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The purpose of this publication is to present the European Economic and Social Committee’s main contributions to the new dimension of cohesion policy provided for in the Lisbon Treaty: territorial cohesion, the third dimension of economic and social cohesion.

Territorial cohesion aims to introduce a European territorial approach that provides a framework for and renders compatible the territorial strategies drawn up and implemented by the Member States and regions. Territorial cohesion should focus first of all on the issues that affect territorial planning, and secondly on urban and regional planning.

The challenges and risks affecting Europe’s territory must be addressed by means of a European approach. The added value of a shared vision of the European territory is undeniable and a shared vision of this nature should be acknowledged to be a key strategic need.

Representative organised civil society at regional, and above all local, level should be given the opportunity for responsible and transparent involvement in defining and executing EU regional programmes.

The participation of economic and social actors in the governance of the territory requires institutional frameworks that enable this system to work. Civil society organisations must be involved in drawing up and implementing the policies established by the different levels of cross-border cooperation between two or more States.

Finally, my thanks are due to the previous president of the ECO section, Mr Dassis, as most of the contributions were prepared during his term of office.
Urban-rural typology of NUTS3 regions

- Predominantly urban regions
- Intermediate regions
- Predominantly rural regions, close to a city
- Predominantly rural, remote regions
- No Data

Close to a city: at least 50% of the population of the region lives at less than 45 minutes travel by road to a city of at least 50,000 inhabitants.
Sources: OECD, Eurostat, EuroGeographics, Statistics Sweden, Statistics Finland, EEA, JRC, REGIO GIS.
TERRITORIAL COHESION

TERRITORIAL COHESION: THE EUROPEAN APPROACH

Territorial cohesion aims to introduce a European territorial approach that provides a framework for and renders compatible the territorial strategies drawn up and implemented by the Member States and regions.

Territorial cohesion should focus first of all on the issues that affect territorial planning, and secondly on urban and regional planning. As stated by CEMAT (European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning) in 1994, spatial planning is the ideal instrument for implementing sustainable development at territorial level.

Efforts must therefore be made to clarify the concept, methodology and terminology of spatial planning. Spatial planning is a multidisciplinary approach and is a cross-cutting priority that affects a range of issues, especially the environment, transport and communications, and housing and human and industrial settlements.

A PROPOSED DEFINITION

On the basis of Article 2 of the Treaty of Rome and Articles 2 and 158 of the Treaty of Nice, territorial cohesion can be defined as follows:

Task entrusted to the European Union of promoting throughout its territory a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of economic activities.

A SHARED VISION OF EUROPE’S TERRITORY

The challenges and risks affecting Europe’s territory must be addressed by means of a European approach. The added value of a shared vision of Europe’s territory is undeniable and a shared vision of this nature should be acknowledged to be a key strategic need.

The following articles of the treaty currently in force should form a legal basis for drawing up a shared approach for Europe’s territory, based on the principle that this is part of the European Union’s remit:

- Article 2 states that the Community shall have as its task «to promote throughout the Community a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of economic activities»;

- Article 16 refers to social and territorial cohesion in the context of services of general economic interest;
• Article 71 in the context of a common transport policy;

• Article 158 states that «In order to promote its overall harmonious development, the Community shall develop and pursue its actions leading to the strengthening of its economic and social cohesion»;

• Article 175(2)(b) states that the Council shall, on a proposal from the Commission, adopt measures affecting town and country planning.
Main economic structures of the European territory
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Origin of data: GDP/Guerita, MEGA: ESPON 1.1.1 Network
Source: ESPON database
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*Switzerland, Norway and Bulgaria 1995 to 2001; Romania 1998 to 2001
GOVERNANCE AND PARTNERSHIPS

GOVERNANCE

The EU should have an appropriate system of governance, in which the right balance is struck between the different levels of territorial government, because within European territory, local, regional, national and EU-level governments all play a role. The principle of subsidiarity must be respected, whilst guaranteeing coherence and a holistic, common and shared approach.

EU territorial governance should be a bottom-up as well as a top-down process: bottom-up because regions have to identify and improve their social and economic, environmental and competitive conditions, and because European (and national) regional policy has necessarily to be implemented on site; top-down because of the financial resources and framework conditions which are provided and defined at EU and national level. It never is one-way traffic.

The concept of governance denotes a more participatory and horizontal form of governing than traditional, more hierarchical and vertical forms. The issue of governance in the Euroregions is particularly complex and interesting and hinges on finding common solutions to common problems.

PARTNERSHIPS

PARTNERSHIPS AT THE VARIOUS LEVELS

The legal reference document concerning «partnership» is Article 11 of the general regulation on the structural funds (Council Regulation (EC) no. 1083/2006 of July 2006), which calls for partnership, i.e. consultation and involvement of socio-economic actors and organised civil society, consisting of well-defined actors at regional and local level. Consultation and involvement should take place in defining, programming and evaluating regional projects. This cooperation should also be accomplished in the case of interregional and cross-border projects, amongst others in the context of a European grouping of territorial cooperation.

