



Cross-border regions & inter-regional policy transfer in the past, present & future

JUNE 29-30, 2017 / CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY
Budapest, Hungary

Workshop Report



The COHESIFY project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 693427

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Presentations	5
Keynote Address I.....	5
Round-Table.....	6
Panel I.....	8
Panel II	11
Keynote Address II.....	14
Panel III.....	15
Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives (OSA)	18
Keynote Address III	19
Conclusions.....	21
Appendix 1: Seminar Schedule.....	23
Appendix 2: Participant List.....	25



This workshop report was prepared by Michael Parrish and Sara Svensson at the Center for Policy Studies, Central European University

Introduction

As borders seem to harden across Europe and North America, it is increasingly important to see and highlight efforts to work across borders and divisions. In the second workshop of the RSA Research Network on Regional Economic and Policy History (ReHi) participants did exactly that. A group of twenty-four researchers and practitioners from institutions representing ten countries joined together on 29-30 of June to discuss “Cross-border regions & inter-regional policy transfer in the past, present & future.” New and emerging research and ideas were presented, as well as reflections on previous research experiences. Altogether, three keynote addresses and nine panel discussions were given, covering a wide array of subjects. The first day included a roundtable of Central and Eastern European practitioners and researchers to set the scene to the particularities of the region where the conference was held. The second day included a visit to the Donald and Vera Blinken Open Society Archives nearby, where the general holdings of the archive were presented, along with themes on cross-border regions and activities.

This workshop showed the diversity of ways that cooperation and projects can connect and transcend borders. With approaches ranging from economic and political to historical, cultural, and even symbolic, this workshop demonstrated the broad array of possibilities for cross-border cooperation. But even with the wide-range of disciplines, participants crossed over their own borders (disciplinary and otherwise) and some general themes and questions emerged.

What does it mean to have a successful Cross-Border Cooperation (CBC) project, and how can we measure the impact of such projects? Perhaps the answer is that we cannot measure the full extent of the impact, even knowing that it exists. An index to measure the maturity of European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC’s) was presented as a way to measure the effectiveness of such organizations. Although economic conditions are a common benchmark due to the nature of many CBC projects, there are further ways, and participants brought up the issue of how long a timeline to look at to measure success. Relating to time and history, can a collaboration be “successful” over only a single project? Showing the variety of CBCs’ goals, could some influence over the policy process equal success? Or by what measure can the more symbolic projects be considered “successful,” such as the “state” of Morokulien on the Swedish-Norwegian border? These questions are good ways to broaden our own horizons, and go beyond

the typical characteristics and benchmarks of our discipline when it comes to cross-border cooperation.

Another general theme was the tradeoff between general prescriptions and specific peculiarities. Although general tools and ideas can be helpful, multiple presenters noted the need to be extremely wary of generalizations and pay close attention to the specific local context and needs of each project. Projects such as CITYNET in Southeast Asia may be very helpful to share best practices, but it is also important to remember that an approach in a Dutch-German border region will be different in a myriad of ways even going as far as a Hungarian-Slovak border region, let alone further afield such as border regions in West Africa. Although this tradeoff between general and specific seems obvious and all participants were aware of it, the importance it has, and frequency that it was hinted at during the workshop warrants mention.

There is a sharp urban versus rural and core versus periphery divide when it comes to border regions, and along with governmental centralization/decentralization this has a large impact on how CBC's are able to operate. This variation at a more local level also contributes to how projects are funded and managed, with varying levels of effectiveness. Attention to these divides and power structures—and the resulting inequalities and political implications therein—are important for researchers and practitioners to bear in mind. We should not take CBC's existence solely as a good thing, without interrogating the divergence and perhaps unintended inequalities that may result.

Unfortunately, borders did play a part in keeping one participant from joining us from South Africa due to a lack of a timely-granted visa, but via video link we were able to connect and collaborate regardless.

This workshop followed the inaugural RSA ReHi workshop at UCL Bartlett School of Planning, London on 25-26 April, and will be followed by the third workshop at Karlstad University, Sweden on 30-31 October 2017, under the title of “Historical Constructions of Regions and Regionalism.”

Presentations

The RSA ReHi network includes a diverse array of research disciplines and topics of study; by definition it is crossing borders and bringing them together. Due to that fact, addresses, panel discussions, and roundtables have been highlighted individually, so as to let the details of each project be seen, and allowing general themes to emerge. All presentations are summarized in the chronological order of the program.

Keynote Address I

Katja Sarmiento-Mirwaldt—Brunel University

Trade-offs in evaluating the long-term effects of small projects funds in territorial cooperation

Based on her experiences of conducting research within the Polish-German border regions, Katja Sarmiento-Mirwaldt, senior lecturer at the Department of Politics and History at Brunel University, talked about the trade-offs that occur when political scientists try to evaluate the long-term effects of policy interventions. She argued that while social scientists may never be able to isolate the precise effect of a particular intervention, they can construct plausible arguments that draw on evidence from multiple levels of policy implementation to say if an effect exists.

