

European Regions, EU External Borders and the Immediate Neighbours. Analysing Regional Development Options through Policies and Practices of Cross-Border Co-operation

Reporting

Project Information

EUBORDERREGIONS

Grant agreement ID: 266920

[Project website](#) 

Status
Closed project

Start date
1 March 2011

End date
28 February 2015

Funded under
FP7-SSH

Overall budget
€ 3 336 192

EU contribution
€ 2 644 320

Coordinated by
ITA-SUOMEN YLIOPISTO
 Finland

Final Report Summary - EUBORDERREGIONS (European Regions, EU External Borders and the Immediate Neighbours. Analysing Regional Development Options through Policies and Practices of Cross-Border Co-operation)

Executive Summary:

Cross-border Cooperation (CBC) can be defined in terms of political projects carried out by state, private and third sector actors with the express goal of extracting benefit from joint initiatives in various economic, social, environmental and political fields. EUBORDERREGIONS has shed critical light on how cross-border cooperation (CBC) at the EU's external borders functions in practice. Based on fieldwork and interaction with stakeholders, our research raises a number of issues of particular policy relevance

interaction with stakeholders our research raises a number of issues of particular policy relevance, including:

1. Understanding the border as a resource. It is clear that national contexts and the gaps between them still very much influence policy-oriented behaviours at the national and subnational levels. As a result we have observed in EUBORDERREGIONS that stakeholders generally affirm the desirability of CBC but that actual implementation remains patchy.
2. Critically interpreting CBC as filling gaps in Cohesion and Neighbourhood Policies. Our research reflects tensions between realist regional policy concerns related to national development and more idealistic policy imperatives that seek to create alternative, border-transcending territorial contexts for regional policy.
3. Highlighting the dilemma of 'hard' versus 'soft' development factors. The one-sided focus on 'hard' factors and physical investment is problematic. CBC is highly networked, and 'soft' in nature: it is about developing social capital and trust.
4. Emphasising the role of civil society actors. Civil society needs to be a more important part of the ENP-Cohesion-CBC nexus. This is a rather long-term concern and reflects the problem that, despite rhetorical assurances to the contrary, actors that represent societal and community issues have very limited access to opportunity structures of CBC promotion.
5. There are huge gaps between local level needs and interests and (geo)politics that governs the management of borders. Rarely do border communities have the political and economic influence to negotiate special border regime conditions with central government agencies. However a degree of local control can be achieved through local networks that create bridges across hard borders..
6. New forms of data collection are needed for policy purposes that focus on social, immaterial, non-quantifiable and networked nature of territorial relations.

If the role of CBC as an element of Neighbourhood Policy is to be taken seriously, the policy aim should be less focused on fulfilling 'objective' and quantifiable targets and more on the capacities of cross-border cooperation to develop according to its own dynamics. At the level of EU Cohesion Policy, the direct coupling of CBC with regional development goals appears to be shifting towards more territorially flexible arrangements and a focus on place-based strategies and 'integrated territorial investments' which can be potentially implemented in cross-border and transnational contexts. Nevertheless, the overall resources available for genuinely border- transcending regional development at the external borders are but a small fraction of overall available funding. As has been suggested above, CBC needs to be understood as more than just filling the gaps between national development strategies and different EU policies; it is a cultural context for regional cooperation and Neighbourhood beyond traditional nation-centric modes. Furthermore, cross-border integration need not be all-encompassing but centred on specific networks that create trust and sustainable working relationships.

Project Context and Objectives:

EUBORDERREGIONS is a four year project that has explored relationships between borders

EUBORDERREGIONS is a four-year project that has explored relationships between borders, cooperation and development at the European Union's external boundaries. Regions on both sides of the EU's new external borders are generally far from large economic centres and lack many of the employment opportunities available elsewhere. A major reason for this situation can be traced to borders and the historical divisions they have emerged within Europe since the 19th Century. This legacy of division has been difficult to overcome – even 20 years after the end of the Cold War and 50 years after de-colonisation in Northern Africa. However, economic disadvantages should not obscure the fact that these border regions are rich in history and therefore key to understanding many of the challenges facing European societies both within and outside the EU.

One question that looms large is whether cross-border co-operation can emerge as a regional development resource as well as promote greater social interaction between the EU and its neighbours. Regions at the EU's outer borders will be directly affected – both positively and negatively – by increasing interaction with neighbouring states. As a result, the future development perspectives of and development options open to these regions will be crucial to addressing core-periphery contradictions, economic and demographic imbalances as well as general sustainability issues within the EU as a whole. A major challenge in this respect is that of strengthening an enlarged EU while avoiding new divisions that security policies, visas and restrictive border regimes could impose. The areas that have been investigated by EUBORDERREGIONS can thus be seen as laboratories of regional co-operation above and beyond strictly economic issues. The project team has analysed potential consequences of increasing cross-border interaction for the development of regions at the EU's external borders and, in this way, contribute to scientific and policy debate on the future of economic, social and territorial cohesion within the EU. Local development issues in 11 case study regions have been framed within a wider European perspectives and thus as interfaces between development dynamics and policy frameworks operating within the EU, on the one hand, and in neighbouring countries, on the other. In doing this, the project has also contributed to the state of the art of policy-oriented research on regional development and cohesion within Europe.

The EU border regions under scrutiny in the project have become borderlands at the eastern edges of the EU with the several waves of the enlargement of the European Union - of 1981 (Greece), 1995 (Finland and Austria), 2004 (Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland) and 2007 (Bulgaria and Romania). Since the "Iron Curtain" has vanished, both between East and West as well as within the former Soviet Union, citizens, communities and regions have attempted to open new avenues of communication with their neighbours across state borders. Furthermore, in those contexts where states have (re)gained their independence (e.g. Baltic States, Ukraine, Moldova, and the Balkans) and new borders have emerged, Euroregions, economic partnerships, twin-city investments, cross-border urban networks and similar forms of interaction have also come into being. As such, more open borders, the EU enlargement process and a new quality of multilateral relationships between the EU and its "neighbourhood" have increased the international salience of social affairs, economic development, minority rights, cross-border employment and trade, the environment, etc.

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that regions at the EU's external borders represent a considerable challenge to national development policies as well as to European cohesion. It is, of course, unrealistic to treat external border regions as a homogeneous group; they are, in fact, quite diverse. However, they most certainly share common problems in terms of "peripherality" and challenges to their

however, they most certainly share common problems in terms of peripherality and challenges to their future development. As the EU Report “Regions 2020” indicates, most (external) border regions in Southern and Eastern Europe are subject to multiple vulnerabilities and globalisation challenges. Low labour productivity, high unemployment, low levels of economic diversification, de-population of rural areas and, in many areas, demographic decline are some of the problems that exacerbate this regional vulnerability. In addition, future development potentials of the EU’s southernmost and easternmost regions will emerge against the backdrop of considerable structural, financial, political and “cognitive” constraints. These regions are, by and large, peripheral areas, not only far from the dynamic centres of “Core Europe” but often distant from prosperous national centres as well. Many of them continue to suffer from outmigration, de-industrialisation, and negative demographic trends.

In addition, neighbouring regions on the other side of the border are similarly disadvantaged, resulting in “double peripheries” within the greater European context. The regions under consideration are thus potential areas of serious social problems, especially if living standards continue to stagnate. Preliminary research has indicated that increasing interaction with neighbouring states such as Russia (and

Kaliningrad), Belarus, Ukraine, Turkey, Morocco, Egypt – and beyond – could have major impacts on the development perspectives of these regions – both in positive and negative terms.

In positive terms, these border areas often function as “gateways” for the European Union, situated as they are at important transcontinental road and railway networks (although mostly distant from major airports). To the extent that they develop locational strengths beyond mere transit spaces for goods, people and infrastructure, cooperation within urban networks on both sides of the border could contribute to economic dynamism and socio-cultural development. On the other hand, however, such development perspectives cannot be separated from geopolitical concerns and border-related problems that necessitate effective security and border-management policies. Environmental problems, the illegal trafficking of humans, the smuggling of harmful goods, illegal immigration and more general cross-border activities of organised crime must be dealt with decisively. It is these European and national concerns, rather than local interests, that affect economic, political and legal barriers, such as those inherent in labour market and foreign resident legislation, and that, ultimately, affect socio-economic mobility, innovation transfer and flexibility.

Objectives and Results of EUBORDERREGIONS

EUBORDERREGIONS has focused on economic, social, cultural, political and environmental factors of transnational importance that will influence development and condition development options in regions at the external borders of the EU. It has taken into account different mesoregional contexts that affect interaction between the EU and its Neighbourhood. Furthermore, EUBORDERREGIONS has developed a cross-cutting approach that both analyses socio-economic dimensions of regional change in more global terms and focuses on selected regional case studies of cohesion challenges and development potentials. The project’s general objective has been to identify challenges to economic, social and territorial cohesion as well as regional development potentials as exemplified by different borderlands at the EU’s external frontiers. More specific objectives include the following:

1. To consolidate knowledge and European research on regional development processes in external border regions of the EU

2. To consolidate knowledge and European research on interrelationships between geopolitics, processes of regional co-operation and regional development.
3. To identify through case studies at the local/regional level, relevant structural and social factors that condition future development prospects.
4. In terms of a “bottom-up” approach: to understand how local communities perceive and interpret local/regional development within a wider European context.
5. To describe and study the ways in which regional development policies are being formulated and implemented.
6. To develop multilevel policy options for regions at the EU’s external borders.

As part of implementation EUBORDERREGIONS utilised a two-step strategy that departed from macrolevel contextual (e.g. geopolitical) observations and then proceeded to more specific local cross-border perspectives and analyses. In terms of methodology, EUBORDERREGIONS combined analyses of available data, including policy analysis, secondary analysis of available documentation and research, media screening, and qualitative interview methods. 11 case studies were completed as planned, giving evidence of complex and highly differentiated relationships across the EU’s external borders.

What we see is that, with very few exceptions, border regimes and geopolitical contexts limit the potential significance of cross-border cooperation (CBC) – and this despite the fact that the EU has continued to argue the importance of CBC. At the same time, our fieldwork documents quite clearly that there are considerable and as yet unexploited potentials for border regions through cooperation. Furthermore, this applies not only to the most dynamic regions in terms of economic exchange, investment and tourism. Rather than seeing CBC as a short-term exercise, the development of trust built around networks of actors and local communities – the basic prerequisite for successful CBC – needs time to experiment and develop. Indeed, based on fieldwork and interaction with stakeholders our research has raised a number of issues of particular policy relevance, including:

1. A better understanding the border as a resource. It is clear that national contexts and the gaps between them still very much influence policy-oriented behaviours at the national and subnational levels. As a result we have observed in EUBORDERREGIONS that stakeholders generally affirm the desirability of CBC but that actual implementation remains patchy.
2. Critically interpreting CBC as filling gaps in Cohesion and Neighbourhood Policies. Our research reflects tensions between realist regional policy concerns related to national development and more idealistic policy imperatives that seek to create alternative, border-transcending territorial contexts for regional policy.
3. Highlighting the dilemma of ‘hard’ versus ‘soft’ development factors. The one-sided focus on ‘hard’ factors and physical investment is problematic. CBC is highly networked, and ‘soft’ in nature: it is about

factors and physical investment is problematic. CBC is highly networked, and soft in nature. It is about developing social capital and trust.

4. Emphasising the role of civil society actors. Civil society needs to be a more important part of the ENP-Cohesion-CBC nexus. This is a rather long-term concern and reflects the problem that, despite rhetorical assurances to the contrary, actors that represent societal and community issues have very limited access to opportunity structures of CBC promotion.

5. There are huge gaps between local level needs and interests and (geo)politics that governs the management of borders. Rarely do border communities have the political and economic influence to negotiate special border regime conditions with central government agencies. However a degree of local control can be achieved through local networks that create bridges across hard borders..

6. New forms of data collection are needed for policy purposes that focus on social, immaterial, non-quantifiable and networked nature of territorial relations.

The policy-oriented results of EUBORDERREGIONS thus support the notion that cooperation must be based on partnership rather than just conditionality. However, the general atmosphere of economic, fiscal, political and social crisis has contributed to a lack of vision of neighbourhood.

Additionally, the EUBORDERREGIONS team asked the question whether, given the very complex nature of EU-Neighbourhood relations, there should be a geographical fixation with border regions and border proximity. CBC could also take place as networks between cities and regions, regardless of location, and these could become a major focus of ENPI funding. There is a need to allow social agents and actors a greater voice in the regional cooperation process of building a viable Neighbourhood. This is particularly relevant to a more inclusive definition of partnership which involves local domestic actors. The issue is how to build these partnerships and how to develop a workable bottom-up approach. What might be common values that could guide such a bottom up approach? It is doubtful that unilaterally imposed values or those that evoke civilisational (European) categories of difference can provide a sense of regional cohesion. European politicians such as Sarkozy or Merkel have tried to reinforce mental borders between Europe, Turkey and other neighbouring countries. The use of what are ultimately very subjective historical, socio-cultural and geographical categories to classify, marginalize and even exclude possible partners does not make sense if the EU is seriously interested in playing an important regional role.

