The place where streams seek ground. Towards a new territorial governmentality: the meaning and usage of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Union

Hissink Muller, B.M.

Citation for published version (APA):
Appendix F  The order of the European Funds usage area

Introduction
The European funds could form the most concrete usage of the concept of territorial cohesion. It is therefore placed at the bottom of the analytical quadrangle made above (see the Introduction of Part II in Book II). The European Funds usage area shown in this appendix then does not only complete the represented demarcation of the concept’s practices by being treated as the last issue in itself, but also by resonating the other three usage areas.

It could for instance be argued that the non-ratification of the Constitutional Treaty made territorial cohesion such a weak and therefore useless concept in the European funds, that this usage area does not transgress the by the earlier Intergovernmental Conferences drawn confines. The first general hypothesis that guides the reader through this appendix could therefore be: there is no formal usage of the concept in the European Funds usage area at all. Still, not all stories told in and on European funding have to be formal and various ones could plea for giving territorial cohesion a role in it nonetheless. The second general hypothesis then arises when the European funds are seen as wanting to fund as much as possible and many different concerns are assumed to self-interestingly use the concept to get (more) funding: the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions. These masses could then reflect both the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas (e.g. their policy positions, but now for funding). When a formal usage of the concept is questionable and territorial cohesion might play an informal role, one could wonder what the actual hassle is all about. The question that leads the reading of this appendix therefore is: ‘How does the concept of territorial cohesion channel European funds?’ Although this is our main interest, from the departure-point of this research (see Chapter 3) we are of course also concerned with the influences between European spatial planning and the European funds in this (e.g. how European spatial planning positions in this usage area affect and are affected by the European funds).

To treat these hypotheses and question, this appendix shows the attempt made to roughly order the wide-ranging masses of stories in the European Funds usage area. Also this appendix starts its presentation of this with the stories that frame and structure the other stories in this usage area: the general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves (§F.1). Yet, the outcomes of the main events are outlined before that, because these are fundamental to understand the European Funds usage area. After these events and framing and structuring stories, the three territorial cohesion metanarratives of substantive objectives, territorial specificities, and governal organisation of the territory are treated (§F.2). A discussion on the ways stories relate these metanarratives follows (§F.3). Also to show the context of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area, both the as metanarratives schematised stories and those connecting them then will be compared to the narratives with an own dynamic (§F.4) and the connections between them (§F.5). Also from these ordered and compared stories conclusions can be on the strategic positions in the concept’s usage, now also foror the closure of the whole territorial cohesion usage field (see Chapter 14).
F.1 European Funds’ events and framing and structuring stories

F.1.1 Financial events as fundament of the European Funds usage area

What characterises the European Funds usage area is that factors which lay outside even territorial cohesion’s contextual its stories largely form it; a feature that, arguably, already hints at the minor role territorial cohesion plays in the debates on the European funds at large. That is, background events actually set the budget of the European Union and the allocations of funds. A better grasp of the concept’s usage and its context in the European funds is therefore in need of a preliminary view. We should first have a rough sketch of the development of the path-depend though unpredictable outcomes of the financial dealings of Member States and European Institutions. Below these developments are sketched along three tracks: the funding for agriculture, the increasing role for the Structural Funds, and the Community Initiative of Interreg.

A year after the Treaty of Rome established the European Economic Community, the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) was created in 1958 to finance the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP).\(^1\) For long the CAP accounted for the majority of the “European Union budget”\(^2\), of which, weakly put, not too much went to the poorest Member States and Regions.\(^3\) The Fund’s Guarantee Section stabilised prices by financing price support measures and export refunds – while in 1972 there were national quota’s for sugar, cotton, and tobacco, it still took the largest share of the budget in 1986 – and the Guidance Section was added in 1964 for other agricultural expenditures (e.g. modernisation of farming).\(^4\) Relatively seen though, the role of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund decreased through the years – e.g. the Common Agricultural Policy and Rural Development Programmes accounted for “only” half the budget in 2004 (90% of which went to market support measures).\(^5\) Finally it was even replaced by the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and European Agricultural Fund for Rural development (EAFRD), to which the publication of the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development in 2006 points.\(^6\) Hence, although the part of the budget reserved for agricultural issues decreased, it remains to have – perhaps not the largest, but – a huge financial weight in the European funds.

The Structural Funds are more important for territorial cohesion though, especially their European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) – i.e. financially assisting development projects in poorer regions and employment schemes respectively.\(^7\) Although the Structural Funds originated around the same time as the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund,\(^8\) it took a while before their financial role gained cloud; something what might have to do with the establishment of the European Regional Development Fund, and linked to this Directorate-General (DG) Regional Policy, when the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Ireland joined the Community some fifteen years later.\(^9\) The role of the Structural Funds started to grow when they were reformed in the end of the 1980s; this also lead the majority of their increased funding, just 13% of the total budget though, to go to NUTS-areas\(^10\) with a GDP/capita\(^11\) of less than 75% of the European Union average.\(^12\) This development continued when the Edinburgh European Council of 1993 made Regional/Cohesion policy funding one third of the European Union budget; this included the addition of the lighter Cohesion Fund established by the Treaty of Maastricht, which funds

---

\(^1\) Of course, most of the time this was not the ‘EU budget’ but the budget of the European Economic Community, as it was only in 1993 that the Treaty of Maastricht established the European Union.

\(^2\) The combination of price guarantees and financing the modernisation of farming could have played a role in the production of “butter mountains” and “wine lakes”.

\(^3\) The other two are the Financial Instrument of Fisheries Guidance and the Guidance Section of the European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund (the latter shows the fluid boundary between Agricultural funds and the Structural Funds).

\(^4\) The more so when it is considered that the Guidance section of the European Guidance and Guarantee Fund is a part of the Structural Funds and also the European Social Fund was created in those times as well.

\(^5\) NUTS: nomenclature d’unités territoriales statistiques (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics), denoting subnational areas such as regions and provinces.

\(^6\) Gross Domestic Product per capita (here adjusted for purchasing power): the total market values of goods and services produced in a country in a year.
environment and transport infrastructure in Member States with a GNI/capita\textsuperscript{a} below 90% of the European Union average.\textsuperscript{9} The early developments of the Structural Funds which are relevant for the usage of territorial cohesion thus only show that their (financial) weight increased.

Then again, out of the planning process for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period, which was already going on in the late 1990s, came that this new period started with a reduction of them (i.e. 195 billion euro’s for the Structural Funds and 18 for the Cohesion Fund as outcome); this even though the European Enlargement was coming up, which would lower the European average capita/income due to the new Eastern Member States in 2004.\textsuperscript{10} Still, a third of the Community budget went to less prosperous regions and social groups.\textsuperscript{11} The first objective, which was for regions whose development lags behind, took 70% of the Structural Funds, and a bit more than 10% went to the other two objectives each, which were for economic and social conversion in areas experiencing structural difficulties and modernisation of training systems and creation of employment outside regions covered by the former respectively.\textsuperscript{12} Although the Structural Funds decreased in weight, they thus maintained their amplified role.

Then, at the time of the Enlargement the European Commission brought forward a proposal to change the objectives and allocations again for the new 2007-2013 funding period.\textsuperscript{13} It took much debate, mutually between the Member States and between the European Institutions, until, at last, an inter-institutional agreement was reached on the new financial perspectives in 2006.\textsuperscript{14} Meanwhile five things happened: i) the three objectives changed into those of convergence, (regional) competitiveness and employment, and territorial cooperation (see below); ii) the Member States (in the European Council) cut down the initially proposed increase in the budget; iii) the relative increase in funding for the first objective in expense of the other two masked a real decrease;\textsuperscript{b} iv) the European Parliament rejected the fought-over European Council’s agreement; and, strangely enough, v) during this bickering about who gets how much money, the final Community Strategic Guidelines (i.e. on how to spend it) were made after a public consultation process on its draft version.\textsuperscript{15} The development which increased the role of the Structural Funds through the years thus by its outcomes already shows several aspects. The Structural Funds were formed with their total budget being inflated under pressure, with changing allocations for different objectives, and av simultaneous but other process for the details on how to spend them.

For territorial cohesion, one initiative funded through the Structural Funds is worthwhile to sketch in further detail: the one for cooperation between regions, Interreg. The first initiatives for transnational cooperation arose in the 1950s and cross-border cooperation in spatial development started around 1972, this in the context of the intergovernmental initiatives for spatial policy (see Appendix D on the (post-)ESDP process).\textsuperscript{16} However, these types of cooperation only came into the European funds at the time of the 1988 Structural Funds reform, as then cross-border cooperation was mentioned among the activities eligible for intervention under the European Regional Development Fund.\textsuperscript{17} A year later Interreg began as a Community Initiative\textsuperscript{c} to stimulate regional cooperation.\textsuperscript{18}

While Member States already participated in transnational groupings, the European Commission started to fund such cooperation’s as well by in 1995 adding transnational to cross-border cooperation to the larger Interreg programme.\textsuperscript{19} This development of Interreg continued. For the 2000-2006 period a bit more than 5% of the one third of the Community budget meant for less prosperous regions and social groups went to the Community Initiatives, whereby the share going to Interreg, which now also included interregional co-

\textsuperscript{a} Gross National Income: Gross Domestic Product of a country plus its negative/positive balance with other countries.
\textsuperscript{b} That is: the piece of the pie gets relatively bigger, but the pie gets absolutely seen smaller.
\textsuperscript{c} The Community Initiatives are pilot interventions of the EC and if others then 'Interreg' appear in this usage area then these mostly are 'Leader' since the early 1990’s and 'URBAN' later on, which focus on urban and rural areas respectively.
operation, increased.20 With the Enlargement the Interreg guidelines from 2000 were updated and the eligible areas changed. What was more important though, is that the European Commission then also proposed Territorial Cooperation as new third Structural Funds objective, which, being similar to Interreg, would imply a mainstreaming of it for the new funding period.21 Hence, as noted above, on top of the overall decrease of the Structural Funds for the 2007-2012 period, the new Territorial Cooperation objective, which already was the smallest, also suffered the most relatively seen.22 Yet, it is save to say that the Community Initiative Interreg increased in prestige and financial weight by developing into the mainstream.

The financial events fundamental for the European Funds usage area thus demonstrate reshufflings of funding. Agriculture became less important in this, although it still remained very important, and the role of the Structural Funds and also its Interreg Community Initiative became larger, but they are still debated upon.

F.1.2 The usage area’s general stories and stories on territorial cohesion and European funds themselves

The general stories and the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves float on the above described forming currents which determine European funding through the three tracks of agriculture, Structural Funds, and Interreg. Since the Treaty of Rome these stories then respectively frame and structure other stories in the European Funds usage area. Also these can be ordered in a schema, here one on the ‘General stories and stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in the European Funds usage area’. Note that also the abovementioned events return in this Schema; relevant events also returned in the three other Schema’s 1 (see Appendix C, D, and E), but those of this usage area form it more than the other events form the other usage areas.

Schema 1 shows that the European Funds policy usage area has six general stories. This amount suggest that this usage area is more complexly framed than the one of Regional/Cohesion policy, which has five general stories, but is not as much a patchwork as the (post-)ESDP process usage area is with its ten general stories. The general stories of the European Funds usage area are then in order of importance – with between brackets their colour in Schema 1 – on money (orange), the political organisation (red), implementation (pink), the official policy directions (deep sky blue), the European Union as a business (cyan), and European spatial planning (olive). These are all debated in 2005 and 2006, extensively so in the former. Of course all of them can be related when it concerns funds, including those that do not fall in these general stories,23 but in this usage area especially those on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions appear more linked – i.e. those on the topic, how to decide on it, and for which use respectively. The general stories on European spatial planning are instead the odd ones.

The stories that structure other territorial cohesion and European funds stories in the European Funds usage area have an image that resembles the structuring stories of the (post-)ESDP process usage area. Here these three are simply on: territorial cohesion itself, the European funds themselves, and their connection. They are respectively coloured yellow, blue, and bright green in Schema 1. Just as for the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas, the argument to put these structuring stories next to each other comes forth out of this appendix” leading question, now on the influence of the concept on the European funds. That is, in this way the structuring stories can be addressed before we go deeper into the more specific stories on the European funds that are in/directly

---

2 The Leader Community Initiative would also be mainstreamed in 2006, but thereby financed through rural development programmes instead of the Structural Funds.
related to territorial cohesion in the metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic (see next paragraphs).

European Funds Schema 1
General stories and stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds in the European Funds usage area
Just as the other three Schema’s 1, this one does not only express that each kind of general stories has another subject matter, but also that their developments and those of the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves can be followed through time, as will be done below.
F.1.3 The stories framing this usage area

The fundamental developments that also form the six general stories portray financial disputes. The working hypothesis for this section on these stories could therefore be: the general stories of the European Funds usage area show the contours of sharp debates. To test this we first treat the three general stories that are more linked than the others: those on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions. After that we follow the other three according to what is left from the abovementioned order of importance by treating the general stories on implementation before those on seeing the European Union as a business and the odd ones on European spatial planning.

Separately seen the general stories on money are primarily for the Single European Market (SEM) – since the Single European Act (SEA) established it in 1986 that is. These are about the single currency, the market’s disadvantages, and also for preserving something which can be seen as a “counterweight” to the SEM: the European Social Model (ESM). When the Structural Funds were reduced in 2000, the political aspect of finance was first added to this with a one-way street: financial problems can become political, but do not demand political solutions from intergovernmental finances. Thereafter the promulgation of the proverb of (States) “getting as much as possible” emphasised the importance of money; while paradoxically these general stories also signalled a tendency to reduce public spending at the time that the new financial perspectives were under negotiation. Although these developments do not explicitly form a debate, especially the politicisation and importance of finance offer room for this.

The general stories on the political organisation commenced later than those on money: with the 2000-2006 period. Typical for this usage area is then, that these stories pose that technical and political choices intricately connect and that the ones on the political organisation are all for the European Union. That is, although these general stories do point to the existing diversity in the political organisation now and then (e.g. by noting the importance of inter-institutional agreement or how members of the European Parliament more represent their own (regional) constituencies than their (European) political party), the promotion of European integration and a smooth running of the European Union, both also with Enlargement in mind, is stronger than the indication of diversity. This promotion furthermore appeared indirectly in assertions for European Union intervention and, though less so and later on, the decentralisation of its tasks when the European Commission proposed new Structural Fund regulations. An additional concern hereby is the role of knowledge in these politico-financial processes. This comes forth out of the description of lobbies and placing of (facilitative) experts, but also by calling for transparent policy planning – *nota bene* at the end of the public consultation on the Community Strategic Guidelines. Hence, if the general stories on money also offer room for debates with a politicisation of finances, those on the political organisation do not seem to take it, as they mostly unpolitically promote the European Union in this.

In 2006 the general stories on money again underline the general financial concern by affirming that it is about what will be paid for. However, this also points to the general stories on the official policy directions (i.e. money is important, but for what will it be used). All such general stories thereby uniformly disregard their initial concern with agriculture. Instead, the Lisbon Strategy seems to rise as a main official policy direction, but this only since 2003, three years after the European Council adopted it. Although the other way, that is: Regional/Cohesion policy, appears well before this strategy, it took until 2004 that those two were related here; which seems to be explained later on by that then the Lisbon Strategy needed to be taken into account, possibly presssed by the European Council which revived it.

---

1 This might only seem contradictory (i.e. why reduce it if it is so important?); as these general stories on money become more logical if it is considered that when public spending reduces, the importance of it might increase (e.g. the less of it, the more valuable, especially when there used to be more).
in 2005. Perhaps, with all the financial negotiations under way, a contemporaneous look forward has hereby to do with a tension hinted at the year after. It namely observes that many decisions on the future regional policy have yet to be taken, this while Western Member States would be positioned behind the Lisbon Strategy and Cohesion policy is noted as useful too. That is, the question remains to which direction European Union funding should go. The general stories on official policy directions therefore also offer room for sharp debates.

Moreover, what becomes the more noteworthy is that in 2006 impressions are uttered that the Member States attach much importance to financial issues but their policy priorities vary greatly. Hence, the general stories on money and the political organisation mainly promote the SEM and European integration, but give no (further) unambiguous official policy direction. Yet, although a tension between the Lisbon Strategy and Cohesion policy might count for something, these outlines themselves do not seem to show the sharp debates that could be expected of the general stories of the European Funds usage area.

Still, it would be more important if it is true that there is a discrepancy between what is told and what actually is. With a look backward a general story on the official policy directions from 2005 already points towards one way in which this can come forward: a gap between policy and reality at the end of the 1980s. What’s more, the combined general stories, which earlier touched upon these issues, made a financially oriented claim that brings forward another way. In this early period they namely accuse the Community’s regional and social policy of tokenism if compared to the aspirations of the Treaty of Rome. The backing up of aspirations by funding appears to remain a concern. The echo of the “tokenism accusation” in 2006 suggests this and, vice versa, the relative silence on agriculture too. Even though the SEA granted the promotion of a formal regional policy of the European Union and the increasing importance of the Structural Funds is taken into account, there might thus remain discrepancies between the general stories and the actual financial developments. The general stories then might not show contours of sharp debates because they do not represent the existing tensions.

Another explanation could hold as well though. The linked general stories on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions show this with a similar problem concerning the political organisation and the Lisbon Strategy. They namely both state that this strategy needs European Union intervention and that it leads to decentralisation. Under these paradoxical statements could then lay unrevealed tensions (i.e. decentralisation entails less intervention of higer governmental levels). Grossly seen though, these linked general stories seldom deviate from unproblematised promotion; a (double) exception comes from 2006 with the forecast that the Lisbon Strategy will not be successful because there is no real SEM. The essential conclusion then remains that although the amounts of funding change, the general stories on money, the political organisation, and the official policy directions hardly do. However, perhaps the general stories do not give the contours of sharp debates because they are (partly) incongruous with the larger disputes about the European funds. That is, they do not represent the existing tensions, as they, and thus this usage area, does not deal with these but with other issues.

In spite of the larger importance of the general stories on implementation compared to those on the official policy directions, the former do not have a main topic, only a minor one, plus two other issues. The latter two only appear when the Community Strategic Guidelines were drafted in 2005: one makes a case for the exchange of best practices – also with the criterion that this should be on common issues and the addition that there should be an European framework programme for it –, the other cares for the effectiveness of Community policy implementation (e.g. to have no conflicting actions on the ground). Alongside these two issues, the only more structural topic of the general stories on implementation appears to be on principles. These started at the time of the Structural Funds reform in 1988 with the call
to base the implementation of Cohesion policy on national and regional multiannual programmes.\textsuperscript{45} Yet, it does not seem to matter whether it concerns principles for implementation or best practices or effectiveness of it, these general stories more appear to lay out than discuss the implementation of European funds.

This implementation appears to develop into a complex though. This starts with a division of labour (e.g. the European Commission approves the programmes that the Member States draw) and differentiation in programmes (e.g. larger ones need Community Support Frameworks\textsuperscript{a} and Operational Programmes\textsuperscript{b}).\textsuperscript{46} It was since ten years after these general stories started that principles also re/structured this complexity. In 1999 a European Union regulation which laid down general provisions for the Structural Funds defined the principles of programming, partnership, additionally, and concentration.\textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{47} While the Council of the European Union and the European Parliament wanted to concentrate funding in areas most in need, the parliament also supported the European Commission’s proposal to stronger apply the partnership principle.\textsuperscript{48} The general stories reflect this the same year with an emphasis on local and regional authorities and the representatives of the social partners.\textsuperscript{49} The complexity does not end here though, as implementation becomes the more complicated when the different practices under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) are accounted for. That is to say, DG Regio and DG Employment and Social Affairs are in 2006 indicated as having different ways of doing – and the same holds for if, as asked for that year as well, the diversity of Europe’s local actors would be recognised.\textsuperscript{50} Insofar the general stories on implementation frame the sharp debates of the European Funds usage area (if they exist), then the complexity these stories portray might more blur than clearly define the contours of these debates.

These implementation complexities might stand in a tension with the wished for effectiveness (i.e. more complexity leads to less effectiveness). The general stories on implementation about complexity and effectiveness could in combination nevertheless be given as a reason to organise politically. That is to say, giving local actors strategic impulses from the European Union (e.g. the Lisbon Strategy) with an effective implementation of sectoral Community policies is for instance said to require European intervention.\textsuperscript{51} However, crucial to remember hereby is thus that the general stories on implementation are important in the European Funds usage area but do not show a clear formation and entail a bunch of interrelated topics and issues – to not even mention the myriad in practice. Save to say therefore that the general stories on implementation do not resonate the disputes which are shown in the developing currents of events.

The least important – but not unimportant – general stories are on the European Union as a business and on European spatial planning. The former grew with the Lisbon Strategy, especially its revival in 2005, and a concurrent European Parliament co-decision report on the regulations of the ERDF. They are not so much concerned with one or more topics, but with a central idea expressed in various forms;\textsuperscript{52} this is reminiscent of the business approach filtered out of the general stories in the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. That is to say, seeing the European Union as a business presupposes a definite goal to work to with a single rationality for a supposedly homogeneous all in an as clear-cut assumed reality – as with profitability and the economical reality for private corporations. This central idea is expressed in demands to let the European Union promote such things as its (regional) innovation, growth, entrepreneurship, and quality.\textsuperscript{53} Because oppositional goals, plural rationalities, a

\textsuperscript{a} Community Support Frameworks outline the strategic objectives of the funding.
\textsuperscript{b} Operational Programmes are specific for a sector or region and describe the detailed measures and delivery arrangements of interventions.
\textsuperscript{c} The programming principle entails the making of multiannual development programmes. The partnership principle is concerned with partnerships between the European Commission and other government levels (and non-governmental actors) during the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes. The principle of additiveness means that Community financial assistance supplements national spending rather than replacing it. The principle of concentration means that resources should be focussed on an area, community, or sector.
heterogenous whole do not fit the European Union as a business, general stories seeing it thus could close the door for debates.

Yet, the idea of seeing the European Union as a single business – whereby it merely is about the management of measures – becomes clearer if contrasted with two statements that go against it – which thereby belong to these general stories on the European Union as business nonetheless. These statements appeared while the business idea got stronger in 2005 and are: the judgement of effects depends on the perspective of different actors on the development of an area (i.e. going against a single reason and homogeneity) and European society consists of national societies (i.e. going against the European whole and assumed economic reality). Although the idea of the European Union as business seems to gain ground, these general stories therefore also cover those going against it. Hence, this shows some debate in the general stories of the European Funds usage area, but not explicitly enough to be called sharp.

The general stories on European spatial planning are the odd ones, as it is no formal European policy (see the previous appendices) and almost negligible in the European funds in general. They are nonetheless influential in this usage area and appeared, all pro European Spatial Planning, since the European Commission’s working document on Community Policies and Spatial Planning in 1998. A related event for the European Funds usage area the year after, is that the guidelines of the Structural Funds for the 2000-2006 period and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund already mentioned the then published ESDP. Moreover, in line of the initial relation of spatial development with cross-border cooperation, the European Commission’s guidelines for Interreg III for the same period did even more than just refer to the ESDP. That is, proposals for Interreg IIIIB funding had to take it into account; here a particular noteworthy Interreg III programme is ESPON, which analysed Structural Funds programmes. Although European spatial planning is marginal in the European funds, these general stories on it frame the European Funds usage area and this by its promotion.

What surprises hereby, is that after the first general stories on European spatial planning, it was indirectly more promoted by discussions on the influence between European and national spatial planning than with the ESDP. Very consequential for this might be if, as posed in 2006, European spatial planning is of the Member States instead of the European Union; this would also make it easier to understand why the Rotterdam Conference of the Ministers responsible for spatial development in 2004 did not have the purpose of discussing the Structural Funds’ financial allocations. Then again, the general stories on European spatial planning which seem to fall outside these discussions appear to characterise them the most. That is, after Interreg incorporated the ESDP, it was stated that a change of spatial planning in the European Union occurs whereby it might lose its name, and that a second ESDP (which appeared at the horizon in 2006) should be more practical to be influential. While European spatial planning thus seems to have its foot in the door of the European Funds (e.g. in the form of the ESDP), the general stories on this show – some discussion, but – no sharp debate at all. This makes them less odd in the general stories though.

