BOUNDING THROUGH TERRITORY: EUROPEAN UNION AND MULTI-LEVEL TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE

Samet YILMAZ[*]
Research Article

Abstract

This study discusses what implications territorial governance has on the governmental and territorial nature of the European Union (EU). The EU increasingly addresses governance on a territorial basis to improve its territorial integrity and coherence. It seeks to set up horizontal and vertical cooperation between different governmental levels and strengthen the institutionalization of territories. This way of governing is bounded by the EU's territory, thereby a single overarching political scale emerges. In this framework, perusing into the documents on spatial development and territorial state/agenda of the EU and the available literature, the study suggests that the spaces of governance in the EU, considered as territorial, are interwoven, and this structure is attached to a supranational territory.

Keywords: *European Union, Multi-Level and Territorial Governance, Territory, Boundedness.*

Teritoryayla Sınırlandırma: Avrupa Birliği ve Çok Düzeyli Teritoryal Yönetişim

Öz

Bu çalışma, teritoryal yönetişimin Avrupa Birliği'nin (AB) yönetimsel ve teritoryal yapısı üzerindeki etkisini tartışmaktadır. AB içerisinde yönetişim, Birliğin teritoryal bütünlüğünü ve uyumunu güçlendirmeye ilişkin olarak artan şekilde teritoryal bir bağlamda ele alınmaktadır. Birlik, teritoryal alanların kurumsallığını güçlendirmeyi ve farklı yönetimsel düzeyler arasında dikey ve yatay işbirliğini kurmayı hedeflemektedir. Bu yönetim biçimi, AB'nin teritoryasıyla sınırlandırılmaktadır ve böylece kapsayıcı tek bir siyasal ölçek ortaya çıkmaktadır.

---

[*]   Assist. Prof. Dr., Bursa Uludağ University, Department of International Relations, E-mail: sametyilmaz@uludag.edu.tr, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5232-5435.

Bu çerçevede bu çalışma, AB'nin teritoryal durumuna/gündemine ve mekânsal gelişimine ilişkin belgeleri ve mevcut literatürü inceleyerek AB içerisinde teritoryal olarak değerlendirilen yönetişim mekânlarının iç içe geçmiş olduğunu ve bu yapının uluslar üstü bir teritoryaya bağlandığı ileri sürülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Avrupa Birliği, Çok Düzeyli ve Teritoryal Yönetişim, Teritorya, Sınırlandırılmışlık.*

Introduction

Governance has been employed in explaining the governing processes of the EU since the early 1990s. In particular, with the works of Marks and Hooghe, the concept of multi-level governance (MLG) has been included in EU studies. Additionally, new models such as multi-tiered governance, polycentric governance, multi-perspectival governance, functional, overlapping, competing jurisdictions, fragmegration (or spheres of authority), and consortio and condominio have been proposed to explicate the diffusion of powers in the EU.[1] These models, conceptualized with different names, basically emphasize that unlike the traditional way of governing, the EU has a multi-level and multi-perspectival functioning. It is asserted that the EU has a spatial and governmental structure, which is different from the modern state.[2]

---

[1] Gary Marks and Liesbet Hooghe, "Contrasting Visions of Multi-Level Governance," in *Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Ian Bache and Matthew Flinders (Oxford: Oxford University 2004), 15.

[2] See, Alexander B. Murph, "Rethinking Multi-Level Governance in a Changing European Union: Why Metageography and Territoriality Matter," *GeoJournal* 72, no (1-2) (2008): 7-18. Andreas Faludi, "Multi-level (Territorial) Governance: Three Criticisms," *Planning Theory & Practice* 13, no 2 (2012): 197-211. Andreas Faludi, "Territorial Cohesion, Territorialism, Territoriality, and Soft Planning: A Critical Review," *Environment and Planning* 45, no 6 (2013): 1302-1317. Andreas Faludi, "European Integration and the Territorial Administrative Complex," *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 98, no 1 (2016): 71-80. Barrie Axford and Richard Huggins, "Towards a Post-National Polity: The Emergence of the Network Society in Europe," *The Sociological Review* 48, no 1 (2000): 173-206. Bob Jessop, "Territory, Politics, Governance and Multispatial Metagovernance," *Territory, Politics, Governance* 4, no 1 (2016): 8-32. Graham Haughton, Phil Allmendinger and Stijn Oosterlynck, "Spaces of Neoliberal Experimentation: Soft Spaces, Postpolitics, And Neoliberal Governmentality," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 45, no 1 (2013): 217-234. Jan Zielonka, *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union* Oxford: Oxford University, 2006). Jussi S. Jauhiainen and Helka Moilanen, "Towards Fluid Territories in European Spatial Development: Regional Development Zones in Finland," *Environment*

Studies that deal with the multi-level and multi-perspectival feature of the EU generally conclude that it is a multi-spatial polity, which comprises fluid territories and fuzzy boundaries. It is clear that governing processes are varied, and there are different spatialities in the EU. However, the EU constructs its own governance structure and territory and forges interconnections among governmental levels. Moreover, governing is attached to the EU level through approaching governance on a territorial basis. The EU seeks to governmentally connect the sub-levels both to each other and to its own scale.

The main argument of this paper is that the spaces of governance in the EU, considered as territorial, are interwoven, and this structure is attached to a single overarching territory on the EU scale. In fact, this argument was specified in MLG studies concerning the political ontology of the EU. Territory, however, itself was not regarded as a policy element in bounding governance, and the effect of territorial governance on territory-building was not adequately handled. Associated with territoriality, which is a spatial control strategy and organizational principle in building political structures through classifying and bounding space, the territory is a significant variable in the institutionalization of governing processes. It provides a spatial frame for economic, social and political interactions and binds actors to a certain geographical scale. Thus, the territory should be featured as it gives a spatial form to the European integration process in terms of governing.

In the framework outlined above, the main research question is the following: *What implications does articulation of territory as an agent to governance have on the governing processes and territorial nature of the EU?* Conceptually, territorial governance was included in the EU's agenda in the 2000s. Its content, in particular, has been improved by the documents on the territorial state/agenda of the EU prepared by ministers responsible for spatial planning and territorial development and scientific reports of the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON). The Committee on Regional Development of the European Parliament has also contributed to the progress of territorial governance. Hence, the concept is pertinent to regional policy and spatial planning with the aim of ensuring the territorial

---

and Planning C: Government and Policy 29, no 4 (2011): 728-744. Phil Allmendinger, Tobias Chilla and Franziska Sielker, "Europeanizing Territoriality—Towards Soft Spaces?" *Environment and Planning* 46, no 11 (2014): 2703-2717. Virginie Mamadouh, "The Territoriality of European Integration and the Territorial Features of the European Union: The first 50 Years," *Royal Ducth Enviromental Society* 92, no 4 (2001): 420-436.

integrity of the EU. Moreover, territorial governance has conclusions for the functioning of the EU and the integration process as it specifies the main principles of governance. Therefore, investigating the implications of the territorial factor on governance may provide further understanding of the political-geographic nature of the EU.

Territorial governance, first of all, *"deals with the number of levels of government, how the borders are drawn, how the functions are allocated, the extent of autonomy and how the units are governed"*[3] by underpinning the context of governance in the EU. It is towards uncovering the effect of territory on governing processes and gives the authority of governmental levels a territorial form. Secondly, in general, territorial governance mainly has a tendency to consolidate the lower levels.[4] This tendency is especially significant for the organizational stability of new scales in the EU. Thirdly, the territory of the EU is politically delineated. The governance of sub-levels is conducted in a territorial manner to improve the territorial integrity of the Union. It is aimed at enhancing the authority of the EU through forging stable cooperation patterns and strengthening the institutionalization of territories.

