

**TERMS OF REFERENCE  
ESPON PROJECT 2.3.2**

**GOVERNANCE OF TERRITORIAL AND URBAN POLICIES  
FROM EU TO LOCAL LEVEL  
(2004-2006)**

**o) Political challenges for the ESPON projects**

The Second and Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion, published in January 2001 and February 2004 respectively, presented for the first time a third territorial dimension of cohesion (beside the economic and social cohesion), which calls for a better co-ordination of territorially relevant decisions. Stressing the persistence of territorial disparities within the Union, the report stated the need for a cohesion policy not limited to the less developed areas as well as the need to promote a more balanced and more sustainable development of the European territory.

The Cohesion Reports represent in that respect a follow up of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), adopted at ministerial level in May 1999, calling for a better balance and polycentric development of the European territory. The projects launched under the ESPON programme shall follow an integrated approach and, seen together, cover a wide range of issues, such as:

- Identifying the **decisive factors relevant for a more polycentric European territory**; accessibility of a wide range of services in the context of enlargement; integration of wider transnational spaces; promotion of dynamic urban growth centres; linking peripheral and disadvantaged areas with those centres; etc.

- Developing **territorial indicators and typologies** capable of identifying and measuring development trends as well as monitoring the political aim of a better balanced and polycentric EU territory

- Developing **tools supporting diagnoses of principal structural difficulties as well as potentialities**, such as disparities within cities and regenerating deprived urban areas; structural adjustment and diversification of rural areas; strategic alliances between neighbouring cities at transnational, national and regional scale; new partnerships between rural and urban areas; potential support from infrastructure networks in the field of transport, telecommunication, energy; etc.

- Investigating **territorial impacts of sectoral and structural policies** in order to enhance synergy and well-co-ordinated decisions relevant for territorial development within policy fields such as Structural Funds, agriculture, transport, fisheries, environment, research and development as well as impacts to be taken into account in Integrated Coastal Zone Management activities; developing methods for measuring the territorial impact of sectoral and structural policies; etc.

- Developing **integrated tools in support of a balanced and polycentric territorial development**; approaches to enhance the potential of cities as drivers of regional development, new tools for integrated urban-rural development and planning, etc.

The Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion included new scientific knowledge and information from a series of ESPON projects. As such the ESPON programme has met one of its objectives by delivering new scientific knowledge and information on European spatial issues as basis for future policy development at EU-level and within Member States.

With the results of all ESPON projects, the Commission and the Member States expect in particular to have at their disposal: **a diagnosis of the principal territorial trends** at EU scale as well as the difficulties and potentialities within the European territory as a whole; **a cartographic picture of the major territorial disparities** and of their respective intensity; a number of **territorial indicators and typologies assisting a setting of European priorities** for a balanced and polycentric enlarged European territory; some **integrated tools and appropriate instruments** (databases, indicators, methodologies for territorial impact analysis and systematic spatial analyses) to improve the spatial co-ordination of sector policies.

In this respect, the ESPON projects will serve as a strong scientific basis for the propositions of the Commission in view of the reform of post-2007 Structural Funds.

### **i) Relation to the ESPON 2006 Programme**

The priorities describing the work-programme of the ESPON 2006 Programme are structured in four strands:

1. **Thematic projects** on the major spatial developments on the background of typologies of regions, and the situation of cities.

2. **Policy impact projects** on the spatial impact of Community sector policies and Member States' spatial development policy on types of regions with a focus on the institutional inter-linkages between the governmental levels and instrumental dimension of policies

3. **Co-ordinating and territorial cross-thematic projects** represent a key component of the programme. These projects evaluate the results of the other projects towards

integrated results such as indicator systems and data, typologies of territories, spatial development scenarios. The cross section projects help to thematically co-ordinate the whole programme and add value to the results and to fill gaps, which are unavoidable when different themes are dealt with in different projects.