In the case of small project funds in territorial cooperation, the plausible arguments come from looking at four different levels of evaluation and evidence. Starting at the Program Level, one can look to the different rules and power structure within the program. Issues such as the ability to repeat projects—potentially increasing the effectiveness as issues are overcome from the first run—or the degree of centralization of the funding structure can give indicators of effectiveness at this level of evaluation. Perhaps the administrative burdens of applying for or running a program limit the spectrum of actors.

From the individual Project Level, one can look at who organizes the project, which actors are involved, and how networking develops. This level of evaluation particularly lends itself to a historical approach, to see how networks develop and sustain over time.

Zooming in further, to the individual Participant Level, one can look at the attitudes of those who did, or did not, participate in the projects. In the case of Sarmiento-Mirwaldt, she did interview participants and non-participants on the German-Polish border, and measure their

attitudes towards their cross-border neighbors, and towards the programs. While at the individual level it is possible to see the effect of the projects, this admittedly does have self-selection issues.

Zooming back out to the Societal level, one can look to opinion polls to try to get a sense of the collection of individuals. This was summed up nicely by fifty-years of opinion poll data from Germany about peoples' opinion on accepting or not accepting the “new” Oder–Neisse line border, showing a reversal of attitude over time towards acceptance. But again, the issue becomes reliability of data, and the area of the survey. To measure the effect of small project funds, it is best to survey the areas affected, but often opinion poll data does not cover these areas nicely, or questions are not consistent year-to-year.

In conclusion, Sarmiento-Mirwaldt stated that data from any individual level is certainly not enough to get a full picture, and even from all four levels it is not enough to prove conclusively cause and effect. However, by looking at the particularities of each level, and bringing them together, it can suggest an answer—even if that answer is a degree of “some.”

Round-Table

Border regions in Central & Eastern Europe

Participants:

Péter Balogh (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)

Sándor Köles (Carpathian Foundation)

Erika Nagy (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)

Gyula Ocskay (CESCI, European Institute of Cross-Border Studies)

Moderator: **Sara Svensson** (Center for Policy Studies—Central European University)

In line with the *Regional Studies Association's* long-standing commitment to “boundary spanning between academia and policy and practice,” this round-table comprised a mixture of academics and practitioners in the area of cross-border cooperation research and practice. It aimed to welcome the workshop participants through interventions and discussions that gave a sense of place in relation to where the workshop was held. Round-table speakers reflected on what can be learned from this particular region in terms of cross-border cooperation and development, taking past experiences and future potentials into account.

The round-table participants opened by briefly describing their initial interest and how they came to research and work in border regions, and their responses related to personal experience, by and large. From growing up and living in border regions, to childhood fascination and eye-opening experiences traveling across borders, the personal impact has informed their work and its direction. The emphasis on keeping a practical and even personal approach, rather than solely academic, was stressed as well as appreciation for the local context.

The Central and Eastern European border regions present some overarching themes, although with specificities throughout. Even looking at the regions represented and researched by the participants, there is a variety of ways to work within regions in Central and Eastern Europe. From the more local Hungary-Slovak border regions (Balogh) and multiple Hungarian border regions (Nagy), to the larger Carpathian Region (Köles) and the Danube Region (Ocskay).

In general the borders here are young in comparison with Western Europe, and nation states came into being somewhat suddenly through the democratic transition. Because of this, sometimes, ethnic minorities across the border also play an important role in partnership building; sometimes, the ethnic questions are highly politicized. This can cause serious risks, as the wider region has seen and knows too well. But this later arrival to the nation-state paradigm can also offer some opportunity, as countries can learn from the mistakes and use the tools of the Western European countries, and maybe bypass some of the potential conflicts (Ocskay).

Many of the border regions are peripheral in relation to national capitals, and from this suffer the consequences and inequalities. Because of these inequalities and peripheral locations problems arise. Balogh brought up the ideas of EU funds and the poverty trap—regions that most need funds are not able to access it—and the subsidy trap—where these regions become dependent on the outside funding. Relating to funding, as EU decreases in the future, and national funding potentially takes its place, it is vital to keep in mind how the intentions change (Balogh) and how the politicization, context and meaning of borders and cross-border cooperation changes (Nagy).

