

Opportunities of cross-border cooperation between small and medium cities in Europe



LE GOUVERNEMENT
DU GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG
Ministère du Développement durable
et des Infrastructures

Département de l'aménagement du territoire



Report written in the frame of the Spatial Development Observatory, on behalf of the *Department of Spatial Planning and Development – Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure* in Luxembourg.

Antoine Decoville, Frédéric Durand, Valérie Feltgen, LISER, 2015

Cover picture: The Schengen Treaty Monument. Source: Schengen asbl

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Foreword | 5 |
| Urban border areas: from marginal territories to interfaces | 6 |
| 1) The challenges involved in linking up small and medium cities | 9 |
| 1.1. Combining the means, know-how and resources | 9 |
| 1.2. Aiming at greater coherence at the cross-border level, by converging economic, social and environmental development..... | 11 |
| 1.3. Deploying a more international image of the border region | 12 |
| 2) Overview of urban cross-border cooperation in Europe | 13 |
| 2.1. Portraits of European cross-border urban areas..... | 14 |
| 2.2. Indicators to measure cross-border integration | 39 |
| a. Cross-border commuters | 40 |
| b. Residents from neighbouring countries..... | 42 |
| c. Measuring cross-border economic inequalities through GDP | 44 |
| d. The labour market | 46 |
| Conclusion: different approaches of the concept of cross-border integration | 48 |
| 3) Factors that influence cross-border integration..... | 49 |
| 3.1. The impact of geographical contexts | 49 |
| 3.2. The importance of forms of cross-border governance | 50 |
| a. Deploying the legal instruments and means available..... | 50 |
| b. The quality of cross-border dialogue and its longevity | 51 |
| c. Involving non-institutional actors in the cross-border dynamic | 52 |
| 3.3. The appropriation of a cross-border area by its inhabitants | 53 |
| General conclusion | 54 |
| Annex: Characteristics of the institutional cross-border context of 21 case studies in Europe | 55 |

List of the European cross-border urban areas studied in the report

| | |
|--|----|
| Aachen-Liège-Maastricht..... | 22 |
| Basel-St-Louis-Lörrach..... | 27 |
| Bayonne-San Sebastián..... | 30 |
| Chaves-Verín..... | 31 |
| Cieszyn-Cesky Tesin..... | 33 |
| Copenhagen-Malmö..... | 18 |
| Esch-sur-Alzette-Villerupt..... | 24 |
| Frankfurt (Oder)-Stubice..... | 32 |
| Geneva-Annemasse..... | 28 |
| Gorizia-Nova Gorica..... | 35 |
| Haparanda-Tornio..... | 17 |
| Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai..... | 21 |
| Newry-Dundalk..... | 20 |
| Nice-Monaco-San Remo..... | 29 |
| Oradea-Debrecen..... | 36 |
| Ruse-Giurgiu..... | 37 |
| Saarbrücken-Forbach-Sarreguemines..... | 25 |
| Strasbourg-Kehl-Offenburg..... | 26 |
| The Greater Region..... | 23 |
| Valga-Valka..... | 19 |
| Vienna-Bratislava-Brno-Győr..... | 34 |

Foreword

This report has been written by the Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research (LISER), on behalf of the Department of Spatial Planning and Development of the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure in Luxembourg. It was conducted within the framework of the Italy, Latvia and Luxembourg Trio Presidency programme.

The Trio presidency has placed its programme in the fields of Territorial Cohesion and Urban Policy under the general theme of making the objectives included in the Lisbon Treaty as well as in the Territorial Agenda 2020 more operational.

The common umbrella theme of small and medium cities is closely linked to the Trio Presidency's assessment of the implementation of the Territorial Cohesion objective and the Territorial Agenda 2020, highlighting the role and development perspectives of small and medium cities in common territorial development visions. Moreover, this umbrella theme is the specific contribution of the Presidency Trio to the proposed EU Urban Agenda.

In this context, Luxembourg has decided to continue its work relative to the development of 'cross-border polycentric metropolitan regions', begun under the aegis of the ESPON project METROBORDER, in which the state of Luxembourg was one of the 'stakeholders'.

This report is meant to observe and highlight the opportunities for cross-border cooperation initiatives between small and medium cities with respect to territorial development and the reduction of inequalities. A selection of case studies, which is far from being exhaustive, will be presented. It aims at being representative of the diversity of the existing forms of cross-border cooperation in Europe which attempt to transcend differences and improve cohabitation and exchanges across borders. This perspective will hopefully nourish the debate on the steps to be taken in order to strengthen the position of small and medium cities within cross-border dynamics.

Urban border areas: from marginal territories to interfaces

In the course of their histories, small and medium cities in border regions have often suffered from their distance from the dynamic developments associated with cities in more central regions. Indeed, at a time when borders were relatively impermeable to the circulation of goods, capital and people, these border cities were first of all handicapped by the relative insecurity (perceived or real) that proximity to a foreign and hostile country conferred¹. This insecurity has long prevented strategic industries and other large infrastructure projects from being located there. Though peace nowadays seems a solid given, history teaches us that this was far from being always the case. Cross-border cooperation contributes to building a more peaceful climate and that is probably one of its greatest advantages even if it is sometimes forgotten in the focus on specific and concrete realisations. Moreover, small and medium cities in border regions were also negatively affected by the limited dimension of their hinterlands, constricted by the barrier that a border represented. Lastly, their distance from decision-making centres and notably national capitals which are often centrally located, reinforced their relative isolation. Yet today profound changes are redrawing the map for these urban border areas under the combined effect of several important forces. Firstly, the progressive opening up of borders through the political construction of the European Union, carried by the globalisation of economic exchanges and the relaxation of international regulations has offered new development opportunities to these urban border regions². The Schengen agreement entered into force in 1995 and the introduction of Euro notes and coins, valid from the 1st January 2002, constituted major milestones in strengthening the relationships between inhabitants of border cities. These changes have been accompanied by developments in the governance of these regions, carried along by the transformation and reconfiguration of the role of the State and the affirmation of the growing importance of cities as major territorial actors. Lastly, the means supplied by the European Union have allowed actors in urban border territories to develop cross-border cooperation mechanisms that have grown in importance since 1990. Thanks to a combination of these different elements, border cities today tend to work out their own planning strategies by partnering with foreign local actors. This lends them a new dynamism which some of them have turned to their advantage by making the transition from “border city” to “interface city”. The presence of a border is no longer systematically seen as an obstacle but can instead be perceived as an asset, one that can be exploited in the interests of all parties. However, such a transition is not always an easy one, given the different geographical configurations, the nature of borders, the quality of the governance systems in place and the differences in legislation from one territory to another.

The aim of this study is to highlight both the opportunities and the challenges inherent in initiatives of cooperation between small and medium cities on different sides of a border. This report does not aim at providing a rigid definition of what a small or medium border city is, since these notions are relative concepts, which depend, first of all, of the regional context and of the level a city occupies in the urban hierarchy of its country. The case-studies presented here mostly correspond to second-tier cities which have a population between about 20 000 and 250 000 inhabitants. Nevertheless, a few metropolitan case-studies are also presented because they include small and medium cities in their regional cooperation approach. Naturally each territory is specific and no two border regions are strictly

¹ Kolossov, V. (eds.), Amilhat, A.-L., Liikanen, I., Newman, D., Joenniemi, P., Yuval-Davis, N., Rosière, S. and Scott, J. 2012. *EUBORDERSCAPES: State of the Debate Report 1*, EUBORDERSCAPES FP7 Project, http://www.euborderscapes.eu/index.php?id=project_reports

² Sohn C. 2014, Modelling Cross-Border Integration: The Role of Borders as a Resource, *Geopolitics*, vol.19, n°3, pp. 587-608.

comparable. The objective of this reports is more to put varying case studies in perspective, geographically, socially and economically, while including their historical attempts at cooperation, rather than identifying good practices in terms of governance that would be universally applicable. Using different angles, the approach is to show that regardless of different contexts, steps towards cross-border cooperation share the same aim: to improve the daily living conditions of its inhabitants, in conformity with the objective of territorial cohesion as defined by the EU:

“Territorial cohesion is about ensuring the harmonious development of all these places and about making sure that their citizens are able to make the most of inherent features of these territories. As such, it is a means of transforming diversity into an asset that contributes to sustainable development of the entire EU.”³

Such a goal is often pursued through the development of a territorial strategy shared by all institutional actors (particularly those in charge of spatial planning). The emergence of cross-border polycentric metropolitan regions, as supported by the Luxembourg actors of the Trio Presidency of the Council of the EU, is one of the territorial strategies marshalled for this ambition. The idea behind the terminology is not to favour the large metropolises but, on the contrary, to promote the constitution of networks of cities so that together they can acquire a more international dimension. Furthermore, cross-border polycentric regions seem to offer better chances to converge towards a more balanced development that is beneficial to the whole territory, including the hinterlands of these cities. Indeed, a polycentric urban framework is supposed to also allow peri-urban and rural areas to share the services essential to a high quality of life. That is why polycentric development is a priority for the European Regional Policy. The Territorial Agenda 2020 (2011) that European ministers for spatial planning and territorial development ratified in 2011 in Gödöllő, in Hungary, states:

“we aim at polycentric development at the macro-regional, cross-border and also on national and regional level in relevant cases. Where possible, it is important to avoid polarization between capitals, metropolitan areas and medium sized towns on the national scale. Small and medium-sized towns can play a crucial role at regional level. Policy efforts should contribute to reducing the strong territorial polarisation of economic performance, avoiding large regional disparities in the European territory by addressing bottlenecks to growth in line with Europe 2020 Strategy.”⁴

This polycentric strategy aims to reinforce the synergies and complementarities between the urban centres of a given cross-border region in order to allow a more harmonious and equitable territorial development for all its citizens and economic forces. These links have generally increased in the last thirty years thanks to the numerous advances in cross-border cooperation. The financial support provided within the INTERREG programme played an important role, it allowed to reinforce the ties beyond borders through the implementation of concrete projects.

³ Commission of the European Communities. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European parliament, the Committee of the regions and the European economic and social committee, Brussels, 2008, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/consultation/terco/paper_terco_en.pdf

⁴ Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions, agreed at the Informal Ministerial Meeting of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning and Territorial Development on the 19th May 2011, Gödöllő, Hungary.

At the institutional level, the event that really launched cross-border cooperation in motion was the Outline Convention of Madrid, ratified in 1980 and put into practice afterwards through agreements between states. This Outline Convention provides a legal basis that allows territorial groupings to develop cross-border partnerships, as attested by article 2:

“ (...) transfrontier co-operation shall mean any concerted action designed to reinforce and foster neighbourly relations between territorial communities or authorities within the jurisdiction of two or more Contracting Parties and the conclusion of any agreement and arrangement necessary for this purpose. Transfrontier co-operation shall take place in the framework of territorial communities' or authorities' powers as defined in domestic law”.

In addition, the establishment of numerous different legal tools, such as the European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC), in 2006, which are instruments for cross-border cooperation endowed with legal status, and others ones (Euroregional Cooperation Groupings, Local Cross-Border Cooperation Groupings...) are a new milestone in the legal simplification of the cross-border cooperation between small and medium cities, even if these instruments are not strictly limited to the latter.

This report aims to show the opportunities of creating cross-border networks between cities by citing numerous concrete examples of cross-border cooperation. The first stage explores the stakes involved in cooperation between small and medium cities in border regions, and thus the gains that can be obtained through cooperation initiatives. The second part proposes an overview of cooperation initiatives in Europe. A great diversity of spatial contexts has been included in order to illustrate the multiple facets of cross-border cooperation between small and medium cities: old or recent initiatives, well- or scarcely institutionalised, benefiting from important or modest means, and so on. The last part, drawing on the lessons from the analysis of the case studies, highlights the factors influencing cross-border integration between small and medium cities.

1) The challenges involved in linking up small and medium cities

Three important issues related to cross-border cooperation initiatives are developed in the first part. The first point concerns the objective of reaching a critical mass and turning an initial impediment situation into an advantage, in other words, using differences between border regions as an opportunity rather than a handicap. The second issue deals with the notion of convergence between border cities, which can be achieved through common strategies for territorial development. The third and last point puts forward the fact that cross-border cooperation can contribute to improve the image of a city by enhancing its international dimension through a branding and communication strategy. The elements presented in this first part are far from being exhaustive, such is the number of possibilities, which continue to evolve with the initiatives being developed and with the creation of new instruments for cooperation.

1.1. Combining the means, know-how and resources

In the globalised context of economic competition between territories, cross-border cooperation between small and medium cities in Europe can allow them, through pooling means and resources (financial, human), to attain a certain critical mass that enables competition with larger cities and thus lets them gain in attractiveness and influence. This notion of 'critical mass', which includes the use of complementarity, can be understood in two different ways:

- First of all it can be a question of mutualising resources, notably financial ones, in view of the collective needs, in order to acquire or operate infrastructures that no city or border region could hope to implement by itself. It could be a question of constructing large public projects that need both private and national or regional funding to get off the ground, such as the joint management of the international EuroAirport Basel-Mulhouse-Freiburg (in use for nearly 70 years already), or the Oresund bridge between Copenhagen and Malmö. It could also be a question of cooperation between border cities for running more local infrastructure facilities and public services jointly with a view to increasing their efficiency and reducing operating costs by exploiting the economies of scale created by cooperation (such as joint water filtering plants and rainwater collection management, waste collection, etc.). It is also important to mention that in the case of small and medium cities subject to demographic decline, looking for mutual cooperation or complementarities at cross-border level can also lessen the management costs of infrastructures that have become onerous.

