

Who works in the local European laboratories?
A comparative study of networks in Euroregions

by

CHRISTIAN CONRAD CLEMENS

BBA, European University Frankfurt/Oder, 2005

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(European Studies)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April 2007

© Christian Conrad Clemens

Abstract

In Europe various policy areas have experienced transfers of authority to the supranational level of the European Union (EU) while subnational regions within countries have become more powerful under the principle of subsidiarity. The three traditional layers of European government are being transformed into a new form of network governance. The EU's multiple Euroregions that are funded by the INTERREG IIIA program develop cross-border cooperation projects that are supposed to lead to policy network structures. The questions raised in my thesis explore how widespread these Euroregional networks are in practice, which organizations are included in the network and which actors are better linked than others. I conduct a comparative case study involving networks of two different Euroregions: The Euroregion Maas-Rhine (MRE), which embodies districts of Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands, and the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina, including Frankfurt/Oder and the region around the Polish city of Slubice. The empirical analysis consists of cataloguing all organizations that have established cross-border cooperation funded by INTERREG III A in the period 2000-2006. These organizations are grouped according to priority fields formulated by the respective Euroregion. It becomes clear that both Euroregions have established projects in multiple policy areas and that the amount of projects is very high. These projects are executed not only by local authorities or municipalities but several private organizations and societal actors cooperate. Therefore Euroregions can be seen as practical examples of network governance. Moreover, my findings reveal that the role of local authorities as system integrators is crucial. As the only actors which have partners in a large number of projects from different priority fields, they act as hubs connecting rather isolated subnetworks.

Table of contents

Abstract	ii
Table of contents	iii
List of tables	iv
Introduction	1
2. EU regional policy – framework for all Euroregions	4
2.1 INTERREG III A	7
2.2 European cross-border network encouragement	8
3. Theoretical Approach	10
4. Empirical Analysis	20
4.1 Outline of the case-groups	21
4.2 Group of established actors in the Maas-Rhine Euroregion	24
4.2.1 Identification of actors	25
4.2.2 Analysis of institutional framework	28
4.3 Group of new actors in the Euroregion Frankfurt/Slubice	30
4.3.1 Identification of actors	31
4.3.2 Analysis of institutional framework	34
5. Comparative Analysis	38
6. Conclusion	45
7. Bibliography	49
Appendix 1	53
Appendix 2	64

List of tables

Table 4.1	Organizations executing more than one project.....	26
Table 4.2	Top 5 Organizations ranked by number of connections.....	27
Table 4.3	Organizations executing more than one project.....	33
Table 4.4	Top 5 Organizations ranked by number of connections.....	34
Table 5.1	Project size by number of partners.....	40
Table 5.2	Comparing basic data.....	41
Table 5.3	Top 5 Relative Degree Centrality Frankfurt/Slubice.....	42
Table 5.4	Top 5 Relative Degree Centrality MRE.....	42

Introduction

Since the Treaty of the European Union was signed in Maastricht in 1992, government structures and processes across Europe have undergone major changes. European politics have been reshaped in the last fourteen years by centralization and decentralization processes. Authority in many policy areas has been transferred to the supranational level of the European Union (EU) while subnational regions within countries have become more powerful under the principle of subsidiarity. The three traditional layers of European government are being transformed into a new form. Hooghe and Marks (2001) have described this new mode of governance as multi-level governance or network governance. The European Commission actively encourages such developments by establishing economic development programs that are characterized by concepts of "bottom-up" capacity building (Perkmann, 2002, Cappellin, 1992). My focus lies on so-called Euroregions which are the most popular and arguably most successful form of cross-border cooperation the EU has to offer. The European Union's multiple Euroregions aim at establishing cross-border policy network structures. Euroregions are therefore very interesting examples of this development of economic and political integration and transformation: they can be considered "European laboratories," showcases of a "borderless Europe," and as such challenge the traditional structure of independent and often centralized nation-states (Knippenberg, 2004: page 611). In my work, I will discuss attributes and effects of these Euroregional policy networks. The first question I will raise explores how widespread these networks are.

By definition, a policy network is described by its actors, their linkages, and its boundaries (Kenis, Schneider, 1991: 41). Policy networks include a relatively stable set

of mainly private corporate and public actors. Each actor in a network has a different and complementary role while no single actor, even when public, represents the privileged leader in regional policy. This stands in stark contrast to centrally-organized national development funds for regions. Network policy is the result of a process of negotiation among varying sets of actors. Private firms, chambers of commerce, entrepreneurial associations and other collective organizations can cooperate with regional and local administrations. My central question therefore addresses who is working in the European laboratories.

I conduct a comparative case study of networks of two different Euroregions: The Euroregion Maas-Rhine (MRE), which is centred on the point where Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands meet and the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina, embodying Frankfurt/Oder and the region around the Polish city of Slubice.

What exactly are Euroregions? All border regions of the EU are entitled under INTERREG III A for support to improve cooperation with their neighbours. "Cross-border cooperation between adjacent regions aims to develop local trans-national social and economic centres through common development strategies"¹. MRE and Pro Europa Viadrina are two regions that share the partner country Germany but other main characteristics show notable differences. Despite many particularities in both cases there is reasoning for my comparative study. Both Euroregions share similar sets of actors and identical overarching funding structures. They provide the basis for the case study. Case studies are "intensive studies of single units wherever the aim is to shed light on a question pertaining to a broader class of units" (Gerring, 2004: 344).

¹ Website www.europa.eu, European Commission > Regional Policy

My aim is to identify all actors in both networks. I define an actor to be inside the network through its involvement in INTERREG III A funding. The criterion to become a member of Euroregion's network is therefore a successful application for an INTERREG III A funded project. Those partners that function as project-executing organizations compose the Euroregion's network.

The third question I will raise is how well connected these networks are in practice. Which actors are better linked than the rest? Does the actors' importance play a role? By comparing a rather established region with a younger region, a region's maturity can be invoked to answer some of these questions. The significance of the role of authorities and municipalities will become clear in my results. The MRE is of special interest: since three nation-states are involved that have different political institutions and cultures, legal frameworks, and languages (French, Dutch and German), it can be considered a real laboratory for the general processes of European transformation as mentioned above.

The "Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina" is a rather young Euroregion, established in 1993. Its common history and current institutional setting are characterized by greater division than those of the MRE. The different levels of maturity will lead to insights concerning the objective setting of these networks, which share identical underlying funding structures. Moreover, the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina is part of a larger transformation process in Central and Eastern Europe. My work therefore also gives some insight into the current state of transformation of a particular region in comparison to a region of Western Europe. The questions I have raised will provide descriptive inferences rather than causal relationships. This is due to the research design as "cross-

sectional" case study (Gering, 2004: 343) and it justifies the choice of two very different Euroregions.

2. EU regional policy – framework for all Euroregions

"The evolution of European regional policy initiatives has been marked by heated debates about purpose decision making logic and priorities" (Thielemann, 2002: 60). Thielemann and others² analyse the member states' discussion on whether regional policy in the EU should serve the purpose of development or compensation, whether there should be intergovernmental or multi-level decision making and whether the focus lies on cohesion or competition. Thielemann concludes that academic literature remains highly sceptical in its first treatments of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in the late 1970s (Thielemann, 2002: 45). The Fund's effectiveness as an instrument of regional development is doubted (Wallace, 1977, 1977b, Armstrong, 1978). Wise and Croxford's judgement a decade later is similar calling the ERDF "an essentially 'cosmetic' policy instrument" (1988: 164).

Another ten years later Ian Bache (1998) still emphasizes the continued gatekeeping role of national governments and the intergovernmental character of regional funding. After this period of rather slow progress in the late 1980s major reforms have strengthened EU regional policy and decreased the intergovernmental nature of priority setting and decision making processes. "The structural fund regulations as they have developed since 1988 deliberately seek to involve subnational actors in the funds." (Sutcliffe, 2002: 102) While all decision concerning the European budget still is an

² For an excellent overview see Bache, 1998

intergovernmental domain (Moravcsik, 1993) there are now many scholars that regard subnational authorities and their involvement as important.

However, controversy remains about the strength of involvement of subnational actors (Sutcliffe, 2002: 102). Sutcliffe (2002) analyses that while Bache (1999) and Allen (1996) still view the member states' central governments as dominant in the policy process "other researchers suggest that subnational actors have become important in the implementation of the structural funds alongside central governments and EU actors." (Sutcliffe, 2002: 102) Hooghe (1996) and Marks (1993) are defenders of this latter hypothesis which is also the hypothesis my own research is based on. By employing a network theory approach I assume that it has some significance in EU regional policy. Of course, my outcome might also falsify this hypothesis. However, in my analysis of Euroregional networks I find some proof of the thesis that traditional fixed European three-tier government structures are being transformed into an architecture that has been referred to as multilevel governance or network governance (Hooghe, Marks, 2001).

This concept has a long tradition as integral part of European integration. Bennett and Krebs (1994) have analysed the regional networks under the LEDA (Local Employment Development Action) program which was founded by the European Commission DG V in 1986. The Encouragement of indigenous potential of regions and subnational entities across Europe was placed in the middle of the attention along with the Internal Market Initiative of the Single European Act (Dankbaar et al, 1994). Especially border regions which have often been neglected by nation states were seen as important places of integration. The analysis of LEDA along with other studies of EU regional policy (Perkmann, 2002, Cappellin, 1992) showed the significance of the

network paradigm for "bottom-up" approaches and regional funding. The framework of this regional funding is described in the following paragraphs.

Regional policy programs benefit from over 35% of the European Union's budget.³ Most of the 347.41 billion euros are employed for programs with the objective of convergence. Other objectives are Regional Competitiveness and Employment as well as European Territorial Cooperation. Main instruments for this complex process are four Structural Funds. They are supposed to exercise a "multiplier effect on the economic and social factors likely to stimulate a region's economy"⁴ across all Member States. The four different types of structural funding are provided by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF) which promotes reintegration into the job market, the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) and the "Guidance" Section of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund⁵. Within these four forms of predominantly nationally oriented funding the EU has also set up four special programs. These so called Community Initiatives are to react to problems affecting the entire EU. There are four Community Initiatives which in total absorb 5.35% of the budget of the four Structural Funds. Each Initiative is financed by only one Fund. The most relevant Initiative is INTERREG III which promotes cross-border, transnational and Interregional cooperation, the creation of partnerships across borders to encourage the balanced development of multi-regional areas. INTERREG III is financed by the ERDF.⁶ These funds are provided by the INTERREG III program to promote Cross-border cooperation on a local level and stimulate the establishment of Euroregions.

³ Website www.europa.eu, European Commission > Regional Policy

⁴ Ibid,

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

2.1 INTERREG III A

INTERREG III aims to encourage interregional cooperation in the EU between 2000 and 2006. The ERDF-financed budget for this time period is € 4.875 billion. This amount represents approximately 2.3 per cent of the total Cohesion Policy budget and half of the budget of all four Community Initiatives.⁷ INTERREG III is made up of 3 strands of territorial cooperation – cross-border, transnational and inter-regional. Strand A funding includes all cross-border cooperation “between adjacent regions aiming to develop cross-border social and economic centres through common development strategies.”⁸ Financially, Strand A is allocated between 50 and 80 % of the total 4.9 billion Euro, strand B between 14% and 44% and strand C will be allocated 6% of the total, according to the European Commission. The exact breakdown between strands depends on decisions by the Member States. The third phase of the INTERREG initiative is designed to strengthen economic and social cohesion throughout the European Union.

Borders with non-EU members are also eligible for project support. In fact, special emphasis has been placed on integrating those regions which share external borders with the candidate countries already in during the INTERREG II phase in the 90s. This has lead to the founding of Euroregions like the “Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina”. Since then four Euroregions have operated on Poland's western border: Nysa, Spree-Nysa-Bóbr, Pro-Europa Viadrina, and Pomerania, which apart from German and Polish communities also include Swedish local government authorities. These institutional frameworks of Euroregions are closely connected to all INTERREG III A regions. Euroregion offices and representations serve as contact persons to INTERREG III A

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

funding. Counselling and project support is offered to ensure that initiatives meet the strict and complex requirements of the European Commission.

The first Euroregion was founded in 1958 on the Dutch-German border involving Enschede (Netherlands) and Gronau (Germany) (Perkmann, 2002: 3). Euroregions and other forms of cross-border cooperation have been established increasingly since then. According to a study by Perkmann there are today "more than 70 cases of cooperation of municipalities and regional authorities with their counterparts across the border in more or less formalised organizational agreements" (Perkmann, 2002: 3). The EU seems to have identified networks as important elements in urban spatial development policy "moving away from top-down legislating, to a more responsive and participatory style" (Ward, Williams, 1997: 1). Consequently, not only local authorities but various actors are authorised as applicants to INTERREG III A funding. All public and private actors can apply for funding. This means that national, regional or local administrations and other public bodies, research bodies, universities and socio-economic actors or organizations if located in the eligible areas may set up projects⁹. Public authorities, legal persons under public and private law, "Personenhandelsgesellschaften" (Form of Business partnership under German law) and physical persons who manage a business can conceptualize their own projects and applications.

2.2 European cross-border network encouragement

Before answering the questions of how widespread or how closely connected such regional networks are it is important to examine the procedure of network assessment. By identifying this process it will become clearer what societal actors must do on a local

⁹ Ibid.

level in order benefit from the funding mentioned above. Moreover, the nature of the application process will reveal the significance of the network framework. First and foremost the procedure is complicated and requires extensive cooperation. Network relations become naturally useful. The complicatedness of assessment and decision making processes of INTERREG III A is described in the following example: An application process for organizations who want to participate in projects by one of the two Euroregions in Brandenburg and Lubuskie. The region covers the Euroregions "Pro Europa Viadrina" and "Spree-Neisse-Bober". Since I also include "Pro Europa Viadrina" in my comparative study this particular process provides a relevant and interesting example.