**4. Scientific briefing and networking** in order to explore the synergies between the national and EU source for research and research capacities.

Project 2.3.2 belongs to the second strand of projects and holds an important position in the definition and elaboration of a common ground for investigating the institutional and instrumental aspects of implementation of territorial and urban policies in Europe. A number of other projects of the ESPON programme are ongoing and a strong co-ordination will be required with these projects in order to reach consistent projects results within the ESPON programme. The necessary networking and cooperation would in particular involve the other project under strand 2 on methodological aspects of the territorial impact analysis, e.g. projects on ESDP and impact of Structural Funds. In addition, close contact with the relevant thematic projects on territorial trends under the first strand is to be foreseen. Finally, close links will be required with the coordinating and cross-thematic projects under priority three building on a scientific coherence in the ESPON programme as well as with the Co-ordination Unit.

### **iii) Thematic scope and context**

The traditional so-called sectoral approach was used for a long time for territorial development. This traditional sectoral approach means that a relatively top-down, hierarchical approach is conducted in which general policies, discarding specific characteristics of spatial areas, are formulated. Consequently, these policies were and are not able to identify the development potential of a territorial unit, determine in an integrated way the needs of this unit, and distinguish which, for instance, infrastructures, should be developed to support and facilitate the fulfilment of this potential. It furthermore does not provide sufficient possibilities, due to its top-down approach, to correlate needs to demands, which is however a fundamental phase of the initiation of sustainable territorial development policies.

Furthermore, political authority and powers have become increasingly dispersed and fragmented in the EU over recent decades. Simultaneously, there has been administrative decentralisation and a strengthening of local and regional democracy in a number of Member States, acceding and candidate countries, leading to a complex division of powers and competences between different levels of decision-making, at transnational, National and sub-national levels.

Within this context, the widely accepted view that decision-making and policy implementation processes in the Union should be organised hierarchically, following a top-down sectoral approach, is in many places being revised, to obtain an important added value in terms of integration, compatibility, convergence, and therefore efficiency of actions with an impact on the European territory.

The coordination process (multilateral monitoring of employment) established under the European Employment Strategy, and brought into effect following the Luxembourg Council in 1997, was one of the first significant steps in that direction, although restricted to a specific policy field.

The Lisbon Summit marked a turning point in the formal recognition of a general need of new forms of policy coordination and cooperation, by supporting “*a fully decentralised approach [to be] applied in line with the principle of subsidiarity, in which the Union, the Member States, the regional and local levels, as well as the social partners and civil society will be actively involved, using variable forms of partnerships*”<sup>1</sup>.

Furthermore, the integrated and cross-sectoral approach described in and promoted by the ESDP<sup>2</sup>, is now widely used in spatial development strategies and planning (which in many situations include consultation and public participation). It is a main input for considerations on governance in relation to territorial and urban policies.

In view of this identified shift to a more space-based paradigm and integrated approach, it is probably nowadays the only governance solution capable to adequately face this paradigm:

- By improving coordination, communication and cooperation between the relevant institutions at different territorial levels (vertical partnerships, multi-level governance), and between a wide range of actors coming both from public and private sector, as well as civil society (horizontal partnerships)<sup>3</sup>.
- By enabling different circumstances, potentials and problems, of each territory to be taken into account and the tuning of policy mix to be adjusted according to the specific needs of those varying circumstances.
- Therefore, by setting up “more integrated policy packages”, encompassing a spatial dimension.

Should EU policy move further towards this integrated perspective for spatial development, as recommended in the ESDP, the web of spatially relevant policy delivery and implementation mechanisms, in particular considering the authorities responsible for regional and local economic development and infrastructures in all countries, need therefore to be better understood and coordinated.

Consequently, though research examining the delivery of sectoral policies is already available, it must be evaluated against the monitoring potentials for improved spatially oriented policy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Presidency Conclusion, Lisbon European Council, 23 and 24 March 2000, point 38.

