination of sector policies as a response to climate change challenges (TA2020 2011: 6).

The 20-20-20 climate and energy objectives, however, belong to the five key objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy (COM(2010) 2020 2010) and are further differentiated in the flagship initiative for a resource-efficient Europe (COM(2011) 21 2011). Adaptation to climate change is an important topic of this initiative, which is also underlined in the draft EU multi-annual financial framework (COM(2011) 500 final Part I 2011). It proposes that 20% of all expenditures in the future EU financial framework shall have a climate component, i.e. have positive effects on either the fight against climate change or contribute to the adaptation to climate change.

The EU Commission proposal for the future Structural and Cohesion Funds places the fight against climate change and the adaptation to climate change in a prominent position. These themes are explicitly included in the investment priorities and for the ERDF even budgetary quotes were formulated (COM(2011) 614 final 2011, COM(2011) 615 final 2011).

The results of the Delphi survey show that the integration of territorial aspects in policy strategies and objectives is considered as the most relevant field of action for the adaptation to climate change.

**4.5.1 Policy context**

The challenges of climate change and the adaptation to it do not concern a single sector policy, but a wide range of different policy areas, e.g. energy, transport policies or urban affairs. At EU level, climate policy has only recently been established in a separate Directorate-General because of its interdisciplinary character. In Germany, the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) is mainly in charge of climate policy. When it comes to the adaptation of infrastructure to climate change – which is the focus of this chapter –, regional research and planning plays an important role, allowing to map territorially different vulnerabilities and to develop integrated responses (strategies, plans, projects). The issue of how to better integrate territorial aspects of infrastructure adaptations to climate change concerns various sector policies and territorial development policies.

To master climate change, a response strategy along two different lines is needed: Firstly, it is necessary to take climate protection actions, i.e. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to hold down the effects of climate change as good as possible. Secondly, adaptation strategies need to be developed, implemented and spread in order to counteract unavoidable climate change effects (see COM(2009) 147 final 2009). Adaptation measures are especially
value when also serving climate protection and thus leading to synergy effects. Examples are e.g. the greening of roofs and facades, which contribute to climate change adaptation as they cool so-called hot spots and at the same time produce oxygen, which together with the need for technical cooling contributes to reducing CO2 emissions.

**Important experiences of climate change adaptation measures in densely populated areas**

This chapter focuses on aspects of adaptation of infrastructure to climate change, where territorial development either can make an own contribution or can contribute to an integrated territorial approach in cooperation with other policy areas. The following pages will thus focus on climate change adaptation measures in densely populated areas (metropolitan areas/industrial zones) and analyse related requirements, instruments and implementation of actions as well as European structural and cohesion policy. This is of particular importance, as infrastructure investments depend on spatial and urban land-use planning, which only in cooperation with other sector policies can get through their (territorial) requirements concerning climate change. Densely populated areas face the strongest effects of climate change (see COM(2009) 147 final 2009: 4) and are confronted with similar problems (by e.g. heat accumulation in summer and intensive rains with flood risks in winter). The concrete territorial context nevertheless varies from city to city and from industrial zone to industrial zone. This requires territorially differentiated responses.

Although testing instruments for climate change adaptation is not advanced yet, a series of interesting experiences does exist, which has been supported by different programmes. At national level, KlimaMORO and KlimaExWoSt (Schlegelmilch 2010; Fahrenkrug 2010) supported local pilot projects, such as climate-friendly industrial zones, climate adaptation as a location factor for different sectors like health, tourism, energy, open space and landscape concepts, integrated climate impact assessments or advancing the decision support system (DSS) “city climate guide”. The latter offers a pragmatic access to possible actions for climate adaptation for individuals.

The EU-funded INTERREG IVB project “Future Cities – Urban Networks to Face Climate Change” developed an interesting structure for adaptation to climate change in urban areas and for organising exchange of experiences. In this context, challenges and possibilities related to climate change in densely populated areas (urban areas and industrial zones) are assessed in numerous pilot projects in order to develop and disseminate successful measures. Such an approach saves time and money. Future Cities forms an umbrella for conducting pilot projects at four different levels: at the levels of cities, industrial zones and single buildings as well as at a more general level (also see text box on this project in section 4.5.2).

**Establishing the fight against climate change and adaptation to climate change in institutional terms**

At European level, climate policy is a young policy field, which is gaining more and more importance. Setting up the Directorate-General Climate Action has established the policy field in structural and institutional terms as well. The European Climate Change Programme (ECCP) defines the overall objectives. For better integrating climate policy in sector policies, the EU Commission published the White Paper “Adapting to climate change” (COM(2009) 147 2009). It contains proposals for establishing instruments which shall ensure that future EU funds are not allocated without considering climate protection and adaptation to climate change. Furthermore, the climate proofing of the EU budget is to back the development of such instruments. As ESPON research on the climate change vulnerability index has shown, climate change may have rather different effects within the EU (see ESPON 2011: 12). This implies that strategies need to be adapted to their territorial context (see TAEU 2011) and that this policy area is of high territorial relevance. Climate change might actually affect territorial cohesion negatively within the EU, if regionally differentiated effects of climate change increase already existing disparities between European regions.

At national level, the BMU and the Federal Environment Agency (UBA) are the main climate protection stakeholders. The Competence Centre for the Effects of Climate Change and Adaptation (KomPass) is an initiative of the UBA. It aims at disseminating meaningful adaptation strategies in the areas of health, agriculture, forestry, water management, biodiversity, transport and tourism. It shall contribute to establishing climate change as important cross-cutting theme at the policy agenda.

---

5 “KlimaMORO” is the abbreviation for a BMVS/BBSR pilot initiative for developing spatial development strategies in the field of climate change. “KlimaExWoSt” is a research project financed by the BBSR dealing with urban strategies in the face of climate change.

6 We would like to point out, that the climate proofing policy strategy is of interdisciplinary character – similarly to territorial development policies – and has limited direct financial resources. Similarly to territorial development policies, this policy always needs coalition partners from other sectors to increase its effectiveness.

7 These are e.g. water shortage, drought, risk of flooding, extreme climate events, threats to biological diversity.
4.5.2 Starting points for territorial policies and recommendations

Climate change concerns all regions in Europe, the way and extent may, however, differ widely. The effects of climate change are highly territorially relevant, as specific local conditions are decisive for the vulnerability and effects in a region. In cities it becomes increasingly important to master the effects of higher levels of rainfall (flooding) and heat (heat spots) with suitable infrastructure adaptations.

Integrating research on climate effects and development of assessment criteria in future EU regulations and programmes

An important territorial policy option is to enhance funding for improving research and development of useful methods and instruments, which contribute to improving territorial impact assessments of climate change and which support identifying and assessing appropriate adaptation measures. As regards cities, a territorially detailed explanatory power of these instruments is crucial. In order to execute territorial impact assessments, it is necessary to further elaborate instruments for assessing exposure and vulnerability. On this basis, appropriate measures can be undertaken.

At EU level, these territorially relevant research instruments should be integrated in the future EU research programme “Horizon 2020” – which is the new framework programme for research and innovation. Research on specific regional or local climate change effects and adaptation needs could also in the future be part of the ESPON Programme. The development of methods for identifying and assessing appropriate adaptation measures needs to consider climate effectiveness as well as cost efficiency.

EU structural and cohesion policy fund various large-scale infrastructure projects. Consequently, (further) advancing methods (e.g. criteria, indicators, scoring approaches) for assessing projects with regard to climate protection and adaptation to climate change should consider territorial specificities (location of projects, high vulnerability as a result of specific exposures or concentrations of effects) from the start. Local or regional climate effect assessments could be introduced as a precondition of public funded climate relevant investments.

The BMVBS might use dialogues and interdepartmental coordination processes to support that the research of local climate change effects and the development of instruments for defining and assessing useful adaptation measures are sufficiently considered in EU programmes to develop infrastructure at an early stage.

Protecting climate-relevant open spaces as an original contribution of spatial planning

In particular for areas with a high population density, the protection or recovery of open spaces is important for adapting to climate change. These measures e.g. contribute to preserving or establishing corridors for air exchange or to preventing or limiting the occurrence of so-called hot spots.

