Scaling and rescaling of EU spatial governance

Sielker, Franziska; Stead, Dominic

DOI
10.4337/9781788978620.00017

Publication date
2019

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Regional Governance in the EU

PART III

Macro-Regional Dynamics and European Integration

8. Scaling and rescaling of EU spatial governance

Franziska Sielker and Dominic Stead*

European spatial governance underwent substantial changes over the last two decades, leading to new scalar relations and politics. These changes have impacted on, and have been influenced by, EU urban and regional policy, structural funds and a range of EU sectoral policies. Although the EU has no formal spatial planning competences, the influences of EU policies on spatial development and governance are evident (Chilla et al. 2017; Evers and Tennekes 2016; Faludi 2010a/b; Sielker 2017).

The EU's various activities, directives, policies and regulations have resulted in the Europeanisation of 'ways of doing things' within domestic planning, and invoke new cooperation across administrative entities (Radaelli 2003; Clark and Jones 2008). In some cases, EU activities have also led to:

> the rescaling of mandates and budgets, dominant levels of power, spatial frames, policy networks, policy concepts, rationales, instruments, actor networks, policy agendas and national policy argumentations, policy networks, as well as a rescaling of norms, narratives, procedures and modes of operation. (Stead et al. 2016: 112)

A complex, yet under-researched, element is how EU territorial politics lead to various forms of rescaling. Using 'scale' as a lens, we analyse the various co-existing spaces and governance that shape contemporary spatial governance, and thereby influence European integration dynamics.

Against this background this contribution, firstly, aims to summarise the nature of spatial governance in Europe and, secondly, to analyse processes of scaling and rescaling, and how these in turn shape contemporary spatial governance. Our hypothesis is that territorial politics and domestic planning have become more fragmented and less integrated, which has, in turn, led to changes in scalar politics.

In order to explain rescaling and the multi-level impacts of territorial politics we introduce an analytical framework in which scale is conceptualised as a construct of multiple dimensions. Scalar construction is

considered to comprise of four co-existing dimensions through which stakeholders operate: (i) regulatory/jurisdictional; (ii) funding/resources; (iii) knowledge/values; (iv) network. Two explorative case studies are presented to illustrate how processes of rescaling occur. The first example discusses scalar reconstruction through one of the EU's sectoral policies – the common transport policy. The second example discusses rescaling in the context of macro-regional cooperation.[2]

The chapter is structured in six parts. First, we introduce EU territorial politics and the construction of Europe's spatial governance. Second, we provide a summary of literature around scale followed, third, by an introduction of the analytical framework of scale. Fourth, we present two explorative cases representing EU initiatives shaping territorial politics. Fifth, we discuss the extent to which these varying initiatives are mutually constitutive. In the conclusion, we then highlight the interrelated rescaling processes and the multi-level fragmentation in territorial governance.

1. EUROPEAN SPATIAL GOVERNANCE AND TERRITORIAL POLITICS IN THE EU

The introduction of project-funding for cross-border regions in the 1990s and the development of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) led academics to discuss the opportunities for the development of European spatial planning (Faludi 2004; Jensen and Richardson 2003; Waterhout 2008). Rivolin and Faludi (2005) argue that the informal ESDP developed in 1999 for the then 15 member states was 'duly applied' and paved the way for the development of transnational cooperation. The ESDP, however, did not lead to a transfer of competences to the EU level. The term European spatial planning in contrast to academia has been excluded from the political vocabulary (e.g. Dühr et al. 2010; Atkinson and Zimmermann 2018). Instead, the narrative of territorial cohesion gained momentum. Territorial cohesion indicates a coordinative role at the European level, in particular the European Commission, jointly with member states as regards territorial development. In 2007, the European Union recognised this territorial dimension formally as part of its cohesion goal in Article 174 of the Lisbon Treaty (see EU 2007).

A diversity of activities at European level is highly influential for land-use management, regional economic management and urbanisation policies (e.g. Dühr et al. 2010; Adams et al. 2011; Stead et al. 2016). However, the importance given to sectoral policies by planning scholars is often limited to the case of urban and regional policies (Waterhout 2008; Rivolin 2010). The role of other sectors, such as transport, agricultural and

environmental policies, is less well covered in the literature. In order to discuss how European policies and activities shape spatial development and governance, a distinction is made between three main aspects: (1) sectoral policies, (2) financial instruments and (3) regional cooperation strategies.