Building on these arguments, the first section addresses that the EU has a territorial dimension about governing processes. Moreover, it deals with the concept of MLG, which is widely harnessed by scholars to clarify the decision-making procedures and political structure of the EU. The second section briefly defines the concept of territory to ensure analytical clarity. The third section specifies the main components of territorial governance by perusing into the relevant documents and literature. The fourth and fifth sections elaborate on the inferences of articulating territory as an agent in governance for the territorial levels and governing of the EU. The conclusion section discusses the main findings.

I. EU: A Polity without Territorial Dimension?

It is explicit that the EU is a polity but not a modern state. It is neither merely an intergovernmental nor completely a supranational political entity.[5] Different methods of governing are implemented, and actors at various

---

[3] Anders Lidström, "Territorial Governance in Transition," *Regional and Federal Studies* 17, no 4 (2007): 499

[4] Lidström, "Territorial Governance," 501.

[5] Poul F. Kjaer, *Between Governing and Governance. On the Emergence, Function and Form of Europe's Post-National Constellation* (Hart: Oxford, 2010).

levels make politics at the EU scale. So, it may be suggested that the EU has a complex governmental structure. In this sense, *"to provide a simplified notion of what is pluralistic and highly dispersed policymaking activity, where multiple actors (individuals and institutions) participate, at various political levels, from the supranational to the sub-national or local,"* MLG as an alternative model was established at the beginning of 1990s.[6]

MLG is basically a way of governing that signifies the multiplicity of levels in decision-making processes.[7] *"'Multi-level' refers to the increased interdependence of governments operating at different territorial levels, while 'governance' signals the growing interdependence between governments and non-governmental actors at various territorial levels."*[8] In such an order, (political) centers are varied, and different units may influence the decision-making processes.[9] Therefore, MLG does not signify a hierarchical and centralist functioning yet does a flexible and heterarchical one.[10]

MLG was primarily evaluated as a decision-making process on an institutional basis. Then, it has been employed to explicate the political ontology of the EU.[11] To that end, Hooghe and Marks developed two types of MLG. Type I governance, the intellectual foundation of which is federalism, is general-purpose governmental structure in which decision-making is dispersed across various but limited jurisdictions. Power is diffused among a wide variety of formal authorities, and actors are mostly

---

[6] Paul Stephenson, "Twenty Years of Multi-Level Governance: 'Where Does It Come from? What is It? Where is It Going?'," *Journal of European Public Policy* 20, no 6 (2013): 817-837.

[7] Garry Marks, "Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance in the EC," in *The state of the European Community*, ed. Alan Cafruny and Glenda G. Rosenthal (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1993), 392. Gary Marks et al., "Competencies, Cracks and Conflicts: Regional Mobilisation in the EU," in *Governance in the European Union*, ed. Gary Marks, Fritz W Scharpf, Philippe C. Schmitter and Wolfgang Streeck (London: Sage, 1996), 41-42.

[8] Ian Bache and Matthew Flinders, "Themes and Issues in Multi-Level Governance," in *Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Ian Bache and Matthew Flinders (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004), 3

[9] Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks, *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001), 1-2.

[10] Virginie Mamadouh and Herman van der Wusten, "The European Level in EU Governance: Territory, Authority and Trans-Scalar Networks," *GeoJournal* 72, no (1-2) (2008): 28.

[11] Beate Kohler-Koch and Rainer Eising, (ed.) *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union* (London: Routledge, 1999). Simona Piattoni, *The Theory of Multi-Level Governance: Conceptual, Empirical, and Normative Challenges* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2010).

territorial at the local, regional and national levels. Moreover, Type I governance is biased towards the voice. Barriers to exit are relatively high, and leaving may be costly for actors. In Type II governance, jurisdictions are task-specific. Membership is intersecting, and jurisdictions which are intended to be flexible rather than durable are aligned at several territorial levels. Type II governance is instrumental and biased towards the exit. Actors remain in the structure as long as it serves their interests.[12]

On the basis of the classification specified, the EU is mainly evaluated to be similar to a Type I jurisdiction, yet in consideration of the Europeanisation of regional policy, there is a consensus to a certain degree that the number of type II governance structures has increased in the EU.[13] So, the governmental and spatial order of the EU is often identified with soft spaces. It is proposed that governing is politically and spatially rescaled in the EU. Spatial planning and territorial policies reconstitute geographical levels.[14] In fact, Faludi says, "*European space itself cannot be conceived of as a fixed container, but rather as the intersection between various spatial configurations.*"[15] However, the emergence of soft spaces in the EU does not mean that spaces cannot be hardened; they may be hardened through institutional and territorial initiatives.[16] In this sense, the EU embraced the

---

[12] Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks, "Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of Multi-Level Governance," *American Political Science Review* no 97, no 2 (2003): 233-243. Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks, "Types of Multi-Level Governance," in *Handbook on Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Henrik Enderlein, Sonja Wälti, Michael Zürn (Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar, 2010), 17-31. Marks and Hooghe, "Contrasting Visions", 15-30.

[13] Vratislav Havlík, "Europeanization as the Reterritorialization of the State: Towards Conceptual Clarification," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 58, no 5 (2020): 1294

[14] Dominic Stead, "European Integration and Spatial Rescaling in the Baltic Region: Soft Spaces, Soft Planning and Soft Security," *European Planning Studies* 22, no 4 (2014): 680-693. Enrico Gualini, "The Rescaling of Governance in Europe: New Spatial and Institutional Rationales," *European Planning Studies* 14, no 7 (2006): 881-904. Jane Holder and Antonia Layard, "Drawing out the Elements of Territorial Cohesion: Re-scaling EU Spatial Governance," *Yearbook of European Law* 30, no 1 (2011): 358-380. Jauhiainen and Moilanen, "Towards Fluid," 728-744. Ole B. Jensen and Tim Richardson, "Nested Visions: New Rationalities of Space in European Spatial Planning," *Regional Studies* 35, no 8 (2001): 703-717. Teresa Pullano, "The Evolving Category of Territory: From the Modern State to the European Union," *GARNET Working Paper*, no 64 (2009): 1-30. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/pais/research/ researchcentres/csgr/garnet/workingpapers/6409.pdf.

[15] Andreas Faludi, "The Poverty of Territorialism: Revisiting European Spatial Planning," *The Planning Review* 52, no 3 (2016): 78

[16] Jonathan Metzger and Peter Schmitt, "When Soft Spaces Harden: The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region," *Environment and Planning A* 44, no 2 (2012): 263-280. Kaj

idea of (territorial) boundedness and integrity.[17] It considers the specific characteristics of places in implementation of policies. This way, it is aimed at the construction of the territory of the EU by advancing territorial cooperation at different levels.[18] Therefore, though not entirely coherent,[19] the EU has a territorial dimension, which is attached to various policy spheres[20] and salient in the spatial development and territorial cohesion policies.[21] With territorial cohesion, in particular, the territory of the EU has been codified and regarded as an element that needs to be strengthened.[22]

Governance is among the policy fields to which the territorial dimension is articulated. The concept of territorial governance has become ubiquitous in the official documents on territorial state/agenda of the EU and scientific reports of ESPON. Some, like Faludi[23] and Lidström[24] claim that governance has always had a territorial feature, and hence, the specification of territorial in MLG does not make sense. Yet, territorial governance is different from MLG, though both have similarities. It is basically related to the construction of the relationship between governance and territory to enhance territorial capital through coordination of actors, mobilization of stakeholder participation and integration of policies.[25] Therefore, the concept

Zimmerbauer and Anssi Paasi, "Hard Work with Soft Spaces (and vice versa): Problematizing the Transforming Planning Spaces," *European Planning Studies* 28, no 4 (2020): 771-789.