- The second way to achieve critical mass is through the networking of the competencies and the sharing of know-how and skills proper to each area in order to improve services quality and to favour innovation⁵ or the taking off of certain economic activities thanks to 'cross-fertilisation'. Following the principles of the complex thought and systems theory, according to which "the whole is greater than the sum of its parts", this search for complementarities can generate cases of added value that could not otherwise have been achieved. Thus, the networking of universities, research and development centres, commercial start-ups, employment agencies and even tourist offices are examples amongst many possible others of the kind of initiatives that link competencies, resources and knowledge in

⁵ Lundquist K.-J. and Trippel M. 2009. Towards Cross-Border Innovation Spaces. A theoretical analysis and empirical comparison of the Öresund region and the Centropo area, *SRE - Discussion Papers 05*. Vienna.

order to generate beneficial returns for urban territories. These opportunities for innovation permitted by opening up borders to networks of entrepreneurs and innovators is also completely in line with the priorities defined in the context of the strategy of Europe 2020, adopted by the European Council in June 2010, “*which aims at establishing a smart, sustainable and inclusive economy with high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion*”. Indeed, given a European context in which high production costs do not favour greater competitiveness, innovation is crucial for maintaining wealth creation *in situ* and for differentiating itself from the economic profiles of emerging countries. Keeping the head start through innovation is the challenge facing European industrialists and entrepreneurs. Border cities can potentially benefit from being at the heart of the intermingling of scientific, industrial, managerial and technical cultures. In the Oresund region, for instance, numerous innovative companies take benefit from the border context and exploit the complementarity they find between Swedish and Danish different working cultures. It allows a ‘hybridisation’ which enrich the global level of competencies. In order to bolster this impetus to cooperation, the creation of innovation poles (clusters, “business incubators”, “science parks”) constitutes an efficient tool to gather together actors in innovation and to allow cross-border spaces to be more competitive at the international level. In the Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai for example, four clusters for innovation have been set up to support the development of those sectors of activity deemed important for the regional cross-border economy: agro-nutrition, health, textiles, innovative materials & design, logistics... These clusters provide a platform for encounters and exchanges for the sectors in question. Likewise, the creation of networks between universities, following the EUCOR initiative in the Upper Rhine, or between centres of training and research, constitute other ways to develop means of synergies between actors in innovation. Moreover, cross-border cooperation between economic actors can allow certain companies to gain the competencies required to conquer new markets. Linguistic skills and knowledge of employment and fiscal rules are the kind of complex elements that require considerable financial means to be overcome. If initiatives aimed at improving reciprocal knowledge of neighbouring environments are organised in border regions, this would allow entrepreneurs to conquer new markets not only in the neighbouring border region but also, more widely, in the whole of the neighbouring country.

The search for critical mass or complementarity on either side of a border has been achieved in numerous domains, as the following examples show:

- In healthcare, there is the creation of a Health Observatory and of “Organised zones for cross-border care access” along the Franco-Belgian border, or the setting up of a cross-border hospital in Cerdagne, along the Franco-Spanish border close to Andorra. In addition, in funeral services, a cross-border Franco-Belgian crematorium has been created in Wattrelos (FR).
- With respect to employment issues, numerous initiatives facilitate access to the job market (circulation of information of vacancies and offers, and administrative and legal procedures), as well as allowing the harnessing of professional competencies located across a border. Several projects of this type have been set up in Europe such as the “Centre for Franco-German employment” in Kehl (DE), the “INFOBESTs” network in the Upper-Rhine, “OresundDirekt” in Copenhagen and Malmö, the “Task force Net” of the Meuse-Rhine Euregio, or the service “Border People” between Ireland and Northern Ireland.
- Concerning the environmental field, numerous examples could be cited, as, for instance, the construction of cross-border filtering plants like the one in Perl (in DE), which is co-managed

with Luxembourg, or the protection against flood risks along the Danube, notably between Ruse (BG) and Giurgiu (RO).

In order to implement cross-border cooperation strategies, it is important to coordinate political actions more effectively. Indeed, public actors are key in synergising, both because of their role in the rule-based aspects of the cross-border cooperation they can supply but also because of their role as facilitators.

1.2. Aiming at greater coherence at the cross-border level, by converging economic, social and environmental development

Border regions are areas of contact between territorial systems with various political, cultural, economic and institutional heritages. Improving the feeling of the inhabitants to belong to a common territory is an important as well as complex task. In a context characterized by the growing influence of the EU on territorial policies at various levels, cross-border cooperation has become a recurrent objective of European territorial policies (ESDP, 1999; Territorial Agenda 2020, 2011), which has made available financial means, such as the INTERREG fund (see table in Annex), as well as legal means for its achievement. Border regions thus constitute in some ways laboratories for studying the process of the construction of Europe and the integration of European territories⁶.

Working out strategies for the territorial development at cross-border level allows for the convergence of objectives in the interest of all parties. These strategies are based on territorial diagnostics taken at cross-border level. Political actors first of all identify possible lines of convergence between the strategies defined by each border region and then prioritise the common objectives that would benefit from the linkage of competencies. In certain European cross-border regions, national and local/regional authorities have already elaborated cross-border territorial strategies such as, for instance, the “Trinational Metropolitan Region of the Upper Rhine” or the “ORUS” strategy in the Oresund Region.

Joint development strategies are often less detailed and applicable than territorial strategies developed on either side of a border, for several reasons. Firstly, they do not have a restrictive framework, since competencies in spatial planning remain the exclusive prerogative of the respective authorities on each side of the border. Secondly, they display different institutional cultures in which working methods, and notably those involved in planning, can vary greatly from one territory to another. Thirdly, the priorities and objectives defined by the political actors of these territories differ on certain points. Lastly, the room for manoeuvre at the disposal of the public actors involved are frequently unequal on both sides of border. Nevertheless, these strategies constitute necessary tools for spatial development that aims at greater coherence in public action at the cross-border level.

Naturally, such cross-border cooperation initiatives do not replace the logic of competition between territories, notably in attracting foreign investors, but new forms of relations and management do appear. One of these forms of relations is the “coopetition” between territories. This concept, borrowed from the business world, is a portmanteau word that combines the terms “cooperation” and “competition”. It is an attempt to forge an alliance between aspects of the two notions they involve: on the one hand, territories cooperate and seek to construct a more positive shared image of the cross-

⁶ Kramsch O., and Hooper B. 2004. Introduction. In *Cross-border governance in the European Union*, eds. O. Kramsch and B. Hooper, 1–21. London: Routledge.

border area to put forward its strengths, its potentialities and the forces involved (logic of economies of scale, critical mass); but on the other hand, at a more local level, the competition between territories for attracting investors into their activity zones remains latent. They are opportunistic collaborations that permit a win-win situation while keeping the spirit of competition alive at micro level. The Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai, for example, has chosen this direction, by multiplying various joint actions for territorial promotion (participation of French, Flemish and Walloon territories on the same stand in the property Fair MIPIM, printing of flyers promoting the cross-border metropolitan territory, realisation of an INTERREG project on territorial marketing).

Beyond just the economic component, joint development strategies can target many other domains, sometimes clearly less subject to the forces of competition and therefore easier to implement. Transport, which is often a fundamental issue in cross-border regions, is a good example of this. Protection of the natural heritage, by opening cross-border natural reserves, or initiatives in the field of culture and tourism, are also frequently implemented to promote the integration of cross-border regions. These initiatives broadly benefit the different territories, and allow the image of the cross-border region to be enhanced at the international level.

1.3. Deploying a more international image of the border region


Territorial marketing or 'regional branding' consists in communicating the advantages of a territory in order to promote it to both investors and the skilled workforce sought by employers. A small or medium city in a border region can gain a lot by profiling itself as the interface to various different territorial systems. These advantages can be appreciated, for example, by investors seeking 'bridgeheads' into new markets. It is also relevant for attracting skilled labour in a context of increasing competition between metropolitan areas. Thus integrated cross-border urban areas can reflect an attractive and welcoming image due to their international and multi-lingual characteristics. Indeed, qualified persons consider in their choices the different forms of individual investment they will have to consent to, before moving to another working place. These investments, notably in terms of time and energy, are the learning of a language, the creation of social networks, the learning of cultural codes, etc. If some would see an interesting challenge in these investments, for many they would put a brake on change. Some cities with an international character can project a more cosmopolitan image and thus appear more welcoming.

The different issues briefly sketched out above are not exhaustive and each networking of cross-border cities can follow its own objectives as defined by its own concerns. The next part offers an overview of cross-border initiatives in Europe. It shows how small and medium cities aim to respond to these different challenges and seize some of the opportunities offered. They are not all at the same stage of realisation since the process of cross-border integration does not have the same history everywhere.

2) Overview of urban cross-border cooperation in Europe

The small and medium cities in the border regions of Europe are legion and present various configurations, linked to the tempestuous and complex history of the old continent which gave birth to a mosaic of nation States. In this part of the report, the aim is to present a panoramic overview using examples that reflect the sheer diversity of urban configurations along European borders. Despite their differences, all these examples share a common objective: improving cooperation at cross-border level for the general interest. The following map shows the examples chosen for this study (Map 1).

Map 1: Location of 21 case studies



2.1. Portraits of European cross-border urban areas


There is great diversity among existing instances of cross-border cooperation in these urban regions. This diversity is based, among others, on the size of the cities, the geographical context, the history of cooperation and/or the surface areas of the different cooperation structures. Not all cross-border cooperation initiatives between small and medium cities share the same successful outcome but all share similar aims: to improve the relationships with the neighbours and to construct a common future. This section will present 21 cases of cross-border cooperation initiatives between small and medium cities in Europe through descriptive fact sheets. Some of them also concern large cross-border metropolitan regions which include numerous small and medium cities.


Each fact sheet presents a cross-border urban area and is made up of six elements.


- 1) The **name of the case study and its general setting**:
 - The title details the names of the principal cities that make up the case study (in general one per state or region) as well as the name of the principal cross-border cooperation structure (if clearly identified). When a multitude of cities belong to the cross-border area, only the name of the main cooperation structure is mentioned.
 - The setting includes statistical data for the population of the cities and the area studied, the surface area of the space involved in the main cross-border cooperation structure as well as data for the distance-time between the principal cities of the cross-border area.
- 2) A **map** for situating the cross-border region within Europe which also brings a spatial overview of the geographical configuration of the cross-border area.
- 3) A **historical timeline** which graphically illustrates the evolution of recent (from the 1960s on) cross-border cooperation initiatives, by highlighting the main events that shaped the construction of these cross-border areas.
- 4) An insert on the **structuring of cross-border cooperation**:
 - This part documents the factual elements of the main structure of cross-border cooperation, its legal status, its organisation and the existence, or not, of a joint territorial development strategy. It also identifies other structures of cross-border cooperation which are present at the scale of the case study.
 - In addition, a graph depicts the “institutional mapping” of the cross-border area. It represents all the cross-border cooperation structures (the main one in red, the others in blue) in relation to two axes⁷:
 - the institutional level on the vertical axis, composed of three rungs:
 - national level: central or federal State and its representatives
 - regional level: Regions, Länder, Provinces, etc.

⁷ Adapted from ESPON. 2010. Metroborder. Cross-Border Polycentric Metropolitan Regions. Final Report. Luxembourg.

- local level: Municipalities, intercommunal structures, Kreise, etc.
- the geographical scale on the horizontal axis which distinguishes between three surface areas:
 - Small < 5 000 km²
 - Medium 5 000 - 25 000 km²
 - Large > 25 000 km²
- the geographical forms that cross-border cooperation structures take are divided into two categories:

- Continuous territory 

- Cities network  (in the case of bilateral cooperation)

or  (in the case of multilateral cooperation)

- moreover, cross-border partnerships can have different aspects:

- symmetrical at all institutional levels:



- asymmetrical at the upper institutional level (for example, state level is involved on one side of the border, whereas the highest level involved in the cooperation structure on the corresponding side is regional):



- asymmetrical at all levels:







5) An insert on the **context of cross-border integration**


It is made up of three parts:

- The first gives an indication about its inclusion, or not, in the Schengen area as well as the year of application, the languages spoken, the currencies used and the differences

in wealth production within the cross-border area (estimated using GDP per capita expressed in purchasing power parity terms for each border region – data collected at NUTS 3 level on the Eurostat site for the most recent available year, 2011).

- The second presents statistical data for the number of cross-border commuters (in absolute values) and for the residential interpenetration at cross-border level, measured according to the number of people originating from one side of a border but living on the other. In some cases there is no data available.
- Lastly, the third section gives the spatial configuration of the cross-border urban area⁸. It is accompanied by a small figure containing information relative to:

- the size of the cities:
 - < 100 000 inhabitants cities: 
 - > 100 000 inhabitants cities: 
- the number of borders:
 - one national border (1) 
 - two or more national borders (2) 
- the functional urban areas (FUA) within the cross-border area, distinguishing the cases where the FUAs are separated on either side of a border (1 or 2) from the cases where they are cross-border (2):



In order to simplify the representation, only one city is represented per national side, except of the case studies, where two main cities of the same country have been clearly identified in the title of the fact sheet.

6) A **brief description** of the main characteristics of these cross-border urban areas.

The list of appearance of the different case-studies is the following: Scandinavia, Baltic States, British Isles, Western Europe, Iberian Peninsula, Central Europe and Southeastern Europe.

⁸ The different spatial configurations are adapted from works conducted under the frame of an ESPON project, no. 1.4.3. on the Study on Urban Functions (2007).

Provincia Bothniensis Haparanda - Tornio

Main cities:


Tornio (FI): 22 356 residents (2014)
Haparanda (SE): 9 886 residents (2013)

Total population of both municipalities: 32 500 residents (2013, 2014)

Total surface of both municipalities (land and sea): 3 216 km²

Time distance between Haparanda - Tornio:

By car: 5 minutes
By public transport: 16 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation

1962: Treaty of Helsinki (cooperation between Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Finland)

1987: Creation of the cross-border organisation Provincia Bothniensis

2005: Development of a new cross-border district



Since the 1960s: Informal institutional links between the two cities

1995: Admission of Sweden and Finland to the EU

Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Provincia Bothniensis


Status of the cooperation:
Association

Organization of technical staff:
Integrated Team

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
No specific document, but spatial planning is carried out jointly by the two municipalities

Other cross-border structures:
North Calotte Council Euroregion (1967)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 2001

Currencies:
Euro (FI), Swedish Korona (SE)

Languages:
Finnish, Swedish and a local dialect spoken on both sides

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
FI: 24 100 € SE: 35 500 €

Cross-border commuters (2004):
Haparanda → Tornio: 282
Tornio → Haparanda: 171

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border "Twin cities"



Cross-border residential integration (2013, 2014):
Foreign citizens in Haparanda (mostly Finns): 2 760
Swedish mother tongue citizens in Tornio: 0.5% of the overall population

Characteristics

The two municipalities of Haparanda and Tornio, located at the northernmost point of the Bothnian Gulf, in two different time zones, have developed very narrow relationships since the 1960's. They share multiple municipal and common services, such as a sewage treatment plant, sport facilities or several educational institutions. The two cities also use each other's currencies and languages. Moreover, they are integrated by multiple shared infrastructures (roads, airport, railway lines). These two cities constitute a single community of interests and appear as a model of concrete cooperation between localities.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Provincia Bothniensis HaparandaTornio; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Öresundskomiteen Copenhagen - Malmö

Main cities:

Copenhagen (DK): 569 557 residents (2014)
Malmö (SE): 312 994 residents (2013)

Other cities within the Öresund Region:


Helsingborg (SE): 132 989 residents (2013)
Helsingør (DK): 61 519 residents (2014)
Lund (SE): 114 291 residents (2013)

Total population of the Öresund Region: 3 800 000 residents (2013)


Total surface of the Öresund Region: 21 100 km²

Time distance between Copenhagen - Malmö:

By car: 48 minutes
By public transport: 34 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Öresundskomiteen

Status of the cooperation:
Association


Organization of technical staff:
Integrated team

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
The Öresund Regional Development Strategy (2010)

Other cross-border structures:

Nordic Council (1952)
Nordic Council of Ministers (1971)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Maritime border,
Schengen area since 2001