1.1 Sectoral Policies

Various EU sectoral policies have grown in importance (and resources) over recent decades. Examples include the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) policies or maritime spatial planning. These changes have led to both direct and indirect impacts on domestic aspects of territorial governance and spatial planning.

Considering the main EU policy sectors (Table 8.1), at least six have direct impacts and influences on spatial planning practices and regulations as well as land-use patterns (see, for example, Streifeneder et al. 2018). These sectors include agriculture, energy, environment and climate change, maritime and fisheries, regional and urban development, and transport. Another 14 EU policy fields have indirect influence or impact on planning processes. Examples include cultural activities – supported by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) – and the Customs Union, which can affect spatial development in border areas (Sielker 2018).

Table 8.1 Areas of EU legislation and their relevance for spatial planning and territorial development

Topics of Directives	Relevance for spatial planning and land use
Agriculture, Energy, Environment and climate change, Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Regional Policy, Transport	Direct influence
Budget, Competition, Consumers, Culture, Customs, Economic and Monetary Affairs, Education, Training, Youth and Sport, Employment and Social Policy, Enlargement, Enterprise, Foreign and Security Policy, Internal Market, Research and Innovation, Taxation	Indirect influence
Audiovisual and Media, Development, External Relations, Fight against Fraud, Food Safety, Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection, Human Rights, Information Society, Institutional Affairs, Justice, Freedom and Security, Public Health	Minor relevance

Source: Compiled by the author.

1.2 Financial Instruments for Territorial Cooperation

Grassroots development of cross-border initiatives, such as the first European region (Euregio) at the Dutch–German border and the establishment of the European Regional Development Fund in 1975, can be considered as the grounding elements of today's regional policies. In the 1990s, the INTERREG Community Initiative for cross-border cooperation was established. During the same decade, the ESDP provided the backdrop against which a line of funding for transnational regions was introduced in regional development funds, followed by interregional cooperation in the third funding period. Since its development in the 1990s, European territorial cooperation policy has increased in terms of budget (about ten times to €10 billion) and coverage (i.e. the number of participating countries).[3]

European territorial cooperation programmes provide one of the major impetuses for cooperation across borders. The intergovernmental organised monitoring committees decide on projects, and subsequently give strategic impetus to territorial development. Urban and regional policies, and in particular INTERREG, have widely been reflected as main gateways for the Europeanisation of domestic planning. They also provide new elements in the EU's multi-level governance system (Faludi 2008; Stead et al. 2016). These programme areas combine different administrative units to new 'spaces' which have exclusive access to funds, leading to rescaling.

1.3 Regional Cooperation Strategies

Over the last decade, macro-regional strategies (MRS) and European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation (EGTCs) have been introduced by the European Commission. The former are informal and strategic tools for cooperation in large-scale areas. The latter offer legal frameworks for cooperation at the regional, cross-border level. A third type of governance concerns bottom-up initiatives which are being generated for various reasons, often in attempts to foster the use of structural funds. Examples are the Europa-Region Danube-Moldova or the Euroregion Alpes-Méditerranée (Telle 2017; ESPON 2017).

In the case of macro-regional strategies, EU member states and third countries identify joint development priorities in areas with common functional challenges (COM 2013). To facilitate the implementation of MRS a governance structure is set up, which includes horizontal coordination by countries representatives and a vertical coordination for thematic priorities (Gänzle and Kern 2016; Sielker 2016). The European Commission's role is mainly coordinative. Since 2007 four MRS have been developed for the

Baltic Sea, Danube, Adriatic-Ionian and Alpine regions (Gänzle and Kern 2016; see also chapters by Gänzle and Perrin in this volume).

The EGTC regulation was adopted in 2006 and then amended in 2012. Since its development, the main objective has been to facilitate structural funds in cross-border transnational or interregional cooperation. The regulation has been applied in multiple contexts. To date more than 60 EGTCs have been implemented with a focus on cross-border organisations (Chilla et al. 2017; Caesar 2017). Both governance forms provide institutional frameworks that bring together representatives from administrative units, thereby shaping agendas and scalar (re-)structuration.