Hence, however awkward, where the events so fundamental for the European Funds usage area already point to debates, a characteristic of its general stories is that they show no sharp debates at all. On the contrary, they run counter to this section’s working hypothesis by merely portraying promotions. That is, promotions of the SEM, European integration, Cohesion policy, European spatial planning, the complexities of implementation which are more or less guided by principles, and the simultaneous growth of the Lisbon Strategy and the idea of seeing the European Union as a business. The only explicit tension that comes

*Interreg IIIIB is concerned with transnational cooperation.*
forward is between the Lisbon Strategy and/or Cohesion policy as official policy directions, and some contentions seem to go against the idea of the European Union as a business. How then to explain that the general stories show no sharp debates? Do they not represent the related financial reality? Do they point to a calm spot amidst heavy weather? Are the currents of the underlying developments so large and/or slow that the discussions that frame this usage area cannot come to the fore sharply? This appendix will further treat these issues below.

F.1.4 The stories structuring this usage area

The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves further structure all the stories in the European Funds usage area that are framed by the general ones. The events that form the general stories are thus also fundamental here. As these events show debates but the general stories almost none, the working hypothesis for this section on the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds in themselves separately and in their connections could be guided further by the first general hypothesis of this appendix. That is, if it is held that there is no formal usage of territorial cohesion in this usage area and its structuring stories are framed by almost no debates, then they might not debate the concept at all. However, before the stories on territorial cohesion itself and its connections to those on the European funds themselves are treated, the latter are separately.

F.1.5 The stories on the European funds themselves in two phases

The stories on the European funds themselves can be divided into two phases: from 1996 until 2004 and when they are treated extensively thereafter in 2005 and 2006. Hereby these structuring stories further build upon the usage area’s disregard for agricultural concerns as framed by the general stories, as they are mostly on the Structural Funds. The only ones on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in the first phase appeared in 2004 (i.e. when 45% of the budget went to market support measures). They thereby asserted that the fundamental justification for the CAP was (and remains) a more effective exploitation of comparative advantage. Thereafter only notice was taken of its large financial weight and the origin of its fund labelled as first structural funding instrument. When territorial cohesion relates to the Structural funds, it will thus probably be the Structural Funds, as shown below for the first before the second phase.

Early on the structuring stories on the Structural Funds rendered these funds as merely being the financial means for “higher purposes”. Such as a smooth running of the European Union – *nota bene* claimed while they were reduced in 2000 – and, with hindsight from 2005, as a balancing of the books of the Member States until the end of the 1980s. Yet, the Structural Funds were in the first phase also considered for their own cause. The structuring stories thereby eventually often show views for and against their reform. New rules were namely appreciated at the time principles re/structured the above mentioned implementation complexities and the Guidelines for the Structural Funds and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund for the 2000-2006 funding period were published. When territorial cohesion relates to the Structural Funds, one should thus keep in mind that these funds are debated and changed themselves too.

Just before such debates on the next period were going to break loose, some friction then emerged: the funding for Cohesion policy would be insufficient to reach the proposed objectives of this policy, but major reform was resisted as well. Hereby the problems of tokenism and a permanent gap between policy and reality (as noted in the general stories) are related to the framework from the end 1980s. This framework is namely said to require continuous policy adaptations and regular changes at the (so complex) implementation level; something which is exemplified by the possibility to propose, if necessary, adjustments that are linked to new Community policy initiatives in the Community Strategic Guidelines.
Another topic is on the Structural Funds’ principles being too generic.\textsuperscript{70} This is a related topic, because generic principles in combination with a complex reality could lead to mismatches; moreover, that generic principles are re/evaluated is less surprising when you consider the complexities shown by the general stories on implementation. Notwithstanding that this smaller topic was not really argued over, it could still be posed that the stories on the European funds themselves appear to show debates on the framework and principles of the Structural Funds.

Another trait of the stories on the European funds themselves seems to be that they support European spatial planning at the outset instead of debating it;\textsuperscript{71} which is of significance for the first general hypothesis about the absence of any formal usage of the concept too, and thus this section’s working hypothesis, as it could show how in/formalities structure this usage area. This with the following three statements for instance: i) the Structural Funds were for European spatial planning identified as the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, ii) DATAR\textsuperscript{a} was said to have heavily influenced Cohesion policy in the structure of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and iii) the political conclusions of the ESDP would have been encouraged to be applied in implementing action that is financed through the Structural Funds and noticed in the 2000-2006 funding guidelines later on.\textsuperscript{72} The structuring stories thus appear to reinforce European spatial planning’s foot in the door of the European Funds as framed by the general stories.

However, these structuring stories also depict a hesitation of European spatial planning to march into the Structural Funds. This for instance comes forward in stories reminiscent of something mentioned above: the informal meeting in Rotterdam (i.e. of the Ministers responsible for spatial development) was simply not meant for the contemporaneous debates on the Structural Funds reform for the 2007-2013 funding period. A year before the ESDP’s publication in 1999 there was namely called to not mix the debate on this document with the institutional procedures which are related to the previous funds reform.\textsuperscript{73} The minor discussion on the Community Initiatives in the stories on the European funds themselves could nevertheless be crucial here, because Interreg incorporated the ESDP.\textsuperscript{74} Simply put, these initiatives were supported at first, but at the end their cancellation in the 2007-2013 funding period was called for.\textsuperscript{75} It is save to say though that the line of in/formality might be a fuzzy one in the European Funds usage area when it concerns European spatial planning. A mark that becomes the more important the stronger territorial cohesion relates to European spatial planning (here). As a consequence it becomes the more difficult to in a clear-cut way determine whether the concept is used formally (i.e. the first general hypothesis).

From 1996 to 2004 the stories on the European funds themselves thus seem to point to debates, at least when it concerns the Structural Funds (i.e. its reforms and principles), and a fuzzy in/formality, as they at the outset deal with European spatial planning. This phase and the later one of 2005 and 2006 then have the promotion of one fund per area/programme as (another) principle in common\textsuperscript{b} – once a European Commission proposal for the 2007-2013 Structural Fund was, along the lines of the general stories on the political organisation and implementation, even linked to bringing up the concerns with decentralisation and concentration.\textsuperscript{76} Yet, a more important question could be: how did the stories on the Structural Funds themselves develop in the later phase? That is to say, in the years of extensive debates and many events. After the Enlargement the extensive debates on the European funds namely display the negotiations on the financial perspectives for the 2007-2013 funding period; the intensity of the funding debates would have been severe, but its

\textsuperscript{a} As mentioned in the chapter on the (post-)ESDP process, the Délegation à l’Aménagement du Territoire et à l’Action Régionale (DATAR) is part of the French spatial planning way of doing that influences (the ways of doing in) the European Union.

\textsuperscript{b} Single Pot funding might reflect a more British way of doing, what perhaps stands in a tension with the way of doing promulgated by DATAR.
agreement easily reached, both politically and diplomatically (i.e. split 50/50% by the old and new Member States). Moreover, also these funds’ Community Strategic Guidelines were debated. This probably in a more intricate fashion though, as DG Regio and DG Employment were reported as submitting the first draft to the Member States in 2005 and the last version as to be provided by the European Commission to the Council after both the 2007-2013 financial perspectives and regulations of the Structural Funds and Cohesion Fund are agreed upon. These developments offer reasons for the stories on the European Funds themselves to differ in phase two.

The second phase differs from the first phase by mostly discussing another reform of the Structural Funds, but not explicitly so. Here major debates are concerned with the European Union budget in three ways: i) deciding on it; ii) expanding but now also reducing the funding for Cohesion policy; and iii) effectively using what is left. This also comes forward by respectively: i) labelling the European Parliament as more assertive, due to its rejection of the European Council’s budget agreement, and, at least its Committee for Regional Policy, as an alley of the European Commission; ii) by even voicing a renationalisation of the Structural Funds; and iii) for instance adding strategic and/or evidence-based targeting, new utilisation forms, and more indirect measures to the ways already referred to; note that these debates presume that the European Union cares whether its funds are well spent, something denied just once. The general and structuring stories thus show parallels with the last reform. That is, while the general stories on money, how to decide on it, and for which use appear linked, the structuring stories had an overlapping debate on the essentials of how to decide on the European funds and how much goes to Cohesion policy – another debate was framed by the general stories on implementation and on how to spend these funds. Moreover, in line of the financial events is that the allocations over the three Cohesion policy objectives were discussed as well (i.e. convergence, (regional) competitiveness and employment, and territorial cooperation); perhaps these structuring stories thereby only partially expose the leeway, as they merely differ marginally. Also in the second phase debates about the Structural Funds appear clearly, of which the debates on how much funding goes to Cohesion policy and the allocation of this over the three objectives might be of special interest for territorial cohesion.

Yet, the debate on how much funding goes to Cohesion policy (objectives) is not the only way in which the general stories on the official policy directions are further structured. Two other (and double related) topics also shape the usage area in this: a disagreement on struggles between the DGs and a quarrel on how the Lisbon Strategy fits into the Structural Funds. Although for the former the stories on the European funds themselves held that there is no competition for funding, they on the other hand regarded Anglo-Saxon tools as a way out of a one-year struggle. Because in this struggle those DGs aligned to the Lisbon Strategy were roughly set against the ones which are better equipped by the European funds (which mostly finance agricultural and regional policy), what clearly relates to this is that the Lisbon Strategy is alleged to both counter national Structural Funds strategies and guide the principles for the Community Strategic Guidelines. The tools as way out of the argued struggle between DGs then appears to point to the official policy direction of the Lisbon Strategy, as these included loans instead of grants and introduced these guidelines; in passing, the latter were also held as not compulsory for all regions and therefore responded in the minor issue of the Structural Funds’ principles being too generic. After the stories on the European funds themselves show entangled debates on the Structural Funds in the first phase, these debates thus change from for and against their reform to how to decide and spent them, the Cohesion policy allocation(s), and the Lisbon Strategy.

Note that the value and purpose of the Structural and Cohesion Funds are seldom questioned in the second phase. Regardless of these interrelated issues of the debate on this
latest reform, what they have in common is that they neither mention higher purposes nor the Enlargement as major political event. A story from these entangled debates on the European funds themselves can then perhaps characterise their differences in opinion best: a common financing is needed which backs up aspirations, but political processes make the policy-making and implementation of the Structural Funds’ distribution more difficult. That is, it seems if the tension of the one-way street between finances and politics and the involved tokenism exposed by the general stories is trailed, as not much seems to remain to be discussed for the European funds themselves, as much became political, except for complexly interrelated issues about difficult implementations.

During this second phase another trait of the stories on the European funds themselves appears to develop in a main way too: European spatial planning does not seem to keep away from the Structural Funds anymore. These structuring stories namely do not only tell about the Structural Funds as means to implement Cohesion policy, but the ESDP as well. Furthermore, the Ministers responsible for spatial development were urged to provide input for the Community Strategic Guidelines; this probably in line with the official policy direction in this pointed at above, because these Ministers were marked supporters of a shift towards the Lisbon Strategy. However, the other side of the coin is the even as heavy indicated influence vice versa. This is described with the Structural Funds regime that would largely handicap the European spatial policy field. Observations on the informal Councils of Ministers responsible for spatial planning fit this picture, as they would lack influence when the intergovernmental conferences already set the framework and/or the Community Strategic Guidelines for the National Strategic Reference Frameworks (NSRFs) would be adopted by the European Council. With the mainstreaming of Interreg into the Cohesion policy objective of territorial cooperation, the role of the fuzzy line of in/formality in the European Funds usage area increases, also in complexity; the more so when the stories on the European funds themselves leave it open which of the spheres of actions and innovative measures the mainstreaming technique incorporates from the Community Initiatives into the objectives and priorities of the operational programmes. What might be clear though, is that the stories on the European funds themselves do not only show changes in entangled debates on the Structural Funds, but also the in/formal promotion of European spatial planning.

F.1.6 The stories on territorial cohesion itself in two phases

In this usage area the stories on territorial cohesion itself can be divided in the same two phases as those on the European funds themselves (i.e. until 2004 and thereafter). However, before also they are treated extensively in 2005 and 2006, the concept appears later than stories on the European funds themselves do. That is, they appear since the 2000-2006 funding period, and habitually so; which could be explained by the remark from 2006 that Barnier (i.e. the Commissioner of DG Regio from 1999 to 2004) pushed the concept. While at its emergence territorial cohesion was claimed to be a European Union principle, the stories on territorial cohesion itself also held that the concept requires a political consensus, such as the acceptance of a common project among different regions. As the general stories frame those on territorial cohesion itself, the need for a common project would open up room for debate.

As the general stories on the official policy directions (i.e. Cohesion policy and/or the Lisbon Strategy) and those on European spatial planning are ambiguous, it is not surprising that the concept was linked to all three. This in the first phase by: endorsing territorial cohesion in its own right under Cohesion policy, letting the Lisbon Strategy or the ESDP give a hypothetical territorial cohesion index, and observing that in trans- and infranational practice territorial cohesion is more promoted than spatial planning. This last observation aligns to the one in the general stories that tells about a change of spatial planning whereby it
might lose its name. The practices which are designated namely seem to be those fostered by the Interreg IIIB programmes that need to take the ESDP into account. Still, even though territorial cohesion might need a common project, there thus seems to ensue no debate on or between these three directions.

Two issues from the general stories on the European Union as business and implementation also return in the early stories on territorial cohesion itself. Especially the linkage of innovation to the concept falls straight into the general stories. It is hereby remarkable that cases were made for measures that strengthen territorial cohesion and an effective territorial cohesion policy before the general stories on implementation are concerned with effectiveness. Albeit that many topics thus come to the fore which place the concept in the European funds, perhaps effectiveness therefore is a preoccupation of the concept. Yet again, until 2004 the stories on territorial cohesion itself mostly seem to adhere to the general stories of this usage area. That is, they affirm that there appears no debate on the concept.

In the second phase of 2005 and 2006 many relevant events happened: the draft Community Strategic Guidelines described territorial cohesion, an informal Ministerial meeting on regional policy and territorial cohesion was held in Luxembourg, and the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development mentioned the concept. It therefore is not surprising that stories on territorial cohesion itself appeared more often in the European Funds usage area after the Third Cohesion and Interim Territorial Cohesion Reports treated the concept in 2004. Thus could also increase the changes for a debate on the concept.

The second phase also differs from the first one in that one major and one minor debate are added and two debates are restructured. The major debate revolves around a question of direct importance for whether there is a formal usage of the concept in this usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis): does the usage of the concept in the funds need the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty or not (see the Appendix C on the IGCs usage area)? The stories on territorial cohesion itself hereby denote a range from fully in favour to indifference. That is, they describe the European Union as holding territorial cohesion as a guiding principle and observed that the concept found its way into in/formal policy documents, also in anticipation of its inclusion in the Constitutional Treaty, but also that the European Commission adopted a subtle approach to the concept after the Treaty’s non-ratification; the latter relates to a side-debate which can be exemplary: to draw a White Paper on territorial cohesion or not? This debate on the need of the Constitutional Treaty’s ratification for the concept’s usage could have great consequences. It might namely create a situation in which the first general hypothesis is affirmed (i.e. no formal usage), but the effects of this are circumvented (i.e. usage still). However, the indifference shown by the statement that a territorial cohesion competency would change little could lead to a re-evaluation of this; the more so when the territorial cohesion aspects dealt with in national strategies (on European funding) depend on the preferences of the Member States, that is, when the complexities which were already brought forward by the general stories on implementation return here. The stories on territorial cohesion itself thus structure this usage area with a major and influential debate about the need for an official ratification of the concept.

One might pose that this debate on the concept’s ratification already negates that the structuring stories do not debate the concept at all. The minor new debate of the stories on territorial cohesion itself in 2005 and 2006 then adds to this, as it shows a disagreement on to
what extent territorial cohesion exists. The differences here come forth out of the details – which relate to the above-mentioned complexity of implementation levels. That is, in 2005 these stories stated that since 1999 trends and policy development slightly contributed to territorial cohesion, but descriptions on whether it in- or decreases differ depending on the level in question (e.g. it lacks on the national level). There thus appears a debate around territorial cohesion’s existence besides the concept’s ratification. However there is neither a structuring story against the concept nor a debate on whether it actually can exist or not. The working hypothesis that the structuring stories do not debate the concept at all then thus still stands.

The two restructured debates of the stories on territorial cohesion itself in this second phase are concerned with the concept’s focus. The therefore restructure the debates on the concept’s political consensus and when it concerns the three official policy directions. While with the emergence of the concept also the requirement of such a common ground aired, here these structuring stories even call to broaden the fields dealt with by territorial cohesion. However, more specifically, the discussion is whether territorial cohesion is an ‘undefined political objective’ or not (i.e. what its ground is); whereby these stories substantively define territorial cohesion as, for example, (unchallengeable) equity, the regional aspect, the diversity of Member States, and spatial development. These structuring stories thereby also define the concept as a method, or better: as related to processes. Territorial cohesion would for instance need a comprehensive strategy that sets the framework for specific objectives and actions to be successful (i.e. *vice versa*). But again, such debates on the concept’s (lack of) focus do not debate the concept itself though.

The other restructured debate is on how the concept links to the general stories of the official policy directions and European spatial planning. While in the first phase merely links appear, here they are more structured. A structure that is build then sees spatial development as a part of territorial cohesion and the concept as a part of Cohesion policy as well as the Lisbon Strategy, or more specific: as connected to ways in which Cohesion policy can contribute to the Lisbon Strategy. Only Cohesion policy seems to be questioned hereby (e.g. as such a “midfield”). That is to say, even though the stories on territorial cohesion itself said that the new Cohesion policy framework provides unprecedented opportunities for the integration of the concept, they observe that no actions or measures in this policy are designated to exclusive pursue territorial cohesion. Thus also when the links of territorial cohesion to three official policy directions are structured, no debate on the concept appears.

Hence, in the stories on territorial cohesion itself the concept seems only to be promoted and not so much debated in itself. That is, territorial cohesion is merely promoted with debates about it (i.e. its in/formality, existence, and focus). This bolsters that the structuring stories do not debate the concept at all (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). Perhaps hereby the concept tries to be used formally in various ways, because no (explicit) argument is made against it – although there is no outcome on this yet, what is also suggested by the scarcity of financial territorial cohesion events. This situation again points to the fuzzy line of in/formality. One might then ask how strong the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves relate to European spatial planning.

F.1.7 The stories connecting territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in two phases

Stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves have, not surprisingly, the same two phases as both have separately. None thereby demote territorial cohesion, what is in common with the stories on the concept itself. A basic difference, however, is that after the Third Cohesion and Interim Territorial Cohesion Reports were published the degree of coverage increased much more greatly. This could be shocking when
combined with their late emergence (i.e. a shock-wave like appearance); also this late emergence on itself surprises when you consider the backward looking story from 2005 which holds that a general awareness of territorial cohesion already began with the planning process of the 2000-2006 Structural Funds programmes in the end of the 1990s (i.e. where are the stories that account for an earlier general awareness). Below this quick development of the just lately emergening stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves are again treated per phase.

The concept and European funds themselves were connected at the time of the European Parliament’s resolution on the management of Regional policy and the Structural Funds of 2002. However, this immediately as a foregone conclusion with the claim that territorial cohesion is an objective of the Structural Funds measures. Two years later though, the connection weakened through the account that territorial cohesion has in cases only been inferred as policy objective of Structural Funds programmes; to not even mention the concurrent message that the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was not set with territorial cohesion in mind. Although the concept itself is again not debated, this usage area is structured by a debate on whether the territorial cohesion is already (explicitly) taken up by the Structural Funds.

During this debate these stories meanwhile brought some other aspects forward as well. That is, the concept could play an important role in the fundamental discussion about the revision of the Structural Funds (e.g. it does not yet), even without an official reference, and, more extreme, it could reorient these funds towards territorial cohesion (also with the help of the principle of concentration). Note that they do not mention European spatial planning at all in this phase. Yet, a more important distinction for this usage area deals with the non-/existence of a formal usage (i.e. the first general hypothesis) and the non-/existence of debate (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis) respectively. We can namely separate the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in the ones that discuss whether the concept is in/formally used in the European funds and those that suggest the possibility to do so.

In 2005 and 2006 the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves continued further and more thoroughly. A basic question thereby was whether the concept changes the funds; this relates to how it channels them (i.e. this appendix’ leading question). For instance, although they insisted that the term ‘cohesion’ assures the continuity with the traditional approach to the European funds, the concept would also add measures to the proposals of the Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG). A more humble observation was that substantive concepts such as territorial cohesion are put aside when Intergovernmental Conferences have set the framework and national Ministers of finance distributed the money; this is similar to the story on the European funds themselves about the influence the informal Councils of Ministers responsible for spatial planning lack. Besides debates on whether territorial cohesion is already taken up by the Structural Funds, and if formally so, these stories also structure this usage area with consequences of the concept for the European funds.

Still, besides the basic question whether the concept changes the funds, the placing of the concept lingered as well. Apart from the agricultural funds the concept was, confusingly, issued as (to be) used in each and all of the thus far mentioned European funds and Structural Funds objectives (e.g. in a cross-cutting manner); this also with arguments such as: if the European Union has a competency for territorial cohesion then it is related to the Structural Funds – what increases the importance of the debate on the need of the Constitutional Treaty’s ratification for the concept’s usage – and if the concept relates to the Lisbon Strategy then it is wider than the Structural Funds – what increases the role of the general stories on the official policy directions. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds
themselves therefore appear to affirm that territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis). That is to say, those that connect them even describe a situation in which policy and political actors pragmatically use the concept in substantively different Structural Funds objectives to suit their own ends. This then leads to a variety of usages. Hence, as these stories note themselves: the undefinedness of territorial cohesion affects the policy targeting through the future Structural Funds. This would then mean a simple answer to this appendix’ leading question of how the concept channels European funds: not at all.

Other stories in the second phase that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves are more on how the concept deals with the complexities of implementation. They are concerned with its place in the Community Strategic Guidelines and the contribution of the Structural Funds to territorial cohesion. The former are ambiguous though. This because they on the one hand describe these guidelines as including territorial cohesion as purpose for which the funds may intervene, or even that the funds will implicitly include an European Territorial Cohesion Strategy; the Member States are in that case also given a role, as a side-discussion is on whether its inclusion would affect the National Strategic Reference Frameworks (e.g. it depends on the financial resources available to Cohesion policy in each Member State). The concept’s undefinedness thereby remains unsolved. What is more, although these guidelines would (partially) reflect previous reports which revealed the European Commission’s position on territorial cohesion, a clearer definition was demanded as a necessity. However, on the other hand these stories also hint at the omission of the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines. They namely point to a “backdoor possibility” which is shown in the stories on the European funds themselves: to make adjustments in these guidelines linked to new Community policy initiatives as way to include territorial cohesion nonetheless. While the stories on territorial cohesion itself disagree on the existing territorial cohesion, the stories that connect the concept to the European funds themselves thus debate its inclusion in the Community Strategic Guidelines.

In the debate on the contribution of the Structural Funds to territorial cohesion, one argument is that their past programmes have been conducive to territorial cohesion. However, that more attention is paid to whether these funds could contribute to territorial cohesion seems to stand in a tension with this (i.e. when the question is whether, then it is not yet the case), especially the arrayed factors this would depend on (e.g. the outcomes of the negotiations between the Member States and European Commission prior to the approval of the legislative proposals, the leverage over the national spending of funds). Moreover, although the 2007-2013 Structural Funds reform, which is strongly debated in the stories on the European funds themselves, was reported to take the concept on board, a warning hereby is that the newly proposed approach actually presents threats to delivering territorial cohesion. Hence, although debates appear about the place of the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines and the contribution of the Structural Funds to it, the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves also seem to harbour an all-out questioning of these implementation oriented debates. They namely ask, in line with the one-way street that appears in the general stories on money (i.e. not demand political solutions from finances), whether European Union programmes are suitable to conduct a thorough political debate on the long-term stakes in the field of territorial cohesion.