The definition of a partnership based on common values should be kept open rather than closed through a priori and unilaterally imposed criteria. The major feasible alternative to a strictly values-driven approach is a concern with social problems and social affairs, even if these are at time controversial. There should be a more open discussion on the politics of conditionality and its impacts. The consensus is that despite demanding considerable concessions from its neighbours, the EU has not held up its end of the bargain. A much greater effort is therefore needed to provide longer term incentives that promote trust between partners. Within the context of a renewed Neighbourhood Policy that the EU is presently targeting, CBC deserves much greater attention and should be understood as a major policy tool for improving intercultural understanding, social engagement and territorial development prospects.

Project results.

EUBORDERREGIONS has shed critical light on how local and regional-level CBC at the EU's external borders functions in practice. The main objectives of EUBORDERREGIONS were to develop a coherent multidimensional framework for the analysis of socio-economic, political and policy-related factors that impact on: 1) border region development and 2) strategies of cross-border cooperation. At the same time, the project also aimed to develop theoretical perspectives linking border region situations, regional development and EU Cohesion Policy. This work provided a rich contextual backdrop for studying the potentials of cross-border cooperation at the EU's external borders. Socio-economic data, on the one hand, contributed an updated profile of the different development issues at stake. On the other hand, a review of geopolitical and regional policy issues that characterise the "neighbourhood" situation highlighted the cooperation challenges facing external border regions. Contextual data was instrumental in refining the research questions and their implementation in case study analysis.

Table 1. Research Objectives of EUBORDERREGIONS

Research objective: Analytical parameters

To identify through case studies at the local/regional level, relevant structural and social factors that condition future development prospects:

Detecting the main fields of cross-border networking, and the types of organisations engaged in CBC networks.

Detecting imbalances, asymmetries in the CBC networks.

Contextualisations of local impacts of geopolitical, border-related and EU/national/regional policy processes

In terms of a "bottom-up" approach: to understand how local communities perceive and interpret local/regional development within a wider European context:

Describing and comparing the participation of subnational and national actors; understanding the position and role of local and regional stakeholders in CBC networks and the differences across the border in these terms.

To develop multilevel policy options for regions at the EU's external borders:

Identification of entrance points for policy intervention to lower barrier effects posed by the border in the way of efficient CBC.

Understanding variations in the level of participation by different stakeholder types and ways for policy to help CBC programmes be more balanced and inclusive and reflecting local and regional development aims.

Defining the ways to fix existing imbalances and gaps in the network and defining those actors through whom certain collaborative energies could be boosted and harnessed from the network

which certain collaborative energies could be boosted and harnessed from the network.

Analytical Approach: Bordering, Scales of Action, Geopolitical Context

Cross-border Cooperation (CBC) can be defined in terms of political projects carried out by state, private and third sector actors with the express goal of extracting benefit from joint initiatives in various economic, social, environmental and political fields. Through new forms of political and economic interaction - both institutional and informal - it has been suggested that greater cost-effectiveness in public investment can be achieved, economic complementarities exploited, the scope for strategic planning widened and environmental problems more directly and effectively addressed.

The EUBORDERREGIONS research design has been based on a development of the state of the art in border studies and research into cross-border cooperation. We have thus understood cross-border cooperation in terms of a nexus between bordering processes, spatial scales of networking and geopolitical contexts. The present state of debate indicates that the field of border studies has opened up possibilities for investigating the rationales behind everyday border-making by understanding borders as institutions, processes and symbols. Borders are thus not given, they emerge through socio-political border-making or bordering that takes place within society (van Houtum and Naerssen 2002, Scott 2012). As such, it is the process of bordering which brings diverse types of borders within a single frame of analysis.

The concept of bordering also raises a series of interesting questions regarding the power relations involved in the making of borders; this manifests itself, for example, in tensions between the local constitution and external determination of borders in society. This has been amply considered in debates on region-building (Keating 1997, Allen and Cochrane 2007, Davoudi and Strange 2009, Jonas 2012). However, these questions remain relatively underdeveloped in the border studies literature. These two generalised border-configuring contexts are not mutually exclusive; they co-exist as elements of social construction that both reference specific geographical spaces as well as functional relationships that are often less territorially fixed.

During the past decade the external borders of the European Union have been re-shaped by a number of overlapping, sometimes intersecting EU policies, among them: new EU geopolitics, EU cohesion policy, security policy, migration policy, neighbourhood policy and other political initiatives. At the same time, EU borders and border regions have also been shaped by economic, political and socio-cultural re-scaling at the local level - often in response to pressures of globalisation. Located at the interface of "East" and "West", areas straddling the EU's external borders embody the diversity of economic development and social transformation trajectories that have emerged since the late 1980s. The progressing confrontation of "western" welfare state models with South European poorhouse capitalism and East European post-transition capitalism has produced subtle systemic divides both inside the EU and between the EU and its neighbours. These divides do not only refer to differences in political cultures, ideologies and regulatory approaches. They also involve the social (re)construction of scales. Local and regional agents make use of re-scaling in order to cope with the challenge of changing imbalances, such as in the continual production of social, economic and spatial disparities (cf. Jessop 2014: 53). Such scales particularly involve borders as socially constructed dividing lines between regions of different economic wealth, political systems

as socially constructed dividing lines between regions of different economic wealth, political systems, national and subnational societies, and social communities (including ethnic groups).

For local people, borders provide opportunities to adapt to changes in national and supranational modes of production and political regulation, yet at the same time they constrain such adaptation. For an agent involved in (re)bordering, scales created by networks and social relations are simultaneously present, though endowed with changing situational significance and intensity. In contrast to other social environments, the variability of re-scaling that bordering and the selective uses of borders imply is significantly enhanced since borders are more exposed to external intervention, contestation, spatial mobility and structural change. Changes in economic structure, political order or the geopolitical constellation of power trigger local responses to the effect that scales are continually, and sometimes even abruptly, re-ordered. In this way, the EU external border is a (geo)political context which fixes a “European” scale as opposed to national and regional scales existing beyond the EU territory. It produces a structural framework which is exploited in different ways by different actors.

The focus on development perspectives and the local reception of EU and national policies centred on cohesion indeed implies a scalar perspective. Local stakeholders often address problems at different scales that those within which overarching EU and national policies operate: it is through the implementation of local/regional policies which deviate from such top-down perspectives that “border-specific” responses to general structural trends emerge. Relevant research questions have addressed issues of scale-building and working with different spatial scales. What social, economic and spatial frameworks of relevance are maintained by local/regional stakeholders when defining development problems and positive aims of development? Are the EU-centred framings that have been provided by the EU Single Market, cohesion policies, migration regimes etc. really considered conducive to regional economic and social development? Which alternative scales (e.g. via global trade and globalized networks, strivings for local autonomy) have been addressed? What happens as soon as these scales are elaborated and implemented?

Within the framework of this project, bordering and scalarity have been developed as a conceptual tool for comparing CBC along the EU’s external borders. In order to reduce the complexity that a study of highly heterogeneous border areas signifies, this project has chosen to focus on cross-border networks themselves as the primary site of cooperation, region-building and multilevel processes of bordering. With this perspective, which contextualises CBC in terms of geopolitical considerations, scales of interaction and the negotiations of cross-border cooperation, EUBORDERREGIONS has developed 11 case studies the results of which are summarised below.

Summary Results of Empirical Research: Network Analysis

An important element of cross-border interaction are collaborative networks connecting various organisations on both sides of the EU’s external borders. From the EUBORDERREGIONS perspective, the main question is whether cross-border networks contribute to some form of integration across the border, a potential increase in ‘territorial cohesion’. This is a rather provocative question since the borders in focus here are EU-external ones, representing a much tighter border regime than the situation at EU-internal borders (which later were recently used as a test ground for investigating “integration” by studying CBC networks in Minniberger, 2012). One can logically assume that wide and balanced participation, a

CBC networks in Mitterberger, 2012). One can logically assume that wide and balanced participation, a higher degree of connectedness and the dominance of local/regional actors in key positions in the network are indicators of sustained processes towards more integrated and harmonious developments across the border. Therefore, these are among the features assessed in the EUBORDERREGIONS network analyses.

Networked cooperation can be temporary, for a fixed term (project), motivated by external funding (for instance, received from the EU instruments, such as the ENPI) and also could evolve into more permanent institutionalized practices that become an inherent part of the regular activities and functions of these organisations and result in joint aims, strategies and practices. Either way, on the longer run, positive experiences of working together contributes not only to eroding some of the barrier effects of national borders (increasing familiarity, trust, decreasing negative prejudices) but also towards joint problem-solving, synergies and an increased coherence in terms of the development of the border region as a whole.

There can be little doubt that national contexts, cultural, social and political factors condition the

emergence, composition and operation of cooperation networks. The nodes, the 'stakeholder organizations' on the two sides of a border are diverse in general, representing various (public, private, civil, etc.) sectors and fields of activities. However, it varies from case to case, depending on which types of organisations are the key networkers, who dominates and controls cooperation activities by taking up the most crucial positions within the network. Imbalances in the networks between the two sides of a border are also rather common, having from one of the countries more numerous and active stakeholders engaged than from the other – and it is not necessarily from the EU-side of the border region in all cases. Furthermore, besides studying the composition of the nodes in a CBC network, it is also possible to differentiate between the nature of links (that are generally considered undirected, that is, mutual) between the different pairs of stakeholder organisations, the 'depths' and aims of cooperation. The methodology applied in the field of 'social network analysis' offers a suitable tool for such investigations (and more), providing the data collected is non-ambiguous and sufficient.

Cross-border cooperation networks between public, civil or private organisations were detected based mainly on data received from interviews and surveys, and also from other sources such as the project databases of recent CBC programmes operating in the different case study areas (CSAs). Some of the more basic measures of social network analysis (SNA) were applied on this inter-organisational relational data, for which the members of the transnational team received a brief training within the project on both the conceptual and practical skills necessary. In the following, the results of network analysis carried out within the case studies is presented following a short account on the aims and practical background (data collection, node typology, basic methods) of this experiment.

Cross-border network analyses

Without exception, the dominance of public sector organisations in the CBC networks is obvious. It is not only evident in their numbers (which could partially attributed to the ways of data collection, i.e. to a measurement error) but also in their connectedness (degree) and the positions they take in the networks. "Local governments often undertake the role of an umbrella" (RO-MD case), and the most frequent stakeholder relations are public-public relations (as opposed to public-private or public-civil), for example, in the SE-NO case. In some cases, there are also some rather specific types of stakeholder organisations identified as key actors, such as the regional or municipal development 'companies' (owned by and working closely together with, their host towns) identified as especially active stakeholders in the SE-NO and EL-PL border regions: despite what their name indicates, these are in fact, public organisations. It is

and FRO border regions, despite what their name indicates, these are in fact, public organisations. It is also rather general across the case studies that civil organisations are under-represented in the CBC networks, no matter whether one looks at all kinds of CBC activities or only those within EU-funded programmes. This is especially notable when comparing to private sector organisations: even companies are engaged in CBC activities to the same extent as or in some cases, even more than civil organisations, despite the fact that businesses are not directly eligible for support in EU-funded CBC projects. Civil society is “generally lacking the strength to apply for or administer EU funding” (SE-NO case).

Network analyses produced also some interesting geographical observations. Organisation-level nodes and their relations were aggregated onto the level of geographical places (the actual locations of organisations) and were in many studies, also visualised on maps. For instance, the Bulgarian-Turkish (BU-TR) case study informs that CBC relations are “heavily concentrated within, around and between a few cities in the close vicinity of the border”, with Kırklareli as a major hub on the Turkish side and Burgas on the Bulgarian side (BU-TR, p. 90). The case with the Greek-Turkish border region is similar, the nodes are concentrated relatively near the border, and there is a significant hub on each side, Komotini in Greece, and Edirne in Turkey. In both of the BU-TR and the GR-TR cases, the biggest hubs coincide with regional authority seats, the main administrative centres of their respective border regions, which include key stakeholders with several linkages, in a gatekeeper position. In addition, in the case of Komotini, the high number of Muslim minority population also contributes to the significance of the city in CBC (GR-TR, P. 115).

The locality networks of the PL-UA and the Spanish-Morocco (ES-MA) cases also indicate that there are a few important locations (nodes) in the CBC network that have high numbers of connections (high degrees), and there is a great number of places that have only a few links to others in the network (low degrees). It has been recently discovered that this is in fact most common in ‘real world’ networks, and is also typical of the Internet, some biological networks as well as social networks. The highest-degree nodes (hubs) are assumed to have specific roles in their networks; however, this varies by the domain. The phenomenon of ‘preferential attachment’ (i.e. by cumulative advantage, ‘the rich get richer’), which by many experts thought to be the mechanism behind the emergence of such hubs (Barabási 2002), can possibly apply in the case of CBC networks, too (both on the level of organisations and localities): obtaining cooperation linkages means an increased network capital, and higher network capital is a resource itself to expand one’s connections.