THE ROLE OF ORGANISED CIVIL SOCIETY

The involvement of the social partners and organised civil society in the framing, development and implementation of the Structural Funds and in adapting co-funded projects to local conditions and needs is essential.

Representative organised civil society at regional, and above all local, level should be given the opportunity for responsible and transparent involvement in defining and executing EU regional
programmes. Taking local and regional (non-governmental) views on board will contribute to the acceptance of the values of the Union by the citizens.

Yet, regrettably, there is often no mention of the social partners or organised civil society, although their role is essential to ensuring that projects meet grassroots needs and enjoy broad public support, and although they contribute to transparency in the use of resources.

The participation of economic and social actors in the governance of the territory requires institutional frameworks that enable this system to work. Civil society organisations must be involved in drawing up and implementing the policies established by the different levels of cross-border cooperation between two or more States.

**INSTITUTIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

In all territory-related issues, the added value of a common European approach is crucial. The experience gained in recent decades and the need to take account of the territorial dimension of European integration mean that policies affecting the overall European territorial approach should gradually be «communitarised».

A formal EU Council of Territorial Development should be set up. This would underline the significance of «multi-level governance». It would be a good platform for developing ideas about a holistic approach for regions and cities. It would give more weight to discussions and agreements in the Council.

Discussions on territorial cohesion within the Council should result in more precise policy decisions and to achieve this, greater involvement on the part of the European Commission is needed, because the Commission is better placed than anyone to ensure that the different approaches to territorial cohesion in the European Union are coherent and compatible with one another.

The Leipzig informal Council of spatial planning Ministers (September 1994) supported an initiative based on European action areas for integrated spatial planning. The Committee has since 1995 wanted this initiative to be generalised and practical measures to be taken. These might involve the development of scenarios, examination of the spatial impact of Community policies, and implementation of pilot planning schemes.
Road efficiency between major urban agglomerations

- Red: < 60 km/h
- Orange: 60 - 70 km/h
- Yellow: 70 - 80 km/h
- Green: 80 - 90 km/h
- Dark Green: > 90 km/h

Sources: Eurostat, EuroGeographics Association, REGIO-GIS
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SPECIFIC PROJECTS AND PROPOSALS

TRANSEUROPEAN NETWORKS

The idea of Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T) was first mooted in the late 1980s, in the context of the single market. Talk of the single market and freedom of movement only made sense if the different national and regional transport networks were linked to one another by means of a modern and efficient Europe-wide infrastructure system.

Since 1992, Title XV of the Treaty (Articles 154, 155 and 156) has been dedicated to Trans-European Networks. The record of the last seventeen years is disappointing, even alarming. Funding difficulties and lack of political will partially explain this poor record. The EESC regrets the fact that governments have consigned to political oblivion the 2003 Initiative for Growth, which included the construction of major trans-European networks. The EESC would ask: to what extent does the absence of an overview of European territory and its infrastructure account for the poor record of the Trans-European transport, telecommunications and energy networks?

ESPON – EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATION NETWORK

The EESC called in 1991 for the establishment of a European «observatory» for physical planning enjoying a certain independence vis-à-vis the national and Community authorities and backed up by a network of research institutes and bodies in all the Member States. This could make a valuable contribution, in a European context, to the definition of objectives for all the national territories, and the development of uniform analysis and evaluation methods.

The first ESPON programme started in 2002 for a period of five years. At the time of writing, the programme is in its second term (2007-2013).

ESPON aims to improve knowledge of the territory. But it is hampered in particular by the lack of economic data at local authority level or at NUTS 3 level throughout the EU. The merit of the project is that it shows up the many shortcomings of the European statistical system.

ESPON is very well placed as a centre for analysis and knowledge, for monitoring developments, and as a platform for analytical exchanges between Member States.
On the following maps, ESPON makes forecasts as to the situation concerning territorial cohesion in 2030. According to these scenarios, if emphasis is placed on the following areas:

- **cohesion policy** (*Cohesion-oriented scenario* – Map 1), this will create significant added value in terms of territorial cohesion, but will have less impact on economic growth and technological innovation;

- **current policies**, without major changes in direction (*Trend scenario* – Map 2), the response would be insufficient to address the short and medium-term challenges (economy, infrastructure, technological investment);

- **competitiveness policy** (*Competitiveness-oriented scenario* – Map 3), this would generate significant economic growth and make the continent more competitive, but would polarise economic activity and strengthen the role of the pentagon, thus depriving Europe of polycentrism.
EGTC – EUROPEAN GROUPINGS FOR TERRITORIAL COOPERATION

In 2004, the Commission proposed that a European grouping of cross-border cooperation (EGCC) be created. In its later proposal in 2006, the Commission amended the name, replacing the term «cross-border» with «territorial».

Legal entities created both under the EGTC and other Structural Funds must be responsible for coordinating the various sources of financing, and for the preparation and realisation of fund projects supporting industrial policy in the given region. This financing would be accessible to the representatives of the various parties involved in the regions. The establishment of such legal entities will create an incentive for cross-border cooperation and give such regions a greater sense of identity and increase their desire to harmonise their regulations.