<sup>2</sup> See ESDP, chapter 4 on “Application”

<sup>3</sup> On vertical and horizontal cooperation, as defined in the in the ESDP: Horizontal cooperation means “cooperation between authorities responsible for spatial development at each respective level”, Vertical cooperation means “between actors at the Community level and the transnational, regional, local levels”.

The “EU Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies” already revealed the complexity of policy instruments and implementation tools available within the EU, and only focusing on the planning side. Although providing a strong base, the planning compendium itself is becoming outdated.

Comparative research is now needed on how effective different systems are, e.g. considering a policy mix of spatial planning (in different forms implemented by Member States), local government powers and taxation policy in meeting common spatial development strategies and objectives such as a polycentric urban system, balancing urban-rural needs, reviving derelict urban areas, urban regeneration, sustainable management of the natural and cultural assets. In that perspective, an analysis based on a comparative review of the instruments used, and stakeholders involved in various policy areas, should be undertaken to draw some valuable conclusions of practical relevance on governance.

The wide diversity of geographic areas and territorial contexts of cooperation, institutional national and regional systems of the enlarged EU territory, implies that the analysis must be based on a representative selection of various types of territorial areas. In that respect, cities constitute privileged places for the territorial integration of sectoral policies formulated from the EU to the local level. The possible links of these policies, closely connected with the question of urban governance, shall be studied, especially in the light of experiences gained in relation the Community Initiative URBAN.

As well, clusters of neighbouring cities also perform in some territories as a way of improving the economic dynamic of the cities involved and the services of general interest being provided. Most often such urban clusters support a more polycentric territorial structure at national and/or regional level. The models of cooperation chosen in practise involve many aspects of governance, which should be included in the study.

#### **iv) General objectives**

- Elaboration of a research framework which allows to comprehensively investigate the issue of governance, through:
  - a theoretical work on definitions and official (binding or non-binding) references on various forms of governance (Treaties, laws, regulations, declarations, political decisions, White Papers...e.g: the Commissions White Paper on European governance, Open Method of Coordination, Broad Economic Policy Guidelines-BEPG, European Employment Strategy ...)
  - a wide analysis of vertical and horizontal cooperation and coordination practices and tools (formal and informal, legal and non statutory) existing in decision-making and implementation processes of territorially oriented policies.
  - Concrete examples of governance processes, through case studies, illustrating both best practices, potentials (e.g. the added-value brought by “a culture of cooperation”), and also the limits of these processes of governance, in the

management of territorial development policies (e.g. limits: “Not In My Backyard-NIMBY” phenomenon).

- Definition of a set of indicators related to specific factors that characterise successful governance among the Member states when developing and implementing territorial and urban policies.
- Preparation of comparable case studies illustrating governance at/between different territorial levels, integration of policies mechanisms, regarding wide common territorial issues such as polycentrism, urban clusters, urban sprawl, urban-rural balance, accessibility, sustainability.
- A particular focus on governance at transnational level, highlighting the progressive construction of a “macro-region system” throughout the EU 27+2 territory, built upon a more and more permanent and structured network of national and regional partners, and cooperation mechanisms.
- Conclusions should be drawn towards the identification of success conditions, actor constellations, and best practice examples (cooperation mechanisms) on the governance in urban and territorial related decision-making and implementation processes. A comparison should be made between the conclusions drawn by the TPG on the identified factors of good governance, and the strategy developed in the Commission’s White paper on European Governance.
- Recommendations for dissemination of good advice (“good practice guide”) on governance (procedures and institutions).

#### **v) Primary Research Issues envisaged**

- Comprehensive overview of formal and informal cooperation and coordination tools and mechanisms (institutional and instrumental approach), relevant for the management of territorial and urban oriented development policies, at EU, transnational, national, and regional/local level.
- Identifying, gathering of existing, and proposition of new indicators and data, conceptualisation and elaboration of methods to measure and to display the degree, trends and impacts of governance processes.
- Defining models/types of governance processes:
  - Multi-level governance processes (vertical approach)
  - Intersectoral coordination of policies, particularly where there are closely linked aspects: e.g: Land use planning/transport/environment... (horizontal approach)
- Investigating on the types of flows and interactions between the different territorial scales: question of the reciprocity of the top-down and bottom-up approaches.