During the question and answer section, one interesting and important question arose, whether it is possible to have a common understanding of history in the Central and Eastern European region, and if, in the context of cross-border cooperation, that should be the goal. Köles relayed the practical difficulties of doing something like this, from his experience in trying to, and suggested focusing on the history not of nations or regions, but of transnational aspects, such as wine, or industries, or space. Balogh noted how attempts are ongoing in this regard (in the

Hungarian-Slovak regions), but that it is difficult as regional or cross-border histories do not serve national interests, and there is a general lack of interest. Nagy stated that a common understanding of history was not necessary, as cross-border cooperation was much more practical in nature, and that re-imaginings of history will likely be used as a political tool. Ocskay suggested that reconciling history in the wider region is contentious and likely impossible and rather projects and focus should be on common perspectives and towards the future, such as the Visegrad Fund. The difficult question and the wide-range of perspectives and answers shows the diversity of ideas in the area of regional cooperation, and is an important one to keep in mind going forward.

Panel I

Cross-border regions as a paradiplomatic playground for non-state actors: Variable place building incited by flows and subsidies

Martin Klatt—University of Southern Denmark

Globalization, discourses on borderless Europe, the subsidiarity principle, and EU funding schemes have triggered the establishment of numerous cross-border regions in Europe, an example increasingly followed in the global world of paradiplomacy. Common for these activities of cross-border space building is their paradiplomatic character, as they are predominantly borne by non-central government actors: federal states, provinces, regional and local government and other, non-political stakeholders. Motives vary from idealistic to the exploitative, and there is always a matter of power at play. Infrastructure construction projects like the Channel Tunnel, the Øresund Bridge as well as the planned Fehmarn Belt connection and a Helsinki-Tallinn connection express metropolises' strategies to connect across borders in a globalized, cosmopolitan world.

All these initiatives have a spatial dimension of region building as understood by Paasi (1986, 2012), usually claiming some pre-border connectivity and shared regional identity or heritage. Still, these modern cross-border regions' spatial concepts are rather flexible and opt for change in case of changing political and economic frameworks.

Looking at the example of greater Copenhagen, Klatt presented the role of infrastructure in CBC, connecting the role of the Øresund Bridge and other similar projects to Copenhagen's historical and ongoing attempts to maintain control of Denmark. He argued that Copenhagen

promotes CBC infrastructure projects where it helps them maintain their power—connecting to southern Sweden and Jutland—while minimizing such projects where it is perceived to minimize their influence—connecting Jutland to northern Germany. This example shows the role and the power of cities in CBC and points to an image of the globalized future.

References:

Paasi, A. (1986) The institutionalization of regions: a theoretical framework for understanding the emergence of regions and the constitution of regional identity. *Fennia*, 164, 105-146.

--- (2012) Regional Planning and the Mobilization of ‘Regional Identity’: From Bounded Spaces to Relational Complexity. *Regional Studies*, 1-14.

Measuring ‘maturity’ of cross-border cooperation institutions: the case of the Hungarian-Slovakian EGTCs

Erika Törzsök—Civitas Europica Centralis Foundation

András Majoros—Civitas Europica Centralis Foundation

Looking at the last 25-30 years of the institutionalization of cross-border relations, Majoros emphasized how conditions have become more and more favorable in Central and Eastern European countries of the European Union. Since 2007 the new, innovative opportunity to establish ‘European grouping of territorial cooperation’ (EGTC) institutions has grown. Hungary and Slovakia are forerunners regarding EGTC establishment: 13 of 62 EGTCs registered (according to the EU rules) until the end of June 2016 were established at the Hungarian-Slovakian (HU-SK) border.

The results of the research project made by the Civitas Europica Centralis Foundation among the HU-SK EGTCs in 2015 have pointed out that the examined EGTCs have reached different ‘maturity level during their developments.’ Based on the aforementioned research, Majoros explained the ‘EGTC Maturity Index,’ a complex measure composed of an objective set of criteria, which can suitable to measure and evaluate the non-linear development as well as the capacity of EGTCs to achieve their defined political and strategic goals. The ‘EGTC Maturity Index’ criteria is based on four dimensions: publicity, resources, regional development, and members’ satisfaction. Both the aggregate indicator and its sub-indexes can each be interpreted on a scale from 0 to 5, where the larger value means higher level of organizational maturity. Each

sub-index can be quantified by the evaluation of different objective aspects (e.g. ‘grant diversification’).

Majoros concluded that the proposed methodology, after refining some aspects and the assumptions behind them, as well as the index’s testing among other EGTCs, can be a suitable tool to monitor the yearly ranking of EGTCs. The index does favor EGTCs in the more developed western part of the HU-SK border due to some of the criteria, but also the yearly score should be used to inspire internal stakeholders to improve the capability of these entities and encourage organizational development.

Bright ideas, thick institutions: Post-industrial development theories as drivers of cross-border cooperation

Marijn Molema— Fryske Academy

True to the intentions of the ReHi network, Marijn Molema brought forward the question ‘what can historical dimensions add to regional studies?’ specifically in regards to cross-border cooperation (CBC) and ‘Euregions’ or ‘Euroregions’. In answering that question, he emphasized that three different levels of history could be used, contextual, evaluative, and in this research most importantly, holistic. The hope is to see and explain how CBC and Euroregions came into being initially, and to illuminate the debate on the nature and effectiveness of cross-border institutes.