The steps organizations from both sides of the border have to take are numerous. First, the applicant submits a project proposal to the responsible Euroregion. In Lubuskie, the proposal has to be send to the Marshall Office, which forwards it to the Euroregion organization. Then, a statement about the quality of the proposal is given by the Euroregion. Should this statement be positive the applicant is able to hand in an official application. This application has to be delivered to the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS) which supports the managing authority and all other bodies involved in the implementation of the INTERREG programs. Moreover, the application also goes to the Fund Management Authority in Brandenburg. This Authority delegates the application to the Investment Bank of Brandenburg. On the Polish side this is done by their Intermediary Body, the Regional Contact Office. The two Intermediary Bodies assess the project idea within their own administration. After this assessment a decision proposal is forwarded to the JTS. "The JTS then sends the German decision proposal to

the Marshall Office of Lubuskie.”¹⁰ Then, the Polish proposal is forwarded to the Brandenburg ministries or municipalities like the city of Frankfurt/Oder. “The public authorities consulted provide a specialist statement to the JTS so that a final proposal can be presented to the Steering Committee for decision.”¹¹ A detailed analysis of the steering committee and other institutions involved in the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina will follow in chapter four.

As is exemplified by this application process in the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina the process requires a high level of interaction and cooperation between German and Polish partners. No matter how strong the interaction during the project will be the application process alone establishes a certain cross-border connection between organizations. This is especially the case when the application is successful. When attempting to assess how widespread cross-border networks are analysing all established projects provides a relevant approach. It is not a major loss of significance to leave out content and implementation of the particular projects. In which way projects are implemented and which communication structure is chosen does not affect the finding that all organizations involved are closely linked to each other. I will further introduce tools to define the level of connectedness within Euroregions networks in order to prepare the comparative study theoretically.

3. Theoretical Approach

The importance of social and economic networks has been documented extensively in theoretical and empirical studies. Definitions of terms such as “network organizations” (Miles, Snow 1986) and “network forms of organization” (Powell, 1990) or “quasi-firms”

¹⁰ INTERREG III A Brandenburg – Lubuskie program management, 02/2006, page 18/19

¹¹ Ibid.

(Eccles, 1981) are well discussed. They describe a form of "coordination that is characterised by organic and informal social systems" (Jones, Hesterly, Borgatti, 1997: 913) and contrast with markets and hierarchies. Regional policy networks have benefits over technical state control approaches and concepts of free market competition. The former calls for centralized hierarchical coordination while the latter demands minimal state intervention. The major advantage for regions involved is an increased dynamism through an "evolving and yet coherent" organizational structure (Marin, 1990)

There are various definitions of network governance. I will briefly introduce three main concepts.¹² Alter and Hage (1993) use the term "Interorganizational networks" and define it as "unbounded or bounded clusters of organizations that are non-hierarchical collectives of legally separate units"¹³. Powell (1990) defines his "Network forms of organizations" as "lateral or horizontal patterns of exchange, independent flows of resources, reciprocal lines of communication"¹⁴. Granovetter (1983) defines "business groups" to be "collections of firms bound together in some formal or informal ways by an intermediate level of binding."¹⁵ All of these definitions show the significance of the network pattern for my research. First, INTERREG III A funding includes no hierarchical structure among project partners. Second, partners are grouped in projects and by objective setting of the Euroregion leading to bounded clusters of organizations. This will become clearer in chapter four. An example is objective ("Priority") four of the MRE which is called "Development and enhancement of human resources". Most participants of projects in this group are universities. One can deduct that the universities of Aachen, Maastricht, Liège and others form a cluster or subnetwork of educational institutions

¹² For a good overview see Jones, Hesterly, Borgatti, 1997

¹³ Quoted from Jones, Hesterly, Borgatti (1997: 915)

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

within the overall Euroregional network. Third, the definition of reciprocal lines of communication and exchange of resources is highly applicable to INTERREG III A application processes and the process of setting up a project. Finally, Granovetter's collection of firms also applies to Euroregions where organizations are bound through formal contracts. Although it must be noted that INTERREG III A contracts represent a relatively high level of binding for all actors involved. The cost of leaving the network is therefore relatively high. It is neither an informal nor unbounded agreement. I will return to this topic in a discussion of "tight coupling" and "loose coupling" (Mayntz, 1993: 44) next. Generally it can be concluded that the paradigm of networks represents a useful methodological instrument to interpret regional cross-border cooperation of local governments, private organizations and other societal actors.

As pointed out with the initial definitions networks are a certain form of institutional setting. In the last decades researchers have discussed whether there is an institutional change from hierarchies to networks in Europe. I will highlight two theoretical approaches that attempt to analyse the difference between hierarchies and networks and describe a possible change of one to the other. Renate Mayntz (1993: 44) uses the terminology of dialectical processes. She describes networks as synthesis of formal organizations and markets. She argues that the transformation of political reality with information and material resources being owned by an increasing number of actors leads to a decentralization of the nation state (Mayntz, 1993: 44). In her model markets are not restricted by any coupling. Mayntz's argumentation can be considered functionalistic one where the needs of the environment are the purpose of institutions.

Others like Scharpf (1997) have tried to explain structural coupling in more detail to identify differences between networks and hierarchies. Scharpf's perspective is a

rationalist one. His actor-centred institutionalism intends to overcome the dualism between the actor level and the institutional level. His approach is to develop a framework to analyze policy processes driven by the interaction of political actors in a given institutional setting. Scharpf defines a typology of "institutional settings" differentiated by four "modes of interaction" (Scharpf, 1997: 47). These are "unilateral action", "negotiated agreement", "majority vote" and "hierarchical direction." His four institutional settings "anarchic field", "network", "association" and "organization" are based on different combinations of interaction modes (Scharpf, 1997: 47). A specific actor constellation, then, combined with a specific mode of interaction determines the outcome of the policy-making process. "Anarchic field" and "network" correspond with Mayntz' "loose coupling" while "associations" and "organizations" are coupled in a tighter way. While according to Scharpf hierarchies include all four modes, networks only allow for unilateral action and negotiated agreement. Unilateral action means that an actor is not planning to cooperate. This mode of interaction is only possible without a strong hierarchical control. Therefore unilateral action can occur only in settings with minimum institutional rules like networks. For example, there is no official punishment when a project partners leaves an INTERREG III A project and exits the Euroregional network. Scharpf argues that decisions by majority vote or by hierarchical authority require a more demanding institutional setting and are not possible in network settings. The form of an association would still allow for majority voting but not for hierarchical authority. In networks Scharpf points out that one mode of interactions dominates. Networks can be characterized by negotiated agreements.

In my research I have found strong empirical evidence that Euroregions are an example of institutional change from hierarchies to network governance. Blatter (2003:

505) who has also worked empirically with these underlying policy transformation theories has called Border Regions in Europe and North America "laboratories of institutional change and international institution building." These regions historically have experienced centralized control of their hierarchical nation states and "anarchical competition" between states simultaneously (Blatter, 2003: 505). Blatter points out that major waves of network governance institution building can be distinguished. After the Single European Act in 1987 and after 1990 and the launch of INTERREG stimulation was high all over the continent. My comparative study will attempt to show a change in the role of authorities by asking the question of their involvement in INTERREG funded projects. My findings will strengthen Blatter's hypothesis since a large number of negotiated agreements are revealed in my empirical data in chapters four and five.

However, Blatter also "challenges the functionalist approach" stressing the fact that a similar expansion of Euroregions is witnessed in border regions with low environmental and socio-economic and in regions with high interdependencies (Blatter, 2003: 508). Does this leave us with a mere symbolic meaning of Euroregions? Are they more about ideas than functional logic, efficiency gains and output generation? My hypothesis is that in the short run symbolic gains overweigh. In the first two or three planning periods which is equivalent to approximately 15 years cultural barriers have to be removed and mere acts of coming together are a success. Communication channels and cooperation agreements have to be established in this time frame. In the long run however the mobilizing capacity and socio-economic relevance increases. My focus on two Euroregions with different levels of maturity will provide insight to that thesis.

After having established the significance of the network approach the next methodological instrument has to be justified. In the following paragraphs the choice of a

comparative study is explained. Moreover, some constraints to the method of a comparative analysis have to be clarified. The two case groups of actors are within the Euroregion Maas-Rhine (MRE) which is centred on the point where Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands border each other and the "Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina" embodying Frankfurt/Oder and the region around the polish city of Slubice. Main economic and political characteristics of both regions show significant differences between them. Despite the fact that these differences are large in number and quality I will explain why a comparative case study has been the right approach.

First, I will turn to describe the difference between the case studies. However, especially the contextual economic and political diversification can not fully be analysed. Therefore I will only briefly name major differences. I begin with highlighting the differences concerning the legal frameworks within which the Euroregions operate. It is difficult to define or identify the term Euroregion by a particular legal framework. Among the abundance of forms of cross-border cooperations three types of Euroregion are distinguished: "Euroregions without legal personality (working communities or communities of interest), Euroregions which are based on private law and Euroregions which are based on public law"¹⁶. Both Euroregions in our set are voluntary associations of public-law bodies. There are no differences in this field. Moreover, at first glance the objectives formulated by the two Euroregions show a similar approach in both regions. Intuitively one could formulate that the Polish-German region seems to adopt the successful strategy of the Euregio. However, the pursuit of these goals needs to be seen in the economic and political circumstances which are strongly divergent.

¹⁶ Council of Europe website:
www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/local_and_regional_democracy/areas_of_work/transfrontier_co%2Doperation/euroregions/Existing_Euroregion.asp#TopOfPage

First, the respective regional economics have different characters. The Euregio Meuse-Rhine encompasses a high-technology industrial area¹⁷. There are large automobile assembly plants, mechanical engineering establishments and biotechnology innovation centres.¹⁸ In contrast the Euroregion Viadrina is characterized by a struggling old industry. Striking examples are old and inefficient power plants. Moreover, the region is characterised by high unemployment on both sides of the border. In addition to these differences between the Euroregions there are significant transboundary inequalities within the Pro Europa Viadrina region. While the MRE consists of relatively even provinces, the German and Polish sides are characterized by economical and political asymmetry. There are almost no Polish Foreign Direct Investments into the German side versus large amounts of German FDI. Furthermore, availability of German products in Poland is considerably higher than vice versa.

Less significant but still considerably large are the political differences within the German-Polish region. The MRE's provinces are all except Dutch Limbourg within countries with federal systems. Consequently, the power to act without approval from national centres is significant. This is very important with regard to the active role these local authorities play in both networks. In contrast the Viadrina region has to operate with a unitary Polish state. They cannot act as independently as their German counterparts and are therefore less flexible. Moreover, the historic developments of the last century have led to fears on the Polish side that any cross-border activity is merely a German attempt to dominate and influence the Polish side.

I point out that my comparative analysis merely concentrates on the effects a funding framework has and how similar organization forms in different regions react to it.

¹⁷ www.euregio-mr.org

¹⁸ *ibid.*

I do not attempt to compare the economic and political effects on both regions in total. My focus is on the ties and links that are formed. Since case studies "presuppose a relatively bounded phenomenon" (Gerring, 2004: 342) the argument of too many contextual differences can be rejected. Gerring defines a case study as an "intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units" (2004: 342). A unit in this sense is a spatially bounded phenomenon like a nation-state, person or Euroregion "observed at a single point in time or over some delimited period of time" (2004: 342). Causal and descriptive inferences can be made. In my study, the source where inferences are drawn from is covariation. Covariation is the extend to which variables "occur together in space and time rather than occurring separately" (Bennett, 1999: 12). Covariation may be observed in a single unit of the case study diachronically, within a single unit synchronically, within a single unit diachronically, across units synchronically, across units synchronically and diachronically, across and within units synchronically, or across and within units.¹⁹ There are two units in my comparative case study: The network of all actors in the MRE and the network of all actors in The Euroregion Frankfurt/Slubice. I test whether there is a covariance of the following variables across these two units: Number of actors inside the network, number of projects per actor, degree centrality of actors. This research design is not diachronically since the temporal component is omitted by using identical timeframes (planning periods) in both regions. Gerring defines this research design as "cross-sectional" (2004).

Cross-sectional research is indeed problematic. It is often difficult to tell which of the many features of a given unit are typical of a larger set of units and material for

¹⁹ For a detailed classification and overview see Gerring, 2004

generalizable inferences. Concerning our network cases it is important to know both what is particular to a unit and what is general about it. The general part is given by the funding structure and the set of actors. They provide the basis for the case study. The results that have been presented and that will be interpreted in section 5 are based on these general characteristics. In answering my research questions I will use descriptive inference. Descriptive inference does not make any assertions about causal relationships. I merely ask how these networks appear and what actors are most dominant. I do not ask why-questions. Gerring points out that "descriptive case study propositions are implicitly comparative and these comparisons must have a cross-unit reference point" (2004). How strongly the differences between the two Euroregions may appear a few striking conclusions can still be drawn. I will turn to the theoretical approach to analyse the two Euroregional networks.

Network relationships can be described in many shapes and sizes. I focus on a very basic way of modelling networks. This basic model is adequate since the complexity of network relationships is not of high importance to my research. First, I will briefly introduce a theoretical framework of network formation. Then I will introduce measures of centrality and connectedness which I want to use in the analysis of empirical data.

