



EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING
OBSERVATION NETWORK



Thematic Background Study on INTERREG and ESPON activities in the field of spatial visions and scenarios

Draft Synthesis Report February 2006
- Please do not quote -

Please note, that this report is one of five input studies to a more comprehensive report on INTERREG and ESPON activities to be presented in late 2006.

Please send any comments to kai.boehme@espon.lu by 17 March 2006

The report has been elaborated by

Dr. Thomas Stumm

Jacques Robert



TERSYN

Disclaimer

The views contained within this document are those of the authors. The content of this document is based on the results of applied research provided by EuroeConsult and Tersyn. As such the document does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ESPON or INTERACT Monitoring Committee. The Managing Authorities of the INTERACT and ESPON programmes are in no way liable for any use made of the information contained herein.

This document is part-financed by the European Union within the INTERREG III INTERACT programme. The ESPON Coordination Unit has been contracted to carry out this study.

Foreword

This report presents the first results of the INTERACT-ESPON study on Spatial Visions and Scenarios, which was conducted within a cooperation of the INTERACT and the ESPON 2000-2006 Programme. The project is co-ordinated by the EureConsult, Luxembourg, in cooperation with Tersyn, France.

Since this report shows only the first results of the study conducted so far, the authors hope to get an extensive feedback from the INTERREG, INTERACT and ESPON communities. Relevant feedback will be evaluated and taken up in the final report, as the aim of this report is to achieve an overview on which lessons for future activities can be learned from current experience in the field of spatial visions and scenario.

This report invites the INTERREG community and all interested readers to comment the draft findings drawn and thus to contribute to further develop the issue. Comments are in particular wanted regarding

- Factual mistakes and possible misunderstandings in the present document
- Additional INTERREG activities which have not been captured by the study but which might enrich the discussion
- Useful insights on how spatial vision and scenario related issues can be taken up under the framework of INTERREG
- Recommendations and ideas regarding future INTERREG projects and ESPON research

Please send all relevant comments to Kai Böhme at the ESPON Coordination Unit (kai.boehme@espon.lu). Comments received until 17 March 2006 will be forwarded to the consultants working on this thematic study and be considered for integration in the final version.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	The evolution of co-operative strategic territorial development planning and scenario development in the European Union	4
2.1	Transnational spatial development planning and the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions	4
2.2	Cross-border spatial development planning and the elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts	7
2.3	Inter-regional co-operation projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning activities	11
2.4	EU-wide prospective territorial research / scenario development and the particular focus of ESPON-activities	13
3	Main themes, objectives and application strategies addressed by strategic territorial planning documents elaborated in the context of transnational, cross-border and inter-regional co-operation	15
3.1	Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC / IIIB programme areas	15
3.2	Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA / IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them	29
3.3	INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning	37
4	The approaches and processes employed for elaborating strategic territorial planning documents in the context of transnational, cross-border and inter-regional co-operation	39
4.1	Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC / IIIB programme areas	39
4.2	Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA / IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them	49
4.3	INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning	54
5	Comparative summary assessment: Results achieved by the various transnational and cross-border activities focussing on strategic territorial development planning and their relation with selected ESPON-project outputs	56
5.1	General remarks regarding the relationship between strategic territorial planning activities and ESPON-project results	56
5.2	The relation between existing transnational spatial visioning activities and the overall findings of ESPON-projects	58
5.3	The relation between selected cross-border spatial development planning activities and the overall findings of ESPON-projects	64

1 Introduction

Co-operation between European states, regions and local authorities in the field of strategic territorial development planning has already a quite long tradition and its very early beginnings date back to the mid-1950s. Although co-operation activities as such can not be considered a recent phenomenon, one has however to acknowledge that especially the joint elaboration of strategic spatial planning documents has become more widespread and intense only during the 1990s especially since the introduction of the Community Initiative programme INTERREG. Within this wider context, one can identify 3 development phases:

- The 25 years from the mid-1950s until the end 1980s can be characterised as the "start-up phase".
- The decade between 1990 and 2000 can be labelled the "intensification and innovation phase" of co-operative strategic territorial development planning.
- Since the year 2000, co-operative strategic territorial development planning has entered a phase that is characterised by consolidation, a further expansion and to a certain extent also by an increasing professionalisation.

Throughout these phases, 3 major co-operation types have developed in the context strategic territorial development planning: "European-wide spatial development planning", "transnational spatial development planning" and "cross-border spatial development planning". But also in the context of inter-regional co-operation, projects are realised that address aspects more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning

Against the wider background outlined above, the **initial "Terms of Reference" (ToR)** for this research project **have formulated a general objective for the thematic study** that is (...) *to provide a systematic and comparative overview on the spatial visions and scenario work currently going on in various INTERREG projects and to draw up an analysis of their differences in thematic priorities and methodologies and in particular on how ESPON results can support the further development of spatial visions in INTERREG programmes and beyond.*

In order to achieve this general objective, the study was expected to compile and compare INTERREG activities and ESPON projects dealing with spatial visions and scenario development at transnational and European level. Although the main focus should be on ESPON and INTERREG IIIB activities, it was also expected that a brief screening of similar experiences in the context of INTERREG IIIA (cross-border co-operation) and INTERREG IIIC (inter-regional co-operation) is carried out.

2 The evolution of co-operative strategic territorial development planning and scenario development in the European Union

2.1 Transnational spatial development planning and the elaboration of transnational spatial development visions

Transnational spatial development planning covering larger areas that transgress the more narrow focus of cross-border regions has started quite early, especially in North-West Europe. These early attempts, which are either inter-state/inter-regional initiatives, can however not be fully assimilated to our today's understanding of transnational co-operation.

- The very first initiative was the **"Conference of the Regions of North-West Europe" (CRENWE)**, which was structured from its foundation in 1955 as a network of planning officials and scientists.
- The second initiative is the **Benelux Economic Union (Union économique Benelux)**, which brought co-operative spatial development planning within the sphere of activity outlined in the Union Treaty by the end of the 1960s¹. In 1986, the first "Benelux Global Structure Outline" (Esquisse de Structure Globale Benelux) having the status of a recommendation, was published. It can be considered the first embryonic transnational spatial development planning document. After several years of preparation², a radically revised version of the first Outline was published in draft form in 1996 (Second Benelux Structural Outline).

Although regional cross-border co-operation over specific sub-areas of the **wider Alpine space** is already practised since the 1970s/1980s and has also produced partial outputs with respect to strategic territorial development planning (see section 2.2), a more comprehensive approach covering the entire Alpine mountain chain has only appeared at end of the 1980s/beginning of the 1990s (1st Alpine Conference of 1989; Alpine Convention that entered into force on 6 March 1995).

Despite these early and partial initiatives, **comprehensive transnational spatial development planning and – alongside with this – an elaboration of the first transnational spatial development visions was only launched around the mid-1990s**. Both aspects can **certainly be considered major innovative developments during this decade**, as they have significantly contributed to further intensify co-operation between European states, regions and local authorities in the field of strategic territorial development planning.

¹ Inter-state agreements on spatial planning between Belgium-Netherlands-Luxembourg (1969).

² 1989-1995: Organisation of study days and conferences, formal adoption of a "Note d'Orientation" (in October 1993) and a "Note d'Approfondissement" (in January 1995).

This process started in 1992 with the Karlskrona Conference in form of an **inter-state co-operation among Ministries responsible for spatial planning and development of countries around the Baltic Sea Region (BSR)**. After a follow-up meeting, the document "VASAB-2010 - Vision and strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010" was adopted at the 3rd Ministerial Conference in Tallinn (December 1994). The "VASAB 2010" report was the first transnational vision for spatial development world-wide and laid the foundation for joint action of the participating countries and regions.

With the introduction of an **INTERREG II strand on transnational co-operation in the field of spatial planning back in 1996 (INTERREG IIC)**, new transnational spatial visioning activities were launched and finalised under the overall control and guidance of national/regional governments involved in the programmes during the INTERREG IIC running period (1997-1999):

- **The INTERREG IIC programme Central European, Adriatic, Danubian and South-Eastern European Space (CADSES)**, the VISION-Planet project has elaborated the document entitled "Strategies for Integrated Spatial Development of the Central European, Danubian, and Adriatic Area".
- **As concerns the INTERREG IIC programme for the North Sea Region**, effective spatial visioning activities were realised by a "Vision Working Group". The main result achieved was the strategic planning document entitled "A Spatial Perspective for the North Sea Region" (NorVision).
- **In the context of the INTERREG IIC programme North-Western Metropolitan Area (NWMA)**, a document entitled "A Spatial Vision for the North-West Europe – Building Co-operation" was elaborated.

At the beginning of the new millennium, the above-mentioned transnational spatial visioning processes have partly achieved to translate mutual co-operation into jointly agreed and/or formally adopted strategic planning documents that are specifically drawn up with a view to providing building blocks for a transnational spatial development policy agenda in the EU. Despite this general merit, there are however considerable differences between these vision documents that concern e.g. the time-period for which they were elaborated, the background against which spatial objectives were formulated, the level of concreteness of objectives and orientations and finally also the type of political validation given to them.

Beyond these 4 major spatial development visions entirely covering the respective transnational co-operation areas (i.e. VASAB 2010; 3 INTERREG IIC visions), one can also observe that **a number of individual INTERREG IIC projects have realised comprehensive strategic planning activities** that aimed at exploring wider territorial impacts of specific long-term developments (Western Mediterranean), at making general or theme-specific contribution to ongoing vision elaboration processes (North-West Europe) or to the preparation of future INTERREG IIIB programmes (Atlantic Space) and at designing development visions for smaller sub-areas of the wider transnational co-

operation space (CADSES, Baltic Sea Area).

During the ongoing Structural Funds programming period 2000-2006, the continuing support to transnational co-operation in the context INTERREG IIIB has strongly favoured **a further consolidation and expansion of transnational spatial development planning (up-dating and up-grading activities).**

- **In the Baltic Sea Region (BSR), important new steps were made between 2000 and 2005 in the context of the VASAB-process.** In 2001, the 5th Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development in Wismar (20-21 September 2001) has adopted a "Declaration on transnational spatial planning and development measures in the Baltic Sea Region up to the year 2010" (Wismar Declaration) and a new report entitled "VASAB 2010+ Spatial Development Action Programme". In 2004, the "Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region" (CSD-BSR) started work on upgrading the 1994 vision and strategies document. To facilitate the preparation of a new policy document that should be presented at the next Ministerial Conference, a background report entitled "Polycentric Development and Territorial Cohesion in the BSR: Strategies and Priorities" was elaborated that makes a summary of ESPON-findings on the BSR development. The new policy document entitled "Connecting Potentials" was presented at the 6th Ministerial Conference in Gdańsk (September 2005). It is the starting point for elaborating a new long-term spatial development perspective for the BSR (expected time-horizon 15-20 years).
- In the context of the **INTERREG IIIB programme North-West Europe,** a spatial vision group has been established to guide and supervise the up-dating process of the existing spatial development vision. For this purpose, three thematic studies on polycentric development, on parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge as well as on the sustainable management of the cultural/natural heritage have been carried out. Based upon these studies, a synthesis report is currently elaborated.
- Under the **INTERREG IIIB programme for the North Sea Region,** the existing NorVision-document is being updated. A series of five thematic and prospective studies on demographic change, transport and mobility, innovation, energy and coastal water management has been carried out, from which a synthesis report is currently being drafted.
- Under the **INTERREG IIIB programme Atlantic Space,** a study project on the "Atlantic Spatial Development Perspective" (ASDP) was realised between September 2003 and the 1st half of 2005. The ASDP-project aimed at developing a vision of the polycentric development of the Atlantic Area.
- Under the **INTERREG IIIB Programme Western Mediterranean (MEDOCC),** various study projects were carried out and their outputs are likely to contribute to a spatial vision for this area ("Les Ateliers Méditerranéens de l'Aménagement du Territoire - AMAT", "Cooperation

Métropoles Méditerranéennes - C2M"). In the final stage of the MEDOCC-programme, the "Medisdec-Stratmed" project was started. It tends to initiate a spatial vision elaboration process, but it has not yet produced outputs.

- Although no transnational spatial development vision properly speaking has been elaborated under the **INTERREG IIIB programme Alpine Space**, a specific working group was set up in 2004 to elaborate a "Prospective Study" on the sustainable territorial development in the Alpine Space. This study, for which a final draft was delivered in August 2005, can be considered a preparatory phase for potential future spatial visioning activities to be realised under the next co-operation programme that will be supported by the future Objective 3 (2007-2013).

In the **remainder INTERREG IIIB co-operation areas, spatial visioning processes are either paused or not being launched at all (even not in a preparatory phase)**. In the context of the **INTERREG IIIB programme CADSES**, no need was seen / to further develop or upgrade the strategic planning documents previously elaborated for the entire transnational co-operation area (Vision Planet-project) or for smaller parts of it (i.e. South-East Europe, ESTIA-project). In addition, both follow-up projects realised during the current programming period 2000-2006 (PLANET CENSE; ESTIA-SPOSE) are not considered "flagship projects" by the INTERREG IIIB programme bodies.³ For the **INTERREG IIIB programmes South-Western Europe, Archimed, Northern Periphery, Caribbean Area, Canaries-Madeira-Azores Area, Indian Ocean Area-Réunion**, no precise information does exist whether preparatory activities for spatial visioning processes covering the transnational co-operation area have been launched.

2.2 Cross-border spatial development planning and the elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts

Cross-border co-operation in the field of spatial development planning has started already during a very early phase (1970s – end of 1980s), mostly in areas immediately located at a commonly shared border and in the context of specific intergovernmental structures. With the introduction of the INTERREG Community Initiative programme (INTERREG I: 1990-1993) and its subsequent continuation / enlargement (INTERREG II: 1994-1999), especially decentralised cross-border spatial development planning was significantly widened and intensified along many EU-borders during the 1990s.

One major aspect that motivated joint spatial development planning activities had been the growing awareness that policy consequences do not stop at borders of the respective neighbouring countries and that legal as well as organisational measures in the field of spatial planning could support a more harmonious development of the cross-border territory.

³ Information based upon a reply in reaction to a questionnaire sent to the INTERREG IIIB programme secretariat.

Already during the 1970s, **bilateral inter-state agreements on co-operation in the field of spatial planning** were concluded between Germany and its neighbouring countries Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Austria and Switzerland.⁴ On ground of these agreements, also specific inter-state co-operation structures were established in form of inter-governmental spatial planning commissions and/or regional commissions and sub-commissions. Although these structures normally lack of a legally binding decision making authority, they have carried out fruitful cross-border spatial development planning activities within the confines of their limited possibilities⁵ over the past 30 years. During the 1980s and 1990s, other **inter-state agreements on co-operation in the field of regional planning** were concluded that mostly involve countries from Central and Eastern Europe.⁶

Joint work within these inter-governmental commissions has – however only more recently - led to an elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts for the respective mandate areas covered by these structures. Examples can be found along several EU-borders:

- Already back in 1982 the German-Swiss and German-Austrian Spatial Planning Commissions have finalised the “International Development Perspective for the Lake Constance Area”, which was subsequently revised and replaced by the “Lake Constance Development Perspective” of 1994.
- Based upon joint work within the German-Polish Spatial Planning Commission since 1992, cross-border spatial planning concepts covering the entire border area had been adopted in May 1995.
- Comprehensive cross-border spatial development concepts were also elaborated during the years 1996/1997 for the entire Dutch-German border.
- Between 1996 and 1999, a “regional planning orientation framework” for the area covered by the Upper Rhine Conference (D/F/CH) was elaborated with support from the INTERREG IIA programme. It should provide guidance for the organisation of future conditions related to living and economic activities and of a high quality transport system, but also for shaping the environment and nature in the co-operation area.

Another interesting example is the “Development Scheme for the Space of SaarLorLux+” (SDE-SLL+). It has been elaborated during the years 1995-1999 for the border-area between Luxembourg, France, Germany and Belgium. The initiative has been supported by the Regional Commission Saar-Lor-Lux-

⁴ E.g. Inter-state agreements on spatial planning between Belgium-Germany (1971), Switzerland-Germany (1973), Austria-Germany (1974), France-Germany (1975) and the Netherlands-Germany (1976).

⁵ Co-ordination of neighbouring domestic spatial planning activities at various levels through a joint formulation of non-binding recommendations, joint elaboration of non-binding spatial development concepts etc.

⁶ Austria-Hungary (1985), Germany-Poland (1992), Slovak Republic-Poland (1994), Slovak Republic-Hungary (1995) and Czech Republic-Poland (1995).

Trier/Westpfalz⁷ and received Community funding under the previous ERDF-Art 10 budget line.

Decentralised co-operation in the field of spatial development planning, involving regional and local level actors from both sides of a border, has become more intense and widespread since the launching of INTERREG I and the subsequent continuation of Community support for cross-border co-operation under INTERREG IIA. Often supported financially through funding from the respective EU-programmes (INTERREG I / IIA programmes; PHARE-CBC), a growing number of cross-border spatial development concepts have been elaborated (see text box below) along

- various internal EU-borders in North-West Europe (D/NL, D/F),
- former external EU-borders of Germany with neighbouring Central and Eastern European Countries (e.g. Poland, Czech Republic),
- some Austrian external borders with Central and Eastern European Countries,
- several borders between Scandinavian countries (DK/S, S/FIN/N).

These decentralised cross-border spatial development concepts, which were elaborated mostly in the context of INTERREG I and IIA projects, have generally adopted a broad and participatory approach during their preparation that involved a broad range of different administrative and socio-economic actors from either side of the border according to the principles of subsidiarity and partnership. In most cases, they also had a positive influence on domestic national, regional and local spatial planning on both sides of a border and thus contributed to make them more concrete.

Along the vast majority of **internal and external borders in the south of the EU**, however, activities related to comprehensive cross-border spatial development planning have remained an exception during the 1990s.

Although a quite long tradition exists with respect to **large-scale cross-border co-operation among various regions that takes place mostly in the context of "Working Communities"**⁸, joint activities in the field of spatial development planning have mostly been realised by some Working Communities set up for parts of the Alpine Space (ARGE-ALP for the Central Alps; ALPEN-ADRIA for the Eastern Alps).

⁷ A steering committee (comité de pilotage) under Luxembourg presidency has been established by the regional commission that was composed of representatives from Luxembourg, the German Länder Saarland and Rheinland-Pfalz, the French Region Lorraine and the Belgium region Wallonie.

⁸ Communauté de Travail des Alpes Centrales (ARGE ALP, 1972); Communauté de Travail des Alpes Orientales (ARGE ALPEN ADRIA, 1978); Communauté de Travail des Alpes Occidentales (COTRAO, 1982) ; Communauté de Travail des Pyrénées (CTP, 1983); Communauté de Travail de Jura (CTJ, 1985); Communauté de Travail Villes des Alpes (CTVA, 1988); Comunidade de Trabalho Norte de Portugal-Galicia (1991); Comunidad de Trabajo Extremadura-Alentejo (1992).