Molema analyzed the implementation of post-industrial development theories in the last quarter of the 20th century as an important driver of the institutionalization of CBC. Social scientists have touched upon new conceptualizations of economic growth connected to CBC, but did not thoroughly investigate them. The analysis is inspired by the political economist Mark Blyth (2002), who stated that the change of ideas precedes the change of institutions. Following this logic, he scrutinized the new economic ideas that were embraced in the fifteen years before the steep rise in the amount of Euregions from the 1990s onwards. Interreg may have been the driver of Euroregions, but what ideas gave rise to Interreg? This holistic approach helps us to assess the functioning of current Euregions against the background of broader societal developments.

What follows from this is that the assessment of Euregions should be based, partly, on the initial post-industrial economic development ideas which gave rise to cross-border institutes in the first place. As the exogenous economic development based on industries declined in the 1970’s, this gave rise to more endogenous, local level initiatives. Interreg, Molema argued, is the result of

these endogenous growth ideas. He ended with some thoughts about how interdisciplinary connections between the social sciences and historical studies can help us to assess the functioning of Euregions, sparking the debate as to what is a “successful” CBC project.

References

Blyth, M. 2002. *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the 20th century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Panel II

Schengen Agreement in Africa? Rethinking the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement

Samuel Kehinde Okunade—University of KwaZulu-Natal

Via video link

African borders are notorious for being porous and unsecure due to the artificial way they were created by the colonialists. The partitioning of Africa by European superpowers translated to what makes up the continent’s borders today. These borders cut across communities and people of the same culture, language and tribe thus causing a division between people that straddle the borders. The examples of Ilara/ Imeko in South West Nigeria, Yekewa and Yardaje communities which used to be a community in Northern Nigeria readily comes to mind. As a result of the preceding, Yekewa became a community in Niger Republic while Yardaje became a community under Nigeria. While scholars have blamed the persistent porosity of African borders on the negligence of states to properly secure them, the nature of the borders already give room for porosity given the way they were demarcated.

The Economic Communities of West African States’ [ECOWAS] Protocol on Free Movement of Persons, Goods, and Capital (1979) seeks to ease and promote free movement of persons and goods among member states thus, converting the borders and walls into bridges. Okunade’s research explores the border architecture of the ECOWAS as a sub-region, with a view to establish how its (non)implementation has affected the porosity of the West African borders.

Numerous factors have undermined the successful implementation of the protocol. A lack of political will to implement at the national level, political instability, inter-state border disputes

and wars leading to increased border securitization (both formal and informal), and the reluctance of countries to surrender national sovereignty to an international regional organization have all contributed. Okunade recognized that the main challenge for member states at this point is to discard the notion of a rigid state sovereignty, so that cooperation can more easily take place.

What elements of mutual learning do the histories of marine hydrocarbon resource extraction entail for regional actors and EU territorial development?

Constantinos N. Antonopoulos—University of Patras

Over the course of several decades marine and maritime regions in the EU have engaged in hydrocarbon extraction and development. Most prominently in the North Sea, but increasingly in the Arctic, the Mediterranean, the Ionian-Adriatic Sea as well as in coastal, inland and terrestrial sites through fracking techniques. Although energy extraction from marine hydrocarbon reserves often requires international collaboration, the historical processes of hydrocarbon extraction remain strongly embedded within narratives of state power and national sovereignty.

This situation poses timely questions on what elements and processes of policy learning are present or can be best effected and how the implementation of sustainable smart practices in local and regional content from energy extraction can best contribute to enhancing value creation in national and regional economies.

By selecting relevant texts from the EUR-Lex database, Antonopoulos investigated to what extent the narratives of current and prospective hydrocarbon developments include elements of cross-border, cross-regional learning, and through which actor-networks are they mediated. As a pilot project, he focused on eighty texts, through a literature survey and text/semantic analysis—but hopes to increase the number and variety of sources of the texts in the second phase of the project. Thus far the findings suggest that regions and regional seas are explicitly mentioned, but in the context of national, macro-regions rather than sub-national, cross-border regions. From the data thus far, evidence of interregional knowledge transfer is not present.

Antonopoulos argues that the research topic is significant for the current policy and societal debates on sustainable energy resource extraction in a subject matter of key importance for the post-crisis regional economies.

Humor and Culture for cooperation over borders. The Swedish-Norwegian example of Morokulien

Peter Olausson—Karlstad University

When you take the northern road between Stockholm and Oslo you will pass the Swedish-Norwegian border at Morokulien. It is a “state” with its own flag, constructed in cooperation between the national broadcasting companies in both Scandinavian countries in 1959. Visitors can visit the grand peace monument that was erected here in 1914, as a sign of hundred years of peace between Sweden and Norway. The major crisis of the split of the union in 1905 had brought up national feelings that the organizations behind the peace monument project wanted to counter.

