

the impact of a work that was decided on beforehand; it should rather be seen as part of the process of definition and carrying out of interventions. As a result, the approximate outline is not built as a procedure of agreement with parameters defined beforehand, but is instead a procedure relating to features, which as described by A. Zeppetella (1999) "refuses to define general and abstract rules for decisionmaking and places the particular context and its specific features at the heart of the reasoning" (p. 158).

Obviously, these suggestions are not conclusive. There are still many unresolved problems, especially if the objective is to meet the practical needs of how to programme and project interconnected and territorialised transport infrastructures as part of a constructive relationship with characteristics, specific features and actors in the various contexts in which they are going to be introduced. As a consequence, the need to face with the practices is an increasing priority in order to be able to answer very pressing questions and clarify the operational aspects of the relationship between infrastructures and territory.

- 1 For the opportunities and limits on models of governance, which are taken to be public policy models stressing the horizontal and vertical coordination of projects, actors and territorial levels in the management of network infrastructures, see Offner (2000). The institutional framework situation with regard to the programming, projection and management of infrastructural interventions in some European countries is described in Dematteis and Governa (2001).
- 2 The debate on the role of local and regional economies in development processes is illustrative of this (Storper, 1997; Crouch *et al.*, 2001; Scott and Storper, 2003), in the debate on the crisis of legitimacy and efficiency of the central levels of decision making in many European countries, with the consequent beginning of the so-called regional "renaissance" (Keating, 1998; Le Galès and Lequesne, 1997) or even in the debate on the redefinition of territoriality levels brought about by globalisation processes (Brenner, 1999)
- 3 The difference between impact and effects is not strictly a terminological one. According to Offner (1993), impact is the direct negative consequences caused by the detonation and explosion of a previous balance; However, effects should be related to certain choices, whether these are the consequences, the collateral relapses - whether positive or negative, desired or undesired - of an action, of a policy, or of a project.
- 4 The structuring effect is considered to be a true "operational myth" which "authorises and legitimises the action of the person taking the decisions; this enables the production of sectorial projects, despite evidence of interrelations between public policies" (Offner, 1993, p. 241).
- 5 However, the local/global relationship is not the only area of confrontation and conflict. It is enough to remember the many varied and ultimately conflicting interests presented by the various actors involved, more or less directly, while the interventions take place, as a result of which possible conflicts also arise in the local framework and between the various territories involved.
- 6 That apart, the *European Spatial Development Perspective* (CEC, 1999) also covers this problem

in one of the first chapters and highlights the importance of appropriate co-ordination of sectorial policies with a territorial connotation on various scales.

- 7 Among the main aspects of a territorial *governance* action, Le Galès (1998) acknowledges the change in the role of public action, internal integration, external integration and orientation towards strategy, all of which are basic factors in carrying out the territorialisation of infrastructural interventions.

## INFRASTRUCTURE AND TERRITORIAL PLANNING. Governance and management of multi-scale dynamics

Joaquín Farinós Dasí

### 1. Infrastructures, the basic element for regional development policies at any scale

By infrastructures I understand the part of an economy's global capital which, while embodying the characteristics of a public asset, is not supplied by the market or else is supplied inefficiently, being the reason why it has been mainly managed by the public sector. It is a key factor for and in Sustainable Territorial Development and the reason why it must be treated as a public asset and with public participation.

There are many different types of infrastructures. According to the tree diagram classification put forward by Gil, Pascual and Rapún (1998, pp. 462-463), infrastructures can be broken down into two main types: natural infrastructures deriving from the physical environment (such as rivers or valleys, etc.) and infrastructures deriving from anthropical endeavours. From among the latter, we need to distinguish between institutional and physical infrastructures. The physical ones break down into "social" infrastructures (education, public health, welfare and cultural centres, and buildings and installations used by governments or administrations) and "economic" infrastructures, also known as "basic infrastructures". The latter comprise public services (such as the supply of water, electricity, natural gas, refuse collection and waste treatment), telecommunication services (telephone systems, mail, cable, etc.), land management (improvements to drainage systems, flood preventions and other natural or technological hazards) and, finally, transport infrastructures (road, rail, waterways, ports and airports). In this article I shall focus on this last group.