Examples for decentralised cross-border spatial development concepts

EUREGIO (D/NL): "Cross-border spatial development perspectives of the EUREGIO" with a time horizon up to 2015, elaborated between 1997 and 1998.

euregio rhein-maas-nord (D/NL): "euregio-plan - cross-border spatial development perspectives" of January 1995.

Euregio Rhein-Waal (D/NL): "Cross-border development and action concept of the Euregio Rhein-Waal" (1989) and revision / up-dating of the previous document by the "Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 Euregio Rhein-Waal" (2001).

PAMINA (D/F): "Orientation Guidelines for the Economic and Spatial Development of the PAMINA-area" (1996) and the subsequent further elaboration / up-grading of this approach through the "Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region" (2002).

Euroregion POMMERANIA (D/PL/S): "Cross-border development and action concept of the Euroregion POMMERANIA" (1993) and revision / up-dating of the previous document by the "Cross-border development and action concept of the Euroregion POMMERANIA 2000-2006" (1999).

Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina (D/PL): "Development and action concept of the Euroregion Viadrina" (1999), which is a revision / up-dating of a previously existing cross-border development concept elaborated in 1993.

Euroregion Spree-Neiße-Bober (D/PL): "Development and action concept of the Euroregion Spree-Neiße-Bober" (1999), which is a revision / up-dating of a previously existing cross-border development concept elaborated in 1993.

Euroregion Elbe-Labe (D/CZ): "Cross-border development concept for the Euroregion Elbe-Labe" (1994).

Border area between Saxony (D), the Czech Republic (CZ): "Development and action concept for the Saxony-Czech border area" of 1999 (partly also covering Poland).

Border area between Bavaria (D) and the Czech Republic (CZ): "INTERREG III-PHARE CBC spatial perspective for the Bavarian-Czech border region, elaborated between 1998 and 1999".

Border area between Austria (A) and Slovenia (SLO): "Cross-border development concept for the border between Austria and Slovenia".

Border area between Bavaria (D), the Czech Republic (CZ) and Austria (A): "Development concept Bayrischer Wald/Böhmerwald/Mühlviertel" of 1994, elaborated as an UNESCO pilot project.

Øresund-Region (DK/S): "Joint Cross-border Regional Development Plan".

Border area between Sweden (S), Finland (FIN) and Norway (N): "Torne Valley Development Concept" of 1999.

Border between France and Spain (F/E): "Livre Blanc de l'Eurocité Bayonne – San Sebastian", elaborated between 1998 and 2000.

With the launching of the 3rd generation of INTERREG programmes and the continuing support to cross-border co-operation (INTERREG IIIA), **new cross-border spatial development planning initiatives** are actually realised through specific projects during the years 2000-2006 **along several borders:**

- Some of the INTERREG IIIA programmes covering the new internal EU-borders of Austria (e.g. Austria-Hungary, Austria-Slovakia, Austria-Czech Republic).
- The INTERREG IIIA programme Euregio Maas-Rhein (D/NL/B).
- The INTERREG IIIA programme Alpen-Bodensee (D/A/CH/LIE).
- The INTERREG IIIA Priority "Estonia-Latvia-Russia / North" of the Baltic Sea Region INTERREG IIIB Neighbourhood Programme.⁹
- The INTERREG IIIA programme South East Finland–Russia.

The activities realised range from an elaboration of comprehensive spatial development visions covering the entire programme zone or larger parts of the cross-border area (cross-border nature-park) to more localised cross-border planning activities at city/town level.

Along many other EU-borders, however, **comprehensive cross-border spatial development planning activities are sometimes not yet realised.** But in some cases there seem to be future perspectives for making progress in this direction (INTERREG IIIA programme Sønderjylland-Schleswig, INTERREG IIIA programme Sweden-Norway, sub-programme "Inner Scandinavia").

2.3 Inter-regional co-operation projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning activities

The "European Spatial Development Perspective" (ESDP) has recognised that the application of its policy options and the promotion of an integrated spatial development policy at EU scale require new and voluntary forms of co-operation, also between actors at the regional and local levels. Within this wider context, also inter-regional co-operation (beyond transnational and cross-border co-operation) was considered an appropriate field of action.

Although inter-regional co-operation apparently lacks one essential precondition that is important for strategic territorial development planning (i.e. project partners are normally not located in a contiguous territorial context), one has to acknowledge that an inter-regional exchange of experience, a transfer of know-how and a dissemination of good practice can facilitate strategic territorial development planning processes. This has already been demonstrated by some early inter-regional co-operation projects funded under various EU-support

⁹ The priority is not separate Strand A programme, but follow the principles of the Strand A co-operation, i.e. cross-border cooperation between neighbouring countries.

programmes during the 1990s (RECITE I, RECITE II, TERRA).

Inter-regional co-operation is currently supported under **Strand C of the Community Initiative INTERREG III (2000-2006)** and aims at improving the effectiveness of regional development policies and instruments through large-scale information exchange and sharing of experience (networks). INTERREG IIIC projects that address aspects more or less directly related to strategic territorial development planning can be found under 3 out of the 4 zone-specific INTERREG IIIC programmes (see Overview Table 2 below):¹⁰

- Most of these projects have been approved under the “West Zone” programme (13 projects), followed by the “South Zone” programme (7 projects) and by the “East Zone” programme (3 projects).
- No projects addressing the study’s main topic were approved under the “North Zone” programme, which is mainly due to the fact that all operations have a very narrow focus on economic development, support to SMEs, environmental protection or tourism development.

In the context of these 23 INTERREG IIIC projects, more than 300 different organisms from nearby all countries of the European Union (except Luxembourg) and many non-EU-countries (Albania, Croatia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Norway, Switzerland, Romania, Russia, Yugoslavia) are involved as partners. Considering the average size of partners involved in these 23 projects (app. 13 partners), one can see that

- some project-partnerships are significantly above this overall threshold (e.g. AAP2020, CoPraNet, FLAPP, InterMETREX, Sulfanet POLYMETREX);
- 8 projects have a number of partners more or less in line with this average (> 10 partners / < 15 partners: e.g. EARD, INCORD, AWARE, ESIN, EWM, FARLAND, PSPE, Euromountains);
- a larger number of projects have project-partnerships that are significantly below the overall average (e.g. ENLoCC, GRIDS, PIMMS, RECORE, DEDEL SDEC, PROGESDEC, RIVERLINKS, Coronas Metropolitanas, MARE).

¹⁰ Information based upon the replies given by the 4 INTERREG IIIC programme JTS to the “screening questionnaire”.

Overview Table 2: INTERREG IIIC projects addressing aspects related to strategic territorial development planning

Interreg IIIC Zone	Project reference name	Lead Partner
East	AAP2020	COMUNE DI ANCONA, Italy
	EARD	InvestitionsBank des Landes Brandenburg, Germany
	INCORD	Bundesvereinigung der Landesentwicklungsgesellschaften (BVLEG), Germany
West	AWARE	Provincie Zeeland, the Netherlands
	CoPraNet	EUCC The Coastal Union, the Netherlands
	ENLoCC	Lead partner: Wirtschaftsförderung Region Stuttgart GmbH, Germany
	ESIN	Comhdhail Oileain na hEireann Inis Oirr, Arainn, Cuan na Gaillimhe, Ireland
	EWM	Provincie Fryslân, the Netherlands
	FARLAND	Dienst Landelijk Gebied, the Netherlands
	FLAPP	Stichting Euregio Maas – Rijn, the Netherlands
	GRIDS	Cardiff University, UK
	InterMETREX	Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Structure Plan Joint Committee (GCVSPJC/RC), UK
	PIMMS	London Borough of Bromley Civic Centre, UK
	PSPE	Dienst Landelijk Gebied, the Netherlands
	RECORE	Mairie de RIEULAY, France
	SULFANET	Provincie Noord-Brabant, the Netherlands
South	DEDEL SDEC	Regional Province of Catania, Italy
	PROGRESDEC	Region Lazio, Italy
	POLYMETREX	Gouvernement of Catalan Region, Spain
	RIVERLINKS	Mairie de Florence, Italy
	CORONAS METROPOLITANAS	Consortium of the Zone North-West Madrid, Spain
	Euromountains	Province of Turin, Italy
	MARE	Commission de Coordination et de Développement de la Région Lisbonne et Vallée du Tage, Portugal
North	-	-

2.4 EU-wide prospective territorial research / scenario development and the particular focus of ESPON-activities

In the wider context of European-wide spatial development planning, prospective territorial research and spatial scenarios adopting a multi-country perspective play an increasingly important role.

Very early attempts have been made in the context of the **Council of Europe's Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning (ECMRP - CEMAT)**. A number of studies were realised between 1978-1981, which – in a today's view – are not this sophisticated due to limited information and processing resources available at that date.

Within the European Union, a first step towards prospective territorial research and spatial scenario development has been made in the context of the

Commission's study programme supporting the elaboration of development perspectives for a future spatial development of the Community territory (Europe 2000" document published in 1991, "Europe 2000+" document published in 1994). In addition to this, an attempt to use spatial scenarios for the Community territory has also been made in the long-lasting and "informal" work process among the EU-Member States for elaborating the "European Spatial Development Perspective" (ESDP).¹¹

With the adoption of the "**ESPON 2006 Programme - Research on the Spatial Development of an Enlarging European Union**" and the subsequent launching of numerous research projects, an important step towards increasing the level of professionalisation in European-wide spatial development planning has been made. The programme helps creating a significant added value when it comes to further promoting and supporting territorial analysis and projection. A first aspect of this added value is the creation of the ESPON-database, which contains many more spatially disaggregated and comparable data than EUROSTAT could produce over the years. Added value is also created by various ESPON-study projects that have carried out a number of trend analyses in different fields as well as scenario development activities. They can provide valuable support to transnational and cross-border spatial planning activities as well as to the co-operative elaboration / upgrading of related strategic planning documents (see text box below).

ESPON projects with relevance for transnational and cross-border spatial planning activities

ESPON-study project 1.1.1: Potentials for polycentric development in Europe.

ESPON-study project 1.1.2: Urban-rural relations in Europe.

ESPON-study project 1.1.3: Particular effects of enlargement of the EU and beyond on the polycentric spatial tissue with special attention on discontinuities and barriers.

ESPON-study project 1.1.4: The spatial effects of demographic trends and migration.

ESPON-study project 2.1.1: Territorial impacts of EU transport and TEN policies.

ESPON-study project 2.4.2: Integrated analysis of transnational and national territories based on ESPON results.

ESPON-study project 3.2: Spatial scenarios and orientations in relation to the ESDP and cohesion policy.

ESPON-study project 3.3: Territorial dimension of the Lisbon/Gothenburg process.

¹¹ Under French Presidency, a trend scenario for an "undesirable future situation" has been elaborated by extrapolating current spatial development trends up to the year 2015. This trend scenario was presented at the Informal Council meeting in Strasbourg (March 1995) in form of 3 overview maps, one for each of the main fields of action of the future ESDP (i.e. balanced and polycentric development, parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge, wise management of natural/cultural heritage).

3 Main themes, objectives and application strategies addressed by strategic territorial planning documents elaborated in the context of transnational, cross-border and inter-regional co-operation

3.1 Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC / IIIB programme areas

The different aspects addressed under this section will be reviewed separately for **two main groups** of transnational spatial visioning activities, which all had been subject to an in-depth examination in the context of this study. The **first group** consists of **already elaborated spatial development visions covering the entire transnational co-operation area**, which have been realised either outside the strict context of Community support programmes (Baltic Sea Region) or as a part of INTERREG IIC-IIIB programme activities (North-West Europe, North Sea Region, CADSES, Atlantic Area). Some of these spatial development visions are currently undergoing an up-dating or revision/up-grading process (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe, North Sea Region), while other vision-elaboration processes have come to a stand-still (CADSES) or were only very recently completed (Atlantic Area). The **second group** covers **newly emerging spatial visioning processes** that were launched only very recently in the context of two transnational co-operation areas (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean) and are yet only partly accomplished.

With respect to the **main themes for which issues and/or trends (and possible trend breaks)** related to transnational spatial development **are discussed**, one can observe relatively strong similarities within each of the two main groups identified above.

Within the group of already elaborated transnational spatial development visions, a first set of observations relates to the initially elaborated documents (finalised by 2000/2001 or later under INTERREG IIIB). Generally speaking, all of the initial documents tend to address a wide range of main themes and related issues that are important for spatial development planning and policy. An important reason behind this was certainly the wish to generate a better understanding of particular spatial situations, trends and problems as well of area-internal and wider international relations / inter-dependencies, which previously did not exist. The most comprehensive assessments can be found in the visions for the Baltic Sea Region and CADSES, but also in the Atlantic Area document if one considers the more limited overall purpose of this vision¹² (see also Overview Table 3). Throughout the different documents, assessments generally focus on a present-time situation analysis as well as on some partial past-present trends analysis for some themes. A systematic and prospective trends analysis for all the themes/issues addressed has not been realised, but

¹² i.e. to evaluate the possible shapes of an area-specific polycentricity-model, to develop a territorialized vision of Atlantic polycentricism.

most of these documents contain some qualitative statements with a forward-looking nature ("future challenges"). Only in the CADSES-vision document, a deliberately future-oriented perspective has been adopted for assessing the spatial impacts of European integration and more specifically of the forthcoming Eastern enlargement of the EU.¹³ A second set of observations can be made for the limited number of vision up-dating / upgrading processes, which are currently under way in various transnational co-operation areas. Whereas the process launched under the North-West Europe programme adopts a relatively wide thematic focus, probably for balancing out some weaknesses of the INTERREG IIC vision document, the Baltic Sea Region and the North-Sea Region processes tend to adopt a more narrow thematic focus. Especially in the Baltic Sea Region (BSR), the recently started VASAB-vision upgrading process (2004/2005) deliberately aims at re-orienting the scope of themes to be covered by a future long-term spatial development perspective. The focus is now on the most important transnational themes with a direct relevance for BSR spatial integration (i.e. transport corridors, development zones, transnational tourist routes, urban networks). This new orientation tries however to achieve a fairly balanced approach between these specific themes and more general aspects, as an exploration of ways how to tackle common problems will be continued (i.e. for issues such as rural area development, urban issues, natural and cultural heritage).

The newly emerging spatial visioning processes, recently launched under the INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space and Western Mediterranean (MEDOCC), adopt both a wide thematic focus. The "Prospective Study" on the sustainable territorial development in the Alpine Space assesses - in a first part - trends for a wide range of different issues mainly related to economy, social aspects and environment / nature¹⁴. Beyond this, numerous other relevant trends were identified and attention was also paid to highlight main future territorial development trends. In the context of the MEDOCC programme, the two Interreg IIIB study projects that can be considered as preparatory work for a spatial vision covering the Western Mediterranean area investigated territorial challenges that EU-Mediterranean regions are facing either for a larger number themes (AMAT)¹⁵ or in relation to the metropolitan / urban systems and polycentric development (C2M)¹⁶. The recently started "Medisdec-Stratmed"

¹³ With respect to this issue, also 3 complex and future-oriented scenarios for the Eastern-enlargement of the EU and their respective impact on the area's spatial structure had been elaborated. Scenario 1: "Euro-Realism" (continuation of existing trends). Scenario 2: "Deadlock Integration" (change for the worse). Scenario 3: Intensifying Integration (change for the better).

¹⁴ The main territorial trends identified are: dynamic increase of natural hazards; loss of habitats and biodiversity; variety of landscapes endangered; increasing pressure on natural resources and natural heritage; growing importance of accessibility to infrastructure and knowledge; overaging population; growing interest in higher education, but also stronger competition between universities; emerging opportunities for European cities and R&D location.

¹⁵ Main challenges identified are the risks of economic and spatial fragmentation, the risks of environmental fragmentation, the imbalances which may occur in the territorial evolution of the Mediterranean basin and the challenges in the transport sector. A number of trends were also analysed with respect to the governance and co-operation systems (i.e. role of regions and states, evolution of the various types of co-operation).

¹⁶ The main objective of the C2M Project (concluded in 2005) was to contribute to the reduction of regional and territorial inequalities in Europe through the strengthening of the metropolitan and urban systems in the MEDOCC area. An additional objective was to create, through the strengthening of cooperation between the metropolitan areas of the MEDOCC space, the

project, which focuses on the elaboration of a spatial vision for the MEDOCC area, primarily investigates spatially relevant themes in relation to the ESDP, the new European priorities of the Lisbon-Göteborg strategy and the national/regional priorities with respect to territorial cohesion and competitiveness.

Overview Table 3: Main themes addressed by transnational spatial development visions

Main themes and related issues addressed	CADSES *)	Atlantic Area	Baltic Sea Region	North Sea Region	North-West Europe			
	Status by 2000/2001	Status by 2005	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent up-dating	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent up-dating		
Issues related to the general external and internal context of the transnational area								
Positioning in the European & EU context	++	+	++	+	++	0	++	++
Positioning in the wider international / worldwide context	0	0/+	++	+	+	0	++	+
Basic physical & geographical conditions	++	+	++	0	++	0	++	+
Population structure & demographic change	++	++	++	0	++	++	+	++
Issues related to the economic system and the social situation								
Productive fabric, structural change, industrial reconversion,	++	++	++	+	++	0	+	++
Research, technology & innovation	+	+	++	+	++	++	0/+	++
Trade links among the countries / regions	++	0	++	0	0/+	0	0	0
Competitiveness & productivity	++	++	++	+	++	0	0	++
Economic growth & regional disparities	++	++	++	0	++	0	+	++
Labour market, employment & unemployment structure, patterns of qualification	++	++	++	0	+	0	+	++
Social cohesion and patterns of social disintegration	++	0/+	++	0	+	0	0	+
Changing life styles & new needs of population	+	0	+	0	++	++	0/+	+
*) For the document elaborated by the VISION-Planet project.								
Intensity of consideration: 0 =not at all; + = to some extent (with larger gaps); ++ = extensively covered								

conditions for territorial cohesion and competitiveness. The third objective was to favour European polycentricity according to the ESDP.

Main themes and related issues addressed	CADESSES *)	Atlantic Area	Baltic Sea Region		North Sea Region		North-West Europe	
	Status by 2000/2001	Status by 2005	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent up-dating	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent up-dating	Status by 2000/2001	Focus of recent up-dating
Issues related to the settlement system								
Urban system & city networks	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++
Rural areas & sparsely populated areas	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	+
New rural-urban relationship	++	++	++	++	++	+	+	++
Issues related to the communication links								
Transport infrastructure, transport flows, internal and external accessibility	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
Telecommunication and information infrastructures, overall accessibility	+	+	+ / ++	++	+	0	+	++
Energy networks and energy provision status	0/+	0	++	0	++	++	0	+
Issues related to environment, natural and cultural heritage								
Status of environmental media (air, water, soil, etc.)	+	+	++	0	+	0	+	+
Waste management and water management	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0
Biodiversity, protection of natural heritage, green networks	++	0	++	0	++	0	++	++
Cultural heritage & cultural landscapes	++	+	++	0	++	0	++	++
Climate change and natural hazards	+	++	++	++	++	0	+	++
Issues related to areas with specific problems & potentials								
Border areas	++	++	++	0	0	0	+	0
Coastal zones & islands, integrated costal zone management	+ / ++	++	++	++	++	++	+	+
Mountain areas	++	+	0	0	0	0	0/+	+
Issues related to the governance system								
Basic features of territorial administration	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0
National/regional spatial planning policies	++	++	++	0/+	0/+	0	0	+
Existing spatial plans and legislation	++	++	++	0/+	0	0	0	+
National/regional sector policies	++	+	+	0/+	+	0	0	+
*) For the document elaborated by the VISION-Planet project.								
Intensity of consideration: 0 =not at all; + = to some extent (with larger gaps); ++ = extensively covered								

As concerns the **territorial impacts of different EU and national / regional policies** that are important factors influencing on issues and/or trends related to spatial development, one can generally observe that the large majority of transnational spatial visioning processes show a well-developed level of awareness in relation to such effects.