One can argue that for such a thorough political debate the concept has to be used formally. Yet, informal possibilities could appear too, with European spatial planning for instance. Then again, something that is striking in the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves in both the first and second phase, is that European spatial planning only plays a minor role. Separately seen the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds support it. Yet, in connection they in the last years merely put
forward: that a European Union competency for territorial cohesion would link the concept to the Structural Funds and result in spatial planning related regulations and that the territorial cohesion definition of the ESDP’s Coming Presidencies Group (CPG)\textsuperscript{9} also holds for the distribution of the Structural Funds.\textsuperscript{129} Perhaps this minor role has to do with the in these connections hardly mentioned debates on the Constitutional Treaty’s non-ratification.\textsuperscript{130} The fuzzy line of in/formality might therefore lie – not central, but – at the border of the European Funds usage area, whereby European spatial planning forms the informal side.

This minor role for European spatial planning thus points to the importance of the question whether the concept is formally used in this usage area (i.e. the the first general hypothesis). Clearly, rather important for an absence of any such formal usage is just this connection between territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves. With an absent formal usage of the concept, a fruitful way to characterise the stories on this is to show what they did not do. They then never state that territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves are not connected and/or cannot be. However, none were, for instance, on the budget, Cohesion policy allocation(s), or how to fit the Lisbon Strategy in the Structural Funds. Hence, although they are not contradicted, the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves appear to be not involved in any major European funds debate (yet).

F.1.8 The main characteristic of the structuring stories

The main characteristic of all these stories that structure the European Funds usage area by being on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves is that they do not really put them into question but outline their debates and discussions. Hereby those on the European funds themselves showed entangled debates on how to decide on and spent the European funds, the Structural Funds’ cause, its reforms, the Cohesion policy allocation(s) and the Lisbon Strategy. Those on the territorial cohesion itself point to debates around the concept: its un/definedness, existence, and in/formality with related policy directions. The stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves relate them by discussing the existence or possibility of this connection and consequential changes for the funds. These stories also debated the place of the concept within the funds and Community Strategic Guidelines (leading to more confusion) and their contribution to territorial cohesion. The concept is in itself thus not debated, what affirms this section’s working hypothesis.

What might be more important though, is that none of the structuring stories debate major funding issues. As the European funds lead to much debate, this underlines that the European Funds usage area is not involved in in such main issues. This might be due to its informality related to European spatial planning. However, although the general stories frame a support European spatial planning, the separate stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves appear to back it in/formally as well, when these structuring stories are connected they do not. A strange situation thus appears, as all these structuring stories together also do suggest that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area (yet) (i.e. the first general hypothesis).

4.1.9 The European Funds usage area is framed and structured by entangled minor debates

The plain message here is that although the financial events that are fundamental for the European Funds usage area reshuffle funds, the general stories do not appear to frame the territorial cohesion and European funds stories in this with sharp debates. Instead, they mainly frame them with the promotion of European finances, economics, politics, and in/formal policies. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves then

\textsuperscript{9} The CPG is a group in the (post-)ESDP process (more on this process in Appendix D) that consists of the immediate past, current and next Presidencies and the European Commission.
further structure this usage area. This with debates that draw a fuzzy line of in/formality as border, a distinction between existing and possible usages of the concept, and an absence of voices that go against territorial cohesion. Hence, in line with this section’s working hypothesis, the concept is not debated. However, without touching upon major debates of European funds, it could seek an active formal usage in this, which until now did not exists; this situation largely defends that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area (i.e. the first general hypothesis).

The territorial cohesion and European funds stories which are framed by these general stories and structured by those on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves can be ordered by the topics which seem to be assumed as those as to be discussed under the concept of territorial cohesion (i.e. its metanarratives) and as part of its European funds context (i.e. the narratives with an own dynamic). Hereby they might portray the various ways in which the concept tries to fit into the European Funds usage area. These stories thus become the testing ground for the second general hypothesis which poses that the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions.

F.2 Territorial cohesion metanarratives in the European Funds usage area

F.2.1 Introducing the three metanarratives

Just as in the IGCs and Regional/Cohesion usage area, also in the European Funds usage area most territorial cohesion stories evolve around a single metanarrative. The ordering of territorial cohesion stories in this usage area thereby lays bare a bundle of three wide metanarratives. These signify that the usages of the concept go all over the place within these metanarratives. The three metanarratives seem thus already to confirm that the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis).

The concept for instance appears with a variety of substantive objectives. However, a stringent splitting up of territorial cohesion stories according to kinds of substantive objectives (as in the other usage areas) would rest upon shaky grounds. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves namely also strongly structure them with a debate on the substantive focus of the concept; thereby framed by the debates on the official policy directions and European spatial planning. The result is therefore a single metanarrative that harbours the whole group of substantive objectives. This metanarrative, simply called ‘substantive objectives’, has the least weight though.

When the European Funds usage area portrays the most concrete usage of the concept, then territorial cohesion might not get any more tangible than with the territorial reality which is told of. Territorial cohesion stories bring many specificities to the fore for this, what forms the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative. This metanarrative is the largest of the three, even huge in 2005. The role of knowledge (e.g. lobbies, experts) and the gap between policy and reality could thus become more significant, as the general stories on, respectively, the political organisation and official policy directions frame these spoken of territorial realities.

Territorial cohesion also appears in this usage area with organisational issues. These range from purely territorial to purely processual, due to which they form the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative. The governal organisation of the territory comes close to the activity of a State, which is formal and territorial per definition. For this metanarrative the European Funds usage area’s fuzzy line of in/formality is therefore essential. The appearance and development of the stories per territorial cohesion metanarrative can then be summarised schematically as shown below in Schema 2a
‘Metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area (without relating stories)’.

These wide metanarratives give a very basal order of the territorial cohesion stories in the European Funds usage area. A main characteristic of all these territorial cohesion stories might thereby already give a glimpse of their picture sketched below. That is, there seldom appear counterstories in these metanarratives. Just as in the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas, also in this usage area no metanarrative is refuted, nor
does one consist of a dominant story opposed by its counterstory. However, this could imply something else for the European Funds usage area. As this usage are lies besides main funding debates, this absence of counterstories could signalise that the points that are brought forward by the territorial cohesion stories are not (yet) discussed, that is: there is hardly paid attention to them. Yet, because the metanarratives are so wide, also here the way in which they should be expressed appears to be discussed. Here this matters for the influence the concept could have on the European funds, which to its possible irrelevance could be a minor influence or only later on, or, perhaps more probable, vice versa. Because of this, also the appearances and developments of these three metanarratives need to be scrutinised. Below this will be done one by one by identifying and relating their main discussions.

F.2.2 Substantive objectives metanarrative

The 'substantive objectives' metanarrative is the youngest metanarrative, as it only appears since 2004 (i.e. only for three years). It are then the substantive objectives of balance, competitiveness, the environment, economic cohesion, social cohesion, infrastructure, services, and polycentrism which appear persistently from the proposals for the debated 2007-2013 Structural Funds reform on (i.e. four years after new substantive objectives arrived in 2000).131 Albeit that the financial events reshuffle allocations and not each of these objectives appears regularly in this metanarrative, developments are hard to detect in it. What is clear, is that the metanarrative follows the structuring stories with an absence of a specifically agricultural objective despite the weight of agricultural funding in general.

Nonetheless, the 'substantive objectives' metanarrative could already begin to test whether the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with territorial cohesion shows an un gathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis). We are thereby guided by a description from the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves: actors use the concept pragmatically in substantively different Structural Funds objectives. In combination with the up until now largely affirmed first general hypothesis, which poses that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all, the working hypothesis for this section then becomes: the substantive objectives that are related to territorial cohesion represent an un gathered mass of informal usages. To see whether this is the case, below the substantive objectives are treated in the following order: polycentrism, three pairs of infrastructure and services, economic and social cohesion, and balance and competitiveness, and the environment.

Although Interreg III (also see §F.2.4) took onboard ESDP policy recommendations such as polycentric development, when territorial cohesion relates to polycentrism in this usage area this relationship is not furthered specified – with the stubborn exception of seeing polycentric patterns as the best precondition for territorial cohesion.132 An explanation for this could be that the Structural Funds Guidelines and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund for the 2000-2006 funding period mentioned the ESDP but not polycentrism. Another explanation could be that the territorial cohesion stories on polycentrism refer more to the by the general stories promoted European spatial planning than to the official policy direction of Cohesion policy (e.g. by seeing territorial cohesion and polycentrism as spatial policy aims).133 As a result polycentrism appears on the fuzzy line of in/formality that comes from the stories on the concept and the European funds themselves.

Furthermore, also in accordance with these structuring stories is that here only indirect links to the Structural Funds were made: their programmes would contribute to territorial cohesion and polycentric development (depending on the national policies and again the geographical level concerned) and the implicit Territorial Cohesion Strategy in the Community Strategic Guidelines would embrace polycentrism.134 That the territorial cohesion stories on polycentrism thus point to both an existing relationship and the possibility
of it could imply that this substantive objective portrays a usage of the concept without a well-established formality (i.e. formally only possible, but existing informally).

Territorial cohesion also relates to infrastructure and services. Yet, in both cases it is not clear if the stories describe an existing relationship or a thought of possibility. These substantive objectives were thereby often paired and mainly seen as parts of territorial cohesion; this at least as the once noted contribution of (also) the Structural Funds programmes’ infrastructural measures to territorial cohesion. What is then typical for this usage area, is that the general stories do not frame these issues, those on territorial cohesion and the European Funds themselves do not (strongly) structure them, and that this metanarrative only weakly puts them forward. Although the territorial cohesion stories on services follow the formal limits set for the concept’s usage (see Appendix C on the IGCs), the substantive objectives of infrastructure and services thus seem to play a minor role in the European Funds usage area.

Economic and social cohesion is another pair in the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative, one that is framed by Cohesion policy as official policy direction. With arguments for the un/importance of the terms of social and territorial cohesion in politics the concept thereby sides a little bit more to the social than to the economic. Mostly these territorial cohesion stories discuss the existence and form of the relationship of territorial with economic and social cohesion though; thereby structured by the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves. For its existence they plea to refer to territorial cohesion when the other two are mentioned in the new Structural Funds period – while the in 2004 proposed Community Strategic Guidelines would eschew just this. For the form of the relationship they extend the concept beyond economic and social cohesion while the Structural Funds (and Cohesion Fund) programmes paradoxically would (intuitionally) contribute to territorial cohesion with just these socio-economic measures. These territorial cohesion stories on economic and social cohesion thus appear to describe usages of the concept, but mostly ask to formalise them, either by adding territorial to economic and social cohesion or via the implication of the former with the latter.

The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves obviously structure the territorial cohesion stories on balance and competitiveness, especially those that with the latest Structural Funds reform debate the allocations between the convergence and (regional) competitiveness and employment objectives and those that place the concept in each and all Structural Funds objectives. The fundamental financial events thereby gave the convergence objective the most financial weight. The concept then appears to relate to the substantive objective of balance (e.g. the convergence objective, territorial balance), whereby the objectives of Structural Funds programmes would even often mention territorial cohesion and balance. However, the counterstory emerged in 2006. It tells that few people in DG Regio see this connection, or more clear-cut: that this DG only works with the concept for the Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment. This does not only mean that territorial cohesion stories on balance are questionable, but also that those on competitiveness form an alternative.

Then again, in 2006 also this story about territorial cohesion and (regional) competitiveness and employment was countered. Notwithstanding that from the start the concept was often related to competitiveness, thereby even with the call to base it on territorial cohesion, an explicit dispute appears on the existence of a relation between territorial cohesion and the objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment. Perhaps the question of how to fit the Lisbon Strategy in the Structural Funds, a question which the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves quarrelled about and left unresolved, structures the latter counterstory. The concerned territorial cohesion stories namely also linked the substantive objective of competitiveness to the Lisbon
Strategy, which was around that time revived by the European Council. Together these counterstories of course dispute any relation of the concept with either the substantive objective of balance or competitiveness. Yet, both were in 2006 also considered to coexist in the European Commission’s approach to territorial cohesion. An approach which was questioned earlier as threatening the potential of the future Structural Funds to deliver territorial cohesion, because it would not resolve how to simultaneously pursue both; it thereby thus does not show how the Lisbon Strategy and Structural Funds fit either. Hence, this metanarrative reveals that there does exist some debate on territorial cohesion: counterstories dispute existing and/or possible in/formal usages of the concept with the substantive objectives of balance and competitiveness.

The environment as the here last-mentioned substantive objective appears mainly in territorial cohesion stories on sustainability; thereby once forming the linkage between the concept and the (regional) competitiveness and employment objective. The debate on the concept’s place in the Community Strategic Guidelines structures these stories. Especially because in 2005, the year of the Bristol informal Ministerial meeting on Sustainable communities in Europe, the observation that the term of sustainable communities crept into these guidelines’ definition of territorial cohesion after the ‘Bristol Accord’ seems to explain why the issue of sustainability often arises thus in this metanarrative. The substantive objective of the environment could therefore show how an informal usage of the concept can enter (marginal) formality.

The question then is whether this listing of the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative represents an ungathered mass of informal usages in the European Funds usage area (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). The number of different substantive objectives noted above could be evaluated as many. Moreover, except for the regular pairing of infrastructure and services, balance and competitiveness, and economic and social cohesion, they seldom link and only appear as a group by being substantive objectives. This metanarrative thus starts to affirm that territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions in the European funds’ area of action (i.e. the second general hypothesis), as they not give a clear picture of what territorial cohesion aims for.

However, this does not imply that all these usages are informal (i.e. the first general hypothesis). With economic and social cohesion the concept appears to ask to formalise usages, while the substantive objective of the environment could show how an informal usage can become formal (i.e. via a territorial cohesion definition in guidelines). Then again, even a formal usage of the concept with a substantive objective does not automatically bring about an acknowledged and/or major role. The the counterstories of the in/formal usage of the concept for balance and competitiveness show this, as does the lack of a well-established formality for polycentrism and the minor role for the formal usage of territorial cohesion with services. Hence, the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative portrays a loose group that fiddles with the fuzzy line of in/formality and might lead to an expansion of the European funds’ area of action.

F.2.3 Territorial specificities metanarrative

The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative appears earlier than the above-portrayed ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative, since 2001, what is still rather late. It thereby mostly harbours descriptions of territorial reality and debates on territories, but also promotions of territorial capital, references to Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA), and links between all these issues. The multi-purposive attention of the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative made it difficult to depict a channelling of European funds as meant in the appendix’ leading question. Yet, while territorial cohesion might not do so substantively, the concept could do this territorially wise. The working hypothesis for this section therefore is: the concept
defines where European funds go territorially. This working hypothesis is therefore tested when it concerns, in the order of appearance below, territorial reality (directly or via indicators or an index), territories (Member States, regions, and urban or rural areas), territorial capital, TIA, the links between these issues, and this metanarrative’s nonstory. It should be noted though, that this could mostly be hypothetical. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves namely structure the metanarratives by not being involved in any major European funds debate.

The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative began to directly relate territorial cohesion to descriptions of territorial reality since ESPON analysed Structural Funds programmes in 2001; thereby possibly reducing the gap between policy and reality as framed by the general stories. In 2004 the concept was then believed to deal with something signalised as a general problem: the geographical level of the collected statistical data upon which European Union policies rest (i.e. NUTS II). However, also another problem of selectivity was addressed with more demand from the start. Territorial cohesion would namely relate to both the territorial model of a region and to, more specific, the structuring of the regional economic system, just as contrasting geographical concentrations (e.g. of deprivation, unemployment) would support territorial cohesion. The concept thus does not seem to select one territorial reality to describe. One could then wonder whether a clear picture of this reality is needed to territorially define where European funds go.

What does not select the territorial reality to describe either (whatever the geographical level), is that more similar issues swarmed to the concept while ESPON researched territorial structures in 2005. These went from, for instance, simply measuring territorial cohesion’s status quo to the objective measurement of specificities for regional development, from territorial cohesion and polycentrism as morphological aspects to specificities which fit the general stories on the European Union as a business (e.g. research, innovation, training activity, diversification of productivity), and from the geography of the spending of the Structural Funds to the ‘territorial’ as new context to identify imbalances which deserve European support. Needless to say, the concept thus appears with increasingly more descriptions of territorial reality. What the metanarrative notes for the draft Community Strategic Guidelines, which could be seen as the entrance way towards the formality of the concept’s usage, tells a lot though. The guidelines’ definition of the concept, whose focus and place in these guidelines the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves debate, would namely differ from the one in the Third Cohesion Report: it does not mention imbalances anymore. That is to say, although all these territorial reality issues would of course imply a choice to expand the role of experts in and concerns of the European funds, what of this reality is defined as territorial cohesion changes. This could thus both clutter a tightening of the gap between policy and reality and obscure a territorial definition of where European funds go.

Around the time of the latest Structural Funds reform the discussions on indicators and an index surpassed the ones that directly and, arguably, less constructively describe territorial reality in the territorial cohesion stories. They are thereby framed by the general stories on the role of knowledge in the political organisation and structured by the stories on the European Funds themselves when these debate evidence-based targeting as a way to effectively use the funds left. Although the metanarrative’s discussions relate territorial cohesion to the old indicator of GDP, there is mainly pleaded for new indicators for territorial cohesion. Of importance for evidence-based targeting is then, that the here observed emphasis lies on easy to comprehend territorial cohesion indicators because all the by ESPON researchers generated information must go through one official of the European Commission. The discussion on indicators could thus more clearly point out how territorial
cohesion might territorially define where European funds go, as an indicator (GDP or another) simplifies the many territorial realities that clutter the gap between policy and reality.

Nonetheless, a problem of complexity did crop up. That is, in the last two years of the reform debate backward looking stories reveal that it was impossible (for ESPON research) to complete territorial cohesion indicators. Technically seen there would have been too much territorial diversity and politically seen too little time.\(^\text{160}\) It is therefore no surprise that the following was stated to be a territorial research challenge: the identification of territorial cohesion indicators related to the adoption of territorial balance as reference for the allocation of funds;\(^\text{161}\) note that by linking to territorial balance this research would also go against the above-mentioned definition of the concept in the draft Community Strategic Guidelines. The brought up territorial cohesion indicator then orders territorial reality with several dimensions\(^\text{a}\).\(^\text{162}\) However, this does not really resolve the complexity problem either, as these several dimensions can relate in many ways, what could make a such a definition of where European funds go territorially seen not only complex but uncertain too.

Despite all this complexity and uncertainty, the forward looking stories which were added in 2006 pose that the concept will mostly be used in relation to territorial indicators.\(^\text{163}\) A condition they hereby give is that the objective of territorial cohesion adds measures to the proposals of the Community Strategic Guidelines by accentuating the programming once new territorial indicators allow for a better targeting; this aligns with the framing and structuring stories on an effective implementation and might expand the European funds.\(^\text{164}\) Then again, to resonate the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves: also when it is evidence-based, probably the undefinedness of territorial cohesion principally affects policy targeting (i.e. towards a lack of it).

Territorial cohesion indicators could, especially through ESPON, fill the relative silence on European spatial planning though; a silence structured by the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves. Moreover, a backward looking story from 2006 gives additional information for this. The ESPON research on territorial cohesion indicators would have decided to focus on the available data that is useable for the development of a composite index which accounts for the ESDP’s economic, social, and sustainable dimensions and the definition of territorial cohesion;\(^\text{165}\) an account which places the structuring debate on the focus of the concept in the heart of such an index.\(^\text{b}\) The complexity and uncertainty that surrounds territorial cohesion indicators could thus also offer possibilities for European spatial planning.

The territorial cohesion stories on the European Territorial Cohesion Index (ECTI), of which all are for the development of it, give some extra information hereby.\(^\text{166}\) That is, while such a single index could be useful in a context which prefers easy comprehension (e.g. one lone European Commission official), a friction came up between the making of it (e.g. the gap between policy and reality) and its utilisation (e.g. the role of knowledge). These territorial cohesion stories namely posed that scientists should not substitute for policy makers but make the procedure and methods of the index transparent; they are thus framed by the general stories on the political organisation insofar they are concerned with the role of knowledge.\(^\text{167}\) Yet, on the other hand they stated that the European Territorial Cohesion Index cannot be a neutral tool.\(^\text{168}\) If the European Territorial Cohesion Index presents a possible usage of the concept that territorially defines where European funds go, this might lead to political and technical tensions.

The territorial cohesion stories touch upon these tensions. Besides that the available data is said to constrain the index’ development (e.g. by focussing on economic instead of
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\(^a\) That is, the territorial dimension with various spatial levels and components of the territorial state (e.g. accessibility to services), the multisectoral dimensions of the economic, social and environmental, and the temporal dimension (also see the hyper-cube intension in Chapter 10).

\(^b\) An account which also might reveal a reason for the multisectoral dimension of the above-mentioned territorial cohesion indicator (i.e. economy, society, environment).
terриториальной интеграции), в будущем это продолжит обсуждение в ESPON на Европейском Индексе территориальной интеграции, который может поместить концепцию на повестку дня Европейского Союза и предоставить пространство для артикулирования связей между техническими и политическими выборами. 

Однако, по мере того как областями проявления европейских фондов можно было бы расшириться с таким пространством; пространство определенного политического разследования, через которое было сложно соединить эти выборы. Там, который может быть как подчиняющий и вместе с тем небольшой роля здесь, знание могло бы не только играть в подчиненную, но и небольшую роль в этом.

С тех пор как появления метанарративов территории также поддерживает специфические территории,170 вероятно, согласно пословицам "получите как можно больше" из общих историй о деньгах, примененных к территориям. С переходом к расширению, концепция поддерживала распределение средств к старым членам-государствам (например, вместо Центральной и Восточной Европы). 171 Однако, более поздние истории сообщали о некоторых из этих членов-государств, которые вряд ли использовали концепцию в процессах межгосударственного обсуждения.172 Разница между возможным и существующим использованием концепции, которая основана на связях территориальной интеграции и европейских фондов, могла бы структурировать этот парадокс (т.е. возможно как поддержка, но не реально используемая). Это могло бы также структурировать высказывания о том, что с Лиссабонской стратегией, как гипотетическим территориальным индексом, средства будут концентрироваться в новых членов-государствах (т.е. возможно использование) и что эти члены-государства не заботятся о таких концепциях, пока они не станут богаче через Европейский Союз (т.е. существующая "использование").173 Кроме того, другие рассмотренные гипотетические территориальные индексы, один из которых введен в обсуждение на Европейский Индекс: ЕСДП, средства могли бы сдвинуться к регионам (регионам) в Южном Средиземноморье. 174 Было бы просто, вот такие возможные и существующие случаи использования концепции максимально различались в относительных членов-государствах, в которых должны были бы отделять европейские фонды.

Два примера из этого метанарратива можем здесь продемонстрировать, что политические и технические выборы, возможно, не в таком интригующем порядке связаны с концепцией (т.е. противоречат). Прежде всего, вы посредством общей истории не разрешенного вопроса, как поставить Лиссабонскую стратегию в Структурные Фонды. В то время как общие истории на официальные политические направления выделяют Западные члены-государства позади этой стратегии, это технически позволяет новым участников территориальной интеграции. Кроме того, история о европейских фондах сами по себе парадоксально ставит, что межгосударственные переговоры были жесткость, то в то время как политическое согласие было легким. Территориальная интеграция истории стабильны, потому что они, по крайней мере, технически идут в разные руки по членам-государствам. Эти два примера, таким образом, приводят к выводу, что выполнение территориальной интеграции с разнообразием членов-государств в области обсуждения концепции уже могло бы обозначить. То есть, область использования европейских средств кажется гармонировать всем политическим разногласиям в межгосударственных переговорах на финансирование Европейского Союза, с территориальной интеграцией также технически.