The societal actors and municipalities involved in both Euroregions will be referred to as "players". The idea behind this definition is that they "may be firms or other organizations, and they might be even countries" (Jackson, 2003: 3).

$$N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$$

N is a set of players who are connected in some network relationship.

The network form I apply is a non-directed graph where two players are either connected or not. This 0-1 link is of significance for my research since it is not important in what direction the link is established, e.g. who contacted who first. As became obvious in chapter 2.2 the process of assessment is one that ensures enough interaction and communication among partners if it is supposed to be successful. I therefore establish the criterion for a network link to have the value 1 as the successful application to a respective Euroregion funding. This criterion seems rather robust and applicable in both regions.

A network g is a list of which pairs players are connected to each other. A network is then a list of unordered pairs of players (Jackson, 2003: 5).

$$\{i, j \in g\}$$

indicates that i and j are linked under the network g .

Furthermore it can be said that the underlying theoretical pattern is one of nonrivalry between players before they form their links. Each player is a potential source of benefits that others can tap. This benefit is made up of two components. First, a link with another player allows access to the benefits available to him via his own links. Secondly, it allows access to EU-funding of a possible Joint-Venture.

In order to analyse the network architecture I will focus further on the degree of all players. The degree is simply the number of other players to which a player is adjacent. Since I aim at identifying all existing links it will be easy to calculate the number of connections each player has. The resulting number gives the player's so called centrality. The idea of the centrality of individuals and organizations in their social networks was one of the earliest to be pursued by social network analysts. A simple example to explain this is the star network. The most important or most valuable actor is

located in the centre of a star. Other players are only connected to him but he has many direct connections. The central player has the highest network centrality. Focusing only on direct neighbours is regarded as a measure of local centrality. In contrast, global centrality includes indirect links. Since the Euroregions networks turn out not to be very dense the local centrality measurement suffices.

There is however one main limitation to using this measure of local centrality in comparative analysis. Comparing centralities is only meaningful for members of the same graph. To overcome this problem Freeman's (1979) relative measure of local centrality will be applied. Here the actual number of connections is related to the maximum number which it could sustain. A degree of 25 in a graph of 100 points, therefore, indicates a relative local centrality of 0.25, while a degree of 25 in a graph of 30 points indicates a relative degree centrality of 0.86, and a degree of 6 in a graph of 10 points indicates a relative centrality of 0.66.

$$RD(x) = \frac{CD(x)}{\text{highest degree}} = \frac{CD(x)}{n - 1}$$

Here n is the number of units in a network, $CD(x)$ is the Degree Centrality of node x and $RD(x)$ is the relative degree centrality of node x . The highest possible degree in a network without loops is $n - 1$. This relatively simple formula will be used in chapter 5.3 when comparing the two networks.

4. Empirical Analysis

My empirical analysis concentrates on two major findings that answer my first question of how widespread Euroregion networks are in practice. First, I want to display how

diversified the agenda of each Euroregion is. The degree of diversification gives a first indication of how widespread the networks are. It also reveals a possible strategy of the respective Euroregion. Secondly, I will compare the number of actors active in each field. This will provide another indication of the level of inclusion of the network.

The second question concerning the level of connections of actors is answered by an analysis of the project partners. Organizations will be ranked by the number of projects and the number of partners.

The question raised in chapter 3.2 whether a more functionalist logic is achieved over time can be answered by the individual projects and their objectives. Furthermore a comparison of the institutional setting will challenge the theory of Maintz (1993) that loose couplings are created through network policy.

4.1 Outline of the case-groups

The respective regional economics have very different characters. The Euregio Meuse-Rhine encompasses a high-technology industrial area. In contrast the Euroregion Viadrina is characterized by a struggling old industry as well as high unemployment. Major contextual differences have been described in chapter three.

As discussed earlier EU regional policy mainly consists of the structural funds, the financial assistance given to relatively poor or declining regions of the EU's fifteen member states. Interestingly, the EU regional policy also has an important external component. The core program for candidate countries from Central and Eastern Europe is PHARE. This acronym seems like an additional major difference between the two case groups, the networks MRE and "Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina." Outside the standard EU external relations cooperation agreements, PHARE was the first program

where the European Union provided financial support to countries that are not full members. The "Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina" has been created mainly because of these PHARE funds. PHARE means lighthouse in French but "Poland and Hungary: Assistance for Restructuring their Economies" in EU official language. The PHARE program was founded in 1989 to help Poland and Hungary in the process of transformation. PHARE management was put in the hands of the European Commission, the European Community's executive body. It has since been expanded to cover 10 countries. PHARE benefits are given to 8 new Member States: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, as well as Bulgaria and Romania, "assisting them in a period of massive economic restructuring and political change"²⁰. Before the CARDS program (Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stability in the Balkans) was established in 2001 the countries of the Western Balkans (Albania, the Republic of Macedonia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina) were also beneficiaries of PHARE. The PHARE program was launched following the collapse of the communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe. It was intended to help these countries reconstruct their economies. One of the core initial concepts was therefore to assist the CEEC in their political and economic transition from a centralised communist system to a decentralised liberal democratic society.

After 1993 and the Copenhagen decision to accept Central and Eastern European Countries as Candidate Countries, PHARE's role was adapted to the accession process. Now the program is intended to help candidates in acquiring the Acquis Communautaire and preparing for Structural Funding. This means that the program evolved from a general and unfocused demand-driven program of support for transition

²⁰ DG Enlargement website > PHARE
http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/financial_assistance/phare/index_en.htm

countries through to the recent accession-driven support. Over the last decade the focus has shifted towards institution building and pursuing economic and social cohesion. End In 1999, PHARE's cumulative financial commitments amounted to some € 10 billion, all in the form of non-reimbursable grants financed from the EU budget, of which some € 7 billion were for the ten Central and Eastern European Countries. In 2000, with the start of the EU's new Agenda 2000 budgetary perspectives, annual budgetary commitments for the ten CEEC that receive PHARE support tripled from € 1 to € 3 billion.²¹ At the March 1999 Berlin summit, EU leaders approved two new pre-accession aid instruments for the CEECs. The first instrument is for agricultural purposes – Support for Agricultural and Rural Development (SAPARD) of € 3.64 billion for 2000–2006 and the second for structural development issues – Instrument for Structural Policies for Pre-Accession Assistance (ISPA) of € 1.04 billion per year for a seven-year total of € 7.28 billion.²² The latter is of particular importance from the perspective of EU regional policy. ISPA aid is provided to help align the infrastructural standards of the CEECs with those of the EU. Interestingly, project decision-making is largely a matter for national authorities in the CEECs, working together with the Commission, without the same partnership requirement of a key role for regional authorities that is found in the structural funds.

The PHARE program is described extensively here in order to explain that the two regions have been in different funding schemes. At first glance the two case groups therefore seem to be an inappropriate selection since the aim of this work is to compare effects of funding in practice. However, there is a component to PHARE that has basically the same effects as INTERREG III A. The Commission also prioritized regional development, assisted by the use of cross-border cooperation (CBC) programs. PHARE

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

CBC was introduced in 1994 to assist border regions in the applicant countries overcome their specific development problems and integrate more closely with the European Union, other countries of Central and Eastern Europe and within their own national economies. The main objective is to prepare candidate countries for future participation in the INTERREG program. Thus, the two case groups do fit in the sense of the initial question.

Until 2003, PHARE CBC focused on promoting cooperation between the border regions of Central and Eastern Europe and adjacent regions of the European Community, as well as border regions between applicant countries of Central and Eastern Europe. This part of the PHARE program is an equivalent of INTERREG III A and both were used in the EU's external border Euroregions most prominently German-Polish Regions. Between 2000 and 2006, € 163 million was available each year to the PHARE CBC program, representing approximately 10% of the total yearly PHARE commitment.

4.2 Group of established actors in the Maas-Rhine Euroregion

The Maas-Rhine Euroregion (MRE) encompasses the southern part of the Dutch Province of Limburg, the Belgian provinces of Limburg and Liège (including the German-speaking community) and the German Regierungsbezirk Aachen. In 1976, after visiting the city of Maastricht, Queen Beatrix instigated the "establishment of an informal working group of cross-border partner regions to create the Maas-Rhine Euregio" (Kramsch, 2002: 182). The official MRE came into existence in 1980 by the European Commission when a mandate was signed by the ministers of economic affairs of the Netherlands, Germany and Nordrhein-Westfalen (Knippenberg, 2004: 609). The Belgian

province of Limburg joined the agreement in the year after. In 1983 Liege followed and its independent German speaking community completed the five MRE partners in 1992. In 1991, the Euregio acquired the juridical status of a foundation under the terms of Dutch private law, embodied in the "Stichting" (Foundation) Euregio Maas-Rhine. From this time on, the Stichting has defined itself as a cross-border jurisdiction with approximately 3.7 million inhabitants.

4.2.1 Identification of actors

To identify all nodes of the network of the Euroregion Maas Rhine, the REGIO Aachen e.V. was contacted. Basic data about all ongoing INTERREG III A projects could be retrieved. The MRE currently lists a total number of 76 projects financed by INTERREG. For a detailed table of all projects see Appendix 1. Projects are implemented according to five different priorities. These priorities are described in 4.2.2. All 76 projects lie within the responsibility of executing organizations. The number of organizations per project varies from one to eleven. Overall 340 executing organizations are registered of which several actors appear multiple times. 129 different partners have applied successfully which means that on average actors participate in 2.64 projects. Actors conducting more than one project are of importance since intuitively they are better connected within the network. Sorting these more active organizations by country reveals no significant differences (see table 4.1)

D	NL	Be
Stadt Aachen	Provincie Limburg (NL)	Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Beligiens

Kreis Aachen	Gemeente Maastricht	Wirtschaftsförderungsgesellschaft Ostbelgiens
Regio Aachen e.V.	Gemeente Vaals	Region Wallonne
Handwerkskammer Aachen	NV Industriebank LIOF, Maastricht	Université de Liège
RWTH Aachen	Universiteit Maastricht	SPI+, Liège
AGIT mbH, Aachen	Stad Maastricht	Limburgs Universitair Centrum
Rursee-Touristik GmbH für MRRT e.V.	Gemeente Heerlen	Provincz Belgisch Limburg
DRK-Kreisverband Aachen-Stadt	ARCUS College Heerlen	A.I.D.E.
Versorgungsamt Aachen	Stichting Euregio Maas-Rhein	LE FOREM
	Gemeente Kerkrade	ZAWM, Eupen
		Province de Liège

Table 4.1 Organizations executing more than one project

No country dominates the other. Organizations from all three countries are represented almost equally in the table. However, it becomes obvious that municipalities and regional governments appear more often than other societal actors. This is true for all three countries. In order to fully understand which actors are better connected within the network than others, measures of centrality have to be applied. The centrality of a node

in a network is a measure of the structural importance of the node. In our case the number of project partners an organization has is summed up for all of its projects. Then, partners that cooperate with that organization in multiple projects are omitted. The result gives us the number of nodes the organization is connected to in the sense of the initial definition. After calculating the centrality degree of each organization we can rank them accordingly (See table 4.2).

Actor	Projects	Centrality Degree
Provincie Limburg (NL)	8	31
Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgiens	8	27
Stadt Aachen	6	23
Kreis Aachen	4	21
RWTH Aachen	5	15

Table 4.2 Top 5 Organizations ranked by number of connections

According to this measurement it becomes clear that the number of projects is not decisive for estimating the centrality of a node. Yet, municipalities and regional governments still dominate the network when it comes to the number of links. The Provincie Limburg in the Netherlands leads with connections to 31 different actors, followed by the German speaking community of Belgium and the city and local government of Aachen. The university RWTH of Aachen is the only non-governmental actor reaching the top five. It even participates in more projects than the Kreis Aachen. However, the partners of the RWTH are often the same. They are mostly other universities such as the University of Maastricht or the Université de Liège. Therefore

the centrality degree is low for all universities. Municipalities achieve such a high score simply because they are more diverse in their operations. One could say they act as hubs between different priority-oriented sub networks. Moreover, no asymmetry of nationality is apparent from the ranked order of centrality.

4.2.2 Analysis of institutional framework

The Political-Administrative Structure of the Euroregion is comprised of a Board with representatives of each of the regions and Euroregional Council (Euregiomat). This Council is lead by a central Presidium, which acts as its primary decision-making body, and is organized as a bicameral consultative organ. Established in January 1995, the Council represents one of the few instances of trans-border parliamentarianism within the European Union. Its 81 members are divided into a chamber of political and social representatives (51 and 30 members, respectively). The Presidium consists of the chairmen of both chambers and 10 council representatives. Rather than being elected by popular suffrage, these members are nominated by the different political, economic and social actors found within each partner region, which include established political parties, chambers of commerce, labour unions and universities.

The rest of the EMR Foundation is made up of a central bureau entrusted with managing public relations on behalf of the Euregio, as well as coordinating various working commissions and steering groups engaged in the direct management of structural fund budgets and projects. There are working groups on four broad themes: economy, technology, qualification and labour market; nature, environment and traffic; health care, social and security issues; youth, culture and euroregional identity. Steering groups are for instance engaged in the management of INTERREG projects, aimed at

the promotion of economic and social cohesion in the European Union by cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation.²³

Since 1991, a whole series of cross-border projects have been implemented in the territory of the Euregio Meuse-Rhine with the support of INTERREG funds. For the 2000-2006 planning period, the European Commission has allocated the Euregio Meuse-Rhine Foundation a budget of 52.7 million euro for organising cross-border projects²⁴. The Council has formulated five different priorities for all possible future projects. First priority is the improvement of physical infrastructure across the region. Two measures are to be fulfilled by proposed projects: the improvement of the work context and the stimulation of cross-border mobility. Here 8 projects have been established within two different measures.²⁵ Mostly municipalities are active within this sub network flanked by few public transport organizations. The second priority is the promotion of economic, scientific and technological cooperation, which is to be achieved by stimulation of new activities and innovative activities and attraction of tourism. 23 projects have been set up making this sub network the largest one. Many tourism agencies, several municipalities and a few universities work together in this field.