2. SCALING AND RESCALING IN TERRITORIAL POLITICS

2.1 Conceptualising Scale

Starting in the 1980s, the academic literature witnessed a considerable growth in debate around conceptualisations of 'scale' and processes of 'rescaling'. Political, spatial and social sciences questioned what 'scale' is, and how different territorial configurations provide a framework for stakeholders' activities. It is inherent to spatial configuration and politics that they are implemented and contested over various levels and scales.[4]

Initially, scale was engaged in theorisation of scale and scalar organisation of society (see Taylor 1981, 1987; Smith 1981, 1984, 1992). In contrast to the materialist views on scale proposed by Taylor and Smith, Hart (1982) drew on the Kantist philosophical tradition, and argued that scales are fictive (see Herod 2011 for further exploration). In the 1990s and early 2000s, contributions disputed the changing role of nation states in the context of globalisation and European integration. In seeking to overcome the notion of scale as 'taken for granted', most contributions were affiliated with forms of neo-Marxist thinking (e.g. Smith 1992; Brenner 1999) or regulation theory (e.g. Collinge 1999; Jessop 1997; Swyngedouw 1997a/b). In this phase, the constructivist approach to scale was developed (Brenner 2001; Delaney and Leitner 1997). Poststructuralist writing challenged these political-economic approaches by disputing the use of the concept of scale as such (Marston 2000; Marston et al. 2005; Jonas 2006). More recently, scalar literature entered a phase of consolidation and highlighted the overlaps of both strands in following a constructivist perspective (MacKinnon 2010).

Throughout the decades, a common concern was to shed light on scalar relations and processes of rescaling. Many definitions of rescaling exist:

most of them follow a narrow understanding as to the reallocation of state power; others encompass modes of governance, policy relationships, agendas, networks or ideas (Gualini 2007; Stead et al. 2016). Regarding an empirical application in environmental and planning studies, however, scholars often maintain a narrow definition of rescaling, focusing on changes in jurisdictional arrangements or on competence shifts (Kern and Löffelsend 2004; Cohen and McCarthy 2015; see also contributions in European Planning Studies 2006). Further foci of analysis are the reasons and circumstances triggering rescaling (e.g. globalisation), the different objects of rescaling processes and/or the direction of processes of rescaling. Interestingly, the rich conceptualisation of scale has not yet capitalised into a guiding framework for analysing scalar (re-)structuration and rescaling. Translating the merits of these conceptual elaborations into an analytical framework is complex and challenging. More specifically, it is argued that the conceptual debates provide a processual understanding of scale, but do not offer a structured way to explain *how* scale is contested.

2.2 Towards a Multi-Dimensional Framework

In short, the notion of 'scale' refers to the 'entangledness' of varying administrative levels and the production and reproduction of trans-scalar relationships in a spatial context. The term 'scale', commonly used in spatial and social sciences, inherits a reference to the spatial relation of this governance level in relation to other scales. the production of scales reflecting the overlapping nature of different dimensions of scalar configurations, including legitimacy questions and network elements. Scale can be conceptualised through multiple dimensions, which differentiate how and through which means and elements scalar production comes into effect. Four dimensions are distinguished here: (i) regulatory/jurisdictional; (ii) funding/resources; (iii) knowledge/value; (iv) network. The first and fourth dimensions appear most frequently in the academic literature.

The first dimension (regulatory/jurisdictional) refers to all types of frameworks, ranging from jurisdictional or legislative frameworks to regulations, provisions or formalised procedures that form part of scalar construction. The network dimension (iv), reflecting the most fluid part of a scalar construction, refers to informal and formal, defined or loose, temporary or institutionalised networks. The second dimension (funding/resources) ascribes a role to financial means and resources. They allow, restrict or facilitate activities. The third dimension we term the 'knowledge/value dimension'. With this dimension, we draw attention to the somewhat intangible parts of scalar construction reflected in 'common knowledge' and even more widely shared or sometimes contradicting societal values.

All human activities are influenced by underlying values and knowledge. Knowledge and values can spread and transgress scales through public interactions; sometimes they enter into the narrative of 'common sense' or the predominant 'canon of values', or change the nature of discourses and question hegemonic relations (Moore 2008). A detailed description of the framework can be found in Sielker (2017) and Sielker and Stead (2017).

3. RESCALING IN TWO EXPLORATORY CASE STUDIES

3.1 The Case of Transport Policy

The EU common transport policy can be traced back to the Treaty of Rome of 1957, which established the goal to create a common market and reinforce economic links between the member states. The succeeding Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC), or Maastricht Treaty, provided a legal basis. In 1996, the first 'Community Guidelines' adopted by the European Parliament and the Council constituted a master plan for connecting national networks. The overall goal for introducing transport networks was to promote proper operation of the single market. When the Lisbon Treaty came into force in 2009, the TEC was amended and named Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). Today, Articles 170–172 and Article 194 TFEU provide the legal basis for Trans-European Networks (TENs). The three activities encompass transport networks (TEN-T), energy networks (TEN-E) and telecommunication networks (eTEN).