Регионы уже появляются в разногласии на то, к которым членов-государств должны прийти европейские средства с концепцией. Виды резервов стали вопросом в метанарративе, несмотря на это, это как классификация: так провозглашаемая доходами (например, индикаторы ВВП) и те с конкретными чертами. 175 Здесь территориальная интеграция появилась с 2001 года, чтобы поддержать регионы, которые не были бедными (и наоборот). 176 Против этой линии думания следует, в то время как с 2005 года, аргумент, что отсутствие территориальной интеграции на национальном уровне (как указано в историях на территориальную интеграцию)
concept itself) results from that the advanced regions benefit most from the Structural Funds and Cohesion Fund; although the statement that there are strategies of Structural Funds programmes for lagging regions in line with territorial cohesion disagrees with this, it comes from the same vain (i.e. territorial cohesion relates to poor regions). 177 What is more, a reading of the Community Strategy Guidelines that year claimed an existing and formal usage of the concept for poor regions. It namely held that these guidelines account for the territorial cohesion angle between the convergence regions and others. 178 Yet, the debate that relates the concept to not/poor regions continued, because the stories also critiqued these guidelines for not accounting for the territorial cohesion angle between non-convergence regions; and with its inclusion territorial cohesion was (again) said to still depend on the domestic policy priorities. 179 These territorial cohesion stories thus develop from discussing not poor to also poor regions. Just as for the Member States, the various possible and existing usages of the concept thus also seem to differ maximally in to which regions the European funds should go.

During the Structural Funds reform debates the metanarrative adds specific region types that overlap with the ones that are classified by wealth. First with the call in 2004 to apply the principle of concentration (which is mentioned in the framing and structuring stories) to tackle territorial cohesion problems that are associated with geographically handicapped regions. 180 Notwithstanding the overtaking supplication a year later to with the concept go beyond both regions with economic weaknesses and those with specific handicaps, 181 the specificity just increased. For starters, the backward looking stories identified the Committee for Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR) as since long supporting the concept (e.g. with lobbying). 182 A discussion then develops when they also hold that the awareness of territorial cohesion became evident in the 1997-1999 Structural Funds programmes for regions that are affected by industrial decline and describe the alike 2000-2006 ones for regions that experience structural difficulties as in line with territorial cohesion too. 183 Moreover, in 2006 the metanarrative added remote areas and those with low or high densities – this well after the European Union was concerned with them (see §F.4.3) –, for these would relate to territorial cohesion in the European Regional Development Funds (ERDF) just as the peripheral regions. 184 Hence, this ungathered mass of usages surely confirms the second general hypothesis, as it does not territorially define the regions where the funds go to with the concept. That is to say, these territorial cohesion stories merely add a polyphony of specific regions to the discussion on poor or not poor regions. What could shed some light on this, is that while the structuring stories held that the Community Strategic Guidelines are not compulsory for all regions, the pushing of the concept by Barnier, as mentioned by the stories on territorial cohesion itself, is said to be for a Cohesion policy for all regions (i.e. on the side of the debate against only poor regions). 185

What is more, during the latest debates on the Structural Funds reform two other types join this already polyphonous discussion on territories through a duet of soloists, that is: urban and rural areas. 186 Also these overlap with the above-mentioned (not) poor and specific territories, as regions can be wholly urban or rural or consist in both urban and rural parts. Since four years after the Community Initiative URBAN 9 continued from 2000 on, the metanarrative then strongly relates territorial cohesion to urban areas (e.g. with URBAN, the urban dimension in general, to apply the principle of concentration to urban centres); whereby the Structural Funds are also judged as not serving territorial cohesion optimally within them. 187 However, immediately the metanarrative expressed the concern of ensuring the economic integration of rural areas with Structural Funds programming too. 188 Stronger put, the years after this these territorial cohesion stories claim a formally existing usage of the
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*It should come as no surprise that the URBAN Community Initiative was for urban areas (e.g. to regenerate depressed urban areas, increase job opportunities, diminish segregation).
concept. With rural areas the Community Strategic Guidelines would namely deal with the territorial cohesion angle within a region. Moreover, these stories even go against the relative absence of a concern with agricultural funding in the framing and structuring stories by describing DG Agriculture as using the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development. The concept might therefore experience a rupture through a reorganisation in European funds, as from 2006 on the agricultural Community Initiative Leader+a will for instance be financed through mainstream rural development programmes instead of the Structural Funds.

Such a rupture becomes deeper in 2005 when a dissolution of this tension between urban and rural areas within the concept is accepted. That is to say, on the meso level the rural-urban dimension would be at stake when discussing territorial cohesion. Hence, besides that the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative neither territorially defines to which Member States European funding goes with the concept, nor chooses for particular regions according to wealth or specificity, it focuses the Structural Funds on both urban as rural areas. Later on this latter usage might even overstretch the concept by engaging in the heavy agricultural funding.

As mentioned above, after the European Council adopted the Lisbon Strategy the stories on territorial cohesion itself fell straight into the general stories that see the European Union as a business. Already three years before that though, a way in which territorial specificities can be assumed as clear-cut reality for the European Union as business came up with the emergence of this metanarrative: territorial capital. These stories do not appear to develop and have as their main disagreement the strength and direction of the relation between territorial capital and territorial cohesion. For instance, for its strength they just mentioned the concept when it concerned a mobilisation of territorial capital to ensure an equitable repartition of competitiveness factors, but more urged to understand the contribution to territorial cohesion as maximally using territorial capital (of regions/Europe);193 at times the general stories on the official policy directions explicitly frame the latter stronger relationship through the Lisbon Strategy. Where in the here assumed territorial reality territorial capital would apparently lead to territorial cohesion, qua usage of the concept it can be vice versa. It was namely held that territorial cohesion would add an emphasis on territorial capital in the Community Strategic Guidelines. Furthermore, facilitating territorial capital could thereby be another more indirect Structural Funds measure (e.g. one that the stories on the European funds themselves debate to effectively use the fund left), also because in their emergence these territorial cohesion stories coupled the concept with institutional cohesion. With territorial capital this metanarrative might thus promote a possible usage of the concept which can expand the European funds’ area of action, even though their relation is not clear. What is clear is that territorial capital does not directly define where European funds go territorially wise with territorial cohesion, but merely what they should fund wherever they go, or define this indirectly by for instance pointing to where there is not enough territorial capital.

When territorial cohesion does not get any more tangible than in this ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative, then its references to Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) become the more important for knowing the concept’s real financial punching power. The tangible effects of the concept could namely be at stake here. Befittingly, the European Union’s Subcommittee on Spatial and Urban Development already studied Territorial Impact Assessment in 2001 and the year after ex ante impact assessment became obligatory for all Community proposals. However, it took the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative a while
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*a The Leader Community Initiative stands for ‘Links between the rural economy and development actions’ (Liaison Entre Actions de Développement de l’Économie Rurale) and was operated by DG VI/AGRI. The ‘+’ after ‘Leader’ designates the renewed Community Initiative for the 2000-2006 period after Leader II.

*b Whereby it should be kept in mind that this is a too crude label, as it here merely gathers (earlier) appearing combinations of also other terms, such as ‘endogenous’, ‘human and physical’, ‘resource’, ‘growth’, and ‘potential’.
before it engaged in this topic: they only did so since the debates on the Structural Funds reform – strangely enough thereby relating territorial cohesion to another type of evaluation of policies as well: *ex post*.\textsuperscript{197} Moreover, after this late emergence of Territorial Impact Assessment as a topic in the metanarrative, it appears to have no development, notwithstanding that ESPON researches territorial impacts a bit later.\textsuperscript{198} The territorial cohesion stories on territorial impacts which did turn up since then are merely less specific about the kind of assessment. They namely state that the European Commission should establish a system to check the impacts of various Community policies on territorial cohesion – whereby on the meso level the strongest effects would be indirect – and that the concept will mostly be used in relation to Territorial Impact Assessment – what surprises when you keep the minor role the issue of experts seems to have here in mind.\textsuperscript{199} The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative is therefore *via* Territorial Impact Assessment concerned with where the European funds went. This of course does not territorially define where they go.

Separately seen the debates and discussions on territorial reality, specific territories, territorial capital, and Territorial Impact Assessment do not appear to define where European funds go territorially with territorial cohesion. However, their links might show this.\textsuperscript{200} Characteristically, the metanarrative hereby links two concerns hardly spoken of: islands and the less demanding problem of selectivity in directly describing territorial reality. Albeit that the structuring stories also fill-in the debated focus of the concept with the regional aspect, here the argument goes that the richer main land encompasses some islands because they are too small for the NUTS II level, therefore complementary data should be used to assess them separately for an effective territorial cohesion policy.\textsuperscript{201} This is characteristic of the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative, because for the rest the links between the different issues (all since 2005) highlight the other side in the debate about to which territories European funds go with the concept (i.e. not only weak ones).\textsuperscript{202} These stories see territorial cohesion, for instance, as justifying a distribution of funds to regions of the old Member States without the income/capita criterion and call for territorial cohesion indicators (e.g. of ESPON) to go beyond those regions with economic weaknesses or specific handicaps as mentioned in the draft Constitutional Treaty.\textsuperscript{203} Moreover, they place territorial capital as a territorial component in the represented territorial cohesion indicator and link it both to all regions and to cities (i.e. not only to poor territories).\textsuperscript{204} The links between the metanarrative’s concerns therefore neither territorially define where European funds go with the concept. Yet, implicitly they might do so when territorial cohesion is loosely linked to its indicator and/or territorial capital, that is: funding then (also) goes to other then poor territories.

Nonetheless, what might best mark this metanarrative is its nonstory. A lone argument namely relates the concept to the territorial criteria for Member States to allocate resources to regional programmes.\textsuperscript{205} What negatively anchors the nonstory is that ESPON researchers would not have intended to propose criteria for future Structural Funds allocations when it concerns the European Territorial Cohesion Index.\textsuperscript{206} The linkage of territorial cohesion to territorial criteria for the allocation of funds thus appears to be the nonstory of the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative in the European Funds usage area. The concept therefore seems to refuse to explicitly define where European funds go territorially wise.

Hence, the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative does not appear to define where European funds go with the concept (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). Its territorial cohesion stories namely totally disagree on Member States, harbour an abundance of region types, and focus on both urban and rural areas. What is more, they do not expose the issue when they point out territorial capital, a territorial cohesion indicator, European Territorial Cohesion Index, or Territorial Impact Assessment (although the first two link to other than poor territories) and only the metanarrative’s nonstory is concerned with allocation criteria.
Besides, territorial cohesion could play no role in a major European funds debate, because the only formal usage that chooses between these specific territories crops up in the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development (i.e. for rural areas). This could then overstretch the concept by aberrantly engaging in agricultural funding as well.

Then again, this situation does give the European funds’ area of action leeways to expand with every type of territory introduced, just as the concept’s promotion of territorial capital and descriptions of territorial reality do for the funds concerns. Moreover, ESPON’s discussion on the European Territorial Cohesion Index could even add a space in this usage area to connect technical and political choices. However, although such hypothetical expansions and Territorial Impact Assessment might increase the role of knowledge, the many discussions and different descriptions of territorial reality in the metanarrative thereby merely seem to clutter the uttered gap between policy and reality – e.g. leading to difficulties for evidence-based targeting. Thus, although inconceivably it seems, the metanarrative that harbours the most tangible issues shows the most un gathered mass of different positions for possible expansions of the European funds’ area of action.

F.2.4 Governal organisation of the territory metanarrative

The ‘goveral organisation of the territory’ metanarrative is the oldest one in this usage area. Its organisational issues range from purely territorial to purely processual: the European territory, the territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, processual coordination, and, as a crown, territorial cooperation. Although the concept does not often merge these interrelated issues, when for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period the allocation for Interreg and transnational co-operation increased and they incorporated the ESDP in 2000, this metanarrative dawned by linking territorial cooperation and the territorial dimension. We should therefore also treat the links between these issues. The metanarrative really rose during the debates on the 2007-2013 Structural Funds reform though, whereby, save for the issue of governing and the first linked two, these issues emerged statically in 2005. Below the issues of are therefore treated separately before their links are, this by following the order from purely territorial to purely processual. Also these issues can thereby be checked with a working hypothesis.

Leads for this come from this usage area’s informal side, even though the stories that connect territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves hardly refer to European spatial planning and this side therefore does not appear to be crucial. Yet, Interreg may be the focal point for a formal usage of the concept here, since Interreg’s placing of the ESDP in the European funds could guide the way. The mainstreaming of Interreg is thus fundamental for this metanarrative. Moreover, the framing and structuring stories did back up European spatial planning and the latter left open which of the Community Initiatives’ spheres of actions and innovative measures the mainstreaming technique incorporates. Hence, this territorial cohesion metanarrative has much to do with parts of the after 2004 restructured debates on the focus of the concept itself: these did not work out how European spatial planning relates to Cohesion policy in the European funds and saw territorial cohesion both as a method and as needing a comprehensive strategy that sets the framework. A working hypothesis for this section could thus be: territorial cohesion crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating European spatial planning in the middle of the European funds. Obviously, an affirmation of this would fill the silence on European spatial planning, which is structured through the connections of the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves, and drop the first general hypothesis, which poses that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all, by putting forward such a formal usage.

What is characteristic for this metanarrative is that the issue that could set the territorial scene in this plays a minor role. Only once its territorial cohesion stories
positively discuss the European territory as a whole. This with the statement that territorial cohesion implies an overarching idea for the territory’s fair and equal treatment; something which follows an in-filling of the debate on the concept’s focus in the stories on territorial cohesion itself. Straight against such a whole runs a debate in which the concept indicates a complex and “un-State-like” territorial organisation. Territorial cohesion would namely be on the divisions that cut up the European territory and the national borders in it by attending to cross-border activities and the jumble of their overlapping fields of action. However, these territorial cohesion stories also explicitly deny the usage of the concept for Cohesion policy if it concerns activities across borders. The way in which this metanarrative treats the European territory thus points to an informal organisation of the territory. Framed by the general stories, it thereby definitively leaves this path open for the Lisbon Strategy as official policy direction and for European spatial planning. The latter is thus not so much located formally in the European funds.

Then the issuing of the territorial dimension, which is not strictly territorial compared to the European territory, as it is a dimension of something else. Besides, this issue just once presupposed a State-like organisation of the territory here. This with a lone assertion in 2004: (regional) State aid should act as a territorial cohesion factor. What these territorial cohesion stories did discuss though, is the incorporation of the territorial dimension in the European funds via the concept, already so since the metanarrative’s dawn. They discuss this with the view of territorial cohesion as goal to enhance territorial policies on the supranational level for territorial cooperation (also see below). Clearly, territorial cohesion could thus cross they fuzzy line of in/formality with the territorial dimension.

However, even while these territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension appear to follow the distinction between the existing and possible usages of the concept (a distinction made by the stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves), they thereby do take the concept’s role in this issue for granted without an agreement on what this territorial dimension entails. For instance, the observation that the intuitional integration of territorial cohesion in regional policy is without an apparent understanding of the territorial implications still claims an existing usage of the concept to begin with. A putting forward of possible usages of the concept seems, in its turn, to mix structuring stories which see spatial development as part of territorial cohesion, the concept as part of both Cohesion policy and the Lisbon Strategy, and the openings the new Cohesion policy framework give for the concept’s integration. This came to the fore in the presentation of the concept for the joint informal Ministerial meeting in Luxembourg on regional policy and territorial cohesion. That is to say, as an opportunity to link the debate on the European Commission proposals for the Community Strategic Guidelines to the consideration of territorial challenges and/or to stimulate debate in the Member States on the territorial development dimension of the proposed National Strategic References Frameworks (NSRFs) and Lisbon action plans. It is here thus not clear what the territorial dimension implies for territorial cohesion. Hence, even though these territorial cohesion stories on the territorial dimension claim an existing usage of the concept in the Structural Funds which does not deal with territorial implications, they with the spotlight of the concept do show possible paths to locate territorial development or territorial challenges within these funds.

With territorial cohesion, the substance which is coordinated could at least indirectly and/or partly be territorial. Substantive coordination therefore lies between the purely territorial and processual issues of the metanarrative. Especially during the emergence of this issue in 2005 territorial cohesion stories much debated it, mostly the horizontal kind. The above-mentioned debate on the processual focus of the concept in the stories on territorial cohesion itself structures the central disagreement here, as it is on the form of the relationship: substantial coordination is implied by or leads to territorial cohesion. Territorial
cohesion would for instance already be shown as coherence in Structural Funds programme strategies. Then again, these funds would also contribute to territorial cohesion with regional policy’s adoption and promotion of a more strategic and integrated cross-sectoral approach to economic development. As so often, there is thus a central disagreement about the form of the relationship between substantive coordination and territorial cohesion.

Besides this disagreement lies another unresolved question: which policies to coordinate? While these territorial cohesion stories did specify the Structural Funds (e.g. they do not mention agriculture funding), they disagree on coordinating (for) Cohesion/Regional policy or (spatially relevant) sectoral policies in general. A single position that chooses sides in both these disagreements is then that at the heart of the concept lies the one fund per programme principle which strengthens the integrated approach of Cohesion policy (i.e. territorial cohesion coordinates, only Cohesion policy); this of course framed by the stories on the European funds themselves that put this principle forward. The central disagreement on which policies to coordinate thus relates to the one on the form of the relationship between substantive coordination and territorial cohesion.

Also when the metanarrative discusses vertical substantive integration, which it seldom does, it strictly follows the framing and structuring stories, now on the role of Member States in implementation. That is, its stories hold that the translation of the Community Strategic Guidelines into policy priorities and their coherence with the goal of territorial cohesion depends on the content of and alignment with domestic regional development policies. This metanarrative thus covers a twofold disagreement on horizontal substantive coordination and accounts for the vertical kind. No wonder therefore, that when it combines these issues, it questions the appropriateness of the 25 distinct National Strategic References Frameworks to (at the Community level) represent the Member States’ perspectives on spatial development and territorial cohesion via their perspectives on cohesion. Hence, when territorial cohesion would cross the fuzzy line of in/formality with substantive coordination the role of European spatial planning seems questionable.

Still, one could also ask why there is even referred to spatial development when it concerns coordination and what this entails for the structured line of in/formality. For instance, although the Structural Funds guidelines and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund for the 2000-2006 funding period from 1999 mentioned the ESDP, they did not take vertical or horizontal integration on board, and their revision in 2003, which mentioned ‘regional cohesion’, did not do so either. The statement that a more integrated approach is the ESDP’s Coming Presidencies Group’s definition of territorial cohesion might thus shed some light on the metanarrative’s reference to spatial development in this. However, it also exposes an informal concern with substantive coordination through the concept’s usage. Hence, territorial cohesion could therefore with substantive coordination place European spatial planning in the European funds when the concept crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality even though the role European spatial planning is questionable.

The structuring stories then claim that the ESDP’s Coming Presidencies Group’s definition also holds for the Structural Funds distribution. Moreover, in line with this the metanarrative simultaneously reported this issue as the only kind of formal usage of the concept too: the Community Strategic Guidelines would only explicitly mention territorial cohesion with the integrated approach as measure. Something what these disagreements and the in/formal usages of the concept then have in common is that they intersect the distinction between existing and possible usages of the concept. In the above, only existing usages come to the fore. However, the territorial cohesion stories likewise state possible usages. The development model underlying many of such holistic Structural Funds strategies would for instance ideally place these funds in line with the comprehensive concept and the integration part of its agenda would play a role in the evaluation of regional policy in 2007.
and the financial framework after the 2007-2013 period (i.e. both do not yet exist). Hence, disagreements on the relationship between territorial cohesion and the horizontal kind of substantive coordination predominate (i.e. on how they relate, policies to coordinate, a possible or existing usage). Nevertheless, it remains the case that the concept might cross the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds insofar it concerns substantive coordination.

In this metanarrative the issue of governing does not appear as purely processual. A reason for this, is that it partly though explicitly acknowledges State conduct, which is territorial, for the governed organisation of the territory. For starters, these territorial cohesion stories slightly favour decentralisation within the frame of the general stories on the political organisation. They for instance demand that the control over territorial cohesion with the Structural Funds should be regional or even pose that aspects of empowerment of regional and local levels of governance contribute to it. However, the concept does not only regard the regional level, far from it. Initially these stories even stated that Member States should be responsible for ensuring social and territorial cohesion and that only they are financially able to do so; this would go against the foregone conclusion of territorial cohesion as European Union guiding principle and in extremis align to the renationalisation of the Structural Funds as expressed in the structuring stories. Territorial cohesion thus does not cross the fuzzy line of in/formality here, because only with formal governing is dealt with.

These earlier stances on governing remain while the debate on all the metanarrative’s issues starts in 2005. Yet, the issue develops into another direction due to, amongst others, the demand to broaden the circle of participants beyond the Member States for territorial cohesion policy. This makes it easier to understand the critical challenge put forward for territorial cohesion – apparently with a European Union viewpoint. That is, to face both the national and regional authorities responsible for the Structural Funds allocation. The governing issue could thus explain the relative silence on vertical substantive coordination above: it is even undecided whether Member States should (together) deal with territorial cohesion. On top of this, these territorial cohesion stories found that the flexibility sought by the Member States with respect to the proposed Community Strategic Guidelines suggests that they do not share the conceptual approach underlying the concept. Reasons for this could be that a part of this conceptual approach might accord with the general stories on implementation, whereby indirect measures come to the fore, and the idea of the European Union as a business, which gains ground and differently acknowledges State activities, as both can give the State a smaller role. This would both imply that territorial cohesion can also with governing issues cross the fuzzy line of in/formality and that this goes against the formal side.

However, as with the issue of territorial capital, while the described processes would here contribute to territorial cohesion, qua usage of the concept it can be vice versa again. That is, where the observed transition to formulate strategic frameworks, which are shaped by the new development model, within regional policy on both the national and European level was related to the concept, Structural Funds programmes would even contribute to territorial cohesion by supporting a new governance and method for policy making and implementation. Conversely, the territorial cohesion stories held that the concept would add measures to the proposals for the Community Strategic Guidelines by potentially contributing to a changed attitude towards stakeholders at territorial levels. Either way, and indirect or business-like, these territorial cohesion stories neither show a formal nor existing usage of the concept.

One argument nevertheless downgrades this new governing way of doing with territorial cohesion (i.e. less State-like), whether it leads to it or is it. It thereby also
reminiscences the indifferent side of the structured debate on whether the concept needs the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty: a European Union competency for territorial cohesion would namely change little because the ESDP process is owned by the Member States.241 Hence, these territorial cohesion stories embody essential debates that are concerned with the governmental levels in the more formal State-like way of doing. They are polarised in this between the European and national levels and slightly for decentralisation to the regional level, and support a change towards a different way of doing. Both directions do not show an existing usage of the concept though. Important hereby is that, concordant with the undetermined spheres of actions and innovative measures for mainstreaming, informal ways of doing should not be equated with European spatial planning. With the issue of governing territorial cohesion namely seems to handle both sides of the fuzzy line of in/formality by affecting the formal conduct of the Structural Funds, but the concept does not locate European spatial planning in this.

The only purely processual issue in this territorial cohesion metanarrative is processual coordination.242 Like most of the other issues it emerged in 2005, here with a statement that immediately locates European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds: the draft Community Strategic Guidelines would account for the policy views expressed at the Rotterdam informal ministerial meeting with a chapter dedicated to territorial cohesion and cooperation.243 However, although with processual coordination the concept thus clearly points towards a crossing of the fuzzy line of in/formality, the territorial cohesion stories give nothing more on this issue itself; that is, besides relating the concept to the partnership principle and the exchange of best practices for which some general stories on implementation want an European framework programme.244 The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative thus hardly expresses purely processual concerns – combined with the territorial though, the issue of cooperation forms the crown of it.

The issue of territorial cooperation is the firmest one in this territorial cohesion metanarrative, as only in 2005 territorial cooperation is not the most debated issue.245 This crown of the metanarrative presents a clear debate on the relation of the concept to territorial cooperation, whether it be the Community Initiative Interreg or the mainstreamed Structural Funds objective (of the European Regional Development Funds), and a derivative side-debate on which kind to support hereby. The former ranges from the observation that the concept is used in Interreg programmes, via the consideration that territorial cooperation is a part of territorial cohesion (e.g. as instrument or key component of a strategy for it), to going so far as the statement that territorial cohesion is this new Structural Funds objective.246 What is more, these territorial cohesion stories said that the Third Cohesion Report sees territorial cohesion as this new Structural Funds objective and called to rename it ‘European grouping of territorial cohesion’, as the 2004 European Parliament’s Olbrycht Report on territorial cooperation suggested.247 This would clearly have great consequences for the concept’s usage (e.g. formalisation and influence).248 Then again, the sole development in this metanarrative runs against the reports in 2006 that most people in DG Regio – or broader: the European Union Institutions – relate the concept to territorial cooperation.249 The only counterstory namely disputes this and suggests that an emphasis on territorial cooperation is different from the concept.250 The eventual name of this Structural Funds objective follows this, as it does not include the concept. When territorial cohesion crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality into full formality it thus concerns possible usages of the concept in the European funds.