An effective protection of open spaces requires suitable analysis and planning methods to identify and protect relevant spaces in densely populated areas. Furthermore, besides protecting single spaces, the reasons for increasing land consumption need to be counteracted. Related examples are revitalising brownfields or other abandoned locations (land recycling), creating new and more dense settlement structures in rural areas, revitalising city centres as living areas or reducing land consumption for transport (e.g. through a targeted development of public transport).

Regional and local planning play a key role in this field and territorial policies need to (a) give high priority to the protection of climate relevant green areas, and (b) investigate possible actions at regional, national and European level. This includes assessing and further elaborating the respective legal bases and planning instruments. The BMVBS and the BBSR might use pilot projects for bringing together existing experiences on new challenges of adapting to climate change. Such pilot projects should have a specific spatial and urban planning focus on open green areas. Existing experiences from MORO and INTERREG have shown that there are related backlogs and potentials for improvements.

Using EU funding for enhancing integrated territorial adaptation measures and measures with broad effects

Adapting infrastructure to climate change is a young and dynamic field where rarely any standard solution exists. In the areas of applied research and planning, many innovative achievements are developed and tested by specific pilot projects. In Germany this includes e.g. KlimaMORO and KlimaExWoSt, and at international level e.g. INTERREG proj-
ects on climate change and the adaptation to it are realised. A review of practical examples within this study (see example in the textbox) has shown, that there is not only a demand for exchanging experiences on integrated territorial climate change adaptation approaches. Many projects, furthermore, result in exemplary innovative approaches which could be interesting for other regions. Therefore, we do not only consider the funding of such projects, especially by EU Structural Funds, to be important but also the development of dissemination channels for good practice experiences made in such projects should be supported by territorial policies. This may contribute to reducing development costs as successfully tested method and adaptation measures are spread.

**Integrating territorial aspects of climate change adaptation in the investment priorities of the new EU regulations**

In the light of the ongoing preparation of the EU structural and cohesion policy for 2014-2020, the question arises, how relevant thematic and investment priorities should be developed from the territorial perspective.

A thematic priority for funding adaptation to climate change, risk prevention and risk management is intended in the draft general regulation (COM(2011) 615 final 2011: 35), the draft ERDF regulation (COM(2011) 614 final 2011: 12) and the Cohesion Fund regulation (COM(2011) 612 final 2011: 8). This also includes the funding of targeted investments for adapting to climate change and mastering particular risks. However, in contrast to climate protection, no budgetary quotas were proposed for climate change adaptation measures.

Article 7 of the draft ERDF regulation, however, suggests that at least 5% of ERDF funding available in a country is to be used for integrated measures for sustainable urban development. This also covers climate change challenges and offers good opportunities for integrating territorial issues in adaptation measures to climate change by combining different territorially relevant issues of sustainable urban development, such as climate relevant issues and traffic congestions.

In addition, other future ERDF priorities – beyond the mentioned climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management priority – as well can be used to fund climate change adaptation measures. Examples are the priority on research, technological development and innovation and the priority for promoting sustainable transport and removing bottle-necks in key network infrastructures.

In the context of dialogue processes, German interdepartmental coordination and the meetings of the EU ministers responsible for spatial planning, the BMVBS should argue for a territorial integrated approach in future regulations as a precondition for financing measures supporting the adaptation to climate change.

### 4.6 Energy networks

The development of trans-European energy networks is a policy area of immediate territorial relevance (see Deutscher Verband für Wohnungswesen, Städtebau und Raumordnung e.V. 2009). The planned North Sea and Baltic Sea offshore networks for transmitting wind energy to large consumer centres shall be part of the European energy grid. They illustrate the large-scale and international dimension of energy networks.

The TA2020 recognises climate change as an increasing and geographically differentiated threat. The coordination of various policy areas needs to be improved in order to maximize the development chances of renewable energies and ensure energy supply for remote regions. Coordination includes energy policy (see TA2020 2011: 6). Germany has already made considerable progress as regards territorial provisions for developing renewable energies in the field of spatial planning (priority, reservation, and eligibility areas) (BBSR 2011). However, German spatial planning has paid little attention to the issue of energy networks so far.

Under the lead of LIPEVERBAND (a regional association of municipalities), eight partners from five EU member states in North-West Europe cooperated on the Future Cities project (www.future-cities.eu). They aimed at jointly facing climate change and elaborating new concepts to master climate change in densely populated. Including ERDF funding, the budget amounts to 11 million euros.

1. The example of Arnhem is used for studying the phenomenon of urban heat islands (UHI) and possible adaptation measures. Urban heat islands occur if the air temperature in the urban area is three to four degrees Celsius higher than in the rural hinterland. The study focuses on green-structures, water and humidity balances, heat and energy balances, landscape and surface structures.

2. In Tiel, an industrial zone between Waal and Amsterdam, the project focuses on how to build in a sustainable, climate- and water-resilient way and how to combine water management with climate-adaptive construction and renewable energies. After a certain phase of testing, the results will be made public.
The fifth priority of the TA2020 mentions fair and affordable connections i.a. to trans-European energy networks as a method to enhance sustainable and territorially balanced development in the EU. It explicitly argues for a more decentralised, efficient, secure and environment-friendly energy production and supply (see TA2020 2011: 9).

Trans-European networks for sound infrastructure corridors as well as regional secondary networks need to be strengthened and developed, in order to develop renewable energy production and to be able to provide it to possibly all regions (see European Parliament and Council 2009).

Energy policy and energy networks also play an important role in the Europe 2020 Strategy when it comes to the objective of sustainable growth and the flagship initiative of a resource-efficient Europe.

4.6.1 Policy context

The development of energy networks plays a key role in the current discussion about the implementation of the EU climate objectives (Europe Energy 2020 Strategy; energy infrastructure priorities for 2020 and beyond). For technical reasons, electricity is transmitted via different network levels, which are maintained by different operators. In short, the network is structured in a transmission grid and different levels of distribution grids. This is necessary, as the transmission grid allows for transmitting energy at maximum voltage with low losses, whereas the lowest level of distribution grids delivers low voltage electricity to the households. The integration of volatile renewable energies implies new requirements for both networks (see Deutsche Energie-Agentur GmbH (dena) 2010: 25).

Developing electrical grids as European climate protection challenge

Two kinds of proposals are of particular interest for territorial policies: (a) at the level of the distribution grids proposals regarding the installation of so-called smart grids and (b) at the level of transmission grid proposals for the development of the trans-European electricity network (TEN-E). The aim is to increase the volume of decentrally produced electricity which can be delivered to the consumer centres with low losses. According to the Europe 2020 Strategy (COM(2010) 2020 final 2010), 33% of the European gross electricity shall be produced from renewable energy sources by 2020. The European grid, as it is today, will have difficulties to carry this amount of renewable electricity.

Using the potentials of renewable energy and integrating possibly all regions in energy production and supply require to restructure and to develop existing electricity grids, especially the distribution grid. Restructuring the distribution grids shall allow for transmitting electricity bidirectionally, allowing every household, depending on its demands, to act as a producer or consumer on the energy market. The combination of both roles results in the term ‘prosumer’, who both consumes and produces electricity. Depending on its temporary needs, the ‘prosumer’ feeds electricity into the grid or consumes energy from the grid.

The EU Commission identified four overriding EU corridors for the electricity sector in order to prepare Europe’s electricity grids for the needs in 2020 (see COM(2010) 677 final 2010: 10; IP/10/1512 2010). They shall be the focus of joint efforts to ensure a timely integration of renewable energy sources. In detail, the corridors are as follows:

- an offshore grid in the northern seas and with connection to Northern and Central Europe, transmitting offshore wind farm electricity to consumers in metropolitan areas and to pumped storage hydro power plants in the Alps and Nordic countries
- power lines in South-Western Europe transmitting wind, hydro and solar energy to other parts of the continent
- power lines in Central Eastern and South Eastern Europe for strengthening regional networks;
- completing the Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan (BEMIP), i.e. integrating the Baltic States into the European market.

The development of offshore wind farming is currently "hampered by insufficient grid connections both off- and onshore" (COM(2010) 677 final 2010: 4). The amount of electricity from renewable sources will massively increase over the next years, especially offshore: about 1,500 wind turbines have already been approved in the North and Baltic Sea and await their installation. To connect these wind turbines, infrastructure for integrating the electricity into the grid needs to be developed – a German overlay grid, which is integrated into the European grid, is urgently needed (Bundesregierung 2010: 21). In addition, Germany is a transit country in the European context. This function implies responsibilities for avoiding transmission bottlenecks.