Within the group of already elaborated transnational spatial development visions, only three out of the five initial vision documents have quite extensively taken into consideration territorial impacts resulting from different EU and national / regional policies (i.e. Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, Atlantic Area). Among these three vision documents, the most comprehensive coverage of related aspects has been realised in the context of the relatively long-lasting VASAB-spatial visioning process (see text box below). But also the vision documents elaborated for CADSES and more recently for the Atlantic Area have taken into consideration a wide range of policy-related territorial impacts, however mostly in their preparatory "background reports". Compared to the above-mentioned examples, one has to conclude that very little if no attention at all was devoted to these important aspects by the initial spatial vision documents elaborated for the North Sea Region and the North-West Metropolitan Area under INTERREG IIC. Only during the recent vision up-dating processes launched under the INTERREG IIIB programmes North-Sea Region and North-West Europe, substantial "catch-up efforts" are realised mostly in the context of the various thematic background studies elaborated for this purpose.

Among the newly emerging spatial visioning processes launched under the INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space and Western Mediterranean, especially the study projects with a wide thematic focus (i.e. "Prospective Study" for the Alpine Space; "AMAT-project") have quite extensively considered territorial impacts of a number of EU policies¹⁷ as well as of national / regional policies. Under the thematically more focussed "C2M project", territorial impacts of EU and national policies were taken into consideration more selectively (transport and innovation policies were particularly investigated).

If one looks at **the goals and policy aims promoted by the various transnational spatial visioning processes** examined in the context of this study, two introductory observations can be made. Only the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions contain well-arranged objective-systems that set out overall development goals and policy aims for addressing particular features / problems and future challenges in the respective co-operation areas. In case of the newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean), it is yet too early for making a clear statement on goals and policy aims that will be pursued in the future.

¹⁷ The Prospective Study for the Alpine Area mainly considered the following EU policies: the Common Agricultural Policy, the EU's research and development policy and the Structural Funds policies. The AMAT project mainly considered the following EU policies: the Common Agricultural Policy, the Structural Funds policies, the EU's research and development policy, the Common Transport policy and the EU's environmental policy.

Baltic Sea Region, the VASAB process between 1994-2004 and beyond

The major documents produced by the VASAB process between 1994 and 2004 have generally well taken into consideration territorial impacts resulting from different EU or national / regional policies.

- Impact of the transition process in Eastern European countries during the 1990s and subsequent steps towards EU-enlargement (1996-2004).
- EU-transport policy (e.g. TEN-T network, TINA-process) and national transport policies (all transport modes; existing infrastructure).
- National and international energy policies (pipelines, nuclear power plants, electricity networks).
- EU's Common Agricultural Policy and national policies for agriculture and rural development.
- International conventions in the field of environment (e.g. RAMSAR-convention, HELCOM-convention), EU-level environmental policy (NATURA 2000 network), national environmental policies (legally protected areas).
- Bilateral or multilateral cross-border co-operation (e.g. impact of inter-state co-operations in the field of spatial planning commissions; regional/local initiatives) and EU-support to cross-border co-operation.
- EU Cohesion Policy, especially project-level transnational co-operation under INTERREG IIC.
- National spatial planning policies and main problems / issues addressed in this context, as well as new territorial trends revealed through European-wide initiatives in the field of spatial development (e.g. ESPD adopted by the EU; CEMAT process in the context of the Council of Europe).

During the upgrading process started by VASAB in 2004/2005, different EU and/or national policies as well as their main territorial impacts are considered:

- The EU Transport Policy, which has as the main territorial impact to strengthening large cities and their co-operation, generally tends to influence on the trends of a growing peripheralisation and of a weakening accessibility.
- The EU Maritime Policy, which has an impact on the integrated development of coastal zones including off-shore areas, generally tends to influence on the trend of managing conflicts in coastal zones.
- The EU Environmental Policy, which has as the main territorial impact to favour the protection of specific areas, generally tends to influence on the trend of an increasing pressure on linking protection with development in protected areas (i.e. NATURA 2000 areas);
- National transport policies, which have an impact on the clustering of cities and the enhancement of the development of territories adjacent to the linear transport infrastructure as well as on a strengthening of polycentricity at meso and local levels, generally tend to influence on the trend of spatial integration/disintegration.
- National innovation policies, which have an impact on the clustering of cities and the strengthening of spatial development zones, generally tend to influence on the trend of spatial integration/disintegration.
- National urban development policies, which have an impact on strengthening polycentricity at meso and local levels, generally tend to influence on the trend of spatial integration/disintegration.

At a very general level, one can observe that already elaborated transnational spatial development visions as well as documents produced by newly emerging spatial visioning processes all contain direct references to wider spatial development policy goals / objectives that were defined in the "European Spatial Development Perspective" (ESDP) and in CEMAT's "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development on the European Continent". More recently elaborated spatial visions (Atlantic Area), ongoing up-dating / upgrading processes (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Area, North-West Europe) and newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean) also directly refer themselves to the over-arching objectives of the EU's Lisbon-Göteborg Strategy.

Beyond these common aspects, however, one can observe a number of marked differences with respect to the structural features of the objective-systems in the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions. Two different approaches can be distinguished:

- The first approach identifies a number of basic values and spatial development principles and contains an explicit vision-statement, which highlights a desired development status to be reached in the transnational area over a long-term perspective. From the vision-statement a limited number of overall development goals are then derived, in relation to which strategic policy aims are subsequently elaborated (i.e. visions elaborated for the Baltic Sea Region¹⁸ and the North Sea Region¹⁹).
- The second approach is mainly characterized by the absence of an explicit overall vision statement in the respective documents. Instead, the documents directly identify a number of overall development goals that are each further deepened by strategic policy aims for spatial development (e.g. visions elaborated for CADSES²⁰, North-West Europe²¹ and the Atlantic Area²²).

If one looks finally at the more recent development of some of these existing transnational visions, it can be observed that especially the VASAB up-grading process for the Baltic Sea Region and the NorVision up-dating process tend to stronger focus their future goals/policy aims on specific themes. Only in case of

¹⁸ In the initial VASAB document of 1994, one single vision statement was formulated to which 4 major themes were related (i.e. "Pearls" - an urban network of international importance; "Strings" - effective and sustainable links between cities; "Patches" - areas supporting dynamism and quality of life; "System" - comprehensive spatial planning in function). With respect to these major themes, in total 14 different policy aims were formulated.

¹⁹ The initial North-Sea Region document (NorVision) has formulated an overall vision that consists of 10 individual vision statements (4 statements relate to the North-Sea Region as a whole, 4 statements relate to the urban regions and 2 statements relate to rural areas). For each of these vision-statements, a larger number of "aims" and "strategies" were subsequently formulated.

²⁰ The initial CADSES-vision (VISION PLANET document "Guidelines and Policy Proposals") has identified 5 "fields of activity" for the development of transnational area, in relation to which a larger number of not clearly identifiable policy aims were defined. In addition, also 4 "principal objectives" for spatial development policy were identified.

²¹ The initial NWMA-vision document identified 6 "principles" for the development perspective, in relation to which a total of 28 policy aims were formulated.

²² The recently elaborated vision document for the Atlantic Area has identified 2 "strategic guidelines", in relation to which a number of more general policy aims were formulated.

the North-West Europe up-dating process, future goals/policy aims continue focussing on the wider range of basic principles defined under the INTERREG IIC vision document.

Whereas the newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space and Western Mediterranean) have not yet resulted in an elaboration of concrete operational provisions, **the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions all contain a consistent and more or less well-elaborated "application strategy"**. None of these vision documents has a binding status, wherefore operational provisions in these application strategies do not generate "formal obligations" with respect to plans drawn up or activities realised at lower levels of government (national, regional, local). The application strategies are all mostly indicative reference frameworks, which have as the main purpose to orientate and inspire concrete actions that could be realised in the future. All of the initially elaborated vision documents state - directly or indirectly - that their operational provisions should generally be taken into consideration by a wide range of different stakeholders from national, regional and local government levels, but also by other non-governmental stakeholders (e.g. research institutes; sector-specific institutions, associative organisations etc).

Beyond these similarities, one can observe considerable differences among the application strategies especially with respect to their stakeholder-orientation, the issue of mental appropriation / ownership and the level of actual up-take of operational provisions in practice.

The stakeholder-orientation of application strategies in already elaborated transnational spatial development visions is strongly conditioned by the way how they are presented. By looking at their basic structural features (i.e. themes/topics addressed, degree of further differentiation), one can highlight the following:

- The most elaborated and well-differentiated application strategies are certainly those of the visions for CADSES, the Atlantic Area and the North-Sea Region. The first two documents formulate a large number of "policy recommendations" or "policy proposals" for the same topics previously addressed under the objective-system (goals / policy aims). The initial NorVision-document adopts a slightly different approach. It identifies 9 "key themes" for integrated planning approaches and sustainable development that are somehow cross-cutting the 10 development vision statements. The application strategy is then further differentiated by a specific annex, in which a large number of concrete project suggestions are elaborated (see text box below).
- Compared to the above, one can observe that the application strategies in the initial vision documents of North-West Europe and the Baltic Sea Region (VASAB 2010 document) were not this elaborated and well-differentiated. Although they address the same topics as under the respective objective-system, only a few policy recommendations and suggestions for concrete transnational activities / projects were elaborated in relation to these topics. Due to this, the VASAB process has already

quite early focussed on further refining the operational dimension of the initial vision document during the subsequent up-dating activities realised in 1996 and 2000/2001.²³ Only more recently, however, a similar objective is pursued by the vision up-dating process launched under the INTERREG IIIB programme North-West Europe.

North Sea Region, types of projects suggested in the "NorVision" document

In a specific annex to the NorVision document, the Vision Working Group has elaborated a larger number of project ideas that were grouped according to the 10 vision statements. These suggestions, which have the purpose to demonstrate possible ways of concrete action, should however be developed in line with the 9 "key themes for sustainable development". Four different types of project ideas were suggested:

- *Development studies: Certain types of shared problems and opportunities in the NSR have already been well researched. Nevertheless a common strategy to tackle these issues is often missing. Other issues have not gained sufficient attention and need deeper analysis. Proposed projects focus on the identification of joint efforts among the North Sea countries.*
- *Implementation projects: These proposals aim at preparing the practical implementation of development measures, especially as regards technical and social infrastructure.*
- *Networking projects: Many of these proposals deal with the establishment of networks to pursue common aims. Networking is essential to raise awareness on shared issues and joining forces may enhance the effectiveness of action.*
- *Best practice projects: These proposals aim at collecting and evaluating different national approaches on a variety of issues with a view to stimulate the transfer of know-how across the NSR, and across European macro-regions.*

The stakeholders actually targeted might subsequently develop (or not) a relationship in form of **"mental appropriation and ownership" with respect to these application strategies**. The probability of its existence could alternatively be described by the extent to which a transnational vision (and its application strategy) is experienced as useful and important by actors to whom it is actually addressed.²⁴ The level of mental appropriation / ownership in case of transnational visions is therefore less depending upon the document's formal status, but much stronger influenced by the way how and to which degree the actors targeted could previously contribute to the elaboration of the spatial vision document and its application strategy (see also section 5.2). Baring in mind these general remarks, one can observe the following aspects when comparing the different transnational vision documents examined:

²³ At the 4th Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development in Stockholm (October 1996), the VASAB-document "From Vision to Action" was adopted. The following up-dating process launched in 2000/2001 has led to the adoption of the document "VASAB 2010+ Spatial Development Action Programme", which was adopted at the 5th Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and Development in Wismar in September 2001. The "Spatial Development and Action Programme" defined the future role of VASAB and further specified concepts and priorities for the 6 "key themes".

²⁴ See also Zonneveld, W.: Expansive spatial planning: The new European transnational spatial visions. Paper presented at the AESOP-ACSP- Conference Leuven/Belgium (8-12 July 2003).

- Only the early spatial visioning process in the North Sea Area has realised a bottom-up consultation before the final editing of the NorVision document and its application strategy explicitly stresses the need for realising a “continuing dialogue” with the concerned key stakeholders in the area. This ex-ante consultation approach is also pursued further during the current NorVision up-dating process. A similar bottom-up consultation process has also been realised more recently in the context of the spatial vision elaboration process in the Atlantic Area.
- For the other early transnational spatial development visions (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe, CADSES), broad stakeholder consultation processes taking place before the final publication were not organised. Their application strategies must therefore be considered “expert-based top-down approaches”, in relation to which often a relatively low level of mental appropriation/ownership has subsequently developed. As a reaction to such initial weaknesses, one can observe that in several cases efforts had been made to improve the stakeholder-orientation of application strategies and to create more favourable conditions to enhance mental ownership. A good example is the VASAB process in the Baltic Sea Region. Here, the application strategy of the 1994 document had been further elaborated quite early (1996-2001) and a more extensive use of preparatory bottom-up consultations will now be made during the recently started up-grading processes (since 2004/2005). But also in the vision up-dating process under the North-West Europe programme, similar efforts are made.²⁵

For the five already elaborated transnational spatial development visions, a comparative appraisal of the **practical application results achieved (i.e. the extent to which operational provisions were subsequently taken up by the targeted stakeholders)** is difficult to realise. This partly due to a generally lacking application experience, which can be observed in one case where the first-time vision elaboration was only very recently completed (Atlantic Area). In many other cases, this is mainly due to a lack of up-dated information on such aspects that have more or less similar levels of concreteness. This, in turn, is either the consequence of a de-facto stand-still of one visioning process (CADSES) or of not existing systematic follow-up evaluations that could have been realised by the “promoters” of still on-going transnational spatial visioning processes (North Sea Area, North-West Europe). Only for the long-lasting VASAB process, substantial information and follow-up assessments are available that allows establishing a quite extensive assessment of application results achieved.

- In the context of **North-West Europe**, the initial spatial visioning process has certainly contributed to establish a transnational network of planning professionals and to enrich the debate on transnational co-operation in the field of spatial planning. The vision document properly speaking and the consultation report were also of a certain use in drafting the INTERREG

²⁵ The up-dating process under Interreg IIIB has realised three thematic studies, in the context of which a series of workshops was organised at national level for each of the respective themes. The purpose of these workshops was to collect ideas and opinions from key stakeholders both for identifying theme-related planning issues and possible projects for future transnational co-operation.

IIIB programme and could inspire various co-operation projects subsequently supported under the programme. Beyond this, however, it can not be observed that the political and administrative appropriation of the initial vision contents was substantial.

- In the case of **NorVision**, it was decided from the start that it would only be an inspiring document that should not substitute national planning documents or aim at becoming a transnational “masterplan”. NorVision was also not conceived as a framework for evaluating sector-specific policies at national, regional and local levels. Despite these initial limitations, the themes identified in NorVision were used as a backbone for drafting the INTERREG IIIB North Sea Programme. A significant number of subsequently realised transnational projects have also helped to put the visions and strategies identified by NorVision into practice. Due to the fact that NorVision underwent a broad consultation process, also new networks not only among planning professionals could be created. Finally, some evidence exists that NorVision has also been taken into account especially by regional planning activities.
- The **CADSES visioning process** realised in the context of the “Vision Planet” project has allowed widening the already established co-operation on spatial planning in Western Europe towards the Central and South-Eastern European states. Furthermore, it has contributed to an increased co-operation between these states themselves. The vision document itself also constituted a basis for a further development of national spatial development concepts and thus made an important contribution to the co-ordination of pre-accession instruments (such as PHARE and ISPA) at national level and also to a more efficient use of these EU funds. Despite these positive achievements, one has to observe that the spatial development vision has only occasionally been used as a reference document by the current INTERREG IIIB programme bodies. This is mainly due to the fact that during the early preparation / implementation phase of the INTERREG IIIB programme it was hardly possible to draw direct conclusions from the vision document with respect to operational programme priorities.²⁶
- Since the publication of the initial VASAB 2010 document in 1994, a quite impressive list of results has been achieved in the **Baltic Sea Region** that stands out among the other spatial visioning processes. During the first

²⁶ Information based upon a reply in reaction to a questionnaire sent to the INTERREG IIIB programme secretariat (the remarks also concern the partial vision document produced by the “ESTIA” project): In the opinion of the current programme authorities, a vision is not and can not be a blue print for implementation. Of course it can be a first step for preparing a scenario that might be better suited for the development of operational objectives, but such a scenario was neither developed for CADSES nor for its sub-regions. Some reasons for this are the following: One could imagine that there was just not sufficient time and energy to work on a vision while programme actors were clearly forced to develop a common management structure, which itself turned out to be a difficult and energy consuming task for member states. One could also imagine that the war in Yugoslavia had an “indirect impact” on this, as bombers were crossing the Adriatic from Italy and Germany towards Belgrade while member states met to prepare CADSES. What vision can one expect from countries on both sides of the front that at the same time participated in CADSES.

years (1994-2000), the VASAB co-operation framework helped "binding together" EU-countries with non-EU countries in the Baltic Sea Region and allowed establishing a new forum for discussion on spatial development policy issues. It helped to improve the basic knowledge on spatial development processes and challenges, strengthened spatial planning at national and regional levels and facilitated the elaboration of a sustainable development strategy for the transnational co-operation area. In addition, "own" VASAB pilot projects were initiated for demonstrating the benefits from transnational co-operation in spatial development and for identifying ways how to implement the spatial development vision. The VASAB process has also made a decisive contribution to elaborate the INTERREG IIC programme for the Baltic Sea Region and inspired many INTERREG IIC projects, the ESDP elaboration process and other emerging transnational spatial visioning processes. After a critical review of past activities, realised during the up-dating process that has led in 2001 to the adoption of the "VASAB 2010+" report ("Spatial Development and Action Programme"), some of the previous actions were continued or re-focussed and new ones were launched alongside the principles, key themes and lines for action set out in the VASAB 2010+ document. This allowed further expanding the list of previously achieved results and the current status (by 2004/2005) of practically applying the VASAB-approach in the Baltic Sea Region can be summarised as follows (see text box below).