[17] Cormac Walsh, "Rethinking the Spatiality of Spatial Planning: Methodological Territorialism and Metageographies," *European Planning Studies* 22, no 2 (2014): 306-322.

[18] Birte Wassenberg and Bernard Reitel, *Territorial Cooperation in Europe. A Historical Perspective* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015). Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/information/pdf/brochures/interreg_25years_en.pdf.

[19] Eduardo Medeiros, "Fake or Real EU Territorialicy? Debating the Territorial Universe of EU Policies," *Europa XXI* 38, (2020): 9-31.

[20] ESPON, *The Territorial Dimension of Future Policies*, Policy Brief, (Luxembourg: European Observation Network, 2018). Accessed: 10 January 2022. https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/ESPON_Policy_Brief_Territorial_dimension_of_future_policies.pdf.

[21] Andreas Faludi, "Territorial Cohesion and Subsidiarity Under the European Union Treaties: A Critique of the 'Territorialism' Underlying," *Regional Studies* 47, no 9 (2013): 1594-1606. Faludi, "Territorial Cohesion," 1302-1317.

[22] Alessandro Vitale, "The Contemporary EU's Notion of Territoriality and External Borders," *European Spatial Research and Policy* 18, no 2 (2011): 17-27

[23] Faludi, "Multi-level (Territorial) Governance," 197-211.

[24] Lidström, "Territorial Governance," 499-508.

[25] Lisa van Well and Peter Schmitt, "Understanding Territorial Governance: Conceptual and Practical Implications," *Europa Regional* 21.2013, no 4 (2015): 209-221. Simin Davoudi

denotes that territory is included in governing processes as a variable.[26] This feature of governance, as it is stated in the introduction, has not been substantially handled in MLG studies. Nevertheless, boundedness matters in multi-level political interactions since it both delimits and enables the use of political authority.[27] The territorial dimension of governance inherently has an impact on the institutionalization of the territorial levels and their relationships with each other.[28] More importantly, it gives a territorial shape to European integration and promotes the territory-building process by politically classifying the territory of the EU as a governmental area.

II. Territory: A Brief Conceptual Framework

The territory is a controversial concept, which is handled by various disciplines. It is mostly employed randomly and separately from theoretical conceptualizations in the EU, as well.[29] The territory may have different features, depending on time and space.[30] However, it may be proposed that it is basically related to territoriality, which is predominantly evaluated as a spatial strategy peculiar to the modern state. However, territoriality may also be observed at the local, regional, transnational or supranational levels. So, it needs to be addressed from a wider perspective. To that end, Sack developed a comprehensive definition that makes the concept applicable to other (political) units. He defines territoriality as "*the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographical area.*"[31] This definition signifies

---

et al., "Territorial Governance in the Making. Approaches, Methodologies, Practices," *Boletin de la AGEN*, no 46 (2008): 33-52.

[26] ESPON TANGO, *Territorial Approaches for New Governance* (Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2013), 26. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/ESPON_TANGO_Scientific_Report_ Final.pdf.

[27] Nathalie Behnke, Jörg Broschek and Jared Sonnicksen, "Introduction: The Relevance of Studying Multilevel Governance," in *Configurations, Dynamics and Mechanisms of Multilevel Governance*, ed. Nathalie Behnke, Jörg Broschek and Jared Sonnicksen (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 8.

[28] See also, Samet Yılmaz, "Territorial Dimension of Governance and Its Institutional Effect on the Geographical Levels in the European Union", *Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi* 19, no 2 (2020): 585-608

[29] Juho Luukkonen and Helka Moilanen, "Territoriality in the Strategies and Practices of the Territorial Cohesion Policy of the European Union: Territorial Challenges in Implementing "Soft Planning"," *European Planning Studies* 20, no 3 (2012): 490.

[30] Stuart Elden, *The Birth of Territory* (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2013).

[31] Robert D. Sack, *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986).

that territoriality is a way of exerting control on space. Classifying and bounding a geographical area is the kernel of the territorial claim.

Classification and boundedness may be carried out for various purposes, yet they fundamentally aim to forge spatial control. Territorial actions are intended for distinguishing an area from other ones through the attachment of action to physical space. The bounded area is organizationally institutionalized to have autonomy for interactions. It gains a political character and reifies authority. In other words, the bounded area turns into a claim of control and acquires a territorial function. Therefore, the territory designates an institutionalized spatial compartment. In this framework, the territory shall be regarded as a delineated governmental partition for this study.

III. EU and Territorial Governance: Territory as an Agent

The concept of territorial governance has been crystallized with the inclusion of territorial and spatial policies in the EU's agenda in the late 1980s. In fact, the EU has considered territorial issues within the framework of regional policy since the foundation of the European Economic Community. However, the approval of a reform package in 1988 that made regional policy more functional and incorporated the Commission, national, regional and local authorities, and relevant stakeholders into decision-making processes, and the introduction of spatial development and territorial cohesion policies have rendered territory and space and their link to governing processes significant parts of the European integration process.[32] Thus, territorial governance may be evaluated as the governmental dimension of Europeanisation,[33] and it is related to the spatial development and territorial cohesion policies which are essentially aimed at the promotion of a balanced and harmonious societal structure in a pluralist manner in the territory of the EU.[34]

---

[32] Andreas Faludi, "From European Spatial Development to Territorial Cohesion Policy," *Regional Studies* 40, no 6 (2006): 667-678. Eve Hepburn, "Cohesion Policy and Regional Mobilization," in *Handbook on Cohesion Policy in the EU*, ed. Simona Piattoni and Laura Polverari (Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar, 2016), 203-216. Julian Clark and Alun Jones, "The Spatialities of Europeanisation: Territory, Government and Power in 'EUrope'," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33, no 3 (2008): 300-318.

[33] ESPON COMPASS, *Comparative Analysis of Territorial Governance and Spatial Planning Systems in Europe*, Final Report, Version 10/10/2018, (Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2018). Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/1.%20COMPASS_Final_Report.pdf.

[34] Eduardo Medeiros, "Is There a Rise of the Territorial Dimension in the EU Cohesion Policy?" *Finisterra* 103 (2016): 89-112. Eduardo Medeiros, "Territorial Cohesion: An EU Concept," *European Journal of Spatial Development* 60 (2016): 1-30.

It may be proposed that the advancement of territorial governance commenced with the publication of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) in 1999.[35] The ESDP is an intergovernmental initiative that provides a spatial vision at the EU scale. It is the basic document that outlines the framework of the spatial development policies of the EU. In fact, the ESDP did not specify territorial governance as a concept but included the concept of *integrated spatial development*, which has similar features to territorial governance. According to the document, the main goal of spatial development is to ensure a sustainable and balanced development throughout the territory of the EU within the framework of vertical and horizontal institutional cooperation at different levels as local, regional, national, transnational, and supranational.[36] Hence, the ESDP embodied a multi-level governmental approach to the functioning of the EU.