---

(8) Volatile refers to electricity which is produced unsteadily, e.g. photovoltaic energy can only be fed into the grid when the sun shines.

(9) TEN-E is the abbreviation for trans-European energy networks.
Need for territorial coordination when developing electricity grids

Related to territorial policies, the development of electrical grids is about (a) including rural areas, (b) coordinating the network development where applicable with other infrastructure developments, (c) accelerating the implementation of planned projects by clarifying responsibilities and improving processes (taking territorial impacts into account) as well as (d) handling possible local opposition.

Rural areas, which are often disadvantaged when it comes to supply aspects, will become more important for the production of energy in future, as they provide large areas for producing solar, wind, and biomass energy (www.de.inforapid.org/index.php?search=Kraft-W%CE%B1Arme-Kopplung). However, land use competition becomes increasingly relevant when networks are planned, especially when it comes to land use for food production and nature protection.

From the planning of a grid to the beginning of its operation it takes often more than ten years because of local opposition (see COM(2010) 677 final 2010: 8). The development of the network has become a bottleneck for implementing European and German energy strategies. Consequently, measures are needed (a) for better communicating the objectives of the development of networks, and (b) for improving acceptance. The question arises, which role spatial planning can play in this context.

Planning processes for large-scale transmission lines are increasingly a task to be solved at European level due to the new energy and climate challenges. In the context of the energy policy strategies (COM(2010) 629 final 2010) and energy infrastructure priorities, coordination is increasingly required, e.g. in connection with the development of the TEN-E or the European Strategic Energy Technology Plan (SET Plan). The implementation of projects of European interest should be supported “through new tools such as improved regional cooperation, permitting procedures, better methods and information for decision makers and citizens and innovative financial instruments” (COM(2010) 677 final 2010: 10). Furthermore, the EU Commission considers a clear policy and common standards to be necessary for smart metering and smart grids, in order to ensure interoperability across the whole network (COM(2010) 639 final 2010: 12).

The demand for improved coordination between policy fields, when it comes to territorially relevant planning of energy networks, is also mirrored by the results of the Delphi survey. According to this survey, the lack of cross-sector coordination is the strongest barrier in the area of infrastructure. At EU level, the Directorate-General for Energy could take a leading role as coordinating body. At national level, the BMWi and the Federal Network Agency are mainly responsible for planning and building energy networks.

4.6.2 Starting points for territorial policies and recommendations

The positioning of the BMVBS/BBSR in the territorially highly relevant policy field of developing energy grids needs to be fast and resolute, as the German energy transition implies that, at present, a series of decisions are taken at federal, national and local level. In addition, a new course is to be set at EU level. This will have considerable impacts on the German future territorial development and especially affect its role as an energy-transit country.

Intensifying the spatial planning dialogue at national and European level

At national level, the BMWi and the Federal Network Agency are important stakeholders and decision-makers, at EU level it is the Directorate-General for Energy. Contacts to these institutions should be cultivated and dialogues intensified to better place aspects of territorial development in the debate about the development of energy networks and grids. Within these processes, the BMVBS might communicate the federal spatial development concepts “Securing services of public interest” and “Conservation of resources, shaping of cultural landscapes”. This could work as eye opener for the obvious territorial relevance of energy networks at national and European level.

The following practical examples illustrate that it is technically possible to take such new demands into consideration and that they can even be implemented in a European context.

AlpEnergy – Virtual Power Systems as an Instrument to Promote Transnational Cooperation and Sustainable Energy Supply in the Alpine Space

(www.alpenergy.net/) deals with the development, demonstration, evaluation and transfer of virtual power systems (VPS)\(^\text{10}\) in six Alpine regions. The challenge is to harmonise energy supply from renewable sources (wind and solar) and variable energy production with the demand side. A reason is that discontinuously produced electricity from renewable sources cannot yet be sufficiently stored. VPS models are a solution for this. VPS have the advantage that they facilitate the integration of a large number of volatile and renewable power stations in an electricity network. This project is also of interest for territorial policies as it has a cross-border component and because it is oriented towards the energy-production and consumption peculiarities in a functional region.

\(^{10}\) VPS (Virtual Power Systems) is a form of electricity management. It combines supply from various electricity producers (e.g. power stations, photovoltaic or wind energy turbines) with the demand of selected users. This is done in a way which allows meeting the demands at any time, despite discontinuous production and variable demands.
The participation of spatial planning stakeholders may contribute to implementing the fifth priority of the TA2020, a fair and affordable connection i.a. to trans-European energy networks. This priority aims at enhancing a sustainable and harmonious territorial development in the EU and argues for decentralised, efficient, secure and environment-friendly energy production and supply (TA2020 2011: 8p.). The territorially balanced development and connection of all European regions as well as the development of endogenous potentials are mentioned as the most important strands for territorial cohesion in the Delphi survey.

The BMVBS and the BBSR should primarily intensify the dialogue on territorial aspects of energy network developments, considering and capitalising on existing sector policy fora and processes both in the area of territorial policies and other policy sectors.

The planning of energy networks offers an important starting point in this context. Territorial policy concepts should be more strongly integrated in the updating of TEN-E plans and in the plans for the development of regional power grids. Targeting the idea of better coordinating various sector policies, the following aspects should be taken into account: inclusion/supply of possibly all regions in line with the maintenance of services of general interest; supporting economic potentials for utilising renewable energy sources; nature and landscape protection; if applicable, coordinating the grid development with other infrastructure developments. This might help to coordinate the various utilisation demands. Furthermore, an intensive dialogue with the responsible authorities could be initiated in order to discuss possibilities to reach the necessary coordination.

With regard to the development of dissemination grids working bidirectionally, it could be a spatial planning task to identify appropriate areas for the development of networks. This requires to consider and to weigh up different and possibly conflicting land-use interests.

At national level, the BMVBS and the BBSR might get involved in the permanent platform “futurewise energy networks” (www.bmwi.de/DE/Themen/Energie/Stromnetze/plattform-zukunftsfahige-energienetze.html), which is operated by the BMWi and aims at involving the main interest groups – network operators, federal and “Länder” institutions and relevant associations – to elaborate joint proposals for developing and modernising electricity networks. The thematic foci also concern issues of territorial importance, such as the public acceptance of the construction of power lines or planning and permission processes for power lines.

The EU Commission plans to elaborate an energy-infrastructure map for a European super smart grid. The BMVBS and the BBSR might promote the integration of spatial planning aspects in this map, e.g. by capitalising on ESPON competences.

The development of energy networks is often opposed by the local population and lobby groups. This is based on expected negative effects for the area directly affected by the infrastructure development, e.g. disturbance by high-voltage lines. It is often ignored, that the planned developments are in accordance to supraregional or even European objectives concerning network development and climate policy, which are usually shared by the local opposition. The question is, whether further elaborating participatory approaches in spatial planning processes may contribute to improve the acceptance at local level and speed up the implementation of networks. One possibility for integrating territorial policy aspects in energy policies is to develop and test innovative participatory processes. This could e.g. be done within the framework of the European structural and cohesion policy, especially under the territorial cooperation strand, but also within the framework of “Horizon 2020”. At national level, MORO might be used.
5 Territorial cohesion in transnational cooperation

The relevance of territorial objectives and impacts is proven by territorial cohesion having been established as major EU objective and included in the Territorial Agenda 2020. Within the context of transnational cooperation (INTERREG B), this objective has been crucial from the beginning, since the origin of transnational cooperation was clearly linked to territorial strategies and visions. In the course of the development of transnational cooperation, this territorial reference lost importance and became less explicit.

The link between transnational cooperation and territorial objectives can be emphasized again in the next funding period by explicitly aiming at a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development and thereby considering territorial imbalances, potentials and challenges. Another cross-national approach was developed by introducing macro-regional strategies, in the context of which areas are heavily overlapping with those of transnational cooperation. Although macro-regional strategies are sector-oriented, transnational cooperation is very important for implementing these strategies (see Görmar 2010: 585p.). This creates an additional area of conflict between transnational cooperation and the objective of territorial cohesion.

The following chapters show how territorial objectives can be strengthened in the context of future transnational cooperation (INTERREG B). There are numerous starting points which include relevant EU regulations, programming processes, development and evaluation of priorities and projects and the relation between INTERREG B and macro-regional strategies.