The policy aims to complete a core network by 2030. EU Regulation 1315/201 identifies nine TEN-T core network corridors: Atlantic, Baltic Adriatic, Mediterranean, North Sea-Baltic, North Sea-Mediterranean, Orient-East Med, Rhine-Alpine, Rhine-Danube and Scandinavian-Mediterranean. These are complemented by a comprehensive network covering all European regions, and by two horizontal priorities – Motorways of the Sea and the European Rail Traffic Monitoring System (ERTMS) deployment. The allocation of EU funding for implementation activities is linked to an obligation for member states to align national investments. In the preface, a new multiannual financial framework of the EU, a consultation phase provides the basis for the inclusion of transport axes into the corridors. The Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) was introduced in the funding period 2014–20; by this means, approximately 50 per cent of the budget is available to member states via the Cohesion Fund.[5] The first generation of work plans for the corridors was approved in 2013,

and renewed in 2016. The plans envisage coordinated improvements to primary roads, railways, inland waterways, airports, seaports, inland ports and traffic management systems, and integrated, intermodal, high-speed, long-distance corridors. Corridor studies and the results of an extensive consultation with corridor and national representations provided input for the work plans. Since 2006, the Trans-European Transport Network Executive Agency (TEN-TEA) has provided technical and financial management for projects.

From a jurisdictional point of view, the European level has no decision-making competence regarding transport development; decisions on transport measures remain with the member states. For most (non-federal) European countries competences for motorways, inland waterways and airports remain at the national level. In terms of financial resources, the TEN-T policy led to a rescaling of resources to the EU level. This includes, first, the resources such as staff in the General Directorate for Mobility and Transport. Second, it includes the funds for the CEF itself. The incentive provided by the availability of this money to implement measures in the core networks impacts the decisions in the domestic planning contexts. The CEF may be in favour of faster development, thereby indirectly impacting decisions at other levels. One example is the electrification of the railway network which, through EU funding, took place at a faster pace. This is also an example indicating that the legislative side to transport planning remains with the member states. Bavaria is an interesting example showing the role of knowledge and networks regarding scalar structuration in transport policy. Resulting from the German input, the TEN-T corridor displays a northern and a southern railway route linking Germany and the Czech Republic, which would make both routes eligible for CEF funding for electrification. Due to the enormous funds needed, it is highly unlikely that both routes will be developed. This inner-German and inner-Bavarian conflict, however, remains within the domestic bargaining sphere. The Czech Republic has electrified parts of the route, while the political upheavals within Bavaria for favouring one district over another led to delays in decision-making. This example shows that while having relative far-reaching competences in the transport sector, legislative means are limited. The inclusion of both routes in the core corridor indicates the dependence on member states' decisions. However, interviews undertaken as part of an assessment of development opportunities for the region indicated that the existence of the European funds changed the narrative, and the opportunities for agenda-setting. The TEN-T corridor platforms allow access to and provision of knowledge changing the multi-level dimension of transport policies.

3.2 The European Macro-regional Strategy for the Danube Region

The first European macro-regional strategy (MRS) was launched in 2009 for the Baltic Sea Region. This was soon followed by development of the Danube Region Strategy (2011), the Adriatic-Ionian Strategy (2014) and the Alpine Region (2015). One key idea of macro-regional cooperation is to tackle common challenges through the development of a joint strategy by countries in the same geographic area. Geophysical characteristics are the building blocks for various areas of cooperation (e.g. navigation or environment). The EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR) is organised in priority areas, representing the thematic foci for cooperation. The EUSDR addresses a total of 11 policy fields ranging from transport and the environment to education or security matters. Starting from this general prioritisation in support of joint activities, the EUSDR has set the goal of making the Danube a more navigable river (European Commission 2011). For each priority area, a governance structure is defined in order to coordinate implementation activities through national and EU-funded activities. Regarding its administrative reach, the macro-regional governance structure is located between national and EU level.

The EUSDR involves the cooperation of 14 countries along the Danube River corridor and the river water's catchment area. The issue of navigation was central to the development of the MRS, not least since European Commissioner Johannes Hahn called on national transport ministers to increase transport volumes on the Danube by 20 per cent between 2011 and 2020.