The entry of the concept of territorial governance into the European policy area, in fact, began with the resolution of Conference of the Council of Europe of Ministers Responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) in 2006.[37] The resolution defined the term as *"the emergence and implementation of innovative shared forms of planning and managing socio-spatial dynamics. Territorial governance aims to manage territorial dynamics by indicating the spatial consequences of policies planned by the public and private sector."* To that end, joint strategies should be carried out, initiatives should be taken at the regional and municipal levels, horizontal and vertical institutional coordination should be established among public authorities, and public-private cooperation should be improved.[38]

The EU had a similar approach to the concept. The Territorial State and Perspectives of the EU, presented to the member states in 2006 and then

---

[35] Dominic Stead, "The Rise of Territorial Governance in European Policy," *European Planning Studies* 22, no 7 (2014): 1373.

[36] European Commission, *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union* (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1999), 35. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/pdf/sum_en.pdf.

[37] Stead, "The Rise of," 1374.

[38] Council of Europe, *Resolution No. 2 on Territorial Governance: Empowerment Through Enhanced Co-ordination* (Strasbourg: 14th Conference of the Council of Europe of Ministers Responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT), 2006). Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://rm.coe.int/14th-european-conference-of-ministers-responsible-for-regional-spatial/168076ccdf.

agreed upon in 2007, included the elements of CEMAT's 2006 resolution on territorial governance.[39] Additionally, it attempted to clarify the concept of *territorial*. According to the document, the notion of territorial differs widely across Europe. However, there is a widespread consensus on its content. It basically signifies considering the place and geographical context in fulfilment of policies and involvement of actors at the sub-national level.[40] The document essentially stated the necessity of addressing governance as place-based.

The Final Report of ESPON Project 2.3.2, published in 2006, further specified that territorial governance is a spatial vision and *"can be seen as an organizational mode of collective action based on partnerships between public and private actors and coalition-building, oriented towards a commonly defined objective."* Moreover, the report stated that territory is not a static and passive space but a dynamic and active one. It is an actor that ensures development and promotes a sense of place and territorial identity to achieve collective action at the local level.[41] Thus, territory and territorial governance were evaluated as dynamic and flexible. These qualifications were also highlighted in the Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union, 2011 Update.[42]

The document entitled Territorial Governance and Cohesion Policy published in 2015 distinguished territorial governance from plain governance and MLG. According to the document, *"governance refers to processes of governing, by a government, market or networks, including a wide range of players influencing the decision-making process… Multi-level governance describes collective decision-making processes where authority and influence are shared among players at multiple levels of governance."*

---

[39] Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union, *Territorial State and Perspective of the European Union: Toward a Stronger European Territorial Cohesion in the Light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Ambitions* (Luxemburg, 2007), 8-9. Accessed: 10 January 2022, http://www.terport.hu/webfm_send/129.

[40] Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union, *Territorial State*, 6.

[41] ESPON Project 2.3.2., *Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level*, Final Report, Part 1 (Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2006), 17-18. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/fr-2.3.2_final_feb2007.pdf.

[42] Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union, *The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union,* 2011 Update, (Hungary, 2011), 85-86. Accessed: 10 January 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/what/territorial-cohesion/territorial_state_and_perspective_2011.pdf.

In such a structure, there is neither an absolute decision-maker nor a stable hierarchical authority, and actors are interconnected. Territorial governance is the *"extension of the more established multi-level governance concept by adding explicitly territorial insights."*[43] It has an institutional approach to the decision-making processes that are related to the quality of places.[44]

It may be concluded from the documents that territorial governance is a way of governing on the basis of horizontal and vertical cooperation among actors and policies to promote the efficiency of governance and territorial integrity at different levels. It regards territory as an agent. In other words, the territory itself becomes a space of governance, and interactions are territorially organized. As an organizational mode of collective action, territorial governance seeks to strengthen the institutional quality of the spaces of governance that are bounded by territory at different levels in collaboration among governmental and non-governmental actors. This way, it is aimed at valorization of territorial capital since *"[t]he place-based approach facilitates the mobile[z]ation of stakeholders (including private sector) and their specific territorial knowledge."*[45] Yet, the concept of place-based does not mean localization. It should rather be seen as the foundation of MLG on a territorial basis.[46] It includes supra-local authorities in specification and implementation of governing processes. Higher authorities determine the general goals and performance standards. In consideration of the characteristics of the place in question, lower authorities fulfil policies in cooperation with relevant units and local elites in accordance with the general goals.[47] Hence, territorialized actions are not equated to localized

---

[43] Kai Böhme et al., *Territorial Governance and Cohesion Policy* (Brussels: Committee on Regional Development, European Parliament, 2015), 15-16. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563382/IPOL_STU(2015)56 3382_EN.pdf.

[44] ESPON COMPASS, *Comparative Analysis*, 8.

[45] Jürgen Pucher et al., *The Future of Cohesion Policy*, Report I (Brussels: Committee of the Regions of the European Union, 2015), 19. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://cor.europa.eu/en/engage/studies/Documents/Future-CP-Report-I-Final.pdf.

[46] In the Barca Report, the words territory and territorial are used interchangeably with the word place-based. Fabrizio Barca, *An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy. A Place-Based Approach to Meeting European Union Challenges and Expectations* (Brussels: Directorate General for Regional Policy, European Commission, 2009). Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/regi/ dv/barca_report_/barca_report_en.pdf.

[47] European Commission, *Territorial Agenda 2020: Put in Practice Enhancing the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Cohesion Policy by a Place-Based Approach*, Volume I–Synthesis Report (Brussels: Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy, Centre for Industrial Studies, 2015), 21-29. Accessed: 10 January 2022:

ones.[48] The distinctive feature of territorialization is to organize political, economic or social action in a place-based manner and mark the difference of a classified area.

IV. Articulation of Territory and the Territorial Levels in the EU

Territorial governance articulates territory as an agent, and naturally, it is towards reforging the spatial and institutional functioning of governance processes. Firstly, by rendering physical space as a matter of politics, it inherently has an effect on the institutionalization of the territorial levels in the EU, which are primarily classified by the existing administrative boundaries of the member states.[49] More accurately, territorial governance promotes the political-territorial feature of governmental levels. In particular, it bolsters the territorial foundations of the sub-national ones. For the achievement of territorial cohesion and integrity, the participation of sub-national actors in the political processes at the EU level is one of the main priorities of the integration process. To that end, the amount of structural funds has been increased, and institutional mechanisms such as the Committee of Regions have been established to provide a voice for regions and localities.[50] Additionally, new scales of governance at multiple levels are forged. The EU seeks to improve cross-border cooperation (CBC), a territorial practice itself.[51] The interregional cooperation program as a part of the structural and investment policy, launched by the European Commission

---

https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/what/territorial-cohesion/territorial_agenda_2020_practice_report.pdf. Kai Böhme et al., *How to Strengthen the Territorial Dimension of 'Europe 2020' and the EU Cohesion Policy* (Warsaw: Polish Ministry of Regional Development, 2011), 23-27. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/challenges2020/2011_territorial_dimension_eu2020.pdf.

[48] Davoudi et al., "Territorial Governance," 44.

[49] European Union, *Consolidated Text: Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on the Establishment of a Common Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS)*, 18.01.2018. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:02003R1059-20180118&qid=1519136753473.

[50] Hepburn, "Cohesion Policy," 203-216.