5.1 Proposed ETC regulation

At the beginning of October 2011, the EU Commission published their Structural Funds regulation proposals for the next funding period. They include the regulation with specific provisions for supporting the objectives of European Territorial Cooperation (cf. COM(2011) 611 final 2011). It is appreciated that territorial issues and territorial cohesion have become more apparent in these proposals compared to the currently applied regulations.

With regard to territorial cooperation, it is also appreciated that it will be regulated by a separate regulation. So far, it has been regulated by the ERDF regulation.

In order to tap the full potential of territorial cooperation, however, territorial objectives need better integration into the regulation by explicitly referring to the TA2020 and its priorities. The statements of the German Conference of Ministers Responsible for Spatial Planning (MKRO 2012) and the Bundesrat (2012) point out that reference to European spatial development is lacking. With regard to transnational cooperation, this holds for several articles both in the INTERREG regulation and the general regulation, especially for the articles listed in the following:

INTERREG regulation

- Art. 5 – Thematic concentration: It could be generally useful for programmes to focus on a maximum of four topics in order to concentrate strengths and increase the visibility of results. But the selection of topics provided in the proposal is highly sector-oriented and, therefore, tends to be counterproductive for integrated spatial development. Thus, a more flexible approach or a separate list for territorial cooperation, explicitly referring to the objectives of the TA2020, would be more capable of emphasizing and promoting the integrating and territorial character of transnational cooperation.

- Art. 6 – Investment priorities: Development and implementation of macro-regional and sea-basin strategies are explicitly mentioned as priorities for transnational cooperation. Territorial cooperation might thereby become a stronger instrument to implement macro-regional strategies. At the same time, it is not emphasized that transnational cooperation is not capable of being the only and dominant instrument to implement these strategies. It would be helpful if the regulation clarified which role transnational cooperation should and might play.

- Art. 7 – Content of cooperation programmes: According to the regulation proposal, each cooperation programme should provide special information for each priority axis and its contribution to
the Europe 2020 Strategy. Neither the priority axes nor the Europe 2020 Strategy show references to territorial objectives, though. An explicit territorial reference would be preferable with regard to the design of the priority axes and the Europe 2020 Strategy. Thus, a corresponding reference to the TA2020 and to other strategic documents of transnational spatial development could be claimed.

- **Art. 15 – Indicators for the European territorial cooperation goal:** To limit the number of common indicators is generally beneficial but they have to be wisely selected for depicting results and successes of territorial cooperation properly. This requires related adjustments i.a. to consider qualitative assessments and territorial differentiation below the level of programmes. This differentiation does not yet exist and should be added.

**General regulation**

- **Art. 9 – Thematic objectives:** The topics suggested are clearly sector-oriented. This eases the development of sector-oriented projects at the expense of integrated projects and regional development approaches. Considering the proposed themes, it may be indeed difficult to link the objectives of the TA2020 with the development of programmes and projects. This hampers reconciling the TA2020 objectives with the basic idea of transnational cooperation. The sector-oriented investment priorities of the Structural Funds should be adjusted to support integrated regional and territorial development and the implementation of the TA2020.

- **Art. 11 – Content:** The different types of areas mentioned, whose challenges have to be met, seem to have been involuntarily selected and do not refer to related challenges and obstacles. Especially the focus on outermost regions seems to be problematic since these regions need not be more seriously challenged than other regions. It would be preferable to explicitly take territorial conditions and diversity into account.

- **Art. 14 – Partnership Contract:** Bilateral Partnership Contracts between the Member States and the European Commission do not seem to be appropriate for orienting transnational cooperation strategically. Hence, another format has to be considered for achieving the strategic orientation.

- **Art. 24 – operational programmes:** Contents regulated in this article do not explicitly refer to territorial matters. It would be important to consider territorial conditions and the diversity of programme areas in operational programmes. This applies to several aspects: when analysing the programme area, formulating priorities, measures and selection criteria for projects and developing the monitoring.

### 5.2 Programmes for transnational cooperation (INTERREG B)

The basis for considering territorial issues in transnational cooperation (INTERREG B) is provided in the programmes. The need for action and territorial specifications are explained in the description and analysis of the programme area. They are translated into objectives and measures, which have to meet the requirements of relevant EU regulations and the programme area’s specific territorial needs.

The Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS) subsidises selected INTERREG B projects with the Federal funding programme “Transnational Cooperation”. These projects are of special relevance at national and European level due to their thematic and territorial focus. Integrating territorial cohesion in transnational cooperation programmes is thus also important for the Federal funding programme and for realising its territorial objectives.

Preparatory work for developing the INTERREG B programmes 2014-2020 has recently been initiated. There have been many changes in the field of territorial development on EU level since the current programmes were compiled. Many new territory-oriented reference documents were released: the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion (European Commission 2008), the Territorial Agenda 2020 (TA2020 2011) and the documents of the Polish Presidency of the European Council (Böhme et al. 2011). These documents should be taken into account when developing new programmes. They can hopefully contribute to strengthening the territory-oriented approach of INTERREG B programmes.


References to corresponding policy documents and territorially specific analyses of programme areas are required in order to better include territorial needs in the pro-
grammes. SWOT analyses have to be territory-oriented and need to highlight challenges and potentials of territorial development as well as territorial features of programme areas. The background report “How to strengthen the territorial dimension of Europe 2020 and the EU cohesion policy”, released by the Polish Presidency of the European Council (Böhme et al. 2011), can be useful in this context. Furthermore, territorial objectives can be strengthened by identifying additional tasks and measures at programme level, which are to be implemented in the course of the next programming period. Joint Technical Secretariats (JTS) and Contact Points, such as the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR), should especially call for:

- analyses focussing on the programme area and on thematic and territorial groups of projects which examine e.g. in how far the range of themes covered promotes integrated territorial development
- analysing sub-areas (e.g. Northern Germany or functionally interdependent federal states) and their development across programme areas
- implementing capitalisation projects with explicit territorial reference, which enable stakeholders, who are not involved in INTERREG, to benefit from INTERREG results
- public relations, which focus on territorial development and objectives, and utilise analyses and projects for addressing a broader public beyond citizens and institutions involved in INTERREG.

5.2.1 Territorial priorities in the light of the EU regulation proposals

According to the Commission’s proposals, the programmes of the next programming period shall have a much more explicit thematic focus. For this purpose, a thematic list was compiled in Article 9 of the general regulation proposal. According to Article 5 of the regulation proposal on European Territorial Cooperation, each INTERREG B programme may choose up to four themes from this list. This is conflicting with strengthening territorial objectives in the next funding period.

Thematic focussing may be useful (1) in order to increase the strength by concentrating funds for territorial cooperation in general and for transnational cooperation in particular, and (2) in order to emphasise the added value more clearly. The list compiled in Article 9 is counterproductive, though. The proposed themes are predominantly focussing on sector policies. Thereby, the development of sectoral projects is facilitated at the expense of integrated projects and integrated development. It might in fact be difficult to promote integrated development with these investments priorities because the individual themes might only deal with selected points of territorial development. Furthermore, it might be difficult to integrate TA2020 objectives into the development of programmes and projects without excluding essential aspects of the TA2020. In order to strengthen territorial cohesion, the following principal options for further developing relevant regulations and programmes arise:

- to modify the proposals for the ETC regulation and, possibly, for the general regulation in line with integrated territorial development
- the current proposals will largely correspond to the final regulations.

In order to realise the first option, the critical assessments of the MKRO (2011) and the Bundesrat (2012), referring to investment priorities of the regulation proposals and their relation to the tasks and objectives of transnational cooperation, need to be addressed to the European Commission by the main stakeholders (BMVBS, BBSR, JTS).

In order to obtain these modifications, there are two possible approaches for improving the selection of themes. The first option is to propose a separate list of themes for the ETC regulation. This list would explicitly refer to the TA2020 objectives. Within the context of this new list, a thematic focus could be achieved by selecting themes from the list which are in line with the needs of the particular programme areas. The second option is based on the themes listed in Article 9 of the general regulation assuming that this list will be applied. In this case, the restriction on the proposed sector policy-related selection would have to be abandoned. By focussing on selected territorial objectives according to the TA2020, programmes of territorial cooperation could focus on cross-sectoral topics instead of focussing on sector policies.