Today, the Morokulien initiative has become a symbol for cooperation over borders, and exemplifies the 20th century Scandinavian history towards open borders and international cooperation. The Swedish-Norwegian example in 1905 of solving national problems with diplomacy instead of warfare has been transformed in practical work, not least in the organization Svenska Freds- och skiljedomsföreningen (The Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society), that until 2005 also was the landowner of the six hectares that form Morokulien. Today there is a park and small garden with trees from all over the world, planted by visiting world leaders and diplomats, a cottage built for a refugee family from Hungary in 1960, the Morokulien Infocenter right over the borderline, and since 2014 one of the three World Peace Bells hangs in the middle of this little Nordic peace shrine.

However, Olausson did bring up some warnings and downsides. Morokulien and its symbolism is based on past history for the most part. Will contemporary refugees also be welcomed? Also, relating to the general theme of centralization/decentralization, Morokulien is economically on the periphery of both countries.

What is interesting about Morokulien is how the borderline has been used as an asset or tool to facilitate understanding between people, rather than something to be minimized or necessarily overcome. The story from 1905 and onwards is a good example of how people have dealt with the situation and tried to make value out of the borderline. Other similar examples using the border as a positive aspect of cross-border cooperation are welcomed, as humor and culture are excellent ways to spark cooperation.

Keynote Address II

Estelle Evrard—University of Luxembourg

Thoughts for analyzing cross-border areas through mutual learning and reflexivity

As a researcher in Political Geography at the Institute of Geography and Internal Fellow at the Institute in European affairs of the University of Luxembourg, Estelle Evrard investigated the challenges of knowledge production in cross-border areas. Based on her research in the Greater Region SaarLorLux, and on conducting several projects at the interface between policy and research, she argued that interrogating the research-policy interface is crucial when studying the so-called category of "cross-border regions". In this quest of exploring the specificities of the science-research interface in cross-border regions, she suggested using the concepts of mutual learning and reflexivity.

In an innovative approach, Evrard applies the Aristotelian concept of knowledge to research and policy in “border-regions.” While recognizing the importance of *techne* (skills, technical knowledge) and *episteme* (scientific knowledge) in policy and research, she emphasized the role of *phronesis* (prudence, practical wisdom, virtue) as particularly useful. This attempts to challenge the purely rational knowledge in the field, and underscores the importance of appreciation for context and subjective nature of cross-border studies. In her research, Evrard has seen the subjective nature of cross-border regions, even in the conceptualization of how the “region” appears on a map. In the SaarLorLux region, individual practitioners’ ideas of how the Grande Région should look differed greatly depending on their country of residence.

How then, can researchers and practitioners find a greater appreciation for *phronesis* within the field? Evrard suggests mutual learning, and reflexivity. Mutual learning was presented through a practical example from Evrard’s research. Practitioners from the SaarLorLux region came together in a workshop where – while using a planning “game” (“*Planspiel*”) – they made an attempt to design a cross-border planning scheme and then came together to reconcile their differences, and create a common vision. Throughout the mutual learning process, researchers need to keep in mind reflexivity—being aware of their role in the research, and how their role as researcher influences the information they receive in the process. Evrard concluded by stressing that mutual learning and reflexivity are really two sides of the same coin.

Panel III

Credit-Claiming for Regional Development Investment—State-level Behavior in Hungary and Romania and How Regions Can Respond

Anita Halasz—Center for Policy Studies, Central European University

Dragos Adascalitei—Center for Policy Studies, Central European University

Cohesion policy is the most important tool for reducing the economic and social disparities between European regions, and a subject of extensive research. The Center for Policy Studies currently takes part in the project COHESIFY, which studies processes of information and dissemination of cohesion policy funding that are key to policy learning. Research from COHESIFY¹ was presented for the first time at the ReHi workshop.

Although the Commission has considerable leverage in managing the policy, the powers of design and implementation are devolved to Member States. Furthermore, member-states themselves do not operate as unitary actors but, to various extents, delegate the responsibility of implementing Cohesion programs at the regional and local levels. Along with multiple objectives of Cohesion policy, it is easy for actors to shift between credit-claiming and blame-avoidance.

To what extent does this mechanism of delegation of powers allow for divergent and sometimes conflicting goals between principals (higher level institutions) and agents (local and regional level institutions)? Using a principal – agent framework the authors look at Hungary and Romania and show that the effectiveness of implementation of Cohesion policy depends on the institutional coherence of national and regional actors.

The different management structure of the policy allows different actors to claim credit for its success or blame for its failures. In Hungary, political and institutional centralization has limited credit claiming behavior to the national level, blame is shifted up to the EU level, and local actors' ideas are often marginalized. In Romania local actors retain the freedom to use the policy as a source of political capital and shift blame for failures to the national level, rather than the EU.