I need hardly dwell on the idea that transport infrastructures continue to be considered a priority strategic element for territorial development and cohesion, be it at a European or regional scale. Transport infrastructures are a key factor, albeit still requiring development, in regional policies arising from the 1988 Structural

Funds reform, the document on European Spatial Development Perspective (the second of its three basic guidelines)<sup>1</sup> and from the objective of territorial integration in the enlarged EU, which attempts to make growth and cohesion compatible. Infrastructures alone do not generate development, but their lack of development (either non-existent or inadequate in terms of quantity and quality) can impede appropriate exploitation of the potential of each territory (Biehl and Muenzer, 1986).

The attention given over to infrastructures, or rather to mobility and accessibility within the EU territory, is still a current issue. But infrastructures themselves also continue to be a fundamental consideration to the degree of constituting a priority not only for the European Investment Bank and the European Commission, but also for the member states as a whole<sup>2</sup>. The "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent" (CEMAT, 2000, p. 16) also notes in its recommendation (35) that a more balanced policy of town and country planning must ensure improvements to the inter-connection of small and medium-sized towns, rural spaces and island regions to the main transport centres and axes (railways, motorways, ports, airports, intermodal centres) and eliminate intra-regional link deficiencies<sup>3</sup>.

There is no doubt that the present-day approach to infrastructures reveals a new focus, such as the importance of sustainability, which is now associated with intermodality as a way of: alleviating road traffic congestion and at the same time the consumption of fossil energy and release of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere following the Kyoto protocol guidelines; reducing costs and improving quality of life in grid spaces (with incentives to use the railway for transporting passengers and freight); and even promoting alternative development projects for coastal areas in decline by reclaiming the role of ports<sup>4</sup>.

The importance which the member states continue to give to transport infrastructures is reflected in a recent final report from the ESPON project 2.4.2 "Integrated analysis of transnational and national territories based on ESPON results". In an attempt to bridge the gap between existing territorial policies developed at a state and European community level, questions were addressed to experts participating in the project and to representatives from Member States themselves in the ESPON programme Monitoring Committee (generally speaking experts from, or closely associated with, government departments), namely, what were the present and future policy priorities of each state *vis a vis* territorial development objectives. Their response is clearly illustrated in figures 1 and 2: the priority issue which concerns Member States regarding territorial development is, overwhelmingly, accessibility and transport, much more

than other territory related matters such as systems for settlement, land use or environmental issues.

## 2. Reinterpreting the relations between town and country development and infrastructure planning: some territorial governance-based considerations

As I pointed out in a previously published article in reference to the European sphere (Farinós, 2004), along the lines pointed out by Tarroja (2000), there has been a changing focus in sectorial territorial policies in which attempts are being made to move towards the objective of sustainable territorial development, greater environmental sustainability, greater social cohesion and socio-economic endogenous development. The very objective of territorial planning is to ensure and improve the socio-economic and socio-ecological functioning of the territories bearing in mind the principles of sustainable development. Territorial planning is linked to a wide range of local, regional, national and EU policies, and from among these especially regional, urban and housing development, and infrastructures.

The influence of transport networks and infrastructures is becoming increasingly more relevant for both territorial structures and models as well as for visions of the future, to the extent that they impede or promote radical transformations in territorial organisation, promoting dynamics or helping to compensate for territorial imbalances (see figures 3 and 4).

Although horizontal cooperation between policies is not limited to infrastructures alone, what is certain is that its impact on territorial organisation is a prime consideration. This is true to the degree that in the case of Spain, in accordance with the STC 61/1997, the Spanish central government is no longer authorised to design or develop Town and Country planning at a national level; such decisions now come under the National Infrastructure Plan. Thus, town and country planning is subordinate to infrastructure planning which in turn has few links to regional economic planning, except in Objective 1 regions where a Regional Development Plan is mandatory at an Autonomous Community level; incidentally, without taking into consideration infrastructure networks other than interregional infrastructure networks. This situation is a far cry from what should be expected from good territorial governing or, put another way, from sustainable territorial development governance.