[51] Emily Lange and Iva Pires, "The Role and Rise of European Cross-Border Entities," in *European Territorial Cooperation: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to the Process and Impacts of Cross-Border and Transnational Cooperation in Europe*, ed. Eduardo Medeiros (Cham: Springer International, 2018), 137.

in 1990, has accelerated CBC initiatives.[52] So, many cross-border regions (CBRs) have emerged in the territory of the EU.[53] Moreover, the EU commenced with a macro-regional strategy as an intergovernmental initiative in 2009. The strategy is intended for the reinforcement of territorial integrity and cohesion of certain regions at the transnational level by promoting cooperation among various governmental levels and stakeholders.[54]

Addressing governance in a territorial manner is notably significant for the durability of new scales. The EU aims to increase territorial cross-border integration. Enhancement of institutionalization and territorial-organizational capacity underlies the governance of CBRs to improve their functioning and autonomy.[55] It is clear that the degree of the institutionalization of CBRs is close to national and local organizations in terms of neither authority nor territorial-organizational capacity.[56] Legal differences between the member states and the weak institutional infrastructure on CBC have led many CBRs to be ineffective or short-lived.[57] However, the spatial evolutionary dynamism of CBRs varies.[58] Certain CBCs such as the Baltic Sea Region[59]

---

[52] Bernard Reitel, Birte Wassenberg and Jean Peyrony, "The INTERREG Experience in Bridging European Territories. A 30-Year Summary," in *European Territorial Cooperation: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to the Process and Impacts of Cross-Border and Transnational Cooperation in Europe*, ed. Eduardo Medeiros (Cham: Springer International, 2018), 7-23.

[53] Markus Perkmann, "Cross-Border Regions in Europe Significance and Drivers of Regional Cross-Border Co-Operation," *European Urban and Regional Studies* 10, no 2 (2003): 153-171.

[54] Stefan Gänzle and Kristine Kern (ed.), *A 'Macro-Regional' Europe in the Making Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Evidence* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

[55] Andrea Noferini et al., "Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU: Euroregions amid Multilevel Governance and Reterritorialization," *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 35-56. Luis De Sousa, "Understanding European Cross- Border Cooperation: A Framework for Analysis," *Journal of European Integration* 35, no 6 (2013): 669-687.

[56] Estelle Evrard, "The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC): Towards a Supraregional Scale of Governance in the Greater Region SaarLorLux?" *Geopolitics* 21, no 3 (2016): 513-537. Tobias Chilla, Estelle Evrard and Christian Schulz, "On the Territoriality of Cross-Border Cooperation: "Institutional Mapping" in a Multi-Level Context," *European Planning Studies* 20, no 6 (2012), 961-980.

[57] Joachim Beck, "Cross-Border Cooperation and the Challenge of Transnational Institution-Building–the Example of the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)," *RECERC*, no 1 Spécial (2017): 1-13. Noferini et al., "Cross-Border Cooperation," 35-56.

[58] Pauline Pupier, "Spatial Evolution of Cross-Border Regions. Contrasted Case Studies in North-West Europe," *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 81-104.

[59] Metzger and Schmitt, "When Soft," 263-280.

and Dutch-German border-regions[60] are institutionally well-established. Moreover, in order to promote the autonomy and territorial integrity of CBRs, the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation, a new supranational unit that has a legal personality, was founded in 2006.[61]

Secondly, territorial governance projects intensified governmental cooperation among territories. Territorial levels, in principle, are hierarchically classified in the EU, ranging from the local to the supranational.[62] However, they are also evaluated as interconnected. In other words, territorial levels that are defined either as given or newly created scales are assumed to be horizontally and vertically linked to each other, which is required to progress the territorial cohesion of the EU, as well.[63] This interconnectedness, in fact, is one of the main characteristics of MLG. The distinctive contribution of territorial governance is to build cooperation in a more institutionalized manner by considering the voice of territorial actors. In other words, governmental authorities and non-governmental actors are enmeshed not merely in decision-making processes but also in territorial units. Interconnectedness is attempted to be established through territorial institutionalization. The goals of participation of local authorities and stakeholders in governing processes, enhancement of the organizational capacity of territorial levels, and promotion of a sense of place are aimed at the achievement of territorially strong units in a multi-level functioning.

V. An Interwoven Governance Connected to Single Boundedness

Territorial governance crystallizes the boundedness of governmental levels. However, transcending administrative boundaries, it also rescales governing patterns and creates horizontal and vertical interconnections. So, the space of the EU is framed both as a *Europe of flows* in which mobilities and spatial transactions are increased, and administrative boundaries are

---

[60] Markus Perkmann, "Construction of New Territorial Scales: A Framework and Case Study of the EUREGIO Cross-Border Region," *Regional Studies* 41, no 2 (2007): 253-266.

[61] Peter Ulrich, "Territorial Cooperation, Supraregionalist Institution-Building and National Boundaries: The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) at the Eastern and Western German Borders," *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 57-80.

[62] Luukkonen and Moilanen, "Territoriality in," 481-500.

[63] Andreas Faludi, *Territorial Cohesion Under the Looking Glass Synthesis Paper About the History of the Concept and Policy Background to Territorial Cohesion*, (2009), Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid:112891b3-3dd6-4252-b0a5-452e5665f0d9?collection=research.

softened and as a *Europe of places* in which uniqueness of localities historically shaped by human experience is emphasized.[64] A governmentally interwoven structure throughout the territory of the EU emerges, which may be interpreted as that hierarchies are blurred. Yet, the inclusion of territory as an agent in governance creates a single political and geographical scale at the supranational level.

As it is stated, the territorial levels in the EU that are basically classified in a hierarchy are assumed as interconnected on the basis of institutional cooperation, and actors enter into interactions at multiple levels. This situation seems to make territorial hierarchies fuzzy. However, the position of the territory of the EU is different from the sub-levels since their spatial development is ultimately linked to the supranational level, and spatial policies are fundamentally aimed at making a single European space.[65] In fact, the ESDP specifies that the member states and the European Commission agreed on the common objectives and concepts for the future development of the territory of the EU by adopting the document.[66] Similarly, territorial cohesion is tasked with the contribution to the sustainable development of the EU by integrating policies at multiple levels[67] and forming cooperation among local, regional, and national authorities.[68] Hence, spatial development and territorial cohesion scale the territory of the EU as a geographical and political partition. The EU level is territorially classified and politically delineated.

---

[64] Jensen and Richardson, "Nested Visions," 703-717.

[65] Ole B. Jensen and Tim Richardson, *Making European Space: Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity* (London: Routledge, 2004). Sami Moisio, "Geographies of Europeanization: The EU's Spatial Planning as a Politics of Scale," in *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making European Space*, ed. Luiza Bialasiewicz (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), 19-39.

[66] European Commission, *European Spatial.*

[67] Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union, *The Territorial State*, 14.

[68] European Commission, *Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion: Turning Territorial Diversity into Strength*, COM (2008) 616 Final, 06.10.2008 (Brussels, 2008), 11. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0616:FIN:EN:PDF. Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union, *Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions* (Hungary, 2011), 8. Accessed: 10 January 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/what/territorial-cohesion/territorial_agenda_2020.pdf.

Territorial governance, in consideration of the classification of the territorial levels in the EU, bolsters the boundedness of the supranational level. Oriented to the valorization of territorial capital in a place-based approach, it seeks to increase the autonomy and institutionalization of the sub-levels in the EU. However, as their spatial and territorial development is ultimately linked to the supranational level, the governance in this territorial order is for improving the efficiency of governing of the EU and its institutions. In other words, the EU enhances its ability in fulfilment of policies by establishing horizontal and vertical integration. Achievement of governance in a multi-level functioning is essentially aimed at the promotion of the Community method,[69] which is viewed as the best way for implementation of MLG.[70] Therefore, territorial governance consolidates the EU level. It strengthens the lower governmental levels, yet the governing processes of the sub-levels are connected to a higher geographical level on the basis of the general principles conditioned by the EU. Advancing the territorial basis of the sub-levels is inherently tended to foster territorial integrity at the supranational level. Accordingly, external intervention is stipulated by the EU.[71] This way, territorial governance crystalizes a single overarching political scale at the EU level.