THE EUROMETROPOLE LILLE-KORTRIJK-TOURNAI: A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE

The Eurometropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai is a European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGTC), which was set up on 28 January 2008. This is the first EGTC to be set up. The area it covers has two million inhabitants in France and Belgium. This bilingual (French and Dutch) Euroregion brings together three regions: Nord-Pas-de-Calais on the French side, and Flanders and Wallonia on the Belgian side. It facilitates cooperation among the local authorities (Urban Community of Lille, four Flemish districts and three Walloon ones) and the regional ones on issues of transport, telecommunications, employment, taxation, the environment, education, training, culture and public health. It is a concrete example of cross-border and Euroregion cooperation, with the metropolitan component playing an essential part.

EXCHANGE PROGRAMME

A European exchange programme could be set up for officials and elected representatives in regions and cities. Cross-border knowledge of one another’s approaches and strategies, e.g. regarding spatial development, promoting economic attractiveness and social housing will be very beneficial.

To this end, a common European training programme should also be promoted for the purpose of creating actors for cohesion who are capable of using the same method to work throughout all the phases of a territorial cohesion project.
GOOD PRACTICE GUIDE

Given the great wealth of experiments carried out on cross-border activity and the considerable ignorance about these schemes, it would be extremely useful if the Commission were to draw up a «good practice guide» in the field, including examples of successful public-private partnerships. As governmental policy objectives and instruments (legal, fiscal and financial), and regional and local implementation are necessarily complementary, a high-level debate on a variety of scenarios as well as analyses and benchmarks are likely to open new perspectives whatever the cultural and institutional differences between Member States.
Accessibility to passenger flights, 2006
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INTERREG PROGRAMME

In the early days of INTERREG, Article 10 of the ERDF regulation of 1988, then 1993, allowed the European Commission to grant a proportion of these funds (1%) to pilot projects for interregional cooperation within and outside the Community, innovation for regional and local economic development, spatial planning and urban policy. Among other things, these innovations led to the progressive implementation of the INTERREG programme, and also to the publication of two Commission communications: *Europe 2000* in 1991 and *Europe 2000+* in 1994. They related to European spatial planning and put forward solutions for territorial cooperation.

Through the Interreg Community initiative for cooperation between regions, the Commission has identified three areas of cooperation:

- **A – Cross-border cooperation**
  The aim of cross-border cooperation is to ensure economic and social integration by implementing common development strategies and structured exchanges between communities on either side of a border.

- **B – Trans-national cooperation**
  The aim of trans-national cooperation between national, regional and local authorities is to promote greater territorial integration by forming large European groups of regions or macro-regions.

- **C – Inter-regional cooperation**
  The aim of inter-regional cooperation is to step up exchanges of information and experience, not necessarily just in border regions.

CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION: A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE, THE EUROREGION

A number of examples throughout Europe help to identify a set of general principles for the success of cross-border cooperation:

- **Proximity to the general public.** The inhabitants of border areas want cooperation, as a means of overcoming the problems they face or of improving their living conditions.

- **The involvement of political representatives** (local, regional, national and European) is crucial to successful cross-border cooperation.

- **Subsidiarity:** The local and regional level has proved to be the most effective for developing cross-border cooperation, although an alliance is needed with national governments.

- **Partnership:** The involvement of all actors from both sides of the border is essential to achieving common goals.
• **Joint structures with common resources** (technical, administrative, financial and decision-making instruments) are a guarantee of lasting and constantly evolving activity. They are also a guarantee of being able to exercise certain powers, manage programmes, including European programmes, achieve cross-border consensus and to prevent national self-interest from taking over.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF A EUROREGION**

• Euroregions and similar structures are neither a new form of administration nor a new level of government; they are a **platform for exchange** and for «horizontal» cross-border cooperation between local and regional government;

• they also promote closer **vertical» cooperation between regional or local authorities, State governments and the European institutions;

• they are **associations** of local and regional **authorities** from both sides of a national border, sometimes with a parliamentary assembly;

• they are cross-border associations with a **permanent secretariat**, technical and administrative team and own resources;

• in some cases, they are **private-law bodies**, based on not-for-profit associations or foundations from either side of a border, in accordance with their respective national laws. In others, they are public-law bodies, based on inter-State agreements, intended, inter alia, to secure the involvement and cooperation of local and regional authorities;

• Euroregions are often not defined solely by their geographical or political/administrative boundaries but **also share common economic**, social or cultural **characteristics**.

**ADVANTAGES OF REMOVING BORDERS: ECONOMIES OF SCALE**

National borders often present an obstacle to the development of Europe’s territory as a whole, and can restrict its competitive potential. One of the main objectives of Community cross-border cooperation is, therefore, to **eliminate the barrier effect between national borders and to establish synergies** to address problems requiring common solutions.

Cooperation of this nature is **particularly needed for small-scale activities** that suffer most acutely as a result of the border effect. SMEs are a case in point.