Furthermore, the third priority focuses on protecting the environment. Partners cooperate in 11 different projects. Predominantly interest groups from the agricultural field, environmental groups and universities have applied successfully. Measures aim at protecting the environment, nature and the countryside and the cautious development of rural areas.

²³ For a detailed explanation of working groups see www.euregio-mr.eu

²⁴ www.euregio-mr.eu

²⁵ see Appendix 1 for details

The Euroregion's fourth priority is developing and enhancing its human resources. This includes strengthening the cross-border job market and offering educational and vocational training. Universities form the largest part of this sub network with its 14 INTERREG projects. Additionally educational institution and organizations that are involved in the apprenticeship system cooperate in this field.

Finally, priority five is the stimulation of social integration. For this the MRE has identified that possible measures should be social integration, promotion of cultural identity, cooperation between care institutions and organizations and between public authorities. Twenty projects are funded. Social and cultural interest groups work together on these projects. In the public authority field it is most municipalities and meso-regional governments that are represented.

All of these objectives show how all-embracing the MRE programs are. Almost every aspect of life in the region is eligible for European funding and the ideas and plans of the Euroregion seem to have no clearly visible border. In this widespread network not many actors are closely linked. Most of the participating organizations have only 4 or 5 connections within one project. Only local authorities play a central role. Further, universities do so to some extent. The role of local authorities as system integrators seems to be crucial for the network to have an integrating effect.

I will now turn to a younger region to see whether similar results can be achieved and the differences that can be analysed.

4.3 Group of new actors in the Euroregion Frankfurt/Slubice

The European Union has actively participated in the development of the eligible regions on either side of the German-Polish border by co-financing the INTERREG III program

for the border region of Brandenburg and Lubuskie during the 2000-2006 period. The total cost of the program is 176.36 million euros, of which the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) will contribute 132.25 million.²⁶

4.3.1 Identification of actors

Proceeding in the same way as with the first Euroregion, the office of the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina in Frankfurt/ Oder was contacted. The data for all projects within the funding period 2000 to 2006 was retrieved. A total number of 89 projects were set up within this time frame.²⁷ There was no data on the different partners per project so every project folder at the office of Pro Europa Viadrina in Frankfurt/ Oder was opened and the names of the participating partners were retrieved individually. The data was set together. Five Similar priorities are formulated according to INTERREG III regulations. However, there are differences in priority setting between the two Euroregions. Pro Europa Viadrina created an additional priority for projects that concentrate only on cooperation. So there is no functional purpose except for the fact that people from both sides of the border get together. The "young life 2004" conference is one example of these projects. The reason for this additional priority is discussed later. A seventh priority is special projects. The EU enlargement and the preparation of regional strategies to cope with the changes is one of the few projects in this field.

Another major difference becomes obvious immediately. It is between the project design of the German-Polish Euroregion and the procedures of the MRE. In most cases only two executing organizations have applied for one project. The majority of projects are pursued by only one polish partner and only a few German partners. This has large

²⁶ www.euroregion-viadrina.de

²⁷ see Appendix 2

effects on the network architecture of the Euroregion. In the continuation of the research this essential difference will remain crucial. There are, however, other findings to be made in order to complete the comparative analysis.

Overall 224 organizations are registered within the network of which again several actors appear more than once. 129 different partners have applied successfully which means that on average actors participate in 1.68 projects. Eighty-nine projects are funded by INTERREG III A. Of these projects thirty-two are projects with non-dyadic clusters having up to six partners per project. Nine mainly infrastructural investment projects have only one executive organization. Roads leading to the border are perfect examples for such projects. In general it can be said that the binary architecture of the network leads to a relatively equal participation of organizations of both countries. 50 projects have one German and one Polish partner.

D	Pol
Stadt Frankfurt(Oder)	Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ), Gorzow
District Märkisch-Oderland (MOL)	Landkreis Gorzower Land
IHK Frankfurt (Oder)	Zachodia Izba Przemyslowo-Handlowa (ZIPH) (Kammer)
bbw Bildungszentrum Frankfurt (Oder)	City of Slubice

EUV Frankfurt (Oder)	Collegium Pollonicum
BIC Frankfurt (Oder) GmbH	Westliche IHK Polens
Landkreis-Oder-Spree	Landkreis Slubice
DRK-Kreisverband Aachen-Stadt	Landkreis Sulecin
Technologiepark Ost-Brandenburg GmbH	Feuerwehr Slubice
Tourismusverein FFO	Stadt Miedzyrzecz
Förderverein „Haus Sonnenhügel“ e.V.	PTTK in Gorzow (Tourism)
Arbeitsinitiative Letschin e.V.	

Table 4.3 Organizations executing more than one project

Table 4.3 shows that among actors with several appearances no home nation dominates the other. Both Polish and German organizations are equally active. But are they connected equally? To answer this question the same measurement is used as for the MRE region. The number of official partners in all projects is added up and compared to other active players. In the respective ranking (table 4.4) we see, similarly to our first region, that the number of projects is not a decisive factor for determining the importance of a node. The city of Slubice is involved in six projects. Most of them however are with the same partner, the city of Frankfurt (Oder). In total Slubice has only two connections.

Actor	Projects	Degree Centrality
Stadt Frankfurt(Oder)	16	18

District Märkisch-Oderland (MOL)	11	17
Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ), Gorzow	6	11
IHK Frankfurt (Oder)	6	9
Landkreis Gorzower Land	4	8

Table 4.4 Top 5 Organizations ranked by number of connections

Frankfurt is far more important by implementing projects with 18 different organizations. The German border city leads with 16 projects and 18 links ahead of the District or Landkreis Märkisch Oderland. Two Polish organizations are among the top five. Zakład Doskonalenia Zawodowego (ZDZ) is a public institution for apprenticeships, professional training and education. The corresponding German Industrie- und Handelskammer is similarly well connected. Gorzów Wielkopolski is a city in western Poland and one of the two capitals of Lubusz Voivodeship. The biggest oil fields in Poland are located near Gorzów. To sum up a very similar picture can be drawn from the ranking in order of the number of connections. There are three local authorities among the five most important actors within the Euroregions network.

4.3.2 Analysis of institutional framework

The Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina was created in 1993 and is constituted as two national sections. In Germany, the Euroregion is constituted as an association of municipalities, districts, associations, etc. (Verein "Mittlere Oder e. V.") and its office is in Frankfurt an der Oder. The districts of Märkisch-Oderland and Oder-Spree and the towns Frankfurt (Oder) and Eisenhüttenstadt form the territorial spread of the membership. "However formal members also include various economic and social

associations" (Grix, Knowles, 2002). On the other side of the border the Euroregion "involves 28 communal self-governing gminas²⁸ in the Polish voivodship²⁹ of Lubuskie" (Grix, Knowles, 2002). In Poland, it is an association of Polish municipalities with its headquarters in Gorzów. On the German side, in Brandenburg, the Euroregions exceptionally the approval authority, intermediary body (ILB) are responsible for receiving project drafts and advising on their relevance and eligibility. In Lubusz Voivodeship, the Regional Contact Point is responsible for receiving project drafts and advising on their relevance and eligibility. In both cases, the Euroregions are involved in the following step: in cooperation with the economic and social partners, the Euroregions provide a statement on the regional integration of the projects and their compliance with the development and activity concepts of the Euroregions. For each project, the statement is provided by the whole Euroregion i.e. both the German and the Polish national sections.

As in the MRE in this program, the Lead Partner principle is also not applied. Under no circumstances is there a common Lead Partner in charge of the overall project implementation and coordination on both sides of the border. Instead, there is a national Lead Partner. In the case of a mirror or joint project, for instance, there is a German and a Polish applicant. Since this cross-border region is a younger one, networks are not well established. Therefore many projects have the purpose of establishing new networks. The official INTERREG III A network that is analysed in this work must be seen as underlying architecture of several less structured and less visible connections and cooperations between organizations. This also becomes clear when priority formulation is considered. The core priorities Economic Cooperation, Development of

²⁸ The gmina is the smallest unit of self-government in Poland.

²⁹ The voivodship is the term for an administrative province of Poland.

Infrastructures, the Environment, Rural and Urban Development and Education, Qualification and Employment are the same with those in Maastricht. There are no particular measures mentioned and the order also differs from the older Euroregion. Economic Cooperation is first priority in this region and a total of 20 projects have been established. There are plans for flanking facilities and entrepreneurial services - measures to make qualifications available, for example - particularly in the field of future technologies, cooperation in the realm of research and development policies, joint product development programs and marketing strategies. The largest subnetwork is dominated by municipal actors, chambers of commerce and industry from both sides of the border. Additionally, some universities serve as partners. The second priority is the development of infrastructures with 15 projects. Under this priority, barriers still existing in the network of traffic routes will be eliminated in order to cope with the increasing cross-border traffic. Provision is made for measures concerning both traffic infrastructures and infrastructures in the fields of telecommunications, and water and energy supply. One third of the projects are only executed by a single organization. This is due to the closing of gaps in traffic route systems, predominantly the cycle way system. The connections to the border justify the use of EU-funds despite the absence of a cross-border partnership. For the creation of a cross-border network in the sense of this thesis these projects do not contribute at all. There is a strong dominance of local authorities in this subnetwork and the clusters are not very large. The number of actors per project does not exceed 3.

Furthermore and similarly to the MRE the third priority deals with the protection of the environment. The essential aims of this priority are the reduction of environmental pollution and risks, in view of sustainable, environmentally friendly development in the

border area, the protection of residential areas that are close to nature and to natural resources, elimination of abandoned industrial waste and cleansing of watercourses polluted through mining, and the construction of purification plants and waste water treatment systems. Seven projects are set up by actors, who can be considered specialists in this field. There are only two organizations within this subnetwork that have connections to other subnetworks.

In contrast to the MRE the development of rural and urban areas is a separate priority within the objectives of the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina. The subject of this priority is the development of the sparsely populated country regions. Support will be given to projects for the renovation of villages and to alternative employment initiatives. Partners cooperate in 10 different projects. Two additional projects have only one executing organization. Again only local governments are actors with outside connections. The Euroregion's fifth priority is developing education, qualification and employment. "With the backdrop of high structural unemployment, raising the level of qualification in the labour force acquires decisive importance."³⁰ There are projects for initial and further "vocational training for young people, for people in or out of work, further training measures for enterprises and teaching staff for vocational training, for youth exchange programs, and for establishing youth and sporting meeting facilities."³¹ The 19 partnerships are characterized by a significant number of educational institutions. The core connection within these institutions seems to be the cooperation between the European University Viadrina and the Collegium Polonicum of the Adam-Mickiewicz-University of Poznan which was opened in 1998. Moreover, of the 4000

³⁰ European Commission, Regional Policy INTERREG III A - Action priorities of Brandenburg (D) / Woiwodschaft Lubuskie (PL)

³¹ *ibid.*

students at Viadrina around 1000 are Polish. Chambers of commerce and municipalities are also active within this subnetwork.

Priority six is labelled "Cooperation" in the sense of coming together or social and cultural integration. Thirteen projects serve no specific purpose except to bring people from both sides of the border together. Another aim formulated by the Euroregion is to "render the border region more attractive, especially for the younger generation, so as to stop them leaving the area."³² These exchanges are organized by a diverse set of actors of which only the municipalities appear in other networks. The projects range from youth conferences such as YOUNG LIFE 2004 to ecumenical meeting places. Especially at this rather early stage of euroregional cooperation such a priority seems reasonable. Finally, the seventh priority is called the special priority and includes 4 projects that are not allocated to other subnetworks.

The distribution of actors within all clusters and priorities reinforces the importance of the role that local governments play. Successful Euroregions can only be created through active municipalities on both side of the border. Without their commitment no real network structure comes to existence.

5. Comparative Analysis

Before discussing the network analysis itself, a few interpretations to the comparison of institutional frameworks are presented. Both Euroregions' institutions pursue corresponding strategies. The objectives formulated by the two Euroregions show a similar approach in both regions. A high priority is given to economic projects in the MRE as well as in Frankfurt/Slubice. Furthermore, the protection environment plays an

³² *ibid.*

important role. In the Viadrina region most projects are established in the field of education, qualification and employment, which is also an important objective of the MRE. It can therefore be concluded that the structure of subnetworks is comparable in both Euroregions. The EU funding framework has lead to underlying network architectures that are almost identical in both regions. Although the MRE's projects are divided further into different measures so that smaller clusters can be identified. I will now turn to comparing these clustered networks in more detail.

First, I start by comparing general figures. Taking a look at the range of projects of both regions it can be said that the two Euroregions have distributed their budget among a similar number of projects. Moreover, they have included a similar number of organizations. In the Maas Rhine Euroregion network 129 players are involved in 76 projects. In the network of Frankfurt/Slubice 129 organizations participate in 89 projects. Surprisingly Pro Europa Viadrina has more projects than the MRE but these projects are significantly smaller. As many as 50 projects have only one German and one Polish partner. One major difference is therefore the number of partners that projects in both regions have (Table 5.1). Individual clusters are more notable in the MRE and the Euroregional network is far denser than that of Frankfurt/Slubice. In the Polish-German region there is no project that has more than six partners. The MRE has almost an equal high number of projects with twice as many organizations (11).