¹ Funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 693427

How Persistent Is Social Capital?

Jan Fidrmuc—Brunel University*

Social capital and other informal institutions are said to be highly persistent, with historical events such as conflict, dictatorship or colonization having a long-lasting effect. I test this proposition utilizing regions that experienced large-scale population displacements after WWII. As social capital is accumulated through relationships and connections, regions that were repopulated by migrants from a wide range of backgrounds are likely to have little inherited social capital. My analysis suggests that the repopulated regions are little different from those unaffected by population transfers. Hence, contrary to the Putnamesque view, contemporaneous social capital need not be determined by long-term historical legacies. I argue that the break-down of law and order and prevalence of organized crime and corruption are more likely explanations for low levels of social capital in Southern Italy and Eastern Europe than historical legacies.

*(*Unable to attend due to last-moment conflicting scheduling)*

Policy Learning and the Potential Role of Transnational City Network as an Emerging Policy Tool in Environmental Governance in Southeast Asia

Annisa P. Wiharani— University of Groningen

Traditionally in the study of International Relations, states are recognized as the primary actors in policy-making. However, Transnational City Networks are becoming more interesting and significant to be examined as a new form of organization, in part because of their impact on policy change, particularly at the local or municipal level.

However, these developments have occurred recently, and existing frameworks often rely on older, Western cities. Wiharani's research examines the network structure of policy learning in city networks in Southeast Asia—in her talk, specifically CITYNET—which is one of the world's largest cities network in the region committed to tackling climate change issues. With whom do cities learn and why? How are policy-learning relationships related to cities' multi-stakeholder governing body, policy performance, and cultural similarities?

The analysis employs both the International Relations and Public Policy literature ideas of 'policy transfer'. This is a dynamic whereby knowledge about policies and institutions is used across nation border, identifies some methodological issues in studying policy transfer, creating a multi-stakeholder governing body to enhance climate change policy engagement, and outlines

some additional routes of research. The research has concentrated on the cross-fertilization of ideas between Public Policy and IR; however, it is also a realm for cross-disciplinary insights from urban sociology and political geography.

Wiharani's research hopes to broaden the understanding of how traditional policy learning takes place. Not only bilateral relations between states or vertical relations between states and their domestic level, but also the horizontal intergovernmental focus of multi-level governance. She concludes that networks like CITYNET do help with sharing best practices, even without national governments.

However, it was noted that these networks sometimes lack evaluation of these suggested practices, and even the full effect of policy transfer—some programs had been set up, but how widespread or well it was used was unclear. Additionally, and relating to other panels, if cities continue to succeed and change the power structure, how long will it last before national governments intervene? It was noted that the decentralized and flexible nature of city networks in Southeast Asia compared to Europe may help to overcome those issues.

Understanding Stakeholder's Success for EU Funded Projects in Cross-Border Cooperation

Marsida Bandilli—University of Antwerp

Research on stakeholders primarily focuses on questions of power and influence in particular policy fields and governance levels. Recently scholars have also shown a growing interest in the mobilization of stakeholders. Bandilli's research adds to that literature by focusing on the mobilization of stakeholders in a multilevel setting. In this talk in particular, it looks at under what conditions do project proposals become successful for EU funds.

Empirically, Bandilli uses data regarding the Interreg Flanders-Netherlands Programme (2007-2013). With interviews and a questionnaire from stakeholders, and using crisp set Qualitative Comparative Analysis, Bandilli focused on eight successful and eight unsuccessful project applications, and focused on what aspects of mobilization led to success. Of the two primary ways that mobilization leads to success, outside lobbying proved to be least important amongst the factors analyzed. The others are: frequency of communication, inside lobbying, similarity with other stakeholders in the project proposal, formality, and past action/collaboration.

A further question that is part of Bandilli's research, and which came up in the resulting discussion was the problem of cohesion funds contributing to and maintaining, rather than decreasing, inequalities—again connecting to some of the general themes of the workshop.

Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives (OSA)

Csaba Szilagyi—Border zones, traffic and trade in the 'small border' areas during communism

Participants were treated to a talk, as well as a guided tour of the beautiful Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives. The OSA is a unique repository of Cold War-related collections and a research institute dealing with archival, taxonomical, informational and historical problems related to its holdings, and also reflecting on the role, obligations, and limits (as well as how to overcome the limits) of repositories that preserve important historical sources.

There were two main aspects of the talk, an introduction to the OSA, its collection, and how researchers can make use of its vast holdings; and a look specifically at what resources may be of interest to researchers of borders. Examples focused on cross-border cooperation and antagonization in the context of borders during the cold war. Participants were shown both Western and Eastern propaganda films and operations. Instructional propaganda on how to spot and stop border crossers going from East to West, and explanations of balloon-carried propaganda pamphlets going from West to East, the talk gave a vivid historical view on maneuvering a fortified border region.