- Impact of the Open Method of Coordination, and associated tools such as benchmarking, in structuring cooperation and coordination among territorial oriented policy delivery and implementation processes.
- Identification of territorial factors for a successful governance, within territories, through:
  - Administrative and legal (soft law and hard law) framework
  - Financial provision
  - Human resources: staff available, ability and skills, professionalism, adaptation and learning capacity...
  - Institutional culture: culture of cooperation, institutionalisation of dialogue, number of institutions participating in one specific policy field, decentralisation degree...
  - Economic and social context<sup>1</sup>: accessibility of people to all parts of territory, to information, degree of polycentricity of the territory, demographic trends, social diversity of the territory...
  - ...
- Strategic recommendations on improvement of governance at EU level, in support of territorial cohesion, in a longer term perspective. Any coherencies/incoherencies with the key proposals made by the Commission in the White Paper of July 2001 should be clearly spelled out.

## **vi) Expected results and timetable**

The research undertaken is supposed mainly to work on the data and information available from the EU, national and regional level, as well as on data and information already available in existing ESPON projects. Furthermore, it should normally be based on existing administrative units.

One of the main objectives of the ESPON 2006 Programme is to focus on research with policy relevance and to contribute to the development of relevant policies. Therefore, deliverables of the governance project should be highly operational and as far as possible fit into relevant political agenda. The following timetable and specification output is reflecting this objective:

### **December 2004: First Interim Report**

- a) Presentation of indicators and information needed after a precise analysis of the availability and comparability of data/information at EU level. For this analysis, the results of the ESPON project in course, in particular project 2.3.1 and 2.2.1 (ESDP impact in Member States and Territorial effects of structural funds), should be taken into account.

---

<sup>1</sup> See major themes of the Third Cohesion Report in terms of territorial relevant factors, trends and potentials.

- b) Presentation of a sound review of the relevant territorial and urban oriented policies to be addressed, and insights of “policy packages” with a high degree of synergy<sup>1</sup>.
- c) First outline of the methodology of the impact assessment analysis. This first step in the methodology for impact assessment should provide a list of core indicators, for qualitative assessment and also, as far as possible, quantitative.
- d) Selection and preparation of the case studies with reference to countries (transnational, National, Regional/local level) and policy tradition and styles.

### **March 2005: Second Interim Report**

- e) Presentation of first results, in terms of governance trends, tools and practices, based on a sound review of the accumulated amount of data and information. A specific part should be deserved to the description and analysis of the implementation of the Open Method of Coordination: added-value of the Open Method as well as limits should be addressed.
- f) Presentation of first results on the basis of case studies.
- g) Tentative of outlining models of governance, in relation to types of territories, types of policy packages, territorial level of the analysis...
- h) Presentation of the achieved methodology for impact assessment of “good governance”, including presentation of the definitive list of case studies, as a full elements of the methodology, to illustrate and provide results on best practices and also limits of governance. Added-value of the methodology, in terms of the qualitative elements it allows to envisage, as well as limits should be presented.
- i) Presentation of hypotheses on the territorial effects of governance of the territorial and urban oriented policies.

### **December 2005: Third Interim Report**

- j) Presentation of a comprehensive analysis/diagnosis of governance trends, applications, mechanisms at EU, transnational, national and sub-national levels, as well as existing territorial disparities in that respect.
- k) Definition of models of governance resulting from the above-mentioned analysis, including a more cross-sectoral approach.
- l) First results of the impact analysis previously developed, including finalisation of comparable case studies.
- m) First propositions on possible and/or necessary improvement of governance: definition, of institutional settings and instruments which could support “good governance” for a better spatial integration and coordination of policies, and in the perspective of a balanced and sustainable territorial development.