Obviously, the side-debate on territorial cooperation not only disagrees on the type of territorial cooperation, but also with the counterstory, as it overlaps with the territorial cohesion stories that support the issue.251 The stories of this side-debate thereby often referred to all three (former) Interreg tracks.252 When they did specify territorial cooperation, however, cross-border cooperation never gets a special treatment – cross-border activities are
accounted for with the issue of the territory though – and their disagreement is on whether territorial cohesion does relate to inter-regional cooperation. What could be more important for European spatial planning in this though, is that when these territorial cohesion stories bent to a territorial cooperation kind, then it is to the one with a European spatial planning origin and largest role for the Member States: transnational cooperation. This does not surprise when it is put in mind that the transnational kind of territorial cooperation appeared in the metanarrative’s emergence in 2000, the year the allocation for Interreg and its transnational track increased for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period and the guidelines for these programmes incorporated the ESDP. That is, at least qua timing the concept and the increasing financial importance of transnational cooperation and the role of European spatial planning in this are tied up. These events and territorial cohesion stories might thus clearly pose European spatial planning in the middle of the European funds, but again, this merely as a possibility.

Moreover, the framing stories which tell about a change of spatial planning whereby it loses its name are structured by the stories on the concept itself which observe that in trans- and infranational practice territorial cohesion is more promoted than spatial planning. When these events and stories do not pose spatial planning but territorial cohesion in the middle of the European funds, this would again concord with the undetermined spheres of actions and innovative measures for mainstreaming (i.e. what is included). That is, territorial cohesion could cross the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating other actions in the European funds.

In spite of the large amount of territorial cohesion stories on territorial cooperation, they thus seem to suffer from the same trait as the general stories which stay the same while the amounts of funding change. To be exact, the update of Interreg guidelines, a change in eligible areas from 2004, and especially the almost halving of the initial funding for the territorial cooperation objective a year later could be of direct consequence for the European Funds usage area, and thus for the concept’s real punching power. This metanarrative merely reflects these events once though, as it is for the concept considered that the Structural Funds objective of territorial cooperation is proposed in principle but not in finances – i.e. territorial cooperation does not form the centre of the European funds. Still, territorial cooperation as crown of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative thus leaves the fuzzy line of in/formality open for territorial cohesion (with three ways). Moreover, it shows that the concept does not have to locate European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds to cross this line; such an activity might form a part of it at these fringes though (e.g. through transnational cooperation).

While the territorial cohesion stories on the territory, the territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, and processual coordination hardly merge in this metanarrative, when they do they seem to follow the crown issue of territorial cooperation. That is to say, the territorial dimension and processual issues are mostly linked. An example of this is then of importance for a crossing of the fuzzy line of in/formality by the concept with European spatial planning. It namely argues that the European Commission loses a part of the ownership of the process where the Community Strategic Guidelines make a strong reference to territorial aspects. To be exact, the Constitution which gives a base for activity in this area was lost and the Ministers responsible for spatial development would have taken over the initiative with their document that deals with territorial cohesion. This could imply a dissolving of the already fuzzy line of in/formality through the concept, because it locates European spatial planning both outside and within the European funds.

However, the concept seems to form a counterweight to such a movement too. This when it links the more processual issues, because then it refers to already existing and/or formal activities instead of (other) territorial aspects. Such “ballast” appears in the territorial cohesion stories by way of the implementation principles for the management of
the Structural Funds: ‘additionality’ as substantive coordination and ‘partnership’ between economic and social actors as processual coordination that are involved in the new policy implementation method (e.g. going beyond the State organisation). Hereby the line of in/formality would thus remain, as the formal side is clearly defined, and therefore the crossing of it by the concept as well.

The rest of the links then hang between this argument on the informal ownership of the process on territorial aspects and its counterpart. They namely do link the territorial dimension and processual issues but do not seem to dissolve this fuzzy line, or at least do not mention European spatial planning or the Community Strategic Guidelines. A part of their suspending thereby is the route via which the concept crosses the line of in/formality. With the spatial focus directing substantive coordination for territorial cohesion the inward route comes across. These territorial cohesion stories namely related a European Commission which continues to integrate territorial policy integration into the Structural Funds after their guidelines of 1999 did not mention spatial integration, as neither the revised version of 2003 nor their coordination with the Cohesion Fund 2000-2006 did. Conversely, another statement appeared outwards aligned to the issue of governing. The Structural Funds would namely contribute to territorial cohesion with the support of regional policy for a model of territorial governance (i.e. away from State government). Territorial cooperation could form a two-way street in this (i.e. in- and outwards), because when the territorial cohesion stories treat it separately they, as mentioned above, leave the fuzzy line of in/formality open for the concept (in threefold) – perhaps no less can be expected from a crown issue in the margin of the European funds mainstream.

This makes it less shocking that when territorial cooperation links to more processual ones, the territorial cohesion stories went beyond territorial cooperation as scene of new strategic ways. They namely posed that the development of a territorial cohesion strategy depends on territorial cooperation because an exchange of best practices and networking are conducted within this framework. In the few links of the interrelated issues of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative the concept thus appears to form a crossing on the border of in/formality. However, as the concept also goes against the weight of the existing and/or formal implementation principles and locates European spatial planning both in- as outside the Structural Funds, territorial cohesion could even turn up in the dissolving of this fuzzy line.

All in all, in the European Funds usage area as portrayed by the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative, territorial cohesion appears to cross the fuzzy line of in/formality by locating European spatial planning in the European funds. The isolated though perfect exemplification of this confirmation of this section’s working hypothesis is when the Structural Funds are concerned with territorial cohesion and cooperation. However, two nuances weaken it. Firstly, just as when both territorial cohesion and European spatial planning are narrowed down to substantive integration: both do not appear in the middle of the European funds, but at their margin. What is more, an extreme though initial stance on the governing issue even placed the quest for territorial cohesion in the hands of national finances.

Most issues combine this side-line feature with the other nuance though: the concept might not need European spatial planning for this crossing. The concept’s concern with governing namely does not locate European spatial planning in its handling of the in/formal conduct of the Structural Funds. Moreover, the opening of this fuzzy line with territorial cooperation at the margin for territorial cohesion merely gives room for this. Hereby the concept’s border-path towards an informal organisation of the territory might merely be free for European spatial planning, amongst others, while for the territorial dimension the concept only spotlights possible ways to locate territorial development and challenges inside the
Structural Funds. Furthermore, when illustrated by the metanarrative’s links between these organisational issues the crossing on the border of in/formality appears to dissolve when the concept locates European spatial planning on it. This metanarrative thus fills the structured silence on European spatial planning by often presenting its framed hesitation to march into the Structural Funds via the concept.

A question then is whether these crossings refute that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all (i.e. the first general hypothesis) or merely put forward possible formal usages of territorial cohesion. Notwithstanding that this metanarrative constantly crosses the fuzzy line of in/formality by flirting with both sides, its only counterstory dissents precisely with the crowning usage of the concept, which would due to events imply formality, that is: territorial cooperation as mainstream Structural Funds objective. Save to say though, the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative could not so much put forward a formal usage of territorial cohesion, but definitely a disputed formal room for a debate on the concept.

F.2.5 The overall picture of the separate metanarratives
The European Funds usage area is roughly ordered in the ‘substantive objectives’, ‘territorial specificities’, and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives. Their wide-ranging concerns much resonate those from the other usage areas (see previous appendices). Yet, they also add the indigenous ones of a territorial cohesion indicator, European Territorial Cohesion Index, Territorial Impact Assessment and territorial cooperation. The answer to how the concept channels funds (i.e. this appendix’ leading question) then signifies the financial punching power of the whole territorial cohesion usage field.

A channelling of European funds through the concept encounters two key difficulties though: in each metanarrative there appears a disagreement on the formality of the existing or even possible usage of the concept and a collection of many positions. This largely affirms that there is no formal usage of the concept in this usage area at all (i.e. the first general hypothesis) and appears to be in line with that the expansion of European funds with the concept shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general hypothesis) respectively. Hence, even if there would be a formal usage of the concept in this usage area, then it is not clear how territorial cohesion channels European funds, neither substantively, territorially, nor organisationally. Something the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative’s nonstory on territorial criteria for the allocation of funds seems to seal as a refusal.

The European funds’ area of action can nonetheless expand over the fuzzy line of in/formality which is drawn through the metanarratives by linking territorial cohesion to substantive objectives, territorial concerns, and/or various territories. That promotions of the concept with substantive concerns are, arguably, more difficult to side as in/formal than organisational ones increases this fuzziness. The same substantive concerns are namely ventilated in both informal and formal areas while organisational concerns themselves deal with the organisation of in/formality. For substantive concerns this is especially the case when they do not relate to informal European spatial planning (e.g. ESPON results), something which would at least indicate their informality.

The formal ground to build such an extension upon for the European Funds’ area of action via the concept then only appears to offer the through the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative marginalised issue of services. Even worse, this formal ground offers a risk detected with the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative: overstretch by an engagement with agricultural funding instead of the nearer Structural Funds. Most starting points lie thus on the fuzzy line of in/formality, some even plainly so. The counterstories of the concept’s promotion of balance, competitiveness, and territorial cooperation might stand for these, as
they signify disputes instead of mere indifference (i.e. openly in/formal position take more notice).

These difficulties are of course structured by the undecided debate on the focus of territorial cohesion itself. Yet, in the face of this the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative develops a disputed formal room for debate on the concept, a room crowned by territorial cooperation. What is more, the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative also presents a space for this, one cluttered with usable knowledge of territorial reality. The connections that are made between the metanarratives could then show whether the relationships between these concerns do channel European funds with territorial cohesion, offer a solidifying formal usage of the concept, and/or (further) order the many positions collected by the metanarratives.

F.3 Stories relating territorial cohesion metanarratives in the European Funds usage area

F.3.1 Territorial cohesion stories connecting metanarratives

In the European Funds usage area the metanarratives often connect. Yet, despite the masses in them separately, they do not do so as persistent as the metanarratives of the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas. While the separate metanarratives dawned, the first two territorial cohesion stories thereby came up that together connected all three metanarratives. These two stories exemplify that the connections of metanarratives show even less extreme viewpoints than the separate ones. They namely appear to follow the structuring stories and ignore the polarised tension which at the moment also leaned to that the Member States should ensure territorial cohesion and are the only ones financially able to. First the observation appears that the European Union takes care for territorial cohesion financially seen while ESPON analysed Structural Funds programmes in 2001. That is, the Objective 1 programmes at that time would already target social and territorial cohesion. A year later the proposition appears to let the European Union and Member States take care of it together through vertical and horizontal substantive substantive coordination. That is, national economic policies and the European Union’s various common policy areas should be coordinated so that they are mutually supportive to strengthen economic, social and territorial cohesion. These connections between the metanarratives thus seem to stay on the middle of the road.

What is awkward these first two years is that the territorial cohesion stories of these middle-of-the-road connections did not connect the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives even though they both had already emerged separately. Yet, in line with all stories noted thus far, this was the silence before the storm. During the debates on the latest Structural Funds reform there namely follow many territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives, also by relating the organisational territorial cohesion issues and territorial specificities. This development thus resembles thunder from a clear sky.

In this sudden blossom of grouping movements it is difficult to detect developments such as a dominant pairing of metanarratives. The territorial cohesion that connect metanarratives can be ordered in a schema though, as shown below in Schema 2b ‘Stories relating metanarratives of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area’.

*Note though, that the metanarratives of the European Funds usage area are wider than those of the (post-)ESDP process and Regional/Cohesion policy usage areas. Because of this, territorial cohesion stories that relate various issues (e.g. the substantive objectives of balance and services or organisational concerns of the territorial dimension and substantive coordination) more often appear inside one metanarrative than connecting two or more.
This Schema 2b comprises all connections between the three metanarratives, of which none are disputed, whereby all three more or less evenly dealt with. The separate metanarratives differ in this, as the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative dominates them. The connected metanarratives therefore increase the weight of the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives. The ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative remains dominant in the European Funds usage area though.

However, just as this dominant metanarrative does not show how territorial cohesion channels European funds territorially, the other two do not do so substantively and the even show a dispute on a formal room to debate territorial cohesion (e.g. to decide the concept’s place). A straightforward working hypothesis for the connected metanarratives might therefore be: the connections between the metanarratives do not show how territorial cohesion channels European funds. Besides that this needs a formal usage, the involved territorial cohesion stories would only line out a clear-cut decision to pursue a certain channelling of funds if they pin-point a particular usage of the concept by specifying a strong relationship between different territorial cohesion issues. The inclusiveness of the connections suggests that this does not take place: they cannot focus on certain issues without excluding others.

F.3.2 Comparing the separate and connected metanarratives
The channelling of European funds which the separate territorial cohesion metanarratives do not bring forward can surface by comparing them with the connected ones since the debates
on the latest Structural Funds reform. Besides presenting extra noteworthy information hereby (e.g. important additions, possible explanations), the focus lays on the territorial cohesion stories which correct the thus far drawn picture of the European Funds usage area. Below this comparison then follows the three connections for some fundamental characteristics, thereby lifts the issue of State aid, and relates the formal ground to build an extension for the concept’s usage upon.

F.3.3 Characteristics of all the connected metanarratives

In the connections between the metanarratives a new issue of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative just breaks the surface. It explicitly combines the concept’s organisational concerns with governing and the territorial dimension, that is: the spatial approach. The spatial approach would guarantee a better economic performance of European Union programmes by concentrating financial means on strategic sectoral and national axes. Such an approach can, arguably, be useful in general. However, when these stories see the spatial approach as a result of a strategic shift in regional policy and territorial cohesion, they specify it territorially and financially with Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs) and the Cohesion Fund. This is not general of course. Such a generally applicable way of doing might therefore with the concept always rest in an ungathered mass of discussed topics, as the spatial approach does with topics of specific territories and the place of the concept in the European funds. In the current state this would lead the spatial approach to stick territorial cohesion to a channeling the Cohesion Fund to new Member States.

To increase this mass of topics the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives even add specific territories to the ones that come up in the separate metanarratives. Besides these territories though (e.g. mountainous ones), when these stories bound all three metanarratives in 2004, this ungathered mass returns too: a proposal for the promotion of sustainable economic growth on the basis of territorial cohesion came up with a broad unorganised focus. It namely seems to be the case that the National Strategic References Frameworks (NSRFs) and Operational Programmes (OPs) simply have to account for almost all issues that are depicted in the metanarratives, except for, amongst others, balance, substantive integration, and territorial cooperation. What is then illustrative of this discussion is that a year later the same connection between metanarratives puts another broad focus forward. Now in a possible formal usage of the concept in the linkage of the European Funds and Intergovernmental Conferences. The appeal to have a vision in the Community Strategic Guidelines which is more in line with draft Constitutional Treaty Article III-220 for instance does include balance as substantive objective (see Appendix C on the IGCs usage area). An ungathered mass of topics could thus hamper a channeling of European funds with the concept (e.g. funding for what).

Although a formal room to debate the concept might thus be much needed (e.g. for the relations between its concerns), territorial cooperation, which as the crown issue of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative could grant such room, appears less often in the connected metanarratives. This formal room is thus not only disputed, but also not (yet) well-stitched in the entire European Funds usage area. These characteristics through all connected metanarratives seem thus to be in line with that the connections between the metanarratives do not show how territorial cohesion channels European funds. They namely even supplement the ungathered masses of the concept’s usages – or at least leave them unorganised due to the different broad foci which do not weigh the various issues – and give less attention to a formal room to debate these territorial cohesion concerns.

Besides an ungathered mass of topics, also the formality of the concept’s usage plays a role for a channeling of European funds. The larger ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal
organisation of the territory’ metanarratives then separately both play with the fuzzy line of in/formality at the fringes of the mainstream European Funds – e.g. by giving possibilities for European spatial planning (such as ESPON). Yet, some shapes in the picture of this alter when these metanarratives connect with commonalities. A minor addition here presents a path for the specific territories (seen from the Community level) to become territorial actors in the more formal State-like way of doing for example. These territorial cohesion stories namely filled-in the call to broaden the circle of participants for territorial cohesion policy beyond the Member States with cross-border regions. Besides that such participants would be representative for the European Union’s complex un-State-like territorial organisation, if this formalises territorial cohesion, it is merely a possible usage of the concept. That is, it is not even how this can indirectly channel European funds.

Another link between organisational issues and the debate on specific territories could be more essential for the concept though, as it might change the crown issue of the organisational metanarrative. It namely holds that the new Structural Funds objective of territorial cooperation would not only group the Interreg legacy but the one of the URBAN Community Initiative as well. Such an incorporation of spheres of actions and innovative measures with the mainstreaming technique gives territorial cooperation a bias. This bias could, depending on the weight this crown issue has, lead territorial cohesion to channel European funds to urban instead of rural areas.

However, the territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives do not only give territorial cooperation less attention, here they also dispute its weight for territorial cohesion. That the concept would not strongly relate to territorial cooperation as Structural Funds objective due to the low importance accredited to territorial grouping thereby even practically emphasises the counterstory of territorial cooperation as territorial cohesion issue. Although territorial cohesion could with territorial cooperation have a bias to channel European funds to urban areas, this channel is thus disputed in itself.

Besides this disputed formal room to debate territorial cohesion (e.g. for the space to relate technical and political choices which the concept can add), this connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives also clarifies the role of experts in the frame of the general stories. Although an advice was that during the work on a European Territorial Cohesion Index engagement should be sought with policy makers in a constructive dialogue, the clarification comes with that the latter were also described as the ones that decide over the content of the index. That is, not experts but policy makers may have the role of sieving the cluttered descriptions of territorial reality. Insofar a territorial cohesion channels European funds through such descriptions, the question becomes which from the ungathered mass topics do policy makers select for this.

These territorial cohesion stories that connect metanarratives thus point out an urban bias in the disputed formal room to debate the concept and that when a European Territorial Cohesion Index channels European funds it can select a territorial view of policy makers. Yet, they do not pin-point a particular usage of the concept by specifying a strong relationship between different issues. Moreover, when the connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives did specify a strong relationship between different issues, it did not give a clear-cut decision to pursue a certain channelling of European funds. That is to say, by seeing territorial cohesion as the substantive coordination of sectoral policies with spatial impacts in 2005 – a year later labelled as a way of thought the Dutch wanted to claim in 2004 –, this connection merely specify a focus. In this way the connected metanarratives therefore do not come any closer to channelling European funds than basing the decision to coordinate certain policies on where already spend funds went.
F.3.4 State aid in the European Funds usage area

A concern worthy of special mention is State aid. Although it is of little significance in the separate ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative, State aid is a major issue in public debate. When this metanarrative is connected to others though, it plays a large role for territorial cohesion.\(^\text{284}\) While State aid is not directly a part of the European funds, the European Union does decide on the rules for this kind of financial aid. The general stories on money and implementation then frame the argument these territorial cohesion stories on State aid make by presenting a tension between the support for the Single European Market (e.g. reduce State aid) and the minor issue of the funding principles being too generic. They namely first go against a too uniform application of the State aid provisions. This by relating State aid to specific territories in the 2004 connection of metanarratives treated above (e.g. State aid for poor or functional urban regions), which implies different ways of doing for different territories.\(^\text{285}\) In the connection with the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative (see below for more on this connection) State aid shows up a year later to reduce regional disparities, this without (directly) specifying territories.\(^\text{286}\) While the usage of the concept in the debate on State aid does not channel European funds, it could therefore play a role in an effort to change the formal rules that solidify for financial aid in the European Union (e.g. for some territories).

F.3.5 The formal grounds of territorial cohesion to channel European funds

Neither the separate ‘substantive objectives’ nor ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative defines how territorial cohesion channels European funds, this both due to the ungathered masses of substantive and territorial concerns expressed with territorial cohesion and the concept’s uncertain formal grounds. More indications for this come from the connected metanarratives when they are concerned with territorial indicators, Cohesion policy for all regions, territorial cooperation, sustainability, the territorial dimension, services, and agricultural funding. These issues are treated in this order below.

One of the territorial cohesion stories which connects the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ metanarratives gives a partial reason for why they do not define a channeling of the European funds. That is to say, it simply remarks that no attempt was made to adopt territorial balance as reference for the allocation of funds in 2004 because it was impossible to identify territorial cohesion indicators.\(^\text{287}\) Hereby the aforementioned problems with territorial cohesion indicators (see §F.2.3) could form a basis for the appearance of the territorial cohesion counterstory of balance (i.e. the concept does not have to do with balance because territorial cohesion indicators are lacking). They could likewise form the basis for the noted absence of the term of imbalances in the concept’s definition in the Community Strategic Guidelines. When the concept’s ungathered masses of concerns lead to the lack of territorial cohesion indicators, they could thus also indirectly affect the channelling of European Funds (i.e. not for balance).

If the metanarratives’ connection explains instead of changes this situation, it thereby at least corrects the thus far drawn picture of the European Funds usage area. The 2000-2006 Structural Funds objectives were namely – unlike those of the 2007-2013 funding period discussed in the separate metanarratives – explicitly territorially specified.\(^\text{288}\) The Objective 1 programmes which were mentioned above because they appear in the emergence of the connections between metanarratives (see §F.1.1) then supported economic and social conversion in areas that experience structural difficulties. This shows that substantive concerns were earlier expressed with territorial cohesion than the separate ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative portrays (i.e. just not by themselves, but linked to certain territories).\(^\text{289}\) The European funds of course still link substance and territories with the objectives for the 2007-2013 funding period. Yet, only these connected metanarratives show
the obvious pairing of, for instance, promoting balance and supporting poor regions. This difference in Structural Funds objectives might therefore at once illustrate how the events fundamentally affected the order of the metanarratives (i.e. substantive instead of substantive and territorial objectives leads to a ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative) and indicate the minor influence vice versa (i.e. of the concept in the European funds on the whole, or at least the concern with specific territories and objectives). This begs the question whether territorial cohesion channels these funds or that these channels structure the concept.

However, a territorial cohesion story that connects these metanarratives appears to go against the latter suggestion. While passing both balance and lagging regions and their obvious relationship, it poses that the concept did have a significant influence in the European funds for the 2007-2013 funding period. Barnier’s pushing of territorial cohesion for a Cohesion policy for all regions would namely be visible in the European Regional Development Funds’ (ERDF) objective of (regional) competitiveness. This might thus add the pair of competitiveness and not poor regions to the one of balance and poor regions for a channeling of European funds with territorial cohesion.

These ties between substantive objectives and territories are more complex though. The debate on whether with territorial cohesion balance aims at peripheral regions or (also with competitiveness) implies the Urban Agenda is namely also included. This debate then weakens the assumed bond between not poor regions and competitiveness insofar the Urban Agenda does not entail a Cohesion policy for all regions (and can thus also link competitiveness to poor regions) and peripheral regions do not overlap with poor ones (not only competitiveness links to not poor regions). Moreover, with the observation that the pre-accession funds provided to Central and Eastern European Countries seldom explicitly addressed territorial cohesion, balanced spatial competitiveness and spatial integration objectives, the disagreement on the concept’s usage for Member States steps in too – i.e. the New Member States might not use the concept due to their habits developed for European Funds. These discussions on how the ungathered masses of territorial cohesion concerns interlink of course do not make it clearer how the concept can channel European funds.

Hence, it seems that such connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ metanarratives do not show how territororial cohesion channels European funds either. They namely do not order the ungathered masses within the metanarratives, but increases the complexity by interweaving the discussions in numerous ways. Moreover, these connections of metanarratives show that the events of the European funds more affected the order of the concept than the separate metanarratives portray, while their discussions are merely on the increase of influence that is needed to channel European Funds with territorial cohesion.