In one of the meetings between experts which took place during the process of drawing up the "Strategic Plan for Transport Infrastructures" by the Spanish Ministry for Economic Development (2005)<sup>5</sup>, namely "*Infrastructures, Territory and Countryside*",<sup>6</sup> Benabent (2005) dealt with the relationship between planning

infrastructures and town and country planning. Based on a meticulous analysis of the different Spanish laws related to transport<sup>7</sup>, he refers to the prevalence of sectorial interests and jurisdiction over horizontal territorial interests and jurisdiction<sup>8</sup>. After due territorial analysis, town and country planning attempts to define a territorial model whose outcome, in the author's opinion, "... is the result of a proposal for land use distribution... and defining the infrastructures which are going to favour the functioning of the territory as a whole". He goes on to say that, "... If there is no combining of sectorial policies with town and country planning, the result is that the impact of territorial infrastructures leads to the failure of territorial policies." (Benabent, 2005, p. 12); and, one could add, vice versa.

At any given moment there has been no shortage of declarations which more and more focus on the need for strategic territorial planning, and which have arrived at the same conclusions as Benabent, but inverting the order of the terms (despite the reticence of those who continue to see the "Plan" as an adequate supreme instrument). The question, then, is whether one can design a transport infrastructure plan without having previously defined territorial planning. If priority is given to coherence then the answer is obvious. But, as tends to happen, more pragmatic considerations take precedence: the influence exerted by pressure groups with important vested financial interests, the absence to date of attempts by the Spanish state to provide an overall structure of inter-administrative relations and the reproduction of this model (allowing for the odd exception) in the autonomous communities, not forgetting that in each case there is a different conception of town and country planning. With this in mind, it is easy to explain the order in which these terms appear today. Here one should add that sectorial policies are absolutely necessary, but these policies need to follow general principles, which here I call operational coherence.

I believe that territorial planning is the best path to follow to be able to achieve this objective of operational coherence. Here, I interpret Planning of Sustainable Spatial Development in the terms proposed by CEMAT: as a geographical expression of the economic, social, ecological and cultural policies of society, being at the same time a scientific discipline, an administrative and political policy where the merging of interdisciplinary understanding leads to balanced regional development and guides physical spatial organisation according to a global strategy.

Planning territorial development is of an integrated or mutually comprehensive nature and needs to articulate the different sectorial policies which have an impact on the territory. This planning requires vertical inter-institutional communication (multi-level) and also horizontal communication

(multi-sectorial, between territories and between involved parties). It is here where the development of new territorial governance practices can prove to be particularly useful, where the objective is not only to enhance coherence but also operational efficiency; in short, to derive greater benefits from policies and public investment. The following closing paragraphs to the second part of this article focus on reinterpreting the relations between town/country planning and transport infrastructures from the perspective of strategic territorial planning, leaving for the third part, the implications of a new territorial governance.

The key to these new relations between infrastructure and territorial planning seen from a strategic approach, is knowing whether the planning of physical transport infrastructures (by definition a "rigid" kind of planning) can be carried out by adopting a "softer" strategic approach, or not; whether "flexible planning" is possible in the case of infrastructures, accepting the fact that this is possible in other fields. This brings us to the discussion on the need and pertinence of the "Plan", or in Indovina's words (2004, p. 6), the path from "Plan" to "Planning", the latter understood as a coordinating element between the plan and the rest of the policies.

How efficient a plan is does not strictly depend on faithfully adhering to regulations and the programme of operations, but rather on being adaptable to the changing conditions of its setting during "implementation" in accordance with the results from continuous assessment. To quote Indovina, planning means building the future, and this is no easy task in a situation where changes take place at breakneck speed. If a plan needs to be flexible to adapt to changes, it loses its vocation of building the future. However, if it is not adaptable then one enters into a technical and policy contradiction of leaving the problems of today for the future; a dilemma with no easy solution. In fields other than transport infrastructure planning, it has been said that today planning is to govern rather than produce transformations, from the perspective of general interests and with an eye to the future. But, is this possible here given the fact that we are dealing with a public asset.

Here we are dealing with planning transport infrastructures with limited flexibility, long term execution (prolonged operations which require high levels of investment), sequential in time (not all of them can be built at the same time), selective as regards which territories are chosen (in all decisions regarding plans and deadlines there are always winners and losers), and with very long-lasting repercussions. Therefore, if this situation corresponds more to the philosophy of the "Plan" rather than "Planning" mentioned earlier, then one would have to incorporate the infrastructures plan into territorial planning<sup>9</sup>, and during the process of drawing up

the “Plan”, foster greater participation (reconciliation of different points of view or options) with the objective of ensuring the best option<sup>10</sup>.