---

<sup>1</sup> This review should, in a first phase, present at Community and National level the already existing groupings of policies, tentatives of integrated and cross-sectoral approaches of territorial development policies. In a second phase (Second and third Interim Report), the analysis should be deepened and supported by case studies, at different territorial levels, including sub-national, focusing on the most relevant policy packages/ groupings, with respect to the achievement of the ESDP objectives.

## **May 2006: Final Report**

- n) Final results of the analysis of institutional and instrumental aspects of governance through a territorial and urban policy approach. Finalised models.
- o) Presentation of new territorial indicators (qualitative, and quantitative if feasible) and datasets for the ESPON database including EU Member States, candidate countries and neighbouring (Norway and Switzerland).
- p) Final results of the impact analysis, including comparable case studies. Focus should be made on best practices and added-value of governance, as well as limits, in relation to specific territorial or policy context.
- q) Formulation of final conclusions and policy recommendations for improved governance (considering institutional and instrumentals aspects of governance) in a long-term perspective, taking into consideration the fact governance, in the case of territorial development policies management, is not an alternative but complementary solution to the “classic” top-down, hierarchical approach.

## **vii) Rationale and structure**

The following text has the role of shaping the mind of thinking in developing a proposal for undertaking the ESPON action 2.3.2.. The text and the listed indicators are not meant to be exhaustive, but to serve the purpose of guiding the tenderer.

### **1) Elaboration of an appropriate methodology for the analysis of governance processes/trends throughout the EU 27+2 space.**

The methodology should take into account spatial concepts and results developed under priority 1 and 3, in order to:

- First, scope the territorial and urban oriented development policies to address when examining governance mechanisms and impacts.
- Second, to be able to provide complementary recommendations in support of ESDP objectives of territorial cohesion, polycentric and better balanced EU territory.

A particular coordination with project 2.3.1, analysing the impact of the ESDP in Member States is also necessary, insofar as it is supposed to provide results on the “content” side, concerning the application of the ESDP in Member States, whereas 2.3.2, focuses on procedures and mechanisms required for the application of the ESDP recommendations and objectives. Considering the proximity of the two projects, attention should also be paid, and efforts of direct coordination taken, to avoid overlapping analyses.

The study should then concentrate on identifying different models of governance, as a set of cooperation and coordination procedures used to develop a more spatially integrated policy approach. Instrumental as well as institutional aspects of governance have to be methodologically considered, compared, and modelled, taking into consideration five

main variables structuring governance mechanisms in the management and implementation of territorial and urban oriented policies:

- **Type of territories, geophysical, social, economic, political and cultural characteristics:** handicapped territories, or with a specific geography (island, mountainous, coastal areas...), urban/rural areas, clusters of neighbouring cities, northern European /southern / central European territories, political background and traditions, structure and repartition of powers and institutions, economic and social context, culture of integration, traditions and experience in spatial development and planning, .....
- **Territorial scale:** EU level, Transnational or macro-regional, National, Regional (NUTS2) /Local level
- **Type of territorial and urban oriented policy (or groupings of policy related to certain territories):**
  - “*Hard infrastructure*” policies (such as transport infrastructures policies, ICT, Energy...)
  - “*Soft infrastructure*” policies: such as provision of services of general interest (regarding health, education...), social and economic services...
  - “*Green infrastructures*” policies: such as environmental management policies, waste management infrastructures...
  - Social and economic policies:* such as employment and social affairs policies, sectoral economic policy such as agriculture, industry, research...
- **Type of stakeholders and cooperation forms: who cooperates and how?** Citizens/institutions, public/private, public/public (inter-institutional), formal/informal partnerships: contracts, agreements, *ad hoc* structures for improving dialogue and public debate (councils, committees...), etc.