Currencies:
Danish Krone (DK),
Swedish Krona (SE)

Languages:
Danish, Swedish

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
DK: 36 667 € SE: 27 100 €

Cross-border commuters* (2012):

DK → SE: 700
SE → DK: 16 539

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border polycentric
metropolitan region



Cross-border residential integration* (2013/2014):

Danes living in Sweden: 24 386
Swedes living in Denmark: 14 771

* within the Öresund Region

Characteristics

The cooperation around the Öresund strait is essentially focused on cross-border economic development based on knowledge and innovation (clusters in life science and clean technologies). The railway and road bridge has allowed to enhance the accessibility and to boost the cross-border functional integration between both regions and has led to the development of new urban districts in Copenhagen (Ørestad) and Malmö (Hyllie) along this cross-border link.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Öresundskomiteen; Statistics Denmark; Statistics Sweden; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Valga - Valka

Main cities:

Valga (EE): 12 261 residents (2013)
 Valka (LV): 5 891 residents (2012)

Total population of both municipalities: 18 150 residents (2012, 2013)


Total surface of both municipalities: 31 km²

Time distance between Valga - Valka:

By car: 5 minutes
 By walk: 25 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
 No cross-border structure - Bilateral Cooperation


Status of the cooperation:
 Association

Organization of technical staff:
 Coordination between local teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
 Common Valga-Valka spatial plan (2007)

Other cross-border structures:
 No

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
 Schengen area since 2007

Currency:
 Euro

Languages:
 Latvian, Estonian, Russian

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
 EE: 11 700 € LV: 10 000 €

Cross-border commuters* (2012):
 LV → EE: 80 (estimation)
 EE → LV: 20 (estimation)

Spatial configuration:
 Cross-border "Twin cities"

Cross-border residential integration* (2013, 2014):
 Latvians living in Estonia: 998
 Estonians living in Latvia: 105



* within the two municipalities

Characteristics

This twin city, located between Estonia and Latvia, has experienced several historical fractures, associated with geopolitical issues. Created as a single city, a first division occurred after World War 1. Under the Soviet period, which lasted for 50 years, they were reunified. But since the independence of the Baltic countries, they are divided again. The political ambition is to build a cross-border agglomeration in order to bring together people and to foster the sense of belonging to a community of interest. In this perspective, a common spatial plan for the two cities has been realized in 2007 as well as a common territorial marketing initiative.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Valga Linnavalitsus; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Newry - Dundalk

Main cities:

Dundalk (IE): 31 149 residents (2011)
 Newry (GB): 29 946 residents (2008)

Total population of the area: 222 797 (2010, 2011) for the County Louth (IE) and the Mourne District (GB)


Total surface of the area: 1 728 km² for the County Louth (IE) and the Mourne District (GB)

Time distance between Dundalk - Newry:

By car: 23 minutes
 By public transport: 19 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
 No cross-border structure - Bilateral cooperation


Status of the cooperation:
 Association

Organization of technical staff:
 Coordination between local teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
 Newry-Dundalk Twin City Region (2009)

Other cross-border structures:
 No

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
 Non-Schengen area


Currencies:
 Euro (IE), Pound sterling (GB)

Language:
 Irish Gaelic, English

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
 IE: 18 700 € GB: 16 000 €

Cross-border commuters (2012):
 18 000 workers and 5 200 students cross the border every day to work or to study within the space of cross-border cooperation

Spatial configuration:
 Discontinuous border cities



Cross-border residential integration:
 No data available

Characteristics

These two cities are interlinked by the major railways and roads that are crucial for the whole island, since they connect Belfast to Dublin. The cooperation, which started in the 1970s, was significantly accentuated during the 2000s thanks to reports which encouraged the setting up of a twin city project. The institutional cooperation is done within the "Newry-Dundalk Twin City Region" organization, which plans "to secure higher inward and local investment and employment and to deliver more balanced regional development and a better quality of life for people".

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics; Newry-Dundalk Twin City Region.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Eurometropolis Lille - Kortrijk - Tournai

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Population of the main cities: | Population of other cities: |
| Lille (FR): 227 533 (2011) | Roubaix (FR): 94 186 (2011) |
| Kortrijk (BE): 75 645 (2014) | Tourcoing (FR): 92 018 (2011) |
| Tournai (BE): 69 751 (2014) | Mouscron (BE): 56 023 (2014) |
| | Villeneuve-d'Ascq (FR): 62 681 (2011) |
| | Roeselare (BE): 59 714 (2014) |

Total population of the Eurometropolis: 2 100 000 residents (2013)


Total surface of the Eurometropolis: 3860 km²

Time distance between the main cities:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| By car: | By public transport: |
| Lille - Kortrijk: 24 minutes | Lille - Kortrijk: 31 minutes |
| Lille - Tournai: 24 minutes | Lille - Tournai: 27 minutes |
| Kortrijk - Tournai: 25 minutes | Kortrijk - Tournai: 35 minutes |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai


Status of the cooperation:
European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)

Organization of technical staff:
Integrated Team

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
Cross-border white paper (2004)

Other cross-border structures:
No

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 1995

Currency:
Euro


Languages:
French, Dutch

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
BE: 27 668 € FR: 23 800 €

Cross-border commuters* (2012):
FR → BE: 27 360
BE → FR: 5 959

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border polycentric metropolitan region

Cross-border residential integration* (2013, 2014):
French living in Belgium: 19 162
Belgians living in France: 47 454



* within the Departments "Nord" and "Pas-de-Calais" in France and the localities within the Eurometropolis in Belgium

Characteristics

The economic interdependencies between Flanders, Wallonia and the French part of the cross-border urban region are very old and were boosted by the textile activities already two centuries ago. The main direction of cross-border working flows has fluctuated since this period, but the functional integration has remained substantial and concerns other kinds of cross-border traffics (studies, shopping). Nowadays, the Eurometropolis can be considered as a pioneer in terms of cooperation, with the adoption of the first EGTC, in 2008. The strategy is to promote territorial development around three axes (socio-economic development, accessibility and environment).

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics; INSEE; INAMI; SNCB.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Meuse-Rhine Euregio Aachen - Liège - Maastricht

Population of the main cities:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Aachen (DE): | 241 683 (2013) | Heerlen (NL): | 88 022 (2014) |
| Liège (BE): | 197 013 (2014) | Herzogenrath (DE): | 46 546 (2013) |
| Maastricht (NL): | 121 900 (2014) | Verviers (BE): | 55 936 (2013) |
| Hasselt (BE): | 74 588 (2013) | | |

Total population of the Euregio: 3 900 000 residents (2013)


Total surface of the Euregio: 11 686 km²

Time distance between the main cities:

| | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
| By car: | | By public transport: | |
| Aachen - Liège: | 43 minutes | Aachen - Liège: | 23 minutes |
| Maastricht - Aachen: | 29 minutes | Maastricht - Aachen: | 1h13 |
| Liège - Maastricht: | 29 minutes | Liège - Maastricht: | 33 minutes |
| Aachen - Hasselt: | 59 minutes | Aachen - Hasselt: | 2h01 |
| Liège - Hasselt: | 42 minutes | Liège - Hasselt: | 60 minutes |
| Maastricht - Hasselt: | 38 minutes | Maastricht - Hasselt: | 1h34 |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Meuse-Rhine Euregio


Status of the cooperation:
Charter

Organization of technical staff:
Coordination between regional teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
EMR 2020 (2013)

Other cross-border structures:
MAHHL cities network (1993)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 1995

Currency:
Euro

Languages:
Dutch, German, French

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
BE: 22 144 € NL: 29 500 €
DE: 24 406 €


Cross-border commuters* (2012):
BE → DE: 4 800
BE → NL: 20 096
DE → NL: 3 500
NL → DE: 3 700

Cross-border residential integration* (2013, 2014):

Germans living in Belgium: 16 231
 Dutch living in Belgium: 44 611
 Dutch living in Germany: 11 803
 Belgians living in Germany: 2 748

* within the EMR

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border polycentric metropolitan region



Characteristics

The cross-border labor market, as well as the residential market, clearly present a transnational dimension in this functionally integrated region divided between Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany. In 2013, a common strategy (EMR 2020) has been defined to orientate the cooperation between the actors and to support the cross-border integration process within this space. The main issue is to provide solutions concerning practical, juridical and administrative obstacles encountered by citizens, mainly on mobility, labour market, health, economic and sustainable development.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Meuse-Rhine Euroregion; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics; INAMI; Grenzfopunkt; Deutsche Bahn.
Author: LISER, 2015.

The Greater Region

Population of the main cities:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Luxembourg (LU): 107 200 (2014) | Trier (DE): 107 233 (2013) |
| Metz (FR): 119 962 (2011) | Nancy (FR): 105 382 (2011) |
| Namur (BE): 110 665 (2014) | Thionville (FR): 40 951 (2011) |
| Saarbrücken (DE): 177 201 (2013) | Arlon (BE): 28 759 (2014) |
| Mainz (DE): 204 268 (2013) | |

Total population of the Greater Region: 11 435 000 residents (2013)

Total surface of the Greater Region: 65 400 km²

Time distance between the main cities:

| | | | |
|------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|
| By car: | | By public transport: | |
| Luxembourg - Metz: | 55 minutes | Luxembourg - Metz: | 40 minutes |
| Luxembourg - Namur: | 1h74 | Luxembourg - Namur: | 2h00 |
| Luxembourg - Trier: | 41 minutes | Luxembourg - Trier: | 59 minutes |
| Luxembg - Saarbrücken: | 1h14 | Luxembg - Saarbrücken: | 1h20 |
| Metz - Saarbrücken: | 57 minutes | Metz - Saarbrücken: | 1h06 |



Historical evolution of the cooperation

1971: Regional commission Saarland, Lorraine, Luxembourg and Trier/Western Palatinat

1988: Creation of the Euregio SaarLorLux +

1996: Signing of the Karlsruhe Agreement



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:

The Greater Region

Status of the cooperation:

Charter

Organization of technical staff:

Coordination between regional teams;
EGTC Secretariat of the Summit of the Greater Region


Existence of a territorial development strategy:

Under preparation: Scheme of territorial development

Other cross-border structures:

- Euregio SaarLorLux + (1988)
- European Development Pole (PED) (1996)
- QuattroPole (2000)
- Tonicités (2007)
- EGTC Alzette-Belval (2013)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:

Schengen area since 1995

Currency:

Euro

Languages:

French, German, Luxembourgish

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):

BE: 20 776 € DE: 20 161 €
FR: 21 519 € LU: 66 700 €

Cross-border commuters* (2012):

| | |
|----------|--------|
| FR → LU: | 78 700 |
| BE → LU: | 40 100 |
| DE → LU: | 40 300 |

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border polycentric metropolitan region



Cross-border residential integration* (2013, 2014):

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| French living in Luxembourg: | 31 456 |
| Germans living in Luxembourg: | 12 049 |
| Belgians living in Luxembourg: | 16 926 |
| Luxembourgers living in Germany: | 8 341 |
| Luxembourgers living in France: | 1 902 |

* within the Greater Region

Characteristics

Luxembourg-city is the point of convergence of more than 160 000 daily cross-border commuters. Different initiatives of cooperation exist at local, regional and state levels to accompany the functional integration within this complex territorial configuration (such as the EGTCs of Alzette Belval and Eurodistrict SaarMoselle as well as networks of cities "QuattroPole" and "Tonicités"). The Greater Region initiative is driven by the regions and the States and is currently developing a cross-border common scheme of territorial development to reinforce its internal cohesion.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics; Grande Région; INAMI; Statistics Belgium; INSEE; Statistisches Landesamt Rheinland-Pfalz; Statistisches Landesamt Saarland; CFL; Deutsche Bahn.

Author: LISER, 2015.

EGTC Alzette Belval

Esch-sur-Alzette - Villerupt

Main cities:

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------|--------|
| Esch-sur-Alzette (LU): | 33 286 residents | (2015) |
| Villerupt (FR): | 9 354 residents | (2013) |
| Sanem (LU): | 15 415 residents | (2015) |
| Audun-le-Tiche (FR): | 6 438 residents | (2012) |

Total population of the EGTC: 91 904 (2012, 2015)


Total surface of the EGTC: 170 km²

Time distance between Esch-sur-Alzette - Villerupt:

| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| By car: | 12 minutes |
| By public transport: | 14 minutes |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
EGTC Alzette Belval

Status of the cooperation:

European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)

Organization of technical staff:

Integrated team


Existence of a territorial development strategy:

Under preparation

Other cross-border structures:

- Euregio SaarLorLux+ (1988)
- Tonicités (1971)
- The Greater Region (1995)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:

Schengen area since 1995

Currency:

Euro

Languages:

French (spoken on both sides),
Luxembourgish

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):

FR: 21 519 € LU: 66 700 €

Cross-border commuters* (2010):

| | |
|----------|---------|
| FR → LU: | 10 130 |
| LU → FR: | No data |

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border
agglomeration



Cross-border residential integration** (2011, 2014):

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| French living in Luxembourg: | 2 356 |
| Luxembourgers living in France: | 420 |

* From France to the Luxembourgish municipalities of the EGTC

** Within the EGTC

Characteristics

The cross-border agglomeration around the cities of Esch-sur-Alzette (LU) and Villerupt (FR) shares a common history, linked to the steel industry. With the decline of this activity, the Luxembourgish government has decided to invest in the region to maintain its attractiveness. The new city of Belval, under development, will host the University of Luxembourg (summer 2015) and strives to become an important employment center. At long term, 25 000 workers, researchers and students are foreseen. The French side follows this initiative and will build an eco-city to complement and integrate the Belval project. A cross-border structure has been created in 2013 (EGTC) to push forward the cooperation.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; INSEE (RGP 2010); IGSS 2010; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics.

Author: LISER, 2015.

Eurodistrict SaarMoselle Saarbrücken - Forbach - Sarreguemines

Main cities:

Saarbrücken (DE): 177 201 residents (2013)
Forbach (FR): 21 954 residents (2011)
Sarreguemines (FR): 21 604 residents (2011)

Total population of the Eurodistrict: 670 000 residents (2010)


Total surface of the Eurodistrict: 1 460 km²

Time distance between the main cities:

| | |
|---|---|
| By car: | By public transport: |
| Saarbrücken - Forbach: 19 minutes | Saarbrücken - Forbach: 16 minutes |
| Saarbrücken - Sarreguemines: 45 minutes | Saarbrücken - Sarreguemines: 28 minutes |
| Forbach - Sarreguemines: 21 minutes | Forbach - Sarreguemines: 45 minutes |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Eurodistrict SaarMoselle

Status of the cooperation:

European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)

Organization of technical staff:

Integrated Team


Existence of a territorial development strategy:

Future vision for the SaarMoselle region (2010)

Other cross-border structures:

Euregio SaarLorLux + (1988)
The Greater Region (1995)
QuattroPole (2000)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:

Schengen area since 1995

Currency:

Euro

Languages:

French, German

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):

DE: 30 206 € FR: 20 200 €


Cross-border commuters* (2012):

FR → DE: 18 407

DE → FR: 1 000

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border agglomeration



Cross-border residential integration* (2011):

Germans living in France: 18 000

French living in Germany: 6 600

* within Saarland and the Département "Moselle"

Characteristics

The municipalities which constitute the cross-border agglomeration of Saarbrücken, Forbach and Sarreguemines are facing the same challenges of industrial reconversion. This is one of the main reasons which encouraged them to follow a strong cooperation which has taken the form of a EGTC in 2010. The cooperation is funded by a membership contribution. Numerous projects have already been achieved in this space, such as the creation of the Tram-train between Saarbrücken and Sarreguemines, or a common area of activities, called the "Eurozone".