Finally, some of the case studies looked at emerging clusters / sub-networks within their CBC cooperation networks and assessed those in terms of different node-attributes, including also the fields of activities in which the actors (and presumably, their CBC activities) engage in. The HU-SK-UA case study finds four clusters. The two smaller and relatively loosely connected ones are focussed on youth and education supporting activities, and are composed of mainly Ukrainian nodes with a couple of Hungarian partners; one is dominantly public (1), the other is composed mainly of NGOs (2). The two larger and dense clusters represent Hungarian-Ukrainian (3) and Hungarian-Slovakian (4) CBC, the former has relatively high civil participation (NGOs and private non-profit make up almost 40% of the cluster). The FI-RU analysis also starts from sub-networks within the entire CBC network (based on ENPI CBC project consortium data), and can identify bridges, key local and regional actors, and some specific features of cooperation within different fields, e.g. IT, social services, environment and rural development.

The analyses of cross-border cooperation networks have produced some findings which allow us to make a few general concluding statements. One important finding regards the different features of stakeholder

a few general concluding statements. One important finding regards the different features of stakeholder organisations that make them less or more likely to be active in cross-border cooperation. Local and regional public organisations were found to be in the most favourable position, especially those that are located near the border or in major centres further away, while civil organisations were under-represented in most of the cases. The network analyses confirmed (what was also a finding from interviews) that the participation of the non-profit sector (NGOs, social enterprises and the like) depends to some extent on the willingness and the capacity of the more resourceful public stakeholders to form alliances with them within CBC projects. Since we are dealing with on the one hand, EU member countries that have longer traditions of civil society inclusion, and on the other hand 'neighbourhood' states where this is rather uncommon, asymmetries across the borders are likely. Still, the network analyses show that differences across the external border are not so tremendous regarding civil engagement in CBC, which indicates that other factors also play a role in their low participation on both sides of the EU-border. One such circumstance is that EU-funded CBC programmes (mainly, the ENPI CBC Programme) provide eligibility to the third sector to participate, but not so much the 'accessibility' in terms of its bureaucratic requirements, for instance.

Differences across the border in the studied regions along the EU-external border occur in terms of the general and cross-border degree-distribution. However, it is not a rule that EU-external regions have lower levels of connectivity and fewer organisations in key (e.g. gatekeeper, bridge) positions in the overall CBC network. On the settlement level, Tunis in the Italian-Tunisian case and St Petersburg in the Finnish-Russian case are single greatest hubs of their respective CBC networks. In most of the cases we find a balanced distribution of primary and secondary 'hubs' on the two sides of the border. Nevertheless, from the various cases examined it is obvious that specific geographical situations (distances, densities of settlements and population, the patterns of the urban network) on the two sides of the border matter much in these configurations, as well as the degree to which national institutions are dominant in local-regional decisions and the extent to which power, resources and infrastructures are centralised in the capital city of a country.

Finally, it is also worthy of attention that in every network there are some key connecting elements, not necessarily always the largest hubs (i.e. stakeholder organisations with the highest numbers of connections to others), without which the network would be fragmented or would be much less of a cross-border nature. These are often organisations with diverse profiles (e.g. universities, municipal governments), connecting several sub-networks, different fields of activities, with a high potential to bring around synergies, cross-fertilisation of different initiatives and developments. Also, some of these key connectors are hybrids in terms of their sector ('legal status') – non-profit or public-interest companies are such, or potentially, social enterprises, which can serve as catalyser of cross-sectoral collaboration and participation. The function of public organisations such as municipal governments as providers of 'umbrellas' for civil participation has already been mentioned. It is also important to note that organisations which have representations/departments on multiple levels (local, regional, national, and even international) and those which have subsidiaries or deputy offices across the border further increase cross-border connectivity. The engagement even of a few of these types of organisations in CBC can generally produce a more connected and larger CBC network.

Summary Results of Empirical Research: Case Studies

The development of border regions and their cross-border cooperation is strongly conditioned by local contexts. Based on the surveys conducted as part of the EUBORDERREGIONS project, we can formulate the hypothesis that the role of the context is much greater for these regions than for the core regions. It is

the hypothesis that the role of the context is much greater for these regions than for the core regions. It is because the latter are more strongly connected to the globalisation processes and, regardless of the actual part of the country or globe, undergo quite similar globalisation and metropolisation processes. As a matter of course, the development context of the border areas varies from region to region and includes geopolitical, legislative, institutional determinants (such as border regime regulations) in addition to the historical, settlement and economic factors. In effect, the case studies analysed under the project show the state of play from a very broad perspective. An attempt at generalisation of the major socio-economic changes occurring in the border regions is presented below. In particular, the authors set out to identify the main similarities and differences in terms of the major factors, to show their impact on the processes of regional development and cross-border cooperation, and evaluate the role of external intervention in the development of these regions. Both statistical data and opinions were taken into account and served as a basis for the following conclusions.

General context of CBC

One of the main similarities found in the analysed case studies is a strong impact of history and development paths shaped by long duration processes on contemporary development processes. This also includes the existence of the state borders, both these well-established and relatively recent ones. It is because, regardless of the fact whether any ethnic minorities live on both sides of the border (however the role of middleman minorities could be especially important), a rather strong sense of common historical heritage, which is often at odds with contemporary ties or conflicts, tends to prevail in the analysed cross-border regions. This is definitely a strong argument for establishing and expanding good neighbourly contacts. In other words, an awareness of a community of fate associated with the border location is much deeper here than in the respective countries, which is manifested by the degree of interest in the neighbouring region shown at local and regional level. At the latter level, however, the border issues are often perceived and resolved from the angle of the foreign policy of the day and geopolitical considerations. Such discrepancies are most strongly visible at the Estonian-Russian border, but can also be noticed at the Greek-Turkish and Bulgarian-Turkish borders (Box 1).

Box 1. Discrepancies between national-level policies and cross-border cooperation needs at the local level
EE-RU:

In 1991 Estonia regained its independence, and the previously soft border (i.e. a regional-administrative one within the Soviet Union) became the hard border of two states Estonia and Russia, and later the external border of the European Union. Foreign policy and its impact to other policies is continuously the most important factor affecting the current CBC.

Even today, 23 years after re-independence, the Estonia-Russia border treaty is still not ratified by the two parliaments (although it was signed by foreign ministers in 2013) and the exact line of the current border has not been legally marked. The visa procedures are time consuming, expensive and restrict movement of people; there are also many complaints on time consuming custom procedures (and even bribing cases). However, looking from the Russian side, we can say that visa procedures have become easier and clearer, and the process of applying for a visa much nicer than, say, it was in the 1990s and the 2000s. Now Estonia, following Finland, also gives a multiple entry visas, and this definitely increase potential of cross-border affairs.

The current political crisis between EU-Russia has very direct negative influence to cross border trade flows (sanctions on certain goods, general mistrust). The main differences between border areas are in economic development, governance and milieu - the income level, local entrepreneurship being higher in Estonian side.

In regional level, South Estonian (excluding Tartu) and Pskov Oblast border areas are economic peripheries

in regional level - South Estonian (excluding Tartu) - Pskov Oblast border areas are economic peripheries of both countries. The relatively higher primary sector role in economic structure, smallness of urban centres and low economic densities have caused long lasting exodus – out-migration of younger and most capable people. As region is located in an economic periphery, then it means that both from Russian and Estonian side, there are limited possibilities to get and attract larger investments. The only exception is so far tourism, which has been mainly developed in Estonian side and attracts growing number of visitors from the Russian side.

In the Northern part of the border, city of Narva plays a key role. Narva residents as well as foreign experts recognize the large potential of Narva as a multifaceted city with manifold opportunities and trajectories of development. One of the obvious advantages of Narva is its geographical and cultural closeness to Russia, which can make Narva a link between the Estonian/European and Russian markets. However, the stakeholders say that the state has been ignoring this potential for long. The situation changed only recently, in the 2010s. The most obvious evidence of the state being serious about Narva and generally Ida-Virumaa is the project of creation of the United Industrial Parks of Ida-Virumaa, which looks promising as a means to convert the region's closeness to Russia into economic capital.

Another important aspect of the discussed context is the scale of cross-border development disparities, which can strongly affect various, mostly economic, interactions (Box 2). It should also be noted that these differences do not directly determine the volume of trade or shopping tourism, but rather open up certain opportunities for building economic cooperation. In particular, huge price differences can boost trade, whether official or assuming the form of shopping tourism if high custom tariffs apply. In the analysed regions, the situation in this regard is rather varied, but the scale of such differences is usually quite extensive. Exceptions to this general rule include the Swedish-Norwegian and the Estonian-Russian borders, but also the Bulgarian-Turkish border, the only case where GDP per capita is significantly higher in the non-EU region. Naturally, these differences are not carved in stone, and changes in the economic situation (such as exchange rates) can in many cases considerably affect the extent of cross-border interactions. The settlement system is another significant factor in cross-border cooperation, in particular the presence of large cities, found, in the analysed regions, especially at the Finnish-Russian border (Saint Petersburg), the Bulgarian-Turkish border (Istanbul) and the Italian-Tunisian border (Tunis).

Box 2. Impact of the economic situation on border interactions – the example of PL-UA

PL-UA: The Polish-Ukrainian border is among the external borders of the EU with the highest number of crossings, characterised by considerable variability due to different external conditions. The number of individuals crossing the border annually peaked at 20 million, and fell by 40% in a space of two years following the 2008 economic crisis. A fall of similar proportions was recorded in 1998 in connection with the Russian crisis, which also took its toll on the economies of Poland and Ukraine. In this context, changes in the border regime were not as important. For instance, the abolishment of visas for Ukrainian citizens in 1997 did not lead to any significant increase in the number of border crossings, just as was the case with the introduction of visas for Ukrainians in 2007 following Poland's accession to the Schengen Area (which coincided with the global economic crisis). Nevertheless, the later introduction of local border traffic in 2009 brought only a slight increase in the number of crossings. It should also be noted that the recent years brought a significant decrease in the border traffic of Polish citizens, who do not have to obtain visas, from some 45% down to 15%. This proves a distinctly commercial character of cross-border relations handled by a relatively small number of people who regularly (and often daily) cross the border to sell Ukrainian citizens and buy food, building materials, household appliances and electronics in Poland, in order to sell them on the Ukrainian market.

Dissimilarities in the institutional and legal systems are yet another important component of the context

Dissimilarities in the institutional and legal systems are yet another important component of the context defining cross-border cooperation. As a rule, they are manifested by a greater decentralisation of the administrative structures in the EU countries and a strong centralisation in the neighbouring countries, which could seriously impede institutional cooperation and pose a barrier to the implementation of CBC programmes. In the latter case, what matters is the adoption (or not) of an indicative breakdown of programmed resources. On the one hand, the parity principle could be used, whereby both sides equally divide the available resources and the responsibility for project implementation (e.g. the Bulgarian-Turkish border). Another possibility is to agree that projects with greatest significance and greatest impact for the support area will be funded, irrespective of their location or the location of the leading partner. In this case, however, it is quite likely that partners from the EU country will prevail among the project coordinators, owing to a greater potential and better administrative capacity (e.g. Polish-Ukrainian border) (Box 3).

Box 3. Degree of 'balancing' of CBC Programmes

FI-RU: An important momentum in the evolution of Finnish-Russian CBC was when Russia entered on equal terms with the launch of the ENPI programme, i.e. by contributing equally to its funding and gaining more weight in decisions on development priorities. In fact, the start of the ENPI funding instrument was

delayed by two years due to Russia's initial reluctance to sign the agreement for the reason that it did not see the European Neighbourhood Policy fit to their status as a re-emerging global power. Instead of entering the circle of the European Union's Neighbours under ENP, Russia insisted on using the existing Common Spaces Agreement for cooperation with the EU; and also, with equal financing responsibilities taken on, assumed stronger influence upon the priorities of CBC. These characteristics support in important ways today's relations in the Finnish-Russian borderlands, producing cross-border activities with more mutuality, and an increasing proportion of projects initiated and coordinated by Russian organisations. At the same time, however, the EU's leverage, its 'soft power' through the CBC programme on Russia in terms of, for instance, human rights (e.g. its pressure to promote civil actorship in CBC), has got less.

PL-UA: The Poland-Belarus-Ukraine Cross-Border Cooperation Programme 2007-2013 did not adopt an indicative breakdown of resources using the state criterion and plans to continue this arrangement in the 2014-2020 programme round. In effect, in the years 2007-2013 contracts were signed for the delivery of 74 Polish-Ukrainian projects (MEUR 107.9) 29 Polish-Belarusian projects (MEUR 58.5) and 14 trilateral projects (MEUR 7.7). This is an effect of adopting the assumption on the cross-border impact of delivered projects, which should in consequence produce benefits on both sides of the border. An indicative breakdown of resources would be difficult in this case also because of having partners from three countries.

The border regime also has an impact on how the border regions will develop; such a regime may either enhance border permeability or considerably obstruct it (Box 4). The most permeable of the analysed borders are those between: Sweden-Norway; Poland and Ukraine; Hungary and Ukraine; Romania and Moldova. They are all governed by various arrangements (such as lack of visas or local border traffic agreements) which facilitate economic contacts between the communities on both sides of the border. In the case of Turkey, Morocco and Tunisia, obtaining a visa is much more difficult and costly, and poses a serious barrier to cross-border interactions.