The methodology should finally provide, as guidance for the case studies on examples of governance practices, a set of relevant criteria/ factors which would determine or display the success of governance, or its failure.

## **2) Assessment of territorial impacts: characteristics, added-value and limits of governance.**

As a first step towards a general assessment of governance impacts, the study should aim at assessing the degree of spatial integration of the policies, in correlation with a degree of implementation of governance mechanisms. It should therefore lead to some conclusions on how governance could contribute to a better achievement of ESDP objectives.

### *2.1 Assessing the degree of governance, and analysing its territorial impacts*

The informal character of most of the mechanisms structuring governance processes, makes it very difficult the identification and gathering of data and indicators for its assessment. Governance has, in most of the cases, no automatic normative connotation nor implication.

Nevertheless, typical criteria for assessing governance in a particular context might include indicators related to the **degree of legitimacy, transparency, representativeness, subsidiarity, popular accountability of policy delivery mechanisms**. Therefore, most of the indicators in relation to these elements have to be found in the legal framework (hard law but also soft law) ruling the decision-making, the implementation of territorial policies at different territorial scales.

e.g.: **Legitimacy, transparency and representativeness**

- Participation, empowerment and involvement of a wide range of actors
  - processes of public discussion on key issues, organisation of formal (though not compulsory) participatory processes
  - use of referendum
  - institutionalisation of dialogue
  - openness and clarity of procedures
  - existence of legal sanctions, performance standards and disclosure laws
  - flexibility and certainty in decision making
  - innovation in consultations

**Subsidiarity**

- Degree of decentralisation in the decision-making process
  - legislation on decentralisation
  - institutional context, structure of government
  - allocation of financial resources (to whom, percents of funds devolved from higher levels of government...)
  - level of adoption and mechanisms of adoption of the budget

**Accountability of policy delivery mechanisms**

- Instruments
  - responsibility for local level instruments
  - framework instruments (local level)
  - regulatory instruments (local level)
  - general standards
- Regulations
  - form of regulatory plans
  - enforcement
  - appeals and challenges to decision
  - betterment and compensations

However, all the elements taking part of a governance process are not all provided by legal instruments. Some of the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of the

territories might also strongly influence and/or display the development of governance mechanisms, e.g.:

- population density
- population groups
- GDP
- Education
- Access to information
- Employment
- extent of civil society organization
- existence of strong leaderships in territories
- tradition of public action and participation

It is obvious that the assessment will be rather qualitative than quantitative, given the obvious difficulty to “measure” governance degrees. However, basing itself when available on measurable indicators, the study will have, as far as possible, to address the problem of quantitatively measuring governance in relation to some specific factors.

## *2.2 Assessing “Good governance”, strengthened efficiency of the policies, and impact on sustainable territorial development*

The assessment of good governance has to be undertaken at two different phases of the policy process:

- First, at the policy decision-making phase: good governance has to be assessed in terms of whether or not it allows to reach a higher level of synergy and integration of policies (added-value of governance in that respect).
- Second, addressing the policies implementation phase: assessing the successfulness of governance means evaluating the efficiency of policies, in terms of whether the identified needs at a territorial level, translated into policy objectives, finally meet the citizens’ demands (correspondence/interlinkage/reciprocity between top-down and bottom-up approach), and therefore meet the general ESDP objective of a sustainable and more balanced territorial development.

Another element to consider when assessing good governance, as a processing tool for reaching better balanced and sustainable territorial development, should be time dimension, more precisely “duration”, i.e. the integration of policies in a long-term strategic perspective of sustainable territorial development. The existence or establishment of strategic development plans, methods, tools at any territorial level, encompassing this concept of duration might have to be considered.

In any case, good governance is partly to be assessed on a territory-basis. It cannot be done on the basis of one-size-fits-all model, but rather on the basis of existing situation. Each coordination/cooperation process has its underlying sectoral  $\alpha$  territorial dynamic, logic, and constraints. In that respect, an efficient assessment implies to adopt in a certain measure a case by case approach.