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurodistrict SaarMoselle; Google maps; EuroGeographics; Eurostat.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Eurodistrict Strasbourg - Ortenau

Strasbourg - Kehl - Offenbourg

Main cities:

Strasbourg (FR): 272 222 residents (2011)
 Offenbourg (DE): 57 328 residents (2012)
 Kehl (DE): 33 991 residents (2012)

Total population of the Eurodistrict: 868 014 residents (2014)

Total surface of the Eurodistrict: 2 176 km²

Time distance between the main cities:

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|
| By car: | | By public transport: | |
| Strasbourg - Kehl: | 16 minutes | Strasbourg - Kehl: | 11 minutes |
| Strasbourg - Offenbourg: | 31 minutes | Strasbourg - Offenbourg: | 30 minutes |
| Kehl - Offenbourg: | 21 minutes | Kehl - Offenbourg: | 18 minutes |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:

Eurodistrict Strasbourg-Ortenau

Status of the cooperation:

European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)

Organization of technical staff:

Integrated team


Existence of a territorial development strategy:

Cross-border white paper (2004)

Other cross-border structures:

Upper Rhine Conference (1991)
 Rhine Council (1997)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:

Schengen area since 1995

Currency:

Euro

Languages:

French, German

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):

DE: 33 186 € FR: 27 300 €

Cross-border commuters (2012)*:

FR → DE: 6 496
 DE → FR: 100


Spatial configuration:

Cross-border polycentric metropolitan region

Cross-border residential integration (2011, 2013)*:

Germans living in France: 14 667
 French living in Germany: 4 624

* within the Ortenaukreis in Germany and the Bas-Rhin Department in France



Characteristics

The territories of Strasbourg Eurometropole and the German Ortenau district are engaged since 2005 in a common territorial project which aims at establishing a sustainable urban region focused on green spaces, water surfaces and infrastructure networks (with the extension of the tramway from Strasbourg to Kehl). Events are regularly organized to promote cross-border mobility and to strengthen the feeling of belonging to a community of interests. The pedestrian bridge over the Rhine, located in the middle of a cross-border garden, constitutes a strong symbol of the renewal of the relationships between both countries as well as an appreciated concrete linkage between both cities.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurodistrict Strasbourg-Ortenau; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics.

Author: LISER, 2015.

Trinational Eurodistrict Basel Basel - Saint Louis - Lörrach

Population of the main cities:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Basel (CH): | 173 808 (2014) |
| Lörrach (DE): | 48 160 (2012) |
| Weil am Rhein (DE): | 28 935 (2012) |
| Saint Louis (FR): | 20 294 (2011) |
| Liestal (CH): | 13 807 (2013) |

Total population of the Eurodistrict: 830 000 residents (2013)


Total surface of the Eurodistrict: 1 989 km²

Time distance between Basel - Saint Louis - Lörrach:

| | | | |
|------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|
| By car: | | By public transport: | |
| Basel - Lörrach: | 17 minutes | Basel - Lörrach: | 21 minutes |
| Basel - Saint Louis: | 10 minutes | Basel - Saint Louis: | 8 minutes |
| Lörrach - Saint Louis: | 21 minutes | Lörrach - Saint Louis: | 45 minutes |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Trinational Eurodistrict Basel (TEB)

Status of the cooperation:
Association


Organization of technical staff:
Integrated team

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
IBA Basel 2020 (2007); 3Land (2012)

Other cross-border structures:

- Regio Basiliensis (1963)
- Upper Rhine Conference (1991)
- Regio TriRhena (1995)
- Rhine Council (1997)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 2008,
but still with customs controls

Languages:
French, German

Currencies:
Euro (FR, DE), Swiss Franc (CH)

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
CH: 87 087 € DE: 30 195 €
FR: 25 600 €

Cross-border commuters* (2012):

| | |
|----------|--------|
| FR → CH: | 28 471 |
| DE → CH: | 24 176 |

Cross-border residential integration* (2013, 2014):

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Germans living in Switzerland: | 25 093 |
| Swiss living in France: | 928 |
| French living in Switzerland: | 2 361 |
| Swiss living in Germany: | 4 507 |

* within the region covered by the TEB

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border
agglomeration



Characteristics

The cross-border region which surrounds the city of Basel is an advanced case-study of cross-border institutional cooperation, with different structures which focus their works on specific issues. This transnational agglomeration is recognized for hosting the Euroairport, which is a bi-national airport. Recently, a cross-border tramway has been created to better articulate the different cities. A world class event is also organized: the IBA Basel exhibition, which contributes to emphasize its image. A think tank, called Metrobasel, is also actively involved in promoting the development of the cross-border agglomeration.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Swiss Federal Statistical Office; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics; INSEE; Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg, Deutsche Bahn.

Author: LISER, 2015.

Greater Geneva Geneva - Annemasse

Main cities:

Geneva (CH): 191 557 residents (2013)
Annemasse (FR): 32 657 residents (2011)

Other cities within the Greater Geneva area:

Saint-Julien-en-Genevois (FR): 11 954 residents (2011)
Vernier (CH): 34 685 residents (2013)

Total population of the Greater Geneva: 945 000 residents (2013)


Total surface of the Greater Geneva: 2 580 km²

Time distance between Geneva - Annemasse:

By car: 17 minutes
By public transport: 42 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Greater Geneva

Status of the cooperation:
Local Cross-border Cooperation Grouping (LCCG)


Organization of technical staff:
Integrated team

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
Charter "Agglomeration Project France-Vaud-Geneva" (2012)

Other cross-border structures:

Franco-Geneva Regional Committee (1973)
Conseil du Léman (1987)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 2008, but still with customs controls

Language:
French

Currencies:
Euro (FR), Swiss Franc (CH)

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
CH: 60 839 € FR: 22 582 €

Cross-border commuters* (2012):


FR → CH: 63 246
CH → FR: 140

Cross-border residential integration* (2013, 2014):

French living in Switzerland: 25 600
Swiss living in France: 5 566

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border agglomeration



* within the Departments of "Ain" and "Haute-Savoie" in France and 428 communes in Switzerland

Characteristics

This functional space is very permeable to daily commuting flows, due to important cross-border differentials (high incomes in Switzerland, more affordable housing prices in France). The needs to smooth traffic flows, to plan urban and economic development, and to improve the governance are huge. For these reasons, a Charter has been signed in 1997 to launch the cross-border agglomeration project. However, the recent difficulties linked to popular votes against cross-border workers interests in Geneva show that cross-border cooperation should never be taken for granted and needs to be continuously promoted.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Greater Geneva; Swiss Federal Statistical Office; Eurostat; Google maps; Eurogeographics; INSEE.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Nice - Monaco - San Remo

Population of the main cities:

Nice (FR): 344 064 (2011)
 Monaco (MC): 36 371 (2011)
 San Remo (IT): 54 042 (2011)

Population of other cities:

Menton (FR): 28 926 (2011)
 Ventimiglia (IT): 23 867 (2011)

Total population of the five cities: 487 270 residents (2011)

Total surface of the area: ≈ 50 km long corridor

Time distance between the main cities:

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
| By car: | | By public transport: | |
| Nice - Monaco: | 31 minutes | Nice - Monaco: | 27 minutes |
| Nice - San Remo: | 51 minutes | Nice - San Remo: | 1h20 |
| Monaco - San Remo: | 49 minutes | Monaco - San Remo: | 45 minutes |



Historical evolution of the cooperation

1991: Signing of the "protocol of intent on cross-border cooperation" between the mayors of Menton and Ventimiglia

1970

1980

1990

2000

2010

1993: - Creation of a Union for cross-border local development -Rome agreement

2011: Creation of the "Metropole Nice-Côte d'Azur" on the french side which is involved in a cross-border strategy of territorial development

Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:

No cross-border structure - Multilateral cooperation

Status of the cooperation:

Multilateral thematic agreements

Organization of technical staff:

N/A


Existence of a territorial development strategy:

No (but Metropole Nice-Côte d'Azur is involved in a cross-border strategy of territorial development)

Other cross-border structures:

No

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:

Schengen area since 1995
 Monaco is a de facto member of the Schengen area. Its borders and customs territory are treated as part of France

Currency:

Euro

Languages :

French, Italian

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):

FR: 27 900 € MC: 51 556 €
 IT: 23 200 €

Cross-border commuters (2013):

FR → MC : 35 463
 IT → MC : 3 829


Cross-border residential integration* (2006, 2008):

French living in Italy: 1 115
 French living in Monaco: 10 029
 Italians living in Monaco: 6596

* in a selection of localities in the border regions for France and Italy

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border polycentric metropolitan region



Characteristics

This natural corridor between the Mediterranean Sea and the southern Alps is densely populated and traversed by important flows of people and goods. The city-state of Monaco, despite its extremely small size, is a very attractive urban pole for cross-border commuters. The cross-border cooperation is still little developed, but it should tend, in the future, to a better structuring of the coastline and to a sharing of public equipment. The issue of a common cross-border management of this high valued natural and cultural patrimony is also considered. Other major questions remain like the environmental degradation, the traffic congestion and the high land pressure.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics; Principauté de Monaco; ISTAT; europa.eu.

Author: LISER, 2015.

Basque Eurocity

Bayonne - San Sebastián


| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Population of the main cities: | | Population of other cities: | |
| San Sebastián (ES): | 186 500 (2013) | Biarritz (FR): | 25 903 (2011) |
| Bayonne (FR): | 44 331 (2011) | Hendaye (FR): | 15 976 (2011) |
| Irun (ES): | 61 113 (2013) | Saint-Jean-de-Luz (FR): | 12 960 (2011) |
| | | Hondarribia (ES): | 16 795 (2013) |

Total population of the Basque Eurocity: 632 000 residents (2011)


Total surface of the Basque Eurocity: ≈ 970 km²

Time distance between Bayonne - San Sebastián:

| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| By car: | 45 minutes |
| By public transport: | 1h30 |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Basque Eurocity


Status of the cooperation:
European economic interest grouping

Organization of technical staff:
Coordination between local teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
White book (2000)
Strategic Plan 2014-2020 (forthcoming)

Other cross-border structure:
Euroregion Aquitaine-Euskadi (EGTC) (2011)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 1995

Currency:
Euro


Languages:
French, Spanish, Basque

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
ES: 33 500 € FR: 23 900 €

Cross-border commuters (2013)*:

FR → ES: approx. 1000
ES → FR: approx. 700

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border polycentric metropolitan region



Cross-border residential integration:

No data available

* within the Basque Eurocity

Characteristics

This 50 km long urban coastline corridor is an important transit axis between the Iberian Peninsula and France. As such, a lot of challenges occur on this territory, in terms of saturation of transport infrastructures, land use and real estate. The cross-border cooperation project of the Basque Eurocity aims at articulating and framing the urban continuum in order to create an integrated city, but also conceiving a common way of better planning the development of infrastructures, providing urban services and improving the governance.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurostat; Basque Eurocity; Google maps; EuroGeographics.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Eurocity Chaves - Verín

Main cities:

Chaves (PT): 41 200 residents (2011)
Verín (ES): 17 600 residents (2013)

Total population of the Eurocity:

58 800 residents (2011, 2013)


Total surface of the Eurocity: 688 km²

Time distance between Chaves - Verín:

By car: 24 minutes
By public transport: no direct line



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Eurocity Chaves - Verín

Status of the cooperation:
European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)


Organization of technical staff:
Coordination between local teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
Strategic agenda (2008)

Other cross-border structures:

EGTC Galicia-Northern Portugal (2008)
Cities network Eixo Atlântico (1991)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 1995

Currency:
Euro

Languages:
Portuguese, Spanish, Galician


GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
ES: 21 800 € PT: 13 200 €

Cross-border commuters (2011, 2013):

PT → ES: 1 189 [within the two municipalities of Chaves (PT) and Verín (ES)]
ES → PT: 80

Spatial configuration:

Discontinuous border cities



Cross-border residential integration (2011, 2013):

Portuguese living in Spain: 1 276
Spanish living in Portugal: 85
[within the two provinces of Ourense (ES) and Vila Real (PT)]

Characteristics

The cooperation between these two municipalities is quite recent. Its ambition is to improve the accessibility between the cities and to consolidate a common life area (residence, recreation, employment). The cross-border territory is branded around the image of the Tâmega River and is called the "Water Eurocity". With the strategic agenda made in 2008, three pillars have been defined (euro-citizenship, sustainable territory, economic development) in order to create an ecological city.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurocidade Chaves-Verín; Eurostat; Social Security of Portugal; Censos 2011 - National Institute of Statistics of Portugal (INE); Department of Labor and Welfare of Galicia; Municipal Register - National Institute of Statistics of Spain (INE); Google maps; EuroGeographics.

Author: LISER, 2015.

Frankfurt (Oder) - Słubice

Main cities:

Frankfurt (Oder) (DE): 58 537 residents (2012)
 Słubice (PL): 18 148 residents (2011)

Total population of both municipalities: 78 000 residents (2013)


Total surface of both municipalities: 166 km²

Time distance between Frankfurt (Oder) - Słubice:

By car: 7 minutes
 By walk: 10 minutes
 A bus line opened in 2012 between both cities



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
 Frankfurt-Słubicer Kooperationszentrum


Status of the cooperation:
 Association

Organization of technical staff:
 Integrated team

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
 Action Plan Frankfurt-Słubice 2010-2020

Other cross-border structures:
 Euroregion Pro Europa Viadrina (1993)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
 Schengen area since 2007

Currencies:
 Euro (DE), Złoty (PL)

Languages:
 German, Polish

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
 DE: 22 000 € PL: 13 500 €

Cross-border commuters (2012, 2014):

PL → DE: 11 792 (in Brandenburg)
 DE → PL: < 100 (in Słubice)

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border "Twin cities"



Cross-border residential integration (2015):

Poles living in Frankfurt (Oder): 1700
 Germans living in Słubice: 260

Characteristics

The end of World War 2 has divided the district of Frankfurt (Oder) and created the city of Słubice on the Polish bank. It is only in 1991 that a first initiative of cross-border cooperation has been realized between the two cities. Today, the cooperation is held by the "Frankfurt-Słubicer Kooperationszentrum" which aims at developing infrastructure projects (cross-border transportation) and promoting education (bilingual European kindergarten, joint university), tourism (investments in water tourism infrastructure) and economic development (joint city marketing project, network for small and middle sized companies).