The connected metanarratives pay less attention to territorial cooperation and the connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ ones even hints at an emphasis on its counterstory in practice (i.e. territorial cooperation is different from territorial cohesion; see §F.3.4). The territorial cohesion stories that connect the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives however still appear to redraw the importance of this crown issue. They showed, for starters, possibilities to expand the formal room for debate on territorial cohesion, which is given with territorial cooperation as mainstreamed objective, through the other two Structural Funds objectives. This due to the concept’s horizontal approach or its relation to the sustainable development aspect of the objective of (regional) competitiveness for instance. Furthermore, the (expanded) formal room to debate territorial cohesion is here thus due to these Structural Funds objectives located in Cohesion policy, while territorial cooperation also opens the backdoor for European spatial planning to cross the fuzzy line of in/formality. Either way, when the concept is in/formally used for territorial cooperation through these
Structural Funds objectives, the question is in how the concept the concept could influence how these objectives channel European funds.

The connecting story concerned with this issue also further specified the structure of the general stories’ official policy directions and informal activity build in the stories on territorial cohesion itself. That is to say, it saw this opening for European spatial planning through territorial cooperation as an opportunity. Then trans-European spatial development cooperation could be strengthened in the context of an enlarged European Union, hereby issues should be maintained in the eligible cooperation priorities that are most likely to contribute to territorial cohesion and growth-oriented territorial development for the Lisbon Strategy.296 These connected metanarratives might thus reset the importance of territorial cooperation for a formal room to debate territorial cohesion and discuss eligible priorities. However, this does not depict a channelling of funds with the concept.

Yet, a possible channelling of funds does appear here in another way. With territorial cohesion it would for the European Union be possible to in the application of policy endow with a limited integration of the territorial dimension in coherence with sustainable balanced development.297 Then again, besides that the metanarratives do not represent an existing channelling of funds with the concept, such presented possibilities connect issues that are in the separate metanarratives discussed or even disputed (i.e. the territorial dimension and balance respectively). This leaves little to firmly root an influential usage of the concept upon: the minor issue of sustainability.298 Yet, one could nonetheless track the alike possibilities that are offered by the separate metanarratives through the issue of sustainability and even the territorial dimension. These are namely a way for the concept’s informal usage to enter marginal formality and possible paths to locate territorial development and territorial challenges (e.g. growth-oriented) within the European funds with the spotlight of territorial cohesion respectively. Moreover, together the issues of sustainability and the territorial dimension can broaden the path, perhaps towards a formal usage of the concept that does channel European funds.299 Hence, the connection between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarratives seems to restore territorial cooperation as crown issue through other objectives (e.g. competitiveness and/or sustainability). What is more, a single territorial cohesion story hereby deeply changes the picture of the European Funds usage area, as it could turn the other metanarrative’s nonstory on territorial criteria into a rumour. That is to say, although the separate metanarratives do not show it, the discussions on territorial cohesion might place the concept as a channel in the European funds, particularly when related to sustainability (again) and the territorial dimension.

Notwithstanding, or especially with, the possible channelling of European funds through the concept as portrayed in the connected metanarratives, the formal grounds to build an extension for the concept’s usage upon remain important. The issues of services and agricultural funding should therefore be treated. However, the territorial cohesion stories that connect the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative only mentioned the objective of services twice, and even further marginalise the concern with this than pictured in the separate metanarrative.300 Also the usage of the concept for agricultural funding appears in such a way. When the connections with the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative appeared to begin to picture this formal usage of the concept by linking rural areas and issues of other metanarratives, they ended quickly and gave territorial cohesion a double edged place. That is, where agricultural funding is structured as marginal in the usage area – which entails the risk of overstrechting the concept with this formal usage —, these funds even hardly mention territorial cohesion to the side.301 It is not clear how the concept can channel European funds from such a marginal place in both this usage area and agricultural funding.

The two times the concept did come to the fore within agricultural funding were without surprise though. Both saw the concept as a goal, thereby relating familiar issues
which would contribute to territorial cohesion (e.g. the environment, the spatial distribution of economic activity and indirectly via land management and forestry as well). \(^{302}\) These territorial cohesion stories might hereby nonetheless have changed the concept’s usage in the European funds in major ways. They namely go against the territorial cohesion counterstories of competitiveness and balance by demonstrating that the concept’s concerns with both competitiveness and territorial balance became formal. However, they are thereby narrowed down to agricultural funding, as all these issues are; or even tighter, to the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development’s axis\(^{303}\) of improving the environment and the countryside. \(^{303}\) Such a usage of the concept in agricultural funding can thus be viewed as parallel to the possible channelling of European funds which is discussed in the connected metanarratives when territorial cohesion relates balance, the environment, and the territorial dimension. The solid fit on this formal ground might paradoxically increase the risk of overstretching the concept though. This well-connected extension would namely be supported by an aberrant and heavy agricultural funding all the same. Yet, for now the concept’s formal usage for agricultural funding, despite its narrowed down set of territorial cohesion concerns, does not appear to channel these funds due to its too marginal place – to not even speak of the concept’s minor role for services in the European funds.

F.3.6 Additional findings from the connected metanarratives

The territorial cohesion stories that connect the metanarratives do not only complete the sketch of the concept’s usage in the European Funds usage area, but also change its image a bit. The connected metanarratives namely seem to supplement the ungathered masses of the concept’s usages (e.g. by adding the spatial approach) and to leave them unorganised due to the different broad foci which do not weigh the various discussed topics, that is, if these connections do not increase the complexity through interweaving issues of different metanarratives in numerous ways. They also appear to reset the importance of the disputed formal room to debate territorial cohesion concerns. Hereby territorial cooperation could open up ways to expand this room through the other two Structural Funds objectives despite that these connections do not fasten this crown issue of the concept tighter in the usage area (e.g. by emphasising its counterstory practically).

Beyond additions though, the connected metanarratives illustrate how the events more affected the order of territorial cohesion than the separate ones portray: the connecting stories show ways in which the concept’s usage for the 2000-2006 Structural Funds objectives did not yet divide substantive and territorial concerns. These concerns namely appear separated in the metanarratives since they are more focused on the next funding period whose policy does not territorially specify its substantive objectives. However, there also pops up a disputed influence of territorial cohesion on the European Funds, which passes the also for the 2007-2013 funding period related lagging regions and objective of balance. That is, a pushing of the concept for a Cohesion policy for all regions would be visible in the Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness. Related to the other two new objectives of these funds, is that the territorial cohesion stories point towards an urban bias of territorial cooperation and base the debate on the concept’s relationship with the objective of balance on the problems with territorial cohesion indicators.

Yet, one could ask whether also the connected metanarratives do not channel European funds (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). The connected metanarratives surely change the picture of the European Funds usage area by suggesting that such a channelling actually is debated. This would turn the nonstory on territorial criteria into a debate. Still, the

\(^{302}\) The new generation of rural development strategies and programmes will be built around four axes, namely: axis 1, on improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sector; axis 2, on improving the environment and the countryside; axis 3, on the quality of life in rural areas and diversification of the rural economy; and axis 4, on Leader (OJEC, 2006).
territorial cohesion stories just come up with the coordination of certain policies based on whether already spend funds had territorial impacts. What comes closest to a possibility for the concept to channel European funds roots it on the minor territorial cohesion issue of sustainability.

The issue of sustainability also represents an undisputed path towards the concept’s formality, one which its concern with the territorial dimension could broaden. The connecting stories namely marginalise the formal usage of the concept which follows the Intergovernmental Conferences (i.e. for services) and the one which does not follow these official limits gives territorial cohesion a double edged place: to the side in the aberrant agricultural funding. The latter thereby formally demonstrates territorial cohesion’s concern with competitiveness and territorial balance and narrows the role of the concept down to improving the environment and the countryside. Yet, the marginality of this place appears to inhibit a channelling of European funds nonetheless. Many things remain undecided; and when the discussions on a European Territorial Cohesion Index will give a space to relate technical and political choices hereby (e.g. make the index usable to channel funds), it could be the policy makers in the role of selecting the descriptions of territorial reality. That these connected metanarratives expose a usage of the concept in the better known debate on State aid is perhaps more important. Territorial cohesion could namely gain more weight hereby without directly channelling European funds. This by playing a role for a change of the European Union’s financial aid rules against the development of the Single European Market (e.g. to lessen the uniform application of State aid provisions for some territories).

The metanarratives thus do not represent an existing channelling of European funds, as no clear-cut decision on this appears through a strong relationship of issues. They therefore do not bring the ungathered masses of the metanarratives together in a neat order, but (further) snarl them like a messy ball of wool. They also do not offer one solidifying formal usage of the concept, but twofold marginal ones that do not explicitly endow. Still, possibilities for the concept to formally channel these funds surface, since territorial cohesion relates the issues of balance, the environment, and the territorial dimension on both the concept’s fuzzy line of in/formality and topical formal side.

However, crossing this expanse might overextend the concept, because it situates territorial cohesion on the divergent currents of the agricultural funding and Structural Funds mainstreams. A firm fit of possible in/formal usages of the concept and its existing formal grounds can paradoxically increase this risk. That is, if the metanarratives underpin a channelling of European funds thus, it is on a watershed. Even so, to know whether it is territorial cohesion that channels European funds, it is necessary to compare the metanarratives with the narratives with an own dynamic. If the latter would namely portray the same picture as the former, such a channelling would not really stream via territorial cohesion, as it might not even need the concept for this.

F.4 Narratives with an own dynamic in European Funds usage area

F.4.1 To sort wide-spread European funds stories in the usage area’ order

The metanarratives above offer an overview of the concept’s usage in the European Funds usage area as they order territorial cohesion stories. Also here, just as in the other usage areas, these stories might belong less to the concept than Schema’s 2a and 2b portray though. Again narratives with an own dynamic might harbour exactly the same stories for instance. If in this usage area the metanarratives and narratives with an own dynamic show similar debates, this can reveal both the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action (e.g. by putting many issues on the agenda) and the ungathered mass of different positions independent from the concept (e.g. this drive demonstrates this mass). In so doing, they would bring the many
possibilities to light for concerns to use the concept instrumentally as well. Furthermore, this would reinforce the present negative answer to the appendix’ leading question: the concept does not channel European funds as the same channelling appears without the mention of territorial cohesion.

Where the metanarratives do differ from the narratives, they point to the concept’s own features in the European funds, whether these are formal or not; the concept’s formality therefore plays only a minor role in this section. However, so far territorial cohesion appears without any outstanding characteristic that channels European funds. The working hypothesis of this section might therefore combine both preliminary deductions: the concept does not channel European funds because the narratives with an own dynamic portray the same picture of an ungathered mass of different issues.

The numerous European funds stories which form the concept’s context already confirm the working hypothesis in the way they are arraigned: the order of the narratives with an own dynamic is the same as the one of the metanarratives. They for instance also treat a range of regularly interrelating substantive objectives. It thereby are the same objectives as in the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative which also form same pairs. Economic and social cohesion, balance and competitiveness, the environment, polycentrism, and infrastructure and services are thus not exclusive features of territorial cohesion. Besides this ‘substantive objectives’ narrative, ‘territorial specificities is another. This because almost all this kind of issues which are debated with territorial cohesion return without mentioning the concept (i.e. territorial reality, specific territories, territorial capital, Territorial Impact Assessment). This also holds for issues that deal with the governal organisation of the territory (i.e. the European territory, territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, processual coordination, territorial cooperation), which is thus a narrative too.

On the other hand, the sizes of these same groups of similar issues differ, since now the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative relatively increases in weight at the expense of the one of ‘territorial specificities’. However, before the working hypothesis for the separate narratives is considered, Schema 3a ‘Narratives in the European Funds usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories)’ will summarise their appearance and development.

---

**European Funds Schema 3a**

**Narratives in the European Funds usage area with an own dynamic (without relating stories)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Substantive objectives</th>
<th>Territorial specifications</th>
<th>Governal organisation of the territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Schema 3a shows many debates on European Funds issues, already so from the Single European Act (SEA) from the late 80’s on and mostly around their reforms, particularly the last one; 36 this is in step with the events fundamental for this usage area and its framing, structuring, and territorial cohesion stories. At first view, the narratives thereby appear to affirm a part of the working hypothesis, as they do not only portray many issues, but even more than the ungathered masses of the metanarratives. However, the European funds stories need to be at least roughly sketched to confirm that part and, moreover, check whether the narratives’ debates are any different from the ordered territorial cohesion stories.

Before the many European funds discussions will be treated below per narrative, a lead which could be significant for the first general hypothesis can be followed. That is, even though in this part of the usage area no in/formal usage of territorial cohesion comes forward by principle, as only the stories on the European funds themselves structure them, later on the
narratives hint here at by simply appearing in 2003.\textsuperscript{308} Strangely enough that year the concept was namely related to the European funds by the structuring stories, and the funding issues continued to be expressed towards the debates on the new Structural Funds reform. The stories on territorial cohesion itself and all the metanarratives, however, suddenly fell silent. An explanation of this might line up with the structuring stories’ debate on the need of the Constitutional Treaty’s ratification for a formal usage of the concept, as territorial cohesion was that year extensively discussed during the drafting of it (see Appendix C on the IGCs usage area). Perhaps the fuzziness of the European Funds usage area’s line of in/formality and nearly absent formal usage of the concept then result from the anticipation on the Treaty’s ratification, its non-ratification two years later, and the ensuing uncertainty since. The channeling of European funding with territorial cohesion depends on more than this line of in/formality though. As will be shown below per narrative to redraw the territorial cohesion channels.

F.4.2 Substantive objectives in the jungle of discussions of the narratives with an own dynamic

The ‘substantive objectives’ narratives thus harbours issues that are similar to the like-named metanarrative (i.e. economic and social cohesion, balance and competitiveness, infrastructure and services). What also characterises the European Funds usage area in this is that the narrative rigorously follows the general stories on the official policy directions with its sole statement on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). It would not be aimed at cohesion (between regions), not even to the extent it takes environmental and socio-cultural concerns on board.\textsuperscript{309} Such a characteristic makes that the extension of territorial cohesion in agricultural funding for its formal usage would have to deal with more than just passing the official limits set for it in the IGCs usage area. Such a formal usage would also be more isolated than shown above in the stories on territorial cohesion itself and the metanarratives, as it might not have the possibility to lean upon its context in the European Funds usage area for this. This is the opposite of the three most debated substantive objectives, which will be treated below first. Thereafter the first traces of a major debate on economic and social cohesion are drawn and the less important debates on infrastructure and services and polycentrism touched upon.

Through the years the most often debated substantive objectives are balance, competitiveness, and the environment.\textsuperscript{310} Just after the Edinburgh European Council made Regional/Cohesion policy funding one third of the European Union budget and the Cohesion Fund funded environment and transport infrastructure these substantive objectives emerged immediately and the first two paired.\textsuperscript{311} This link developed from initially using terms of workers and their adaptation to industrial changes in 1994 to those of employment and competitiveness and the relative weighting of balanced development and growth hereby ten years later (e.g. by describing Member States that are concerned with growth instead of internal disparities or by reporting that 60% of the programmes for the new convergence objective may be linked to the Lisbon Strategy).\textsuperscript{312} This thus seems to be the same as the tension between balance and growth of the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative.

Yet, it is striking that although balance was in 1999 even linked to polycentrism, this objective did not appear independently in the context of territorial cohesion before 2003.\textsuperscript{313} Furthermore, the year thereafter balance just played a part similar to its initial concern with work in the second Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment that was proposed for the 2007-2013 funding period.\textsuperscript{314} Only when the debates on this latest reform broke loose the issue of balance was really discussed in itself. This with European funds stories against regional disparities or on the first objective of convergence in the same proposal for instance.\textsuperscript{315} The stories on the European funds themselves structure a
fundamental question in this by debating the expansion/reduction of funding for Cohesion policy. That is, should the European Union finance regional development (i.e. with the first two new Structural Funds objectives) besides its support for convergence between Member States (e.g. with the Cohesion Fund)? The substantive objective of balance is thus disputed as belonging to territorial cohesion and whether it should be a European funds objective.

To answer the question above, the Member States and European Commission would especially have much debated the second new Structural Funds objective. The narrative seems in line with this debate between the Member States and the European Commission, as the substantive objective of competitiveness appears to be its main issue, and this even more pronounced than in the metanarrative, through the frequent promotion of growth the general stories on seeing the European Union as a business frame this substantive objective as well. For starters, after its initial pairing with balance, the substantive objective of competitiveness did appear independently before 2003, even a year before the European Council adopted the Lisbon Strategy in 2000. The European funds stories thereafter explicitly link competitiveness to this strategy. This for instance by reporting the obligation for 75% of the programmes of the second new Structural Funds objective to do this; an objective they label as less or even non-redistributive, but that the European Commission held that it uses money for European Union policy goals (i.e. a political justification). What is more, a forward look in 2006 sees that the Structural and Cohesion Funds could even bent to this narrow economic agenda. This would partly answer the structuring stories’ question of how to fit the Lisbon Strategy in the Structural Funds (i.e. with an all prevasive competitiveness objective). Yet, that competitiveness is a much debated issue in the context territorial cohesion of course does not decide upon the relationship it to the concept (e.g. for/against the metanarrative’s counterstory). Hence, with balance and competiteness the same channels for European funding appear with and without territorial cohesion, but with their own dynamics.

Perhaps it are the European funds stories themselves that explain why the substantive objective of the environment only appeared independently since 2004 (e.g. without the issue of infrastructure). The namely give a hint a year later: the starting-point for DG Environment concerning Cohesion policy would be the integration of the environment into Structural Funds programmes and financial means for the implementation of environmental policy. That is, possibly such an integration of the environment first entails an attempt to relate it to established objectives, which is often shown – and this is not done in the way the territorial cohesion stories do: only once and to the issue of competitiveness, but also to balance and later on even to services (i.e. the innovative use of renewable energy resources). The narrative thus treats the substantive objective of the environment differently than the territorial cohesion stories do: it covers more than sustainability (e.g. the environmental balance, natural heritage) and might therefore hardly use the concept to promote the environment in the European funds.

Either way, this promotion of the environment seems to be unsuccessful, as these stories held in 2005 that sustainable development as policy statement is not followed through with clear guidelines and targets. Hence, also when territorial cohesion links to the substantive objective of the environment, then its context in the European Funds usage area largely reflects such a usage of the concept. Both do not seem to channel European funds though. The concept’s context thereby does suggest a rather one-sided relationship in the promotion of the environment and territorial cohesion though. When the environment only returns in the concept with sustainability, then environmental concerns might attend to the concept far less than the latter towards sustainability.

Traces of the ‘substantive objectives’ narrative’s first major debate emerge when the Single European Act included economic and social cohesion. The debate namely does not
derive its importance from its size but the weight of these substantive objectives. However, notwithstanding their early appearance, the European funds stories that promote these substantive objectives just developed into a debate from the 2000-2006 funding period on. The substantive objectives would then change easily. The link of economic cohesion to the substantive objective of balance instead of social cohesion is telling here: during this funding period the classification of cohesion into economic and social cohesion seems to disappear from the context of territorial cohesion, social cohesion even completely. This is strange, doubly so, because the territorial cohesion stories continued to discuss economic and social cohesion and bended a bit more to the latter. Here the narratives thus differ from the metanarratives.

Moreover, when this narrative did mention economic and social cohesion since the new Structural Funds objectives were proposed in the debates on these funds’ latest reform, the low levels of compatibility between economic cohesion and convergence came up and the relationship of competitiveness to cohesion in general was questioned. In the European funds the mention of territorial cohesion with economic and social cohesion thus seems to be doubtful, because even in the concept’s context such classifications might fade away in disputed relations to both new Structural Funds objectives. When the concept loses this relationship with its context, this would mean that here the same channeling does not appear without as with territorial cohesion. Yet, this difference could also mean that economic and social cohesion channelled European funds, but territorial cohesion will not do so due to their disappearance.

Even though the substantive objective of infrastructure already surfaced in 1989 (i.e. even before the Cohesion Fund funded transport infrastructure), it appears as a minor issue, mostly to promote European networks, and it does not to develop in this narrative. Yet, this does indicate something. The European funds stories on infrastructure might namely indicate a debate, but one that relatively decreases in importance (i.e. in the context of territorial cohesion) due to the growth of the stories on the European Funds themselves and other issues of this narrative. Although the ‘substantive objectives’ narrative does not pair the issue of infrastructure and the ten years later emerging issue of services as strongly as the metanarrative does, also the latter substantive objective seems to have a minor role here. That is, while these European funds stories held in 2006 that services were on the agenda in 2004, the narrative strangely enough does not show this. Services thus do not seem to figure prominently on the European Funds’ agenda, or at least not when it concerns the context of territorial cohesion (see Appendix E on Regional/Cohesion policy though). The ‘substantive objectives’ narrative is thus reflected by the ‘substantive objectives’ metanarrative when it concerns infrastructure and services: both substantive objectives are debated, but weakly so. Although infrastructure channels European funds, this does not appear in this usage area.

The other less important debate is on the substantive objective of polycentrism. It only appeared since the ESDP’s publication and mention of this document in the Structural Funds Guidelines for the 2000-2006 period and their coordination with the Cohesion Fund, which is logical (see Appendix D on the (post-)ESDP process). The debate that develops in this narrative is then about polycentrism’s importance. It is mostly promoted with, for instance, statements which hold that the European Parliament always supported polycentrism and even that it met universal approval. However, a contrary assertion is that with the Structural Funds no direct polycentric development is needed on measure or priority level.

This even though ‘services’ is a too narrow label here, one under which divers accessibility kinds fall that are not as physical as transport infrastructure, such as Services of General Interest, labour market access, knowledge, ICT.
shows the side in this debate that seems to prevail – when the accounts that the theme of polycentric development is not so apparent in the strategies of 2000-2006 Structural Funds programmes and the Community Strategic Guidelines do not include it are correct that is.\textsuperscript{336} Polycentrism might thus play a larger role for territorial cohesion than in its context of the European funds; this can be explained by that both polycentrism and territorial cohesion relate to the informal activity of European spatial planning (again, see Appendix D). Due to this difference, it could be a way in which the concept channels European funds.

F.4.3 Territorial specificities in the jungle of discussions of the narratives with an own dynamic

The narrative concerned with territorial specificities appeared regularly since the 1988 Structural Funds reform, which is while the European Commission’s budget just increased two years earlier, and each of its issues blossomed during the debates on the latest reform.\textsuperscript{337} Besides the weight territorial reality, specific territories, territorial capital, and Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) concerns, their development differs from the ‘territorial specificities’ metanarrative – this could be due to their earlier emergence, as sometimes the difference is just that they develop (through time). The differences and additional significant information in territorial specificities are then treated below: first the here most discussed specific territories and the in European funds stories less similar territorial reality before the more notable Territorial Impact Assessment and even less important issue of territorial capital.

The development of the specific territories in the narrative seems to differ from the metanarrative.\textsuperscript{338} That is, even though the narrative also first mostly spoke of regions according to wealth (i.e. those lagging behind) and since 2005 many specific regions appear, some specific ones turn up near the beginning too: regions affected by industrial decline and regions with extremely low population density; just as a later backward looking story explains the first development as a compensation for the United Kingdom and others with low benefits from the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), the creation of a Structural Funds objective for the second type of regions might relate to Austria, Finland, and Sweden joining the European Union.\textsuperscript{339} The context of territorial cohesion thus did not discuss a specific territory later than the territorial cohesion stories did, and even more come up within it (e.g. are lobbied for). The hereby formed leeway for the European funds’ area of action to expand could point out that specific territories do not so much use the concept in this but vice versa.

Regardless of such usages, this leeway appears to be disputed later on. The European funds stories namely both report that the Structural Funds regulations account for specific territories and that the Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG) do not focus certain strategic activities on them.\textsuperscript{340} Even despite the stories on the European funds themselves that hold that these guidelines are not compulsory for all regions, whether specific territories are actually dealt with is disputed.