Baltic Sea Region (BSR), summary of the most important results achieved by the VASAB process between 1994 and 2004/2005

The application of the VASAB approach has allowed to better conceptualising one's thinking about the location of the BSR in a wider European context (territorial positioning function): VASAB is considered to be the "common Baltic voice", i.e. it allows reaching consensus on the most important spatial priorities for development of the BSR. This consensus-based process, taking place during meetings of the "Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region" (CSD-BSR), includes also an examination of the BSR position in the wider European context. The vision documents have served as a reference document for many BSR stakeholders and thus helped developing a "BSR-identity" and positioning the BSR in the European and global activities of those stakeholders.

The application of the VASAB approach has fulfilled the function of a discussion and consensus building framework for the elaboration of INTERREG IIC/IIIB programmes: The vision document of 1994 has served as one of the main inputs for elaborating the INTERREG IIC programme. In the year 2000/2001, VASAB has again contributed to the elaboration of the INTERREG IIIB programme for the BSR. Preliminary results of the ongoing up-dating process, leading to the adoption of the "VASAB 2010+" document in 2001 ("Spatial Development Action Programme"), were incorporated into the programme.

The application of the VASAB approach has contributed to establish a transnational network of planning professionals: The CSD-BSR of VASAB is a network of planning professionals from the national level. During each CSD-BSR meeting there is time reserved for exchange of professional information about changes of spatial planning in the BSR countries. Periodical seminars and workshops are organised for a broader audience to discuss spatial planning methodological issues. In 2003, VASAB organised a seminar on Spatial National Strategic Documents and Policies. In addition,

the identification of good practices in transnational spatial development is likely to be provided by the INTERREG IIIB project "Commin".

The application of the VASAB approach has provided suggestions for preparing INTERREG IIC/IIIB projects that translate the objectives / contents of the vision into concrete action: The vision document of 1994 has helped to inspire many INTERREG IIC projects that address aspects promoted by VASAB 2010. The "Spatial Development Action Programme" and the Wismar Declaration of 2001, adopted at the 5th Ministerial Conference, have provided suggestions on possible focuses for INTERREG IIIB projects. Several of the 6 "key themes" for transnational co-operation on sustainable spatial development (promoted by the VASAB 2010+ document) are currently addressed and taken forward by several INTERREG IIIB projects. Projects such as "South Baltic Arc", "String II" "Metropolitan Areas+", "MECIBS", "Baltic Palette II", "Seagull" and "Baltic+" address the co-operation of urban regions on key issues of sustainable development (theme 1) and the strategic development of zones important for transnational integration (theme 2). For the issue of transnational transport links important for cross-BSR and cross-Europe integration (theme no 3), important strategic results are to be delivered by the INTERREG IIIB projects "Baltic Gateway", and "BaSIM". Positive expectations in relation to a more effective integration of the mobility network in the BSR are associated with the INTERREG IIIB project "Rail Baltica", which was approved in 2005. With regard to an integrated development of coastal zones and islands (theme 6), the INTERREG IIIB project "Baltcoast" is expected to make an interesting contribution.

The application of the VASAB approach has provided guidance for project selection under INTERREG IIC/IIIB: The VASAB Secretariat took active part in project assessment teams both under Interreg IIC and IIIB. The link to VASAB is part of the assessment procedure (see the application form). VASAB members form also part of INTERREG programme's Steering Committee.

The application of the VASAB approach has provided a reference framework for influencing strategic planning at state, regional and local levels: In many BSR countries, especially the new EU-Member States, VASAB documents were used in national and regional planning. An example is Latvia, where VASAB-recommendations on spatial planning in the coastal zone have been incorporated to the national law. In Lithuania, the construction of the bi-polar system of Vilnius-Kaunas was inspired by VASAB. In Poland, the "South Baltic Arc project" initiated by the Wismar Ministerial Conference of 2001 reshaped spatial visions of three coastal regions of Northern Poland. In Germany, the "Baltcoast" project results were used for preparing the off-shore plan in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. In the core area of the BSR, the "Baltic Palette" joint strategies are essential parts of Swedish regional development policies and programmes. In other parts of Sweden, similar actions have been taken to integrate results from the VASAB documents/INTERREG projects into regional development frameworks. A recent achievement with regard to supporting co-ordination of sectoral planning is the VASAB-driven "East-West Forum" project of TACIS. It aims at capacity building among Russian spatial planners to make them engaging more actively into transnational co-operation.

The application of the VASAB approach has to some extent provided a reference framework for evaluating sector-specific policies at state, regional and local levels: VASAB related documents are used by some countries for an evaluation of strategic infrastructural investments. An example is the "Rail Baltica" transport project conducted in the Baltic States.

With respect to **the overall geographical focus adopted** by the different transnational spatial visioning processes examined, one can observe some strong similarities.

A first similarity characterising already elaborated transnational spatial development visions is that the assessments of territorial challenges/trends, the objective-systems and the application strategies in the respective documents are predominantly "inward-looking". Although this highly focussed view on the respective transnational programme area can somehow be understood, it is however equally important to adopt more systematically an "outward-looking" perspective that relates the transnational area to the wider European and world-wide context. In doing so, it might well be the case that some aspects identified as particularly relevant for transnational spatial development will slightly change in nature, especially if one considers the increasing Europe-wide and global interdependencies for some specific issues (i.e. international transport flows, direct investment flows & capital movements, global climate change). In the context of the recent vision updating and up-grading / revision processes, one can however observe a growing interest in adopting a view that goes beyond the formal boundaries of the respective co-operation area. Themes for which such an extended view is most frequently adopted are European and global aspects of transport connections, including the "Motorways of the Sea" and the connectivity to TEN-T and pan-European transport corridors (Baltic Sea Region, North-Sea Region, North-West Europe), the marketing of area-specific assets (Baltic Sea Region) and energy-related issues (North-Sea Region). An interesting and somehow more systematic effort in this direction has been made in the context of the newly emerging spatial visioning process, launched under the INTERREG IIIB programmes Alpine Space (see text box below).

"Prospective Study on the sustainable development of the Alpine Space"

Under this study, an interesting approach is adopted for the elaboration of the 6 visions (scenarios) that follow two main logics.

In the first logic (visions 1, 2 and 3), the Alpine Space is in priority addressed as an area of internal regulation that has to manage its own diversity, to arbitrate its internal conflicts, to find accommodations between contradictory stakes concerning it. The Alpine Space remains concerned by itself.

In the second logic (visions 4, 5 and 6), the Alpine Space is regarded in a larger global perspective of Europe and the world. The stake is not its internal regulation in priority any more, but its integration in these encompassing areas, the preservation of its specificity, the role that it plays at a higher level.

These two logics do not exclude each other, but are complementary. However, they lead to significant differences when understanding transnational cooperation.

A second similarity is that all transnational spatial development visions generally contain geographically differentiated approaches that focus on specific sub-zones located in the wider context of the transnational co-operation area. This

approach is normally applied throughout the different main elements of the various vision documents, i.e. the assessments of territorial challenges/trends, the objective-systems and the application strategies. Geographical differentiation is continued to be adopted in the context of the recent updating and up-grading / revision processes (Baltic Sea Region, North-Sea Region, North-West Europe) as well as by the newly emerging spatial visioning processes (Alpine Space, Western Mediterranean).

3.2 Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA / IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them

The four cross-border spatial development concepts elaborated during the second half of the 1990s, which were examined more in-depth in the context of this study²⁷, show a number of similarities. They are relatively strong with respect to the main themes for which issues and/or trends related to spatial development are discussed, but also regarding the most important goals / policy aims that are promoted by these spatial development concepts. Equally important are however the sometimes considerable differences that can be observed among the four concepts. They are particularly evident when it came to considering territorial impacts resulting from different EU and national policies and with respect to the application strategy of the spatial development concepts, but also to some extent with respect to the geographical focus adopted by these documents.

The **main themes addressed** for establishing a comprehensive diagnosis of the present-time situation prevailing in the cross-border area are quite similar across the 4 spatial development concepts examined, but sometimes variations do exist with respect to extent / intensity of consideration (see also Overview Table 4). In some cases a wider range of themes and related sub-themes has been considered during the preparation phase that were subsequently "merged" under more compact or cross-thematic headings in the final version of the cross-border spatial development concepts (e.g. F/E, D/F). With respect to future development trends (possible trend breaks), only the "Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 of the Euregio Rhein-Waal" (D/NL) contains an explicit trends-assessment for all main themes addressed. The others either indirectly mention trends in the context of theme-specific comments (D/F, E/F) or contain no such references at all (D/PL).

²⁷ Euregio Rhein-Waal (D/NL): "Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 Euregio Rhein-Waal" of 2001. PAMINA (D/F): "Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region" of 2002. Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina (D/PL): "Development and action concept of the Euroregion Viadrina" of 1999. Border between France and Spain (F/E): "Livre Blanc de l'Eurocité Bayonne – San Sebastian" of 2000.

Overview Table 4: Main themes addressed by the 4 cross-border spatial development concepts

Main themes addressed	F/E: Eurocity White Paper	D/PL: Viadrina 2000 concept	D/NL: Euregio Rhein- Waal concept	D/F: PAMINA region concept
Basic physical conditions of the cross-border area	++	++	++	++
Cross-border area & wider European, transnational and national context	++	+	++	++
Settlement structure & urban system / network	++	+	++	+
Rural areas, agriculture & rural-urban relationship	0/+	0/+	++	++
Population structure & demographic evolution	+	++	++	++
Transport infrastructure, transport flows, public transport & overall accessibility	++	+	++	++
Information/communication infrastructures & overall accessibility	++	0	++	0/+
Situation & availability of other public services / infrastructures *)	++	0/+	+	++
Economic fabric, structural change, industrial reconversion, quality of locational factors	++	++	++	++
Research, technology & innovation	++	+	++	++
Labour market and qualification	+	++	++	++
Environment, nature & cultural heritage	++	++	++	++
Current state of cross-border co-operation and level of integration	++	++	++	++
*) e.g. waste disposal / sewage water treatment, fresh water provision, health care services, recreational infrastructures/services				
Intensity of consideration: 0=not at all; += to some extent (with larger gaps); ++ = extensively covered				

With respect to the **territorial impacts of different EU and national / regional policies** that are important factors influencing territorial development, one can generally observe that none of the concepts examined has carried out a sufficiently comprehensive assessment of the related effects emerging in the respective cross-border areas. This is somehow astonishing, as during the 1990s a growing number of widely accessible strategic assessments and studies was elaborated at EU-level that assessed in-depth the spatial consequences of the wider European integration process (i.e. Internal Market; EU-enlargement) and especially the sometimes considerable territorial impacts of various EU-policies. Although not directly geared towards the cross-border context, use could at least have been made of these studies by key stakeholders in border areas for raising the awareness on such aspects during the elaboration of their cross-border development concepts.

- Among the four cross-border spatial development concepts examined, only the “White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian” (F/E) has explicitly used such EU-level strategic studies such as Europe 2000+ and

made quite frequently reference to territorial impacts resulting from the wider European integration process, from specific EU-level policies and from national, regional or local policies (see also text box below).

- The other concepts elaborated along the borders between D/PL, D/NL and D/F have directly or indirectly addressed some isolated aspects, mostly related to the Common Transport Policy (TEN-T), the EU's environmental policy (NATURA 2000, new EU-wide legal standards) and the EU's Structural Funds policy (effects resulting from INTERREG-support).

"White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian"(F/S)

The entire Eurocity-initiative is explicitly embedded into the wider context of an increasingly integrated European Union and the wider effects resulting from a subsequent dismantling of EU-internal borders. This overall process and the related re-orientation of territorial functions is considered to create new potentials for a more integrated development, but also new challenges that manifest themselves simultaneously at all government levels and across different public policies. This requires an extended view towards the external environment and a new consideration of the area's own situation as well as a new conceptual approach for actually realising a new type of integrated development. Against this wider context, the White Paper has taken into consideration / makes reference to a number of territorial impacts that are related to specific Community policies:

- *The increasing restriction of public budgets in the domestic context, due to the realisation of the EU's economic and monetary union.*
- *Need for local/regional/national adaptations, due to the introduction of new EU legislation with regard to telecommunication, transport, water and waste management.*
- *The general objectives of the Commission's White Paper on transport policy and the priority that should be given to rail transport, but also new challenges resulting from the development of high-speed rail technologies and long-distance rail freight transport.*
- *The effects of a future EU-wide harmonisation and liberalisation of public interest services.*
- *The need for making more concrete EU-citizenship and new instruments required for better urban governance (in line with the Commission's White Paper on Governance).*

With regard to the territorial impact of national, regional and local policies, the role of national high-speed rail policies (AVE, TGV) and especially the negative effects resulting from a situation when different territorial or sector-specific policies are "meeting at the border" are taken into consideration. With regard to the latter, the White Paper observes that numerous dysfunctions, area-internal neutralisation effects and double work do exist. With regard to transport policy, for example, all instruments, regulations and administrative directives currently "end" at the common border and thus create a considerable incoherence in the wider cross-border perspective. But also in relation to spatial planning and regional development policies, each side of the border disposes of own instruments and regulations that can not be simply "added" or juxtaposed for achieving a coherent cross-border result. The challenge of creating a new cross-border Eurocity requires therefore that different territorial and sector-policies implemented on either side of the border take better into consideration the wider cross-border territorial dimension and that the institutional representatives co-operate closer towards a common goal.

If one looks at **the goals and policy aims promoted by the various cross-border spatial development concepts**, one can observe quite strong similarities among the objective-systems in the four documents examined.

- At a first level, each of the four cross-border spatial development concepts sets out an overall development goal or a development vision, which briefly highlights a desired future situation that should be reached in a long-term perspective (see also Overview Table 5). This is done either directly through an explicit goal / vision statement (D/PL, D/F, D/NL) or indirectly through the wider purpose assigned to the concept (F/S, realisation of the Eurocity). In the context of the cross-border concepts that were a revision of former planning documents (D/PL, D/NL), one can observe that the previously elaborated long-term development goals were generally maintained and only up-dated to some extent in order to consider more recent evolutions.

Overview Table 5: Overall development goals / vision statements formulated in the 4 cross-border spatial development concepts

F/E: Eurocity White Paper	The wider purpose assigned to the White Paper is to promote the emergence of the "Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian" as a truly cross-border European metropolitan area with 600.000 inhabitants that plays an important role in the wider context of the Atlantic Arc and of the EU, mainly through transforming the current juxtaposition of different administrative entities and the loose grouping of medium-sized cities / smaller towns in the cross-border area.
D/PL: Viadrina 2000 concept	The up-dated overall development goal has been defined as follows in the concept: "Raising the standard of living and increasing the economic capacity through creating a cross-border integrated economic region. Future efforts of the Euroregion in this direction should <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lead to an improvement on the living conditions of the population in the long-term and, considering the different ways of life, reach similar levels on both sides of the border, • increase the economic capacity in order to lower wealth disparities within the Euroregion and to enable a balanced development in the cross-border region under the conditions of a globalised competition."
D/NL: Euroregio Rhein-Waal concept	The up-dated overall development vision has been defined as follows in the concept: "Sustainable development of a European region without borders - the Rhein-Waal region as an area for living and economic activities that is secure in the future and competitive and characterised by a high quality of locational and living conditions within the inter-metropolitan core area of North-West Europe.
D/F: PAMINA region concept	The overall development vision has been defined as follows in the concept: "The PAMINA-area is pre-designated to become a European cross-border model area. The cross-border dimension creates its specificity and allocates to the area a particular attractiveness: decisions on both sides of the border are jointly supported, policy shapes the common future in a co-ordinated manner, PAMINA occupies a singular position in the wider Upper Rhine area and positions itself in the global competition. Little by little, the jointly defined development perspectives will be integrated into planning efforts realised at different levels of subsequently be implemented. The joint cross-border development objectives will be backed by a "cross-border local purpose association" established alongside the provisions of the Karlsruhe-Agreement and new perspectives for a realisation of these objectives will emerge with a further development of legal instruments of European level."

- At a second level, a limited number of strategic aims are formulated for guiding the spatial development policy that should be pursued in the cross-border area to actually achieve the long-term development goal (see also Overview Table 6). Within each of the four planning documents examined, these strategic policy aims normally constitute a "meta-level" that is situated between the overall development goal/vision and the operational part of the concept (i.e. the application strategy).

If one looks at the relationship established by the objective-systems of the four cross-border concepts with wider goals / objectives defined for EU spatial development policy, a relatively astonishing situation can be observed: Only the "Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region" (D/F) and the "White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian" (F/S) make a direct reference to the ESDP, whereas the other two concepts do not explicitly consider this wider EU-dimension in relation to their development goals and policy aims (D/NL, D/PL).

Overview Table 6: Strategic policy aims formulated in the 4 cross-border spatial development concepts

F/E: Eurocity White Paper	The White Paper formulates three "basic objectives" for developing the Eurocity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating an Atlantic platform for intermodal change, communication and information, mainly by transforming the current "transit corridor" into an "Eurocorridor for development". • Structuring the Eurocity as a linear and polycentric metropolitan area organised as a network, mainly by practically managing the territory, the infrastructures and the public service offer in a way that they are well linked and at quality level that corresponds to the standards of other European metropolitan areas. • Protection and proactive use of the area's natural heritage potentials, mainly by applying the principle of environmental excellence in the context of the concept of a "green metropolitan area".
D/PL: Viadrina 2000 concept	The concept formulates two "main objectives" for the future development of the Euroregional territory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strengthening of economic potentials and the lowering of unemployment, while preserving and developing nature and landscape. • The active support to the establishment of good neighbourly relations.
D/NL: Euregio Rhein-Waal concept	The future development of the Euregio should be centred around the following 3 "strategic objectives": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening of the regional economic structure, • Improvement of the regional economic framework conditions, • Intensifying of the regional organisation and integration.
D/F: PAMINA region concept	The future development of the PAMINA area should focus on the following three "basic principles": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development of the PAMINA-area: Improvement of the general living conditions and the environment; mobilising synergies through networking and joint action. • Co-ordinated action in the PAMINA-area: Realisation of a joint spatial development policy with the aim to preserve / extend existing qualities, to use diversity and to ensure balanced development through solidarity. • The European dimension of the PAMINA-area: REGIO PAMINA as a pilot area for the implementation of the ESDP and as a test-area that illustrates the leading role of regionalised action and thinking („Europe in a nutshell").

Each of the 4 cross-border spatial development concepts examined contains a well-elaborated **application strategy**, which constitutes the operational part of the respective planning document. The respective time-horizons of the application strategies either adopt a medium-term perspective with around 5 years (D/PL) or a long-term perspective with 10 or more years (F/E, D/NL, D/F).