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Frankfurt-Słubicer Kooperationszentrum; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Cieszyn Silesia Euroregion Cieszyn - Český Těšín

Population of the main cities:

Cieszyn (PL): 36 119 (2012)
Český Těšín (CZ): 25 154 (2012)

Population of other cities:

Jastrzębie-Zdrój (PL): 92 105 (2013)
Haviřov (CZ): 77 449 (2014)
Karviná (CZ): 57 005 (2014)

Total population of the Cieszyn Silesia Euroregion: 680 000 (2012)


Total surface of the Cieszyn Silesia Euroregion: 1 400 km²

Time distance between Cieszyn - Český Těšín:

By car: 3 minutes
By walk: 10 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Cieszyn Silesia Euroregion


Status of the cooperation:
Association

Organization of technical staff:
Coordination between local teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
No

Other cross-border structures:
No

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 2007

Currencies:
Czech Koruna (CZ), Złoty (PL)

Languages:
Czech, Polish, Silesian dialect

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
CZ: 17 800 € PL: 16 000 €

Cross-border commuters:
No data available

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border "Twin cities"

Cross-border residential integration:
No data available



Characteristics

The city of Cieszyn has been divided in 1920, between Czechoslovakia and Poland, along the Olza River. Whereas the old town remained in Poland, the industrial district was entrusted to Czechoslovakia. The end of the Soviet system allowed to restore links between both sides, first in terms of institutional cooperation, and afterwards in a more concrete manner, with the connection of roads and the opening of new border-crossing points. Since 2000, projects in the fields of culture, environmental protection (prevention and information of industrial risks) and spatial planning (new organization of traffic between the two cities, touristic trails) have been conducted.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics; Euroregion Śląsk Cieszyński - Tesinske Slezko.

Author: LISER, 2015.

Centrope

Vienna - Bratislava - Brno - Győr

Population of the main cities:

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Vienna (AT): | 1 781 105 (2014) |
| Bratislava (SK): | 417 389 (2013) |
| Győr (HU): | 131 267 (2011) |
| Brno (CZ): | 385 913 (2011) |

Population of other cities:

| | |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Sankt Pölten (AT): | 51 926 (2013) |
| Sopron (HU): | 60 755 (2011) |
| Szombathely (HU): | 79 590 (2011) |
| Trnava (SK): | 65 578 (2011) |

Total population of the Centrope Region: ≈ 6 500 000 residents (2014)

Total surface of the Centrope Region: 48 200 km²


Time distance between the main cities:

By car:


| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| Vienna - Bratislava: | 54 minutes |
| Vienna - Győr: | 1h21 |
| Vienna - Brno: | 1h43 |
| Bratislava - Győr: | 55 minutes |
| Bratislava - Brno: | 1h18 |
| Brno - Győr: | 2h02 |

By public transport:

| | |
|----------------------|------|
| Vienna - Bratislava: | 1h23 |
| Vienna - Győr: | 1h56 |
| Vienna - Brno: | 2h17 |
| Bratislava - Győr: | 1h31 |
| Bratislava - Brno: | 1h27 |
| Brno - Győr: | 4h08 |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Centrope


Status of the cooperation:
Charter

Organization of technical staff:
Centrope Agency (composed by the Centrope coordination office and four decentralised Centrope offices)

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
The Centrope Strategy 2013+ (2012)

Other cross-border structures:
No

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 2007

Languages:
Czech, German,
Hungarian, Slovak

Currencies:
Euro (AT, SK), Czech Koruna (CZ),
Hungarian Forint (HU)

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
AU: 36 562 € CZ: 19 000 €
HU: 19 652 € SK: 34 357 €

Cross-border commuters* (2011):

SK → AT: 5 530
AT → SK: 81


No data available for other borders

Cross-border residential integration:

No data available

* within the whole countries

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border polycentric
metropolitan region



Characteristics

The institutional relationships between the capital cities of Vienna and Bratislava are mostly driven by the desire to promote economic development. The end of the transitory period which limited the right of the Slovakian workers to access the EU labor market, in May 2011, has increased the level of cross-border interactions between both cities. Nowadays, the leading institution in terms of cross-border cooperation is clearly the Centrope initiative, which includes territories of Hungary and the Czech Republic. One of the main objectives of the Centrope Strategy 2013+ is to define a coordinated approach of the regional planning to improve the accessibility within this vast area in terms of infrastructures and services.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Eurostat; Statistik Austria; Google maps; EuroGeographics, <http://www.centrope-tt.info>.

Author: LISER, 2015.

EGTC GO Gorizia - Nova Gorica

Main cities:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gorizia (IT): | 35 315 residents (2012) |
| Nova Gorica (SI): | 31 992 residents (2011) |
| Šempeter Vrtojba (SI): | 6 269 residents (2011) |

Total population of the three municipalities: 73 576 (2011, 2012)


Total surface of the cooperation area EGTC GO: 375 km²

Time distance between Gorizia - Nova Gorica:

| | |
|----------|------------|
| By car: | 7 minutes |
| By walk: | 10 minutes |



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
EGTC GO (Gorizia Nova Gorica Šempeter-Vrtojba)


Status of the cooperation:
European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)

Organization of technical staff:
Coordination between local teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
No

Other cross-border structures:
Euroregion Istria (Project)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Schengen area since 2007

Currency:
Euro

Languages:
Italian, Slovene

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
IT: 27 400€ SI: 19 700€

Cross-border commuters (2014)*:
SI → IT: 790

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border "Twin cities"

Cross-border residential integration* (2014):
Slovenes living in Italy: 340



*For the whole Province of Gorizia
No Data for Slovenia

Characteristics

These two municipalities are located in a region where borders have fluctuated a lot during the 20th century. Historically contained within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the city with the current name of Gorizia became Italian at the end of World War I. After 1945, Yugoslavia called for the re-inclusion of the city within its sovereignty space but received only the eastern part, renamed as "Nova Gorica". Paradoxically, it is probably during the Yugoslavian period that cross-border integration was the most innovative, driven by cross-border shopping and by many cultural projects. An EGTC has been adopted in 2011 to give a new impetus to the cooperation.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Comune di Gorizia; Eurostat; Google maps; EuroGeographics.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Hajdú-Bihar - Bihar Euroregion Oradea - Debrecen

Main cities:

Debrecen (HU): 204 333 residents (2013)

Oradea (RO): 196 367 residents (2011)

Other cities within the Euroregion:

Hajdúböszörmény (HU): 32 228 residents (2013)

Hajdúszoboszló (HU): 23 695 residents (2013)

Salonta (RO): 17 735 residents (2011)

Total population of the Euroregion: 1 134 255 residents (2010)

Total surface of the Euroregion: 13 600 km²

Time distance between Oradea - Debrecen:

By car: 1h09

By public transport: 54 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:

Hajdú-Bihar - Bihar Euroregion

Status of the cooperation:

Association

Organization of technical staff:

Coordination between local teams


Existence of a territorial development strategy:

No

Other cross-border structures:

No

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:

Non-Schengen border

Languages:

Hungarian (HU), and
Romanian and Hungarian (RO)

Currencies:

Hungarian Forint (HU),
Romanian Leu (RO)

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):

HU: 12 500 € RO: 10 100 €


Cross-border commuters* (2012):

RO → HU: 6889

HU → RO: 423

Spatial configuration:

Cross-border polycentric
metropolitan region



Cross-border residential integration:

No data available

* for the whole countries

Characteristics

If the cooperation between the two cities is quite recent and still little developed, the potential for future collaborations is high since the overall population is numerous. Moreover, the existence of a Hungarian minority in the Romanian part of the cross-border space contributes to tie these two regions. One of the ambitions of the Hajdú-Bihar - Bihar Euroregion, which contains these two cities is to better integrate the actions pursued by public stakeholders in the fields of health, culture, education and economic development. Public transportation lines have already been developed between both cities, which are 70 km far from each other.

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; EDC Debrecen Urban and Economic Development Center; Google maps; EuroGeographics; Eurostat.
Author: LISER, 2015.

Euroregion Ruse - Giurgiu

Main cities:


Ruse (BG): 149 642 residents (2011)
Giurgiu (RO): 54 655 residents (2011)

Total population of the Ruse-Giurgiu Euroregion: 204 297 residents (2011)


Total surface of the Ruse-Giurgiu Euroregion: 195 km²

Time distance between Ruse - Giurgiu:

By car: 15 minutes
By bus: 15 minutes



Historical evolution of the cooperation



Cross-border cooperation structures

Principal cross-border cooperation structure:
Ruse-Giurgiu Euroregion


Status of the cooperation:
Association

Organization of technical staff:
Coordination between local teams

Existence of a territorial development strategy:
Euroregion Ruse-Giurgiu Operations - Masterplan (2012)

Other cross-border structures:
Danubius Euroregion (2002)

Institutional mapping:



Cross-border integration context

Type of border:
Non-Schengen border

Currencies:
Bulgarian Lev, Romanian Leu

Languages:
Bulgarian, Romanian

GDP/capita (PPP, 2011, NUTS 3):
BG: 8 700 € RO: 9 000 €

Cross-border commuters:
No data available

Spatial configuration:
Cross-border agglomeration

Cross-border residential integration:
No data available



Characteristics

Ruse and Giurgiu constitute the principal cross-border agglomeration between Bulgaria and Romania. They are separated by the Danube River, which is in itself a motive for collaboration due to the risk of flooding. Rehabilitating the access infrastructure for the development of the cross-border integration within this area is another priority which is pursued. Between 2010 and 2012, common master plans have been realized in order to better articulate the regional development. The Ruse-Giurgiu Euroregion is included in another larger Euroregion, the "Danubius Euroregion".

Sources: Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière; Google maps; EuroGeographics; Mercado Sud; Eurostat, Euroregion Ruse-Giurgiu Operations (ERGO) Masterplan, 2012.
Author: LISER, 2015.

As already mentioned, these 21 case-studies do not constitute an exhaustive list of the different cross-border initiatives that are existing in Europe between small and medium cities, but they just depict the great variety of approaches that are followed. This variety can be observed through the diversity of the territories engaged in cross-border cooperation. Whereas the smallest cooperation initiative covers an overall surface of only 30 km² and concerns only two municipalities (Valga and Valka) for approximately 20 000 inhabitants, the largest space of cooperation (the Greater Region) extends on more than 65 400 km² and gathers 11.5 million inhabitants. The number of countries that are involved also differ, from 2 countries in most of the examples to four (in the Greater Region and in the Centroepe space).

The different case-studies also reflect the various relations with borders that cities have. Some small and medium cities are engaged in cross-border cooperation approaches at different scales: with another municipality in an urban contiguity (Haparanda-Tornio, Valga-Valka) or in distance (Newry-Dundalk, Chaves-Verin), with a network of local authorities (Strasbourg-Ortenau), and/or within a whole regional cooperation space (Centroepe, the Greater Region).

The history of the cooperation is also very different: whereas in some cases, there has already been a cooperation in the 1960s, in other cross-border regions, the cooperation has only been established after 2000.

Concerning the institutional dimension, the most common form of cooperation in the cases studies is the flexible status of “association” (9 cases on 21), whereas the tool of the European grouping for territorial cooperation (EGTC), which was introduced in 2006, has been adopted in 6 case-studies so far. The multi-level and multi-tied aspects of the cooperation also greatly vary according to the number of municipalities and other territories that are included and according to who initiated it (is it locally, regionally or State-driven?)⁹.

Concerning the spatial configuration, 12 of the studied cross-border cooperation initiatives are embedded in a close proximity context: 5 case-studies are twin cities, 5 are cross-border agglomerations and 2 are discontinuous border cities, whereas 9 case-studies refer to larger cross-border polycentric metropolitan regions. Of course, the nature of the objectives that are targeted differ depending on the spatial scope of the cross-border cooperation. Some are very pragmatic and concrete and aim at solving everyday problems, whereas some other approaches consist more in branding the cross-border territory at a global scale. 16 case-studies have already adopted or are working on a common which allows to identify shared priorities and to lead a reflection about a common vision of the future territorial development. These documents can be very precise and targeted on specific issues or more directed towards general principles.

⁹ Sohn C. and Reitel B., 2013, The role of national states in the construction of cross-border metropolitan regions in Europe: A scalar approach, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, doi: 10.1177/0969776413512138.

2.2. Indicators to measure cross-border integration


This section intends to put into perspective the economic and social dynamics at work in the different case studies presented in the previous section by using statistical indicators. As mentioned in the ESPON METROBORDER¹⁰ project, cross-border integration depends on both the intensity of cross-border interactions and on dynamics of territorial convergence. These two approaches allow to depict the various dimensions induced by the complex process of cross-border integration. Several statistical indicators can highlight these two approaches. The first two indicators proposed allow to evaluate the degree of cross-border integration since 2000 thanks to statistics concerning the number of cross-border commuters and the number of residents with passports from the neighbouring country. They are a reactivation of the ones gathered during the METROBORDER project involving ten cross-border metropolitan regions. In this way, by adopting a diachronic approach, it is possible to see whether the dynamics at work in each of the 10 cases examined show signs of a reinforcement of cross-border integration, or, on the contrary, of a weakening. Two other indicators have likewise been studied: disparities of GDP per capita and a comparison between unemployment rates and the number of employments (data provided by Eurostat), for which all the 21 case-studies are included.

¹⁰ ESPON. 2010. Metroborder. Cross-Border Polycentric Metropolitan Regions. Final Report. Luxembourg.

a. Cross-border commuters

Cross-border commuters constitute the most frequently used indicator for measuring the functional dimension of cross-border integration. This indicator has the advantage of being regularly updated by national or regional offices for statistics, contrary to other types of flows (cross-border tourism, cross-border shopping). In this analysis ten cross-border urban areas have been studied comparatively. This indicator illustrates the degree of integration between border territories from the angle of the employment market, by measuring the importance of cross-border commuters and its evolution between 2000 and 2012. The graph (Figure 1) shows that the number of cross-border commuters in the regions studied has risen almost systematically. This means that in a context of open borders, neighbouring border areas often seem to be areas of opportunity for a good number of active people. Only Saarbrücken has seen a significant decline in the number of cross-border commuters. The most numerous cross-border commuters flows can be observed in Western Europe, and more specifically between France and its bordering territories in Switzerland, Luxembourg, Belgium, Germany and Monaco. The sometimes very significant number of cross-border commuters in certain regions can lead to serious transport problems. Indeed, the organisation of infrastructure and transport often lags behind the dynamic of commuter flows since adapting the transport networks into cross-border entities can take a long time given the large number of institutional actors that would need to be involved in the decision-making process regarding new transport routes, whether road or rail. In certain cases, cross-border cooperation has itself guided cross-border mobility by managing transport infrastructures to improve and facilitate flows on both sides of the border. In this respect one can cite the extension of national tram networks across the border (between Basel and Weil am Rhein in 2014 as well as between Strasbourg and Kehl due in 2016) or the creation of the rail and road bridge in the Oresund cross-border region, which was of course not a local strategy given its international scope, but which has nevertheless allowed the further development of the phenomenon of cross-border commuters.