Box 4. Examples of 'soft' and 'hard' border regimes

SE-NO (very soft): Swedish-Norwegian border is among the best examples of 'soft' border regimes at the EU external border. Back in 1959 Sweden and Norway signed a customs cooperation agreement, as well as an agreement concerning a common Nordic labour market in 1954. The former aimed at facilitating the border crossing, simplifying customs controls and clearance procedures. The latter gave right for nationals

border crossing, simplifying customs controls and clearance procedures. The latter gave right for nationals of the Nordic countries to be able to freely take up employment and settle in another Nordic country.

Moreover, as part of the Schengen cooperation, there is no visa regime, no passport and any other type of border control imposed at the Swedish-Norwegian border. Due to 'soft' border regime the border between Sweden and Norway is perceived as a bridge rather than as a barrier.

HU-UA (soft): An international consortium of experts and think-tanks (Europe Without Barriers) monitoring the visa policy and practices of the EU countries found that between 2008 and 2012 compared to other EU countries the visa practices of Hungary: (1) were of high quality, (2) had the best overall results in all components of visa practices, (3) had the smallest percentage of visa refusals, (4) had the most simplified package of documents for applying for Schengen visas for the members of the Hungarian minority.

IT-TN (hard): The rules across the border have a negative impact on cooperation initiatives, even in those funded under the ENPI CBC programme. The progressive closure of the border between Italy and Tunisia following the implementation of the Schengen Agreement (2001) and through national laws (Italian Law on Immigration – or Bossi-Fini Law – n. 189/2002) have limited the actual human exchange between the territories, de facto making it very difficult for Tunisians to come to Italy and thus compromising the

principle of reciprocity in the relations that might be established.

Socio-economic relations and flows

Given the above considerations, both the scale and scope of cross-border interactions can vary considerably. In particular, they can be analysed in four basic dimensions: economic (e.g. economic ties between enterprises, foreign investments), socio-cultural (e.g. tourism, cultural events), environmental (e.g. cross-border ecosystems, i.e. sea and water basins, forest areas and migration of pollution), and institutional (e.g. cooperation between local governments, incl. partner cities, joint projects, CBC partnerships). The first two aspects are discussed below, based on the findings from the case studies; the other two will be presented in the following sections of the study.

Trade, including trade servicing transit traffic, especially in the regions with major transnational transport corridors, was among the best developed economic interactions in the analysed regions, in addition to tourism (mostly shopping tourism – see Box 5). It should also be noted that while economic cooperation in the surveyed regions was as a rule quite strongly focused on contacts with the neighbouring border region, its form and scope were largely dependent on the border regulations and custom tariffs. Benefits from the growth of trade between the European Union and the neighbouring countries varied from region to region, and their restricted scale was mainly due to the tunnelling effects (Box 6), whereby the leading role in trade was taken over by the core regions.

Box 5. Different types of shopping tourism

BG-TR: Transborder shopping tourism is developed in the Bulgarian side. It is quite common for the Bulgarian customers to go across the border on daily basis or for weekend. Especially those from Malko Tarnovo prefer to go to Kirklareli which is closer than Burgas. In the Turkish side, this mobility of Bulgarian people is called as KİPA-tourism. Its reasons are quite obvious: the Dereköy-Malko Tarnovo border crossing point is a small gate to ease border-crossing on daily basis. The Bulgarian people do not encounter with visa obstacle. They have access to cheaper and high quality products in the Turkish side. In the Turkish side, transborder shopping tourism is not fully utilized due to the strict visa regime to the Turkish people. Only Turkish people, holding double citizenship and green passport, can easily and any time cross the border for short-term vacations, entertainment, casino and shopping.

PL-UA: The main purpose of the Ukrainians' visits to Poland is shopping, which accounts for 90% of trips, while tourism only for 1.4%. The average purchase value per traveller is EUR 150 (2012) (EUR 130 for those who live up to 20 km from the border and EUR 220 for those living at a further distance (including

those who live up to 30 km from the border and EUR 220 for those living at a further distance (including Lviv)). The most popular products include building materials, also vehicle spare parts, food products, household appliances (minor importance: clothing and footwear, cosmetics, electronics, furnishings). In the opinion of marketplace sellers, the price is the most important aspect for the majority of buyers (40%), but also quality matters (10% exclusively, 40% also). A relatively small group of visitors make most trips – especially those who live within 30 km zone covered by the LBT agreement.

FI-RU: Russian tourism to Finland has increased rapidly, particularly during the last 5 years or so. The main purpose of the Russians visits to Finland is shopping, which accounts for 60% of trips, while leisure/holiday makes up 30%. The average purchase value per traveller is EUR 250-300 (2005-2011). The most popular products include clothing, foodstuffs, shoes, car maintenance and appliances. For Russian customers, quality is more important than the price in all product categories, while price differences are partly due to Russia's import tariffs. In addition, tax free shopping or invoicing add to the competitiveness of Finnish prices. A relatively small group of visitors make most trips.

SE-NO: Due to high income, prices and strong currency in Norway and relatively low prices in Sweden, Norwegians often travel over the border for shopping on the Swedish side. Therefore cross-border

shopping is quite intensive in the border area and makes a significant contribution to the local economy of the small Swedish settlements located between Kiruna and Riksgränsen. Cross border-shopping is also apparent in the ski and mountain hiking resorts such as Abisko and Björkliden. The main shopping items are consisted of food, alcohol and tobacco which are highly taxed in Norway. Sales of dairy products in the border trade are larger than the Swedish export of dairy products to Norway. Norwegians purchasing power is also reflected in demand for holiday houses as residents of the Narvik region (and in Northern Norway as a whole) tend to spend their summer vacations in Kiruna or in Luleå, Piteå and Boden (towns on the coast of the Bothnian bay). A survey from the Swedish Institute of Retail (HUI) shows that Norwegians made approximately 9.5 million trips to Sweden in 2011, of which two thirds were day trips with shopping as the main purpose. The value of the Norwegian cross-border shopping in Sweden is approximately SEK 25 billion per year.

Box 6. The tunnelling effect in the border region

BG-TR: The Dereköy-Malko Tarnovo border is easily accessible and not busy, making it attractive for especially Bulgarians to travel for shopping or other reasons. Kirklareli is surrounded by larger cities such as İstanbul, and other medium-sized cities. Most of foreign tourists, Bulgarian people and trademen use the Dereköy-Malko Tarnovo border crossing point as a gate to these cities. These cities are more developed than Kirklareli and more attractive in terms of trade and shopping. There is access to more diversified products in quantity and quality. İstanbul Airport is located at roughly the same distance from Burgas as Sofia airport. As a large international hub, Atatürk airport provides easy access to many international locations. Many of the local residents from Varna and Burgas use it as 'their' primary airport. The fact that the Bulgarian people do not encounter visa problem in crossing to the Turkish side eases their pass to the Atatürk airport in İstanbul. In the Turkish side, the entertainment opportunities, especially casinos, in Burgas are very attractive in the use of the Dereköy-Malko Tarnovo border point. Those who travel from İstanbul, Kirklareli and other surrounding cities to Bulgaria for this reason by-pass Malko Tarnovo and reach to Burgas as their main point of destination. For the double passport holders, the tourism facilities in Burgas also increase the attractiveness of the city as the major point of destination for vacation.

PL-UA: The Podkarpackie Voivodship (border region) played quite an important role in Polish-Ukrainian trade in comparison to its economic potential (3.7% share in the national GDP). In 2012, the regional companies accounted for 6.4% of overall trade between Poland and Ukraine, generating more exports

companies accounted for 6.4 % of overall trade between Poland and Ukraine, generating more exports (7.5%), than imports (4.2%). Nonetheless, the region's role has quite distinctly diminished, especially starting from 2004, a period of a boost in trade between these two countries. In 2004, companies from the Podkarpackie Voivodship had a 9.6% share in mutual trade (13.4% in exports and 3.5% in imports). This could be viewed as proof of the 'tunnelling effect', that is expansion of direct trade contacts, without intermediation of companies situated in the border region. In consequence, the Voivodship's share in Poland's foreign trade gradually diminished. While in 2000 the region's share in both exports and imports was ca. 4.0%, in 2010 it fell to 3.3% in exports and 2.4% in imports of goods and services.

On the other hand, foreign investments, modest in volume in the majority of cases, were of a much smaller significance due to the existence of various legal and administrative barriers and threat of corruption, particularly if we look at the cross-border aspects (Box 7). The few exceptions in this regard include the Finnish-Russian and the Italian-Tunisian borders. In some cases, a reverse trend can be observed: making investments in the EU countries by companies from the neighbouring countries in an attempt to gain better access to the Community market and better conditions for doing business. This is rather a new trend, but can be observed at the border between Poland and Ukraine, Finland and Russia, Bulgaria and Turkey (but in this case GDP per capita is higher in Turkey).

Box 7. Scale and nature of cross-border foreign investments

FI-RU: Although in South Karelia 20 per cent of new businesses are of Russian ownership these businesses are generally small. The Finnish border regions are increasingly trying to promote their regions to Russian capital through organising 'activating seminars' regularly for target groups of potential Russian investors, but only with limited success (as the larger Russian investments do not appear to prefer the border regions over other regions of Finland). During year 2011, the volume of accumulated Finnish investment in Russia as a whole increased by 2.5% to USD 3.3 billion. Over two-thirds of the investments by Finnish companies in Russia were direct investment.

HU-UA: Since FDI exists in the region almost unidirectionally (i.e. from Hungary to Transcarpathia) therefore our analysis should focus as well on this direction. Since Transcarpathia used to be the western frontier of the Soviet Union, it had never been a target of large-scale industrial investment and agriculture has dominated the local economy. The plan of the early 1990's that the region would acquire the status of a special economic zone failed and this has significantly limited the interest of foreign capital in the region. The main characteristics of the FDI in Transcarpathia are as follows: 1) The number of Hungarian FDI projects is large but the amount of capital of Hungarian enterprises investing in Ukraine in most cases is small due to the undercapitalized economic situation of Hungarian firms. In 2005 the Hungarian FDI was 5th in the rank order in Transcarpathian FDI, following the USA, Japan, Germany and Austria; 2) The Hungarian investing activity, especially that of SMEs was extremely active in the first years following the transformation of the system, however, later on the investment activity lost its dynamism; 3) A relatively considerable part of Hungarian capital was invested in the trading sector and not in the productive branches of the Ukrainian economy; 4) The majority of Hungarian investment was located near to the Hungarian border. This allocation pattern was due to the following factors: existing networks, better communication possibilities with the Hungarian quasi-Diaspora, cultural similarity, and relatively better transportation; 5) Compared to Ukraine in general, Transcarpathia has lost its initial advantage in terms of FDI per GRP (Gross Regional Product) around the time Hungary joined the EU: while between 2000 and 2004 the rate of FDI/GRP was significantly above the average of Ukraine by 2007 its level is similar to the other West Ukrainian regions.

IT-TN: Italy is the second most important partner for Tunisian inbound and outbound foreign direct investments flows. Outward foreign investments from Tunisia to Italy are 3 to 4 times higher than those to

investments flows. Outward foreign investments from Tunisia to Italy are 3 to 4 times higher than those to Germany and only 30% less than those from Tunisia to France. However, the flow of investments is basically from Italy towards Tunisia: outward investments from Tunisia accounts for only 5% approximately of inward investments. According to the interviews conducted for the EUBORDERREGIONS project, basically three main attractive elements have so far encouraged Sicilian investments in Tunisia: lower costs of production, the favourable institutional and fiscal environment and the opportunity to use Tunisia as a connection to other North African markets.

The existence of a border regime, coupled with having to wait for passport control, is the reason why there is practically no commuting to work across the EU external border, save for the border between Sweden and Norway where no such barriers can be observed (Box 8). In other cases, daily commuting is replaced by the inflow of temporary or permanent immigrants who travel to the EU to work. This phenomenon is best visible at the Spanish-Moroccan and the Italian-Tunisian borders, but, albeit on a smaller scale, is also found at the Polish-Ukrainian and the Hungarian-Ukrainian borders.

Box 8. Flow of workforce in the border regions

NO-RU: The visa regime/Schengen regime is the main reason for the lack of daily commuters across the Russian-Norwegian border. The demand for Russian workers is strong on the Norwegian side and many Russians would have liked to work in Norway. Currently, the border regime makes this very complicated. Paradoxically (in the eyes of the borderlanders) it is easier to import workers from Portugal and Greece than from the neighbouring municipality across the border.