- The medium-term application strategy of the “Viadrina 2000 concept” is generally considered a guiding framework for future INTERREG IIIA / PHARE CBC interventions. This relatively narrow approach identifies 7 thematic support priorities, which are however not very consistently related to the two strategic policy aims previously defined in the cross-border spatial development concept²⁸. For these support priorities, the application strategy also identifies a total of 24 different “fields of action” as well as 40 related “suggestions for potential projects”.
- The application strategies with a long-term perspective (F/E, D/NL, D/F) adopt a comparatively wider approach. Their main purpose is to set out a non-binding orientation framework that aims at promoting general cross-border co-operation in the area, also including support interventions from related INTERREG programmes. In addition, the overall design of the application strategies is also relatively more complex compared to the one of the “Viadrina 2000” concept. At a first level, the three long-term concepts normally foresee a limited number of main interventions that are in a consistent way directly related to the previously defined strategic policy aims. The main interventions of the Eurocity White Paper (F/E)²⁹ and the Euregio concept (D/NL)³⁰ are horizontally cross-cutting the different policy aims, whereas those of the PAMINA concept (D/F)³¹ are further differentiated according to a territorial/non-territorial dimension and focussed on specific policy aims. At a second level, each of these main interventions is then made further operational by the definition of a larger number of theme- or area-specific measures³² and of related project proposals that are more or less well-elaborated.³³

The operational part of all application strategies (i.e. the measures and project-proposals) was generally elaborated on ground of the results of specific “bottom-

²⁸ (1) Infrastructure, (2) economy, (3) tourism, (4) environment & nature protection, (5) agriculture & rural development, (6) spatial planning & local/regional development, (7) social aspects, culture science, education youth and sports.

²⁹ The Eurocity – White Paper mentions 10 different “lines of intervention”: Eurocorridor for multimodal transport, logistical bridge-heads, excellence in the field of equipment, own and common symbols, structuring the metropolitan area, competitive public services, support to public transport/ restricting private transport, strengthening of the urban environment, excellence in the field of environment, reinforcement of the existing values.

³⁰ The “Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 Euregio Rhein-Waal” (D/NL) mentions 6 strategic themes: (1) Spatial structure and accessibility, (2) economy, technology and innovation, (3) labour market and qualification, (4) culture and tourism, (5) nature, environment and agriculture, (6) cross-border integration.

³¹ The “Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region” (D/F) contains the following 6 “strategic priorities”: (1) landscape park PAMINA; (2) communication / networked spaces; (3) balanced development of the location or factors; (4) diversity and solidarity; (5) Europe-oriented, networked and co-operative; (6) future chances through integration.

³² F/E: 25 proposed “actions”; D/NL: 56 “options for development & action”, D/F: 109 “potential measures” defined in relation to 20 “sub-objectives”.

³³ D/NL: 208 “fields of action”; D/F: 16 “pilot projects”.

up consultation processes”, which were organised during the preparation phase (see also section 5.2). They involved either a wide range of public and private actors (D/PL, D/F, D/NL) or mostly actors from various public and semi-public organisms located in the cross-border area (F/E). This approach has allowed establishing a close relationship with the key stakeholders that should be addressed by the future planning concept. A particularly interesting “double filtering approach” has been adopted by the PAMINA concept for identifying and selecting potential measures and pilot projects (see text box below).

"Spatial planning scheme for the PAMINA-region" (D/F)

The potential measures and pilot projects listed in the in the "Spatial planning scheme for the PAMINA-region" have been gathered and subsequently selected through a "double filtering process". During an initial phase, proposals have been gathered that where derived - on the one hand - from the requirements for action (based upon the SWOT-analysis realised for PAMINA) and - on the other - from already existing objectives defined for the entire PAMINA-area or for specific sub-areas as well as from actor-specific preferences.

From this overall sample of suggestions, a limited number of measures and project proposals have been filtered out - in a first step - through applying a number of specific "eliminating criteria". Proposals were eliminated if projects have already been realised in this context or are currently implemented, if an implementation has already been tried and subsequently failed or if proposals were not politically validated or where a double-mentioned. Based upon this first selection, the remaining proposals were allocated to the 6 strategic priorities according to their respective implementation contribution. In the second step, a number of pilot projects were selected among the remaining proposals that are particularly important for the PAMINA-area and show a specific relevance / need for related cross-border co-operation efforts. This selection of pilot projects has been realised by applying the following 8 "filtering criteria" (F1-F8):

a) Filtering criteria related to the character of the project

- F1. Demonstration- and lead function of the project and transferability of the approach.*
- F2. The project should not yet exist in this way in the respective area.*
- F3. The project should correspond to existing selection criteria for support (mainly in relation to INTERREG IIIA), in order to ease its implementation.*
- F4. The problem to be solved by the project should be important.*

b) Filtering criteria related to the project content

- F5. The cross-border interest for the project and the cross-border relevance of the project should exist.*
- F6. The theme of the project should have the ability to be well communicated to the wider public (e.g. transport-related projects) and the project should produce a concrete benefit for the wider public.*
- F7. The project should have a link to other projects / pilot projects in order to generate synergy effects.*

c) Filtering criteria related to the project results

- F8. The project should cover the various dimensions of the concept of sustainability.*

The 14 finally selected pilot projects were then directly included in a well-elaborated manner into the cross-border spatial development concept.

Accordingly, most of the application strategies in the final version of the planning documents explicitly address public- and private-sector stakeholders in the cross-border area that are competent in the respective themes mentioned (D/NL, D/F, D/PL). Only the "Eurocity White Paper" application strategy (F/E) seems implicitly to be stronger oriented towards different public policy actors, which can be derived from the general nature of the lines of intervention and measures mentioned.

With respect to the subsequent take-up of operational provisions in the application strategies by stakeholders located in the respective areas, one can observe that they generally allowed initiating and realising a sometimes considerable number of follow-up activities. For those cases where appropriate information has been made available³⁴, one can briefly summarise the situation as follows:

- Since the publication of the "White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian" (F/E) in June 2000, reflections were launched to progressively integrate its proposals for action into the respective territorial or sector-specific policy planning applied on either side of the border. These activities were intended to help converting this virtual reference framework into a truly joint master plan for the development of the Eurocity. In addition, various follow-up activities have been carried out in order to progress towards actually realising the cross-border metropolitan area. These activities focus on 3 strategic themes (i.e. transport, industrial/urban re-conversion and environment) and can be allocated to two wider categories: Firstly, various initiatives covering the entire area of the future Eurocity were realised³⁵ that aim at establishing cross-cutting guidelines for supporting a better structuring of the cross-border territory. Secondly, follow-up actions in the context of sector-specific policies were accomplished.³⁶ They aim at illustrating the concept of a "functional urban zone", which the initiative wishes to develop for applying the ESDP and for putting into place a multi-sectoral policy in the context of a process of co-

³⁴ For the cross-border spatial development concepts D/PL and D/NL no information on this aspect does exist, as the respective "case study questionnaires" were not returned to the researchers.

³⁵ A prospective study on transport infrastructures has been elaborated, which was accomplished in June 2004. A study on local public services in the Eurocity has been realised (December 2000) and another prospective study on the cross-border treatment of waste has been finalised in 2002. The Internet site of the Eurocity (already launched in 1999) was further developed. A measurement indicator system for the Eurocity was progressively created and a structured cross-border observation of different sectoral aspects such as health or housing was put into place (it is based upon a number of sectoral and theme-specific observatories that have been created on either side of the border). Based upon this measurement / observation system, a "Cross-border Mobility Study" was finalised in 2002 that is a point of reference for defining future exchange scenarios and for establishing transport infrastructures especially with regard to the light rail metro that is currently studied. The further integration of the respective Territorial Information Systems existing on either side of the border is also considered an imperative, as cartographic illustration allows better highlighting different aspects of the socio-economic reality.

³⁶ A first step was to suggest a new planning scenario to administrations responsible for certain sector-specific aspects in order to create a set of common "rules for the game". Against this wider background, various sector-specific cross-border working groups have been created (environment & sustainable development, culture & tourism, social services, synergies in the economic structure, sports) and two specific observatories have been established (observatory on public health 1999/2000; observatory on housing and habitat in 2002).

ordinated decision-making between all territorial levels of government involved.

- In case of the "Spatial Planning Scheme for the PAMINA-region" (D/F), the newly established public-law based cross-border local purpose association REGIO-PAMINA has decided in 2002 to take over the results and recommendations of the concept in its future working programme. It was also decided to derive from it a comprehensive orientation framework for the future development of the PAMINA area, the "Orientation Guideline Objectives for the PAMINA-area"³⁷. This framework has an informal character for cities and municipalities in the area and therefore only creates a kind of "self-binding effect" for the public law based cross-border body, its members and its partners. A related document was presented in early 2005 and enumerates the 6 "guideline objectives" together with a number of related potential measures that aim at their implementation.

With respect to **the overall geographical focus adopted** by the different cross-border spatial development concepts examined, one can observe some commonalities and differences among the 4 approaches. All concepts obviously focus their territorial assessments, their objective-system and their application strategies on the targeted cross-border areas. Throughout these main elements of each concept, also a differentiation at the level of sub-areas is elaborated (where necessary) in order to better take into consideration the specific particularities of the cross-border territory. The main difference among the four concepts is the extent to which the wider spatial context has been taken into consideration: Only the "White Paper of the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian" (F/S) and the "Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010 of the Euregio Rhein-Waal" (D/NL) contain specific sections/chapters that aim at "localising" the cross-border area in the transnational and/or European-wide macro-space.

3.3 INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning

The 23 previously identified INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning (see section 2.3) are quite evenly addressing 3 more or less directly related main issues (see also Overview Table 7):

- 9 INTERREG IIIC projects strongly focus on a particular policy and the themes addressed are mostly related to transport policy, environmental policy (in a wider sense) and to land-use / re-conversion policy
- 8 INTERREG IIIC projects strongly focus on themes that are related to specific territorial characteristics or geographical situations of coastal zones and islands, metropolitan / urban areas and of mountainous areas.

³⁷ Zweckverband REGIO PAMINA: Leitziele für den PAMINA Raum – PAMINA Zukunftsregion in Europe (März 2005).

- 6 INTERREG IIIC projects are generally dealing with strategic spatial development planning at the level of NUTS II or NUTS III regions. Some of them are focussing spatial planning in general, while others address planning issues at smaller scale or under a narrow angel (regional planning).

Overview Table 7: Main themes related addressed by the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects

Main Issues	INTERREG IIIC programme zone		
	East	West	South
Planning activities are strongly focussed on a particular policy (e.g. transport policy, environmental policy, R&D-policy etc.).	EARD (airport regions)	AWARE (risk management) ENLoCC (transport & logistic) FLAPP (water & flood management) PIMMS (transport) EWM (waste management) RECORE (coal mining areas) SULFANET (landfills management)	MARE (transport)
Planning activities are strongly focussed on specific territorial characteristics or geographical situations (border areas, coastal zones, urban areas, mountainous areas, islands etc.).	AAP 2020 (Adriatic region)	CoPraNet (coastal management) ESIN (small islands) InterMETREX (urban management)	Polymetrex (metropolitan areas) Coronas Metropolitanas (metropolitan areas), Riverlinks (city-river interface) Euromountains (mountain areas)
Activities are generally dealing with strategic spatial planning at the level of first level regions (NUTS II or NUTS III).	INCORD (for smaller regions)	FARLAND (land development) GRIDS (regional planning) PSPE (participatory spatial planning)	PROGRESDEC DEDEL SDEC (balanced local development & application of the ESDP)

4 The approaches and processes employed for elaborating strategic territorial planning documents in the context of transnational, cross-border and inter-regional co-operation

4.1 Transnational spatial development visions for larger INTERREG IIC / IIIB programme areas

There are different methodological approaches and techniques that can be used for preparing the elaboration of a spatial vision. As a starting point, the elaboration of a spatial vision generally requires a territorial analysis of the area concerned (presentation of the situation and of trends). This is normally realised on ground of quantitative and qualitative approaches and may comprise a global analysis for the entire zone, a series of thematic analyses for the entire zone (population, economy, transport, environment etc.) as well as analyses for various sub-areas. Vision elaboration also requires information about the future in the co-operation area. This information can be provided through linear and more complex / cyclic approaches such as projections and forecasts (modelling) or prospective investigations (scenarios, speculative research). Another important issue are "visualisation approaches", i.e. the use of cartography / mapping for raising awareness / understanding about complex spatial situations or trends and for illustrating the political key messages promoted by the planning document. The mix of approaches used during the preparatory analytical work is normally quite well reflected by the finalised spatial vision document, mostly in the section presenting a summary territorial assessment of the area concerned and in the part highlighting "key issues" relevant for spatial development policy as well as the desired overall territorial development perspective.

Beyond these rather "technical" issues, also the procedural aspects of the co-operative planning process adopted for elaborating a spatial vision are of great importance. This might be briefly illustrated by two possible extreme cases: Preparatory work and the actual drawing-up of a spatial vision can be realised by a small group of administrative planning professionals, who might be supported by some other administrative key actors and by external expert contributions. In the second case, however, the aforementioned actors still realise the essence of the work, but only as one component of a broader participatory approach that involves a wide range of public, private or semi-public key stakeholders located in the area (i.e. through consultation procedures, workshops etc). This stakeholder involvement normally aims in a narrow sense at gathering additional specialist contributions (not yet available to planning experts) and at validating already elaborated suggestions, but in a wider sense also at creating an extended "functional legitimacy" for the future planning document. But the important role of procedural aspects does not end right after the final publication of a vision document. Specific issues related to this ex-post dimension are whether spatial visioning is conceived as an "on-going process" and whether the vision document has been subject to some kind of agreement, a political discussion or even a political validation. Especially the latter issues can be

important support arguments that can be used by spatial planners in the countries involved to argue for improving policy practice.

In the context of transnational spatial visioning processes examined, **qualitative and quantitative approaches** were normally used for generating a better understanding of the particular spatial situation in the area (i.e. current problems, future trends, development prospects) and of international relations or inter-dependencies. With respect to the actual mix of quantitative and qualitative approaches that had been adopted during the preparation phase of the various transnational spatial visions, it is clear that the emphasis has been on the side of qualitative approaches.

A number of spatial visioning processes did not rely at all on extensive quantitative analyses (e.g. NorVision, spatial vision for North-West Europe, preparatory studies for a spatial vision in the MEDOCC area, Prospective Study of the Alpine Space).

Other spatial visioning processes have combined during the preparatory analyses both qualitative and quite extensive quantitative approaches (Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Area, CADSES).

- In case of the **Atlantic Area**, the various "Interim Reports", but especially Volume 1 of the "Final Report", has adopted a dominantly quantitative approach for realising the "strategic evaluation" (general description of the Atlantic space). It was carried out in four different steps by using a large range of social, economic, accessibility and dynamics indicators. Based upon the results of the quantitative diagnosis realised in the context of this "strategic assessment", a more qualitative approach has been used for elaborating proposals and recommendations for an organisation of polycentrism in the Atlantic space area.
- In the context of the **Baltic Sea Area** and the initial VASAB 2010 document of 1994 ("Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea"), mainly a descriptive and qualitative approach has been adopted for describing and analysing the current situation in the BSR. Only very few quantitative indicators had been directly used in the VASAB 2010 document. For the VASAB 2010+ document, adopted in 2001 at the Ministerial Conference in Wismar, the "background report" has provided an extensive qualitative presentation of spatial trends and challenges in the BSR (see also 2.1) that was supported by a wide range of quantitative data. In most cases, the quantitative data show either a static situation for a given year or establish a dynamic past-present development path in a medium-term perspective. The overall approach adopted for the up-grading process of the BSR spatial vision (2004/2005) can be best characterised as a "fairly balanced consideration of immediate problems and long-term oriented developments". This overall approach, which aims at focussing on essential issues for territorial development, is mostly of a qualitative nature that uses "brainstorming" for exploiting knowledge and experience of the CSD-BSR members.

- In the **CADSES** spatial visioning process, mainly realised by the INTERREG IIC project Vision PlaNet and partly also by the ESTIA-Space project, different qualitative and quantitative approaches were employed for elaborating the respective spatial vision documents. In both documents, however, mostly the trends had been quantified whereas policy aims were mainly described in a qualitative way. The Vision Planet "Background Report" has to a larger extent than the document "Guidelines and Policy Proposals" used a quite extensive quantitative approach for explaining territorial features at the level of CADSES, but also at the national and regional levels. Nevertheless, the description deliberately avoided country-by-country descriptions in order to preserve a unified and synthetic character of the document (i.e. national specifics are rather shown in tables and maps). The document "Spatial Planning Priorities for South-East Europe" of the ESTIA-Space project has assessed spatial development trends and prospects on ground of a quite extensive quantitative approach, whereas the definition of spatial development priorities for South-East Europe was mainly qualitative.

Many quantitative approaches have faced constraints and limitations of data availability and comparability in a transnational context. This is true for the Baltic Sea Region, where at the time of the initial VASAB 2010 document of 1994 some quantitative data were not complete/comparable/compatible especially in the case of Russia. For characterising the main spatial structures and development trends in CADSES, the Vision PlaNet project had to use and drive quantitative information from different international sources in order to ensure comparability. Only in the absence of international statistics, national statistical yearbooks had been used, in which identical and standardised definitions and contents were however not always ensured. Also in the context of the ESTIA Space project (CADSES)³⁸, the collection of sufficient, comparable and homogeneous data (e.g. demographic, economic, labour market data) was very difficult and in some cases even impossible. Such limitations in the availability and comparability of spatial data underline the importance of the ESPON data base, which was unfortunately not available when the respective spatial visions were prepared or updated.

As already mentioned above, **linear and more complex / cyclic approaches** may serve to "forecast" territorial development. In practice, however, an extensive direct use of sophisticated or complex approaches can not be observed throughout the various transnational spatial visioning processes. This observation particularly applies to the early spatial visioning processes in the North Sea Area and North-West Europe (under INTERREG IIC), but also to the newly emerging spatial visioning processes under the INTERREG IIIB programmes MEDOCC and Alpine Space.

Only for very specific issues, three of the early spatial visioning processes have directly made use of more complex approaches:

- In the **Atlantic Area** spatial visioning process, an interesting but mostly static approach was used by the ASDP-study project. It helped designing

³⁸ The basic aim of the vision document was to present comparative data for the total ESTIA-area and its specific countries/regions.

and calculating a "relative development index" (RDI) for NUTS III level regions in the Atlantic area. The purpose of the RDI was to deliver quantitative data that allow classifying the different regions with regard to their economic performance. Such a classification appears to be useful for deepening the knowledge on the regional environment of urban systems as well as their current and future positioning in the wider Atlantic Area.

- In the **Baltic Sea Region**, the different steps of the VASAB process between 1994 and 2004 have not used specific model-based approaches for analysing spatial patterns in the and for "forecasting" territorial development. Only in the context of the "VASAB 2010+" document of 2001, a prospective long-term view for some isolated aspects has been established.³⁹ In the currently ongoing up-grading process, mainly an "intuitive trend exploration" with an extrapolation / linear projection is used for forecasting territorial development of the BSR. The basic assumption is that the current trend will continue if no regulatory policy measures are adopted. The main purpose of this intuitive trend exploration and the extrapolation / linear projection approach is to raise awareness and to highlight potential threats during the process of shaping the future territorial development of the BSR.
- In the context of **CADSES**, the spatial vision document elaborated by the Vision PlaNet project contains 3 descriptive and complex scenarios with a future-oriented perspective that aim at identifying territorial impacts related to the forthcoming Eastern-enlargement of the EU. The vision document has also quantified a demographic prognosis for CADSES over the time period 1997-2025. In the context of a wider assessment of the sectoral employment structure, the ESTIA Space project has analysed both the absolute and the relative specialization of regions in Bulgaria, Romania and Greece on ground of a more sophisticated quantitative approach (based on available data on employment in the three sectors of economic activities). The INTERREG IIIB follow-up projects "PlaNet CenSE" and "ESTIA-SPOSE" that do not carry out spatial visioning activities properly speaking have however clear potentials for generating methodological improvements, which might allow a future application of more complex or cyclic approaches in the assessment and forecasting of spatial trends / developments (see text box below).