Figure 1: Evolution of the number of cross-border commuters within cross-border urban regions



Sources: **Aachen-Liège-Maastricht:** INAMI, Meuse-Rhine Euregio; **Basel-Saint Louis-Lörrach:** OFS, MOT, INSEE, Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg; **Copenhagen-Malmö:** Öresundstatistik; **Geneva-Annemasse:** OFS, INSEE, INSEI; **Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai:** INAMI, INSEE, INSEI; **Nice-Monaco-San Remo:** INSEE, ISTAT 2009, Principauté de Monaco 2009; **Saarbrücken-Forbach-Saargemüines:** INSEE, ADEM Eures, BA, INAMI, INSEE, Observatoire interrégional du marché de l'emploi, Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg; **The Greater Region:** IGSS, ADEM Eures, BA, INAMI, INSEE, Observatoire interrégional du marché de l'emploi, Statistisches Landesamt Rheinland-Pfalz, Statistisches Landesamt Saarland; **Vienna-Bratislava-Brno-Győr:** Arbeitsmarktservice Austria, OECD.

b. Residents from neighbouring countries

The second indicator concerns the number of foreigners living in a border region who have the nationality of the neighbouring country and thus expresses the degree of residential interpenetration between bordering regions. It is an indicator that in some ways tries to answer the following question: are the individuals of one country ready to settle on the other side of the border (more precisely in the border region studied), despite the cultural and sometimes linguistic differences between them?

In almost all the examples studied (Table 1), statistical data clearly show an upward tendency for the number of residents in border regions in possession of the nationality of the neighbouring country. The cases that have witnessed a large increase in cross-border commuters are also those who have experienced, at least proportionally, the greatest rise in the number of inhabitants who have the neighbouring nationality. The reasons which can push the households to settle in the neighbouring border regions are various: the will to reside closer to the working place, tax reasons, housing prices differentials, etc.

Yet other cross-border urban regions have also seen an increase in foreign residents while the number of cross-border workers has stagnated or decreased, as in the case of Saarbrücken-Forbach-Sarreguemines. 1300 Germans came to live in Sarreguemines in Lorraine between 2006 and 2012. Settling on the other side of the border can thus be effected either in the same direction as the phenomenon of concentration of employment (from the periphery to the main urban centre, as in the case of Basel and Luxembourg), or in the opposite direction, notably in order to exploit lower property prices (the Dutch moving to Belgium, the Swiss moving to bordering French departments and Luxembourgers settling in the Länder of Rhineland-Palatinate and Saarland).

Note also that this dynamic has remained steady for the examples of the borders between France, Italy and Monaco as well as between Denmark and Sweden.

Table 1: Evolution of the number of residents from neighbouring countries within the different cross-border areas

| Case Study | Population | 2000 | 2006 | 2012 | Difference (2000-2012) | Tendencies (2000-2012) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Aachen-Liège-Maastricht | BE citizens in DE border region | 2721 | 2514 | 2748 | 27 | ≈ |
| | BE citizens in NE border region | 2580 | 2483 | 2598 | 18 | ≈ |
| | DE citizens in BE border region | 15337 | 16128 | 16231 | 894 | ↗ |
| | DE citizens in NE border region | 15113 | 12183 | 12829 | -2284 | ↘ |
| | NE citizens in BE border region | 32009 | 42592 | 44611 | 12602 | ↗↗ |
| | NE citizens in DE border region | 8677 | 10293 | 11803 | 3126 | ↗ |
| Basel-St-Louis-Lörrach | CH citizens in DE border region | 3304 | 3938 | 4507 | 1203 | ↗ |
| | CH citizens in FR border region | 878 | 861 | 928 | 50 | ≈ |
| | DE citizens in CH border region | 11111 | 17019 | 25093 | 13982 | ↗↗ |
| | DE citizens in FR border region | 1329 | 1613 | 1649 | 320 | ≈ |
| | FR citizens in CH border region | 1729 | 1871 | 2361 | 632 | ↗ |
| | FR citizens in DE border region | 3397 | 3426 | 3837 | 440 | ≈ |
| Copenhagen-Malmö | DK citizens in SE border region | 10054 | 17062 | 16610 | 6556 | ↗↗ |
| | SE citizens in DK border region | 10317 | 8480 | 8983 | -1334 | ↘ |
| Geneva-Annemasse | CH citizens in FR border region | 2554 | 4125 | 5566 | 3012 | ↗ |
| | FR citizens in CH border region | 18746 | 20349 | 25600 | 6854 | ↗↗ |
| Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai | BE citizens in FR border region | 6209 | 6067 | 6768 | 559 | ↗ |
| | FR citizens in BE border region | 18795 | 21500 | 22832 | 4037 | ↗ |
| Nice-Monaco-San Remo | FR citizens in IT border region | 1036 | 1115 | 1299 | 263 | ≈ |
| | FR citizens in MC | 11217 | 10029 | 10029 | -1188 | ↘ |
| | IT citizens in FR border region | 12203 | 12448 | 11886 | -317 | ↘ |
| | IT citizens in MC | 7029 | 6596 | 6596 | -433 | ↘ |
| Saarbrücken-Forbach | DE citizens in FR border region | 12646 | 14276 | 18414 | 5768 | ↗↗ |
| | FR citizens in DE border region | 6444 | 6335 | 6590 | 146 | ≈ |
| Strasbourg-Kehl-Offenburg | DE citizens in FR border region | 10320 | 12118 | 14667 | 4347 | ↗ |
| | FR citizens in DE border region | 25489 | 24807 | 28732 | 3243 | ↗ |
| The Greater Region* | BE citizens in LU | 14800 | 14197 | 16926 | 2126 | ↗ |
| | DE citizens in LU | 10052 | 8639 | 12049 | 1997 | ↗ |
| | FR citizens in LU | 19979 | 20386 | 31456 | 11477 | ↗↗ |
| | LU citizens in BE border region | 1439 | 1711 | 1812 | 373 | ≈ |
| | LU citizens in DE border region | 1671 | 3915 | 8341 | 6670 | ↗↗ |
| | LU citizens in FR border region | 1280 | 1584 | 1902 | 622 | ↗ |

Sources: **Aachen-Liège-Maastricht**: INAMI, Statistisches Landesamt Nordrhein-Westfalen, Statistics Netherlands; **Basel-Saint Louis-Lörrach**: OFS, INSEE, Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg; **Copenhagen-Malmö**: Öresundstatistik, Statistics Sweden, Danmarks Statistik; **Geneva-Annemasse**: OFS, INSEE; **Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai**: INAMI, INSEE; **Nice-Monaco-San Remo**: INSEE, ISTAT 2009, Principauté de Monaco 2009; **Saarbrücken-Forbach-Sarreguemines**: INSEE, Statistisches Landesamt Saarland; **Strasbourg-Kehl-Offenburg**: INSEE, Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg; **The Greater Region**: INAMI, INSEE, Statistisches Landesamt Rheinland-Pfalz, Statistisches Landesamt Saarland, STATEC.

Notes:

*The other figures are negligible for this case-study

"↘" means that the number of people who live in the neighbouring country has decreased (< -500)

"≈" means that the number of people who live in the neighbouring country has remained steady (between -500 and +500)

"↗" means that the number of people who live in the neighbouring country has slightly increased (> 500)

"↗↗" means that the number of people who live in the neighbouring country has strongly increased (> 5 000)

c. Measuring cross-border economic inequalities through GDP

This indicator attempts to illustrate the more or less converging economic dynamics of the territories situated on both sides of a border by looking at the growth in GDP per capita in terms of purchasing power parity (Table 2). The table presents the GDP per capita for each border region for the three years 2000, 2006 and 2011, and allows to observe the extent of the evolution of wealth creation in relation to the population.

In all cases the GDP per capita has increased in absolute terms but at very different rates. In the last column, the information is synthesised using signs which allow to see whether GDP has increased at rates that are:

- still below the average increase for European regions in NUTS 3 (-), which was 5 500 € (according to calculations based on Eurostat figures),
- between 5 000 € and 10 000 € above the EU average growth (+),
- or very above (++), over 10 000 €.

This information allows to see whether, over time, there has been a form of convergence of the factors pertaining to wealth creation within the border regions, which would be in line with the objectives of European Cohesion Policy, or whether, on the contrary, the differentials are growing. In the majority of cases studied, the wealth differentials per inhabitant expressed as purchasing power parity have shown a tendency towards increasing on both sides of the border, something that does not argue in favour of a real convergence of dynamics of economic development. Despite the context of European integration, the efforts undertaken by the European Regional Policy and the increase of cross-border interactions, inequalities in wealth creation persist and are even growing in some cases, in **absolute terms**.

The GDP per capita is often considered as providing a quite good estimation of the living conditions. Nevertheless, in some case studies in which the overall population is quite reduced and the number of cross-border commuters is high, the GDP per capita can lead to misinterpretation. Indeed, the cross-border commuters contribute to the creation of GDP on one side of the border, but they “export” the main part of their salaries in the other border region. Consequently, the average living conditions are higher than expected from the figure of the GDP per capita in the region which emits more cross-border commuters, and lower in the one which polarizes the flows (Luxembourg with French neighbouring departments, for instance).

Table 2: GDP per capita differentials (in purchasing power parity – at current price levels)

| Case Study | Country | GDP per capita | | | Evolution 2000-2011 |
|--------------------------------------|---------|----------------|----------|----------|------------------------|
| | | 2000 | 2006 | 2011 | |
| Aachen- Liège-Maastricht | NL | 22800 | 27800 | 29500 | + |
| | DE | 19038 | 21676 | 24406 | - |
| | BE | 17392 | 20226 | 22144 | - |
| Basel-St-Louis-Lörrach | DE | 22223 | 26699 | 30195 | + |
| | FR | 20600 | 23927 | 25600 | - |
| | CH | 77787 | 82263 | 87087 | + |
| Bayonne-San Sebastián | ES | 23200 | 32200 | 33500 | ++ |
| | FR | 19500 | 23200 | 23900 | - |
| Chaves-Verín | ES | 14300 | 21000 | 21800 | + |
| | PT | 9000 | 11900 | 13200 | - |
| Cieszyn-Český Těšín | CZ | 10500 | 15700 | 17800 | + |
| | PL | 9900 | 12000 | 16000 | + |
| Copenhagen-Malmö | SE | 22100 | 25700 | 27100 | - |
| | DK | 29161 | 33419 | 36667 | + |
| Esch-sur-Alzette-Villerupt | FR | 18223,31 | 21393,94 | 21519,26 | - |
| | LU | 46500 | 63800 | 66700 | ++ |
| Frankfurt/Oder-Słubice | DE | 15100 | 18800 | 22000 | + |
| | PL | 8200 | 10900 | 13500 | - |
| Geneva-Annemasse | CH | 48168 | 53402 | 60839 | ++ |
| | FR | 20662,83 | 23339,71 | 22582,48 | - |
| Gorizia-Nova Gorica | IT | 24100 | 25900 | 27400 | - |
| | SI | 14900 | 19300 | 19700 | - |
| Haparanda-Tornio | FI | 18900 | 23500 | 24100 | - |
| | SE | 22000 | 29400 | 35500 | ++ |
| Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai | FR | 18300 | 22200 | 23800 | + |
| | BE | 21469 | 25318 | 27668 | + |
| Newry-Dundalk | IE | 15400 | 24700 | 18700 | - |
| | GB | 14200 | 19100 | 16000 | - |
| Nice-Monaco-San Remo | FR | 21400 | 25900 | 27900 | + |
| | IT | 21100 | 23100 | 23200 | - |
| | MC | 48000 | 50751 | 51556 | - |
| Oradea-Debrecen | HU | 7600 | 10900 | 12500 | - |
| | RO | 4700 | 9300 | 10100 | - |
| Ruse-Giurgiu | BG | 4700 | 7100 | 8700 | - |
| | RO | 2700 | 4800 | 9000 | + |
| Saarbrücken-Forbach- Saarguemines | FR | 18100 | 20900 | 20200 | - |
| | DE | 20904,38 | 27230,07 | 30206,05 | + |
| Strasbourg-Kehl-Offenburg | FR | 22700 | 24900 | 27300 | - |
| | DE | 23511 | 29296 | 33186 | + |
| The Greater Region | BE | 16531 | 19285 | 20776 | - |
| | LU | 46500 | 63800 | 66700 | ++ |
| | DE | 14864 | 17914 | 20161 | - |
| | FR | 18223 | 21394 | 21519 | - |
| Valga-Valka | EE | 5600 | 10300 | 11700 | + |
| | LV | 4300 | 7300 | 10000 | + |
| Vienna-Bratislava-Brno-Győr | AU | 30263 | 34547 | 36562 | + |
| | CZ | 12400 | 17200 | 19000 | + |
| | HU | 12803 | 16139 | 18652 | + |
| | SK | 15652 | 26855 | 34357 | ++ |

Sources: EUROSTAT 2015.

Notes:

- means that the evolution of the GDP per capita is below 5.500 € (EU NUTS 3 average growth) between 2000 and 2011.

+ means that the evolution of the GDP per capita is between 5.500 and 10.000 € between 2000 and 2011

++ means that the evolution of the GDP per capita is higher than 10.000 € between 2000 and 2011

The threshold values have been calculated based on the average and standard deviation in all the NUTS 3 regions in the EU.

d. The labour market

The similarity or dissimilarity of the labour market on each side of a border can have a potential impact on cross-border integration. Indeed, beyond differences in the levels of received remuneration, cross-border work can constitute an opportunity for inhabitants of small and medium cities severely affected by unemployment. This opportunity can be reciprocal, notably when the destination territory is affected by a decrease of its working population, and which cross-border employment could compensate for.

Using Table 3, different configurations that are more or less conducive to cross-border complementarity can be identified. In certain case-studies, the differences in unemployment levels are very important and cross-border cooperation can potentially allow a higher fluidity of the labour market at the benefit of both regions. Yet workers are not always in a position to make their skills count across the border for various reasons (linguistic barriers, regulatory and administrative obstacles, lack of knowledge concerning actual job opportunities). In order to satisfy the requirements of employers while helping a neighbouring population to improve its precarious position there are several strategies available. We can list, amongst others, those strategies aiming to pool the job offers from recognised agencies in the different territories, the trainings available for learning languages, or initiatives to coordinate the recognition of qualifications. The initiatives of EURES (European employment services) offer information to citizens about the employment market, both regarding administrative aspects and at the level of professional training and job offers, with a view to promoting the free circulation of workers within the thirty countries making up the European Economic Area (EEA).