EE-RU: One of the most promising directions for the economic cooperation in Narva and Ivangorod is a shared labour market (in fact, a shared labour market is what both cities experienced before the establishment of the border). As result of high level of unemployment, a large part of Narva working age population migrated and now work in Europe and the UK; many people from Ivangorod work in St. Petersburg. Nevertheless, Narva and Ivangorod have a fairly high labour potential. What benefits the shared labor market is the common language, close and long-term personal ties, as well as the fact that many Narvans have Russian citizenship that allows them to cross the border on a regular basis, without let or hindrance. The labour market is open in both directions, but there has been significantly more Narvans working in Ivangorod than the other way around, according to the experts. The largest employer is Yura Corporation, with about 200 Narva residents working there. The collapse of the ruble, however, has greatly increased the gap between Russian and Estonian wages and, in fact, deprived the work of Narvans on the Russian side of any purpose. Moreover, the representatives of Ivangorod authorities noted that some enterprises and institutions of Ivangorod are currently being re-oriented towards cheaper workforce, for instance, from Central Asia.

As regards the social dimension, cultural cooperation has best thrived in the analysed border regions (Box 9). In many cases, this was a continuation of the cooperation established during the 'Iron Curtain' era. Cultural cooperation is also facilitated by the operation of partner cities, and takes such forms as visits of artists from the partner cities to take part in various cultural events, mostly local in character.

Box 9. Cross-border cultural cooperation

BG-TR: In the Turkish-Bulgarian case, CBC projects paved the way for cultural rapprochement between Bulgaria and Turkey, as their interaction positively changed their attitude to each other. Almost all of the respondents in both side of the border agree that CBC project brought a new understanding to the region in terms of overcoming the past prejudice and cultural and political distance between two countries. Both the Bulgarian and Turkish people restart to know each other and discover common historical, cultural and regional aspects. On the other hand, the cultural cooperation achieved through the CBC projects led to the increase of institutional cooperation between city and town municipalities, educational institutions, and

increase of institutional cooperation between city and town municipalities, educational institutions, and civic organizations.

NO-RU: Cross-border cultural cooperation has long and strong traditions in the Russian-Norwegian borderland. The cross-border cultural cooperation goes back to the Cold War era. Art was and is still used instrumentally to reduce tensions and build trust in the borderland. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has actively supported cultural cross-border cooperation initiatives. An annual Russian-Norwegian border art festival, Barents Spektakel, has been set up in Kirkenes. The festival has become a showcase for good Russian-Norwegian relations and has received generous support from the Norwegian government.

Regional development and strategies for co-operation

Assessment of the border location

The interviewees frequently expressed quite varied opinions about the advantages of the border location. On the other hand, positive opinions tended to prevail, which was more visible in the neighbouring countries than in the EU countries. On the side of the benefits associated with location, economic and financial aspects were typically mentioned in the EU Member States. The argument offered in the case of

the former was that the economic development of the neighbouring countries helped reduce the scale of economic disparities. It also had a positive impact on the regions in the EU countries owing to the increased trade volume and easier access to the neighbouring sales markets. The financial aspects included the availability of funds for initiatives fostering cross-border cooperation. Also, in the regions of the new Member States, respondents pointed to the availability of the Cohesion Policy funds on the one hand, and on the other – to institution building and improving the administrative potential, which however was not a consequence of the border location but of a low level of development.

The negative aspects of the border location quoted by the respondents mainly included economic and spatial peripherality and the resultant low attractiveness for inward investors. Interviewees also pointed to limitations posed by the existence of the state border, in the form of various obstacles to crossing the border, which also crippled possibilities for developing cross-border cooperation. They also listed the relatively small funds earmarked for cross-border cooperation under the ENPI and in effect their slight impact on socio-economic development in the border regions, especially when compared to other EU programmes, in particular those funded under the Cohesion Policy.

On the other hand, respondents in the neighbouring countries talked about a high level of economic development in the regions on the EU side of the border, in which non-EU regions saw some advantages for themselves, through acting as ‘gateways’ to their national economies. They also stressed the economic and institutional significance of cross-border cooperation. Conversely, respondents quite seldom quoted the examples of transfer of knowledge and know-how (see Box 10), both of which were more often mentioned by respondents on the EU side of the border.

Box 10. Example of cross-border transfer of knowledge

HU-UA: One of the ENPI CBC projects implemented by Debrecen and Uzhgorod universities aimed at handling the challenges of national health. On both sides of the Hungarian-Ukrainian border they worked on spreading and changing information, experiences concerning healthcare and to ameliorate the cooperation between the educational, healthcare, social and civil sectors. There were several other projects with similar aims, e.g. an ENPI project with the title of “Healthy communities without borders” aimed at ameliorating equity and living standards of people living in the border region. “Skills for the future” is also an ENPI project between Hungary and Ukraine aiming at fighting the difficulties of public health care and sharing knowledge, experience, etc. In 2013 there was a conference for Hungarian doctors from Ukraine, Romania, Slovakia and Hungary to share their experiences and knowledge with

doctors from Ukraine, Romania, Slovakia and Hungary to share their experiences and knowledge with each other in Budapest. This project was in the frame of the Hungarian national health policy.

IT-TN: 'Mediterranean Forum' for entrepreneurs and scholars in the field of fisheries, with the aim of developing mutual knowledge and dialogue. The Sicilian fishing district has stimulated the creation of a "Mediterranean Forum", participated by Mediterranean experts, entrepreneurs and scholars in the field of fisheries, with the aim of developing mutual knowledge and dialogue.

The negative aspects included barriers posed to development by the poorly developed technical infrastructure, including transport infrastructure. This was particularly well visible in comparison with better-developed EU countries (Box 11). On the other hand, however, progress that had taken place in this regard in the Cohesion countries was also emphasised. Other factors listed by the respondents included insufficient decentralisation of both competencies and funds nationally, which made institutional cooperation more difficult; it also hampered efficient management of local and regional development, CBC included. Respondents also indicated problems of a social nature caused by migration outflow, of both employees with low qualifications who go to work (often illegally) in the highly developed EU countries and of those with high qualifications (brain drain). In some cases, it was stressed that the benefits arising from the border location were relatively small for the ordinary residents, with public institutions and private companies being the main beneficiaries.

Box 11. Unfavourable aspects of border location as viewed by respondents in non-EU countries

PL-UA: There are some negative implications of the border location on the Ukrainian side of the border, in particular the brain drain of the most talented and mobile individual; illegal trade and a large share of grey economy; lost taxes, business oriented on short-term gains rather than on a strategic vision for higher productivity and creativity; some social problems related to long term emigration of family members. Overall, however, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, and hopefully the latter could be mitigated through well-developed policies and instruments.

HU-UA: The most prevalent problems are related to the long queues on the border and the unfriendly behaviour of the Ukrainian border officers. These are followed by smuggling and informal economic activities as well as the problems caused by the difficulties of cooperation due to cultural and bureaucratic incompatibility, i.e. differences in mentality, laws, and procedures. Emigration, nationalism and immigration are mentioned only by Ukrainian actors, Hungarian actors consider isolation, corruption and cheap goods (which is another form of complaining about smuggling- an issue more problematic for Hungarian than Ukrainian actors). The most often mentioned positive aspects of the proximity of the border are partly the same as were the negative ones such as the labour migration and the mix of shopping tourism and petty smuggling.

RO-MD: The Moldovan stakeholders believe that the proximity of the border creates the preconditions for migration, in particular, the migration of high qualified human resources to Romania. Along with the positive trends that ensures proximity of borders, this factor stimulates the migration of scientific and skilled workers. In turn, the reservoir formed by the migration of people, the basic energy that should be focused on the development of the state, a serious blow to the scientific and innovative potential of the country. In the case of the Republic of Moldova, the departure abroad of scientific human resources creates the effect of a missed opportunity.

EE-RU: For the case of Narva-Ivangorod, one of the problems is that the border road goes through the cities and therefore turns both cities into a transit zone – a traffic and waiting place for many freight and passenger vehicles. If Narva partly solved this problem, having organized a special zone for vehicles at the outskirts of the city, for Ivangorod this problem remains. The organization of transit requires special infrastructure, related, in particular, to traffic regulation within the city or waste collection, which

infrastructure, related, in particular, to traffic regulation within the city or waste collection, which, respectively, requires additional investments. On the Russian side, another negative aspect of the border location is a special border regime that regulates and, thereafter, limits the movement of people in the border zone and also makes difficult to organize and conduct public political, cultural and other events. To visit the city, non-locals must have special permits which are checked on the road check point at the entry to the border zone. The permits must be ordered and issued in St. Petersburg before the trip. The border regime is most problematic for individual tourists that come to Ivangorod on their own. Furthermore, there are certain difficulties for travel agencies that organize group tours to Ivangorod. They also have to obtain special permits. Such difficulties undoubtedly slow down the development of tourism and tourist infrastructure in Ivangorod, despite the fact that there are quite a few tourist points of interest, so tourism could become one of the directions of city development in post-industrial conditions.

Costs and benefits of the border location

Practically in all the cases, respondents emphasised that the benefits of the border location outnumber its negative consequences. Firstly, they indicated aspects associated with tourism (which however - except shopping tourism - in most cases still holds potential for development but does not represent an important

development feature of the border regions) and trade (which can take various forms, also shopping tourism) (Box 12). Secondly, they noted the improved quality of the transport infrastructure, made possible mainly due to external funding (both European and national). In some cases, improved sense of security and lesser threat of common crime was mentioned, thanks to the permanent presence of the border services.

Box 12. Development of cross-border tourism

FI-RU: The tourism industry is the branch of the economy from which the Finnish regions in the case study area have expected their economic revival, since this sector provides the jobs and tax income that were lost to the crisis of the forest-industrial sector. Tourism from Russia to Finland, particularly for the purpose of shopping, has grown exponentially during the last five years. The key underlying factors are the increasing affluence of a certain stratum of population on the Russian side of the border, improved and extended border crossing stations as well as the enhancement of the auxiliary road infrastructure, and the more reliable quality, high levels of service, and attractive prices on the Finnish side of the border. Russian customers travelling through the border crossing points of the case study area spent EUR 1154 million in Finland in 2012 (EUR 879 million on products and EUR 274 million on services), with an average of EUR 303 spent by each Russian visitor on a single trip.

HU-UA: Following the transformation of the system only a very narrow segment of the Transcarpathian population could afford being “purely” tourist, and more or less the same characterized the average Hungarians living in the region. For decades the attractiveness of Transcarpathia for the average Hungarian consumer existed only potentially mainly because its elementary infrastructure and the difficulty of crossing the border, but the minimal level of complementary services and the lack of a qualified workforce have been hindering the development of tourism as well. Moreover, after the first years when enthusiasm have produced the initial steps of developing tourism policy in Ukraine (e.g. setting up tourist offices, joining the international organizations, etc.), these activities have recently slowed down, and in many respects the tourism concept and system preserved from the Soviet past became permanent.

Threats to and opportunities for regional development

In light of the above, it is clear that the border location can bring both opportunities and threats to the regions. According to the respondents, the advantages include mainly economic aspects, associated with the possibilities to enhance competitiveness as a result of developing innovative business activities, but this is quite seldom associated with strictly cross border relations. Particularly, we found no evidence to

this is quite seldom associated with strictly cross-border relations. Particularly, we found no evidence to support the notion of cross-border diffusion of innovations. Referring to advantages, respondents were highlighting the complementarity of the border regions and the related comparative advantages. One side effect of the latter however could be the petrification of disparities in the development level between the areas situated on both sides of the border. Such a threat is particularly significant in a situation of a small scale of direct cross-border investments and, as shown above, such investments in the surveyed border regions have not been significant, to say the least. Respondents also often pointed to the tourism and transit potential of the border regions. It should be borne in mind however that this involves the threat of low-paid, unqualified jobs. Some opportunities are also perceived in the prospect of EU membership for the neighbouring countries and in maintaining their political stability, also in the conditions of EU support for the democratisation processes taking place there.

The future threats include above all the progressing marginalisation of the cross-border regions (Box 13). Such a scenario is possible especially in a situation when the local enterprises show little propensity to invest and the 'grey economy' sector is developed, which exerts a negative pressure on enterprises that legally hire their staff. Corruption, visible particularly in the neighbouring countries, can also be viewed as a threat. In the social dimension, problems associated with illegal immigration are likely to be exacerbated, the level of security is likely to fall and the regional disparities can increase even further due to a lower development rate in the areas outside large cities. In the political sphere, the respondents pointed to threats associated with the lack of progress of the neighbouring countries on their path to association with, or membership of, the European Union. Threats in this sphere also include the lack of progress in the decentralisation of the administrative structures, which could have a negative impact on cross-border cooperation at the regional and local level. Yet another threat is the low institutional capacity, also of the Euro-regional institutions, which could become major players in the development and consolidation of cross-border contacts. As a final threat, respondents listed political tensions, recently so acutely pronounced in the Ukrainian crisis.

Box 13. Threats to the development of border regions

EE-RU: One of the most important factors of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) activity across the border has been the EU funding. However, there is a risk that CSOs are getting more dependent on externally defined agendas/funding and may lose the local focus. As the case studies show, small and locally oriented CSOs do gain valuable experience through externally dominated networks, but it also tends to "deform" them in terms of their outlook and self-image. For Russian CSO it is even more difficult - as according to Russian NGO law from 2012, all non-commercial organizations (NCO) have to register with the state prior to receipt of funding from any foreign sources, in order to be determined "NCOs carrying out functions of a foreign agent", which also bring them several reporting requirements.