More recently, however, some spatial visioning activities have indirectly used more sophisticated, mostly by making reference to information that was generated "externally" on ground of an application of linear or cyclic approaches. Examples are the vision up-dating process for North-West Europe, where reference was made to the TEN-STAC transport scenarios, and the preparatory studies for the emerging MEDOCC spatial vision process that have referred back to various ESPON studies.

³⁹ Time space map for rail passengers (1993 and 2020). Change of daily accessibility by a road, 1996-2016, due to TEN/TINA investments.

CADSES, INTERREG IIIC projects "PlaNet CenSE" and "ESTIA-SPOSE"

The **INTERREG IIIC "PlaNet CenSE"** aims - on the one hand - at building bridges to other European activities focussing on spatial political consultancy (e.g. the ESPON 2006 Programme) and thus at developing a common sense on space-related processes and strategies. On the other hand, space-related themes (e.g. Transeuropean Transport Networks, Global Economic Integration Zones of an enlarged EU) will be evaluated and – for the purpose of strategic spatial development – specific project-related actions will be brought together. A vital basis for PlaNet CenSE will be the Vision Planet document "Guidelines and Policy Proposals", which sets out a framework for spatial planning on the ideas of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). Methodological improvements can mostly be expected to emerge from the following two project modules (of three in total):

- The module "European Spatial Planning Gateway" (ESP GATEWAY) is an expert dialogue, research information and knowledge exchange about the application and further development of the ESDP. On the one hand, it aims at transferring information and knowledge from the EU-level to the national levels, i.e. the application of ESPON-approaches and ESDP-concepts by countries in the PlaNet CenSe project. On the other hand, a converse flow of information is organized in order to influence the EU-level by the national levels, i.e. in evaluating and further developing ESPON and the ESDP by the new EU-Member States, Candidate Countries and Neighbouring Countries. The main aim of is to translate the common learning process / the common understanding realized under this module into a strategic spatial development document with objectives for future development of the urban system and transport infrastructure in Central and South East Europe. This strategic document should provide both a framework for national spatial development perspectives and place the urban system / transport network of CenSE in a wider European perspective (→ revising the ESDP).
- The module "Forum for Territorial Impact Analysis" (TIAN FORUM) will develop the planning instrument TIAN and provide an opportunity for testing its application at the transnational and cross-sectoral level. This will be achieved in the context of two pilot projects, i.e. "Metropolitan Networks in Central and South East Europe" and "North-South Transnational Transport Corridors". A "platform" has been established to co-ordinate different transport projects and initiatives in CenSE with similar aims and overlapping geographical scope to the proposed North-South corridors in order to stimulate dialogue among different stakeholders, to utilize synergy effects and to reduce redundancies.

The overall goal of the **INTERREG IIIB project ESTIA-SPOSE** is to reinforce the capability of South-East European Countries for collaborating in spatial planning and development issues at national level and to elaborate and analyze spatial data in a comparative way. Methodological improvements can be expected to emerge from the three main components that will be realized:

- The Territorial Indicators System (TIS) is the conceptual and methodological component of ESTIA-SPOSE. The construction of an integrated territorial indicators system (TIS) is the most decisive factor for the establishment of a spatial planning observatory in South-East Europe. The base for the construction of TIS is the overall framework and the incoming results of the European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON). The value added of TIS lies on the adaptation of the system of indicators to the South-East European situation and the construction of a comprehensive data-base. In particular the TIS will focus

upon the basic socio-economic and environmental conditions of the ESTIA-SPOSE space, the southeast part of CADSES, consisting of EU member states, accession countries and other non-EU member states.

- *The Pilot Applications of Indicators (PAI) in selected sectors and areas is the empirical component of ESTIA-SPOSE. The applicability of the TIS will be tested in real terms. The empirical field is defined at NUTS II and NUTS III level areas including major urban areas and development corridors. The specific areas of pilot applications will be selected by the national teams and the joint project panel in ways intended to stabilize the method of calculation and to locate the sources for all kinds of indicators in each country within the broader ESTIA-SPOSE space.*
- *The Spatial Planning Observatory Platform (SPOP) intends to establish a more permanent network of agencies of spatial planning and development that will support the operation and discuss all conceptual, methodological and practical aspects of SPOSE based on TIS and PAI in ESTIA-SPOSE space. The SPOP meetings will play also the role of the disseminator and political promoter of the ESTIA-SPOSE in order to increase its use in policy decision-making and policy impact assessment.*

Also the elaboration of alternative scenarios is still rather exceptional in the preparation and elaboration of transnational spatial visions. An interesting attempt that is worth being mentioned has been developed in the context of the newly emerging spatial visioning process under the **INTERREG IIIB Alpine Space programme** (i.e. "Prospective Study for the Alpine Space"). Six prospective visions / scenarios have been identified for the Alpine Space. Each vision comprises strategic issues (substantial key issues and procedural key issues) as well as the definition of key actors, whose activities are necessary for the realisation of the scenario. The various visions / scenarios are not exclusive from each other; they co-exist among the stakeholders of transnational co-operation. These visions must be thought of as a basis for reconciling different points of view and building a consensus for action (see also Overview Table 8).

Overview Table 8: Scenarios of the Prospective Study for the Alpine Space and their main characteristics

Scenario	Main characteristics
Alpine core and MEGAs"	Metropolisation, attractiveness, global sustainability, protection, city/mountain solidarity, international tourism ...
"Regional diversity: puzzle and competition"	Territorial systems, multi-level governance, clusters, cultural partnerships, regional heritage, local development...
North-South mediation"	Transit routes, governmental cooperation, infrastructures, impacts, ports and airports, technological risks...
Network, corridors, connecting elements"	Polycentrism, distribution, knowledge networks, mobility management
Openness and Enlargement"	Large basins, openness, enlargement, "little Europes", solidarity, Alpine experience...
Positioning: us and the others"	Key words: globalisation, international tourism, Alpine amenities, global competition, image, joint promotion....

With respect to **the use of visualisation and mapping** during the various transnational visioning processes, a clear distinction has to be made between two main aspects: the cartographic presentation of the actual spatial context or of future trends (i.e. through analytical maps) on the one hand and the visual representation of the voluntary spatial development perspective (desired future development status) and of individual development goals on the other hand.

Most transnational spatial visioning processes have extensively elaborated **analytical maps** in order to illustrate the spatial dimension of various socio-economic and environmental aspects and/or of related future trends (Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North Sea Region).

- In the context of the **Atlantic Area visioning process**, volume 1 of the "Final Report" contains in total 55 maps that illustrate very different issues. A large majority of these maps provide a static geographical illustration of a specific socio-economic indicator (e.g. employment in the primary sector in 2000) or a particular feature (e.g. number of maritime links or number of protected zones), whereas others visualise past socio-economic development trends (e.g. average variation of per capita GDP during 1991 and 2001). Some of the maps shown in this volume were directly drawn from ESPON projects. The "Synthesis Document" on the Atlantic Spatial Development Perspectives takes up 13 of these maps to illustrate the current development status⁴⁰ and to visualise the spatial organisation of the Atlantic area.
- In the initial "VASAB 2010" document of 1994 covering the **Baltic Sea Region**, maps are an important element that are used for illustrating each main theme addressed. Altogether 21 theme-specific maps were elaborated and one comprehensive map covering all themes. Also in the analytical "background report" elaborated for the "VASAB 2010+" document of 2001, a total of 32 maps were elaborated to illustrate a wide range of different aspects in the Baltic Sea Region.
- The spatial vision documents produced by the "Vision Planet" covering **CADSES** as a whole have also extensively used maps (i.e. the "Background Report" and the "Guidelines and Policy Proposals")⁴¹. These maps mostly illustrate the static spatial situation of specific aspects (e.g. transport infrastructures, natural & cultural heritage potentials) and in one case also the dynamic evolution of long-term development trends (population density). Also the spatial visioning document produced by the ESTIA-Space project entitled "Spatial Planning Priorities for South-East Europe" has made use of maps (19 in total), mainly for illustrating static spatial situations of several aspects.

⁴⁰ Maps on the distribution and concentration of employment, on the dominant sector specific specialisation, on a sector specific specialisation coefficient, on road-based connectivity of urban centres, on the average annual evolution of GDP between 1991 and 2002, on the per capita GDP variation between 1991 and 2002, on a cross-reference between the variations of per capita GDP and population between 1991 and 2002, on the importance of urban areas, on the "indicator for relative development", on the dynamics in demography and exchange

⁴¹ The "Background Report" contains in total 21 maps, whereas the document "Guidelines and Policy Proposals" has taken over 10 maps from the "Background Report".

- In the context of the **North Sea Area**, the NorVision document contains a series of static maps reflecting the existing situation in a number of fields (energy production, regular air links, sea transport flows between ports, intermodal terminals, nature potential areas, population density, existing urban settlements). NorVision does however not contain a mapping of trends.

Compared to the situation described above, a combined **visual representation of the voluntary development perspective and of the related territorial development goals** was not realised by any of the transnational spatial visioning processes. Only a few of the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions have actually visualised their territorial development perspectives (North-West Europe, Atlantic Area). The initial spatial vision elaborated for North West Europe under INTERREG IIC includes a mapped representation of the development perspective. It highlights the global cities and gateways, the strategic polycentric areas, the strategic centres, the counterweight global gateways and economic centres, the eurocorridors / transport axes to be strengthened, the communication bottlenecks and the external connections to be enhanced. In the "Synthesis Document" on the Atlantic Spatial Development Perspectives, a map is included that visualises the future development perspectives advocated for by the vision. But also the newly emerging spatial visioning process in the Alpine Space has used a limited number of simplified maps to illustrate the visions and scenarios produced.

"Non-mapping" has in the other cases mostly been a deliberate choice and the main reason behind this was of a political nature. The examples of the Baltic Sea Region and the North Sea Area clearly suggest that a map-based representation of the spatial vision might be politically damaging.⁴² Although in both cases transnational vision documents have clearly a non-binding status, it was decided not to accompany the textual formulation of spatial development perspectives and objectives by such "voluntary maps" that tend to generate stronger local and regional impacts (see text box below).

With respect to the **procedural aspects of the co-operative planning process** adopted for elaborating the existing transnational spatial development visions, one has to observe that the extent to which participatory approaches were used strongly depended upon the overall nature of the spatial visioning process itself.

In most of the initial transnational spatial visioning processes (CADSES, Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe), the preparation and elaboration process has clearly to be characterised as a "top down approach". The vision documents were generally drafted by a relatively small group of experts, belonging or not to the respective spatial planning administrations of the countries concerned. In these cases, only the finalised vision documents were submitted for consultation to a wider range of bodies and organisations. For some of these initial "top-down approaches" it can however be observed that the participatory dimension was quite significantly increased over time (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe).

⁴² This position is somehow similar to the experiences made in the elaboration of the ESDP, where the "Committee of Spatial Development" decided not to include maps on future territorial conditions as they could potentially have derailing effect.

North Sea Area & Baltic Sea Region,
reasons explaining a "non-mapping" of the spatial development perspective

*In the **North Sea Area**, it was considered that NorVision is a long-term framework intended to remain valid for coming decades. Maps that allocate specific roles or status to towns and cities could potentially derail political debates as they have the tendency to attract attention more than verbal images.*

*During the current up-grading process of the 1994 vision-document for **the Baltic Sea Area** (started by VASAB in 2004/2005), it is not envisaged to make use of maps for explicitly visualising the territorial development principles of the future spatial vision. This is mainly due to the fact that negative experiences in this respect have been made in the past. The VASAB process had problems with a "politically acceptable" visualisation of some aims and goals while preparing the "Spatial Development Action Programme" of 2001. Due to the fact that VASAB is based on consensus, maps must be acceptable by all countries. There had however been some attempts in using "sketches", but also this was not acceptable.*

- Although in **CADSES** the "Vision Planet" project has started from the working level and was strongly oriented towards communication and process, the spatial visioning process must be qualified as a highly planning expert-centred top-down process. This is mainly due to the composition of the different project working structures that have played an essential role in the vision elaboration process. An international "Working Team" from thirteen countries, consisting of spatial planning experts from national administrations or experts nominated by them, elaborated strategies and formulated the common vision document. The conceptual work was supported by a "structured dialogue on spatial planning", which took place within the "Project Panel" that was composed of representatives from national ministries or government agencies responsible for spatial planning. The Panel also gave the necessary orientation for communication and organised thematic seminars/workshops on topics related to the strategy document.⁴³
- In the **Baltic Sea Region**, the VASAB-process was launched on ground of a high-ranking intergovernmental decision and the initial VASAB 2010 report of 1994 was the result of common work of a "group of focal points", representing the ministries responsible for spatial planning of the participating countries/regions in the Baltic Sea Region. A very limited consultation process has taken place, as only 3 Pan-Baltic organisations and the EU Commission were contacted to comment on the document. Subsequently, the final document had also been disseminated to and discussed with other transnational initiatives, national and regional bodies, mainly to promote joint action. Despite this formal "openness", many regional (and local) actors in the Baltic Sea Area have quickly reclaimed

⁴³ The "Project Panel" had also organized several seminars that offered a chance for taking into account main elements of the policy environment (e.g. ESDP, TINA process, EU programmes for CEEC). These seminars were open to the members of the Working Team, so that a continuous thematic exchange took place.

that the distance between VASAB-process and the local-regional levels needs to be reduced and that the role of VASAB should be further clarified. During the up-dating of the initial vision document that led to the publication of the VASAB 2010+ document in 2001, an "external concertation approach" was adopted. Although the main stakeholders directly involved in the elaboration process of this document were again the 10 national Ministries responsible for Spatial Planning and Development and the 3 regional governments from Russia and Germany, a wide range of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at local, regional, national and transnational levels were contacted mainly for gathering additional inputs.⁴⁴ More recently, the VASAB Ministerial Conference at Gdańsk (2005) has decided to adopt a very open and participatory approach for preparing the new long-term spatial perspective for the Baltic Sea Region: A larger number of key stakeholders located in the BSR will be involved in this up-grading process. Beyond the national governments from 11 countries, probably one or two regional government representatives per country (representing the other regions in the country) will be directly involved in the process. In addition, also around 10 Pan-Baltic organisations are willing to directly participate in the process. Some 100 other regional and local stakeholders will be indirectly involved through a specific "concertation process".

- The initial elaboration process of the spatial vision for **North-West Europe** was strongly expert-centred and national/regional authorities were only consulted up to a certain extent (workshops etc.). The main consultation process took place after the spatial vision has been published as a "Discussion Document" (September 2000). The Spatial Vision Group agreed that a consultation process should start in each Member State from January 2001 in order to gather comments on the vision document.⁴⁵ Subsequently, a consultation report was published in June 2001 that describes and summarises the responses in the country reports and also includes examples of comments from individual respondents by way of illustration. Surprisingly, no attempt was made, from the part of the Spatial Vision Group, to provide an answer to the comments. Instead, it was decided that this was something to take up during any subsequent vision project under INTERREG IIIB. The more recent up-dating of the North-West Europe spatial vision is carried out on the basis of numerous meetings and workshops organised during the preparatory phase, which also involved a wide range of representatives of the civil society and not only from local, regional or national administrations.

⁴⁴ During spring 2001, a first draft of the "VASAB 2010+ report" has been widely spread to the EU-Commission, to international or Pan-Baltic organizations (6 contacted) and to some 100 national sector-specific organisations or regional and local authorities. Members of CSD-BSR have arranged presentations and discussions inviting the addressees to comment on the report. A considerable number of direct comments have been received (more than 100), including proposals how to further improve the report, to broaden its focus or to address more intensively issues and problems of some BSR sub-regions. These "external inputs" have been taken into account as far as possible when revising the draft report.

⁴⁵ The national consultations should be led by the relevant members of the Spatial Vision Group. In order to focus comments on certain topics, a consultation briefing paper was drawn up and put at their disposal. Each national contact point was asked to prepare a report summarising the findings of the consultation in their country.

It must however be stressed that not all spatial visioning processes were conceived as top-down approaches. Good examples in this respect are the visioning processes in the North Sea Area and the Atlantic Area, where participative approaches / consultation had been used before the finalisation of the vision document. Once elaborated, the vision documents had in both cases also been subject to some kind of wider political discussion and validation.

- In the **Atlantic Area**, background research for the spatial vision process has been realised by ASDP-study project with an active participation of the regions and the socio-economic actors located in the area. This participation was made operational – on the one hand – in the context of the project steering committee and – on the other hand – through the organisation of “national workshops” (one or more workshops realized in each country), which had the aim to enable the study to link up with other stakeholders and with other projects working on similar topics. In addition, also a close co-ordination with other networks and study projects existing in the Atlantic area has been established.⁴⁶
- In the context of the initial spatial visioning process of the **North Sea Area**, a draft of the NorVision document was circulated to all counties throughout the region. The vision working group received many comments that were integrated into the work. It then subsequently revised the vision draft to as large extent as possible, without hampering the basic ideas. The final document was presented at the North Sea Commission’s annual meeting in Bergen in 2000.⁴⁷ The Chairman had prepared a political statement, in which the North Sea Commission approved the document and agreed to work for the implementation of NorVision. All politicians adopted this political statement.

4.2 Cross-border spatial development concepts for INTERREG IIA / IIIA programme areas or smaller parts of them

As in the case of transnational spatial visioning (see 4.1.), a combination of **quantitative and qualitative approaches** was adopted for the preparation and elaboration of cross-border spatial development concepts.

- Quantitative approaches applied in the cross-border context also face general problems of data availability and comparability,⁴⁸ but compared to transnational spatial visioning processes they are generally less subject to

⁴⁶ Within this context, especially the “Atlantic Arc Commission” of the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions, the “Conference of Cities in the Atlantic Arc” (CVAA), the “Association of Agricultural Chambers in the Atlantic Arc” (AC3A) and the “Atlantic Transnational Network” (RTA) with its studies on mobility and maritime transport, maritime safety and innovation have been considered in the work process.

⁴⁷ The North-Sea Commission consists of regional politicians from the countries around the North Sea.

⁴⁸ LACE-Infoblatt zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit – Statistik in den Grenzgebieten (Ausgabe 11, Dezember 2000).

such constraints because the number of countries and regions involved is smaller (two and, in some cases, three). This allows realising a wide range of thematic analyses, sometimes also for smaller sub-areas located in the cross-border co-operation area.