Partners per Project	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
MRE	7	8	10	17	14	9	5	1	1	1	3
Pro Europa Viadrina	9	50	18	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0

Table 5.1 Project size by number of partners

Why do these larger projects not lead to participation of more actors in the MRE? The reason lies in the different average number of projects an actor participates in (see Table 5.2). Here the number of all registered organizations is divided by the number of different organizations appearing in the network. The result shows how active the average player is by finding out how many projects it has on average. We have seen in chapter four that Viadrina's top five organizations in terms of connections actually participate in more projects than the top five of the MRE. The best example is the city of Frankfurt participating in sixteen projects. The best connected player of the MRE, the province of Limburg, is only involved in eight projects. However, the average number of projects an actor executes is significantly lower in the Pro Europa Viadrina region. This demonstrates that a high level of activity is limited to a small number of actors in this region. A higher amount of organizations participate in only one project.

	Maas-Rhine Euroregion	Pro Europa Viadrina
Registered executing organizations	340	224
Number of actors in network	129	129
Average projects per actor	2.64	1.68

Table 5.2 Comparing basic data

It can be interpreted that the MRE network is more established and better connected. Actors that are within the network are more active than in the Viadrina network. Mobilizing capacity is therefore indeed higher in a more mature Euroregion. Socio-economic relevance of the objectives set by both regions is similar. However, an

increasing mobilizing capacity also affects relevance positively. Thus, more mature regions are able to fulfil the dreams or meet the objectives that young regions have more effectively.

In order to answer the last question the connectedness is now compared. To compare the role of important organizations Degree Centrality is analysed. For comparing Degree Centrality of the key players in networks the formula for relative degree centrality is applied. When dividing the number of contacts each node has by the highest number of possible links the following results are obtained (see table 5.2 and 5.3).

Actor	RD(x)
Stadt Frankfurt(Oder)	0,1385
District Märkisch-Oderland (MOL)	0,1308
Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ), Gorzow	0,0846
IHK Frankfurt (Oder)	0,0692
Landkreis Gorzower Land	0,0615

Table 5.3 Top 5 Relative Degree Centrality Frankfurt/Slubice

Actor	RD(x)
Provincie Limburg (NL)	0,2403
Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgiens	0,2093
Stadt Aachen	0,1783
Kreis Aachen	0,1628
RWTH Aachen	0,1163

Table 5.4 Top 5 Relative Degree Centrality MRE

It becomes clear that local authorities and other municipal players are significantly better connected in the MRE. The Province of Limburg might participate in fewer projects than the city of Frankfurt; it does work together with almost twice as many organizations as the German municipality. In total, the Province of Limburg is connected to one fourth of all organizations. The German speaking community of Belgium participates in projects that involve one fifth of all organizations inside the Euroregional network. Moreover, the German speaking community of Belgium, the city of Aachen and the district of Aachen have more links with different partners than Frankfurt/Oder. The best connected player of the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina would end up in fifth place in the ranking of relative degree centrality in the MRE. Furthermore, overall relative degree centrality in Pro Europa Viadrina is very low. The value of 0.06 of the district Gorzow in Poland is hardly significant. All other actors have an even lower centrality results. There are descriptive inferences to be drawn from these figures. Not only does the role of local authorities as system integrators seem to be crucial for the network to have an integrating effect. This role does not change with a better connected network. Instead the importance of these municipalities rises.

Generally, one can say that all actors within the Euroregion Maas-Rhine are connected quite well and better than in the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina. The Dutch Province of Limburg is twice as degree central in its network as the city of Frankfurt (Oder). It plays a perfect role as hub between subnetworks. All top five actors also show a notable diversification in their involvement. The city of Aachen as well as the Province of Limburg and the German speaking Community in Belgium are active in almost all

priority fields. The German border city Aachen is involved in projects within four different priority fields. Although it is not present in the educational network one can say that the city of Aachen truly is a connector between particular clusters. All top five MRE actors are largely better connected and more important than their counterparts in the east. I will now answer the last question I have raised.

How powerful are these networks? Is it more about symbolic meaning of Euroregions? Are these networks more about ideas than functional logic, efficiency gains and output generation?

The institutional framework of the Euregio Aachen Maastricht shows that it is inappropriate to speak of a shift from "tight coupling" to "loose coupling" (Mayntz, 1993: 44). Cross-border regions are linked strongly and communication channels are well established. The Euregio Council is a prominent example for this. Moreover, the amount of costs that occur when undergoing the application process is proof of strength of the ties and interdependence within these networks. The relatively poor institutional coupling in the Viadrina region shows that such effects also take time and experience. Blatter (2003) came to a similar result in analyzing the Upper-Rhine-Valley region and the Konstanz region. He suggests talking of "increasingly organic and less mechanical" interactions or "elastic coupling" (Blatter, 2003: 513). My hypothesis was that in the short run symbolic gains outweigh. In the long run however the mobilizing capacity and socio-economic relevance should increase. The Euregio Council is the Meuse-Rhine's most promising achievement. The political groups of the council are formed according to party affiliation not nationality. Such an institution has not been established in the Frankfurt/Slubice area. Structures are far less institutionalized in the young region. This leads to less legitimacy of the cross-border actors such as the Euroregion offices. They

are not as powerful and indisputable as their counterparts in the west may be. A weaker position is therefore obtained in establishing network relations since the institutional network itself is not well developed. Concluding it can be said that in the long run mobilizing capacity and socio-economic relevance do increase. However, in the case of the MRE increasing output generation leads to "tighter coupling" and stronger institutions. The organic nature of the network is lost to some extent.

This leads us to think of certain policy recommendations for the Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina. Can lessons be learned from the questions that were answered in this work?

"The comparison is unfair" said the head of the Euroregion's office in Frankfurt (Oder) to me while I was researching in Pro Europa Viadrina's archives. He was right and I have admitted throughout this work that both Euroregions are at essentially different stages of development. Yet, I will try to draw a few conclusions for further strategies of the Frankfurt region.

First and far most the role of local authorities as system integrators remains crucial. If they cannot create an environment of competitive and responsive project generation the network approach is jeopardized. All major benefits depend on their power over the interplay of control and guidance and freedoms of ideas and cooperation. This role is well adopted by the city of Frankfurt and other German municipal actors. However, it has to be a high priority in the near future to stimulate the Polish partners. The Polish local authorities are not diversified enough in their activities. One reason for this might be the Polish unitary system. Despite all activity in many of the Candidate Countries in putting in place sub-national bodies, "national governments remain firmly in control of domestic sub-national actors, and these national governments

can be seen as gatekeepers in discussions with the Commission and in terms of preparation for Structural Funding" (Bailey and De Propriis, 2004: 94). While it can be argued that the Commission has been attempting to use PHARE and Cross-border regional cooperation to shift Candidate Countries towards a system of multilevel governance in relation to EU structural policy, it seems that national governments have quickly learned these so called gate-keeping roles and have been resisting Commission pressure. It will be interesting to see to what extent the Commission will be able to encourage this multilevel governance process further and stimulate sub-national involvement after its regional policy has been established fully and a couple of years of membership of the CEEC have gone by. The Euroregion itself should encourage Polish local authorities to increase their activities further.

The second major recommendation is to achieve a higher number of executing organizations per project. The low average number might be due to the young age of the region. However, it must not become the usual case or a common pattern.

A third and final recommendation is to develop the institutional framework further. The MRE's political and cultural success provides a perfect role model. This goal might be a long-term one considering recent German-Polish tensions but it is not out of reach.

6. Conclusion

The European Commission's attempt to actively encourage developments that transform the traditional fixed European three-tier government structure by establishing structural development programs that are characterized by concepts of "bottom-up" capacity building across Europe seems to work. The architecture that has been referred to as multilevel governance or network governance (Hooghe, Marks, 2001) becomes visible in

Euroregions such as the Maas-Rhine Euroregion and the Pro Europa Viadrina region. The empirical data displays municipalities, districts and societal actors forming negotiated agreements in a network form of cooperation.

A North-American example of spatial creation of a supranational region is the creation of Cascadia. Cascadia is an invented region that connects Canadian province of British Columbia and the US states of Washington and Oregon. This cooperation however does not appear to reproduce a territorial form by establishing public governing bodies and pursuing strategies targeted at a specific territory and its population. Cascadia remains an image while EU's Euroregions take action. Another view of the subject is given by Kramsch (2002) who discusses Euroregions from a postcolonial perspective. Colonial spatial imagination has tried to naturalize through the creation of suggestive maps "the continuity between colony and metropolis" (Kramsch, 2002: 175). This legacy for Kramsch can explain to some extent the reluctance of Euroregion citizens to believe in democratic transparency of such imagined and created spaces. The complicated nature of the organization form MRE adds to this impression. Despite all complexity the network approach has led to a considerable amount of activity.

The first question I have asked was: How widespread are such Euroregional networks? The objectives of the two Euroregion show how all-embracing the programs are. Almost every aspect of life in the region is eligible for European funding and the ideas and plans of the Euroregion seem to have no clearly visible border. The amount of projects is very large in both regions. Moreover, approximately 130 organizations work within both networks. This leads us to my central question: Who works in Euroregions? Not only local governments but many private organizations and societal actors establish projects with the help of INTERREG funds. All actors cooperate in a form that can be

seen a practical example of "lateral or horizontal patterns of exchange, independent flows of resources, reciprocal lines of communication" Powell (1990)³³. The numbers and tables confirm the significance of the network pattern for my research. The set of actors is large and very divers. The Viadrina network shows as much heterogeneity as the MRE. Organizations tend to build cluster and subnetworks in their field of operation. Most of these subnetworks also have a significant size.

In this widespread network actors are linked to different degrees. Some are very isolated and have only one or two links. Others are central and act as hubs connecting several subnetworks. These findings respond to the third question block: Which actors are better linked than others? Does the importance of actors play a role? In both Euroregions the role of local authorities as system integrators is essential. They show the most divers collection of contacts. When ranking actors according to their relative degree centrality the MRE's local authorities outscore their less connected counterparts in Frankfurt/Slubice. In general however, the importance of municipalities and subnational governments is crucial to the existence of both networks.

Furthermore, when comparing the two regions it can be concluded that the MRE network is better established and connected. Actors that are within the network are more active than in the Viadrina network. Therefore mobilizing capacity seems to be indeed higher in a more mature Euroregion. Moreover, the institutional framework reveals significant differences. In the Euregio Council of the MRE political groups are no longer formed according to nationality. The Frankfurt/Slubice region has not reached this level of institutionalization. These findings correspond to my hypothesis that in the short run symbolic gains overweigh. The Euroregion Frankfurt/Slubice is still in the first two or

³³ Quoted from Jones, Hesterly, Borgatti (1997: 915)

three planning periods. Breaking down cultural barriers and building up communication channels are major achievements for such a young region. More mature regions like the MRE do prove to have an increased socio-economic relevance. Over time, frameworks seem to be built up that stress the binding character of the network. Euregio Aachen Maastricht's council can be identified as an example of "tight coupling" rather than "loose coupling" (Mayntz, 1993: 44). Further research will have to clarify how strong the ties between organizations within the INTERREG III A funding schemes are legally and politically.

In answering my research questions I have used descriptive inference and a comparative case study. Gerring (2004: 347) notes that there is some "affinity" between both. Examining two Euroregions proved to be informative and appropriate to show how policy networks appear and what actors are central. I neither ask nor answer why-questions. However, my how- and what-questions provide valuable insight into Euroregional network architecture.

What is to come? In the next INTERREG budget programming period, from 2007 to 2013, all three strands of territorial cooperation – cross-border, transnational and interregional – are continued. The increase in funding for the next period is not considerably high. "Heavy pressure on overall expenditure resulted in a budget for territorial cooperation that increased by only a little, and certainly not in proportion with the increase in the number of regions and borders that we have seen with EU enlargement."³⁴ It will be interesting to see and to research whether the younger Euroregions follow the classic path of the older ones and what stage of integration the well connected west-European Euroregions will reach next.