In the case of infrastructures, this same lack of flexibility makes ex-ante evaluation even more necessary as well as giving priority to secondary networks that connect to the principal national and trans-European networks, which brings us to the vertical, multi-level dimension of territorial governance. For these secondary networks, re-designing is easier, self-sufficiency greater, and consequently also their level of “flexibility”<sup>11</sup>.

### 3. Managing multi-scale dynamics for cohesion in the enlarged EU: trans-European infrastructures for new developing areas and axes

In the new territory-network framework, understood as a combined spatial structure comprising nodes and channels (material or otherwise) of traffic flows, each territory, each local space and each city must design their own strategy to form part of the new networks. There are no networks without infrastructures, or without transport or telecommunication corridors, but there are no networks either without interrelations between the different parties involved. So, in the new globalisation context infrastructures and governance (new territorial government) emerge interrelated.

Earlier I made two points regarding transport networks. The first is their importance for territorial structures (impeding or promoting radical transformations in territorial organisation) when it comes to promoting existing dynamics or countering territorial imbalances, thus playing an active role in achieving the objective of territorial cohesion. The second point is their sequential nature (not all of them can be built at the same time), long-term implementation and the fact that they require heavy investment. But the fact is that once defined and implemented, they also pose risks, both from the perspective of sustainability (increase in traffic, levels of greenhouse gas emissions and costs, making transport more expensive), as well as efficacy (for example, the so-called “tunnel” effect).

With reference to the first point, intermodality is proposed as the most suitable method to achieve a balanced, polycentric and sustainable model. The combination of modes differs depending on the objective - this is particularly relevant in the case of freight transport. But, in accordance with the objective of accessibility and the reduction of periphcity, which kinds of infrastructures turn out to be the most effective or the most strategic? On this matter the results of the reports are quite clear. From the continental Europe perspective, the most

important effects for the Iberian peninsula are in the sphere of air transport; in second place, although with far less impact, rail transport, while road transport appears to be of little relevance at this scale level (MOPTMA<sup>12</sup>, 1996).

The same conclusion can be drawn from the maps presented by Hervé et al. (2003, pp. 103, 105, 107 and 110). Therefore, from a strategic point of view, of accessibility at a continental level, the most efficient intermodality is air-rail. Logically it has its limitations as it basically refers to transporting passengers, and, to a lesser degree, small-volume goods with a high unit value. For freight, as we well know, the most commonly used means is road, although railway networks and their links to ports can regain an important role following the recommendations of the European Community's documents such as the ETS or the White Book on transport (EC, 2002).

In short, the most efficient intermodality for passenger transport is the air-rail combination, for freight the port-rail combination. Clearly road traffic is the most efficient from the point of view of territorial coverage. For intermodal freight transport, the regional space is usually considered as a whole with the objective of offering those services necessary to guarantee an adequate level of traffic (market threshold)<sup>13</sup>. For the transport of passengers, however, it is the urban and suburban spaces that are most relevant (Hervé et al., 2003, p. 49). The new territorial structure that will derive from establishing new modes and new intermodal connections opens up a field of important possibilities in which each local space will have to try and situate itself. Regarding the impact of territorial models, the current situation is not that far removed from what was, in its day, the division of Spain into provinces and, more recently, the division into a state of autonomous regions.

In the second case, turning to efficacy, the solution lies in a greater integration of territorial infrastructures, which brings us to the concept of local territorial development (see the article by Francesca Governa in this publication), characterised by the coordination of territorial policies and infrastructures, and cooperation between territories and their representatives. When it comes to designing, assessing and financing infrastructures, these territories and representatives share common needs and strategies through territorial cooperation, the formation of partnerships and the involvement of local and regional representatives, including public authorities<sup>14</sup>. This territorial and citizen cooperation (for example, agreeing on itineraries, transit stops, transport chain breakpoints or potential nodes) contributes to anchoring the influence of infrastructures in the territories they cross; moderates excessive polarisation and discontinuities between points (be

they well communicated or not) inasmuch as it promotes an integration of the different levels of networks, from local to supranational, combining these networks so as to share the benefits.