- Qualitative (cross-border) analyses are generally used to describe a number of constraints and opportunities related to the presence of the border that can not be properly quantified, but are important for the elaboration of the spatial development concept or strategy. The cross-border spatial development concepts and strategies are expressed in qualitative terms. They generally do not contain quantified objectives.

The above-mentioned issues can be illustrated by the examples of the cross-border spatial development concepts elaborated for the PAMINA area, the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian and the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina.

- In case of the **PAMINA cross-border development concept (D/F)**, a larger number of sources/data were used during an early stage of the preparation phase for performing an extensive quantitative diagnosis of the present-time situation. With respect to the cross-border economic development, however, more profound assessments were still missing, especially concerning the cross-border labour market, the framework conditions for economic development, the spatial distribution of already existing enterprises and the location of local business zones. As a consequence, the objective spatial analysis has used and updated already existing theme-specific assessments and deepened the cross-border assessment of all aspects related to economic development. The results of the initial quantitative present-time situation diagnosis have been summarised in four cross-cutting analyses, on ground of which a distinction of 26 relatively homogeneous sub-territories with typical characteristics, existing within the wider PAMINA-cross-border area, has been made possible.
- The **White Paper for the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian (F/E)** was based upon an extensive quantitative research carried out during the preparatory phase on either side of the border. A comparative diagnosis of the current situation and of development trends for both parts of the cross-border territory as well as for the Eurocity as an entity has been realised alongside a number of common themes and specific criteria. This comprehensive assessment has also allowed establishing a description of the major strengths and weaknesses of the cross-border territory.
- The **Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina (D/PL)** has faced some problems with respect to data availability / compatibility especially on the Polish side. Despite this, the cross-border development concept "Viadrina 2000" has adopted a quantitative approach that focussed on an analysis of the socio-economic situation currently prevailing in the Euroregion. It is predominantly static (i.e. analysis of certain indicators for one specific year), but sometimes also of a dynamic nature (development path analysis of specific indicators from a previous situation to the present time).

The approaches generally used for preparing cross-border spatial development concepts have a less sophisticated character, not going beyond usual static or dynamic quantitative analyses. However, some examples do exist where **linear and more complex / cyclic approaches** have been used (Euregio Rhein-Waal, Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian):

- The **Euregio Rhein-Waal concept (D/NL)** contains a descriptive exploration of future development trends that has been realised for 6 strategic themes and a larger number of related sub-themes that are considered important for the development of the cross-border area up to the year 2010 (see text box below). This comprehensive trends assessment has been elaborated on ground of basic research realised during the preparation phase and alongside the concept's assessment of the current situation, but also on ground of information that has been derived from discussions, workshops and seminars organised during the elaboration phase.

Euregio Rhein-Waal (D/NL), descriptive trends assessment in the concept

The general description of trends for the Euregio Rhein-Waal focuses on 6 strategic themes, but within each of them, specific trends are also indicated for a larger number of related sub-themes.

- *Spatial structure and accessibility: specific trends are indicated for the national/international environment, the urban-rural relationship, freight transport, passenger transport, population development and information/communication infrastructures.*
- *Economy, technology and innovation: specific trends are indicated for the aspect of structural changes, development of markets, requirements for locational factors.*
- *Labour market and qualification: specific trends are indicated for aspects related to a harmonisation on the labour market, employment patterns and requirements with regard to qualification.*
- *Culture and tourism: specific trends are indicated for culture and societal leisure time behaviour.*
- *Nature, environment and agriculture: specific trends are indicated for aspects such as cultural landscape, agriculture, environment and sustainability.*
- *Cross-border integration: specific socio-cultural trends are indicated (open health and rescue services in the cross-border context, consumer behaviour.*

- In case of the **Eurocity White Paper (F/E)**, only the application strategy contains some forward-looking development options (proposals) that were elaborated in a descriptive manner for similar issues/themes and sub-areas of the future Eurocity. After the publication of the White Paper in 2000, however, a number of follow up-activities were realised up to the year 2004 that made use of complex/cyclic forecasting approaches and

improved the methodological capacities in the area. The studies exploring further themes of strategic relevance for the Eurocity (e.g. transport infrastructures and cross-border mobility, cross-border waste treatment, joint public services⁴⁹) contain quite sophisticated quantitative assessments and have realised prospective exercises or elaborated scenarios in a local, regional and cross-border perspective. In addition, other follow-up activities helped to further upgrade the quality / capacity of the "methodological toolbox" available in the cross-border area⁵⁰.

Although not directly related to specific methods / techniques, it is worth mentioning that the singular and specific approach adopted for preparing and elaborating **the PAMINA concept (D/F)** was relatively complex and can also be considered innovative. It aimed at further developing standardised approaches for elaborating spatial planning schemes in the national, regional and local context that already exist in Germany and France, mainly through introducing specific adaptations that are appropriate for adequately addressing the cross-border dimension. Through further developing these approaches, a specific methodology for the different phases of the elaboration process was developed that has allowed preserving the territorial specificity of sub-areas in the context of the wider cross-border area.

In most cases, **visualisation and mapping approaches** generally form part of the cross-border spatial development concepts examined either for illustrating the territorial analysis or for translating in a visual way the spatial development objectives. Only the concept "Viadrina 2000" did not make use of mapping techniques for illustrating aspects of the current socio-economic situation or of the future development perspective.

- The mapping approach adopted by the **"Spatial planning scheme for the PAMINA-region" (D/F)** is quite extensive and especially the maps elaborated for illustrating the specific key messages of each strategic priority with a territorial character (3 maps) and the overall approach adopted by the cross-border spatial development strategy (1 map) can be considered an example of good practice (see also text box below).
- In the **White Paper for the Eurocity Bayonne-San Sebastian (F/E)**, the use of mapping aimed at positioning the Eurocity in the wider European context or at visualising potential options to re-structure / further develop the narrow cross-border urban context (i.e. the "Consortio Bidasoa-Txingudi") and to locate new major or secondary transport infrastructures.
- The "Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010" for the **Euregio Rhein-Waal (D/NL)** uses visualisation and mapping techniques for highlighting the current situation, illustrating theme-specific future

⁴⁹ Study on local public services in the Eurocity (December 2000). Study on the cross-border treatment of waste (2002). Prospective study on transport infrastructures (June 2004). Cross-border Mobility Study (2004).

⁵⁰ Setting up of a measurement indicator system for the Eurocity. Further integration of the respective Territorial Information Systems existing on either side of the border. Establishment of the observatory on public health (1999/2000) and the observatory on housing and habitat (2002).

development perspectives (thematic maps on "mobility", "territory for economic activity and working", "culture and landscape") and for presenting the overall development model up to the year 2010.

PAMINA (D/F), mapping approach adopted by the cross-border spatial development concept

The cross-border concept contains 3 thematic "main maps" that visualise the strategic priorities with an explicit territorial dimension in relation to the PAMINA area:

- *Map 1 on the landscape park PAMINA.*
- *Map 2 on communication / networked spaces.*
- *Map 3 on a balanced development of locational factors.*

These thematic "main maps" are supplemented by a number of basic sketches / topic-oriented maps that aim at deepening - on a visual basis - specific aspects related to the territorial strategic priorities mentioned above. The most important ones are the following:

- *The sub-areas identified with respect to the Strategic Priority A1: Landscape park PAMINA.*
- *Proposal for a development of railway transport in the PAMINA-area (high-speed rail network TGV-ICE).*
- *Proposal for a development of long-distance railway transport in the PAMINA-area.*
- *Proposal for the development of the motorway network in the PAMINA-area.*
- *Proposal for the development of urban/inter-urban railway transport in the PAMINA-area.*
- *Proposal for the development of regional railway transport in the PAMINA-area.*

A fourth comprehensive "main map" establishes an overlap of the previously mentioned 3 thematic "main maps". This approach allowed obtaining an overall visualisation / illustration of the entire cross-border development concept. The primary benefit of this summary map lies in its orientation-function for spatial planning at regional, sub-regional and local levels. As such, the summary map also helps to take into consideration the cross-border aspects in a systematic way and to support further steps with respect to a joint and coherent spatial development.

Equally important as for transnational spatial visioning are the **procedural aspects of the co-operative planning process adopted to elaborate a cross-border spatial development concept**. In case of all cross-border concepts examined, participatory approaches involving different actors from either side of the border had been an important component of the preparation and elaboration processes.

Although the number of actors involved was quite significant in all cases, participation did not in all cases concern the same types of stakeholders. While all four processes imply public stakeholders (mainly representatives of local and regional authorities and of various public organisations), the elaboration of the spatial development concept for the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina also involved the wider public through an intensive dialogue and an opinion-building process. Also in case of the Euregio Rhein-Waal, the approach adopted during the elaboration phase was very broad and has been accompanied by an intensive regional participation, discussion and consensus-finding process (see text box below).

Euregio Rhein-Waal (D/NL), elements of the participatory elaboration process

The "Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010" was elaborated on the ground of a broad participatory approach that was supported by a number of events:

- In parallel to the elaboration of the INTERREG IIIA sub-programme 2000-2006, various workshops for the elaboration process of the cross-border concept have been organised.*
- Discussions in the structures of the Euregio Rhein-Waal have been organised (e.g. committees, Euregio-council).*
- The assessment of a questionnaire survey realised among the members of the Euregio (realised in spring 2000) has given important information on the current level of cross-border networking and contacts (80 questionnaires have been sent out, a return rate of 60% was achieved).*
- A seminar on the "Cross-border development and action concept 2000-2010" has been organised in December 2000 by the Euregio Rhein-Waal, which aimed at further completing and fine-tuning the existing draft concept and allowed to achieve consensus on the specific recommendations for action in the region.*

4.3 INTERREG IIIC projects focussing on strategic territorial development planning

Although activities are generally quite diverse across the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects dealing with issues related to strategic territorial development planning, they mainly concentrate on aspects that help improving planning methods / approaches and on the transfer of related planning-knowledge or technical skills in order to up-grade capacities in the participating areas (see also Overview Table 9):

- A clear majority of projects focuses their project activities either on quantitative and qualitative planning methods and/or strategic forecasting approaches (13 projects) or on administrative planning instruments and procedures (10 projects).
- Only a comparatively lower number of projects concentrate their activities on elaborating new technical tools and/or support tools for decision making (4 projects) or on aspects related to participatory planning processes to improve stakeholder involvement / planning consultation (4 projects).

With respect to the particular focus of this study, a number of projects were suggested by the INTERREG IIIC programme areas that display a particularly innovative approach for some aspects:

- **East Zone:** INCORD (innovative for new EU-Member States) and AAP2020 (innovative for Third Countries in former Yugoslavia).
- **West Zone:** PSPE (innovative with respect to participatory spatial planning) and AWARE (innovative with respect to risk management at a cross-border level).

As there is generally no territorial continuity between the regions involved in INTERREG IIIC projects, issues directly related to **procedural aspects of the co-operative planning process and its** participatory dimension are less important in the context of these projects. Again, the main added value of inter-regional co-operation lies mainly in the improvement of methods and/or in the transfer of know-how.

Overview Table 9: Main focus of activities realised under the 23 INTERREG IIIC projects

Focus	INTERREG IIIC programme zone		
	East	West	South
Quantitative and qualitative planning methods and/or strategic forecasting approaches.	-	GRIDS ESIN FARLAND InterMETREX AWARE ENLoCC FLAPP PIMMS PSPE CoPraNet EWM RECORE SULFANET	-
Elaboration of new technical tools and/or support tools for decision making.	-	PSPE ENLoCC InterMETREX AWARE	-
Administrative planning instruments and procedures.	INCORD	GRIDS FARLAND AWARE	DEDEL SDEC Polymetrex PROGRESDEC Riverlinks Coronas Metropolitanas Euromountains MARE
Participatory planning processes for wider stakeholder involvement / consultation.	AAP2020 EARD	PSPE AWARE	-

5 Comparative summary assessment: Results achieved by the various transnational and cross-border activities focussing on strategic territorial development planning and their relation with selected ESPON-project outputs

5.1 General remarks regarding the relationship between strategic territorial planning activities and ESPON-project results

A spatial vision has an intermediate position between a spatial scenario and a spatial development programme. While scenarios are mainly the product of scientific speculation and investigation – even in the case of “desirable prospective scenarios” – spatial development programmes have a more normative character and are politically or administratively validated.

The specific context of transnational and cross-border co-operation calls for more flexible and intermediate tools which enable the progressive joint elaboration of possible and desirable future situations of the transnational or cross-border territory. The elaboration of spatial visions is therefore particularly well adapted to the diversity of national/regional approaches, interests, working methods and languages, planning cultures etc. which prevail in a transnational / cross-border area.

The elaboration of a spatial vision for a transnational /cross-border area is rather demanding in terms of knowledge and information. It can be assumed that it is possible to define a kind of “ideal process” for the elaboration of spatial visions with a common denominator in terms of knowledge base which would comprise:

- basic information about the present situation and recent trends in the transnational / cross-border area in terms of harmonised data related to main themes relevant for spatial development (demography, economy, environment, natural and cultural assets etc.);
- geographical information about networks, poles, specific areas represented through homogeneous mapping systems;
- processed information related to the spatial structure of the transnational / cross-border area in terms of harmonised concepts and typologies concerning for instance the accessibility, functional and physical polycentricity, sensitiveness to natural and technical hazards etc.
- information about the positioning of the transnational / cross-border area in a wider context and about its functional relationships with neighbouring areas;
- information about the future evolution of the transnational / cross-border area, related to a diversity of aspects: projections under various

hypotheses (trends, policy-oriented projections); knowledge about the potential evolution of driving forces likely to shape the territory; speculative investigations in the form of alternative scenarios; knowledge about the potential evolution of the wider context of the transnational / cross-border area; knowledge about the impacts of policies and programmes already in a process of implementation.

Although not all information required can be expected from the ESPON programme and although the contribution of the ESPON programme to the elaboration of spatial visions is only one task among others that it has to fulfil, it is of primary interest to investigate which types of interactions have developed between transnational/cross-border territorial planning activities and the elaboration of ESPON studies and their results.

The most important contribution of the ESPON programme in relation to transnational/cross-border territorial planning activities realised in the context of INTERREG (or outside of it) is that it has produced a number of harmonised data, typologies and concepts enabling rather homogeneous territorial analyses which are not handicapped by the existence of national borders and by the related heterogeneity of spatial information systems.

- The elaboration of the ESPON data base is a first and significant output, which usefully complements the data and information produced by Eurostat and the European Environmental Agency.
- Another important contribution is the elaboration of harmonised territorial typologies, as produced by a number of ESPON Studies (for instance 1.1.1., 1.1.2., 1.1.3). Typologies generate added value in the sense that they facilitate an in-depth understanding of complex spatial structures, disregarding the existence of national borders.
- The third significant contribution of the ESPON Programme is that it provides information about the future through a wide range of scenarios. The scenarios are mainly policy scenarios and show the potential territorial impacts of various policy options in the different themes and sectors considered. This is for instance the case in ESPON studies 1.1.1., 1.1.3., 1.1.4., 2.1.1. and 3.2.

An important element to be taken into account is the fact that the respective agendas of INTERREG and ESPON did not make possible to establish a fruitful co-operation and synergy between both programmes. During the previous programming period, a number of spatial visions were elaborated while ESPON did not yet exist. In the present programming period, the first ESPON results became available at a stage when further work on spatial visions was already advanced. Only in a few cases where spatial visions are being updated, a number of ESPON studies could be used, among many other studies and information sources, to support the updating process.

5.2 The relation between existing transnational spatial visioning activities and the overall findings of ESPON-projects

For the **thematic results achieved by transnational spatial visioning processes**, it can generally be observed that the range of topics for which the situation / trends are assessed is relatively wide and similar across all initial spatial vision documents. More recently, however, some of the up-dating processes tend to adopt a more narrow thematic focus mainly for re-orienting their spatial development co-operation (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Area). The various spatial visioning processes and documents elaborated also show a well-developed level of awareness on the territorial impacts of different EU and national / regional policies, directly or indirectly refer back to overarching goals and policy aims formulated for EU-wide/European-wide spatial development (ESDP, CEMAT) and are characterised – with respect to the overall geographical focus adopted – by a predominantly “inward-looking” perspective.

Beyond these similarities, a number of marked differences do exist especially among the already elaborated transnational spatial development visions. With respect to the objective-systems of transnational spatial visions, for example, some contain an explicit vision statement from which development goals and policy aims are subsequently derived (Baltic Sea Region, North Sea Region), whereas others only work at the level of development goals and policy aims (CADSES, North-West Europe, Atlantic Area). But also the application strategies of the initial transnational spatial development visions are quite different from each other. Some of them show a high degree of stakeholder-orientation due to the large number of policy proposals and suggestions for measures/projects made in the documents (CADSES, Atlantic Area, North-Sea Region). Others are clearly characterised by initial weaknesses in this respect, which are however pro-actively addressed during subsequent up-dating processes (Baltic Sea Region, North-West Europe).

If one looks at the relation between the results of transnational spatial visioning processes and the overall findings of ESPON projects dealing with policy impact assessment, trend analysis and scenario development, one can firstly remark a strong “common denominator” among them. At a very general level, they are both closely linked to the objectives and policy options that have been formulated for the three main themes of the ESDP, i.e. (1) urban systems and polycentric development as well as urban-rural relationship, (2) parity of access to infrastructures and knowledge and (3) enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage. But also at the level of more specific issues and topics relevant to spatial development, a significant overlapping can be observed between ESPON studies and the transnational spatial visioning processes. Finally, a number of transnational spatial development visions (Baltic Sea Area, CADSES, Atlantic Area) also pay attention to the territorial impacts of EU policies, which corresponds to the investigations also carried out by several ESPON studies.

The afore-mentioned observations allow assuming that clear cross-referencing potentials between ESPON-study results and transnational spatial visioning processes do exist. A comprehensive overview on the potential usefulness of selected ESPON studies (and on their limitations) for transnational spatial

visioning processes is provided hereafter (see Overview Table 11). Beyond the ESPON-studies properly speaking, also the ESPON data base covers a wide range of themes that largely correspond to the data and indicators used in the most ambitious preparation works for spatial visions (for instance in the Baltic Sea Area and in the CADSES area). It must however be stressed that a number of themes that are important for transnational spatial development visions (e.g. housing and social-spatial issues, functional aspects of urban systems) have so far not yet been properly tackled in the context of ESPON.