With another line of debate specific territories do more clearly come to the fore. This in the track of agricultural funding: the expenditure of the Common Agricultural Policy would be concentrated in the wealthier and more densely populated areas.\textsuperscript{341} Such a concentration would go against the Structural Funds (i.e. both qua lagging regions and regions with a low density). Yet, these two streams of funding did link, even if only superficially, as a backward looking story noted in 2004 that after the 1990s the Agricultural Funds’ Guidance Section was considered alongside the Regional and Social Funds as part of the regional and national Operational Programmes (OPs) in Objective regions.\textsuperscript{342} This link of agricultural funding and Structural Funds did not subsist for the 2007-2013 funding period, and the latter seem to take the urban side in this line of debate; one European funds story even went beyond the often mentioned urban dimension by stating that cities are central to
Cohesion Policy. The ‘territorial specificities’ narrative thus further portrays the watershed on which the concept situates itself with its formal usage for agricultural funding and the more nearby and, arguably, urban Structural Funds – i.e. the void between the two streams widens.

Still, the actual spending much depends on the Member States. This comes to the fore with the urban dimension. The reflection of urban development would vary because urban development policies vary across Member States. This comes stronger to the fore with the financial problems in the broader context of the concepthough. That is, while territorial cohesion stories remain undecided between specific territories, also in the case of Member States, the European funds stories depict the high stakes in the debates on the latest Structural Funds reform: the Eastern ones want the priority because they suffer the most acute problems, the Southern ones enough to tackle unresolved problems, and the Western Member States refuse to pay for both. Again, territorial cohesion thus seems to play no role in major reshufflings in European funds.

Hence, the ways in which the European funds stories on specific territories differ from how they are treated with the concept seem to show that each of them came forward without a concern for territorial cohesion too (e.g. for a leeway to expand the European funds’ area of action). This makes it questionable whether the concept channels European funding thus. Moreover, the watershed of agricultural funding and Structural Funds on which territorial cohesion situates itself appears to widen in line with the debate on, respectively, rural and urban areas in the concept’s context. This increases the risks for when it would channel European funding. However, territorial cohesion plays no major role in reshufflings of these European funds, nor within them. Still, the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative does not bring forward a Cohesion policy for all regions. Such a (financial) non-/decision which expands the European funds’ area of action might therefore not only be a territorial cohesion concern, but a concern pushed solely by it (or one far out of the concept’s context). This is thus a way in which the concept could channel European funding.

There appear more descriptions of territorial reality in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative than in the territorial cohesion metanarrative. The tightening of the gap between policy and reality, as framed by the general stories on the official policy directions, might thus be more cluttered in this usage area than the metanarrative portrays. In spite of their amount, some direct descriptions do not come up, such as the geographical concentrations of deprivation and the territorial model of a region. What is more, this narrative says nothing on polycentrism, which could indicate that insofar territorial specificities are concerned, the concept might be used as a passageway to get European spatial planning concerns in the European funds – and less so with polycentrism as substantive objective, as shown above. Such direct descriptions of territorial reality (e.g. territorial model of a region, polycentrism) could thus be territorial cohesion features.

Also in the narrative’s indirect descriptions of territorial reality the context of territorial cohesion differs from the concept. These descriptions developed since the start of the narrative by debating many different indicators. First voices rose that criticise the statistical straitjacket created by the European Council in which, for instance, the Structural Funds regime expresses regions in the statistical representation of NUTS II as dominant unit of analysis. From 2004 on these European funds stories did more than only promoting or criticising the indicator of GDP/capita though. They also endorsed (other) indicators for territorial imbalance. Territorial cohesion could hereby further open up this debate. This because the situation described in 2006 was that the European Parliament demanded new territorial indicators but that the European Commission just held options open while awaiting the faith of the Constitutional Treaty. And this Treaty did not include any other new particularly territorial element related to indicators except for territorial cohesion. The debate
about territorial indicators thus did not only develop both with territorial cohesion and in the concept’s financial context, but might also fit both together.

This debate thereby fell straight into the frame of the general stories on the European Union as a business. This by mentioning earmarking in relation with (measuring) how the Structural Funds contribute to the Lisbon Strategy and by often making the relationship between benchmarking and spatial development (e.g. as undertaken by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)); earmarking is hereby just stated as not a finalised process in this without dealing with the question from the framing and structuring stories how these funds and strategy relate.\textsuperscript{352} \textit{Nota bene}, these financial developments of the European funds and the possibility to further open the debate on territorial criteria with territorial cohesion become the more important, as the narrative, unlike the metanarrative, does touch upon the relationship between territorial reality and the activity of defining where funds go. Besides relating indicators to the identification of regional specificities and their acknowledgment through higher funding allowances, the European funds stories namely state that ESPON outcomes are considered as usable to develop more sophisticated criteria for the Structural Funds and that territorial criteria would be contemplated for Member States to allocate resources to regional programmes.\textsuperscript{353} This electrifies the concept’s context as a circuit into which territorial cohesion can be plugged.

Of course, neither territorial cohesion indicators nor a European Territorial Cohesion Index (ETCI) appeared in the electrification of the concept’s context; ESPON would have recommended EUROSTAT\textsuperscript{a} to elaborate target indices of social cohesion though.\textsuperscript{354} Moreover, the narrative does not appear to discuss a space to interconnect political and technical choices as the metanarrative does with its index, but merely mentions some relations between these activities.\textsuperscript{355} Another caveat for this is that these European funds stories often align with the general stories on the political organisation which frame the role for experts. That is to say, the European Commission would not want to leave the formulation of the criteria for allocating funds to analysts and ESPON could play a role in, for example, providing territorial analyses for European Union policy making. Although the context of territorial cohesion might help the concept to channel European funding, this is therefore far from a closed deal.

A possible expansion of the European funds’ area of action with the addition of territorial reality concerns might thus (again) more provide many ways to promote territorial cohesion than \textit{vice versa}. Still, the concept could do more than further opening the debate on indicators which developed in its context. It could namely with its European Territorial Cohesion Index bring a focus into the clutter of the uttered gap between policy and reality, even though it may thereby add some own features (e.g. polycentrism). Hence, instead of providing difficulties for evidence-based targeting as mentioned in the metanarrative, the concept could be a (small) step towards such a chanelling of European funding.

Territorial Impact Assessment appears to play a larger role in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative than in the territorial cohesion metanarrative. Albeit that the issue emerged in 1998 – which is before the EC’s Spatial and urban development subcommittee (SUD) studied it and well-before \textit{ex ante} impact assessment became obligatory for all Community policies – and discussion on this grew, the concern with it did not change.\textsuperscript{356} That is, the narrative mostly promotes Territorial Impact Assessment. This for instance by linking it to the principle of concentration to insure that the Structural Funds are not geographically or thematically spread too thinly.\textsuperscript{357} These European fund stories hereby also added to the electrified context of territorial cohesion (i.e. electrified by the territorial criteria for the allocation of funds; see above) by linking with the issue of specific territories. Funds

\textsuperscript{a} EUROSTAT is as a general service the EC’s Directorate-General for statistics.
could namely be invested where they have the greatest impact;\textsuperscript{358} perhaps this relates to the obligatory \textit{ex ante} impact assessment. THUS

However, through the years some statements undercut this support for Territorial Impact Assessment in various ways. To begin with, these European funds stories described some assessment fatigue in the Directorates-General (DGs) and that ESPON keeps Territorial Impact Assessment alive in a less technical manner.\textsuperscript{359} They also debated the impact that comes forth from the distribution of the financial resources from the European Union budget instead of (indirectly) other European Union interventions.\textsuperscript{360} These stories, moreover, downgraded the abovementioned larger role for Territorial Impact Assessment in the context of territorial cohesion. That is, in 2004 spatial impacts would not even have been talked about.\textsuperscript{361} More essentially though, while an account was that not all Member States have a tradition in Territorial Impact Assessment, its application is said to depend on the priorities set by the authorities.\textsuperscript{362} Even its origin was not free of criticism insofar it does not lay in Environmental Impact Assessment but in European spatial planning. It namely would, at least then, only be for large transnational projects.\textsuperscript{363} Hence, if the concept will mostly be used for Territorial Impact Assessment as the territorial cohesion stories declare, then it has a context in the European funds usage area already filled with arguments for and against it. The relationship of the concept to its context remains an unknown in the territorial cohesion stories though, as it could for instance matter that territorial cohesion more appears with the \textit{ex post} than \textit{ex ante} evaluation of policies.

In which the metanarrative’s stories might be more accurate than the ones of the narrative is that the inclusion of the concept in the Community Strategic Guidelines would add an emphasis on territorial capital. To be precise, since territorial capital appeared statically in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative, it did not only do this in 2002, a year later than the metanarrative, but also similarly and less so.\textsuperscript{364} Again, the general stories on the European Union as a business might for a clear-cut reality frame stories on territorial capital. This thus more so for the concept’s usage than for its context in the European Funds usage area; just as those on European spatial planning seem to do for direct descriptions of territorial reality. Even though the issue of territorial capital does not appear as a feature of the concept, an emphasis on this issue might therefore be a feature of territorial cohesion nonetheless. The ‘territorial specificities’ narrative thus indirectly reveals territorial cohesion’s emphasis on territorial capital for the European funds and directly reveals a promotion of Territorial Impact Assessment in the concept’s context – weakened from all sides though – in which the usage of it would fit.

F.4.4 The governal organisation of the territory in the jungle of discussions of the narratives with an own dynamic

The order of the narratives with an own dynamic differs from the one of the territorial cohesion metanarratives in that relatively more European funds stories treat organisational issues. Although most issues in the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative (i.e. the European territory, spatial approach, territorial dimension, substantive coordination, governing, processual coordination, territorial cooperation) are the same as in the metanarrative, they seem to have slightly different weights as well: all issues that side to the territorial, save for territorial cooperation, are less important (i.e. the territory, spatial approach, and territorial dimension).\textsuperscript{365} The emphasis on the processual appears thus more pronounced here, something which is not surprising without the mention of territorial cohesion which makes the stories less ‘territorial’ to begin with.\textsuperscript{366} Just as with the other narratives, the concept lands in long ongoing debates, here since 1987.\textsuperscript{367} Territorial cohesion’s organisational context is complex too, because these organisational issues far more often interrelate in this part of the usage area than in the territorial cohesion stories.\textsuperscript{368}
To treat this complex context of the concept, the line from more territorial to processual issues listed above will be followed below and thus be completed by the exemplary territorial cooperation.

The European funds stories discussed the territory well-before the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative did, even almost since the start of the similar narrative; whereby it first only related to spatial planning.\(^{369}\) A debate on territorial divisions emerged in the issue of the territory during the latest Structural Funds reform. Although the European funds stories thereby also considered the European Union without internal borders for the Structural Funds, the NUTS – which in the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative come forward as dominant unit of analysis – are discussed as scientifically seen the best but politically wise unwelcome territorial divisions;\(^{370}\) this might give the facilitating role of experts, as framed by the general stories on the political organisation, more cachet. Either way, the “un-State-like” organisation of the territory which is noted in the territorial cohesion stories thus clearly returns in their context. It thereby points towards the new third Structural Funds objective as promoting a stronger integration of the European Union territory in all its dimensions (see for territorial cooperation below).\(^{371}\) Hence, the organisational narrative’s territorial issue of the territory shows a way in which territorial cohesion could fit in the contextual debates of the European Funds usage area: suiting “un-State-like” territorial divisions which could include an important role for experts.

In the narrative also the spatial approach appears as a minor issue again, just as in the metanarrative. In the narrative it did even regularly so since 2004 (e.g. as territorial approach).\(^{372}\) The European funds stories thereby mostly debated whether this approach is successful in the Structural Funds.\(^{373}\) Yet, they also harbour a statement that is significant for territorial cohesion. That is, a territorial or space-based approach and territorial coordination through information and dialogue can help to translate territorial concepts into policies of the European Union and Member States with, for instance, the Community Strategic Guidelines in Cohesion policy and sectoral policies.\(^{374}\) Such a statement also shows how the spatial approach and substantive coordination can relate. Still, it does not envisage a great role for territorial cohesion due to the small role of the spatial approach in the context of this concept. Hence, the organisational narrative’s territorial issue of the spatial approach shows how territorial cohesion could not fit the contextual debates in the European Funds usage area so well. The spatial approach’s relative insignificance could namely drag the concept along.

A more discussed territorial issue in the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative is the territorial dimension, whose emergence stutters since in 1995 the European fund stories posed the problem that the national level is too small and the Community level too big.\(^{375}\) Almost ten years later the territorial dimension namely re-emerged at the time of the European Parliament’s resolution on the management of Regional policy and the Structural Funds. This with the call to embody a stronger spatial and sectoral targeting of resources and by shortly discussing the un/importance of State aid for Member States; the latter appears as in the territorial cohesion stories: scarcely.\(^{376}\) Only during (again) the latest reform of the Structural Funds the territorial dimension issue developed into a debate. Thereby it was promoted and its existence was questioned (e.g. in the Community Strategic Guidelines, the Structural Funds programmes, the investments in regions).\(^{377}\) Yet, the European fund stories also point out that the concept’s context could for the most part to be formed by different concerns. The European funds stories namely hold that many of the policies and funds that the metanarratives speak of are not primarily territorial but regional-economic if not sectoral (i.e. the Structural Funds, rural development and environmental directions, transport and energy networks, Leader and URBAN).\(^{378}\) Thus insofar it concerns the territorial dimension similar issues do appear in the context of territorial cohesion as with the concept, but in an essentially different way, that is, much less self-evident.
Another some significant point for territorial cohesion comes to the fore here as well, as the narrative’s stories reveal that the promotion of the territorial dimension might not so much be a political affair. That is to say, various approaches to introduce the territorial dimension into European Union policies would be proposed through mechanical and technical processes. Disagreeing examples of such approaches are: the broader axis of the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development might give a resting-place for the formal usage of territorial cohesion – if this axis affirms the report that it is completely territorial – and in the 2007-2013 funding period territorial cooperation would become the only territorial instrument (see below). Note that such processes that are not part of politics proper could rule out a space to interconnect political and technical choices as put forward with the European Territorial Cohesion Index. Hence, territorial cohesion could still offer possible paths to locate the territorial dimension within its primarily non-territorial context of the European funds (e.g. territorial development and challenges related to the informal Ministerial meeting in Luxembourg on regional policy and territorial cohesion). However, as the territorial dimension already appears in this context, the concept might for the incorporation it in the European Funds the concept merely be needed to interconnect political and technical choices instead of introducing the issue.

The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative did not immediately treat the issue of substantive coordination as the territorial cohesion stories did, since at the beginning, when the 2000-2006 Structural Funds period commenced, it related to the Community Initiatives (mostly Interreg). Thereafter, however, these European funds stories slowly started and later, during (yet again) the debates on the funds for the next period, their promotion of substantive coordination was amplified more in general, also indirectly when they picture a current situation of uncoordinatedess. What is particularly interesting for territorial cohesion is that some stories thereby attended to the watershed between agricultural funding and the Structural Funds. That is to say, there was neither a debate on whether an alignment of agricultural and regional policy objectives is a challenge nor on whether this should be done – e.g. their (by ESPON shown) inconsistencies qua financial allocations were even seen as logical consequence of their aims. Differences just appeared about how to do this. Although the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development are claimed to help out in providing consistency with other policies, other more territorial directions might better suit territorial cohesion than this agricultural base of its formal usage in the European funds. For instance, (informal) territorial development and the seldom issued territorial approach were put forward as well. This to, respectively, guide the political and strategic development of various agricultural policy measures and allow for coherence between rural and regional development policies (see below for a territorial management of funds). Clearly, European funds stories are concerned with substantive coordination, apparently with their own reasons, such as the now even wider portrayed watershed between agricultural funding and the Structural Funds.

However, in this narrative both the direct and indirect way of promoting substantive coordination appeared in a wider variation of informal policies, funds, and/or guidelines than around the watershed between agricultural funding and the Structural Funds. The financial gains thereby became especially clear in two European funds stories. One argued for horizontal substantive coordination that trade-off effects and inconsistencies between European Union sectoral policies would lead to an inefficient allocation of European Union resources and a reduction of policy effectiveness. The other expressed a concern of vertical substantive coordination with European Union policies to mobilise the largest amount of resources; hereby framed by the general story on money of “getting as much as possible”. When it concerns substantive coordination, it is thus hard to notice differences between territorial cohesion and its context.
The metanarratives showed that insofar territorial cohesion is concerned with substantive coordination it might have crossed the fuzzy line of in/formality (i.e. by locating European spatial planning in the middle of the Structural Funds). Now we can see that this situation could have a strange consequence. The integrated approach as a territorial cohesion definition might namely be so well-matched for its context in this usage area, that the concept could be difficult to recognise due to isomorphism – a form which could cohere with the French practice mentioned with le Fonds national d’aménagement et de développement du territoire (again, see below).

The oldest concern in this narrative is with governing, and it took almost ten years since 1987 for other concerns to also appear independently.\textsuperscript{390} The European funds stories hereby get increasingly more detailed on the management of the funds within the frame of the general stories on implementation (e.g. how to deal with the various levels).\textsuperscript{391} Perhaps the since 2004 voiced need of flexibility in following the rules (e.g. criteria and/or regulations) is thus not so much, as a territorial cohesion story posed, sought by the Member States in disagreement with the territorial cohesion approach. Instead, together with the asked for simplification of the delivery system, it just shows a (counter)movement in the management of European funds (e.g. against strict rules).\textsuperscript{392} What is more, the implementation principles which are noted in the general stories (i.e. programming, partnership, additionality, concentration) are here even stated to refer more to a management and implementation model of the Structural Funds than to a specific vision of territorial prospects.\textsuperscript{393} This thus underlines the regional-economic and sectoral character of the context of territorial cohesion in the European funds. It would also imply a major a redrawing of the picture of the concept’s usage, as concept could even be less important than portrayed above.

Notwithstanding the regional-economic and sectoral character of the concept’s context, it does show a debate on the degree in which the management of the Structural Funds is territorial.\textsuperscript{394} The narrative for example disclosed that in 1991 the regulations of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) included on DATAR’s insistence gave the European Commission the power to produce a schéma de développement de l'espace communautaire.\textsuperscript{395} This is not strange at all when you consider that the narrative exposes a more general relationship of aménagement du territoire to these funds – according to a backward story in 2006 already so since the end of the 1980s;\textsuperscript{396} thereby filling-in the stories on the European funds themselves which hold that DATAR heavily influenced these funds. The uttered search for new utilisation forms of the funds by according a special status to the financial and geographical lever effects of regional policy could likewise give a possible answer to the call of frequently improving the delivery mechanism.\textsuperscript{397} A territorial form of management (e.g. aménagement du territoire) might namely stack related problems. These are a lack of strategic and implementation capacity where needed (i.e. notice an absence of it on territorial levels) and, arguably, of keeping it simple while the mechanisms constantly change slightly (i.e. frame change through the territorial).\textsuperscript{398} When the context of territorial cohesion is more territorial than stories on its regional-economic and sectoral character tell, it would therefore differ less from the concept and be more open to it. Yet, this is thus debated for the management of European funds.

Albeit that the narrative debates the details and territorial character of the management of European funds, it hardly deals with the decision-making over them or formal State-like ways of doing in this;\textsuperscript{399} the narrative therefore appears more framed by the general stories on implementation than the ones on the political organisation. Even when its European funds stories for the 2007-2013 funding period discuss a renationalisation of the Structural Funds or a clear reflection of the overall European Union policy objectives in the allocation of resources instead, then they do this, unlike the metanarrative, indirectly via the new delivery or planning system.\textsuperscript{400} Perhaps the ways to (formally) decide on funds were already
established for the context of territorial cohesion (but not for the concept). Those few European funds stories that do touch upon these more political matters then regularly favour decentralisation. This for instance by remarking that the regions have no part in the definition of national strategies for European funds or that the support for the modernisation of regional development strategies is a main area of European Union intervention. Hence, through its own dynamic the governing issue seems to offer a fertile context to cultivate territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area insofar it harbours (French) territorial ways of managing funds. However, the governing issue also distances the concept from deciding were European funds go, as it does not often link to these matters. Moreover, it further reduces the role of territorial cohesion in this as well by supporting decentralisation, as lower levels have less to say in these matters, and by uncovering the implementation approach for which the Member States seek flexibility without mentioning the concept.

Although the balance in the ‘govermental organisation of the territory’ narrative might veer away from the more territorial issues, this context of territorial cohesion does not tip over to the purely processual side either. The European funds stories namely did not often deal with processual coordination. Moreover, when they did, this issue came solely forward with the partnership principle besides a few mentions of European spatial planning; hereby also affiliated to aménagement du territoire again with contrats de plan Etat-Région which mix the general stories on implementation and European spatial planning by aligning to both. For instance, during the debates on the new Structural Funds period, it was in 2004 observed that since 1988 significant and uneven progress has been made in strengthening the application of the partnership principle in the governance of the Structural Funds programmes. However, since then the treatment of the issue of processual coordination, and even the partnership principle, dimmed in this narrative. A simultaneous statement is though, that tripartite negotiations are a main area of European Union intervention for the European Union funding policy delivery mechanism. This thus seems to insinuate that the development in which concerns for processual coordination dimm might not hold for European funds, but only for the context of territorial cohesion within them. Hence, it could still be save to say that the concept does not so much have a purely processual but a territorially tainted organisational context.

The best example of this territorially tainted organisational context of the territorial cohesion could be the promotion of territorial cooperation. The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative began with issuing the transnational cooperation when the European Commission added it to cross-border co-operation in 1995 – first this was predominately about Interreg of course. The European funds stories then mostly back up this key issue, but also convey observations of the 2007-2013 Structural Funds debates that some Member States did not support territorial cooperation and that the financial commitments did not match the stress of both the European Commission and other Member States on it (see section 5.1.1). Because territorial cooperation is less undisputed in the context of territorial cohesion than with the concept, it also exemplifies that this context is less territorially tainted than the concept.

Then again, criticism on territorial cooperation paradoxically underlines support for it as well. This first happened with the statement that the formulation and execution of Interreg programmes was closed on all territorial levels. Later on this also happens more in detail by discussing the improvement of the coherence of zoning and limits for the amount of partners for territorial cooperation. More essential though, the regulations and Community Strategic Guidelines would not solve the typical restraints that hindered the effectiveness of territorial cooperation in the 2000-2006 funding period: the difficulty to qualify and quantify value for money and the intangible nature of outcomes. The narrative thereby also portrays how the development of the general stories on the European Union as a business frames this
organisation of territorial cooperation. Those regulations and guidelines would namely stress it linked to innovation, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), and entrepreneurship – these European funds stories even come up with something called 'entrepreneurship territorial pact'. However, seeing territorial cooperation as a part of the European Union business (e.g. as a way to manage measures) does not suggest how to change its uttered intangible nature and value for money, nor how to organise its demarcations (e.g. not closed ones). Still, debates about territorial cooperation do not dispute it, but their support of territorial cooperation make this context of territorial cohesion more familiar to the concept.

Notwithstanding the difficulties of territorial cooperation, the strategic projects of this new third Structural Funds objective were put forward to link with governing issues. This as a site to improve European territorial governance in absentia by developing common approaches, networks, and integrated developments; perhaps the development of the European Union as a business partially fills the void here, also because it was noticed that DG Regio sees territorial cooperation as relating the Lisbon Strategy and Cohesion policy. While the European funds stories never gave more weight to one of the territorial cooperation types (i.e. crossborder, interregional, transnational), it is still according to them the trans-European dimension which plays a key role in promoting better territorial governance in the European Union (e.g. away from formal State-like ways of doing). Territorial cooperation might thus in various ways play a pivotal role when (French) territorial ways of managing funds provide a fertile context to cultivate territorial cohesion.