Euroregions are conducive to economies of scale. In short, they offer increased market size (agglomeration economies), complementarity of production factors and greater **incentives for investment**. It is estimated that some investments in innovation and development can have a direct impact at a distance of 250-500 kilometres. Although some Euroregions are larger, the average Euroregion ranges from 50 to 100 kilometres.
CREATING REAL EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE

Cross-border cooperation and its steady implementation by Euroregions not only helps to prevent conflict, deal with disasters or overcome psychological barriers; it also clearly improves development on both sides of a border. This added value can be seen at the political, institutional, economic, social and cultural levels and also in terms of European integration. Cross-border cooperation makes a very useful contribution to promoting peaceful co-existence and European security and integration. It is a highly effective means of implementing the Community principles of subsidiarity, partnership and economic, social and territorial cohesion, and of bolstering the full integration of the new Member States into the EU.

From the socio-economic point of view, cross-border cooperation structures facilitate the following:

• harnessing the endogenous potential of all actors (chambers of commerce, associations, businesses, trade unions, social and cultural institutions, environmental organisations or tourism bodies, amongst many others);

• opening up labour markets and harmonising professional qualifications and

• enhancing economic development and job creation by means of measures in other sectors such as infrastructure, transport, tourism, the environment, education, research and cooperation between SMEs.
Freight transport, 2006
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TOWARDS A POLYCENTRIC DEVELOPMENT MODEL

A model of a balanced polycentric development in Europe would give rise to new forms of living communities, also to the benefit of society as a whole.

It is important to develop and implement dual-level polycentrism in the context of harmonious development, in order to avoid the detrimental effects of polarisation. The first level facilitates the emergence of development hubs spread throughout Europe, to disperse growth and jobs beyond the economic hub (the pentagon); the second level consolidates the links and synergies between the large urban centres and the (quasi-)rural areas, mainly to avoid territorial divisions.

The EESC has repeatedly advocated the implementation of polycentrism within the EU. The Fourth Cohesion Report highlights the dominance of the economic hub (or pentagon) and the growing importance of the capital cities, as well as the ensuing social and environmental costs. It talks about secondary growth poles and metropolitan areas, and consolidating synergies and complementarities between urban areas and the more remote regions.

THE METROPOLITAN PHENOMENON

OPPORTUNITIES

Globalisation

European urban areas are structured according to processes and dynamics that exist increasingly at global level. Europe’s major cities are hubs in a constantly evolving global network of metropolises. Europe needs well equipped cities and metropolitan areas.
Technological dynamics and international economic integration mean that cities are facing directly international trends and competition.

It is unsurprising, and promising, that many cities and metropolitan areas are defining new ambitions. The best among them are poles of skills and knowledge at all levels and centres of future-oriented investments.

**European integration**

The more national borders are blurred, the more there will be a natural tendency to strengthen the economic poles across the continent. The gradual organisation of inter-regional poles and even cross-border poles shows that economic development will be increasingly blind to the often artificial political and administrative borders bequeathed by history.

**Attractiveness of the European urban model**

Metropolitan areas are the main focal points of research, innovation and the creation of new activities. They are where activities with high added value are centred.

European cities are now developing both as cities and conurbations. City centres still serve as hubs of activity and meeting points. Metropolises also play a crucial part in consolidating a European model of society.

**CHALLENGES**

**Governance**

Lack of identity and inadequate administrative governance stand in the way of a balanced development for modern metropolitan areas.

**Exacerbation of social inequalities**

Metropolisation often exacerbates social inequalities and spatial disparities. Less-favoured social groups, e.g. unemployed young people and elderly people on low incomes, tend to gather in certain areas, leading to a concentration of disadvantages.

The exclusion of less-favoured sectors of the population and the poor quality of public services in these areas feeds on itself, eventually becoming a trap from which it is almost impossible to escape. Often there is mounting urban exclusion, even where urban regeneration policies have been in place for years. Large-scale action coordinated at metropolitan area level is needed if implementation is to have the best chance of success.
**Urban-rural relationship**

The relationship between rural areas and cities is a real challenge. A harmonious relationship between rural areas and cities for living and working conditions within metropolitan areas is crucial. This fits perfectly well in the new model of polycentric development.

**Environment**

Environmental protection and compliance with sustainable development objectives are another challenge facing metropolitan areas. They must honour the international commitments under the Kyoto protocol and thus reconcile economic development and environmental protection, which can be mutually reinforced by organising urban development (transport systems, establishment of centres of habitation, waste and waste water management, noise reduction, protection of city centres, and of the natural and agricultural heritage, etc.).

**Gap between reality and administrative borders**

The complicated administrative structures that exist across Europe are, as a rule, not designed for up-to-date long-term regional policies in densely populated areas.

It is important to note that metropolitan areas cover areas and socio-economic situations that do not coincide with the European regional administrative entities defined in the NUTS system (Nomenclature of Statistical Territorial Units) as used for official purposes by Eurostat and the European institutions. It is not useful to use administrative areas to analyse and compare the socio-economic development of European metropolitan areas.