Soon after adoption of the MRS in 2011, work began on implementing Priority Area 1a ('Mobility – Inland Waterways') under the leadership of Austrian and Romanian coordinators with support of the Technical Secretariat at the viadonau GmbH, the Austrian waterway operator. A governance structure was set up for the implementation of the Priority Areas with a Steering Group as the central governance element. The group was formed of representatives from the 14 countries, including representatives from public authorities such as ministries or waterways and shipping offices. Several governmental and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) – such as the Danube Commission, the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) and Pro Danube International – are observers to this committee. The committee is responsible for decision-making on joint goals and strategies. The decisions have no formal character; nor do they represent binding agreements.

In a second step, this Steering Group prepared the 'Luxemburg Declaration' (Danube Ministers 2012), signed by most of the Danube Transport Ministers, which provides political commitment to the develop-

ment of a more effective waterway. In a third step, the Steering Group including waterway companies developed the Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan, based on a former Network of Danube Waterway Administrations (NEWADA) project (FRMMP 2014). The plan covers the river's navigable tributaries in each country and the critical sectors. In addition, public authorities defined so-called common minimum levels of service as well as different waterway maintenance activities. In a fourth step, the Master Plan was presented to the Danube Ministers, who subsequently endorsed it (Danube Ministers 2014). Fifth, the Master Plan established the basis for National Roadmaps (2015) and the development of specific implementation activities. One example is the FAIRway Project, whose scope is to procure the necessary equipment to carry out pilot activities for hydrological services and to allow the identification of innovative approaches to Fairway rehabilitation and upgrade. The eight beneficiaries from six countries (Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Romania and Slovakia) obtained funding through the Connecting Europe Facilities. In February 2016, the FAIRway Project was launched with a total budget of ca. €22 million with ca. €19 million from EU contributions.

This case shows how stakeholders crossed different scales and made use of the different dimensions of scale to influence political priorities and decision-making at the EU and national level. In short, the EUSDR provided a network that developed a new and necessary knowledge base on the challenges of shipping. This information had a crucial impact on decisions for allocation of funds, changes in funding priorities and political agendas at the EU as well as at the national level. The Steering Group is a new network through which public authorities can enhance their position with respect to the national context. In this case, the knowledge and the network dimensions were essential for stakeholders to gain political support. This, in turn, led to allocations of resources. The example of the Steering Group, essentially driven by active public authorities and the Technical Secretariat of viadonau, shows how this new network influenced the political decision-making and funding at national and EU level. In order to achieve this goal, they used the knowledge dimension in providing a new information base and directed this development towards the network dimension at the macro-regional level. The official framing of an EU strategy helped this network make its voice heard at the group of the Transport Ministers. Through this 'upscaled' network of interest groups and public authorities in cooperation with the waterway associations and shipping companies, stakeholders were able to seek political support from the national transport ministers as a first step. Different stakeholders used different dimensions in the process to influence developments and change political priorities.

4. DISCUSSION: RECIPROCAL INFLUENCES OF EU TERRITORIAL POLITICS SHAPING SCALAR CONSTRUCTION?

The exploratory case studies illustrate that all processes and their outcomes are connected by the developments within different dimensions of scalar structuration; all of these dimensions are essential within processes of restructuration, depending on the phenomena and actors involved. Common to both cases was that, due to the limited regulatory capacities from the EU level, the main incentive for shaping policies and thematic goals was the opportunity to develop financial incentives. As the example of the TEN-T corridors shows, these can develop towards an overarching narrative and provide background to decision-making on other levels. When looking at scalar politics through the four dimensions discussed, it is striking that the newly established and often morphological networks result from EU initiatives – for example the ERDF-funded projects and programme worlds, corridor platforms or steering committees as new governance arrangements. They provide access to information and offer platforms for lobbying and agenda-setting. The impact of these networks is substantial and influences decision-making at all levels.

These results confirm research on Europeanisation processes (Waterhout 2008). Looking at scalar structuration through these dimensions, however, lays bare that the existence of these networks is a result as much as a source of debate. Furthermore, discussing these initiatives in comparison demonstrates also that, as regards sector policies, regulatory force often comes alongside financial incentives. Had we taken, for example, environmental policies, the EU's legal and regulatory relevance would have been stronger (e.g. through the Water Framework Directive). Nevertheless, the networks involved in development and implementation play a considerable role (see e.g. Chilla 2013; Stead 2014). The examples here highlight the role of these networks in providing knowledge.