The external intervention of the EU, in a broader sense, means transferring the European territorial order to the sub-levels. The EU inevitably alters the spatial organization of the member states and the relations between actors of governance.[72] It is clear that it is uncertain to what extent the policies of the EU are embraced and fulfilled by the member states.[73] Territorial governance is also included in national systems to varying degrees, and its impact on the sub-levels is rather heterogeneous.[74]

---

[69] Commission of the European Communities, *European Governance: A White Paper* (Brussels, 2001), 5-6. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/DOC_01_10.

[70] Committee of the Regions, *The Committee of the Regions' White Paper on Multilevel Governance* (Brussels: Committee of the Regions of the European Union, 2009), 21, Accessed: 10 January 2022, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/regi/dv/cdr89-2009_/cdr89-2009_en.pdf.

[71] Faludi, "European Integration," 74.

[72] Havlík, "Europeanization as," 1288-1306.

[73] Tanja A. Börzel, "How the European Union Interacts with its Member States," *IHS Political Science Series*, no 93 (2003): 1-31. Accessed: 10 January 2022, http://aei.pitt.edu/1049/1/pw_93.pdf.

[74] Giancarlo Cotella, "Editorial: EU Cohesion Policy and Domestic Territorial Governance. What Chances for Cross Fertilization?" *EUROPA XXI* 35, (2018): 5-20.

However, the overall European territorial governance, in the framework of an institutional cooperation, establishes a hierarchy. An interwoven governmental cooperation is attached to a higher scale that is bounded by the territory of the EU.

Conclusion

This study has discussed what implications territorial governance has on the construction of the governing patterns, authority and territory of the EU, analyzing the documents on spatial development and territorial state/agenda of the EU and the available literature on territorial governance. It is asserted that the spaces of governance in the EU, considered as territorial, are interwoven, and this structure is attached to a single overarching territory on the EU scale. Some conclusions may be drawn from the analysis presented.

Firstly, territorial governance seeks to strengthen the institutionalization of governing processes on a place-based foundation. It is inherently intended for hardening the spaces of governance by regarding territory as an agent. Therefore, territory, which primarily designates a bounded governmental area, functions as a means of political control in the implementation of governance in the EU. This effect of territory has implications for all the territorial levels. It is aimed at the advancement of institutionalization and autonomy of the sub-levels that are assumed as interconnected. However, the cooperation among them is attempted to be linked to the supranational level and be made a part of the territory of the EU in the long run. Thus, the political scale is unified, and a new supra-territorial scale is reified, which is bounded by the territory of the EU. Territorial governance confers a territorial form on the EU and promotes the territory-building process in terms of governing. It confirms that the EU is a political entity that occupies a psychical compartment.

Secondly, in consideration of the territorial order of the governmental levels in the EU and the content of territorial governance, it may be suggested that the distinction between Type I and Type II governance has been theoretically blurred in two perspectives. First of all, the claim that the EU is more akin to Type I governance with respect to scalar territorial demarcations does not seem substantive enough, except for the supranational level. The territorial levels that are classified as overlapping with the existing boundaries of the member states are primarily assumed as nested and hierarchical. However, new spaces of governance at various levels are

established, and actors enter into multiple interactions. Territorially sophisticated and influenced actors like the member states participate in the new governing relationships that are founded by the EU. So, it is aimed at the achievement of an institutionally interwoven governmental and administrative order, which encapsulates the whole territory of the EU. Such a structure reduces the meaning of territorial hierarchies among the sub-levels. Second of all, though theoretically regarded as flexible and task-specific, the territorial foundation of new scales or Type II structures is more stable. The EU seeks to promote the participation of local authorities and stakeholders in the governance of new scales and constructs a sense of place in an institutional manner. This way, it is attempted to increase the voices of territorial actors. It is clear that, in comparison to the formal national and local levels, the possibility of exit from new scales is higher. Yet, the fact that governance in the EU is place-based and long-term projections are foreseen to improve territorial development urges local actors to participate in governing processes and reduces the possibility of exit from new scales. Thus, also given the interwoven structure of governance, the distinction between Type I and Type II governance softens.

Thirdly, the fact that the governance of the sub-levels is provided as territorial displays that there are various territorialities by which the degree of institutional capability is diverse in the EU. The territorial-organizational capacity of the new scales, in particular, differs. Hence, concerning territoriality, an interwoven governmental order, which is composed of different territorialities but bounded by a supranational level, emerges. This situation is not an anomaly in terms of territoriality since the foundation of new territorial orders does not mean that the old ones shall be immediately abolished; new and old territorialities may co-exist. New territorialities may replace or completely eliminate the old ones.[75] In this framework, the EU seeks to increase the territorial basis of jurisdictions operating at numerous scales to align governance with a view to improving its territorial integrity and authority. The institutional structures and governance of the sub-levels are forged to bolster the functioning of the EU level as a higher scale. This way, the institutionalization of a geographical area that is delineated by a supranational territory is promoted.

---

[75] Robert D. Sack, *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986), 54.

Consequently, the articulation of territory to the governing of the EU in an organizational manner is intended for establishing spatial control. Territorial governance is a way of exerting political authority for the EU, and it classifies the territory of the EU as a governmental area. Therefore, it enhances the fixity of the supranational level. It is clear that in practice, the ability of the EU for the achievement of territorial governance is controversial. However, the EU considers the territorial effect on governing processes and seeks to organize its own space. In this respect, territory, which is a source of authority by classifying and bounding a geographical area, should be specifically handled more by studies on governance. Its influence on the institutionalization of the spaces of governance and construction of the authority of the EU should be empirically tested by conducting case studies to further comprehend the territorial nature of the EU.

References

Allmendinger, Phil, Tobias Chilla and Franziska Sielker. "Europeanizing Territoriality— Towards Soft Spaces?" *Environment and Planning* 46, no 11 (2014): 2703-2717.

Axford, Barrie and Richard Huggins. "Towards a Post-National Polity: The Emergence of the Network Society in Europe." *The Sociological Review* 48, no 1 (2000): 173-206.

Bache, Ian and Matthew Flinders. "Themes and Issues in Multi-Level Governance." in *Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Ian Bache and Matthew Flinders, 1-11. Oxford: Oxford University, 2004.

Barca, Fabrizio. *An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy. A Place-Based Approach to Meeting European Union Challenges and Expectations*. Brussels: Directorate General for Regional Policy, European Commission, 2009. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/ meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/regi/dv/barca_report_/barca_report_en.pdf.

Beck, Joachim. "Cross-Border Cooperation and the Challenge of Transnational Institution-Building–the Example of the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)." *RECERC*, no 1 Spécial (2017): 1-13.

Behnke, Nathalie. Jörg Broschek and Jared Sonnicksen. "Introduction: The Relevance of Studying Multilevel Governance." in *Configurations, Dynamics and Mechanisms of Multilevel Governance*, ed. Nathalie Behnke, Jörg Broschek and Jared Sonnicksen, 1-19. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

Böhme, Kai, Sabine Zillmer, Maria Toptsidou and Frank Holstein. *Territorial Governance and Cohesion Policy*. Brussels: Committee on Regional Development, European Parliament, 2015. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/563382/IPOL_S TU(2015)563382_EN.pdf.