Shortcomings in metropolitan areas are aggravated when the administrative management of these areas does not keep pace with economic development and the increase in population, housing and commuting. Often the administrative management within metropolitan areas still reflects bygone times. This in turn hampers effective government. Proper coordination between the administrative management and economic stakeholders and, in broader terms, between the public and private sectors is a prerequisite for good governance in metropolitan areas.
PRACTICAL PROPOSALS

NEED TO PRODUCE STATISTICAL DATA ON METROPOLITAN AREAS

Eurostat statistics do not, then, make it possible to track population trends, activities, unemployment or production in metropolitan areas, nor do they provide for any reliable comparison of strategic indicators such as: population growth rates, production value added, employment, unemployment or overall productivity per job.

The lack of any reliable, geographically comparable figures can lead to incorrect or even contradictory conclusions regarding the socio-economic trends that have been «observed» in European metropolitan areas (e.g. with regard to productivity trends within a single region).

It is essential for a «metropolitan areas» unit to be set up within Eurostat, which would be responsible for producing the aforementioned data each year.

HIGH-LEVEL GROUP ON SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT

A forum bringing together metropolitan areas and the Commission could promote polycentrism and increase knowledge of these areas. A group could be set up to identify and disseminate best practice.

Further deepening and broadening of the European debate is therefore desirable with respect to resilient and sustainable cities, and city-regions or metropolitan areas across Europe. To that end the EESC recommends the establishment of an EU High Level Group on «Sustainable Urban Development».

In cooperation with the Commission – the Interservice Group Urban Affairs - such a High Level Group may contribute to a more effective and targeted European debate on cities, amongst others by setting a prospective agenda, a list of relevant issues for cities, metropolitan areas and governments.

URBAN AGENDA

Big cities and metropolitan areas have to identify their own agenda in the areas of competitiveness, sustainable development, and social cohesion and inclusion.

Such an agenda should offer a future-oriented structure and long-term programme to policymakers and all other stakeholders at regional level. In doing so, self-confidence of cities and city-regions will be fostered increasing their expressiveness, nationally and internationally.
REPORT ON METROPOLITAN AREAS

There could be a regular report on the socio-economic situation of metropolitan areas, which would require the development of a statistical monitoring tool.

The EU and national governments should take into account the mechanisms and working practices in successful metropolitan areas.

EXAMPLE OF GOOD PRACTICE: BAUKULTUR

Baukultur – the quality of the built environment as a whole – can be interpreted as an integrated policy approach for sustainable urban development. The term Baukultur reflects the idea of a commitment to the built environment, including both the materials used in construction and the processes used for its supply and maintenance. Baukultur encompasses all the factors that influence the built environment, including architecture, engineering, infrastructure, town planning, the external appearance of buildings, landscaping, building maintenance and the construction industry.
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1957 Treaty of Rome, EEC, Article 2
«The Community shall have as its task… to promote throughout the Community a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of economic activities…»
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1970 First CEMAT: Council of Europe's European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning (Bonn, Germany)

1975 Creation of the ERDF (European Regional Development Fund) (Regulation no. 724/75 of 18 March 1975)
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Economic and social cohesion policy
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GLOSSARY

ACCESSIBILITY
Ease of reaching a destination. In addition to physical accessibility through transport infrastructure, connectivity through advanced telecommunication systems contributes to improving the intangible accessibility of areas.

CEMAT – EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS RESPONSIBLE FOR SPATIAL/REGIONAL PLANNING
Body attached to the Council of Europe (CoE) consisting of the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning in the CoE’s 47 Member States. At the ministerial meetings of CEMAT, which are held every three years, the ministers look at a different topic at each conference, for which they set a number of general guidelines.

COHESION FUNDS
Set up in 1993 as one of the instruments of cohesion policy, its purpose is to co-finance environmental and infrastructure projects.

COMMUNITY METHOD
Decision-making method typical of the first pillar, relating to areas falling within the European Union’s competence. In this context, the Commission has the sole power of initiative and puts forward legislative proposals to be put to the vote under the co-decision procedure. The Council votes by qualified majority and the European Parliament proposes amendments.

CPMR – CONFERENCE OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS
Promotes the interests and needs of coastal regions, which face particular problems. It works with the European institutions and national governments. Member regions develop cooperation programmes on specific projects to make the most of their assets.

CONNECTIVITY
Corresponds to the nature and capacity of transport and communication/telecommunication links with other urban settlements and with the major networks. The level of connectivity does not depend only upon the proximity of major transport and communication networks, but also and primarily upon the proximity to the points of access to these networks (railway stations, entrance to motorways). The concept of connectivity applies to both transport and telecommunication networks.

CONURBATION
Aggregation or continuous network of urban communities which have physically merged through population growth and expansion. It is a polycentric form of agglomeration.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COHESION
Expresses the solidarity between the Member States and the regions of the European Union. It encourages balanced and sustainable development, the reduction of structural disparities between regions and countries, and the promotion of genuinely equal opportunities for individuals. It is put into practice through various funding schemes, e.g. the Structural Funds.