We hypothesised that various activities influence spatial governance and territorial politics, leading to fragmentation and disintegration of domestic policies due to changes in scalar politics. Despite the absence of a coherent framework, spatial development results from these various processes and politics at the same time. In order to understand territorial politics and shape them, a better understanding of these processes is needed. Analysing these through a multidimensional conceptualisation of scale allows us to question the interrelatedness of different levels, processes and stakeholders.

The cases illustrate that stakeholders make use of different levels to achieve their goals (e.g. the transport sector). The empirical cases reveal that stakeholder groups attempt to achieve their goals through these differ-

ent governance arrangements and platforms. The macro-regional example showed that transport policy is developed, shaped and implemented through different strands of the European spatial governance framework. These reciprocal influences are noticeable, for example with the MRS aiming to support the TEN-T network, and vice versa, to seek alignment and political support.

All cases presented here lead to rescaling in the more fluid parts of scalar structure, while mostly retaining formal competence at the original level. While upwards rescaling of human resources or competence over resources displays an important feature, European spatial governance today is particularly effective and vivid in the knowledge/value dimension and the network dimension. The recognition of new inter-scalar networks as influential shows the fragmentation and spreading out of debates and discussions into different levels. The examples provided indicate that through these initiatives and the development of new governance arrangements policy processes become fragmented, giving advantages to institutions able to act over different networks and political levels.

Viewing the EU's activities as a whole and the effects from one activity to another shows the complex set of rescaling and scalar interrelations that shape European spatial governance. Looking at European spatial development and territorial politics through the lens of scale allows the links to be identified between the different activities throughout stakeholders' involvement. The multidimensional framework allows for a differentiation of scalar practices. At the same time, this shows that operationalisation of scale towards an analytical framework faces its own challenges. Further research and testing are needed to link empirical analysis with the abundant conceptual debate.

NOTES

* This chapter is based on Sielker (2018) and Sielker and Stead (2017).

1. The case study material is mainly derived from research projects carried out by the first author (Franziska Sielker) at FAU Erlangen-Nuremberg. The projects that provided empirical input and served as the basis for the elaboration here are the dissertation project 'Macro-regional Integration: New Scales, Spaces and Governance for Europe?' (Sielker 2017); 'ESPON Actarea: Thinking and Planning in Areas for Territorial Cooperation' (ESPON 2017); and the Newton International Postdoc Project 'Power in Planning: Stakeholders' Choice of Power Channels in EU Sector Policies'.
2. For further elaboration on individual programmes, their development and content – as well as further spatial strategies such as the Territorial Agenda and the Urban Agenda –see for example: Dühr et al. (2007, 2010); Faludi (2004, 2010b); Faludi and Waterhout (2002); McCann (2015).
3. An important distinction should be made between 'level' and 'scale'. The term 'level' as commonly used in political science describes the existence of different tiers of an

administrative or statehood system, whereas the term 'scale' inherits an analytical conceptual approach (Lang and Sauer 2016).

4. Further funding for TEN-T projects is expected to come from the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI) and the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF). From the grant budget of €33 billion, about €22 billion are available for TEN-T projects.

REFERENCES

Adams, N., G. Cotella and R. Nunes (eds) (2011), *Territorial Development, Cohesion and Spatial Planning: Knowledge and Policy Development in an Enlarged EU*, London: Routledge.

Atkinson, R. and K. Zimmermann (2018), 'European Spatial Planning Policy', in: Heinelt, H. and S. Munch (eds), *Handbook on EU Policies*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 156–172.

Brenner, N. (1999), 'Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union', *Urban Studies*, **36** (3), 431–451.

Brenner, N. (2001), 'The Limits of Scale? Methodological Reflections on Scalar Structuration', *Progress in Human Geography*, **25** (4), 591–614.

Caesar, B. (2017), 'European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation: A Means to Harden Spatially Dispersed Cooperation?' *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, **4** (1), 247–254.

Chilla, T. (2013), *Punkt, Linie, Fläche: Territorialisierte Europäisierung*, Frankfurt/Main, Brussels: Peter Lang.

Chilla, T.; F. Sielker and F. Othengrafen (2017), 'Governance Diffusion in Europe: The EGTC Tool and its Spatial Implementation Patterns', *Working Paper No. 2*, available at: http://blogs.fau.de/regionalentwicklung/wp2-governance-diffusion (accessed 18 December 2017).

Clark, J. and A. Jones (2008), 'The Spatialities of Europeanization: Territory, Government and Power in "Europe"', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, **33** (3), 300–318.