As the *ESPON 1.2.1* project points out (Hervé, B. et al., 2003), trans-European transport networks are first and foremost interregional networks. This is a further reminder that territories need to establish networks of territorial collaboration, both horizontally and vertically (EC, 1999, p. 39). As regards EC territory, Davoudi (2003a) typifies vertical cooperation as that which is established between the European Union, member states, regions, and local authorities; while horizontal collaboration is that between cities, regions, or neighbouring states. Both axes of collaboration need to be considered together, from an integrated perspective, because whether vertical or horizontal, all infrastructures form part of the network, which in turn poses the need for inter-administration cooperation, now known as multilevel governance. This is acknowledged as such by the European states themselves, as illustrated in figure 5. Shared views have two advantages: to begin with there are less barriers, which increases their effectiveness; and they are more durable, or at any rate less vulnerable to changes resulting from political / policy cycles, which has a direct bearing on greater efficiency and also on the effective use of investments. One should not forget that when it comes to financing, the most important role in trans-European transport networks is that of the territories themselves (states and regions).

So, territorial cooperation becomes a key element in territorial cohesion<sup>15</sup>. The Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (EC, 2004), as well as the subsequent “*Strategic Community Guidelines for Cohesion 2007-2013*” (EC, 2005), envisage territorial cooperation as one of the priorities for cohesion policy, and this territorial cooperation is explicitly focused on the objective of territorial development at a European level, bearing in mind the idea of “petites Europe” (see figure 6) and a long term perspective. Territorial cooperation has become one of the three objectives of future cohesion policies for the next programming period, alongside the objectives of convergence (traditional Objective 1) and competitiveness (Objective 2)<sup>16</sup>.

In the light of the Lisbon objectives, the key challenge for reinforcing Territorial Cohesion is to increase the territorial capital of all the EU regions and to promote territorial integration; that is, to foster trans-European synergies and competitive and innovative clusters. Grouping regions with an adequate level of infrastructures will contribute to providing the necessary critical mass to compete in a global economy.

In practical terms territorial cohesion implies, among other things, putting the regions of

Europe in a better position by reinforcing their profile and facilitating their territorial connectivity and integration through trans-European cooperation. In effect, what is being said in the European documents is that the EU perspective needs to be reinforced in national and regional strategies, taking into account territorial identity, specialisation and position. Put another way, each territory must identify its own unique and individual development potential and place within the EC, and locate their territorial development strategies within a context of trans-national and European development. In order to do this, and bearing in mind the objectives of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Agendas, one needs to ensure the active involvement of national and regional planning authorities. To this end one attempts to promote a "... greater use of transnational cooperation in planification and decision making at the regional and national levels, as well as for the structural programmes, and a more extended legal base for transnational and trans-frontier cooperation combined with a better UE management. (Council of Ministries, Rotterdam, 2004)<sup>17</sup>.

#### 4. The Western Mediterranean Arc: the case for an end to a stalemate

When it comes to applying a strategy through which a wide range of European peripheral cities attempt to better their chances of competing in a global market through the polycentric integration of their neighbouring towns and cities, the most difficult challenge is to develop economic links and functional specialisation, because without these a polycentric urban region would be reduced to a mere symbolic image rather than an integrated functional space (Davoudi 2003b). And for this, infrastructures constitute a fundamental element.

As Davoudi points out, there are two key areas in which political intervention is particularly useful: the development of physical infrastructures (efficient transport and telecommunication networks) and "soft" infrastructures, particularly a regulatory capacity (institutional infrastructures) and regional identity. This is the very dual challenge for the western European Mediterranean space (also known as the "Arco Latino"), especially in the Spanish part of the Mediterranean Arc and its link to the French part. Although cooperation is easier between dynamic territories able to find interests in common, territorial policy options can lead to another direction. For example, from an exclusively Spanish perspective, the priority of a radial model has prevailed for many years, allowing for the evident differences from a polycentric point of view and from the system of cities (demographic and economic) between the Murcia-Valencia-Girona and Alicante/Valencia-Madrid axes, and bearing in mind that cooperation is easier between dynamic territories able to find interests in common. However, in the new context of networked territories there

are no grounds for monopolistic territorial strategies (rather the complete opposite) that would mean excluding other present alternatives or any other possible options that might offer potential for the involved territories as a whole.