If it is not possible to achieve these modifications of regulations, the current proposals will most probably and to a large extent correspond to the final regulations. Then the question arises if it is possible to downgrade the list’s status to a recommendatory rather than a mandatory list. Otherwise, it should be questioned how an integrated development can be achieved by only selecting four themes within the given list.
Figure 7 illustrates how the TA2020 objectives can be used in the context of INTERREG in line with the themes proposed in the regulation. Only examples are given. Even more detailed and differentiated information could be entered in the various boxes of the table.

The table shows how sectoral themes can be linked with TA2020 objectives despite the fact that these themes do not consider the territory. The concrete shape of these references depends on the territorial features in individual INTERREG B areas. In general, references to all TA2020 priorities can be derived from the regulation themes. The table nevertheless emphasises that the ‘density’ of potential references varies for different priorities, i.e. some TA2020 priorities cannot be related to the same degree to the regulation themes. Even though the proposed themes offer opportunities for transnational cooperation to achieve the objectives of integrated development, three main aspects remain unsettled:

- **Relevant themes:** For each INTERREG B programme area it has to be clarified if essential matters concerning territorial development are excluded by the range of themes of the general regulation. If the themes excluded important matters in single areas, this restriction would be misleading and essential matters would not be considered. This can be promptly checked by the programmes in the course of the currently conducted SWOT analyses for the next programming period. Relevant themes could still be integrated in the ongoing consultation processes.

- **Integrated territorial development:** Trying to select combinations of TA2020 priorities and themes from the general regulation implies an increasing risk that the selection is too restricted for integrated development, as becomes apparent in figure 7. Integrated territorial development, which combines various relevant dimensions, would not be achievable. It would neither be possible to realise a focused implementation of the TA2020 priorities.

- **Territorially interrelated challenges and opportunities:** Themes resulting from figure 7 mainly suggest cooperation in territorially separate challenges and development opportunities. This is why the full potential of transnational cooperation cannot be tapped. In terms of integrated development and in terms of territorial cohesion, it would be more appropriate to focus on TA2020 priorities without any sector-oriented differentiation and to concentrate on territorially interrelated challenges and opportunities.

It would be preferable if the general regulation or, at least, the ETC regulation included the TA2020 or its priorities in the thematic list. This requires relevant stakeholders to call for territory-related themes in the regulations. Besides the JTS, Contact Points etc., the Network of Territorial Cohesion Contact Points (NTCCP) might contribute to this matter.
**Figure 7: The themes of the ERDF regulation and the TA2020 priorities as a basis for INTERREG B programmes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERDF regulation themes</th>
<th>Promote polycentric and balanced territorial development</th>
<th>Encouraging integrated development in cities, rural and specific regions</th>
<th>Territorial integration in cross-border and transnational functional regions</th>
<th>Ensuring global competitiveness of the regions based on strong local economies</th>
<th>Improving territorial connectivity for individuals, communities and enterprises</th>
<th>Managing and connecting ecological, landscape and cultural values of regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening research, technological development and innovation</td>
<td>• Polycentric R&amp;D, i.e. softening concentration tendencies in the R&amp;D sector</td>
<td>• Cross-border R&amp;D and innovation projects</td>
<td>• Global competitiveness of regions through innovative and R&amp;D-oriented local and regional economies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small-scale innovation with territorial specific approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing access to and use of information and communication technologies</td>
<td>• Territorially balanced access to ICT infrastructure and services</td>
<td>• ICT solutions and services enhancing/integrating cross-border regions</td>
<td>• Cross-border ICT solutions and services enhancing local and regional economies</td>
<td>• Räumlich ausgewogener Zugang zu IKT-Infrastruktur und Diensten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the competitiveness of small and medium-sized enterprises, of the agricultural sector (for the EAFRD) and of the fisheries and aquaculture sector (for the EMFF)</td>
<td>• Polycentric structures for the support of SMEs, i.e. slowing down economic centralisation tendencies and regional business networks</td>
<td>• Urban-rural relations for supporting SMEs and small-scale production and consumption patterns</td>
<td>• Functional integration to promote cross-border market areas</td>
<td>• Functional integration to promote global competitiveness (image, networks, cluster)</td>
<td>• Territorial connectivity to enhance trade relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CO2-neutral or reduced local and regional economies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-border work in the field of risk prevention and risk management</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrating and coordinating individual measures in integrated approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency</td>
<td>• Cross-border work in the field of environmental protection and resource efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing efficiency through joint action and common strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures</td>
<td>• Polycentric territorial structures for reducing regional transport distances</td>
<td>• Sustainable transport solutions for urban-rural relations</td>
<td>• Sustainable solutions for bottlenecks in cross-border networks</td>
<td>• Sustainable transport solutions by assessing and minimising negative impacts of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting employment and supporting labour mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-border functional labour markets and education areas</td>
<td>• Cross-border functional labour markets and education areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning</td>
<td>• Polycentric structures for lifelong learning</td>
<td>• Cross-border functional labour markets and education areas</td>
<td>• Cross-border functional labour markets and education areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing institutional capacity and an efficient public administration</td>
<td>• Certain issues can only be solved by cooperation</td>
<td>• Certain issues can only be solved by cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own illustration
5.2.2 Calls for project proposals and project development

Assuming that the current proposal for the ETC regulation comes into force, investment priorities on the programme level will be shaped by sector policies rather than by territorial development – similarly to the current programme period. This affects the thematic orientation of calls for project proposals and the development of projects. The focus on sector policies has to be translated into a territorial orientation by explicitly focusing the calls for project proposals and project development on projects contributing to integrated territorial development.

In this context, specific geographical features of the programme area and different types of areas within the programme area play a key role. Considering these aspects, territorially unspecific themes may be formulated more concretely and become territory-oriented and might then contribute to integrated development. In order to meet the needs of specific geographical features and the diversity of programme areas, these territory-oriented considerations need a certain precision. At the same time, territorial differentiation within the programme area must not be restricted in a way that the programme’s implementation becomes too complicated or that various sub-areas start to battle for funds.

The following aspects should be taken into account when announcing calls for project proposals and developing projects in order to ensure sustainable integration of territorial aspects into INTERREG B projects:

- **Necessity:** INTERREG B promotes cooperation of projects across national borders. These projects should focus on challenges and opportunities that cannot be (appropriately) realised without cooperating with partners in other countries. Therefore, one main question is whether and to what extent the task requires cooperation. With regard to the TA2020, it is also important whether the project is essential for territorial development in the programme area.

- **Reference to the territory:** INTERREG is based on territorial development. The individual projects should therefore also refer to territorial development and should contribute to territorial development objectives. Explicit reference to the TA2020 objectives, territorial relevance of the project’s theme or specific reference to geographical features of the programme area or its sub-areas may represent a territorial reference. It should be underlined when developing a project.

- **Territorially interrelated challenges:** Experiences from previous programming periods have illustrated that the added value of transnational cooperation becomes apparent if projects deal with territorially interrelated challenges, which can only be solved if stakeholders tackle them jointly. These projects easily emphasise the added value of transnational cooperation. Therefore, it would be useful to increase the number of such projects. For projects dealing with separate territorial challenges, common geographical features are particularly important. Exchange of experiences is usually crucial in these projects.

- **Territorial relevance of partners:** INTERREG is an instrument emphasising the idea of partnership. From a territorial perspective, contributions of local, regional and/or sector-oriented policy-makers are an important key to success. Therefore, calls for project proposals and project developments should always offer space for new ideas and approaches. They should especially allow for integrating relevant and new stakeholders. Cooperation with new stakeholders and/or on new topics is more challenging than coping with well-known topics in well-established partnerships. Monitoring and evaluation should consider these aspects by assessing them differently from established partnerships and themes. In addition, projects which involve such new elements may require specific assistance.

All in all, apart from some formal aspects resulting from administrative structures, several aspects have to be considered when announcing calls for project proposals and project development. The following box proposes a wording, which might be used for future calls for project proposals.

5.2.3 Evaluation of projects

Evaluation of project ideas and proposals is crucial for the programme’s success. The expected added value of the projects needs particular consideration. For strengthening territorial matters it should be considered how a project can contribute to achieving territorial objectives.

