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Peripheralization

• **ITN RegPol²** – *Socio-economic and Political Responses to Regional Polarisation in Central and Eastern Europe* (www.regpol2.eu)

• The process of the peripheralization in Central and Eastern Europe – differences at national level are decreasing but at regional disparities within CEE countries increase

• Increasing differences between core metropolitan regions and peripheries
  – demographical and economic decline
  – geographical isolation + different dimensions (economic, social, demographic, communicative and political consequences)

GDP per capita in CEE countries 2000 and 2007, NUTS level 3

Source: Lang, 2011, p. 2
Evolution of governance

- Increase in complexity of decision making → involvement of non-state actors
- Changing role of traditional states as main governmental bodies responsible for a decision making (upwards/downwards/outwards)
- The interactions „characterised more by dialogue and negotiation than command and control”
- As a result interests and powers in spatial planning development are diversifying and responsibility of decision making become fuzzier → numerous conflicts among sectoral policies

(e.g. Marks, 1993; Rhodes, 1996; Breretor and Temple, 1999; Peters and Pierre, 2001; Hooghe and Marks, 2003; Bache and Flinders, 2004; Kooiman, 1993).
Cross border cooperation

• Subsidiarity of EU regional policy and increased importance of cross-border relations.
• Usually there is no formal authority or jurisdiction over the cross-border territory (*Faludi, 2012*)
  – Multilevel governance type II (*Hooghe, Marks, 2010*)
  – Functional governance = networks and polycentricity (*Blatter, 2004*)
• Polycentric organisation of cross-border regions facing hierarchical governance arrangements (at national and regional levels)
• Different perceptions of borders
  – Borders could be seen as economic opportunities as well as threats
  – Cross-border cooperation or competition?
EU Multilevel governance

- Allows to gain knowledge from subnational actors and better targeting of policies \textit{(Bache, 2010)} and increases effectiveness within policy process and organisational learning \textit{(Leonardi, 2006)}
- Destabilizes existing system, tensions and conflicting situations, questionable accountability \textit{(Peters, Pierre 2001; Scharpf, 2007, Geissel, 2009)}
- Is seen as a fundamental tool for a balanced spatial development of the European Union \textit{(First Action Programme, 2007)}
  - based on many optimistic preconditions: suitable institutional settings, willing of politicians or their experience, sufficient capacities, decentralization of the state, collaborative culture, ... \textit{(Dabrowski, Bachtler, Bafoil, 2014)}
- more common in EU countries but its enforcing is problematic within the new EU member states
- In practise EU Cohesion policy under multilevel governance results in different outcomes due to differentiated national institutional arrangements
Challenges of Multilevel Governance

• Key challenges of multilevel governance are to identify appropriate mechanisms to coordinate actors and their interest that emerge at multi scale and diversified space.

• Core concept:
  Purposeful institutional change following evolution of polycentric regional relations is seen essential for coordination of actors and power of EU policies for cross-border regions.
Institutional changes

- Institutions “are the rules of the game in society or, more formally, are devised constraints that shape human interaction” and institutions “reduce uncertainty by providing a structure to everyday life” (North, 1990, p. 3)
- Formal X informal
- Fast moving X slow moving (Roland, 2008)
- Different approaches to institutional change:
  - as results from political or collective-action process (Ostrom, 1994; Alston, 1996)
  - evolutionary theories placing institutional change into the context of the Darwinian evolutionary principles (Lewis and Steinmo, 2012)
  - is not explained as a change of rules but rather as a change of expectations (Aoki, 2001)
Research Objectives

• **The main objective:**
  – To identify novel mechanisms which enable successful cooperation between actors from the core region and peripheries from Usti nad Labem – Dresden region (cross-border region), Bratislava – Brno – Wien region (cross-border region) and Central German Metropolitan Region.

• **Additional objectives:**
  – To assess potential of cross border peripheral regions for co-evolution of institutional and technological innovations.
  – To identify promising governance innovation to promote such co-evolution (e.g. low carbon energy) in model regions.
Research Questions

• What elements of multilevel governance are present in model regions in relation to the successful cooperation between cores and peripheries?
  – What are key factors for successful cooperation?
  – Who are the key players to be involved for successful cooperation?
  – What conditions should be fulfilled for successful cooperation?

• How can (eco-)innovations under the multilevel governance of the EU contribute to regional development and regional competitiveness in the pilot regions?
Model Regions

Location of the research: the Slovak Republic, the Czech Republic and Germany
Data

- **Data sources:**
  - **Secondary data:**
    - the ESPON,
    - the Czech Statistical Office,
    - the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic,
    - the Federal Statistical Office of Germany and Eurostat,
    - strategic development documents of border regions, districts, municipalities and informal associations or institutions
  - **Primary data:**
    - Questioner survey
    - semi-structured interviews
    - Role-playing game
Methodology: Case Study Approach

• A case study approach = the main methodological tool for analysing the situation in three model regions.

• The institutional analysis:
  – Institutional Analysis and Development Framework
  – Framework for analysing sustainability of social-ecological systems
    \( (Ostrom, 2005; Ostrom, 2009; Ostrom, McGinnis, 2010; McGinnis, Ostrom, 2012) \)

• both quantitative and qualitative approaches
  – data from surveys and interviews
  – regional secondary data
Multitier Framework For Analysing a SES

Methodology: Experiments and role playing

• **Experiments**
  – enable simulation of decision making under controlled conditions
  – allow study decision making process under different institutional arrangements (*Ostrom, 1998*)
    
    – cooperation leading to better common outputs occurs more often than it is predicted by the game theory (*Ostrom, 1998*)
    – level of cooperation increases by 34-40 p.p. thanks enabling communication among actors (*Sally, 1995; Zelmer, 2003*)

• **Role playing**
  – incorporates complexity and emotion into simulation (*Bolton, 2002*)
  – not all conditions can be controlled
    
    – appropriate tool for forecasting decision making in conflicting situations (*Green, 2002, 2005*)
Role playing game – Green Energy

- Simulation of decision making process under the uncertainty and multiple interests

- Common pool resource – 100 units of renewable energy

- Common governance of the cross-border Different roles (5+1) with different goals

- Cooperation and solidarity dilemmas
Green Energy
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