Therefore, one could say that the Western Mediterranean Arc has not been a real priority in the different plans at the level of European states, and consequently neither has it been a real priority for the EU<sup>18</sup>. In fact, despite the fact that this is clearly reflected in the polycentrism maps<sup>19</sup>, and is acknowledged as one of the new megalopolis of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Boira, 2006 –quoting Richard Florida), what is certain is that the Mediterranean Arc is not recognised clearly and neatly as a world area of economic integration. In a recent document from the ESPON network, it appears broken up into two spaces (or even four if one takes into account the European Mediterranean Basin) clearly differentiated, not only from each other but also from the rest of the EU spaces (as in the case of the Iberian and Hellene limits). These are two unique spaces that lack intersection with other areas (see figure 7).

To be able to meet future challenges with a major guarantee of success, the Mediterranean Arc needs a territorial vision to truly become one of the "petites Europe" and an integrated functional space, with a sense of identity but has to avoid running the risk of becoming a mere symbolic image. Three requisites are necessary for this task: technical capacity, mobilisation of interest groups and citizens, and political leadership. From these three, only the first seems to be assured, while the situation appears to be progressively more complicated as we approach the third, which in turn has repercussions for the second, especially in a political and territorial culture such as the Mediterranean.

As I have previously stated on a number of occasions (Plaza, Romero and Farinós, 2003; Farinós and Payá, 2006) the implication and leadership, or rather the commitment, of the different political-administrative levels (especially the sub-state level) becomes a crucial factor. New forms of territorial cooperation must be tried and tested at all levels (regional, state, trans-frontier), without exclusivity (it is possible to arrive at multiple co-partnership agreements) but with a clear definition of shared objectives and priorities. The framework envisaged by Interreg IIIB, or rather the philosophy with which it is impregnated, should be the basis from which to delve further into this test of new shared forms of territorial information and exchange of experiences that are to lead to a combined territorial strategy built over that of each of the territories concerned (Farinós, 2006). Only in this way, with the introduction and putting into practice of new forms of territorial governance, or if you prefer new governance practices in territorial and infrastructure planning, does

it seem viable to me, in the mid-term, to put an end to the present stalemate.

- 1 Access equivalent to infrastructures and knowledge, by means of "Promotion of integrated transport and communication concepts, which support the polycentric development of the EU territory and are an important pre-condition for enabling European cities and regions to pursue their integration into EMU. Parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge should be realised gradually. Regionally adapted solutions must be found for this." (EC, 1999, p. 20)
- 2 In 2005 the Regio Directorate General published issue 18 of *Inforegio panorama*, a monographic article titled, "Transport, a driving force for regional development", 27 pp. On the 22 of June 2006 the European Commission adopted the orientation laid out in "Keep Europe moving - Sustainable mobility for our continent" (EC, 2006a), a mid-term review of the 2001 "White Paper on Transport", which included new guidelines for future transport policies. The measures foreseen in the aforementioned White Paper (such as promoting sea and rail connections for long distance freight transport) are to be complemented with new measures (such as the inclusion of new technologies and intelligent systems that would improve efficiency, greater interoperability of equipment, encourage use of "green" fuels, a revision of mobility models in cities, and so on), to help offset the negative consequences of energy dependence and protect the environment. And, all of this without forgetting that mobility is the driving force behind prosperity and freedom of movement of citizens and European merchandise within the common European space. Therefore, one can conclude that transport has not ceased to be an important part of the EU's political agenda, as is also the case for regional policies and structural funds, especially in the Objective 1 regions. One should bear in mind that the territorial Cohesion Fund is exclusively reserved for transport and environmental infrastructures.
- 3 The text reads as follows: "(35) In the interests of achieving a regionally more balanced development, links between small and medium-sized towns as well as rural and island areas and the trans-European networks and transport centres (railways, motorways, navigable waterways and ports, airports or intermodal centres) should be improved. Regional accessibility must also be increased through the elimination of missing intra-regional links. Considering the on-going growth of traffic flows, integrated strategies taking into account the various transport modes and – on an equal basis – spatial planning policy requirements are necessary. The lower environmental impact of railways, waterways and maritime transportation should be taken into account in doing this."
- 4 Taking transport intermodality into consideration, especially freight transport, can contribute better to the objective of a balanced, polycentric and sustainable territorial model.
- 5 "Plan Estratégico de Infraestructuras de Transporte" (Ministerio de Fomento, 2005).
- 6 '*Infraestructuras, territorio y paisaje*'.
- 7 Ley 16/1987, de 30 de julio de Ordenación de los Transportes Terrestres, Ley 25/1988 de 29 de julio de Carreteras, Ley 27/1992, de 24 de noviembre, de Puertos del Estado y de la Marina Mercante.
- 8 His appraisal is of particular interest. He quotes the contributions by eminent jurists interested in territorial matters such as Luciano Parejo and Pérez Andrés, concerning the important limitations of developing horizontal and vertical relations of cooperation and coordination between policies and the three State levels. As I point out in this article, the mechanisms for inter-administrative