Further information about the wide array of holdings and exhibits, as well as access to the digital holdings, can be found at: <http://www.osaarchivum.org/>

Keynote Address III

Birte Wassenberg—*University of Strasbourg*

Linking the history of European integration with the history of regional territorial cooperation: the role of 'forgotten' actors

In the concluding keynote address Birte Wassenberg, Professor in Contemporary History at University of Strasbourg painted the larger picture of how European integration and regional territorial cooperation has co-evolved over seven decades. She delineated territorial cooperation from European integration, and discussed whether the history of territorial cooperation has followed the same temporal pattern on all border regions in Europe.

Wassenberg illustrated the simultaneous, but parallel development of regional territorial cooperation and European integration. Even though they shared some overarching objectives (depending on the territorial cooperation program)—reconciliation, peace, healing wounds of history, economic development, mobility—due to different actors, tools, and degrees of formulation, they advanced in parallel. European Integration has states as the main actors, with a role in foreign policy, and backed up by EU law, whereas regional territorial cooperation has sub-national actors, and (at least initially) much less formal arrangements and legal standing.

One key distinction is in how these two projects approach borders. While the European Community sought to take away at least economic borders, Cross-border regions (CBRs) sought ways to decrease the negative aspects of borders, and ease their crossing, not necessarily removing them completely. Wassenberg hinted that CBRs may have good insights into how to confront some of the challenges the EU faces today.

The parallel development changed in the 1980's with the Council of Europe's Madrid Convention as a political tool, the Schengen agreement, and most importantly Interreg in 1990. The importance of Interreg is, at least in part, due to seeing regions as actors whereas the European Community previous did not.

The reconciliation between East and West after the transition also played a part in intertwining territorial and European integration. Newly democratic states were not ready to be a part of the EU, but were ripe for CBR territorial cooperation—which helped to integrate these regions with the West, even if they could not formally integrate into the EU. Wassenberg argued that CBRs were in some ways a model, but in more ways a testing ground for integration policy.

Due to the topic of the address, and as this was the final event of the workshop, questions yet undiscussed about Brexit, terrorism, Euroskepticism came bubbling up. Wassenberg responded by positing that rebordering, as a national decision, does not entail a failure of cross-border regions or collaboration; it is more a threat at the level of European integration.

Conclusions

In the past decades the world has witnessed two strong and parallel trends. On the one hand, flows of goods, people and ideas across international borders have increased in conjunction with institutional innovations in the area of cross-border cooperation between sub-national (local and regional) authorities. This development has been especially strong in Europe, where since the 1950s around 150 formalized institutions for cooperation have been set up, but similar institutions have been created in North and South America, Africa and Asia as well. What they have in common is that emphasis is put on construction and/or reconstruction of local transnational political, social and economic spaces. Regional cooperation on continental scale (e.g. EU, ASEAN) have supported these endeavors in various ways.

Some have noticed tendencies to assume, and aspire for, further development towards cross-border regional integration, i.e. the research agenda on cross-border cooperation has had strong normative and teleological underpinnings, often fuelled by policy-demand for short-term evaluations of specific programs or projects. However, the number, length and security level of wall or fence border has, according to some estimates, never been higher than today, with border management and border security being increasingly in the focus of commercial and political interest.

The workshop aimed at taking stock at these two cross-border regional developments over time, paying specific attention to communication and policy learning across regional and national boundaries. Thus, following the detailed presentations of the individual papers and presentations in this workshop report, some reflection on what the workshop's cumulative output represented in relation to the dimensions of 'region', 'time' and 'communication & learning' is warranted.

As is familiar to scholars of *regions*, this is perhaps the most difficult territorial scale to delineate. Regions can be understood as administrative, functional or cultural spaces, and several case studies implicitly showed how cross-border regional cooperation is essentially about trying to align perceived mismatched administrative and functional spaces through what Martin Klatt in his presentation referred to as 'cross-border space building'.

The notion of *time* was up, front and center throughout the workshop presentations and discussions. However, the time-scales differed. Katja Sarmiento-Mirwaldt stressed the difficulties of finding written and oral history of cross-border cooperation in the Polish-German borderlands

as recent as the 1990s, whereas Birte Wassenberg's exposure of her archival search demonstrated how current understandings of the European Union as a funder in the field has clouded the importance of other institutional actors in earlier periods. The round-table on Central and Eastern Europe brought up the difficulties of reconciling nation-based historical narratives in cross-border areas, and how history promotes cross-border cooperation in a more productive manner if focused on societal functions or local issues rather than national narratives.

Finally, Estelle Evrard's innovative application of Aristotle's different notions of knowledge to cross-border policy practice offered useful reflections on the difficulty to define *policy communication & transfer*, but how nonetheless this is taking place in practice, as was also shown by the presentation of how city networks spread environment-friendly policies in Southeast Asia.