³⁴ Danuta Hübner's (Regional Policy) Speech "The benefits of territorial cooperation – now and in the future" held at Interreg Forum in Stockholm, 17 February 2006

7. Bibliography

- Allen, D. (1996) "Cohesion and Structural Adjustment", in H. Wallace and W. Wallace (eds), *Policy-Making in the European Union*, Oxford University Press, pp.209–33.
- Alter, C., Hage, J. (1993) "Organizations working together" Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Armstrong, H.W. (1978) "Community Regional Policy: A Survey and Critique", *Regional Studies*, Vol.12, No.5, pp.511–28,
- Bache, I. (1998) "The Politics of European Union Regional Policy: Multi-level Governance Or Flexible Gatekeeping?" Sheffield Academic Press
- Bailey, D., de Propriis, L. (2004) "A Bridge Too Phare? EU Pre-Accession Aid and Capacity-Building in the Candidate Countries" *Journal of Common Market Studies* Volume 42 Page 77
- Bertram, H. (1998) "Double transformation at the eastern border of the EU: the case of the Euroregion pro Europa Viadrina" *GeoJournal*, Volume 44, Number 3
- van Beek, C. (1996) "Samenwerking? Er zijn grenzen! Onderzoek naar de invloed van de culturele factor op het proces van economische en politiekbestuurlijke integratie in de euregio Maas-Rijn" Rotterdam/Tilburg
- Bennett R., Krebs G. (1994) "Local Economic Development Partnerships: An Analysis of Policy Networks in EC-LEDA Local Employment Development Strategies", *Regional Studies*, Vol. 28, No 2, pp. 119 - 140
- Bennett., A., George,A., (2004) "Case Studies and Theory Development" Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Bennett., A. (1999) "Causal Inference in Case Studies: From Mill's Methods to Causal Mechanisms" APSA Atlanta
- Blatter, J. (2003) "Beyond Hierarchies and Networks: Institutional Logics and Change in Transboundary Spaces" *Governance* 16 (4), 503–526
- Casella, A. and J. Rauch, (2002), "Anonymous Market and Group Ties in International trade", *Journal of International Economics*.
- Cappellin , R. (1992) Theories of local endogenous development and international cooperation, in: M. Tykkylainen (Ed.) *Development Issues and Strategies in the New Europe*, pp. 1-19. Aldershot, Avebury.
- Castells, M. (1996) "The Rise of the Network Society" Oxford: Blackwell

- Cook, K. S., Whitmeyer, J. M. (1992) 'Two Approaches to Social Structure: Exchange Theory and Network Analysis' *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 18, pp. 109-127
- Dang-Nguyen, G., Schneider, V. and Werle, R. (1994) "Networks in European policymaking: Europeification of telecommunications policy" in: S. Andersen and
- Dankbaar, B., Corvers, F. and Hassink, R. (1994) "Euroregions, springboard to regional development?" in: Moulaert and Demaziere (Eds) *New Trends in Local Economic Development* Lille
- Dixit, Avinash, (2003) "On Modes of Economic Governance", *Econometrica*, Eliassen, K. (Eds.) *Making Policy in Europe: The Europeification of National Policymaking*, pp. 93-114. London: Sage Publications.
- Gerring, J. (2004) "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?" *American Political Science Review*, Page 341-354
- Granovetter, M. (1983) "The Strength of weak ties: a network theory revisited" *Sociological Theory*, Volume 1, 201-233
- Grix, J. and Knowles, V. (2002) "The Euroregion as a Social Capital Maximizer: The German-Polish Euroregion Pro-Europa Viadrina" *Regional & Federal Studies*, Volume 12, No 4
- Gualini, E. (2003) "Cross-border Governance: Inventing Regions in a Trans-national Multi-level Polity" *DISP*, Vol. 152, Issue 1, Page 43-52
- Hooghe, L. (1996) "Building a Europe with the Regions: The Changing Role of the European Commission", in L. Hooghe (ed.), *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-Level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.89-126
- Hooghe, L. Marks, G. (2001) "Multi-Level Governance and European Integration (Governance in Europe)" Rowman & Littlefield
- Jackson, M. (2002) "A survey of Models of Network Formation: Stability and Efficiency" *Group Formation in Economics: Networks, Clubs and Coalitions*, Cambridge
- Jones, Hesterly, Borgatti (1997) "A General Theory of Network Governance: Exchange Conditions and Social Mechanisms" *The Academy of Management Review*, pp. 911-945
- Kenis, P., Schneider, V. (1991) "Policy Networks and Policy Analysis: Scrutinizing a New Analytical Toolbox." Pp. 25-62 in *Policy Networks: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations*, edited by Bernd Marin and Renate Mayntz. Boulder/Frankfurt: Campus/Westview Press

- Kepka, J. and Murphy, A. (2002) "Euroregions in Comparative Perspective" in Kaplan, H. and Häkli, J. "Boundaries and Place: European Borderlands in Geographical Context"
- Knippenberg, H. (2004) "The Maas-Rhine Euroregion: A Laboratory for European Integration?" *Geopolitics*, Volume 9, NO 3 pp. 608 - 626
- Kramsch, O. (2002) "Reimagining the Scalar Topologies of Cross-border Governance: Eu(ro)regions in the Post-colonial Present" *Space & Polity*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 169–196
- Kranton, Rachel and Deborah Minehart, (2001), "A Theory of Buyer-Seller Networks", *American Economic Review* 91, pp. 485-508.
- Marin B. (1990) "Governance and Generalized Exchange: Self-organizing Policy Networks in Action" Campus/Westview Press, Frankfurt
- Marin B. and Mayntz R. (Eds) (1991) "Policy Networks: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations", Campus, New York.
- Markusse, J. (2004) "Transborder Regional Alliances in Europe: Chances for Ethnic Euroregions?" *Geopolitics*, Vol.9, No.3 pp.649–673
- Mayntz, R. (1993) "Policy networks and the Logic of Negotiated Systems" in Heritier, A. (ed) "Policy analysis: Critique and new perspectives" Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag
- Miles, R., Snow, C. (1986) "Organizations: New concepts for new forms" *California management review* 28
- Moravcsik, A. (1993) "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.31, No.4, pp.473–524
- Paasi, Anssi (2002) "Regional Transformation in the European Context: Notes on Regions, Boundaries and Identity" *Space & Polity*, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 197- 201
- Perkmann, Markus (2002), "The rise of the Euroregion. A bird's eye perspective on European cross-border cooperation"
- Powell, W. (1990) "Neither markets nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization" in Staw and Cummings "Research in organizational behaviour", Greenwich, p. 259-336
- Rauch, J. and Casella, A. (eds.) (2001) "Networks and Markets", Russel Sage Foundation, New York
- Ribhegge, H. (1996) "Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina. Chancen und Schwierigkeiten einer grenzüberschreitenden Kooperation" in *Weltrends Nummer* 13

- Scharpf, F.W. (1997) "Games Real Actors Play" Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Scott, J. (2002) "A Networked Space of Meaning? Spatial Politics as Geostrategies of European Integration" *Space & Polity*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 147–167
- Sutcliffe, J. (2002) "Subnational Influence on the Structural Funds: The Case of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland" *Regional & Federal Studies*, Routledge, Vol 12, No 3
- Thielemann, E. (2002) "The Price of Europeanization: Why European Regional Policy Initiatives Are a Mixed Blessing" *Regional & Federal Studies*, Taylor & Francis
- Wallace, H., (1977) "National Bulls in the Community China Shop: The Role of National Governments in Community Policy-Making" in H. Wallace, W. Wallace, and C. Webb (eds.), *Policy-Making in the European Community*. New York, pp.33–68
- Wallace, H. (1977b), "The Establishment of the Regional Development Fund: Common Policy or Pork Barrel?" in H. Wallace, W. Wallace, and C. Webb (eds), *Policy-Making in the European Community* New York, pp.137–63
- Ward, S., Williams, R. (1997) "From Hierarchy to Networks? Sub-central Government and EU Urban Environment Policy" 35 *Journal of Common Market Studies*
- Wise, M. and G. Croxford (1988) 'The European Regional Development Fund: Community Ideals and National Realities', *Political Geography Quarterly*, Vol.7, No.2, pp.161–82

Appendix1: Actors in the Euroregion Maas Rhine

Priority 1 - Improvement of the physical infrastructure											No of Actors
Measure 1.1 - Improvement of the work context											
<u>Campus Europa</u>	Gemeente Heerlen	Stadt Aachen									2
<u>GEMAAL</u>	Gemeente Maastricht	Stadt Genk	Stadt Asldorf	Stadt Eupen							4
<u>WTC</u>	Stichting WTC Heerlen-Aachen	Kamer van Koophandel en Fabrieken voor Zuid-Limburg	Industrie- und Handelskammer Aachen								3
Measure 1.2 - Stimulation of cross-border mobility											
<u>ÖPNV in der EMR</u>	Regio Aachen e.V.										1
<u>Eifel-verkehrsplanung</u>	Wirtschaftsförderungsgesellschaft Ostbelgiens	Kreis Euskirchen	Region Wallonne								4
<u>Mobilität im Dreiländereck</u>	Wirtschaftsförderungsgesellschaft Ostbelgiens	Ministère Wallon de l'Équipement et du Transport (MET)	Gemeente Vaals	Kreis Aachen							4

<u>Monitoring goederenvervoer</u>	Provincie Limburg (NL)	Staatskanzlei NRW	Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap, Departement	Leefmilieu en Infrastructuur, Brussel	Ministère Wallon de l'Équipement et du Transport (MET), Namur							5
<u>ÖV-Sofortprogramm EMR</u>	Aachener Verkehrsverbund GmbH	SNCB	Euregio Verkehrsschiennennetz-Stolberg	Parkstad Limburg	De Lijn							5
Priority 2 - Promotion of economic and scientific/technological cooperation												
Measure 2.1 - Stimulation of new activities and innovative activities												
<u>OLED Lichtquelle</u>	RWTH Aachen, Institut für Theoretische Elektrotechnik	Université de Liège, Institut de Physique										2
<u>AutoNet.eu</u>	NV Industriebank LIOF, Maastricht	Flanders' DRIVE vzw	Cluster automobilité de Wallonie	Limburgse Economische Raad vzw	Car e.V., Aachen	AGIT mbH, Aachen						6
<u>CMD</u>	Fachhochschule Aachen	Hogeschool Zuyd, Heerlen	Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg									3
<u>EuBAN</u>	AGIT mbH, Aachen	Socran, Angleur	Limburg BAN, Hasselt	WFG Ostbelgiens, Eupen	NV Industriebank LIOF, Maastricht							5
<u>Euregioaal Bedrijven Platform</u>	Kamer van Koophandel en Fabrieken voor Zuid-Limburg	Industrie- und Handelskammer Aachen	Industrie- und Handelskammer Eupen-Malmedy-St. Vith	Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie Liège-	Kamer voor Handel en Nijverheid van							5

<u>EuRegional e 2008</u>	AGIT mbH, Aachen	Deutschsprac h. Gemeinschaft Belgiens	Regio Parkstadt Limburg	Gewest Maastricht Megelland								4
<u>Life Sciences</u>	AGIT mbH, Aachen	RWTH Aachen	UM Holding, Universiteit Maastricht	Universite de Liege, Interface Entreprises- Universite	Wirtschafts förderungs gesellschaft LIOF, Ostbelgien	NV Industrie bank Maastric	Gemeente Maastricht					7
<u>Micropartic ules</u>	Centre des Recherches Métallurgiques, Liege	RWTH Aachen – Research Network Innovative	Limburgs Universitair Centrum, Centrum voor Milieukunde	Hogeschool Zuyd, Heerlen								4
<u>MR Triangle</u>	AGIT mbH, Aachen	NV Industriebank LIOF, Maastricht	Provincie Limburg (NL)	SPI+, Liège								4
<u>Strategisch Innoveren</u>	Universiteit Maastricht, MERIT	Limburgs Universitair Centrum	AGIT mbH, Aachen	SPI+, Liège								4
<u>TERA- GRID</u>	Université de Liège GIGA	RWTH Aachen	Universiteit Maastricht	Limburgs Universitair Centrum								4
<u>Transcend</u>	Universite de Liege, Interface Entreprises- Universite	AGIT mbH, Aachen	NV Industriebank LIOF, Maastricht									4
<u>Wissensch afts- kommunika tion EMR</u>	RWTH Aachen, Dezernat für Presse und Öffentlichkeitsa rbeit	Universiteit Maastricht	Limburgs Universitair Centrum	Deutschspr achige Gemeensch aft Belgien								4

Measure 2.2 - Tourism											
<u>Wasserlebens-Eifel</u>	Rursee-Touristik GmbH für MRRT e.V.	Gemeinde Bütgenbach	Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgiens	Gemeinde Simmerath	Rureifel-Tourismus e.V.	Stadt Heimbach	Gemeinde Hürtgenwald				7
<u>Châteaux de la Meuse</u>	Federation du Tourisme de la Province Liège asbl	VVV Zuid-Limburg	Tourisme Limburg vzw								3
<u>Coeur(s) de Ville</u>	Ville de Liège	Stad Heerlen	Stad Hasselt	Stadt Aachen	Stad Maastricht						5
<u>Couven Route</u>	Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgiens	Stadt Aachen	Provincie Limburg (NL)	Provinz Belgisch Limburg							4
<u>DAL Grenzenloos Limburg</u>	Stichting Samenwerkende VVV's	Limburg (SVL), Maastricht	Toerisme Limburg vzw, Hasselt								3
<u>EBGN</u>	Université de Liège -Unité aCREA	Botanische Tuin Kerkrade	Park Natuur & Cultuur, Hasselt								3
<u>Eifel-Ardennen Marketing Büro</u>	Eifel Tourismus (ET) GmbH, Prüm	Eifel-Touristik Agentur NRW e.V., Bad Münstereifel	Verkehrsamt der Ostkantone, St. Vith	Sport und Tourismus im Landkreis	Bitburg-Prüm GmbH						5
<u>Vallée de la Geule</u>	Agence de Développement Local Lontzen	Verkehrsamt der Ostkantone	Gemeente Vaals								3

<u>Wasserland Eifel-Ardenne</u>	Rursee-Touristik GmbH für MRRT e.V.	Verbandsge-meinde Daun	Ortsgemeinde Schalkenmehren	Ville de Verviers	Association de gestion du complexe touristique								5
<u>Zeitreisen</u>	Vereniging „CulTour Euregio“ - Kerkrade												1
Priority 3 - Protection of the environment													
Measure 3.1 - Protection of the environment, nature and the countryside													
<u>Drielanden park</u>	Provincie Limburg (NL)	Region Wallone	Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap	Kreis Aachen	Stadt Aachen	Province de Liege	Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgiens	Provinz Belgisch Limburg					8
<u>Europom A, Europom B</u>	Nationale Boomgarten Stichting, Viermaal-Kortesse	Stichting IKL, Roermond	Stichting Botanische Tuin, Kerkrade	Nature&Technique, Bilstain	RWTH Aachen								5
<u>Raeren-Petergensfeld</u>	Gemeinde Raeren	A.I.D.E.	Gemeinde Roetgen										3
<u>Heiden-Moore</u>	Commission de gestion du parc naturel, Eifel	Reserves Naturelles RNOB, Brüssel	Universite der Liege	Biologische Station im Kreis Aachen	Biologische Station im Kreis Düren	Biologische Station im Kreis Euskirch	Naturpark Nord-Eifel						7
<u>Heiden-Moore II</u>	Commission de gestion du parc naturel, Eifel	Reserves Naturelles RNOB, Brüssel	Universite der Liege	Biologische Station im Kreis Aachen	Biologische Station im Kreis Düren	Biologische Station im Kreis Euskirch	Naturpark Nord-Eifel						7