collaboration and coordination here in Spain is an issue which still needs to be resolved and has hardly been developed. On the subject of problems coordinating policies which have a bearing on the territory and the limited expectations faced by the Spanish composite state model, I would also like to make note of two publications by Romero (2005 and 2006).

- 9 Territorial policy is a public matter; the objective is to produce a territorial model (a physical configuration of the territory) in accordance with the needs and requirements of the population. The realisation of this policy must fall mainly to the instruments of territorial planning themselves, but also to other types of plans, basically regional, infrastructure and environmental development plans. After the various parties have diagnosed and defined the desired future vision, strategic territorial planning must set out the general lines of operation and the means with which to achieve and assess them. As for plans, these are the instruments used to pursue given objectives concerning certain fundamental aspects that will contribute to reaching the global goal (for example, infrastructures as a way of ensuring the functioning of the required settlements' model and land use). In the case of territorial plans of a more integrated nature, they tend to be more "tactical"; renouncing bearing more operative and setting out their proposals, a degree of specificity which is more present in the case of sectorial plans.
- 10 When I say the best option I am not referring to the one which technically might be the most advisable, but rather the one that correlates and forges agreement between the different interested parties, even though the administration might be the body which directs and ensures the process. If, according to mathematical logic, the shortest distance between two points is a straight line, obviously orography and the (until now given a lower priority) interests of the inhabitants of the territories through which the infrastructure has to pass can mean that a "technically perfect" route is not viable. A good example of this is the controversy that arose when it came to deciding the route for the last stretch that finalised the Madrid-Valencia motorway which resulted in a confrontation between central, autonomous (Castile-La Mancha and Valencia) and local governments. This conflict leads to an excessive hold up in the completion of the motorway and also had corresponding political repercussions (within the political parties and in the elections).
- 11 "There is a risk that investments in secondary networks and their integration into the TENS cannot be carried out in time, or cannot be carried out at all, if the completion of higher ranking networks is given greater priority. To avoid a relative deterioration of service quality in those EU areas which are not directly integrated into the Trans-European Networks, the extension of secondary networks should not be treated as less important. This also includes the modernisation of regional transport services. In doing this, the utilised means of transport should be adapted to the specific local and regional circumstances (conventional rail network, buses, regional airports, etc.). Apart from this, the secondary networks can contribute to managing the traffic flows on the TENS and tapping the critical potential for large scale links. In this respect, the timetable for linking the secondary networks to the trans-European networks can be crucial for their development." (recommendation 113 of the European Spatial Development Perspective, p.27)
- As regards this issue the very same document defined two clear policy options: "24. Strengthening secondary transport networks and their links with TENS, including development