IT-TN: In the Italy-Tunisia case local stakeholders have identified many elements that threaten the development paths of Sicily and Tunisia because of their border location. The main threats include: the threat represented by the current migration policies, that, if not modified, could definitely determine the perception of the border as a division; the risk of an uncontrolled flow of delocalisation that weakens the production in Italy exploiting lower wages and weaker labour protection in Tunisia; the weakness of public administration both in Sicily and Tunisia that might affect the opportunities to develop a stronger cooperation; the threat deriving from the scarce interest and diffusion of information on common problems and challenges.

Role of the European Union

From the very beginning, the European Union and its policies raised many hopes for development in the

From the very beginning, the European Union and its policies raised many hopes for development in the border areas (just as they did in the EU at large), with a distinct tendency to maximise expectations from the financial policies, such as the Cohesion Policy. Due to the asymmetry in institutional and income aspects, with the non-EU countries in an unfavourable position, it was clear from the very beginning of the implementation of CBC programmes that the border regions situated at the external borders will only be able to succeed if they receive EU support (as in Phare prior to 2004 or the ENPI at present). Naturally, this means that the EU funds and the accompanying practices are by assumption an important tool for the development of the border areas and their development policies. But do they play the role that was anticipated for them?

Within the EU, European Union CBC funds are usually regarded as a significant but not major source of financing regional development (as there are also other programmes, with bigger budgets). On the other hand, in most of the neighbouring countries (Russia being an exception), the European funds are regarded as quite insignificant, mostly due to their small volume, and also because they are unlikely to create new jobs and sources of income (Box 14). Generally, the higher the level of the country's development, the more instrumental the attitude to European programmes, viewed as tools for achieving the national policy

goals. At the other end of the spectrum, there are less-developed countries which border on the EU, where the small EU funds are supplanted by other assistance funds and, above all, by the national policies. In between, we have less-developed EU countries where the financial resources and the development methodologies are regarded as crucial development tools (Box 15). In the non-EU (neighbouring) countries, the main benefits are observed primarily in the environmental protection infrastructure, as this is a major concern of all institutions with available funds in the border areas. Other support areas (development of enterprise in particular) are basically negligible.

Box 14. Role of EU funds in the development of cross-border regions

IT-TN: EU funds are a key instrument for the development of CBC across the Italy-Tunisia border.

However, the resources available for this programme are scarce, especially if compared with the total amount of European regional development funds available for Sicily. According to some interviewees the ENP in Tunisia has such a small amount of resources that its impact is negligible.

PL-UA: EU policies have the strongest impact on the development of technical infrastructure and closing the civilisational gap (incl. environmental protection). Respondents agreed that the social objectives prevail over the economic ones and have a small impact on economic development processes, which is connected with the asymmetries in development, finances and administrative structures on both sides of the border. The planned reforms in Ukraine could change this situation, although their first results will not be visible until some time in the future. These phenomena are also manifested in the border areas and result from the nature of projects prepared and implemented as part of EU-financed programmes. In both cases, respondents on the Polish side believed that activities financed under the Regional Operational Programmes were of the greatest significance (due to their being managed by the regional authorities, which is commonly perceived as a guarantee of a better identification of the local needs and therefore a greater impact on the allocation decisions), followed by the Sectoral Operational Programmes (offering substantial funding for the biggest projects of regional importance such as the A4 motorway), and, finally, INTERREG/ENPI. Respondents on the Ukrainian side attached more importance to the role of the national policies which determine how the ENPI funds will be utilised. The ENPI CBC programmes are regarded as important, but not as important as the national programmes. For obvious reasons (being a non-EU country, with a small financial contribution), Ukraine has a limited 'say' in developing the CBC strategy and also it gains disproportionately less from the projects that come to fruition.

Box 15. Benefits provided by European policies to cross border regions

BG-TR: Both Bulgarian and Turkish stakeholders underline that the European cross-border policies have a considerable positive impact for building a synergy for the enhancement of the region as well as the increase in the cultural relations. However, the scopes of CBC projects remain limited and ineffective to encompass the acute problems shared by both of the bordering towns. In Kırklareli and Burgas, CBC projects are single-shot projects with find short-term solutions without any follow-ups and/or transformative capacity in the long term. In addition, the EU policies are not compatible with the local conditions with its promotion to generic projects. This situation hampers the possibility of producing local answers and falls short meeting the local demands, yet, it persistently imposes an EU-led framework expected to cover all different external borders of the EU.

PL-UA: The role of the European Union and technical assistance programmes that it provides in the Ukrainian border regions, in particular the Lviv Oblast, is significant. And it is not only because of the absolute scale of actions and amount of funding provided – in fact many respondents in the Lviv Oblast noted that for the support to be really effective, the assistance package needs to be 10 times larger – but because domestic policies in the area of socio-economic development of border areas are ineffective and chronically underfunded. However, in many respects the complementarity of EU and Ukrainian domestic policies is essential for achieving real progress and that is why they should be considered together rather than in isolation.

Contrary to expectations, respondents also see negative results In the EU countries, especially the less-developed ones, an insufficient level of compatibility with the region's specific features, excessive bureaucracy and lack of flexibility in implementation have been listed most frequently; less often, also the problem of becoming permanently dependent on grants. In the non-EU countries, the frequently quoted example of a by-effect is the Schengen policy, which is often in contradiction with the CBC policy. For instance, Tunisia maintains that the gradual closure of the border with the EU is an obstacle to developing cooperation. Less frequently listed negative results include the risk of the border communities becoming dependent on external aid; also excessive bureaucracy associated with the programmes is regarded as a problem.

To sum up, it can be said that the role of European funds (policies) is not everywhere regarded as particularly significant. EU funds play a major role in less-developed Member States (since in other countries they are dominated by national policies and resources). They do not play any major role in the non-EU (neighbouring) countries, mainly due to the scarcity of funding and the key role of national budgets (not to mention foreign assistance funds from non-EU countries). In some cases, individual EU policies stand in conflict with cross-border cooperation (e.g. the Schengen regime obstructs border traffic and cooperation). Less-developed countries and regions tend to overestimate the role of infrastructure in CBC at the expense of business development and cooperation, which can be viewed as proof that the old, industrial-era development paradigm is still entrenched. In general terms, the impact is relative and depends on country status (i.e. which side of the EU border it is on) but also on the overall level of development (the two are often interconnected). As a result, their impact on the development of border areas is important, but less than expected. It should also be noted that, in many Eastern Partnership countries, organisations funded by wealthy countries, sponsors or international organisations, play a notable role. Coordination of their activities with the Cohesion Policy definitely presents a serious challenge.

In many countries, results achieved in different areas of European policies are underlined, above all in environmental protection, followed by e.g. transport, culture, business or innovation; these areas are emphasised mainly by the non-EU neighbouring countries, which may be due to such issues as availability

emphasised mainly by the non-EU neighbouring countries, which may be due to such issues as availability and structure of resources, or perhaps due to the scale of grassroots needs, and most likely both of these. One way or another, it seems that the less-developed an area the greater the tendency to overestimate the role of infrastructure in development. In any case, the issue of differentiating tasks in a given context should be taken into consideration. Moreover, it is probably necessary to strengthen the European policies in terms of finance and expertise so that they are better suited to meet the requirements of the new development paradigm and the Europe 2020 strategy. Maximisation of the synergies between European policies should also be considered; for instance, restrictions associated with the Schengen regulations may obstruct local cooperation. The local border traffic arrangements which are in place in Poland can be viewed as one of possible improvements.

It should also be stressed that, although this phenomenon has not been reported anywhere outside of Poland, there are grounds to believe (or at least hypotheses to be verified in the future), that there is a tendency in many regions to replace truly cross-border projects by what in fact are close-to-border projects (which in theory are jointly prepared and implemented; one investment or event on one, the second on the other, side of the border, formally making up one cross-border project. This method in many

cases helps to circumvent the formal requirements through the delivery of twin projects. To take an example: the project involves the construction of a ski jump on one side, and an indoor swimming pool on the other side of the border. At face value, this is one joint project aimed to enhance the tourism potential of a border region, but in reality both border regions are in this way building independently their own competitiveness. This issue should be subject to closer analysis in the future.

All the above considerations prove that the European funds have a significant (though not always the same) impact on the development of the border areas, albeit smaller than expected. The neighbouring countries in particular tend to express such opinions which can hardly be challenged, especially in light of recent developments.

When the study was in progress, unexpected events took place at the Ukrainian-Russian border, which are of momentous significance for the border areas, Central and Eastern European countries and the whole EU. The annexation of Crimea by the Russia, then the crisis in Eastern Ukraine, have – at least for the time being – signalled a setback for CBC. If left unaddressed, these new geopolitical tensions could threaten the many achievements and good practices developed at the external border of the EU.

Conclusions, Some Typologies and Policy Considerations

The EU's external borders lie at the intersection between the EU's ambitions for influence, acceptance and stability on the one hand, and its territorial challenges and anxieties on the other. Economic co-operation and cross-border dialogue compete with border security agendas and the Schengen visa regime. However, this is only part of the story as local actors have also emerged as important agents in the rebordering and rescaling of cross-border relations, if in very selective and targeted ways. The most important issues related to bordering and scale that have emerged in our research have involved the intensity and breadth of network-building given the often contrasting nature of institutionalised or politicised policy settings on the one hand and locally-driven cooperation on the other. As our research indicates, CBC contexts at the external borders manifest several dimensions, such as:

- 1) they pre-determine local scopes of action to a certain extent, e.g. by implementing "Europeanizing" funding schemes while keeping neighbouring regions at a distance.

2) they trigger different routines of cross-border interaction dependent on the purposefully designed permeability of the border.

3) they highlight regional economic development as another highly relevant condition. The contrast between the rich European Northwest and the poor European South/Southeast involves the re-scaling of regional and international relations (in terms of political influence, migration, market dynamics, investment, human capital, exploitation of resources etc.): East and Southeast European peripheries, often classified as “neighbouring” or “approaching” regions, have less access to Research & Development, innovation, global economic networks than the north-western core regions have. Consequently, scales attached to economic, political and social spheres in the North and South diverge considerably.

4) they reflect variations in the pathways of Eastern transition, resulting in variegated capitalisms (between modernized catch-up systems, restorative authoritarian capitalism, clientelist capitalism and criminal catch-as-catch-can capitalism) do not only involve varying levels of economic wealth, economic policies, adherence to models of regional development, external policies, different paces of social change, adverse national political cultures, etc. They also comprise enormous variations in scale building, often dependent on the degree of openness towards external influence or dominant ideologies (between neo-liberalism and defensive nationalism). All in all, each item involved in EU enlargement or neighbourhood relations has been attached to different arrangements of (local, regional, national, supranational, virtual) scales – and to massive changes in their significance, governance, management, conceptual balancing and factual utilization.

Consequently, typologies can be elaborated based on project data that shed light – based on current assessments – on the 11 case study areas as potential development regions of CBC. These typologies are based on the EUBORDERREGIONS approach which has interpreted border regions as a contextual nexus where geopolitical forces, bordering processes and scalar positioning have direct impacts on perspectives for development (and thus Cohesion).

Table 2. Typology of Case Study Areas based on Contextual Criteria

Type	Case Study Areas	Contexts	Characterisations
1	FIN-RUS	Character of CBC	multisector: economic, political, cultural
	Bordering Context	hard border regime, visa regime with local exceptions,	high frequency of border crossings and local border traffic
	Scales of Interaction	local, regional, national	
	Development type	Dynamic and resilient development corridor	
2	NOR-RUS	Character of CBC	economic, shopping, cultural, local political networks
	NOR-SE Bordering Context	hard border regime, visa regime with local exceptions,	moderate frequency of border crossings and local border traffic
	Scales of Interaction	local and regional	
	Development type	Dynamic within a context of economic and political peripherality	
3	MOR-ES	Character of CBC	Cultural, social, economic – civil society major player
	TUN-IT Bordering Context	hard border and visa regime, moderate frequency of border crossings and local border traffic	

border traffic

Scales of Interaction discontinuous; networks between communities and civil society groups; lack of policy framework for CBC

Development type Potentially dynamic economic and cultural CBC reduced by border security and restrictions

4 POL-UKR Character of CBC civil society and public actors main drivers; some business-oriented networking

TR-BUL Bordering Context Hard border and visa regimes with some local exceptions

TR-GR Scales of Interaction selective and isolated networks between key localities

EE-RUS Development type Introverted peripheries with high degree of dependence on national policies, lack of cross-border economic development (with exceptions of tourism)

5 HU-UKR Character of CBC Social, cultural and economic but highly dependent on ethnic (Hungarian) affiliations

Bordering Context hard border and visa regime, moderate frequency of border crossings and local border traffic, local exceptions, special dispensations for ethnic Hungarians

Scales of Interaction Local, regional and national–regional (diasporic); important role of Hungarian government

Development type Isolated national periphery in HU and UKR lacking dynamism, lack of connection to larger economic contexts, important role of informal economy, EU and HU subsidies

6 RO-MOL Character of CBC multisector: economic, political, cultural

Bordering Context hard border and visa regime, moderate to intensive frequency of border crossings and local border traffic, local exceptions, dual citizenship expedites flows;

Scales of Interaction National, regional and local (diasporic)

Development type Cross-border development space within a context of promoting closer binational ties

One further, but very specific, type of CBC context hinted at in Table 2 is that where quasi-diasporas, ethnic minorities and people holding dual citizenship facilitate cross-border cooperation (HU-UA, GR-TR; BG-TR: Turks that emigrated from Bulgaria). Social networks streamline the contacts between the two sides of the border. People from the diaspora often serve as gatekeepers, being accustomed to culture and language of both countries – their country of residence, and the country to which they feel related. Moreover, dual citizenship enables them to cross the border more easily.