Rode Beek	Gemeente Onderbanken	Gemeinde Gangelt										2
Wege des Wassers	RWTH Aachen	Universite der Liege	Waterschap Roer en Oevermaas, Sittard	Ministerie van Verkeer en Waterstaat, Directie	Zuiveringschap Limburg Roermond	Vrije Universiteit Aardwetenschap						6
Iterbach-Tueljebach	A.I.D.E.											1
Measure 3.2 - Development of rural areas												
Regionale vermarktung in der EMR	Aachener Stiftung Kathy Beys	Landwirtschaftskammer Rheinland Kreisstelle Aachen-	Landwirtschaftskammer Rheinland Kreisstelle Aachen-	Interessengemeinschaft Regionale Produkte (IG-	Die Raupe, Eupen	Provincie Limburg (NL)	Mergelwind e.V.					7
Industrielle Folge-landschaft	Kreis Aachen	Kreis Düren	Gemeinde Übach-Palenberg	Gemeinde Gangelt	Stadt Aachen	Aachener Stiftung Kathy Beuss	Gemeente Heerlen	Gemeente Onderbanken	Gemeente Kerkrade	Gemeente Landgraf	Gemeente Brunssum	11
Sint-Pietersberg	Regionaal Landschap Haspengouw, Hasselt	Gemeente Maastricht	Gemeente Eijsden, Administratie communale de Visé	Commune d'Oupeye	Commune de Bassenge	Gemeente Riemst	Cynorhodon asbl - Bassenge Réserves Naturelles	Vereniging Natuurmonumenten	Stichting het Limburgs Landschap	Natuurpunt, Mechelen	Musée du Silex asbl, Eben-Emael	11
Priority 4 - Development and enhancement of human resources												
Measure 4.1 - Strengthening of the cross-border job market												
Euro-Mobilzeit	Stabsstelle für Projektentwicklung, Forschung und Gleichstellung	Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgiens	Beschäftigung und Europäische Programme, Eupen	Gemeente Heerlen	Fondation André Renard, Liège	Subregionaal Tewerkstellingscomité						6

<u>Regenbogen</u>	Verein für Integration durch Arbeit, Aachen	Tagesstätten Kelmis&Umgebung VoE "König Baudouin".	AIGS, Votten	Stichting WAD, Kerkrade								4
<u>TUL</u>	Universiteit Maastricht	Limburgs Universitair Centrum										2
Measure 4.2 - Education and vocational training												
<u>Euregiokompetenz Plus</u>	Stichting Euregio Maas-Rhein											1
<u>AutoWEB Training</u>	AutoFORM asbl	ZAWM Eupen	ARCUS College Heerlen	VIA Opleidingen Diepenbeek	Handwerkskammer Aachen							5
<u>C@ke</u>	Berufskolleg des Kreises Aachen, Herzogenrath	Berufskolleg des Kreises Heinsberg, Geilenkirchen	ARCUS College Heerlen	ZAWM, Eupen								4
<u>Campus Automobile</u>	LE FOREM	Université de Liège	RWTH Aachen für das Institut für Kraftfahrwesen	Université de Liège	VETC Vlaams Engineering en Testcentrum	ALLANT A vzw, Genk						6
<u>CaroLingua</u>	Provinciale Onderwijsinspectie Talentcademie Nederland	EU-Geschäftsstelle Wirtschaft und Berufsbildung	Communauté française Wallonie-Bruxelles	Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgien	Pädagogische Dienststelle							5
<u>Dual Masterprogramm ICT</u>	Universiteit Maastricht	Limburgs Universitair Centrum										2

<u>PROQUA-Euregiokompetenz</u>	Stichting Euregio Maas-Rhein												1
<u>Qualité</u>	EPICURIS Le centre de competence des metiers de bouche, Villers-	LE FOREM	VIA Opleidingen Diepenbeek	Dürener Gesellschaft für Arbeitsförderung mbH	ZAWM, Eupen	ARCUS College Heerlen	Handwerk skammer Aachen	Nelly Pütz Berufskolleg	Ecole d'Hotellerie de Liege	Syntra Limburg vzm			10
<u>Social Work</u>	Stichting Hogeschool Zuyd	Katholieke Fachhochschule Nordrhein-Westfalen	Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg (Departement Sociaal-	Hogeschool Limburg (Departement Sociaal-Agogisch-	HEMES-ESAS (Département Assistants	Haute Ecole Charlemagne (Catégori							6
<u>Synergien in der Fleischerausbildung</u>	ZAWM, Eupen	Handwerkskammer Aachen											2
<u>KOMM</u>	Stichting HORA EST												1
Priority 5 - Stimulation of social integration													
Measure 5.1 - Social integration													
<u>Euregio For All</u>	Dienststelle für Pers.m.Behinderung der Deutschpr. Gemeinschaft, St. Vith	Versorgungsamt Aachen	Provincie Limburg	AIGS, Liege	IRv Limburg	Kenniscentrum voor Relvalidatie en Handicap							6
<u>Eurecard</u>	Dienststelle für Pers.m.Behinderung der Deutschpr. Gemeinschaft, St. Vith	Versorgungsamt Aachen	Vlaams Fonds voor sociale Integratie van Personen met een Handicap,	Agence Wallone pour l'Integration des Pers. handicapées, Charleroi	Provincie Limburg								5

<u>Euregio-Konekt</u>	Stadt Würselen	Bildungswerk Aachen	A.I.G.S	A l'ecoute des jeunes	Centrum voor Maatschappelijke Gelijkheid	Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft Belgien							6
<u>RECES</u>	CRIPEL, Liège	Stichting Hogeschool Zuyd	Regionaal instituut voor maatschappelijke opbouw	Belgisches Rotes Kreuz Eupen	Katholisch Fachhochschule NRW	DRK-Kreisverband Aachen							6
<u>Risicogedrag adolescenten</u>	GGD Noord en Midden-Limburg, Venlo	GGD Westelijke Mijnstreek, Geleen	GGD Oostelijk Zuid-Limburg, Heerlen	GGD Zuidelijk Zuid-Limburg, Maastricht	Gesundheitsamt des Kreises Heinsberg	Gesundheitsamt der Stadt Aachen	Gesundheitsamt des Kreises Düren	Gesundheitsamt des Kreises Euskirchen	Provincie Limburg, Directie Welzijn, Hasselt	AG für Suchtverhütung und Lebensbewältigung	Gesundheitsamt des Kreises Aachen		11
Measure 5.2 - Promotion of cultural identity													
<u>After Cage</u>	Neuer Aachener Kunstverein	Z33, Hasselt	Espace 251 Nord, Liège	Marres, Maastricht									4
<u>Grenzgeschichten</u>	VHS Bildungsinstitut VoE, Eupen	Volkshochschule Aachen	Fondation André Renard, Liège	Limburgs Universitair Centrum, Diepenbeek	Gemeente Kerkrade								5
<u>NDZW</u>	Kreisstadt Heinsberg	Parkstadt Limburg											2
Measure 5.3 - Cooperation between care institutions and organizations													
<u>Zorg over de grens in de EMR</u>	Academisch Ziekenhuis Maastricht	CZ Zorgverzekeringen	Stichting Centrale Zorgverzekeraarsgroep	Ziekenfonds, Sittard	Owm Zorgverzekeraars VGZ, Nijmegen								5

<u>Chronos</u>	Psycho medisch Steekcentrum Vijverdal	Alexianer Krankenhaus, Aachen	Openbaar Psychatrisc Ziekenhuis (OPZ) Rekem	Sint Jozef vzw Medisch Centrum, Bilzen									4
<u>Profinteg</u>	Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Liège	Projet Come Back- Behindertenst ätten Eupen VoE	Universiteit Maastricht, Instituut Hersenen en Gedrag										3
<u>Unfallversic herung</u>	ETHIAS, Lüttich	Rheinischer Gemeindeunf allversicherun gsverband, Düsseldorf											2
Measure 5.4 - Cooperation between public authorities													
<u>Netzwerk Bürgerinfoz entren</u>	REGIO Aachen e.V.	Deutschsprac hige Gemeinschaft Belgiens	Grens Infopunt										3
<u>Bürgeranla ufstelle</u>	Polizeipräsidiu m Aachen	PolitieLimbur g Zuid	Gemeente Kerkrade	Stadt Herzogenrat h									4
<u>Clearingstel le</u>	Stichting Euregio Maas- Rhein												1
<u>Ehrenamts börse in der EMR</u>	DRK- Kreisverband Aachen-Stadt	Belgisches Rotes Kreuz Deutschsprach ige Gemeinschaft	Nederlandse RK-district Zuid-Limburg	Limburgs Rode Kruis									4
<u>EIS</u>	Provincie Limburg (NL)	AGIT mbH, Aachen	Universite der Liege	Limburgs Economisch e Raad Hasselt	Deutschspr achige Gemeensch aft Belgiens								5

EMRIC	Provincie Limburg (NL)	Province de Liège	Provincie Limburg (B)	Berufsfeuerwehr Aachen	GHOR Zuid-Limburg	CIPAL DV						6
Plannen en bouwen	Provincie Limburg (NL)	Gemeente Heerlen	Stadt Aachen	Kreis Aachen	Gemeente Sittard-Geleen	Gemeente Maastricht	Kreis Heinsberg	Kreis Euskirchen	Region Wallone			9
Polizei- zusammenarbeit	Politie Limburg-Zuid, Maastricht	Polizei-Präsidium Aachen	Federale Politie België, Brussel									3
76	Projects										Sum	340

Appendix 2: Actors in the Euroregion Frankfurt/Slubice

Project name	Project executing organizations						
Priority 1 - Economic Cooperation							No of Actors
„Viadukt“ (Gründerviadukt)	BIC Frankfurt (Oder) GmbH	Powiatowy Urząd Pracy w Gorzowie Wlkp. (Existenzgründung)	Stowarzyszenie Wspierania Małych Przedsiębiorczości (Teil ETN und Partnerschaften)				3
Frankfurter Verkehrstage 2001, 2002, 2003	Stadt Frankfurt (Oder), Wirtschaftsförderung	City of Slubice					2
Marketing-Assistenz	bbw Bildungszentrum Frankfurt (Oder)	Deutsch-Pol Bildungstiftung der Wirtschaft, Zielona Góra					2
Polen-Coaching KMU	IHK Frankfurt (Oder)	Zachodnia Izba Przemysłowo-Handlowa (ZIPH) (Kammer)					2
LOGTRANS 2002 Frankfurt (Oder)	Stadt FFO, Amt für Wirtschaft	IHK Frankfurt (Oder)	Frankfurter Institut für umweltorientierte Logistik	Deutsche Verkehrs-Zeitung Hamburg	Westliche Wirtschaftskammer Gorzów Wlkp. (ZIG)		5
Euro Investor II	Technologiepark Ost-Brandenburg GmbH FFO	Polsko-Niemieckie Towarzystwo Wspierania Gospodarki S.A.					2

Service Centre „Polen“	IHK Frankfurt (Oder) FFO	Zachodnia Izba Przemysłowo- Handlowa (ZIPH) (Kammer)					2
Viadukt II	BIC Frankfurt (Oder) GmbH	Powiatowy Urząd Pracy w Gorzowie Wlkp. (Existenzgründung)	Stowarzyszenie Wspierania Małej Przedsiębiorczości (Teil ETN und Partnerschaften)				3
„Access Polish Markt“	Technologiepark Ost- Brandenburg GmbH FFO	Deutsch-Polnische Wirtschaftsförderge- sellschaft AG	Sonderwirtschafts- zone Kosztyń- Slubice	TU Warschau	Institut für Land- und Lebensmittelw- irtschaft	Institut des Elektronikm- arktes, GmbH	6
(RSK) – Räumliches Strukturkonzept FFO- Slubice (Fortschr.)	Stadt FFO	City of Slubice					2
Fit für die Deutsch- Polnische Zusammenarbeit für KMU	HWK – Frankfurt (Oder)	Izba Rzemiosła i Przedsiębiorców (Kammer)					2
Qualität ohne Grenzen (Qualitätsmanagement), in grenz-überschreitenden Wirtschaftskooperationen	VQB Verein für Qualitätsförderung BB e.V.	Inżynierów i Techników Mechaników Polskich), Verein in Gorzów	Zachodnie Stowarzyszenie Rozwoju Gospodarczego, Verein in Szczecin	Zachodnia Izba Przemysłowo- Handlowa (ZIPH) (Kammer)	TU Zielona Góra	TU Poznań	6
„Wirtschaftskraft mit Pferdestärken“	Stadt FFO	Tourismusverbände MOL/LOS	Westliche IHK Polens	Pferdezüchter verband Polens	5 Pferdehöfe in Brandenburg		5
Gemeinsames Vermarktungskonzept für das Reisegebiet beiderseits der Oder	MOL	Städtische Abteilung PTTK in Gorzów					2
Touristisches Marketing	Tourismusverein FFO	Burmistrz Skubic Ryszard Bodziacki					2