Cohen, A. and J. McCarthy (2015), 'Reviewing Rescaling: Strengthening the Case for Environmental Considerations', *Progress in Human Geography*, **39** (1), 3–25.

Collinge, C. (1999), 'Self-organization of Society by Scale: a Spatial Reworking of Regulatory Theory', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, **17** (5), 557–574.

COM (European Commission) (2013), 'Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Concerning the Added Value of Macro-regional Strategies', COM (2013) 468 final, Brussels.

Danube Ministers (2012), 'Declaration on Effective Waterway Infrastructure Maintenance on the Danube and its Navigable Tributaries', Danube Ministers Meeting, Luxembourg, 7 June 2012, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/inland/promotion/doc/danube_declaration.pdf (accessed 2 June 2016).

Danube Ministers (2014), 'Conclusions on an Effective Waterway', Danube Ministers Meeting, Brussels, 3 December 2014, available at: http://files.groupspaces.com/MobilityWaterways/files/1285252/OiaUEBRsmpIf_Jk3xWr4/Conclusions_signed.pdf (accessed on 2 June 2016).

Delaney, D. and H. Leitner (1997), 'The Political Construction of Scale', *Political Geography*, **16** (2), 93–97.
Dühr, S.; C. Colomb and V. Nadin (2010), *European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation*, London: Routledge.
Dühr, S.; D. Stead and W. Zonneveld (2007), 'The Europeanization of Spatial Planning through Territorial Cooperation', *Planning Practice and Research*, **22** (3), 291–307.
ESPON (2017), *ESPON ACTAREA: Thinking and Planning in Areas of Territorial Cooperation. Final Report*, Luxembourg: ESPON, available at: https://www.espon.eu/actarea (accessed 20 December 2018).
European Commission (2011), 'Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – European Union Strategy for the Danube Region', COM (2010) 715 final, Brussels.
European Planning Studies (2006), Special issue 'Governance Rescaling in Europe: Analytical and Empirical Explorations', *European Planning Studies*, **14** (7), 881–995.
Evers, D. and J. Tennekes (2016), 'Europe Exposed: Mapping the Impacts of EU Policies on Spatial Planning in the Netherlands', *European Planning Studies*, **24** (10), 1747–1765.
Faludi, A. (2004), 'Territorial Cohesion: Old (French) Wine in New Bottles?' *Urban Studies*, **41** (7), 1349–1365.
Faludi, A. (ed.) (2008), *European Spatial Research and Planning*, Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
Faludi, A. (2010a), *Cohesion, Coherence, Cooperation: European Spatial Planning Coming of Age?* London: Routledge.
Faludi, A. (2010b), 'Centenary Paper: European Spatial Planning: Past, Present and Future', *Town Planning Review*, **81** (1), 1–22.
Faludi, A. and B. Waterhout (2002), *The Making of the European Spatial Development Perspective: No Masterplan*, London: Routledge.
FRMMP (2014), *Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan*, available at: http://files.groupspaces.com/MobilityWaterways/files/1285189/Tlf2h8uhUWcAxzQTJ32K/2014-11-13_FRMMP_final_document_clean.pdf (accessed 2 June 2016).
Gänzle, S. and K. Kern (eds) (2016), *A Macro-regional Europe in the Making: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Evidence*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gualini, E. (2007), 'The Rescaling of Governance in Europe: New Spatial and Institutional Rationales', *European Planning Studies*, **14** (7), 881–904.
Hart, J.F. (1982), 'The Highest Form of the Geographer's Art', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, **72** (1), 1–29.
Herod, A. (2011), *Scale*, Abingdon: Routledge.
Jensen, O. and T. Richardson (2003), *Making European Space: Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity*, London: Routledge.
Jessop, B. (1997), 'A Neo-Gramscian Approach to the Regulation of Urban Regimes', in: Lauria, M. (ed.), *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory*, London: Sage, pp. 51–73.
Jonas, A.E.G. (2006), 'Pro Scale: Further Reflections on the "Scale Debate" in Human Geography', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, **31** (3), 399–406.