Therefore, case studies, elaborated in a comparable way, are of an outstanding importance for this project and purpose, compared to other former ESPON projects. These case studies assessing “good governance”, through best practices examples as well as failed experiences, could be undertaken taking for instance into consideration indicators of level of economic development, environmental quality, adequate spatial coverage of services and infrastructures, consumer satisfaction.

Examples could be taken among the large number of INTERREG projects, for a transnational approach of good governance, as well as relevant experiences from LEADER and URBAN, for a more local and regional approach.

Finally, from this set of case studies, a set of criteria for assessing what is good/bad governance, when is governance successful or has failed, should be provided.

#### **4) Orientations for policy recommendations**

##### *3.1 The perspective of an updated version of the EU Spatial Planning Compendium*

The final aim of the project should not be to provide a comprehensive updated review, of the governance chapter of the “EU Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies”, which would be too ambitious. However the policy recommendations should in a way be drafted in the perspective of providing suggestions, orientations, to a future possible revision of the document.

##### *3.2 ESDP*

Reference should be made to all policy options in the ESDP dealing with the objective of territorial cohesion. Recommendations should address institutional and procedural/instrumental aspects of Governance, and set a clear link to the achievement of a better balanced and sustainable spatial development of the EU territory. Results to be provided by project 2.3.1 could be very helpful in that respect, and will have to be taken into account.

##### *3.3 Multi-level approach*

When providing recommendations on the basis of the results, a focus has to be made on the transnational level, additionally to the EU, National and Regional/Local level: transnational cooperation being a fundamental element of EU development and cohesion, enhanced by the enlargement process.

#### **5) Existing access points**

The access points listed below can serve the purpose of providing the tenderer useful information for preparing a proposal. It is by no means to be exhaustive, but only as information that can be helpful in tracing additional useful background information.

- COM(2001) 428 final, *Commission White Paper on European Governance*
- Related working reports and contributions, e.g.:

- contribution of the ESC to the drafting of the White Paper (2001) on “*Organised civil society and European Governance*”).
- Report by working group 4c (2001), “*Multi-level governance: linking and networking the various regional and local levels*”
- Report by working group 4a (2001), “*Networking people for good governance in Europe*”, on role of networks and their possible development as policy-making instruments in the EU
- Report by working group 2b (2001), “*Evaluation and transparency*”, on societal evaluation of a better policy coordination
- Report from the Commission on European Governance (2003). Implementing the White Paper.
- Council of the European Union (2000), “*The ongoing experience of the Open Coordination Method*”.
- COM (2003) 615 final, “*Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee on Governance and Development*”.
- Concerning the coordination process established under the European Employment Strategy (multilateral monitoring of employment): Commission White Paper on “*Growth, Competitiveness and Employment*”, COM (1993) 700.
- For a general approach of governance and sustainable development, as well as indicators: United Nations Development Programme (1997), “*Governance for Sustainable Human Development*”

#### **Useful Websites**

- <http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/>
- Consultations, the European Commission and Civil Society (Coneccs): [http://europa.eu.int/comm/civil\\_society/coneccs/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/civil_society/coneccs/index_en.htm)
- OECD: [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)

Academic and “think-tank websites”

- Centre for applied policy research: [www.cap.uni-muenchen.de/fge/english/index.htm](http://www.cap.uni-muenchen.de/fge/english/index.htm)
- Centre for European policy studies: [www.ceps.be/Default.php](http://www.ceps.be/Default.php)
- European Policy centre: [www.theepc.net/](http://www.theepc.net/)

NGO websites

- Eurocities: [www.eurocities.org/portal.asp](http://www.eurocities.org/portal.asp)
- Progressive governance: [www.progressive-governance.net/](http://www.progressive-governance.net/)

The project should run for 2 years.  
Estimated budget: max. 434.000 €