„Grenzübergreifendes Marketing“	Stadt FFO						1
Aufbau effizienter Gesamtlogistikketten unter Einbeziehung von Unternehmen des deutsch-poln. Grenzraumes	ETTC – Gesellschaft FFO	Insytut Logistyki i Magazynowania EAN Polska, staatl.	Wirtschaftsberatungsteam TOR, Warszawa, GmbH				3
Bedarfs-, Handlungs- und Entwicklungskonzept des Tourismus in der ER PEV	IHK-Projektgesellschaft mbH	Stadt FFO					2
branchenorientierte Information und Kooperation in der Grenzregion Brandenburg - Lubuskie	Kowa, Verein zur Förderung der Kooperation von Wissenschaft und Arbeitswelt in Ost BB FFO	NSZZ Solidarnosc, Gorzow					2
Grenzüberschreitende Beratung von deutschen Verbrauchern mit rechtlichen Fragen	Verbraucherzentrale Brandenburg e.V.	Federacja Konsumentow Rada Krajowa (Verbraucherschutzorg)					2
Priority 2 - Development of infrastructures							
Skaterweg und Radweg	Stadt Lebus	Gemeinde Gorzyca	Klub Sportowy				3
JoinTraMan – Joint Transport Management (PEV / SNB)	Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg GmbH	Wojewodschaft Lubuskie, Marschallamt					2
Radweg Bleyen-Hohenwutzen	MOL						1

Lückenschluss am Radweg von Zechin nach Kostrzyn	Amt Golzow						1
Ausbau Verbindungsstraße Falkenberg-Amalienhof	Landkreis Märkisch-Oderland						1
Dreisprachiges touristisches Wegeleitsystem	Stadt FFO	City of Slubice					2
Radweg von Fürstenwalde nach Kostrzyn	Landkreis Märkisch-Oderland						1
Ausbau der K 6701 von Breslack bis Wellmitz	Landkreis Oder-Spree						1
Radweg entlang der Bundesstraße 1-Manchnow	Stadt Seelow						1
Europagarten Frankfurt (Oder) – Slubice 2003	Stadt FFO	City of Slubice					2
Anlegestelle Brieskower See für Fährgastschiffe	Amt Brieskow-Finkenheerd	Landkreis Sulecin, Landrätin					2
Anbindung des mittleren Oderbruchs an die Oder-Lausitz-Trasse und Grenzübergang Küstrin-Kietz K6410,	Landkreis Märkisch-Oderland	Landkreis Gorzower Land	LK Slubice				4

Fähre Güstebieser Loose - Gozduwice	Gemeinde Neulewin	Gemeinde Mieszkowie					2
Grenzüberschreitender Wassertourismus Ufereinfassung	Stadt Eisenhüttenstadt	Stadt Cybinka					2
Neubau einer Messehalle	Stadt FFO	City of Slubice	Westliche IHK Polens				3
Priority 3 - The environment							
Abwasserentsorgung Bomsdorf – Breslack – Steinsdorf	Gubener Wasser – u. Abwasserverband LOS	Przedsiębiorstwo Oczyszczania Sciekow, Abwasserbehandlung					2
Greenway Teil 2	Stadt FFO Amt für Brand-, Katastrophenschutz	Feuerwehr Slubice					2
Abwasserentsorgung Steinsdorf/Coschen/Breslack	Gubener Wasser- u. Abzweckverband	Przedsiębiorstwo Oczyszczania Sciekow, Abwasserbehandlung					2
„Natur- und Kulturwege im Lebusser Land“	NaturFreunde Landesverband BB e.V.	PTTK Miedzyrzec, Sulecin, Gorzow					2
Umwelt- und Katastrophenschutz	Stadt FFO Amt für Brand-, Katastrophenschutz	Eigenbetrieb Bevölkerungsschutz des LK Oder-Spree	Feuerwehr Gorzow	Feuerwehr Slubice			4

Umweltbildungsstätten sowie Entwicklung u. Förderung des Naturraumpotentials in der Region – PEV (Ausbau)	Landesumweltamt BB	Landeslehrstätte Lebus	Park Narodowy "Ujście Warty"				3
Priority 4 - Rural and urban development							
Errichtung des mehrsprachigen Besucherleitsystems in Märkisch-Oderland, Touristisches Leitsystem	Tourismusverband Märkisch-Oderland						1
Internationaler Kinderbauernhof	Gemeinde Petershagen	Urząd Gminy Bogdaniec					2
Broschüre Oder-Neiße-Radweg D-POL-CH	Arbeitsinitiative Letschin e.V.	Verein für Entwicklung von Wirtschaftsinnovationen und Tourismus					2
Oderbruchs (Bleyen-Gorgast) an den Oder-Neiße-Radweg, die L 33 und Grenzübergang Küstrin-Kietz	Landkreis Märkisch-Oderland	Gemeinde Sulechów	Landkreis Powiat Gorzowski				3
Landfrauen im Zeichen der Zeit	Arbeitsinitiative Letschin e.V.	Landfrauenverein Mittleres Oderburch e.V.	Bezirksverein der Bauern(WZRKiOR)				3
Ausbau – „Bremsdorfer Mühle“	DHJ - Landesverband Berlin	PTSM, Szczecin (Jugendherbergen)					2
Einheitliche Gestaltung des Oder-Neiße-Radweges im Bereich des Oderbruches zw. FFO u. Hohensaaten	Arbeitsinitiative Letschin e.V.	PTTK Miedzyrzec, Sulecin, Gorzów					2

Grenzüberschreitender Tourismus – Brücke zum Osten	Tourismusverband Oder-Spree-Seengebiet e.V. (TOSS) LOS	Landratsamt Slubice					2
Radwege R 1 Kugel-Kienbaum-Maxsee T B und länderübergreifende Radwege Beeskow-Sulecin	Landkreis Oder-Spree						1
Grenzüberschreitendes Entwicklungs- und Handlungskonzept	MOL	Stadt FFO	LOS				3
Touristische Verkehrswegeleitsystem in LOS	Landkreis-Oder-Spree	Landratsamt in Slubice					2
Touristische Verkehrswegeleitsystem in MOL	MOL	Landratsamt Gorzow					2
Priority 5 - Education, qualification and employment							
Kinder der Grenzregion – Partner von Morgen	Förderverein „Haus Sonnenhügel“ e.V.	Przedsiekole Samorzadowe (KiTa)	Schule Guben				3
Sanierung und Umbau von Schul- u. Internatsgebäuden für das Europäische Gymnasium im Stift Neuzelle	Stiftung Stift Neuzelle	Starosta Krosnienski (Bildung LK Krosno)					2
Kinder der Euroregionen – Sprache verbindet	Förderverein „Haus Sonnenhügel“ e.V.	Kindergarten Nr.2 in Jasien					2

Einrichtung eines europäischen Wissenschaftszentrums	EUV Frankfurt (Oder)	Collegium Pollonicum	Adam-Mickiewicz-Uni Poznan				3
Benachteiligte Jugendliche als Systembauer „JUBaS“	QCW Qualifizierungszentrum der Wirtschaft	Gorzowskie Centrum Kształcenia Praktycznego					2
„Deutsch-Polnische Jugendfabrik – Die lernende Fabrik“	bbw Bildungszentrum Frankfurt (Oder)	Stadt FFO	Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ) Gorzow				3
„Jugend-, Freizeit- und Kommunikationszentrum“	Kinderring Neuhardenberg e.V.	Urad Miasta i Gminy (Jugendeinrichtung)					2
Bildung kleiner Handwerksbetriebe im Blickwinkel der EU-Osterweiterung	Gemeinnütziger Verein e.V. Lietzen	Stadt Miedzyrzecz	Berufsbildungsstätte in Bobowicko	Berufsbildungseinrichtung Lubuska Wojewodza Komena	Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ) Gorzow		5
Weiterentwicklung Fort Gorgast	Arbeitsinitiative Letschin e.V.	Bürgermeister von Dobiegniew					2
Integrative Erstausbildung sozialbenachteiligter d. und p. Jugendlicher - Qualifizierungsprojekt	Landkreis-Märkisch-Oderland	Ochoćnicze Hufce Pracy Centrum Kształcenia i Wychowania, Ausbildungszentrum					2
EU-Ausbildung für das grenzüberschreitende Speditionsgeschäft	IHK Frankfurt (Oder)	Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ) Gorzow					2
Einrichtung eines dt.-poln. Career-Centers	EUV Frankfurt (Oder)	Collegium Pollonicum	Adam-Mickiewicz-Uni Poznan				3

Schule Wirtschaft Euregio	Stiftung der Deutschen Wirtschaft für Qualifizierung u. Kooperation e.V.	6 Gymnasien ffo, hütte, beeskow, storkow					2
Integration von Behinderte und Schwerbehinderte AN	ISB Gesellschaft für Integration, Sozialforschung und Betriebspädagogik gGmbH	Ochotnicze Hufce Pracy Centrum, Ausbildungszentrum					2
Zusatzqualifikationen zur Stärkung technologischer, außenwirtschaftlicher und interkultureller Kompetenzen"	QCW, QualifizierungsCentrum der Wirtschaft GmbH LOS	IHK Frankfurt (Oder)	Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ) Gorzow	Kształcena Ustawicznego i Praktycznego Zielena Gora			4
Deutsch-Polnischer Sport- und Erlebnistreff	Kinderring Neuhardenberg e.V.	Gemeinde Gorzyca	SV Blau-Weiß Turbine Lebus	Gemeinde Lubikowo			4
Ausbilder/innen in der transnationalen Aus- u. Weiterbildung	bbw Bildungszentrum Frankfurt (Oder)	Anstalt für Berufsausbildung (ZDZ) Gorzow	Centrum Kształcena Ustawicznego i Praktycznego Zielena Gora				3
IBETZ – Interkulturelles Bildungs-, Erlebnis- und Trainingszentrum - Hochseilgarten	IB e.V. / Internationaler Bund e.V.	Specjalny Ośrodek (Erziehungszentrum)	ZESPOL Szkol (Schule)	Ośrodek Sportu	Oberschulzentrum Kamien		5
Erweitertes deutsch-polnisches Schulprojekt am Karl-Liebknecht-Gymnasium, LATARNIA	Stadt FFO	Staatl. Gymnasium "Marek Kotanski", Slubice					2
Priority 6 - Cooperation "Begegnung"							
Deutsch-Polnisches Kulturangebot der Region zwischen Berlin und Gorzow, - Freilichtmuseum	Kultur GmbH Seelow	Ethnographisches Museum in Zielona Gora					2

Ausbau Friedenskirche zum Oekumenischen Europa-Centrum (OeC)	Stadt FFO	Förderkreis OeC e.V. FFO	Diakonie MOL	Bischoff Adam Dyczkowski			4
Instandsetzung Gedenkstätte/Museum Seelower Höhen	Landkreis Märkisch-Oderland	Stadt Miedzyrzecz	VolksGEDächtnisha us Michinow	Stadt Suchedniow	Stadt Kostrzyn	Militärmuseum um Lubusker Land	6
Jugendsprungschanze K 35 (40) am Standort Papengrund	Wintersportverein Bad Freienwalde e.V.	Uczniowski Klub Sportowy "Zieloni" Mieszkowski					2
Sanierung Jugend-Ökohof Beeskow	Stadt Beeskow	AWO	Urząd Miasta i Gminy Sulecin (Stadt Sulecin)				3
„YOUNG LIFE 2004“	Stadt Frankfurt (Oder)	City of Slubice					2
Vorbeugen ist besser als heilen, Prävention	LOS Gesundheitsamt	Kreisstelle für Familienhilfe, Sulecin	Landrätin Slawiak, Starosta				3
Skateranlage	Sportverein Blau-Weiß Turbine Lebus	Miejski Klub Sportowy "Polonia" ,Slubice					2
Seminargebäude der Heimbildungsstätte	Heimbildungsstätte der Caritas, Bad Saarow	Zespół Szkół, Schulzentrum Choszczno					2
Museumsverband Gerhart-Hauptmann-Häuser	Verein zur Förderung der Gerhart-Hauptmann-Häuser e.V.	Dom Gerharta Hauptmanna, Jelenia Góra					2

Spotkanie heißt Begegnung – wir lernen für Europa	RAA Brandenburg e.V.	Civilitas, Zielona Gora, e.V.					2
Jugendprojekt „Klub“	SLUBFURT e.V.	Kulturhaus SMOK, Slubice					2
Entwicklung einer deutsch- polnischen Schülerfirma / Tourismus	Verein zur Förderung von Beschäftigung und Qualifizierung Bad Freienwalde	Zespol Skol, Schulzentrum Mysliborz					2
Priority 7 - Special							
Fortbildungsmaßnahme für Bedienstete der Polizei des Landes BB mit Aufgabenschwerpunkte in Grenzregionen	Fachschule der Polizei des Landes BB	Komenda Wojewodzka Policji w Gorzow Wlkp					2
BB – Poln. Workshop zur Erarbeitung einer gemeinsamen EU- Erweiterungsstrategie	MdJE	Lubuskie	Zachodnieopomors loe				3
Jugendsprungszchanze K 35 (40) am Standort Papengrund	Wintersportverein Bad Freienwalde e.V.	Gestüt "Bielin" GmbH, Moryn					2
Europäischer Radweg R1, ZR1 Rehfelde	Amt Märkische Schweiz	Gemeinde Lagow	Stadt Buckoe	MOL	LK Slubice	K Gorzow	6
89	Projects					Sum	224