Finally, based on fieldwork and interaction with stakeholders our research raises a number of issues of particular policy relevance. One present restriction – which could be converted into an advantage – is the fact that CBC at the external borders is caught within the territorial and programming rigidities of Cohesion and Neighbourhood Policy and does not enjoy a truly functioning action space: spatially defined indicators, goals, remits as well as fragmented responsibilities create their own barriers to interaction. At the same time, national implementation of Cohesion policies often remains guided by a fixation with physical investment and development and not on the development of cooperative networks across borders. Given these considerations, EUBORDERREGIONS policy communications have stressed the following as a basis for crafting more efficient modes of EU-level, but also national CBC support:

1. Understanding the border as a resource. It is clear that national contexts and the gaps between them still very much influence policy-oriented behaviours at the national and subnational levels. Despite three decades of support, cross-border cooperation is by no means a self-evident resource for territorial

decades of support, cross-border co-operation is by no means a self-evident resource for territorial development – it is also not a process that can be understood as inherently ‘rational’, based on commonsense economic, social and/or cultural logics. The informal economy appears to understand the border quite well, but formal governance structures oftentimes do not, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe and in neighbouring countries. One reason for this are the lack of incentives and (still) high transaction costs that are associated with CBC. As a result of this situation we have observed in EUBORDERREGIONS that stakeholders generally affirm the desirability of CBC but that actual implementation remains patchy.

2. Critically interpreting CBC as filling gaps in Cohesion and Neighbourhood Policies. Our research reflects tensions between realist regional policy concerns related to national development and more idealistic policy imperatives that seek to create alternative, border-transcending territorial contexts for regional policy. Cohesion policies and ENP are nationally oriented and highly territorial. Furthermore, funding and policy marginality affects CBC at the external borders - where we also find the poorest border regions - to a much greater degree; here, cooperation networks are highly localised and not well developed. Generally speaking, some parts of ‘core Europe’ do much better in this respect. The sustainability and a high degree of self-referentiality has been achieved, for example, in the Dutch-German case even if funding is low.

3. Highlighting the dilemma of ‘hard’ versus ‘soft’ development factors. The one-sided focus on ‘hard’ factors and physical investment is problematic. Regional policy tends to be positivistic, based on an ‘objective’ and containerised picture of territorial conditions, assets and structural relationships. CBC, on the other hand, is highly networked, often ‘de-territorialised’ in the sense that interaction between different actors is the main driving force.

4. Emphasising the role of civil society actors. Civil society needs to be a more important part of the ENP-Cohesion-CBC nexus. This is a rather long-term concern and reflects the problem that, despite rhetorical assurances to the contrary, actors that represent societal and community issues have very limited access to opportunity structures of CBC promotion.

5. The gaps between local level needs and interests and the level of high (geo)politics that governs the management of borders. Rarely do border communities have the political and economic influence to negotiate special border regime conditions with central government agencies. However a degree of local control can be achieved through local networks that create bridges across hard borders. Furthermore, and in the long-term, local level and people-to-people cooperation can play an important role in supporting the high politics of interstate dialogue.

6. Drawing attention to the need for new forms of data collection. New forms of data collection for policy purposes. Much of the basis for developing regional policies is provided by quantitative and criteriologist methodological approaches. The assumption underlying these traditional approaches is that regions are ‘given’ and objectively existing spatial categories. While necessary for general policy purposes these are broad-brush methods that ignore the social, immaterial, non-quantifiable and networked nature of territorial relations. Finally, there are methodological issues at issue. Many socio-spatial phenomena can only be described, explained, or traced; they cannot be meaningfully measured, counted or ‘correlated’ in a positivistic manner. Studies with a ‘soft’ approach focusing on perceptions and representations also have the benefit that they critically challenge the researcher’s own preconceptions. Our research indicates that

the benefit that they critically challenge the researcher's own preconceptions. Our research indicates that bordering processes serve as important sources of insight for policy-relevant research on spatial planning and regional development. This is clearly most relevant in relating the significance of cross-border cooperation and other flexible territorial arrangements to European Cohesion Policy.

Finally, what might be the future of CBC as a project of de-bordering? At the level of EU Cohesion Policy, the direct coupling of CBC with regional development goals appears to be shifting towards more territorially flexible arrangements and a focus on place-based strategies and 'integrated territorial investments' which can be potentially implemented in cross-border and transnational contexts. Nevertheless, the overall resources available for genuinely border- transcending regional development are but a small fraction of the overall EU structural funds budget which is – targeted largely at newer and “poorer” member states. As has been suggested above, CBC needs to be understood as more than just filling the gaps between national development strategies; it is a cultural context for Cohesion beyond traditional nation-centric modes. Furthermore, cross-border integration need not be all-encompassing but centred on specific networks that create trust and sustainable working relationships. If the role of CBC as an element of European Territorial Cohesion is to be taken seriously, the policy aim should reduce somewhat its focus on a priori defined criteria (fulfilling 'objective' quantifiable targets) and more on the capacities of cross-border cooperation to develop according to its own dynamics. This includes more support to civil society actors and their networks; these groups, together with other local-level actors can in effect create regional geographies above and beyond traditional state-centred and administrative territoriality.

Potential Impact:

Achieved and Potential Impacts

The EUBORDERREGIONS project has completed four years of intensive investigation of processes of cooperation along the European Union's external borders. The project has had considerable academic and policy-relevant impact as well as a strong educational and training component. An important aspect of the project was that much of the empirical work as well as dissemination that was carried out involved interaction with stakeholders and civil society actors knowledgeable about cross-border cooperation.

Eleven case studies were completed as planned, giving evidence of complex and highly differentiated relationships across the EU's external borders. What we see is that, with very few exceptions, border regimes and geopolitical contexts limit the potential significance of cross-border cooperation (CBC) – and this despite the fact that the EU has continued to argue the importance of CBC. At the same time, our fieldwork documents quite clearly that there are considerable and as yet unexploited potentials for border regions through cooperation. Furthermore, this applies not only to the most dynamic regions in terms of economic exchange, investment and tourism. Rather than seeing CBC as a short-term exercise, the development of trust built around networks of actors and local communities – the basic prerequisite for successful CBC – needs time to experiment and develop.

EUBORDERREGIONS has identified challenges to economic, social and territorial cohesion as well as regional development potentials in the eleven case study areas at the EU's external frontiers. Research in the field was designed to provide a holistic picture of regional development situations at the external

the field was designed to provide a holistic picture of regional development situations at the external border as well as to involve local organizations and actors in elaborating potential scenarios of future development in conjunction with cross-border interaction. We have understood these regions as interfaces between different development dynamics, policy framework and scales of cross-border interaction. As part of its contribution to scientific and policy debate, EUBORDERREGIONS has therefore raised the question of whether and in what ways the concept and policy process of Cohesion might be applicable to the conditions prevalent at the EU's external borders. The areas at the external borders are large territories that will have both a stake in and impacts on the future of economic, social and territorial cohesion within the EU as well. However, in these cases, the question of Cohesion cannot be divorced from "Neighbourhood" and the structuring conditions of border regimes, bilateral relations with neighbouring states, geopolitical contexts and the quality of social interaction across the border. We have thus situated local development issues in selected borderlands within wider perspectives of an emerging European neighbourhood that goes beyond more territorially restricted notions of European Cohesion.

In terms of the potential future impacts of the project, one of the most significant has been to sharpen academic debate on cross-border cooperation based on pragmatic assessments of the contextual framings and potentialities of CBC. Reviewing the present state of the art, much scholarly work on CBC is often characterised by highly abstract socio-political theorisation and philosophical positions that skirt issues of every day cooperation practice. Indeed, there has been a tendency to marginalise CBC as an area of academic research in favour of critical reflections on borders as such. While important in terms of conceptual development of the field, such positions are not helpful as guides for action. EUBORDERREGIONS research, its output as well as forthcoming publications and post-project seminars has combined a sophisticated level of theoretical abstraction with on-the-ground empirical work informed by local stakeholders.

Furthermore, as part of its commitment to providing scientific and wider social impact, EUBORDERREGIONS has elaborated preliminary policy considerations, also in terms of exploring CBC as a potential resource for place-based development strategies. In line with this endeavour, EUBORDERREGIONS has engaged the ongoing debate as to the future of European Cohesion Policy with regard to CBC. At the start of the project, the Polish presidency (July-December 2011) raised a number of issues related to reforms and enhancement of the political influence of EU Cohesion Policy that were then pursued by our research: 1) developing "place-based" and integrated approaches, 2) increasing overall effectiveness (via performance-based conditionality and thematic concentration), 3) orientation on results (instead of formal compliance) and thus on improved systems of indicators and programme evaluation. The Polish presidency (Lublin conference in November 2011) also gave a clear indication of concern for the EU's easternmost regions, such as those located at the EU's present external borders. The 2009 Barca Report also confirmed that for reasons of legitimacy, multilevel governance and democracy within the EU, place-based approaches must be closely integrated into national development programmes. While the primacy of national development is not of necessity a disadvantage, EUBORDERREGIONS confirms that cross-border co-operation has been primarily a policy aimed at – in the language of DG Regio – "filling the gaps" between national development strategies and operational programmes that form the backbone of Cohesion Policy.

Another significant impact of EUBORDERREGIONS was sustained interaction with stakeholders, both as part of empirical work as well as more direct policy oriented activities. During the life of

part of empirical work as well as more direct policy-oriented activities. During the life of EUBORDERREGIONS, civil society actors, business organisations as well as local and regional government representatives were interviewed, consulted and involved in stakeholder seminars. As a result, the research consortium was able to conduct research that closely reflected working reality and everyday concerns at the border.

Additionally, EUBORDERREGIONS provided considerable training and educational inputs. Fieldwork training and instruction in the use of Social Network Analysis was provided for PhD students as part of the overall empirical work undertaken. In addition, three Summer Schools were organised as part of the project.

To sum up, EUBORDERREGIONS has achieved the socio-economic, scientific and policy oriented impacts that were set out at the start of the project:

1) Contributions to the debate on Cohesion Policy and the role that cross-border cooperation (CBC) plays in promoting more balanced regional development within the EU. In particular, possibilities for place-based strategies that go beyond territorially bound conditions and stress relational multi-actor networks (Lublin Policy Conference 2011, Ankara (2013) and Narva Policy (2014) Policy Seminars

2) Scientific contributions that have linked regional research to the study of geopolitics and European borders. In the area of European regional research the project has focused attention to the specific problems of European “double peripheries” at the external boundaries of the EU. In the area of European research on borders and cross-border co-operation EUBORDERREGIONS will explore the political and social construction of border regions – as well as the limits to such regional projects. In the area of European research on geopolitics: Instead of a merely top-down, state-centred perspective, we have focused on the geopolitics of local spaces and the impacts that shifting regional political relationships and co-operation policies have on development potentials of border regions. We have developed the state of the art by providing knowledge with regard to:

- local perceptions of geopolitical contexts and their consequences for development
- local understandings of cross-border neighbourhood, regional (inter)relations and local historical ties
- assessing the relative capacities for exploiting borders as resources based on structural and also attitudinal factors
- a concerted focus on policy and its effects as well as their local adaptability.

3) The project has provided insights with regard to the interplay of different factors that condition regional development perspectives at the EU’s external boundaries. Cooperation indicators have been elaborated based on factors related to governance, policy frameworks and perceptions of borderland situations and cross-border cooperation.

4) EUBORDERREGIONS has also involved an educational element. The project’s theoretical insights, empirical results and methodology will continue to be incorporated in university curricula for

empirical results and methodology will continue to be incorporated in university curricula for undergraduate/post-graduate studies in geography, regional planning, sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, etc.

In terms of the potential post-project impacts

Policy-relevant results have been generated in terms of scenarios for local and regional development through CBC at the EU's external borders. These include scenarios for local capacity building through, among other things, co-operative networks and "intelligent partnerships" that both cross EU borders but that also connect border regions to other areas within the EU. Identifying institutional consequences and institution-building scenarios is also a necessary part of this process. A further policy-related result of EUBORDERREGIONS has been to suggest possible synergistic links between Cohesion and Neighbourhood policies and to suggest ways to more effectively integrate cross-border cooperation within the ENPI framework and within different regional contexts.