There is a broad variety of added values in INTERREG projects. The main idea is that one can much better cope with a challenge by cooperation, whether cross-border or transnational cooperation, than without.
**INTERREG B promotes**

- projects dealing with territorial development issues which require transnational cooperation or can be best dealt by cooperation.
- projects referring to TA2020 objectives which show specific references to territorial challenges of the programme area or its sub-areas.
- projects dealing with territorially interrelated challenges and opportunities. Projects dealing with territorially separated challenges should focus on common geographical features.
- projects which allow policy-makers relevant for territorial development to cooperate in new combinations and which can therefore contribute to innovative ‘breakthroughs’ in crucial matters of territorial development.

The debate on added value in the field of transnational cooperation is implicitly often based on territorial considerations. This applies both to the specific geography of cooperation as well as the territorial levels for which this added value shall be realised. In order to emphasise the contribution to territorial development objectives, the following points should be considered in the course of project evaluations:

- **Relevance for territorial development:** The overall question is whether the proposed project themes are relevant for the territorial development of the programme area. This very complex question can be checked in a simple way by enquiring reference to the SWOT analysis of the programme. This analysis should cover all important territorial development aspects of the programme area.

- **Reference to TA2020 objectives:** If INTERREG is supposed to contribute to the implementation of the TA2020, the reference to TA2020 objectives should be checked. For this purpose, related European and programme documents need to refer to the TA2020 (cf. suggestions in section 5.2.1).

- **Specific features of the programme area:** Each programme area has certain geographical features. A project may express its territorial relevance by referring to specific geographical features, potentials and obstacles of the programme area.

- **Differentiation by sub-areas:** Depending on the project theme, it might be difficult to develop a reference to the geographical features of the whole programme area. The territorial reference may alternatively be expressed by differentiations by sub-areas. Such a differentiation may include urban or rural areas, coastal or mountain areas, peripheral regions or industrial regions in transition. Projects that directly focus on certain areas and their problems have an explicitly territorial perspective.

- **Horizontal integration:** The interdisciplinary dimension plays a key role for INTERREG and for general territorial development. Territorial development and relevant sector policy stakeholders successfully cooperate in many INTERREG projects. For maintaining this kind of cooperation in the future, interdisciplinary cooperation should be considered in the course of project evaluations.

- **Relevant stakeholders:** Barca (2009) emphasises that the participation of ‘local elites’ is essential for integrated territorial development. In the context of INTERREG, this implies that all local stakeholders important for the specific theme should be involved. They do not necessarily have to be a formal partner but should be included in the project design in some way. For the project evaluation this means to check to which extent important stakeholders of all relevant levels have been involved.

All in all, several aspects concerning the expected added value and the consideration of territorial objectives have to be taken into account when evaluating a project. We have collected these aspects in a check list containing different key questions (cf. fig. 8). With this list it will be possible to check different aspects for comparing projects and raising awareness for relevant territorial questions. These questions do not per se imply an assessment. A separate column enables programme actors to indicate own priorities and preferences. These specific programme priorities and preferences can be used for documentation and assessment purposes.
5.3 Macro-regional strategies

Macro-regional strategies are a new instrument in the EU, which is currently tested in a number of regions. This approach dates from different initiatives for regional profiling and European acknowledgement of regional challenges (e.g. Baltic Sea Initiative, EU Common Strategy for the Mediterranean) (see Görmar 2010: 581) and from considerations deriving from the Northern Dimension in 2004. In December 2007, the Member States asked the Commission to develop a Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region under the lead of the Directorate-General for Regional Policy. Meanwhile, two macro-regional strategies have been adopted by the European Council: in 2009, the Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region and in 2011 the Strategy for the Danube Region. Additional macro-regional strategies are under discussion and/or development, e.g. for the Alpine Space and the North Sea Region.

5.3.1 Motivation and objectives of macro-regional strategies

Strategies, objectives and action programmes are elaborated in complex processes, which –somewhat exaggerated – are based on two assumptions:

- **a need for cooperation.** There are certain policy relevant issues, which can be better solved based on cooperation at macro-regional level than by single Member States or at EU level.
- **existing stakeholder networks.** There are different stakeholders in a given macro-region, who deal with relevant issues in different (even transnational) geographies, with different instruments and programmes. Macro-regional strategies shall not compete with these established structures but shall offer them a coordination platform.

In the end, the objectives of the strategies shall be achieved through various measures and they shall considerably contribute to implementing the more comprehensive Europe 2020 Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. According to some authors, macro-regional strategies shall furthermore contribute to implementing territorial cohesion (Schymik 2011).

The strategies build on the principle of the ‘three NOs’, which limit scopes (see e.g. Schymik 2011):

- **NO additional EU funding or programmes:** Implementing the strategies shall rely on existing European programmes as well as national and regional funds. In other words, existing instruments at various territorial levels within the area of a macro-region shall serve the implementation of the strategy.
- **NO new institutions:** Already existing cooperation structures at various territorial levels shall be used, further developed and intensified. They should be sufficient for pursuing the objectives of the strategies without establishing them by way of institutions.
- **NO new EU regulations:** The legal basis for implementing the strategies refers to existing national legal frameworks of the countries involved as well as to the macro-regional level.

The definition of macro-regions and also the territorial definition for the strategies are pragmatic case-by-case policy decisions. Görmar (2010) and Dubois et al. (2009) discussed this approach in detail and distinguish two types of macro-regions, which are currently relevant for the work of the EU Commission. It should be shortly mentioned that the Baltic Sea Re-

---

**Figure 8: Check list for project evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme preferences (where appropriate)</th>
<th>Assessment of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project relevant for the territorial development of the programme area (link to programme’s SWOT)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project linked to the TA2020 objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project related to territorial characteristics of the programme area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project consider a territorial differentiation of the programme area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project contribute to horizontal integration?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are local stakeholders, relevant for the project’s theme, involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own illustration
region and the Danube Region are functional regions (transport and economic regions) which are simultaneously based on common landscapes.

These strategies were developed since it was recognised that certain policy issues can be better solved in cooperation. Although the origin of the strategies has clear territorial links, it does not mean that the strategies automatically contribute to improving territorial awareness or to implementing territorial objectives:

Indeed, implementing territorial objectives within the framework of macro-regional strategies rather appears to be difficult. References to the concrete issues of the TA2020 are mostly indirect, since the themes of the macro-regional strategies are sectoral rather than territorial. However, similarly to transnational cooperation, it is reasonable to assume that implementation offers possibilities for enhancing territorial aspects and thus for sector policies to contribute to the territorial objectives of the TA2020. It can be assumed that territorial ideas are integrated into sectoral themes – via the backdoor – since many projects are funded by territorial cooperation programmes (Savbäck et al. 2011) and the INTERREG community constitutes the majority of organisations executing projects. A more detailed assessment, however, demands for a specific study on this topic.

Macro-regional strategies thus only indirectly support territorial thinking, the implementation of the TA2020 objectives and territorial cohesion. Dubois et al. (2009) argue that the strategies contribute to territorial integration anyway. They bring different stakeholders, policy domains and instruments together and contribute to improving vertical and horizontal integration.

The largest added value of macro-regional strategies is to identify the most urgent themes which need to be solved in cooperation within macro-regions. Equally important is to mobilise and bring different stakeholders and funding instruments together to work on these themes. It cannot be expected that macro-regional strategies can additionally support the implementation of the thematic TA2020 objectives.

So-called flagship projects are important for achieving the objectives of macro-regional strategies. The partially high degree of territorial concretisation of flagship projects might support the integration of territorial issues and possibly, at a smaller scale, the implementation of the TA2020. However, at present it seems that most flagship projects neither consider territorial aspects nor the TA2020. In particular multifund-flagship projects could offer a possibility for integrating targeted territorial sub-projects in different flagship projects and thus enhance territorial objectives.

5.3.2 INTERREG and macro-regional strategies

Macro-regional strategies clearly use territorial and especially transnational cooperation for achieving their own objectives. Often, for a layperson the differences between macro-regional strategies and transnational cooperation programmes remain blurred, as their names and geographical definitions are similar. However, it has to be noted that these are two entirely different things: macro-regional strategies are by no means directly linked to territorial cooperation programmes, neither geographically nor as regards content or organisation. The implementation of the strategies can be supported by a large spectrum of different instruments, territorial cooperation programmes are only one of them. In the case of the Baltic Sea Region, e.g. more than 100 different funding alternatives can be used for implementing the strategies, although in many cases this might be a rather theoretical possibility. The actual financing is dominated by territorial cooperation programmes – in particular the Baltic Sea Programme (Savbäck et al. 2011). Thus, territorial cooperation programmes, and especially transnational programmes, are currently de facto an important pillar for implementing macro-regional strategies.