- of efficient regional public transport systems." and "28. Improvement of co-operation between transport policies at EU, national and regional level." (ESDP, p. 28)
- 12 MOPTMA = Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Transporte y Medio Ambiente (Spanish Ministry for Public Works, Transport and the Environment).
- 13 Transport network nodes become a reference point for both industry strategies (at the level of production and logistics) as well as territorial organisation by administrations that have jurisdiction in matters of town and country planning.
- 14 The issue of financing infrastructure plans opens up other questions of major importance, such as the role that has to be played by private initiatives, the relations between the public and private sectors, and also, in the public sphere, of the relations between the different levels of government (financing models, fiscal federalism, etc).
- 15 For further details regarding territorial cooperation initiatives at a European level, see Farinós and Payá (2004). On relations between territorial cooperation and cohesion, see Farinós and Payá (2005). Regarding the concept of territorial cohesion, see Farinós (2005).
- 16 Although the future Objective 3 "*European territorial cooperation: promoting the harmonious and balanced development of the Union territory*" (EC, 2004), only represents 4% of the funds (to be distributed between trans-frontier, trans-national and inter-regional cooperation), it translates as the opportunity to receive additional financing in the new programming period as well as the possibility of modifying not only the objective but also territorial development planning methods. If we remember that one of the ETS guidelines was precisely that of consolidating these kinds of spaces by promoting territorial and, in particular, trans-national cooperation, and we relate this idea to the objective of territorial competitiveness, then we can better understand the nature of the future Objective 3.
- When it comes to trans-frontier cooperation and those regions where the conditions for trans-frontier cooperation already exist, funds will have to be directed towards priorities that could generate added value to trans-frontier operations by bringing about a transition from simple economic penetration from both sides of the border to a true trans-frontier economic system. To achieve this aim the following are considered necessary: improving competitiveness resulting from innovation, R+D, setting up material networks (infrastructures) and non-material networks (services), and developing the feeling of belonging to a trans-frontier community (redesigning the mental maps). Territorial connectivity and integration are thus variables positively related to territorial cohesion. In turn, trans-national cooperation provides a strategic profile for achieving major EU territorial objectives, contributing to better EU territorial integration. One of the EU tasks is to facilitate trans-European integration stimulating the development or conservation of zones and networks which are important for Europe. The mid-term evaluation by Interreg IIIB, carried out in 2004, already emphasised the crucial role of trans-national cooperation programmes and projects for European territorial integration and cohesion. It has also been stated that cities and regions make use of trans-national cooperation as a siting factor, attracting investments and integrating them into the networks (Conference on Trans-national Cooperation, Berlin, November 2004). In these spaces a series of structuring projects would be developed, among which the Commission proposes: trans-European transport corridors, natural hazard prevention, water management at river basin level,

integrated maritime cooperation and R+D networks /Innovation.

- 17 To achieve this greater legal base referred to in the document, the Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (EC, 2004) envisaged creating two new instruments, the New Neighbourhood Instrument (NNI) and the Cross-border Regional Authority, later renamed as the European grouping of territorial Cooperation (EGTC) to make it clear that it not only dealt with trans-frontier cooperation but also transnational and interregional cooperation. The EGTC is seen as "...a cooperation instrument at Community level for the creation of cooperative groupings in Community territory, invested with legal personality, ... An EGTC should be able to act, either for the purpose of implementing territorial cooperation programmes or projects co-financed by the Community, ... or for the purpose of carrying out actions of territorial cooperation which are at the sole initiative of the Member States and their regional and local authorities with or without a financial contribution from the Community." (Regulation (EC) 1082/2006)
- 18 The recent decision by the French government serves as a good example: they have decided to postpone until 2030 the link construction work that would connect high speed trains from both sides of the Pyrenees (Serra Ramoneda, 2006), despite the many, diverse and reiterated efforts (Arco Latino, Comunidad de los Pirineos, meetings and agreements between cities on both sides of the frontier) to stress this situation.
- 19 See the ESPON 1.1.1 Project Final Report;

## THE MEDITERRANEAN AXIS AND THE TRANS-EUROPEAN TRANSPORT NETWORKS (TEN-T): A HISTORY OF FAILING TO MEET. From the Essen summit (1994) to the external dimension (2006)

Josep Vicent Boira Maiques

### Introduction

The focus of this article is to provide a critical review of the role of the Mediterranean axis (essentially comprising the autonomous region of Valencia, Catalonia and the Balearic Isles, with the addition of Murcia, Andalusia and the French region of Languedoc-Roussillon) in the overall trans-European transport networks' (TEN-T) map; its role and how it has been integrated -if in fact this is the case. In addition, I shall evaluate the reaction of a number of public and private governing bodies, companies and institutions in these regions, to the European Union's plans to extend trans-European networks to neighbouring countries.

Therefore, I shall begin with an overall view of the European transport networks and how they have evolved since the mid 1990s, and end with an analysis of the relationship between these networks and their evolution, particularly in the light of the latest developments: the external dimension of the TEN-T (2006) (that is its extension to EU neighbouring countries), and the allegations in documents and