EGTC – EUROPEAN GROUPINGS FOR TERRITORIAL COOPERATION
Proposed by the European Commission in 2004 and brought into existence by the adoption of the Regulation of 31 July 2006 (OJ L 210/19). This is a Community instrument that provides legal personality to an association of local authorities
whose ultimate aim is to implement one of the aspects of the European territorial cooperation objective. This legal capacity means that it can participate directly in the management of programmes and structural funds.

**EMPLOYMENT AREA**
Sphere of influence of a particular economic hub, in which a significant part of the active population lives and works. This concept is closely linked to those of metropolitan area and functional urban area.

**ERDF – EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND**
Set up in 1975, this is the largest of the structural funds in quantitative terms. Its purpose is to reduce disparities between regions of the Community by providing financial development aid to deprived regions.

**ESDP – EUROPÉENNE SPATIALE DÉVELOPPEMENT PERSPECTIVE**
Common frame of reference, launched in Liège in 1993 and adopted in Leipzig in May 1999 by the Ministers of the 15 Member States responsible for regional planning. Its aim is to improve the coordination of national policies in this field. It is based on three key principles: the development of a balanced and polycentric urban system and a fresh relationship between cities and the countryside; the assurance of equal access to knowledge infrastructures; and the sustainable development, intelligent management and conservation of nature and cultural assets. This document was also the basis for the Leipzig Charter.

**ESPON/ORATE (ESPON: EUROPÉENNE SPATIALE PLANNING OBSERVATORY NETWORK / ORATE: OBSERVATEUR EN RÉSEAU DE L’AMÉNAGEMENT DU TERRITOIRE EUROPÉEN)**
Programme whose ultimate objective is to collate a set of indicators relating to the development of European territories in every dimension (economic, demographic, social, environmental, geographical) by networking national data and research centres. The coordination is carried out by the Support Unit based in Luxembourg. The first ESPON programme started in 2002 for a period of five years. At the time of writing, the programme is in its second term (2007-2013).

**EUROCITIES**
Network of European cities founded in 1986. It has two tasks: acting as a go-between between the European institutions and its member cities (institutional follow-up and defence of interests); and facilitating the exchange of good practice in urban management (in particular through its committees).

**EUROPE 2000 [COM(91)452 FINAL] AND EUROPE 2000+ [COM(94)354]**
Two European Commission communications on spatial planning. They both (one is, chronologically, an update of the other) contain data and the main structural themes relating to European spatial planning, and compare the different institutional systems. Their ultimate objective is to provide strategic guidelines and thus lay the foundations for a wider debate about the added value of a Community vision of Europe’s territory.

**EUROREGION**
Euroregions are permanent structures intended to promote cross-border cooperation between directly neighbouring local or regional authorities located along shared State borders.
**FUNCTIONAL URBAN AREA**
Consists of an urban core and the area around it that is economically integrated with the centre, e.g. the local labour market. The point of reference is travel to work (base unit: commuters).

ESPON proposes that, for countries with more than 10 million inhabitants, a Functional Urban Area be defined as having an urban core of at least 15,000 inhabitants and over 50,000 in total population. For smaller countries, a Functional Urban Area should have an urban core of at least 15,000 inhabitants and more than 0.5% of the national population, as well as having functions of national or regional importance.

**GOVERNANCE**
**Territorial governance**, also known as local governance:
Presupposes the organisation of the complex relationships between various authorities and grass-roots actors in the context of the implementation of spatial planning policies. It is based on the concepts of partnerships and local cooperation and thus strengthens the role of organised civil society partners.

**Multi-level governance:**
Flexible structure of relations between Commission, governments, and regional and local authorities, tailor-made according to specific situations and thematic considerations rather than a hierarchical framework of competences between governmental layers.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING**
Process involving the drawing together of level and sector specific planning efforts which permits strategic decision-making and provides a synoptic view of resources and commitments. Integrated planning acts as a focal point for institutional initiatives and resource allocation. In the context of integrated (or comprehensive) planning, economic, social, ecological and cultural factors are jointly used and combined to guide land- and facility-use decisions towards sustainable territorial development.

**INTERREG IV**
see territorial cooperation

**INTERACT – INTERREG ANIMATION, COOPERATION AND TRANSFER**
For the period 2007-2013, this is a programme whose aim is to promote the good governance of programmes financed by the Community that relate to the objective of European territorial cooperation. It has a budget of around EUR 40 million.

**INTER-GOVERNMENTAL METHOD**
Decision-making method characteristic of the second and third pillars, known as the cooperation pillars, of the European Union. The intergovernmental method implies a unanimous vote by members of the Council, a process during which the European Parliament is able to issue opinions.

**JASPERS - JOINT ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORTING PROJECTS IN EUROPEAN REGIONS**
Technical assistance partnership between the European Commission’s Regional Policy DG, the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). The main objective of this programme is to provide technical expertise to the Member States with a view to developing large-scale high-quality infrastructure projects, mainly in the transport and environmental sectors, with the help of EIB and EBRD experts.
**JESSICA – Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas**

Initiative supported by the Commission, the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB). Its objective is integrated urban development by means of bank loans.