Böhme, Kai. Philippe Doucet, Tomasz Komornicki, Jacek Zaucha and Dariusz Świątek. *How to Strengthen the Territorial Dimension of 'Europe 2020' and the EU Cohesion Policy*. Warsaw: Polish Ministry of Regional Development, 2011. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/ sources/docgener/studies/pdf/challenges2020/2011_territorial_dimension_eu20 20.pdf.

Börzel, Tanja A. "How the European Union Interacts with its Member States." *IHS Political Science Series*, no 93 (2003): 1-31. Accessed: 10 January 2022, http://aei.pitt.edu/1049/1/pw_93.pdf.

Chilla, Tobias, Estelle Evrard and Christian Schulz. "On the Territoriality of Cross-Border Cooperation: "Institutional Mapping" in a Multi-Level Context." *European Planning Studies* 20, no 6 (2012), 961-980.

Clark, Julian and Alun Jones. "The Spatialities of Europeanisation: Territory, Government and Power in 'EUrope'." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33, no 3 (2008): 300-318.

Commission of the European Communities. *European Governance: A White Paper*. Brussels, 2001. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/commission/ presscorner/ detail/en/DOC_01_10.

Committee of the Regions. *The Committee of the Regions' White Paper on Multilevel Governance*. Brussels: Committee of the Regions of the European Union, 2009. Accessed: 10 January 2022, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ meetdocs/ 2009_2014/documents/regi/dv/cdr89-2009_/cdr89-2009_en.pdf.

Cotella, Giancarlo. "Editorial: EU Cohesion Policy and Domestic Territorial Governance. What Chances for Cross Fertilization?" *EUROPA XXI* 35, (2018): 5-20.

Council of Europe. *Resolution No. 2 on Territorial Governance: Empowerment Through Enhanced Co-ordination*. Strasbourg: 14th Conference of the Council of Europe of Ministers Responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT), 2006. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://rm.coe.int/14th-european-conference-of-ministers-responsible-for-regional-spatial/168076ccdf.

Davoudi, Simin, Neil Evans, Francesca Governa and Marco Santangelo. "Territorial Governance in the Making. Approaches, Methodologies, Practices." *Boletin de la AGEN*, no 46 (2008): 33-52.

De Sousa, Luis. "Understanding European Cross- Border Cooperation: A Framework for Analysis." *Journal of European Integration* 35, no 6 (2013): 669-687.

Elden, Stuart. *The Birth of Territory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2013.

ESPON COMPASS. *Comparative Analysis of Territorial Governance and Spatial Planning Systems in Europe*. Final Report, Version 10/10/2018, Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2018. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/1.%20COMPASS_ Final_Report.pdf.

ESPON Project 2.3.2. *Governance of Territorial and Urban Policies from EU to Local Level*.

Final Report, Part 1, Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2006. Accessed: 10 January 2022, ttps://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/ attachments/fr-2.3.2_final_feb2007.pdf.

ESPON TANGO. *Territorial Approaches for New Governance*. Luxembourg: European Spatial Planning Observation Network, 2013. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/ESPON_TANGO_ Scientific_Report_Final.pdf.

ESPON. *The Territorial Dimension of Future Policies*, Policy Brief. Luxembourg: European Observation Network, 2018. Accessed: 10 January 2022. https://www.espon.eu/sites/default/files/attachments/ESPON_Policy_Brief_Ter ritorial_dimension_of_future_policies.pdf.

European Commission. *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1999. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/ regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/pdf/sum_en.pdf.

European Commission. *Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion: Turning Territorial Diversity into Strength*. COM (2008) 616 Final, 06.10.2008, Brussels, 2008. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/ LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0616:FIN:EN:PDF.

European Commission. *Territorial Agenda 2020: Put in Practice Enhancing the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Cohesion Policy by a Place-Based Approach*. Volume I–Synthesis Report, Brussels: Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy, Centre for Industrial Studies, 2015. Accessed: 10 January 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/what/territorial-cohesion/territorial_agenda_2020_practice_report.pdf.

European Union. *Consolidated Text: Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on the Establishment of a Common Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS)*, 18.01.2018. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:02003R1059-20180118&qid=1519136753473.

Evrard, Estelle. "The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC): Towards a Supraregional Scale of Governance in the Greater Region SaarLorLux?" *Geopolitics* 21, no 3 (2016): 513-537.

Faludi, Andreas. "European Integration and the Territorial-Administrative Complex." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 98, no 1 (2016): 71-80.

Faludi, Andreas. "From European Spatial Development to Territorial Cohesion Policy." *Regional Studies* 40, no 6 (2006): 667-678.

Faludi, Andreas. "Multi-level (Territorial) Governance: Three Criticisms." *Planning Theory & Practice* 13, no 2 (2012): 197-211.

Faludi, Andreas. "Territorial Cohesion and Subsidiarity Under the European Union Treaties: A Critique of the 'Territorialism' Underlying." *Regional Studies* 47, no 9 (2013): 1594-1606.

Faludi, Andreas. "Territorial Cohesion, Territorialism, Territoriality, and Soft Planning: A Critical Review." *Environment and Planning* 45, no 6 (2013): 1302-1317.

Faludi, Andreas. "The Poverty of Territorialism: Revisiting European Spatial Planning." *The Planning Review* 52, no 3 (2016): 73-81.

Faludi, Andreas. *Territorial Cohesion Under the Looking Glass Synthesis Paper About the History of the Concept and Policy Background to Territorial Cohesion*, (2009). Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid:112891b3-3dd6-4252-b0a5-452e5665f0d9?collection=research.

Gänzle, Stefan and Kristine Kern. (ed.) *A 'Macro-Regional' Europe in the Making Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Evidence*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Gualini, Enrico. "The Rescaling of Governance in Europe: New Spatial and Institutional Rationales." *European Planning Studies* 14, no 7 (2006): 881-904.

Haughton, Graham, Phil Allmendinger and Stijn Oosterlynck. "Spaces of Neoliberal Experimentation: Soft Spaces, Postpolitics, And Neoliberal Governmentality." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 45, no 1 (2013): 217-234.

Havlík, Vratislav. "Europeanization as the Reterritorialization of the State: Towards Conceptual Clarification." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 58, no 5 (2020): 1288-1306.

Hepburn, Eve. "Cohesion Policy and Regional Mobilization." in *Handbook on Cohesion Policy in the EU*, ed. Simona Piattoni and Laura Polverari, 203-216. Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar, 2016.

Holder, Jane and Antonia Layard. "Drawing out the Elements of Territorial Cohesion: Re-scaling EU Spatial Governance." *Yearbook of European Law* 30, no 1 (2011): 358-380.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. "Types of Multi-Level Governance." in *Handbook on Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Henrik Enderlein, Sonja Wälti, Michael Zürn, 17-31. Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar, 2010.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. "Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of Multi-   Level Governance." *American Political Science Review* no 97, no 2 (2003): 233-243.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.

Jauhiainen, Jussi S. and Helka Moilanen. "Towards Fluid Territories in European Spatial Development: Regional Development Zones in Finland." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 29, no 4 (2011): 728-744.

Jensen, Ole B. and Tim Richardson. "Nested Visions: New Rationalities of Space in European Spatial Planning." *Regional Studies* 35, no 8 (2001): 703-717.