Table 3: Evolution of the labour market between 2006 and 2013

| Case Study | Country | NUTS 2 (totally or partly incorporated in the cross-border urban area) | Economically active population. Evolution 2006- 2013 (in %) | Unemployment rate (%) | | | Employment evolution 2006-2013 (in %) |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|-----------------------|------|---|--|
| | | | | 2006 | 2013 | Difference (in percentage points) | |
| Aachen- Liège-Maastricht | NL | Limburg | -1,9 | 4,5 | 6,7 | 2,2 | -4,2 |
| | DE | Köln | 1,2 | 9,1 | 5,9 | -3,2 | 4,9 |
| | BE | Prov. Liège | 4,8 | 11,5 | 11,7 | 0,2 | 4,6 |
| | | Prov. Limburg | 5,3 | 6,2 | 5,5 | -0,7 | 6,1 |
| Basel-St-Louis- Lörrach | DE | Freiburg | 3,2 | 5,5 | 2,9 | -2,6 | 6,1 |
| | FR | Alsace | 3,3 | 6,6 | 9,7 | 3,1 | -0,1 |
| | CH | Nordwestschweiz | 9,7 | 4 | 4,1 | 0,1 | 9,6 |
| Bayonne- San Sebastián | ES | País Vasco | -2,1 | 7,2 | 16,6 | 9,4 | -12,1 |
| | FR | Aquitaine | 6,8 | 7,9 | 8,9 | 1 | 5,7 |
| Chaves-Verín | ES | Galicia | 1,9 | 8,3 | 22 | 13,7 | -13,5 |
| | PT | Norte | -4,3 | 8,9 | 17,2 | 8,3 | -13,4 |
| Cieszyn-Český Těšín | CZ | Moravskoslezsko | -1,6 | 12 | 9,9 | -2,1 | 0,7 |
| | PL | Slaskie | 7,3 | 14,2 | 9,7 | -4,5 | 12,9 |
| Copenhagen-Malmö | SE | Sydsverige | 9,0 | 8,2 | 9,9 | 1,7 | 6,8 |
| | DK | Hovedstaden | 8,8 | 5 | 7,4 | 2,4 | 3,8 |
| | | Sjælland | -2,0 | 4 | 6,8 | 2,8 | -5,6 |
| Esch-sur-Alzette- Villerupt | FR | Lorraine | -0,3 | 9,9 | 12,2 | 2,3 | -2,9 |
| | LU | Luxembourg | 22,6 | 4,7 | 5,8 | 1,1 | 21,1 |
| Frankfurt/Oder- Stubice | DE | Brandenburg | -8,0 | 16,6 | 7,4 | -9,2 | 2,3 |
| | PL | Lubuskie | -7,2 | 14 | 9,7 | -4,3 | -2,4 |
| Geneva-Annemasse | CH | Région lémanique | 10,2 | 7,3 | 5,5 | -1,8 | 8,5 |
| | FR | Rhône-Alpes | 4,9 | 7,7 | 8,4 | 0,7 | 4,1 |
| Gorizia-Nova Gorica | IT | Friuli-Venezia Giulia | 0,1 | 3,5 | 7,7 | 4,2 | -4,3 |
| | SI | Zahodna Slovenija | 2,5 | 4,6 | 8,7 | 4,1 | -2,0 |
| Haparanda-Tornio | FI | Pohjois- ja Itä-Suomi | -1,5 | 10,8 | 9,9 | -0,9 | -0,4 |
| | SE | Övre Norrland | -2,9 | 8,5 | 7,2 | -1,3 | -1,6 |
| Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai | FR | Nord - Pas-de-Calais | 2,2 | 12,5 | 14,7 | 2,2 | -0,4 |
| | BE | Prov. West-Vlaanderen | 2,0 | 4,2 | 3,9 | -0,3 | 2,3 |
| | | Prov. Hainaut | 3,9 | 14,4 | 13,2 | -1,2 | 5,2 |
| Newry-Dundalk | IE | Border, Midland and Western | 0,4 | 4,7 | 14,2 | 9,5 | -10,0 |
| | GB | Northern Ireland | 6,9 | 4,4 | 7,6 | 3,2 | 3,2 |
| Nice-Monaco- San Remo | FR | Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur | 8,0 | 11,5 | 10,8 | -0,7 | 8,8 |
| | IT | Liguria | 1,9 | 4,8 | 9,9 | 5,1 | -3,6 |
| | | Monaco | N/A | 1* | 1* | 0 | 14,4 |
| Oradea-Debrecen | HU | Észak-Alföld | 5,7 | 11 | 14,4 | 3,4 | 1,7 |
| | RO | Nord-Vest | 0,6 | 5,9 | 4,1 | -1,8 | 2,7 |
| Ruse-Giurgiu | BG | Severen tsentralen | -9,1 | 13,5 | 15,3 | 1,8 | -11,1 |
| | RO | Sud - Muntenia | -8,8 | 9,4 | 9,9 | 0,5 | -9,0 |
| Saarbrücken-Forbach- Saarguemines | FR | Lorraine | -0,3 | 9,9 | 12,2 | 2,3 | -2,9 |
| | DE | Saarland | 0,8 | 9,5 | 6,2 | -3,3 | 4,8 |
| Strasbourg-Kehl- Offenburg | FR | Alsace | 3,3 | 6,6 | 9,7 | 3,1 | -0,1 |
| | DE | Freiburg | 3,2 | 5,5 | 2,9 | -2,6 | 6,1 |
| | | Karlsruhe | 2,6 | 7,2 | 3,6 | -3,6 | 6,6 |
| The Greater Region | BE | Prov. Luxembourg | 11,0 | 7,7 | 7,9 | 0,2 | 10,7 |
| | LU | Luxembourg | 22,6 | 4,7 | 5,8 | 1,1 | 21,1 |
| | DE | Trier | 4,1 | 6,2 | 3,1 | -3,1 | 7,7 |
| | | Saarland | 0,8 | 9,5 | 6,2 | -3,3 | 4,8 |
| FR | Lorraine | -0,3 | 9,9 | 12,2 | 2,3 | -2,9 | |
| Valga-Valka | EE | Estonia | -1,8 | 5,9 | 8,6 | 2,7 | -4,7 |
| | LV | Latvia | -7,7 | 6,8 | 11,9 | 5,1 | -12,6 |
| Vienna-Bratislava- Brno-Győr | AT | Burgenland | 3,5 | 5 | 4 | -1 | 4,7 |
| | | Niederösterreich | 6,2 | 4 | 4,5 | 0,5 | 5,6 |
| | | Wien | 7,4 | 8,8 | 8,4 | -0,4 | 7,8 |
| | CZ | Jihovýchod | 3,7 | 7,1 | 6,8 | -0,3 | 4,1 |
| | HU | Nyugat-Dunántúl | -0,7 | 5,7 | 7,8 | 2,1 | -2,7 |
| SK | Bratislavský kraj | 0,3 | 4,6 | 6,4 | 1,8 | -1,7 | |

Source: Eurostat 2015

* Estimation

Conclusion: different approaches of the concept of cross-border integration

The analysis and cross-comparison of the different case-study sheets allow to stress the existence of several approaches to assess the cross-border integration process. There can be some contradictory mechanisms between cross-border interactions (flows of people, goods and capitals) and cross-border convergence (tendency towards more similarity between the patterns of development on both sides of a border). A high intensity of interactions between two border regions does not systematically lead to more equal levels of territorial development. Usually, four main approaches of the concept of cross-border integration are used to try to capture the phenomenon, summarised below¹¹:

- The **functional approach** of integration relates to the interactions occurring on either side of the border and which are essentially each and everyone's business. These interactions can be linked to work, to cross-border consumer behaviours, to leisure activities, to the use of cultural and touristic offer, or to services located on the other side of the border. The quality of the accessibility between border territories, notably with transport and communication infrastructures potentially improves, of course, the level of cross-border integration.
- The **institutional approach**, in a European context, derives from study of the organisation of cross-border cooperation and the networking of actors to let emerge, assist or encourage cross-border initiatives. This can take the form of formalised governance, but it can also take a less official form while remaining active and dynamic.
- The **structural approach** of cross-border integration is concerned with the contextual characteristics of the cross-border area (in terms of urbanisation, economic activity and social composition) and highlights the complementarities, the differences as well as the dynamics of convergence or divergence between territories. An integrated cross-border area from a structural point of view would thus present only a small degree of developmental inequality between both sides of a border.
- Alongside these first three uses of the concept of cross-border integration, the **ideational approach** designates a variety of more subjective elements, linked to individual and collective representations, such as the sharing of common social and political references, or the identification with similar images and symbols. In fact, individuals could cross a border following an opportunity without necessarily developing a sense of belonging to a cross-border living area or without strengthening their cultural and linguistic affinities with the people next door. The pursuit of the objective of a complete cross-border integration (and not just an economic one) therefore implies the involvement of public actors in the promotion of events and practices that concretely allow inhabitants to meet and exchange with the 'other'.

It is important to mention that these approaches do not necessarily go together and that certain processes of functional integration, for example, can even have negative effects on the quality of the ideational integration. An example of such a contradiction between two dimensions of the integration process is the hostile demonstrations of residents regarding the increasing numbers of cross-border workers or the settling of foreigners. A truly and completely integrated cross-border area is one that can combine these different notions of integration. In the next section, the factors that can contribute to strengthening one or the other of these different approaches will be presented.

¹¹ Durand F. 2015. Theoretical framework of the cross-border space production - the case of the Eurometropolis Lille - Kortrijk – Tournai, *EUBORDERSCAPES Working paper series*: http://www.euborderscapes.eu/index.php?id=working_papers

3) Factors that influence cross-border integration

This final part aims to shed light on the principal factors that positively or negatively influence the construction of a fully integrated cross-border region. Some of them have already been presented in the fact sheets of the case studies, such as sharing the same currency or the same or a similar language. In addition, three other types of factors seem to influence the growth in cross-border flows, perceived as the main engine of cross-border integration. The first is linked to geographical context, the second to cross-border governance and the third to the appropriation of the cross-border area.

3.1. The impact of geographical contexts

Even though the intensity of cross-border cooperation is foremost the result of political will, there are geographical elements that drive it, or, on the contrary, act as a brake in relation to the dynamic of integration. These factors are linked firstly to the nature of the border and thus its degree of permeability and secondly to the spatial configuration of the border cities.

The first element intervening in cross-border integration is the length of time a border has already been open to flows (as well as the inclusion of the countries, or not, in the Schengen area). Historically, western Europe border regions first benefited from the opportunities brought by European programmes and the free circulation of people, goods and capital. The structuration of cross-border cooperation therefore often (but not always) appears more advanced in these areas than in the border areas of central and eastern Europe. Consequently, there is a discrepancy between different cross-border situations even if certain issues, such as employment and transport, are shared by all cross-border areas. Some of the examples of cross-border relations studied in this report have a long history of cooperation (such as for instance the cooperation between Haparanda and Tornio, Copenhagen and Malmö or the cities in the agglomeration of Basel, etc.) and the results obtained today must of course be interpreted in the light of this history.

A second element that strongly influences the level of integration is the spatial configuration of small and medium cities involved in a cross-border cooperation initiative. In the case of cross-border urban territories belonging to a single cross-border agglomeration, political actors are confronted with the necessity to manage, together, a certain number of local services for their inhabitants. The cases of Basel (with the agglomerated communities of Saint Louis or Weil am Rhein), of Geneva (with Annemasse) or the Eurometropolis of Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai stand out in this respect. The imperative to cooperate, and thus agree on a certain number of services to be provided, can explain to a large extent why cooperative measures are much more advanced there than in other cross-border regions. Yet this kind of spatial configuration can equally generate tensions, notably in relation to the problem of financing certain kinds of infrastructure and services.

In a polycentric configuration in which the small and medium cities are further apart, local actors who engage in cross-border cooperation are de facto distant collaborations, without territorial continuity between their respective areas of sovereignty. The forms of cross-border cooperation that are actually developed there are consequently focused on other themes than the management of local services or public amenities, such as economic or tourist territorial promotion (as in the Tri-national metropolitan region of the Upper Rhine including the Eurodistrict Strasbourg-Ortenau and the Trinational Eurodistrict Basel) or seeking convergence and articulation between spatial planning strategies (Centreop, the Meuse-Rhine Euroregion, the Greater Region). Therefore, the number of institutional

actors engaged in the negotiations, the topics dealt with, the strategies adopted and their modes of implementation are going to vary depending on the spatial context of these cross-border cooperation initiatives between small and medium cities. Such a situation brings more complexity and it is more important to sketch a suitable system of governance in order to bring appropriate and effective responses.

3.2. The importance of forms of cross-border governance

It is essential to remember that strengthening cooperation between cities at cross-border level must begin with identifying objectives that are shared by all. Though such an assertion may seem obvious and even trivial it is important to remember it because the lack of prospects of any positive benefits constitutes the first limit to a strong involvement of the policymakers in small and medium cities. In addition, it is important to emphasise that building up cross-border cooperation is a long-term process, one that requires overcoming technical, legal and cultural obstacles. That is why it is fundamental, in order for a fledgling cooperation to have a chance to take root, that each party committed is fully aware of the personal gain that can be expected.

Over and above this reminder, an efficient cross-border governance is vital for institutional actors of small and medium border cities to be able to develop cross-border integration and to launch concrete and efficient initiatives to respond to social and economic needs. To achieve this, the final consolidation of cross-border governance has to be shaped by the legal tools and structures of cooperation, the quality of the dialogue between participating parties and the involvement of non-institutional actors.

a. Deploying the legal instruments and means available

The implementation of cross-border actions is often further complicated by the great variety of national administrative systems. Different territorial authorities rarely possess the same skills, responsibilities or even the same human and financial resources. So how can one further articulate cooperation within small and medium cities? In order to make a cross-border initiative prosper, be supported and have legal backing, it is fundamental to create the conditions for a solid multi-level governance structure that brings together the institutional actors authorised to adopt and endorse the project.

In numerous regions in Europe, cross-border cooperation within urban areas is steered by local actors in charge of the cross-border issue. This is obviously the case in city to city partnerships (Gorizia-Nova Gorica, Newry-Dundalk) but it is equally true in the larger spaces of the Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai¹² and the Oresund Region (Copenhagen-Malmö)¹³. In all cases, when local territorial actors have limited legal competence, the involvement of higher institutional levels is required in order to validate the initiatives from a legal point of view.

¹² Nelles J. and Durand F., 2014, Political Rescaling and Metropolitan Governance in Cross-Border Regions / Comparing the cross-border metropolitan areas of Lille and Luxembourg, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, Sage, Vol. 21, n°1, pp. 104-122.

¹³ Hansen A. and Serin G., 2007, Integration strategies and barriers to co-operation in cross-border regions: Case study of the Øresund region, *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, Vol. 22, n°2, pp. 39-56.