**LEADER**

The aim of this initiative, launched in 1991, was to support innovative actions for rural development in the disadvantaged regions of the EU. The different stages of these initiatives were: Leader (1991-1994) Leader II (1994-1999) and Leader + (1999-2006).

**Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities**

Adopted at the Leipzig informal Council in May 2007, alongside the Territorial Agenda, this lays the foundations for a new urban policy at European level. The charter seeks to set out the priorities to which the Member States are committed at national level. The idea is to regenerate economically and socially deprived areas. At Community level, the Charter provides for a regular exchange of good practice and shared lessons learned.

**METREX**

The Network of European Metropolitan Regions and Areas has a secretariat based in Glasgow (UK). It is a network of practitioners and a metropolitan interest group at European level. METREX has two roles: firstly, a horizontal one, facilitating contact between technicians, political staff and administrations of large European conurbations; and secondly, a vertical one, as an intermediary between the Community institutions and its members.

**Metropolitan area**

Urban agglomeration and its periphery, from which a significant number of residents commute to the central core every day. It includes the green spaces in the agglomeration and is usually delimited by its commuter belt. The notion of «metropolitan area» is thus close to that of «employment area» or «functional urban area». From a European perspective (METREX), a metropolitan area is defined as an area with at least 500 000 inhabitants. Sometimes the concept of metropolitan region is used in specific cases where the metropolitan area has an administrative boundary.

**NUTS – Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics**

Created by the European Office for Statistics (Eurostat) in order to create a single and coherent structure of territorial distribution. It has been used since 1988 in Community legislation relating to the Structural Funds.

The current nomenclature sub-divides the 27 Member States of the European Union into:

- NUTS 1 (e.g. German Länder, regions in Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, Wales and Scotland);
- NUTS 2 (e.g. the autonomous regions in Spain, French regions and overseas departments (DOM), the Belgian and Dutch provinces);
- NUTS 3 (e.g. the Kreise in Germany, the French departments, and the Spanish and Italian provinces).

**Outermost Regions**

Overseas territories of Member States that are an integral part of the European Union. They benefit from specific special measures,
including allocation of structural funds, scientific programmes and rules for protecting local markets. These are Guadeloupe, French Guyana, Martinique and Reunion, the Azores archipelago, the island of Madeira and the Canary Islands.

**PARTNERSHIP**

One of the Structural Funds' principles which implies the closest possible cooperation between the Commission and the appropriate authorities at national, regional or local level in each Member State from the preparatory stage to implementation of the measures.

**PENTAGON**

Also known as the blue banana or the economic hub, this is an imaginary geographical construct referring to the area running between Europe's five economic capitals: London, Paris, Milan, Munich and Hamburg. The ESDP, one of whose main objectives is to encourage movement towards a polycentric Europe, points out that this area accounts for 20% of the European Union's territory, 40% of its population and produces around 50% of its wealth.

**PERIPHERAL**

Peripheral regions are areas located far away from the main urban and economic centres, either within a State or on the European continent. Peripheral regions generally have lower economic potential and accessibility than the more central ones. Regional development policies pay specific attention to peripheral regions.

**PERI-URBAN**

Areas that are in some form of transition from strictly rural to urban. These areas often form the immediate urban-rural interface and may eventually evolve into being fully urban. Peri-urban areas are places where people are key components: they are lived-in environments.

**POLYCENTRISM**

Type of morphology of the settlement system, promoted by SDEC. It assumes that a plurality of urban agglomerations of similar size exist at the various levels of the urban hierarchy, as opposed to situations where a single large urban centre dominates each level and even eliminates the presence of intermediary levels. The principle of polycentric spatial structure and development can be applied at the various geographical scales, from the European to the regional one.

**RANDSTAD**

Geographical and administrative agglomeration including the Dutch cities of Utrecht, Amsterdam, The Hague and Rotterdam. It is often quoted as an example for its polycentrism, its administrative and political organisation, and its integrated planning.

**SGI – SERVICES OF GENERAL INTEREST**

Describes activities that serve the entire population of a given area. Community practice distinguishes between two types of SGI:

- **SGEI - services of general economic interest**: commercial services of general economic utility, on which the public authorities therefore impose specific public-service obligations (Article 86 of the EC Treaty, formerly Article 90). Transport, energy and communications services are prime examples.

- **Non-economic services**: relate to the statutory powers of the Member State and to the security of individuals (police, justice, statutory social security schemes).
**SPATIAL PLANNING**

Methods used by the public sector to influence the distribution of people and activities in spaces at various scales as well as the location of the various infrastructures and other forms of land use.

Spatial planning activities are carried out at different administrative or governmental levels (local, regional, national), while activities of co-operation in this field are also implemented in cross-border, transnational and European contexts.