These issues will be further explored in future collaborations among participants of the workshop and within the broader ReHi network and RSA networks.

Appendix 1: Seminar Schedule

DAY 1

- 11:00 **KEYNOTE ADDRESS I: Katja Sarmiento-Mirwaldt**, Brunel University: *Trade-offs in evaluating the long-term effects of small projects funds in territorial cooperation*
- 11:30 **ROUND-TABLE: Border regions in Central & Eastern Europe**
 Moderator: **Sara Svensson** (Center for Policy Studies CEU)
 Participants: **Péter Balogh** (Hungarian Academy of Sciences), **Sándor Köles** (Carpathian Foundation), **Erika Nagy** (Hungarian Academy of Sciences) and **Gyula Ocskay** (European Institute of Cross-Border Studies).
- 12.30 Lunch
- 13.15 **PANEL 1: Border regions and development over time**
Martin Klatt, University of Southern Denmark: *Cross-border regions as a paradiplomatic playground for non-state actors: Variable place building incited by flows and subsidies*
András Majoros & Erika Törzsök, Civitas Europica Centralis Foundation: *Measuring 'maturity' of cross-border cooperation institutions: the case of the Hungarian-Slovakian EGTCs*
Marijn Molema, Fryske Academy: *The relationship between endogenous growth theory and the rise of Euroregions*
- 14.45 Coffee break
- 15:00 **PANEL 2: Border regions and learning**
Samuel Kehinde Okunade, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa: *Schengen Agreement in Africa? Rethinking the EDOWAS Protocol of Free Movement* (via video link)
Constantinos N. Antonopoulos, University of Patras: *What elements of mutual learning do the histories of marine hydrocarbon resource extraction entail for regional actors and EU territorial development*
Peter Olausson, Karlstad University: *Humour and Culture for cooperation over borders. The Swedish-Norwegian example of Morokulien.*
- 16.30 Coffee break
- 17:00 **KEYNOTE ADDRESS II: Estelle Evrard**, University of Luxembourg: *Thoughts for analyzing cross-border areas through mutual learning and reflexivity*

DAY 2

- 8:45 Coffee break
- 9:00 **PANEL 3: *Regions, learning and policy transfer***
Dragos Adascalitei & Anita Halasz, Center for Policy Studies CEU: *Credit-claiming for regional development investment –state-level behavior in Hungary and Romania and how regions can respond*
Jan Fidrmuc*, Brunel University: *How Persistent is Social Capital?*
*Unable to attend due to last-moment conflicting scheduling
Annisa P. Wiharani, University of Groningen: *Policy Learning and the Potential Role of Transnational City Network as an Emerging Policy Tool in Environmental Governance in Southeast Asia*
Marsida Bandilli, University of Antwerp: *Understanding stakeholder’s success for EU Funded projects in cross-border cooperation*
- 10:40 **Walk to the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives (OSA)**
- 11:00 **Csaba Szilagyi**, OSA: Border zones, traffic and trade in the ‘small border’ areas during communism. Resources of the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives. Note: The talk is combined with a guided tour to the Archives, a unique repository of Cold War-related collections and a research institute dealing with archival, taxonomical, informational and historical problems related to its holdings, and also reflecting on the role, obligations, and limits (as well as how to overcome the limits) of repositories that preserve important historical sources. Location: 1051 Budapest, Arany János u. 32.
- 12:30 Lunch
- 13:30 **CONCLUDING KEYNOTE: Birte Wassenberg**, University of Strasbourg: *Linking the history of European integration with the history of regional territorial cooperation: the role of ‘forgotten’ actors*
- 14:15 Closing remarks and discussion – what’s next? **Sara Svensson**, Center for Policy Studies CEU

Appendix 2: Participant List

András Majoros, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Andreea Leru, Center for Policy Studies CEU
Anita Halasz, Center for Policy Studies CEU
Annisa P. Wiharani, University of Groningen
Birte Wassenberg, University of Strasbourg
Constantinos N. Antonopoulos, University of Patras
Csaba Szilagyi, Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives
Erika Nagy, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Estelle Evrard, Universite du Luxembourg,
Gyula Ocskay, European Institute of cross-border studies, Central European Service for Cross-border Initiatives (CESCI)
Katja Sarmiento-Mirwaldt, Brunel University
Marijn Molema, Fryske Academy
Marsida Bandilli, University of Antwerp
Martin Klatt, University of Southern Denmark
Michael Parrish, Center for Policy Studies CEU
Péter Balogh, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Péter Molnár, Central European University
Peter Olausson, Karlstad University
Samuel Kehinde Okunade (via link), University of KwaZulu-Natal
Sándor Köles, Carpathian Foundation
Sara Svensson, Center for Policy Studies CEU
Sarah Wing, Central European University
Silke Reeploeg, Karlstad University
Yuko Kambara-Yamane, Center for Policy Studies, CEU