In connection with the flagship projects mentioned above, the awarding and importance of the title 'flagship project' as a label or quality approval needs to be reflected. At present, this label is awarded by the Priority Area Coordinators, i.e. the actors responsible for a certain theme within a strategy. Depending on the theme and persons in charge, different criteria are used for this labelling. Since the themes follow sector rather than territorial policies, the labelling does not consider territorial considerations or objectives. This raises questions concerning the meaning of such a label for a project or project application in an INTERREG B programme. Since the objectives and added value of INTERREG B differ from those of macro-regional strategies, transnational programmes – e.g. in the case of project approvals – should not be primarily guided by the labelling of macro-regional strategies.

These are projects which have been labeled as representative projects since they substantially contribute to achieving the aims of the respective strategy.
Funding instruments, which have not per se a cross-border or transnational character, such as national or regional programmes, find it often difficult to fund projects beyond their own programme area. As the programmes’ legitimacy is based on their programme areas, there is a desire to spend the money within the own area rather than outside the area – even if the latter might be beneficial for the own programme area. At least for EU programmes, the regulations allow – to some extent – to spend money outside the programme area. Furthermore, the EU Commission advocates the aligning of funding from different funds – however with limited success so far.

The implementation of macro-regional strategies is not very advanced so far and new ideas for better targeted funding possibilities are needed (Savbäck et al. 2011). The discussion about the next Structural Funds period and the development of programming documents offer good opportunities for rethinking the relation between territorial cooperation programmes and macro-regional strategies. It has to be discussed, whether transnational cooperation programmes should play a key role in future. For promoting this debate, some thoughts about possible alternatives will be given in the following:

• **Thematic guidance.** The present proposal for the Structural Funds regulations suggests that especially territorial cooperation programmes should be oriented towards the themes of relevant macro-regional strategies. In this case, the strategies would function as guiding documents for territorial programme development and implementation. This includes the risk that territorial cooperation programmes could be perceived as a main implementation instrument for the strategies. Other sector programmes could be released from their responsibility for contributing to the implementation, although the territorial programmes never got the means nor the mandate for implementing the strategies.

• **Strategy = programme.** Selected transnational programmes could get a key role in the implementation including the necessary financial means and thematic orientation. Then they could primarily serve the implementation of the respective macro-regional strategy. This would, however, raise questions as to what extent this weakens the, aforementioned, thematically integrative character of macro-regional strategies and contradicts their original ideas.

• **Macro-regional strategy funds & secretariats.** In the case of this alternative, all EU programmes within a macro-region would need to make a certain percentage of their funding available for implementing a macro-regional strategy. In order to coordinate the use of these funds, they would be collected in one fund, about which the programmes decide jointly. The technical implementation or secretariat function could be supported by a transnational programme with experience in transnational implementation mechanisms.

• **Complementary programme.** An alternative to the thematic guidance would be territorial and especially transnational programmes covering territorially relevant thematic gaps of macro-regional strategies. This would allow the programmes to orient themselves more towards the TA2020 and to complement macro-regional strategies. The latter would have to be implemented by other EU and national programmes. Although this alternative would enhance the territorial perspective, it is politically unrealistic and would possibly even weaken both macro-regional strategies and territorial programmes.

• **INTERREG focusing on territorial development.** Alternatively, INTERREG programmes could be independently developed from any macro-regional strategy. In doing so, the programmes would focus on territorial development issues. For a number of aspects the programmes and strategies might overlap, i.e. in these cases INTERREG would contribute to implementing macro-regional strategies. The programmes would, however, focus on supporting projects relevant for territorial development in the programme area and the macro-regional contribution would be a kind of by-product.

Altogether, it seems rather likely that macro-regional strategies and territorial cooperation programmes will move up closer to each other in one form or the other. To ensure independence of the INTERREG programmes, sector programmes as well as regional and national Structural Funds programmes need to contribute more strongly to the implementation of macro-regional strategies in the future. Otherwise, there is a risk, that the approach and governance dimension of the strategy as well as the territorially integrative thinking of transnational programmes will be weakened.
With regard to territorial issues considered in INTERREG, these programmes must develop their own priorities rather than copying the priorities of macro-regional strategies by definition. Following this idea, the above-discussed alternative “INTERREG focusing on territorial development” seems to be the most desirable. Simultaneously, the implementation of macro-regional strategies could be supported by establishing macro-regional strategy ‘funds’ and secretariats as explained above.
6 Policy recommendations

This report focuses on identifying and differentiating territorial policy options for improving the integration of territorial objectives in future EU cohesion policy and other policy fields. The place-based approach is central in this context. The cogwheels in the figure below illustrate that the focus is primarily on horizontal and vertical integration and on the territorial dimension of sector policies (fig. 9).

The following policy recommendations are based on the discussions in chapters 4 and 5. In this chapter, the overarching policy recommendations are derived from the more detailed recommendations developed in the previous chapters. The in-depth analysis of the previous chapters has shown that measures related to the development of strategies and programmes are of outstanding importance for integrating territorial aspects in sector policies. The potential for directly influencing the policy design tends to be positively correlated with existing contacts to the sector policy in question.

As pointed out in the previous chapters, territorial policies’ starting points for influencing strategy development can be found for several investigated thematic fields. They vary from the cooperation on future Partnership Contracts – where territorial aspects can be realised by addressing urban-rural relations and services of general interest – to the cooperation on developing concrete transport and energy network plans.

The starting points for territorial policies in the field of programme development are manifold, too. They especially comprise the explicit inclusion of territorial objectives both in relevant regulations as well as in programme documents. Such documents in particular imply OPs of different sector policies including INTERREG.

Programmes and strategies are developed at various administration levels and in almost all sector policies. The analysis of territorially relevant themes and the Delphi survey have shown that territorial objectives should be primarily enhanced at European and regional (in Germany “Länder”) level.

According to the experts of the Delphi survey, the lack of awareness with regard to territorial cohesion is the most important obstacle. At European, national and regional (“Länder”) level, additional requirements were identified by the experts when it came to coordinating sector policies (at national and regional level) and developing a political will for strengthening territorial cohesion. Furthermore, at regional (“Länder”) level a lack of financial means hampers territorial cohesion.

The largest potentials for better implementing territorial cohesion are seen at European level, especially by influencing future programmes. This is followed by potentials of INTERREG (concrete cooperation on territorial development). At regional level, the potential is mainly located in the area of concrete cooperation. The level of the German federal states was considered to be the third important one. Here the potentials are mainly linked to influencing future programmes and concrete cooperation. Indeed, comparing all territorial levels, future programmes and concrete cooperation on territorial development are considered as offering the most important starting points for integrating territorial objectives (see fig. 10).

This assessment has been used for developing policy recommendations, which address different administrative levels in terms of content seem to be the most promising.
6.1 Cross-sector policy-making

Interdisciplinary or cross-sector policy-making forms the heart of territorial policy and of implementing the TA2020. Different policies are of particular interest in this context. On the one hand, policies of specific territorial relevance (see chapter 2.1) and, on the other hand, policies which contribute to implementing the Europe 2020 Strategy and therefore are important for a territorially differentiated implementation of the strategy. For these reasons, cross-sector policy-making is mainly suggested with regard to national German and “Länder” policies in the fields of regional development, transport, energy and rural areas. Furthermore, environmental policies may also be considered. However, already today, environmental policy is more territorially oriented than the aforementioned policies.

At a more general, overarching level there are mainly the following starting points:

• Dialogue among equals: The TA2020 refers to coordination, which is to be interpreted in the sense of dialogues. This implies that coordination in this context is not to be understood in terms of higher and lower levels of hierarchy, but rather as a joint approach with partners at equal footing. In the long-run, the objectives of the TA2020 shall be integrated in various sector policies. This demands for providing targeted information to sector policies by means of positive cross-sector dialogues. These considerations lead to a number of dialogue potentials. At ministerial level, especially two aspects should be primarily considered for the dialogue: the cross-sector dialogue between federal ministries and the vertical dialogue with federal states and regions. Short and informal meetings might facilitate a thematically focused exchange with a clear added value for all participants. In addition to the cross-sector dialogues at ministerial level, a parallel dialogue on interdisciplinary issues should be initiated between relevant federal sector policy agencies. Such constructive dialogues could be roughly subdivided into four steps:

1. Illustrating territorial potentials, obstacles and impacts: Firstly, it should be illustrated how the acknowledgement of territorial objectives and effects can help a sector policy to achieve its own aims more efficiently. Secondly, based on the approach developed by ESPON ARTS, the territorial effects of a sector policy should be assessed. This allows to generate a territorially differentiated picture of potentials and obstacles for achieving the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy.

