The structuring effect is considered to be a
feature of a territorializing action (Offner, 1999). It involves 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. Zepetella (1990) “refuses to
define general and abstract rules for
decisionmaking and places the particular
context and its specific features at the
heart of the reasoning”.

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
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 Damatais
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 Throup, 2003). It is the debate on the crisis
of legitimacy and efficiency of the central levels
decision making in many European countries,
with the consequent beginning of the so-called
“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
cau sed 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
type of “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 (ECB, 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
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 anthropological
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,
wellfare 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) 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.6 The
“Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial
Development of the European Continent”
(ECMAT, 2000, p. 16) also notes in its
recommendation (35) that a more balanced
policy of town and country planning must
make 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,
terminal facilities) and eliminate intra-
regional link deficiencies5.

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 the quality of public services
(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 ports6.

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
teritories 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-
à-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 (Fanás, 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), namely “Infrastructures, Territory and Countryside”; Benabent (2005) dealt with the relationship between planning infrastructures and town and country planning. Based on a meticulous analysis of the different Spanish models related to transport, he refers to the prevalence of sectorial interests and jurisdiction over horizontal territorial interests and jurisdiction. 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 combination 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 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-sectoral, between territories and between involved parties). It is here where the development of 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 the 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 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 and in other fields 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, and during the process of drawing up...
the "Plan", foster greater participation (reconciliation of different points of view or optional) with the objective of ensuring the best option10.

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"11.

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 importance to 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 periphericity, 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 in no less impact, rail transport, while road transport appears to be of little relevance at this scale level (MOPTMA12, 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)13. 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 Gómez in this publication), characterised by the coordination of territorial policies and infrastructures, and cooperation between territories and their representatives.

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 Gómez 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 important roles. Strategies through territorial cooperation, the formation of partnerships and the involvement of local and regional representatives, including public authorities14. 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 insomuch 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 (2003) 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 cohesion15. 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)16.

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 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 innovation. 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 planning 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)\(^2\).

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. 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 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) in 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\(^4\). In fact, despite the fact that this is clearly reflected in the polycentrism maps\(^3\), and is acknowledged as one of the new megapolises of the 21\(^{st}\) 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 Liberian and Helene 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 infrastructural planning, does it seem viable to me, in the mid-term, to put an end to the present stalemate.

\(^{1}\) Access equal 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, 1989, p. 20)

\(^{2}\) In 2005 the Regio Directorate General published issue 18 of “Infrogeo 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 Structural Cohesion Fund is exclusively reserved for transport and environmental infrastructures.

\(^{3}\) The text reads as follows: “(136) 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 pointed 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 reference to two publications by Romero (2005 and 2006).

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 drafted their plans 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 trans-European Networks, the extension of secondary networks and their integration into the TENs (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). In addition, I shall evaluate the reaction of a number of public and private governing bodies, companies and institutions in these regions, to the 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).

There is a risk that investments in secondary transport systems 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” (ESPD, p. 28)

12 MOPITMA = Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Transporte y Medio Ambiente (Spanish Ministry for Public Works, Transport and 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 relative objective of 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 Fariños and Payá (2004). On relations between territorial cooperation and cohesion, see Fariños and Payá (2005).

16 Although the future Objective 3 “European territorial cooperation: promoting the harmonious and balanced development of the Union territory” (IEC, 2004), only represents 4% of the funds (to be distributed between trans-frontier, trans-national and interregional 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 ETFs 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 the 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 of cross-border cooperation 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 string 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.

To achieve this greater legal base referred to in the document, the Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (IEC, 2004) envisaged creating two new instruments, the New Neighbourhood Instrument (NNI) and the Cross-border Regional Authority, later renamed as the European group 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)

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 Maigues

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