Overview Table 10: Potential usefulness (and limitations) of ESPON project results for transnational spatial visioning processes

Project	Summary appraisal of potential usefulness / limitations
<p>ESPON project 1.1.1.</p> <p>Potentials for polycentric development in Europe</p>	<p>The usefulness (or practical applicability) of the study for an elaboration of transnational spatial visions is facing limitations. While it provides an interesting framework (or starting point) for the analysis of transnational and cross-border urban systems as well as recommendations for structuring cooperation among cities, the elaboration of spatial visions for specific areas requires a substantial amount of additional in-depth studies aiming at both refining the concepts introduced by the study and complementing them with other types of investigations related to the future potentialities of urban entities not provided by the study (in particular functional aspects of urban systems).</p>
<p>ESPON project 1.1.2.</p> <p>Urban-rural relations in Europe</p>	<p>The study has the merit of providing for the first time a typology of spaces according to their urban or rural character (six categories) and to show for these categories trends related to population change and change of GDP/capita for the period 1995-2000. The study does not provide however Europe-wide analyses of urban-rural relationships in terms of flows, relationships, functional interdependence, mainly because of the lack of relevant data. The typology of areas in six categories is of a certain interest for the elaboration of transnational spatial visions. The model provided could be applied with more recent and differentiated data. It can be considered as a tool which is perfectible in more limited geographical contexts.</p>
<p>ESPON project 1.1.3.</p> <p>Particular effects of enlargement of the EU and beyond on the polycentric spatial tissue with special attention to discontinuities and barriers</p>	<p>Once completed, it will be of interest for the elaboration of transnational spatial visions, especially in the eastern part of the EU, i.e. in the new member countries and in the EU-15 countries adjacent to them. The territorial impacts of a number of policy options, in addition to the impacts of trends, which are all tested in the two series of scenarios, provide valuable guidelines for the elaboration of spatial visions. A particularly interesting aspect is the study of situations and policy impacts in the backward and rural areas of the new member countries, which has so far not been the object of much consideration in other studies devoted to enlargement issues. A weak point is however the discrepancy in time horizons used for the two series of scenarios. While the SASI scenarios consider the year 2021, the RESSET scenarios consider the end of the 21st century. This extremely long term does not seem appropriate for economic scenarios based on models and seriously reduces the credibility and usefulness of their outcomes.</p>
<p>ESPON project 1.1.4.</p> <p>The spatial effects of demographic</p>	<p>The study is fundamental for the elaboration of spatial visions for transnational areas. First, it provides a sound basis for the analysis of population changes over the 1990s at a highly disaggregated level (NUTS 3 areas), showing the most determining factors of population change for the various areas. This makes possible comparisons between the demographic situation and evolution of the co-operation area concerned for which the</p>

trends and migration	<p>spatial vision is being elaborated with other neighbouring areas. The study is however subject to a number of limitations. Interactions between demography and other factors (economy, technology, foreign policies, integration policies, social policies, cultural policies etc.) have not sufficiently been taken into account, both in the explanation of trends and in the elaboration of scenarios. It will therefore be necessary to carry out in the various areas for which spatial visions are elaborated, complementary investigations about the specificities of these areas, which may enable the adaptation of study results with regard to potential future evolution.</p>
ESPON project 2.1.1. Territorial impacts of EU transport and TEN policies	<p>The study offers various opportunities for use in the context of the elaboration of transnational spatial visions. Its main merits are to highlight the territorial impacts of individual policy measures (didactic impact) and of combinations of policy measures (contribution to the elaboration of integrated approaches). While the study reaches its limits, both in terms of simulations and of policy recommendations, because of the Europe-wide context in which it is carried out, it stresses the need to apply and further elaborate the outcomes and strategies in more limited spatial contexts, which is precisely the case for spatial visions. The study offers therefore a valuable conceptual and instrumental framework for the elaboration of spatial visions. An important limitation of the study is that it does not integrate the significant increase of oil price in the various transport simulations. This is presently one of the most critical factors for the development of future transport policies, as it directly concerns the potentialities of the various transport modes as well as the issues of mobility in general and the relationships with substitution possibilities through more efficient ICT.</p>
ESPON project 2.4.2. Integrated analysis of transnational and national territories based on ESPON results	<p>The study contains various types of analyses, its usefulness for the elaboration of transnational spatial visions should consider this diversity of approaches. At the present stage and as long as final results are not available, it is however difficult to make a clear assessment. The impression prevails however that the transnational integrated analysis could be of key importance for the elaboration of spatial visions because it precisely highlights the rationale and needs for transnational cooperation in spatial development policies. This analysis should provide information about the areas best suited for transnational cooperation and about the most relevant themes to which co-operation should be devoted. The other analyses could provide complementary information, in particular as far as the identification of problem area is concerned, both at transnational and national level.</p>
ESPON project 3.2. Spatial scenarios and orientations in relation to the ESDP and cohesion policy	<p>The project is expected to have significant impacts on the elaboration of transnational spatial visions. At the present stage, the first series of thematic scenarios can only contribute to awareness rising about the issues mentioned above. The process has already started, in particular in the case of the spatial vision for the North Sea Region in relation with energy issues. The more integrated scenarios to be elaborated in the third phase will contribute more structurally to the elaboration of spatial visions. The baseline scenario will provide an extensive picture of trend evolutions, using a variety of reference values and indicators. The rollback scenario is intended to show the policy path leading to a competitive and spatially balanced Europe. A particularly important aspect of ESPON Study 3.2. is that it provides information about the various driving forces of spatial development, while other studies only consider policy impacts as factors of change.</p>
ESPON project 3.3. Territorial dimension of the	<p>The usefulness for the elaboration of transnational spatial visions will become clearer when final results are available. Although the main aim of the study is to contribute, in general terms, to the improvement of the Lisbon/Gothenburg strategy and not to the spatial vision exercises, provisional results indicate that a key of success of the Lisbon/Gothenburg strategy in a context of compatibility with the objectives of the ESDP and of the Structural Policies is to pay greater attention to individual regional</p>

Lisbon/Gothenburg Strategy	potentials and to specific territorial characteristics at meso/micro scales. In this respect, the study outcomes are likely to be of interest also for the spatial visions, and in particular for the development of competitiveness of the areas concerned in a context of sustainability and of territorial and social cohesion.
-----------------------------------	--

With respect to **the results achieved by the various transnational spatial visioning processes in methodological terms**, the following can be observed: All processes have used a mix of rather standardised qualitative and quantitative approaches for generating a better understanding of the particular spatial situation in the area. An extensive use of quantitative analyses can be observed in some cases (Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Area, CADSES), while others did not rely at all on such exercises (NorVision, North-West Europe, MEDOCC, Alpine Space). Also a wide direct use of more complex / cyclic approaches to “forecast” territorial development can not be observed throughout the various transnational spatial visioning processes. Already more common had been a punctual direct application of such approaches for very specific topics (Atlantic Area, CADSES, Baltic Sea Region) or an indirect use by making reference to external information sources generated on ground of such approaches (North-West Europe, MEDOCC). This general lack of prospective research in transnational spatial visioning processes is accompanied by the fact that they hardly take into consideration / integrate factors of significant change already perceivable in the present period, which tend to become increasingly important in the coming decade. Finally, also the development of alternative scenarios has remained rather exceptional in the elaboration of spatial visions (Alpine Space). Most transnational spatial visions have quite extensively used analytical maps to illustrate the actual spatial situation or future trends (Atlantic Area, Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North Sea Region), but there are only two cases where the territorial development perspectives have been visualised (North-West Europe, Atlantic Area).

The ESPON programme is producing more and more outputs (new project results, but in particular the data base and the maps), which tends to increase significantly the potentialities for using methodological results of ESPON-projects in transnational spatial visioning. However, if one compares the methods and approaches or techniques applied in the case of most ESPON studies, it becomes evident that they are not easily and immediately exploitable by those who are elaborating or actualising transnational spatial development visions. Whereas most ESPON studies elaborate complex typologies or use econometric and other types of models to realise projections and quantitative scenarios, the spatial analyses carried out for the preparation of transnational spatial development visions are - with a few exceptions - much less sophisticated in nature. This clearly creates a quite significant discrepancy between the actual needs of practitioners or spatial planners involved in the elaboration of spatial visions and the academic community that is predominantly involved in the elaboration of ESPON studies. Other problems resulting from this are also existing at the level of the terminology used in ESPON studies, which is considered as too abstract and not enough understandable by those involved in spatial visioning processes. This might partially also be related to the fact that ESPON produces studies only in English, while not all actors involved in spatial visioning processes (in particular in southern Europe) are familiar with the English language, especially with the academic terminology.

A particular weakness in the present ESPON outputs is the lack of systematic research on the drivers and factors of causality related to territorial change. The only drivers of change taken into account are those concerning policy options, but all factors of change not explicitly related to policies (for instance changes in the values, behaviours and ways of life of the European society, factors underlying migration patterns or the location of businesses, technological evolution etc.) have largely been ignored. A consequence of this is that the elaboration of long-term scenarios under ESPON Study 3.2, which in theory has to rely upon previous ESPON works and to integrate their results, is severely restricted by the lack of available knowledge on causality relations and on their evolution over time. Study 3.2 has therefore to carry out research about drivers of change in a variety of fields, but the scope of this kind of investigation is limited by the resources available.

Another limitation is the fact that the hypotheses chosen for the elaboration of scenarios or projections under the various studies have no common denominator, neither in terms of general orientation nor in terms of practical aspects such as time horizons or geographical scope. This makes the use of such scenarios particularly difficult for the elaboration of spatial visions.

With respect to **the “mental appropriation/ownership” developed by stakeholders in relation to transnational spatial development visions**, two general observations can be made that summarise well the current situation: (1) There is a clear trend towards increasingly involving a wider range of area-specific key stakeholders at an early stage in transnational spatial visioning processes and thus towards applying a more participatory planning approach. (2) The subsequent emergence of a high level of “mental appropriation and ownership” is significantly favoured by the combined existence of a strong participatory dimension, a clear “stakeholder-orientation” of application strategies⁵¹ and the extent to which a political discussion on / a validation of the finally elaborated strategic documents has taken place.

The participatory dimension in the preparation and elaboration process of transnational spatial development visions varies strongly and has much to do with the overall nature of the spatial visioning process itself. Several of the initial transnational spatial visioning processes have adopted a “top down approach” (Baltic Sea Region, CADSES, North-West Europe). A relatively small group of administrative and/or non-governmental planning experts was in charge of actually elaborating the respective vision documents, which - once finalised - were submitted in a sort of ex-post consultation process to a wider range of other administrative or political actors and organisms representing the civil society. The other group of initial spatial visioning processes shows elements that allow qualifying them as more bottom-up oriented approaches (North Sea Area, Atlantic Area). Here again the elaboration process involved a small group of planning experts, but also a wider range of area-specific “key stakeholders” (from transnational, national and regional/local levels as well as from NGOs) mostly through organising specific discussion/consultation events.

⁵¹ i.e. appropriateness and consistency of themes/issues addressed; high level of differentiation through a suggestion of measures and concrete project proposals in the document.

A transnational spatial development vision is originally not intended to (and should not) function as a "blueprint" for a concrete implementation scheme comparable e.g. to an operational INTERREG IIIB programme. But the way how application strategies in spatial vision documents are presented is important for its degree of stakeholder orientation. A consistent thematic focus together with a wide range of concrete operational provisions (i.e. territorial and sector-specific policy recommendations, suggestions and project proposals) establish an effective reference framework, which helps to orientate and inspire future actions that can be realised by various stakeholders in the area. The level of subsequent practical take-up of these operational provisions also allows judging to what extent "mental ownership and appropriation" has actually developed. A good example that positively combines these elements is the NorVision document. But also in case of the Baltic Sea Region, where the initially weak application strategy of the 1994 VASAB-document had been rapidly up-graded and further developed during the years 1996-2001, an increasing subsequent practical take-up can be observed.

In several cases, the finally elaborated spatial vision documents have not been politically validated (North West Europe, CADSES, including ESTIA) and there seems to be a quite considerable lack of substantial and wide-spread mental appropriation and ownership. There are however a number of cases where transnational spatial vision documents were formally adopted either by the respective ministerial authorities (Baltic Sea Area) or by regional co-operative structures composed of political representatives from the respective areas (North Sea Area, Atlantic Area). Although such processes did not change the "indicative value" of the spatial vision documents, their administrative and political credibility is stronger and more substantial impacts on mental appropriation / "ownership" can be expected. In some transnational co-operation areas, finally, the spatial visioning process had just started, wherefore observations with respect to mental ownership / appropriation can not yet be made (Alpine Space, MEDOCC).

The general and issue-specific remarks above clearly suggest that the time is over, where transnational spatial development visions had been realised by relatively small expert-centred / academic circles without any significant participation of other stakeholders from the "real world". It seems also that a turning point has been reached from which onwards the issue of a necessary political validation needs to be considered more systematically by all spatial visioning processes. This does not mean, however, that transnational spatial development visions are to become formally binding spatial development plans. But a systematic political discussion and subsequent validation of transnational spatial visions could significantly increase further the level of mental ownership / appropriation and the associated benefits (see text box below).

Beneficial impacts of an increased mental ownership / mental appropriation:

Vision documents become a reference document for influencing strategic planning at state, regional and local levels.

Vision documents become a reference framework for evaluating sector-specific policies at state, regional and local levels.

Vision documents improve and widen the mutual understanding of spatial development processes, instruments and institutions in the various countries and regions of the co-operation area.

Vision documents make effective contributions to the content of new EU-supported transnational co-operation programmes and help generating project ideas and/or support future project selection processes.

Vision documents contribute to the setting up of sustainable networks of planning professionals in the co-operation area.

5.3 The relation between selected cross-border spatial development planning activities and the overall findings of ESPON-projects

With respect to the **thematic results achieved by the 4 cross-border spatial development planning processes examined and their relation with the overall findings of ESPON project-results**, one can observe the following:

- By the themes addressed and the overall development goals/policy aims selected as well as by the overall geographical focus adopted, most of the cross-border spatial development concepts could highlight a coherent set of strategic issues that need to be addressed on a cross-border basis by spatial development policies (Eurocity White Paper, Euregio Rhein-Waal, PAMINA). Only the "Viadrina 2000" concept (D/PL) shows a number of inconsistencies with respect to the main topics addressed throughout the different parts of the document⁵² and also some gaps in relation to other strategically important themes that could have been better taken into consideration in the assessment of the current situation as well as in the operational part.
- All cross-border spatial development concepts had been elaborated and finalised before the start of the ESPON programme, wherefore no "real-time" cross-referencing could be established in relation to the provisional outcomes / results of the various ESPON-projects examined in the context of this study. In all cases, however, potentials for a stronger theme-specific cross-referencing with ESPON-results do exist if an eventual future

⁵² Although a number of strategic themes are currently reappearing in these different parts of the concept (i.e. assessment of the present situation; development vision; priorities for EU-support), one can observe that their precise denomination as well as the listing of related sub-themes slightly changes throughout the sections.

up-dating / revision process should be launched. These potentials do exist both with respect to themes already identified in the various cross-border concepts and with respect to a number of other topics that are not yet sufficiently addressed / considered (see Overview Table 11).

Overview Table 11: Thematic cross-referencing potentials between the 4 cross-border spatial development concepts and ESPON-projects

Area	Deepening of themes already addressed by cross-border concepts	Including new themes not yet sufficiently considered by cross-border concepts
F/E: Eurocity White Paper	Concept of polycentric development. Transport related issues. Demographic evolution.	Impact of climate change. Natural risks/hazards in the coastal area. Evolution of energy prices. Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg & Lisbon process
D/PL: Viadrina 2000 concept	The general patterns of the settlement structure. Potentials in the field of higher education/universities.	Polycentrism and the urban-rural relationship. Research & development and innovation. Role of Trans-European transport corridors. The role modern ICT-infrastructures. Aspects related to accessibility and connectivity. Natural/cultural heritage potentials. The existence of potential sources for industrial / natural risks. Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg & Lisbon process.
D/NL: Euregio Rhein- Waal concept	Concept of polycentric development and rural-urban partnership. Transport related issues. Demographic evolution.	Territorial impact of climate change/related natural risks and hazards. Evolution of energy prices and impact on transport and the logistics sector. Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg & Lisbon process.
D/F: PAMINA region concept	Environmental issues. Rural-urban partnership. Transport-related issues. Demographic evolution	Concept of polycentric development. Territorial impact of climate change/related natural risks and hazards. Evolution of energy prices. Territorial dimension of aspects related to the Gothenburg & Lisbon process.

The methodological results achieved by the 4 cross-border spatial development planning processes can be situated between a just satisfactory level of sophistication ("Viadrina 2000" concept, D/PL) and a medium-high level of sophistication (Eurocity White Paper, Euregio Rhein-Waal, PAMINA). All cross-border spatial development concepts were prepared and elaborated on ground of a mix of standard-level quantitative and qualitative approaches. They normally combined a partly dynamic (past-present) and a partly static (present-time) analysis of the socio-economic situation with a descriptive SWOT-analysis and a description of basic development perspectives.

Complex or cyclic methodological approaches to forecast territorial development were in most cases not used during the initial cross-border planning processes or within the finalised spatial development concepts (Eurocity White Paper, Euroregion Viadrina, PAMINA). A first exception is the descriptive trends exploration approach in the Euregio Rhein-Waal concept (D/NL) and a second

one the follow-up activities realised after the publication of the Eurocity White Paper (explorative and/or prospective thematic studies). Visualisation and mapping has extensively been used in the Eurocity White Paper and the spatial development concepts for PAMINA and the Euregio Rhein-Waal, with the latter two standing out as examples of good practice. The "Viadrina 2000" concept (D/PL) did not at all make use of mapping techniques.

With respect to the potentials for further improving methodological approaches in case of potential up-dating / revision activities, some elements applied by specific ESPON-projects could be used for further deepening / sharpening the territorial background analysis or the exploration of socio-economic development trends. Of particular interest could be, for example,

- the ESPON-typology elaborated with respect polycentric development (project 1.1.1),
- the analytical approaches used for exploring urban-rural relations (project 1.1.2),
- the long-term / very long-term scenarios elaborated for a number of themes particularly important for future territorial development (projects 1.1.4 & 3.2) that are either already identified or not yet sufficiently addressed / considered in the respective cross-border development concepts (see also Overview Table 11).

As regards the **stakeholder-orientation of application strategies and the "mental appropriation / ownership" that has developed with respect to the cross-border spatial development concepts**, no major differences can be observed among the medium-term approach of the "Viadrina 2000" concept (D/PL) and the three other approaches adopting a long-term perspective (Eurocity White Paper, Euregio-Rhein-Waal, PAMINA).

The application strategies of all cross-border spatial development concepts establish in most cases a very consistent relationship with the territorial assessments and the development goals/policy aims (exception D/PL). They are in general also well-differentiated (i.e. suggestion of a larger number of operational measures and/or project ideas), which allows them to effectively fulfil the function of providing key stakeholders with practical orientations for deriving concrete cross-border activities that could be realised in the future. Even if the range of stakeholders addressed might sometimes vary, this clear and explicit "stakeholder-orientation" of the concepts was in all cases strongly supported by the fact that during their elaboration process an intensive cross-border participatory approach had been adopted (i.e. brainstorming & discussion events, consensus-building processes). An indicator that might support the assumption of a well-developed "mental appropriation / ownership" is the high level of actual take-up that can be observed in those cases where information on follow-up activities has been available (Eurocity White Paper, PAMINA).

For this particular topic, potentials for establishing a cross-reference with respect to the provisional outcomes / results of the various ESPON-projects examined in the context of this study are relatively low. This is mainly due to the fact that ESPON-studies only include policy recommendations that are of a rather general nature and thus not appropriate for stimulating concrete cross-border actions.