2. Win-win-dialogue: Based on the first step one should seek the dialogue with relevant sector policies. It should focus on the question, how a territorial perspective can facilitate a more efficient approach to achieving the Europe 2020 targets.

3. Territorial issues in the policy cycle: In a next step, in cooperation with the respective sector policy, territorial concerns can be integrated in the policy cycle. Important in this context is to formulate objectives, territorially differentiated, quantified targets (for cities and regions) and to formulate mechanisms of implementation. Furthermore, specific sector policy elements might be included in spatial monitoring activities and territorial aspects be integrated when evaluating sector policies.

4. National spatial planning report inviting to an interdisciplinary dialogue: The BBSR could invite other relevant sector policies to intensively discuss the recent national spatial planning report. These discussions should focus on finding win-win situations between sector and territorial policies and on identifying territorial potentials and obstacles for achieving the Europe 2020 targets. For this purpose, the BBSR could organise a series of events, to which prominent representatives of the BMVBS and other relevant ministries should be invited for discussing the national spatial planning report. Representatives from other EU countries could also be invited in order to enrich.
the discussion by international examples and experiences. This would implicitly contribute to enhancing territorial dialogues with other sector policies and thus support the implementation of the TA2020.

• **Strategic use of European committees:** From a territorial policy perspective, there are various committees useful for discussing and thereby promoting territorial cohesion. They especially include intergovernmental cooperation and the European General Affairs Council:

1. **NTCCP and TA2020 roadmap:** The National Territorial Cohesion Contact Point (NTCCP) and other fora of intergovernmental cooperation dealing with the implementation of the TA2020 could be used as strategic communication channels for strengthening the influence on European policies. For this purpose, the Polish EU Presidency 2011 presented a roadmap for strengthening the territorial orientation of future Structural Funds. Further steps were the endorsement of the TA2020 roadmap and the Commission dealing with the Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA). Thus, for the first time, intergovernmental cooperation and Structural Funds programmes interfere with each other. It would be desirable, if Germany actively contributed to implementing the roadmap.

2. **European General Affairs Council:** An institutionalisation of territorial cohesion at the European Council would increase the status of territorial cohesion and imply a strengthening of territorial issues in EU and national policies. The cases of the macro-regional strategies for the Baltic Sea Region and the Danube Region illustrated that the EU General Affairs Council may deal with territorial issues. So, why should the General Affairs Council not regularly address territorially relevant issues and adopt a strategic reference document on territorial development in the EU? Following a discussion of this idea in the German context, the MKRO (2011) argued for a discussion of territorial matters in the General Affairs Council. In a next step, the opportunities for cooperation should be assessed in the NTCCP. For the first time, the draft regulations were discussed by the European Council – this is a first step in that direction.

• **Interdisciplinary framework documents:** The BMVBS and the BBSR might furthermore argue for elaborating an interdisciplinary framework document. No additional documents should be created but existing framework documents to be revised should be used for integrating and bringing together territorial and sectoral views. An explicit territorial differentiation in framework documents might support territorial objectives and the implementation of the TA2020 in Germany. At the same time, this would illustrate that the integration of territorial objectives may contribute to increasing the effectiveness of different sector policies. Such an approach furthermore shows that the federal states and regions have a special responsibility for implementing the place-based approach. It should be focused on two documents:

1. **Partnership Contract:** In the context of designing the next EU Structural Funds period, the Member States have to elaborate a Partnership Contract. When elaborating this Contract, more emphasis could be put on the cross-sectoral dimension than in the present National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) or the Cohesion Report. This Contract furthermore offers the chance to focus on a territorially differentiated implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy, when arguing for different combinations of sector policy measures for different types of regions.

2. **National reform programme:** The national reform programme for achieving the Europe 2020 targets was elaborated by the BMWI in cooperation with other relevant sector policies. Based on the analysis of territorially differentiated potentials and obstacles for achieving these targets, they could be territorially differentiated and approaches for different types of regions and cities in Germany could be developed. Such a territorially differentiated approach would increase the efficiency for achieving the targets and might counteract strong territorial concentration tendencies.

• **Influence future EU regulations and EU programmes in a cross-sectoral manner:** The principal features of the next EU financial framework, the EU cohesion policy and other sector policies are currently formulated. The BMVBS communicates its positions in various consultation processes, e.g. for better integrating territorial objectives in different relevant EU regulations.
Policy recommendations

• The next Structural Funding period will allow for multifund programmes. To promote interdisciplinary policy-making (and thus territorial issues), the BMVBS and the BBSR could argue for the elaboration of multi-fond programmes with an integrated approach towards regional and territorial development.

• Spatial monitoring of sector policies: Although it can be interesting for sector policies to get illustrations on useful integrations of territorial issues, for integrated spatial planning it is ever more important to analyse territorial effects of sector policies. Accordingly, attempts for systematically assessing the territorial effects of sector policies in Germany should be undertaken and the most important aspects should be integrated in the spatial monitoring system. This might also represent a German contribution to action 2 of the roadmap to implement the TA2020.

Successful persuading requires a proactive approach. The approaches of the BMVBS and the BBSR are of particular importance here. This particularly concerns the identification of possible win-win situations and of appropriate themes and occasions (timing) for interdisciplinary dialogues. It also includes the preparation of relevant background documents, which underline the advantages of a territorially differentiated approach for implementing the Europe 2020 Strategy.

6.2 Vertical cooperation in policy-making

Focusing on regional and local development potentials and obstacles is not possible without involving relevant stakeholders at all administrative and policy-making levels. Knowledge and instruments of all levels, from the local to the European, are needed for implementing the Europe 2020 Strategy and the TA2020. In the German context, the mechanism of the principle of countervailing influence is particularly important.

At a general level, mainly the following starting points should be mentioned:

• Multilevel governance: The implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy and the TA2020 demands special attention when involving regional and local stakeholders. They should participate when territorially differentiated targets are developed and overarching framework documents are discussed. Participation should have the character of an open dialogue, which focuses on jointly identifying specific territorial potentials and obstacles rather than only covering formal participation processes.

INTERREG is an especially appropriate instrument for promoting both vertical and horizontal cooperation. Consequently, it is important that the BBSR (a) continuously argues for keeping and further developing territorial development as a central pillar of INTERREG B and (b) promotes broad participation in INTERREG projects.

• Involving ‘local elites’ for accessing their tacit knowledge: The tacit knowledge of local and regional elites is crucial for a place-based approach following Barca’s ideas and even more for a territorially differentiated implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy. Their knowledge about their regions and cities – including informal mechanisms and dynamics – is indispensable when developing suitable targets and implementation options.

• References to individual policies: Multilevel governance and the use of tacit knowledge in regions and cities should not be limited to issues of spatial planning and regional policy. At local and regional level, the impacts of different national and European policies are visible and possible synergies or mutual blockades of different policies have an effect. Consequently, multilevel governance needs to cover several sector policies and has to refer to different relevant policy fields.

A concrete starting point could be a pilot study, which analyses the benefits of integrating territorial issues in one sector policy thoroughly. For convincing sector policies and their stakeholders of the importance of territorial objectives, it is necessary to illustrate the direct benefits for sector policies reaching their objectives. For a long-time, mainly the territorial impacts of sector policies have been discussed without actually addressing these policies. Such a study could also serve as a German contribution to action 1 of the roadmap for the TA2020 implementation.

• National spatial planning report as an invitation to a dialogue with regional representatives: The recent national spatial planning report – similarly to the horizontal dialogue – might be used to initiate a vertical dialogue. Events, for instance, could be organised in every “Land” and in cooperation with the responsible ministry for regional development. At these events,
relevant representatives from the “Land” in question could discuss the national spatial planning report. Implicitly, this would contribute to enhancing territorial dialogues with other sector policies and to implementing the TA2020. Preferably, high-ranking speakers from the BMVBS and the relevant ministry in the respective “Land” would open such an event.
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