We believe that the scientific impacts of EUBORDERREGIONS will also be sustainable. We have contributed to a theoretically sophisticated but pragmatic approach to the study of cross-border cooperation that eschews the application of a priori categorisation and the application of limiting theoretical constraints. We believe that working with local stakeholders has contributed to learning processes and multiplier effects but also to a better understanding of the situational character of CBC. Conversely, knowledge transfer has also worked in the opposite direction, since the research tools developed for the study of West European regions are not always appropriate in different cultural contexts. This knowledge could have important ramifications for future CBC policies if these are potentially understood as central to Cohesion – that is, as complex socially networked as well as territorial development strategies.

Dissemination Activities

These insights into CBC and the multilevel conditions that govern its efficacy have contributed to working papers, several dedicated conference panels and a first policy seminar. As part of the overall work programme the consortium participated in a three major conference events held in Budapest (May 2012), Bergamo (June 2013) and Tartu (November 2014). The Bergamo conference was in fact a large international event where EUBORDERREGIONS and its sister project EUBORDERSCAPES provided the backdrop for several intensive days of intellectual debate that not only involved established border researchers but also younger scholars, PhD candidates and postdoctoral trainees doctoral training. Other major EUBORDERREGIONS events were policy seminars organised in Ankara (Turkey) in September 2013, Tartu (Estonia) in November 2014 and Istanbul in February 2015. The policy seminars and which reflected many of the themes that have emerged as part of the overall project.

Selected List of Major Publications (available and forthcoming)

Edited Books (all forthcoming)

Brambilla, C., Laine, J. Scott, J.W. and G. Bocchi (2015) *Border Imaginations, Imaginaries and Images: From Bordering to Borderscapes*. Aldershot: Ashgate Border Series

Celata F., Coletti R. (2015) *Neighbourhood Policy and the Construction of the European External Borders*, Berlin: Springer

Liikanen, I. Scott, J.W. and T. Sotkasiira (2015) *Borders, Migration and Regional Stability in the EU's Eastern Neighbourhood*, London: Routledge

Peer Reviewed Articles and Book Chapters

Bürkner, Hans-Joachim (2015) "Scaling and Bordering in Europe: From Nested Hierarchies to Bending and Bubbling", *Political Geography* (Submitted)

Bürkner, Hans-Joachim (2013) "Interculturality and Transculturality as Norm and Practice: A Reading of German-Polish Bordering", *Człowiek i Społeczeństwo (Man and Society)* 35 (1): 135–158.

Celata F., Coletti R. (2011) "Le politiche di cooperazione transfrontaliera in Europa: una lettura interpretativa", *Rivista Geografica Italiana*, 118(2), pp. 219-245.

Scott, J. (2015) "Cross-border, Transnational, Interregional Co-operation", in: D. Ricardson (chief ed.) *International Encyclopaedia of Geography. People, the Earth, Environment and Technology*, New York: AAG-Wiley (forthcoming)

Scott, J. and J. Laine (2012) "Borderwork: Finnish-Russian Co-operation and Civil Society Engagement in the Social Economy of Transformation", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24 (3–4) pp. 1–17.

van Well, Lisa (2012) "Conceptualizing the Logics of Territorial Cohesion", *European Planning Studies*, 20(9), 1549-1567

Book Articles

Liikanen, I. (2013) "European Common Foreign Policies and CBC in a Wider Europe", in: Ayca Ergun and Hamlet Isaxanli (eds), *Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU, Black Sea Region and Southern Caucasus*, Amsterdam: IOS Press, pp. 58-69.

Nemeth, S. (2015) "Vázlat az EU határrégióinak összehasonlító elemzéséhez". in: E. Sik and R. Suráni (eds), *Határhatások* joint publication of Eötvös Lorand Tudományegyetem Társadalomtudományi Kar (ELTE TáTK) and Tárki Társadalomkutatási Intézet Zrt. (Tárki

Scott, J. (2014) "From Europhoria to Crisis. Cross-Border Cooperation, Euroregions and Cohesion", in: L. Dominguez and I. Pires (Eds), *Cross-Border Cooperation Structures in Europe. Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future*, Basel: Peter Lang, pp. 81-94

Scott, J. (2013) "Territorial Cohesion, Cross-Border Cooperation and the EU's Political Identity: A Brief

Scott, J. (2013) "Territorial Cohesion, Cross-Border Cooperation and the EU's Political Identity, A Brief Observation", in: Pálné Kovács, Ilona-Scottt, James – Gál, Zoltán (eds), Territorial Cohesion in Europe, Pécs: Institute for Regional Studies Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, HAS. pp. 73-84.

Scott, J. (2013) "The EU's Role in Promoting Cross-Border Co-operation: Perspectives from the Finnish-Russian Border Region" in: Ayca Ergun and Hamlet Isaxanli (eds), Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU, Black Sea Region and Southern Caucasus, Amsterdam:IOS Press, pp. 22-41.

Scientific Conference Panels and Presentations (selection)

April 2011: Association of American Geographers Conference (AAG) (Seattle),

- Paper by James Scott (UEF), "Cultural geopolitics and the "Europeanisation" of borders: The case of Transcarpathia"

August 2011: Adjusting to Europe: Institutional Legacies of Communism and Ethnocultural Diversity,

Kaunas, 29-30 August;

- Presentations by Ilkka Liikanen, James Scott (UEF): "Europeanisation of Civil Society in Post-Soviet Contexts?"

September 2011: Mobile Borders: Border Regions in Transition Conference XI, Geneva/Grenoble, 6-9 Sept.

- Paper by James Scott (UEF), "Border security and the Europeanisation of Post-Soviet borders?";
- Paper by Elena Nikofova (CISR), "Constructing collective memory at the Estonian-Russian border: Narva, nomadology, and the Goh game";
- Paper by Raffaella Colletti (CeSPI) and Filippo Celata (La Sapienza), "Soft, mobile or networked? Cross border cooperation and the construction of the EU's external frontier"

September 2011: Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU, Black Sea Region and the Southern Caucasus, Ankara, 23-24 September;

- Paper by James Scott (UEF): "The EU's Role in Promoting Cross-Border Co-operation"

September 2011: "Twenty Years after 1991: The Reshaping of Space and Identity", Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow;

- Presentations by James Scott (UEF); Alexander Chvorostov/Daniela Grozea Helmenstein, (IHS-Vienna)

February 2012: Association of American Geographer Annual Meeting, New York.

- Paper by Filippo Celata (CeSPI) and Raffaella Coletti (La Sapienza), "European Regions, EU External Borders and the Immediate Neighbours. Analysing Regional Development Options through Policies and Practices of Cross Border Cooperation";
- Paper by James Scott (UEF), "EU geopolitical identity and the bordering of the Neighbourhood";
- Paper by Xavier Gallardo (UAB), "Seeing Mediterranean space (anew) with Al-Idrissi"

April 2012: Association of Borderlands Studies Conference, Houston (USA) 2012,

- Presentation by James Scott and Ilkka Liikanen (UEF): "The EU and the Transformation of Post-Soviet Borders: A View from the "European North"

June 2012: Borderscapes III, Trieste;

- Paper by Filippo Celata and Raffaella Coletti (la Sapienza), "Europe and its 'other': bordering processes and cross-bordering relations along the EU's southern and eastern frontier"

August 2012: IGU Cologne;

- Presentation by James Scott (UEF), "Civil Society Co-operation in the Russian-Finnish Borderlands: Processes of Social Learning"

September 2013: IV EUGEO Congress - Rome, 5-7 September 2013; EUBORDERREGIONS Panel: Beyond fortress Europe? Bordering and crossbordering processes along the EU external frontier

June 2014: ABS World Conference, Joensuu (Finland) , St. Petersburg (Russia); EUBORDERREGIONS Panels: Learning from Case Studies on EU Border Regions: Comparing the Incomparable?/

- Inner and outer border regions in the European Union: different development processes – case study of two Polish subregions" (M. Kozak, M.Smętkowski),

- Evolution of Shopping Tourism at EU External Borders – the cases of FI-RU and PL-UA border regions (H. Eskelinen, M.Smętkowski)

- Inside the black box of cross-border cooperation projects" (A. Płoszaj);

June 2014: Conference Regional Studies Association, June, Izmir, Turkey, "Diverse Regions: Building Resilient Communities";

- paper "Inner and outer border regions in the European Union: different development processes – case study of two Polish subregions" (M. Smętkowski, M. Kozak);

September 2014: IGU conference Kraków, EUBORDERREGIONS – Political Geography panel

November 2014: Conference European College, The Centre for EU-Russia Studies (CEURUS) and Peipsi Centre for Transboundary Cooperation, November, Tartu (Estonia) "Borders, Regions, Neighbourhoods: Interactions and Experiences at EU External Frontiers";

- paper: "A Comparative Approach to Thematic Allocation of Resources in ENPI Cross Border Cooperation" (J. Rok)

Policy Conferences and Seminars

November 2011: Lublin Conference of the Polish Presidency "Cohesion Policy and Catching-up Regions", Lublin 17-18 November 2011;

- Presentations by Grzegorz Gorzelak and Maciej Smetkowski (Euroreg)

- Presentation by James Scott (UEF)

June 2012: Conference on "Intercultural Competence as a Key Factor to the Effective International and Cross-Border Cooperation", org. by the Municipality of Szczecin (Poland), Euroregion Pomerania and the NATO Multinational Corps Northeast; Szczecin;

- Presentation by Hans-Joachim Bürkner

- Presentation by James Scott

- Presentation by James Scott

September 2013: Ankara Policy Seminar

February 2014: SEARCH Final Academic Conference, EUBORDERREGIONS Panel

August 2014: European Union Study Weeks S: Regional and Cross-Border Cooperation between Russia and the European Union; Narva, Estonia;

- Presentation by Margit Säre;

November 2014: Tartu-Värska Policy Seminar

February 2015: Istanbul Policy Seminar

Summer Schools

August 2012: Summer School on Crossborder cooperation, Tartu, Estonia;

April 2013: Intensive course "Bordering perspectives and processes in everyday life at the EU's external frontiers", Narva, Estonia;

July 2013: PhD Summer School. EUBORDERREGIONS and EUBORDERSCAPES joint Conference, Bergamo, Italy

Website, Electronic and Social Media Dissemination

1. Project website development, regular updated: <http://www.euborderregions.eu>

According to the page statistics the website has an average 230 visits per month

2. Project Facebook page with regular updates:

<https://www.facebook.com/pages/EUBORDERREGIONS/147168102014352>

The Facebook page has 117 followers and 108 post during the project reporting period (September 2012-February 2014)

3. E-mail dissemination

- Project has internal (project partners) and external e-mail list (to distribute project related publications, calls etc.

- External e-mail list has 130 addressees and reporting period (September 2012-February 2014); 9 News via e-mail were sent out

4. Media coverage; 9 project related press releases published on the project website

5. Border film (case on Estonian-Russian CBC) in Estonian, English and Russian languages

It was shown in Estonian national TV on 10 April 2014, 23 September 2014

Available at: http://etv.err.ee/u/moolalabutus/kinguagade/kinguagato_load/ee4649e6-125e-4dec-9722

6. Project Newsletters are available at
<http://www.euborderregions.eu/dissemination/newsletters>

Project Working Papers

The following working papers were uploaded at the project website
(<http://www.euborderregions.eu/dissemination/policy>)

Working Paper Nr. 1 “Laboratories of European integration: city-twinning in Northern Europe” ; by Pertti Joenniemi, University of Eastern Finland

Working Paper Nr. 2: “Soft, mobile or networked? Cross-border cooperation and the topology of the European Union external frontier”; by Filippo Celata and Raffaella Coletti, University of Rome La Sapienza

Working Paper Nr. 3: “EUrope and its ‘other’: free trade and the geographical imagineries of Euro-Mediterranean politics, , by Filippo Celata and Raffaella Coletti; University of Rome La Sapienza

Working paper Nr. 4: "Macro-regions, 'la nouvelle vague' of transnational cooperation: the geopolitical case of the Mediterranean basin", by Battistina Cugusi and Andrea Stocchiero; CeSPI (Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale)

Working paper Nr. 5: European Union and its Neighbourhood. The role of external powers: Russia, China and the USA, by Andriy Bryn; University of Rome La Sapienza

Working paper Nr. 6: Macro-regional dynamics in the Mediterranean area(s): The case of the Adriatic Ionian Macro-region, by Battistina Cugusi, CeSPI (Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale)

Working paper Nr. 7: Scaling and Bordering. Conceptual implications of scale-related perspectives on European borders, by Hans-Joachim Bürkner

Working paper Nr. 8: Finnish-Russian CBC Experiences: From the ‘Karelian Issue’ to European Cross-Border Regionalization? by Ilkka Liikanen and Sarolta Németh

Working paper Nr. 9: Can the EU Help Egypt to Have a Cohesion Policy? Egypt and Italy/Greece reference study, by Ahmed Farouk Ghoneim CeSPI

Working Paper Nr. 10: Eastern Neighbourhood as a Political Divide: EU Policies of Regional Cooperation and ‘Selective Visibility’ in the Case of Ukraine, by James W. Scott

List of Websites:

www.euborderregions.eu

Related documents

 [final1-poster-presentation2-read-only.pdf](#)

 [final1-euborderregions-beneficiaries.pdf](#)

Last update: 27 November 2015

Record number: 173362