Jensen, Ole B. and Tim Richardson. *Making European Space: Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Jessop, Bob. "Territory, Politics, Governance and Multispatial Metagovernance." *Territory, Politics, Governance* 4, no 1 (2016): 8-32.

Kjaer, Poul F. *Between Governing and Governance. On the Emergence, Function and Form of Europe's Post-National Constellation*. Hart: Oxford, 2010.

Kohler-Koch, Beate and Rainer Eising. (ed.) *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Lange, Emily and Iva Pires. "The Role and Rise of European Cross-Border Entities." in *European Territorial Cooperation: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to the Process and Impacts of Cross-Border and Transnational Cooperation in Europe*, ed. Eduardo Medeiros, 135-149. Cham: Springer International, 2018.

Lidström, Anders. "Territorial Governance in Transition." *Regional and Federal Studies* 17, no 4 (2007): 499-508.

Luukkonen, Juho and Helka Moilanen. "Territoriality in the Strategies and Practices of the Territorial Cohesion Policy of the European Union: Territorial Challenges in Implementing "Soft Planning"." *European Planning Studies* 20, no 3 (2012): 481-500.

Mamadouh, Virginie and Herman van der Wusten. "The European Level in EU Governance: Territory, Authority and Trans-Scalar Networks." *GeoJournal* 72, no (1-2) (2008): 19-31.

Mamadouh, Virginie. "The Territoriality of European Integration and the Territorial Features of the European Union: The first 50 Years." *Royal Ducth Enviromental Society* 92, no 4 (2001): 420-436.

Marks, Garry. "Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance in the EC." in *The state of the European Community*, ed. Alan Cafruny and Glenda G. Rosenthal, 391-409. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1993.

Marks, Gary and Liesbet Hooghe. "Contrasting Visions of Multi-Level Governance." in *Multi-Level Governance*, ed. Ian Bache and Matthew Flinders, 15-30. Oxford: Oxford University 2004.

Marks, Gary, Franrois Nielsen, Leonard, Ray and Jane Salk. "Competencies, Cracks and Conflicts: Regional Mobilisation in the EU." in *Governance in the European Union*, ed. Gary Marks, Fritz W Scharpf, Philippe C. Schmitter and Wolfgang Streeck, 40-63. London: Sage, 1996.

Medeiros, Eduardo. "Fake or Real EU Territorialicy? Debating the Territorial Universe of EU Policies." *Europa XXI* 38, (2020): 9-31.

Medeiros, Eduardo. "Is There a Rise of the Territorial Dimension in the EU Cohesion Policy?" *Finisterra* 103 (2016): 89-112.

Medeiros, Eduardo. "Territorial Cohesion: An EU Concept." *European Journal of Spatial Development* 60 (2016): 1-30.

Metzger, Jonathan and Peter Schmitt. "When Soft Spaces Harden: The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region." *Environment and Planning A* 44, no 2 (2012): 263-280.

Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union. *Territorial State and Perspective of the European Union: Toward a Stronger European Territorial Cohesion in the Light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Ambitions*. Luxemburg, 2007. Accessed: 10 January 2022, http://www.terport.hu/webfm_send/129.

Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union. *The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union*. 2011 Update, Hungary, 2011. Accessed: 10 January 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/what/territorial-cohesion/territorial_state_and_perspective_2011.pdf.

Ministers of Spatial Planning and Territorial Development of the European Union. *Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions*. Hungary, 2011. Accessed: 10 January 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/ sources/policy/what/territorial-cohesion/territorial_agenda_2020.pdf.

Moisio, Sami. "Geographies of Europeanization: The EU's Spatial Planning as a Politics of Scale." in *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making European Space*, ed. Luiza Bialasiewicz, 19-39. Surrey: Ashgate, 2011.

Murph, Alexander B. "Rethinking Multi-Level Governance in a Changing European Union: Why Metageography and Territoriality Matter." *GeoJournal* 72, no (1-2) (2008): 7-18.

Noferini, Andrea, Matteo Berzi, Francesco Camonita and Antoni Durà. "Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU: Euroregions amid Multilevel Governance and Reterritorialization." *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 35-56.

Perkmann, Markus. "Construction of New Territorial Scales: A Framework and Case Study of the EUREGIO Cross-Border Region." *Regional Studies* 41, no 2 (2007): 253-266.

Perkmann, Markus. "Cross-Border Regions in Europe Significance and Drivers of Regional Cross-Border Co-Operation." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 10, no 2 (2003): 153-171.

Piattoni, Simona. *The Theory of Multi-Level Governance: Conceptual, Empirical, and Normative Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2010.

Pucher, Jürgen, Alexandra Frangenheim, Angelos Sanopoulos and Wolfgang Schausberger.*The Future of Cohesion Policy*. Report I, Brussels: Committee of the Regions of the European Union, 2015. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://cor.europa.eu/en/engage/studies/Documents/Future-CP-Report-I-Final.pdf.

Pullano, Teresa. "The Evolving Category of Territory: From the Modern State to the European Union." *GARNET Working Paper*, no 64 (2009): 1-30. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/pais/research/researchcentres/csgr/garnet/workingpapers/6409.pdf.

Pupier, Pauline. "Spatial Evolution of Cross-Border Regions. Contrasted Case Studies in North-West Europe." *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 81-104.

Reitel, Bernard, Birte Wassenberg and Jean Peyrony. "The INTERREG Experience in Bridging European Territories. A 30-Year Summary." in *European Territorial Cooperation: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to the Process and Impacts of Cross-Border and Transnational Cooperation in Europe*, ed. Eduardo Medeiros, 7-23. Cham: Springer International, 2018.

Sack, Robert D. *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986.

Stead, Dominic. "European Integration and Spatial Rescaling in the Baltic Region: Soft Spaces, Soft Planning and Soft Security." *European Planning Studies* 22, no 4 (2014): 680-693.

Stead, Dominic. "The Rise of Territorial Governance in European Policy." *European Planning Studies* 22, no 7 (2014): 1368-1383.

Stephenson, Paul. "Twenty Years of Multi-Level Governance: 'Where Does It Come from? What is It? Where is It Going?'." *Journal of European Public Policy* 20, no 6 (2013): 817-837.

Ulrich, Peter. "Territorial Cooperation, Supraregionalist Institution-Building and National Boundaries: The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) at the Eastern and Western German Borders." *European Planning Studies* 28, no 1 (2020): 57-80.

Vitale, Alessandro. "The Contemporary EU's Notion of Territoriality and External Borders." *European Spatial Research and Policy* 18, no 2 (2011): 17-27.

Walsh, Cormac. "Rethinking the Spatiality of Spatial Planning: Methodological Territorialism and Metageographies." *European Planning Studies* 22, no 2 (2014): 306-322.

Wassenberg, Birte and Bernard Reitel. *Territorial Cooperation in Europe. A Historical Perspective*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015. Accessed: 10 January 2022, https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/ sources/information/pdf/brochures/interreg_25years_en.pdf.

Well, Lisa van and Peter Schmitt. "Understanding Territorial Governance: Conceptual and Practical Implications." *Europa Regional* 21.2013, no 4 (2015): 209-221.

Yılmaz, Samet. "Territorial Dimension of Governance and Its Institutional Effect on the Geographical Levels in the European Union." *Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi* 19, no 2 (2020): 585-608.

Zielonka, Jan. *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2006.

Zimmerbauer, Kaj and Anssi Paasi. "Hard Work with Soft Spaces (and vice versa): Problematizing the Transforming Planning Spaces." *European Planning Studies* 28, no 4 (2020): 771-789.