Kern, K. and T. Löffelsend (2004), 'Sustainable Development in the Baltic Sea Region: Governance beyond the Nation State', *Local Environment*, **9** (5), 451–467.
Lang, S. and B. Sauer (2016), 'European Integration and the Politics of Scale: A Gender Perspective', in: Abels, G. and H. MacRae (eds), *Gendering European Integration Theory: Engaging New Dialogues*, Opladen: Barbara Budrich, pp. 217–236.
MacKinnon, D. (2010), 'Reconstructing Scale: Towards a New Scalar Politics', *Progress in Human Geography*, **35** (1), 21–36.
Marston, S.A. (2000), 'The Social Construction of Scale', *Progress in Human Geography*, **24** (2), 219–242.
Marston S.A.; J.P. Jones and K. Woodward (2005), 'Human Geography without Scale', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, **30** (4), 416–432.
McCann, P. (2015), *The Regional and Urban Policy of the European Union: Cohesion, Results-orientation and Smart Specialisation*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
Moore, A. (2008), 'Rethinking Scale as a Geographical Category: From Analysis to Practice', *Progress in Human Geography*, **32** (2), 203–225.
Radaelli, C. (2003), 'The Europeanization of Public Policy', in: Featherstone, K. and C. Radaelli (eds), *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27–56.
Rivolin, U. (2010), 'Book Review: "European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation" by Dühr, S.; C. Colomb and V. Nadin (2010)', in: *Planning Practice and Research*, **25** (5), 626–627.
Rivolin, U.J. and A. Faludi (2005), 'The Hidden Face of European Spatial Planning: Innovations in Governance', *European Planning Studies*, **13** (2), 195–215.
Sielker, F. (2016), 'New Approaches in European Governance? Perspectives of Stakeholder in the Danube Macro-region', *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, **3** (1), 88–95.
Sielker, F. (2017), *Macro-regional Integration: New Scales, Spaces and Governance for Europe?* Doctoral thesis, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU), available at: https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-fau/frontdoor/index/index/docId/8517 (18 December 2017).
Sielker, F. (2018), 'European Spatial Governance: Towards a Sectoralisation of Spatial Planning', *Journal of Property, Planning and Environmental Law*, **10** (2), 126–139.
Sielker, F. and D. Stead (2017), 'Revisiting the Question of Scale and Rescaling in EU Macro-regional Strategies', in: Sielker, F. (2017), *Macro-regional Integration: New Scales, Spaces and Governance for Europe?* Doctoral thesis, FAU, available at: https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-fau/frontdoor/index/index/docId/8517 (18 December 2017).
Smith, N. (1981), 'Degeneracy in Theory and Practice: Spatial Interactionism and Radical Eclecticisms', *Progress in Human and Geography*, **5** (1), 111–118.
Smith, N. (1984), *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and Production of Space*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Smith, N. (1992), 'Geography, Difference and the Politics of Scale', in: Doherty, J.; E. Graham and M. Malek (eds), *Postmodernism and the Social Sciences*, London: Macmillan, pp. 57–79.
Stead, D. (2014), 'Rescaling Environmental Governance: The Influence of European Transnational Cooperation Initiatives', *Environmental Policy and Governance*, **24** (5), 324–337.

Stead D.; F. Sielker and T. Chilla (2016), 'Macro-regional Strategies: Agents of Europeanization and Rescaling?' in: Gänzle, S. and K. Kern (eds), *A Macro-regional Europe in the Making: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Evidence*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 99–120.

Streifeneder, T.; C. Giuliani and C. Hoffmann (2018), 'Eine grenzüberschreitende Analyse der Politiken für die Almwirtschaft in den Alpen', in: Chilla, T. and F. Sielker (eds), *Grenzüberschreitende Raumentwicklung Bayerns*, Hannover: Forschungsberichte der Akademie für Raumordnung und Landesplanung, pp. 45–71.

Swyngedouw, E. (1997a), 'Excluding the Other: The Production of Scale and Scaled Politics', in: Lee, R. and J. Wills (eds), *Geographies of Economies*, London: Arnold, pp. 167–176.

Swyngedouw, E. (1997b), 'Neither Global nor Local: "Glocalization" and the Politics of Scale', in: Cox, K. (ed.), *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local*, New York: Guilford Press, pp. 137–166.

Taylor, P.J. (1981), 'Geographical Scales within the World-economy Approach', *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, **5** (1), 3–11.

Taylor, P.J. (1987), 'The Paradox of Geographical Scale in Marx's Politics', *Antipode*, **19** (3), 287–306.

Telle, S. (2017), 'An Institutionalist View on Experimentalist Governance: Local-level Obstacles to Policy-learning in European Union Cohesion Policy', *European Journal of Spatial Development*, **66**, 1–20.

Waterhout, B. (2008), *The Institutionalisation of European Spatial Planning*, Delft: Delft University Press.