**SUBSIDIARITY**

This principle was adopted at the Edinburgh European Council in December 1992 and is intended to ensure that decisions are taken as closely as possible to the citizen and that constant checks are made as to whether action at Community level is justified in the light of the possibilities available at national, regional or local level. Specifically, it is the principle whereby the Union does not take action (except in the areas which fall within its exclusive competence) unless it is more effective than action taken at national, regional or local level. It is closely bound up with the principles of proportionality and necessity, which require that any action by the Union should not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Treaty.

**TEN – TRANS-EUROPEAN NETWORKS**

Cross-frontier infrastructures in the field of transport, energy, telecommunications and the environment. In 1994 the European Council decided to provide support for 14 priority transport projects and 10 energy projects.

**TERRITORIAL COOPERATION**

Third separate objective of the European Union's cohesion policy for the 2007-2013 programme period (on a par with convergence and competitiveness), this concept is closely associated with the INTERREG IV Community initiative. According to a commonly-agreed definition, its purpose is to implement and facilitate partnerships with various European regional actors through:

- **cross-border cooperation (for 2007-2013: INTERREG IV A):** between adjoining border areas (NUTS 3), e.g. Eurometropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai. Enables better local geographical integration on problems common to neighbouring areas, which are sometimes disadvantaged because they are remote from centres;

- **transnational cooperation (INTERREG IV B):** between regions that share a common border (NUTS 2), thus creating large territorial groupings (e.g. INTERREG IV B programme for North West Europe). Facilitates better integration in terms of strategic issues;

- **inter-regional cooperation (INTERREG IV C):** between regions (NUTS 2) that may be geographically very distant. They cooperate on specific issues by sharing good practice and networks of technicians and practitioners. (e.g. EUCO2 project 80/50 administered by the METREX association).

**TERRITORIAL AGENDA**

Strategic framework for European spatial planning, adopted in its final version at the Leipzig informal council (May 2007). The agenda provides a set of broad guidelines that were agreed among the 27 Member States. It is accompanied by its first action programme, which came out of the Azores informal
Council (November 2007). The two aims of this document are balanced territorial development of the Union and sustainable economic growth (polycentrism, networks of partnerships, sustainable development).

**TERRITORIAL COHESION**
On the basis of Articles 2 and 158 of the Nice Treaty, territorial cohesion can be defined as the task entrusted to the European Union of promoting throughout its territory a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of economic activities.

**TERRITORIAL IMPACT (ANALYSIS)**
Method which aims to identify the impacts that all types of spatially-relevant public policies, measures and projects may have on the territory, especially on territorial sustainability and cohesion. In this respect, the territorial impacts to be identified may be of economic, social, environmental and cultural nature. They may be related to changes in accessibility, biodiversity, locational preferences, regional/local employment opportunities, quality of life, etc.

**TERRITORIAL POTENTIAL**
Linked to the concept of territorial capital. All the assets of a territory, in terms of infrastructure, economic activities, natural resources, accessibility of geographical location, etc.

**URBACT**
URBACT is a European Programme, funded by the ERDF, which aims to foster the exchange of experience among European cities and the capitalisation-dissemination of knowledge on all issues related to sustainable urban development. The second cycle of the Programme, URBACT II (2007-2013), follows in the footsteps of URBACT I (2002-2006).

**URBAN**
Community programme (1994-2006) focusing on the economic and social regeneration of towns and urban areas in difficulty to promote sustainable urban development.

**Urban**
An urban area is an area which physically forms part of a town or city and is characterised by an important share of built-up surfaces, high density of population and employment and significant amounts of transport and other infrastructure (as opposed to rural areas). Urban areas may also comprise non-built-up, green areas generally used for recreational purposes by urban dwellers.

**Urban Audit**
Comparable information on a certain number of selected urban areas in the Member States of the EU – fruit of a joint effort by Eurostat and the Directorate General for Regional Policy. The urban audit, which took place in two phases (2004 and 2007), brings together information on the quality of life in 258 towns and cities in the European Union. The areas covered by the data collected include demography, housing, health, the labour market, the economy, education, the environment, transport, culture and leisure.

**Urban Development**
Evolution of a specific (urban) area or of the various activities contributing to develop this area. Promoting urban development means acting towards the enhancement of the various economic, social, environmental and cultural potentials of cities and urban areas.
**URBANISATION**
Long-term process which characterises both the increasing share of population living in towns and cities and the growth of urban areas.

**URBAN SPRAWL**
Urban sprawl is the unplanned, uncontrolled spreading of urban development into areas on the outskirts of a city. The term is also used to designate the extensive, rapid and sometimes unbridled growth of a greater metropolitan area over a large area. Urban sprawl is characterised by several land-use patterns such as car-dependin communities, low-density land-use but larger scale of development than older established areas (wider roads, larger stores with expansive car parks) and lack of diversity in design, sometimes creating a sense of uniform urban environment.
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This publication on territorial cohesion sets out the various contributions from a number of ECO section opinions relating to territorial cohesion. This new Community competence, provided for under the Lisbon Treaty, is additional and complementary to economic and social cohesion.