In support of this process of strengthening cities in their cross-border cooperation, States have taken legal steps to remove certain technical obstacles. In 1980, the Outline Convention of Madrid was ratified by the European partners to promote cross-border cooperation between territorial groupings. Three revisions of this convention have permitted to better structure cross-border cooperation. Thus, in 1995, territorial authorities received the right to conclude cooperation agreements and to set up legally recognised bodies. In 1998 came the added possibility of establishing cross-border agreements between non-contiguous territories. In 2009, a new legal collaboration instrument was introduced: Euroregional Cooperation Grouping (ECG). This new legal instrument, which is close to the EGTC previously described, allows for cross-border cooperation between EU member States and EU non-member States. More recently, the Integrated territorial investment (ITI) tool has been defined within the frame of the EU cohesion policy, for the period from 2014 to 2020¹⁴. The ITI allows EU member States to combine investments from several priority axes of one or more operational programmes for the purpose of multi-dimensional and cross-sectoral intervention. This tool is not specific to cross-border areas, but it can be used to implement an integrated strategy for urban development in cross-border cities.

These different initiatives have and will continue to encourage a better coordination between the actors involved, whether they work at local, regional or national level in order to improve territorial integration on a European scale.

However, decisions taken in the context of these agreements for cross-border cooperation are implemented by territorial authorities in full conformity with the governing law of their respective countries. This means that the right to cross-border cooperation is not a new, autonomous legal framework since it refers back to national law. As regards the structure of cross-border cooperation, its legal status is defined by the law in force in the territory in which it is registered. This means that a structure of cross-border cooperation solely rests on national law. Therefore, one cannot therefore speak at this stage of an autonomous legal framework proper to cross-border areas.

There thus exist today various possible configurations for operating cross-border cooperation initiatives. The forms vary according to the political choices or legal possibilities of each partner, which can range from association status (for instance Valga-Valka, Oradea-Debrecen) to that of charter (the Meuse-Rhine Euroregio has legal status as foundation since 1991). In recent years, however, the EGTC has been acclaimed by institutional actors as the instrument of choice for steering cross-border cooperation. By April 2015, 54 EGTC were counted in Europe with a further 14 in preparation. They have adopted this cooperation structure because it supplies a legal basis to the cross-border activities of local and regional authorities and allows States to participate in cross-border governance.

b. The quality of cross-border dialogue and its longevity

Cross-border cooperation initiatives often still consist of a specific project with defined timeframe and budget. While these projects are clearly opportunities for forging cross-border links, it is also important to place them on a more long term footing in order to capitalise on the positive experiences and prevent loss of momentum in promising cooperation initiatives. When an elected leader reaches the end of his term, for example, it is not unusual for the cooperation initiatives to be affected. In fact, such cross-border initiatives are sometimes driven substantially by individuals who have the required legitimacy and commitment. Generally speaking, it matters that actors who have competence in cross-

¹⁴ ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/2014/iti_en.pdf

border cooperation feel committed to their mission, and that they demonstrate a talent for diplomacy, communication, openness and perseverance.

Beyond the importance of good relations between the policymakers, the existence of *ad hoc* cooperation structures which gather technical resources and non-political actors also constitute valuable tools for moving cross-border cooperation up a gear while ensuring its longevity. The dedicated teams are generally made up of people who represent the local territories participating in the project and who master the different languages spoken in the cross-border region. They are in charge of running the internal functioning (at the level of the political entities and administrative follow-up) and coordinating the realisation of projects. The involvement of a dedicated team in a cross-border project generally leads to the development of detailed territorial strategies which aim to build, legitimise and manage the cross-border living area (ORUS Strategy in Copenhagen-Malmö, Eurometropolis 2020 Strategy, Action Plan Frankfurt-Ślubiice 2020). In Basel and Geneva, these territorial strategies have resulted in the implementation of cross-border urban projects (IBA Basel, France-Vaud-Geneva Conurbation project). The existence of dedicated teams in areas of cooperation also constitutes part of the promotion of cross-border activities and cross-border scale.

c. Involving non-institutional actors in the cross-border dynamic

In most cross-border urban regions, the creation of an open form of governance associating institutional actors and those representing civil society and business remains a challenge. Nevertheless, for the relationships between border cities to move from simple political project to actual reality anchored in the daily life of its inhabitants, it is necessary for all the major actors to be involved and aware of the gains cross-border cooperation can bring. In some examples, associations exist that bring together experts in cooperation, academics, business leaders and managers in social services (employment, health, education, rehabilitation...). The mission statement of such groupings are broad, they guarantee a monitoring and distribution of any information and play the role of relaying civic initiatives while constituting a meeting place for exchanging ideas. Most often they articulate the thoughts and advice on cross-border issues, like the Cross-border Forum of the Eurometropolis of Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai. This consultative assembly, made up of actors from development councils of Picardy, Wallonia and the Lille metropolis, as well as the Transforum association in western Flanders, has produced decision-making support to the policymakers concerning the crucial issues of health and transport in 2011. In addition, it co-organises the Eurometropolis Employment Forum, bringing together employers, French and Belgian job seekers, as well as career advisors, training and administration experts. For its part, the association Metrobasel in Basel brings together actors from the private sector, while not denying entry to associations and territorial actors. This think tank constitutes an interesting example of the involvement of non-institutional actors in strategic territorial development at cross-border level. In the Bayonne-San Sebastián cross-border area the Bihartean structure was created in 2010. It is a reinforced collaboration between the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Bayonne Pays Basque and the Camara de Comercio de Gipuzkoa in the Spanish Basque region. It was set up to develop cross-border economic projects, to respond to the needs of businesses in each territory and to provide joint economic and training opportunities. Generally speaking, cross-border integration is not accomplished by the mere political will, but is constructed by involving the civil population.

3.3. The feeling of sharing a common cross-border living area

Culture, cross-border provision of training, cross-border schools, academic exchanges and other initiatives are so many elements that contribute to the lowering of cultural barriers and push inhabitants to take possession of their cross-border area. Recommendation Rec (2000)1 to the member States on “fostering transfrontier co-operation between territorial communities or authorities in the cultural field” adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe¹⁵ testifies to the awareness of the importance of this issue in the construction of a common cross-border identity.

The “*Mission opérationnelle transfrontalière*” (MOT), a structure set up by the French government to produce expertise on border areas and help in their development, has identified different ways of promoting culture at cross-border level¹⁶. This can happen, amongst other ways, by:

- Proposing a joint cultural offering by organising events at cross-border level, following the example of Luxembourg and the Greater Region, (European capital of culture in 2007) and the cross-border festivals of Cieszyn-Český Těšín (“Cinema on the border”, “Theatre without Borders”). It can also take the form of setting up the cross-border structures dedicated to culture such as “Manège Maubeuge Mons”, which is a platform for the creation and showcasing of contemporary theatre.
- Facilitating access to culture at cross-border level, such as the common pricing policy set for museums in the Upper Rhine region.
- The promotion of a common cultural and natural heritage in a cross-border area, such as the initiative to restore and promote tourism in the network of fortifications called “guardians of the Alps” between France and Italy.

In addition to the examples of the MOT, and concerning education, there is the setting up of schools for pupils on both sides of a border, as the Germano-Luxembourgish High school of Schengen-Perl, the cross-border School of Perthus in Catalonia or the bilingual school in Haparanda-Tornio. Furthermore, since 1991, different INTERREG programmes have permitted to finance projects related to the learning of the neighbouring language.

Furthermore, the creation of physical spaces that favour encounters between neighbouring populations is a vector of appropriation. The example of the “Garden of two banks” and the Mimram Bridge between Strasbourg and Kehl is thus more than a symbol of Franco-German reconciliation; it is also a recreational area that is very popular. The organization of events is, generally speaking, an efficient way to make people meet in a festive atmosphere.

All these initiatives, which can be sustained by local institutional actors, are very important in fostering exchanges, combat prejudice and to get to know one’s neighbour, his territory and his culture better.

¹⁵<https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=Rec%282000%291&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=original&Site=CM&BackColorInternet=DBDCF2&BackColorIntranet=FDC864&BackColorLogged=FDC864>

¹⁶ <http://www.espaces-transfrontaliers.org/en/resources/topics-of-cooperation/culture/culture-8/>

General conclusion

In the current context of borders open to the circulation of goods, people and capital, many small and medium cities are seeking ways to cooperate in order to generate, reinforce and structure new relationships across borders but also to meet the expectations they raise in society. At the same time these steps remain relatively difficult to implement even if the setting up of legal cross-border structures by the EU helps to simplify the formal relations. Moreover, they cannot in themselves guarantee the quality of the relationships established between societies on either side of a border because cross-border integration is not effected by decree but built-up patiently over time through active steps towards collaboration and inclusion.

Nevertheless, taking the case studies into account, a few general principles can be identified, in which cross-border cooperation can bring fruitful opportunities for small and medium cities. At least three can be extracted: the definition of a common strategy for cross-border development, based on the identification of the priorities to be addressed jointly, the search for a policy framework conducive to the realisation of a strategy and lastly, the involvement of civil society.

- The definition of a common strategy for cross-border development between small and medium cities

This strategy has to be based on a territorial diagnosis conducted at cross-border scale which allows the identification of common issues and objectives, as well as the way cooperation could achieve them. It is a question of finding the middle ground between, on the one hand, a strategy that is too general and all-encompassing to be actionable and, on the other, a strategy that is too targeted and limited to serve cross-border integration in the general sense of the term.

- The putting in place of a tailored system of governance

The challenge is to find the right balance between the degree of institutionalisation necessary to facilitate cross-border operations on the one hand, and to keep the level of flexibility needed to guarantee their efficacy and responsiveness on the other. The EGTC for example offers both the legal capacity and moral personality which are conducive to realising certain projects. In the same way, the 'decision-making sphere' has to be open simultaneously to actors in power and to the driving forces in the territory, without which no cross-border strategy can properly take root.

- Involving civil society in cross-border cooperation initiatives

The most functionally integrated regions are not always those in which the quality of integration, in terms of cohabitation of communities, is necessarily the highest. In fact, under the pressure of flows, protectionist and even hostile feelings can arise. The increase of flows and interactions is therefore not systematically associated with an improvement in the quality of relationships. It is thus all the more important to accompany the setting up of legal frameworks or strategies with events and actions which will allow civil society to appropriate the cross-border area and familiarise itself with the culture of the 'other' in order to improve exchanges and openness.

Annex: Characteristics of the institutional cross-border context of 21 case studies in Europe

| Case study | Main cross-border cooperation structure | Date of creation of the structure | Status of the structure | Technical staff | Interreg IVa programmes |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| Aachen-Liège-Maastricht | Euregio Meuse-Rhin | 1976 | Charter | Coordination between regional teams | Euregio Maas Rhein (http://interregemr.info/index.html) |
| Basel-St-Louis-Lörrach | Trinational Eurodistrict Basel (TEB) | 1994 (Basel Trinational Agglomeration), 2007 (TEB) | Association | Integrated Team | Rhin supérieur – Oberrhein (http://www.interreg-oberrhein.eu/) |
| Bayonne-San Sebastián | Basque Eurocity | 1993 | European economic interest grouping | Coordination between local teams | España - France – Andorra (http://www.poctefa.eu/) |
| Chaves-Verín | Eurocity Chaves-Verín | 2007 | EGTC | Coordination between local teams | España – Portugal (http://www.poctep.eu) |
| Cieszyn-Český Těšín | Cieszyn Silesia Euroregion | 1998 | Association | Coordination between local teams | Česká Republika – Polska (http://www.cz-pl.eu/) |
| Copenhagen-Malmö | Öresundskomiteen | 1993 | Association | Integrated Team | Öresund - Kattegatt – Skagerrak (http://www.interreg-oks.eu/se) |
| Esch/Alzette-Villerupt | EGTC Alzette-Belval | 2013 | EGTC | Integrated Team | Grande Région (http://www.grossregion.net/de/index.html) |
| Frankfurt/Oder-Ślubiце | Frankfurt-Ślubice Kooperationszentrum | 2010 | Association | Integrated Team | Województwo Lubuskie – Brandenburgia (http://de.plbb.eu) |
| Geneva-Annemasse | Greater Geneva | 1997 (Charter), 2004 (Agglomeration Project), 2013 (Greater Geneva) | Local Cross-border Cooperation Grouping (LCCG) | Integrated Team | France - Schweiz (http://www.interreg-francesuisse.org/) |
| Gorizia-Nova Gorica | Gorizia Nova Gorica Sempeter-Vrtojba | 1998 (Cross-border Pact between the two cities) 2011 (EGTC) | EGTC | Coordination between local teams | Italia - Slovenija (http://www.interreg-it-si.org) |
| Haparanda-Tornio | Provincia Bothniensis | 1987 | Association | Integrated Team | Sweden-Finland-Norway (Nord) (http://2007-2013.interregnord.com/) |
| Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai | Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai | 1991 (Copit), 2008 (EGTC) | EGTC | Integrated Team | France - Wallonie – Vlaanderen (http://www.interreg-fwf.org/) |
| Newry-Dundalk | No cross-border structure | / | Association | Coordination between local teams | Northern Ireland/ Western Scotland (http://www.seupb.eu/programmes.htm) |
| Nice-Monaco-San Remo | No cross-border structure | / | Multilateral thematic agreements | / | Italia - France ALCOTRA (http://www.interreg-alcotra.org) |
| Oradea-Debrecen | Hajdú-Bihar - Bihar Euroregion | 2002 | Association | Coordination between local teams | Magyarország – România (http://2014.huro-cbc.eu/) |
| Ruse-Giurgiu | Ruse-Giurgiu Euroregion | 2001 | Association | Coordination between local teams | România – Bulgaria (http://www.cbcrromaniabulgaria.eu/) |
| Saarbrücken-Forbach-Saarguemines | Eurodistrict Saarmoselle | 1991 (Association Zukunft SaarMoselle Avenir) 2010 (EGTC) | EGTC | Integrated Team | Grande Région (http://www.grossregion.net/de/index.html) |
| Strasbourg-Kehl-Offenburg | Eurodistrict Strasbourg-Ortenau | 2005 (Eurodistrict - Association) 2010 (EGTC) | EGTC | Integrated Team | Rhin supérieur – Oberrhein (http://www.interreg-oberrhein.eu/) |
| The Greater Region | The Greater Region | 1995 (1 st Summit of the Greater Region) | Charter | Coordination between regional teams | Grande Région (http://www.grossregion.net/de/index.html) |
| Valga-Valka | No cross-border structure | / | Association | Coordination between local teams | Eesti – Latvija (http://www.estlat.eu/) |
| Vienna-Bratislava-Bрно-Győr | Centrope | 2004 | Charter | Regional offices in all four participating countries | Österreich - Česká Republika (http://www.at-cz.eu/); Slovensko – Österreich (http://www.sk-at.eu/); Österreich – Magyarország (http://www.at-hu.net) |