The transnational kind of territorial cooperation is not only mentioned more often through the years and related to the improvement of territorial governance, but it also seems to have a privileged relationship with European spatial planning. This relationship thus appears without the mention of territorial cohesion. Just as territorial cohesion does not have to locate European spatial planning within the Structural Funds to cross the usage area’s fuzzy line of in/formality, European spatial planning therefore does not need the concept to form an activity at the fringes of the European funds either. In the narrative a debate on such a role for European spatial planning comes forward too. It is namely claimed that the Ministers responsible for spatial development will play a key role in applying territorial cooperation, but also that the new third Structural Funds objective does not refer to spatial planning and that the application of the ESDP through its Interreg predecessor was mixed. Hence, in the own dynamic of the narrative a possibility opens up whereby European spatial planning might indeed disappear in trans- and infranational practice as the framing and structuring stories suggest.

However, when European spatial planning dissappears thus territorial cohesion does not necessarily take its place as argued in the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ metanarrative. This could be even more probable for the inter-regional than transnational cooperation type territorial cooperation. The territorial cohesion stories namely disagree on whether inter-regional coeopration relates to the concept; the more so if a European funds story is correct in that itis more thematic (e.g. instead of geographical). The own dynamic of territorial cooperation, the crown issue of territorial cohesion, thus does not so much put itself into question but discusses its form in various ways, such as the difficulties with its intangible nature and value for money and the adjustments for its demarcations. Also possibilities to improve territorial governance come to the fore with ways of doing for the European funds that are in accordance with the European Union as a business and European spatial planning and perhaps both in combination on the transnational level. Then again, European spatial planning could also disappear from the concept’s context formed by territorial cooperation, and this without a territorial cohesion sneak route. This would thus essentially change the picture of in the European Funds usage area.
F.4.5 Redrawing territorial cohesion channels with the narratives

The narratives with an own dynamic change the picture the metanarratives drew of the European Funds usage area. The narratives namely clarify that the ungathered masses of different positions in the metanarratives are surrounded by the even greater masses of the likewise ordered European funds stories. Metaphorically speaking, the general stories of the European Funds usage area thereby might not so much point to territorial cohesion as a calm spot amidst heavy weather (see §F.1.3), but frame the concept as a sheet floating above the large forming currents of financial events. The stories on territorial cohesion and the European funds themselves thereby structure how funding might go through the tangent plane. The metanarratives and narratives then bring the details of this to the fore. As shown below by the ways in which the concept’s context gives opportunities and obstacles for the promotion of it, points to instrumental usages of territorial cohesion and its own features, how ungathered masses can expand the European funds’ area of action, and what the consequences of this are for how the concept channels European funds.

The narratives thereby portray the same kind of picture of an ungathered mass of different issues as the metanarratives do. Both by looking alike and by differing slightly, the concept’s context in the European Funds usage area then gives some opportunities for the promotion of territorial cohesion. The narratives for instance present contextual opportunities for territorial cohesion with their territorially tainted organisational issues. This because they thereby offer a warm welcome for the concept with similar “un-State-like” territorial divisions and a suiting display of (French) territorial ways of managing funds. Territorial cooperation could lend a hand in this too due to its additional role of improving territorial governance. Moreover, the concept might also enter the lively debate on Territorial Impact Assessment and get familiar with some difficulties for territorial cooperation.

However, the narrative mostly presents obstacles for the promotion of territorial cohesion. The substantive objective of the environment for instance seems to provide less opportunities then the metanarratives picture. It namely appears to be more occupied with other concerns than the one which attracts territorial cohesion to become formal (i.e. sustainability). An obstacle that comes from the narratives more clearly, is that they appear to situate the concerns with economic and social cohesion outside this usage area while these are more important for formalisation. They also mirror the concept’s own out of place formal status with their relative silence on services. Obstacles also rise due to reasons that are not related to formalisation. The role of territorial cohesion could for instance diminish when it would depend on the spatial approach to translate the concept in the European funds, as this approach is rather insignificance. The same holds for the dependence of territorial cohesion on its relationship to both agricultural funding and the Structural Funds, as the differences between, respectively, supporting rural or more urban areas are widening. All in all the context of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area thus does not appear very receptive for the concept.

The narratives do bring possibilities to light for concerns to use territorial cohesion instrumentally. That is to say, the many debates in the concept’s context that are similar to it reveal both the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action and the ungathered masses of different positions independently from the concept. Then again, in this large overlap most issues seem rather to signify territorial cohesion for their reinforcement within the in/formally established European funds’ area of action instead of signifying an expansion of it. The concept is for instance not so much used to make specific territories beneficiaries of the European funds, but to let them retain their funding. Nonetheless, issues that would certainly represent courses to expand the European funds’ area of action come up where the narratives indirectly point to own features of territorial cohesion, as these are not (yet) part of this area of action.
However, these own features of territorial cohesion appear to be scarce, as the territorial cohesion stories merely lay more emphasis on some concerns than the European funds stories do. That is, more emphasis on: i) supporting all regions in the promotions of specific territories, ii) polycentrism as direct description of territorial reality and substantive objective (an emphasis that is framed by the general stories on European spatial planning), and iii) territorial capital as clear-cut assumed reality that fits the idea of the European Union as a business. Moreover, that the territorial cohesion stories more discuss economic and social cohesion than their European funds context could mean that the concept does not expand this area of action thus; what becomes the more probable when these substantive objectives have disputed relationships to the new Structural Funds objectives of convergence and (regional) competitiveness and employment. Only one expansion route of the European funds’ area of action appears via the promotion of territorial cohesion. This is through the further opening of the debate on indirect descriptions of territorial reality with a territorial cohesion indicator and through a focus in this gap between policy and reality with a European Territorial Cohesion Index (e.g. for evidence-based targeting). Hence, not only do most issues that appear with territorial cohesion also appear in its context, but this also mostly in the same way.

The narratives’ stories thus do not portray the same but a largely similar picture of ungathered masses of different issues when compared to the metanarrative. It therefore comes as no surprise that they largely uphold that the concept does not channel European funds because this (i.e. the narratives’ working hypothesis). That mostly the same issues appear, and more and since longer promoted and discussed, namely mostly entails that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without the concept. Expansions of the European funds’ area of action seem mostly to depend on the events that are fundamental for this usage area though. The narratives namely do not show how the context of territorial cohesion redirects funds and even further distance the concept from the major reshufflings of them. The changing winds then pilot the leeway. Yet, all of this does not necessarily affirm that the channels with which territorial cohesion could channel European funding would also do so without what the appearance of territorial cohesion no place would be surprising.

With such complicated and large overlaps and slight differences of the metanarratives and narratives, the question becomes what the consequences of this are for how the concept channels European funds (i.e. this appendix’ leading question) – or rather, following the structured undefinedness of territorial cohesion and the similar narratives, how it does not. The three situations to distinguish in this are when: i) the concept and its context are the same, ii) the concept differs from its context by not treating an issue, iii) the concept differs from its context by treating an issue. Territorial cohesion merely underlines a channelling of funds when it is the same as its context when it for instance concerns funds for competitiveness, polycentrism, a specific territory, territorial cooperation, focussing substantive objectives with horizontal substantive coordination. This can even hold if a channelling would have appeared in the metanarratives before the narratives – which indicates possible influences of territorial cohesion on its context. To give a negative example of this: by depicting multifocality similar to the one in the metanarratives, the narratives neither substantively clarify the European funds’ aims. The concept could namely have done the digging here, but the channel that channels funds might also remain there without the mention of territorial cohesion.

Where the concept and its context overlap the narratives also cut down ways in which territorial cohesion could channel funds. The narratives for instance increase the risk that the
only formal usage of territorial cohesion that chooses between specific territories overstretches the concept. Besides that the narratives show a wider watershed between agricultural funding and the (urban) Structural Funds, they namely also list specificities of rural areas directly from territorial reality as an isolated resting-place for an extension of alike (combined) territorial cohesion concerns (e.g. with farming systems and landscape, mountain pastures, agricultural and forestry products). Another overlapping situation appears with the own dynamic of the issue of territorial cooperation. That is to say, territorial cooperation does not clearly cut down this possible way through which the concept could channel funds, but merely discusses its form. Yet, these discussions do voice a disappearance of European spatial planning without territorial cohesion as a replacement too. This would cut off this route for the concept’s influence in twofold (i.e. neither directly nor indirectly via European spatial planning). The overlaps between the narratives and metanarratives thus in many ways show how the concept does not channel European funds.

Dissimilarities between the metanarratives and narratives might, in their turn, show how territorial cohesion could channel funds. In many instances the concept does not treat an issue of its larger European funds context. Yet, this implies a choice in concerns but not directly in a channelling of funds; at most an absence of possibilities to do so, or even a way in which not the concept but its context channels funds. Territorial cohesion could channel European funds due to the concept’s own features of a territorial cohesion indicator and European Territorial Cohesion Index though. However, that the concept can thereby easily channel European funds when it would link in its near options for this in the usage area depends more on its context then on the concept. This context namely actually debates territorial criteria while the concept merely links a territorial cohesion indicator and index to not poor territories. Another possibility for territorial cohesion to channel European funds comes up with investing where funds have the greatest impact (e.g. an evidence-based targeting). Again, this runs that territorial cohesion mostly appears with ex post evaluations of policies and that in its context Territorial Impact Assessment is weakened from all sides. Hence, the narratives mostly cut down ways in which territorial cohesion could channel European funds.

The only possibility for the substantively and territorially vacillating concept to channel European funds appears through its substantively multifocal context: via territorial criteria and, if related to this, territorial cooperation. Nonetheless, the narratives indirectly underline the importance of the Constitutional Treaty as basis for formal usages of the concept to channel funds. They namely also increase territorial cohesion’s risk of overstretching by channelling agricultural funds with the concept’s major existing formal usage. Perhaps the direction to which a structuring story points might thus be followed here: question all these implementation oriented debates because a political debate on territorial cohesion needs other ways.

The ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative is then extra significant for the comparison between metanarratives and narratives. Not only because it is relatively more important than the alike metanarrative, but also because its own dynamic in the European funds could come closest to a revelation of how the concept relates to spheres of political debate. However, what is telling for this usage area, is that the issues discussed distance the concept even further from decision-making. They could be indicative in spite of this, but not by giving a glimpse of proper political debates though, as the defining where funds go hardly comes forward through them. The narrative’s support for decentralisation and exposure of the Member States that seek flexibility for a general rather then territorial cohesion implementation approach can for instance cut down the role for the concept. This narrative’s issues could instead show how to channel funds more downstream where funding passes through the machinery of implementation. The narrative namely follows the general stories
on the European Union as business more than the metanarrative does and this could guide the
leeway for territorial cohesion to channel European funds. That is to say, the less directed the
funding comes from the top (i.e. with multiple foci), the more influence the downstream
drainage area can have.

For such an influence downstream the European funds it should then become clear
whether the concept can contribute to a changed attitude towards stakeholders at territorial
levels (e.g. with broad facultative guidelines and an undefined concept). Moreover, it should
also became clear whether territorial cohesion can be significant insofar this changed attitude
overlaps with seeing the European Union as a business. The links between such concerns and
those issues that do channel European funds thus become important. Therefore the need
arises to clarify how the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative connects with the
other ones and thereby gives room for territorial cohesion to influence the streams of funds
(e.g. through transnational European spatial planning or the concept’s urban bias in territorial
cooperation).

F.5 Stories relating the narratives with an own dynamic in the European Funds
usage area

F.5.1 Connected narratives as messier ball of old wool

Also in the European Funds usage area the separate narratives make clear that the debates
shoved under territorial cohesion have their own dynamics without the concept as well. This
strengthens the largely negative answer to this appendix’ leading question of how the concept
channels European funds: it does not and probably will not. The narratives nonetheless
affirmatively nuance that the drive to expand the European funds’ area of action with
territorial cohesion shows an ungathered mass of different positions (i.e. the second general
hypothesis). They namely portray larger ungathered masses of different positions and how the
drive to expand might instrumentally use the concept in this. Moreover, this ungatheredness
might order such an expansion with the concept. The treatment of the European funds stories
that connect the narratives adds to this picture.

Where the connected narratives of course correct some lines that are drawn above, as
shown below if needed. The connections between the ‘governal organisation of the territory’
narrative and the others are namely mostly treated to trace the tracks of possibilities for the
concept to influence the channelling of the largely multidirectional – or even directionless –
European funds more downstream. However, with a concept that hitherto appears so
insignificant for the funds as territorial cohesion, a working hypothesis could better be: the
connected narratives with an own dynamic show how the concept’s context hampers a
channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream.

Just as the orders of the metanarratives and narratives in which, respectively, the
territorial cohesion and European funds stories differ and overlap are the same (as shown in
Schema 2a and 3a), the same order holds for the ways in which both form bundles through
connections too. The ones between the narratives thereby amplify the larger role for
territorial organisational issues in the concept’s context. Their only development namely was
that the connection between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the
territory’ narratives started to dominate since the debates on the new Structural Funds period
in 2004. Perhaps this development has something to do with the possibilities for territorial
cohesion to influence the European funding downstream as shown in the concept’s context.
Yet, whether this is the case, and whether the connected narratives hamper such a channelling
more in general, does not depend on their order but on the discussions in the European funds
stories that connect the narratives. These stories are schematised below in Schema 3b ‘Stories
relating narratives in the European Funds usage area with an own dynamic’.
### Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive objectives</th>
<th>Territorial specificities</th>
<th>Governance organisation of the territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Planning, development, management, implementation</td>
<td>- Transport infrastructure projects</td>
<td>- Involves public, private and民间 organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economic and social development, regional competitiveness and employment objective</td>
<td>- Improve access to information society priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved access to infrastructure priority</td>
<td>- Improve access to information society priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban development</td>
<td>- Improved access to infrastructure priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.
- The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.

---

### Territorial Specificities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive objectives</th>
<th>Territorial specificities</th>
<th>Governance organisation of the territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Planning, development, management, implementation</td>
<td>- Transport infrastructure projects</td>
<td>- Involves public, private and民间 organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economic and social development, regional competitiveness and employment objective</td>
<td>- Improve access to information society priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved access to infrastructure priority</td>
<td>- Improve access to information society priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban development</td>
<td>- Improved access to infrastructure priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.
- The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.

---

### Governance Organisation of the Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive objectives</th>
<th>Territorial specificities</th>
<th>Governance organisation of the territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Planning, development, management, implementation</td>
<td>- Transport infrastructure projects</td>
<td>- Involves public, private and民间 organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economic and social development, regional competitiveness and employment objective</td>
<td>- Improve access to information society priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved access to infrastructure priority</td>
<td>- Improve access to information society priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban development</td>
<td>- Improved access to infrastructure priority</td>
<td>- Involves national, regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.
- The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.

---

### Example

- **Narrative:** The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.
- **Territorial Specificities:** The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.
- **Governance Organisation of the Territory:** The narratives are adapted to the EU's Interreg guidelines and updated EC's Territorial Agenda proposals.
gramme documents on readiness among public authorities and private beneficiaries.

300 million for SF Objective 3, 500 million for Cohesion Fund.

Policy regulations with emphasis on dimension but primarily SF Objectives 1 and 2.

Interregional cooperation in national development objective respecting territorial balance.

EU region approach contribution of all regions.

Cohesion policy has strong indirect impacts on selection of priorities.

Cohesion policy contributes to rural development.

EU must concentrate limited financial means on convergence.

Axon tools show refashioning of business model.

Territorial State and Member States'/regions' territories.

Regional policies highlight improving attractability.

Urban strategies by spatial approach which reinforces proactive planning in development decisions.

Urban and rural interface.

EU accession instruments.

European framework for integrated strategies and enhanced strategic alliances.

Urban and rural poles.

Territorial planning approaches reflecting national models.

Transnational urban poles.

Territorial axis.

Perspectives of EU.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.

Territorial ownership.

Territorial cooperation.

Territorial challenge.
After Schema 3a above showed the emergence of ungathered masses of European funds stories since the Single European Act (SEA) in 1986, it comes as no surprise that many of them connect the narratives. Even though European funds stories only connected narratives since almost ten years after the narratives emerged, this is from early on when you compare this to the emergence of the territorial cohesion stories. The concept’s context in the European Funds usage area thus seems to reveal an even messier ball of wool than the connected metanarratives. In combination with the situation in which the orders of territorial cohesion and its context are similar, this opens up the room for many differences in the substantive details.

The differences that are already found in the separate narratives could be a starting-point to search for details that are essential for how territorial cohesion could channel European funds. This because the connections between the narratives seem to compare to the connected metanarratives as the separate ones do (e.g. there are more European funds stories and they are older). Below the connected narratives are therefore compared to the connected metanarratives before a first glance, road towards formality, and relevant ways of doing come from the comparison between the separate and connected narratives. This to finally finish the picture of the European Funds usage area with these additional findings from the connected narratives.

F.5.2 Trailing territorial cohesion’s funding channels by comparing the connected narratives to the connected metanarratives

Here it is not about the detailed information which the European funds stories that connect the narratives add to the separate ones (i.e. much). Instead, it is about the differences that matter because they correct the already drawn picture of the European Funds usage area and/or show how the concept’s context hampers or gives possibilities for a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream. The above-made comparison between the narratives and metanarratives could be a good point to start the search for such essential substantial differences in the connected narratives.

However, this might be a step too fast, especially when organisational concerns link with substantive or territorial priorities. That is to say, also the connections between the narratives can correct the depiction of the connections that bundle the metanarratives. The connected narratives can therefore also correct the findings on how the concept channels European funds and thus the starting-point to search for essential substantial differences in the connected narratives. This should be clear before the ways in which the connected narratives could hamper or give possibilities to the concept’s channelling can be traced with a focus which is derived from the separate narratives.

Compared to both the separate narratives and (connected) metanarratives, all the relevant trails in the connected narratives emerged during the debates on the new Structural Funds period (unless explicitly stated otherwise below). While hereby all the mentioned European funds stories signify what could be posed, none are the only one standing and substantively seen all can be varied with (e.g. some are even contradicted). Thus, the picture that is drawn of the bundle of metanarratives will thus be corrected by its well-connected context, this when it concerns a Cohesion policy for all regions, State aid, and territorial cooperation as shown below respectively.
The connected narratives can correct the portrayal of the connected metanarratives just as with the comparison of the separate ones: by showing the ways in which features that are presented as belonging to the concept also appear without the mention of territorial cohesion. A way in which European funds stories connect the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives follows this path, as it discusses a with territorial cohesion disputed broadening of funding streams by a Cohesion policy for all regions. Moreover, the descriptions of an all-region approach were mostly national instead of European. They for instance emphasise the contribution of all regions to national development and growth and that countries where regional disparities are perceived as negligible would shift to this approach, or, if not so perceived, that countries do so due to the negative economic cycle around 2005 and the difficulties to maintain sustainable economic growth in even the wealthiest and economic strongest regions. When it concerns a Cohesion policy for all regions, the similarity between territorial cohesion and European funds stories thus suggests that such an all-region approach is not a feature of the concept.

Despite the correction of this territorial cohesion feature, something is in accordance with the posed effect of the concept qua channelling of funds. This is that the all-region approach seems to manifest itself in the Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment, that is, the objective for which these European funds stories mentioned all regions or those that do not qualify for the convergence objective as eligible. Still, besides that the all-region approach is a disputed territorial cohesion concern, it is questionable whether it actually is the concept that influences the usage of an all-region approach for competitiveness in Cohesion policy as suggested by the metanarratives. The connected narratives more portray the concern as a wave for territorial cohesion to ride on than a characterising trait of the concept. It might be save to say though, that an all-region approach more presents an opportunity for territorial cohesion to channel European funding than that it shows how the concept’s context hampers this.

When it concerns State aid, the connected narratives do appear to clearly correct the options that are mentioned for territorial cohesion instead of merely questioning the concept’s influence; this even though they, just as the territorial cohesion stories do, expose debates on regional State aid and the concerned European Funds stories go against the uniform application of the provisions for some territories (here peripheral or least developed regions). The connections made between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives namely decrease the financial importance of regional State aid in this usage area. The connecting stories do this by both stating that regional State aid is a small part of the overall national spending in regions and by for the Community level promoting the reduction of it in eligible areas. That not that many European funds stories are on State aid places the debates on this mostly outside the European Funds usage area too, what further decreases the probability that the concept will channel funds thus. Hence, territorial cohesion might more downstream not only not channel funds indirectly through (regional) State aid, but have a hard time gaining weight through this better known debate as well. However, the by the connected narratives presented lessening of the importance of State aid for territorial cohesion thereby does not exemplify how its context hampers a channelling of European funds through the concept, merely how it could remove a possibility.

With the issue of territorial cooperation the connected narratives even go beyond offering an opportunity for territorial cohesion to channel funds. This in a paradoxical way, as the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives underline that features belong to the concept by showing how they also appear without territorial cohesion. The concerned European funds stories namely gave territorial cooperation an urban bias, but a bias to other territories or combinations of them as well (e.g. differentiated according to wealth). The concept’s context therefore both
emphasises that only having an urban bias in territorial cooperation is a territorial cohesion feature and replicates it.

In a similar fashion the connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives support the concept’s linkage of territorial cooperation with the other two Structural Funds objectives. Also here this linkage appears in the European funds stories (with an emphasis on interregional cooperation), what indicates that it is not solely a feature of territorial cohesion, but that the concept’s context can also make this linkage firmer. Moreover, hereby not only balance and competitiveness come up, as the European funds stories express all substantive objectives in this linkage – except for the one of polycentrism that is (which scarcely plays a role in the connected narratives). An expansion of the disputed formal room to debate territorial cohesion concerns in territorial cooperation through the other two new Structural Funds objectives could therefore lean on the part of the concept’s context that gives this leeway.

All in all, with territorial cooperation the connected narratives do not show how the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion. Quite the contrary, it forms favourable circumstances. This by replicating also the urban bias in territorial cooperation and by backing how territorial cooperation links to the other two 2007-2013 Structural Funds objectives. In both ways European funding can then be channelled more downstream to debate territorial cohesion. Insofar the connected narratives are compared to the connected metanarratives they thus do not show that the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). This context namely at most removes a possibility for this with State aid, if it does not support or gives opportunities instead with an all-region approach, urban bias of territorial cooperation, and by linking territorial cooperation to the other two 2007-2013 Structural Funds objectives.

F.5.3 Trailing territorial cohesion’s funding channels by comparing the connected narratives to the separate ones: first glance

Perhaps by comparing the connected narratives to the separate narratives some ways come to the fore in which the concept’s context does hamper a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion more downstream. Yet, not every time a connecting European funds story corrects the findings from the separate narratives a channelling of European funding through territorial cohesion needs to be hampered (or supported). After infrastructure and partnership are touched upon as examples of corrections that do not influence such a channeling of European funding, Territorial Impact Assessment and territorial criteria are treated as instances that do point to such an influence.

The findings on the substantive objective of infrastructure and the organisational issue of partnership which come from the separate narratives call for some correction. Although infrastructure does not have a prominent place in the separate or connected narratives, it was nonetheless regularly mentioned, mostly for specific territories or as one of many on a list of concerns. Partnership might, on the contrary, be less important in the European Funds usage area than portrayed in the separate ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative, since before 2004 this concern hardly came forward in the connections. This suggests that the issue of partnership could not only dim in the concept’s context, but also that it is not well-knit into the usage area’s fabric (e.g. making the dimming easier). The picture of infrastructure and partnership in this usage area should thus be changed slightly. Yet, these changes would have no influence on a possible channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion, as both seem to play a minor role for the concept.

Also the lively debate on Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) which is shown by the separate ‘territorial specificities’ narrative does not appear to be tightly knit into the European
Funds usage area, as it hardly relates to issues of the other narratives. Although this holds for the issue of Territorial Impact Assessment just as for the one of partnership, those few times that Territorial Impact Assessment does relate to these other concerns in the concept’s context might still be noteworthy nonetheless. This because independently seen the debate could already be important enough for territorial cohesion due to the alternatives it can offer for a channelling of European funds with the concept (e.g. evidence-based targeting by investing where funds have the greatest impact). The question then is how an issue that is loosely knit into this usage area could open up funding channels for territorial cohesion.

A backward looking European funds story that connects the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives appears to go against possibilities for territorial cohesion to channeling European funding with Territorial Impact Assessment. The ESDP would namely have proposed that Member States further develop national regulations and instruments related to Territorial Impact Assessment for large infrastructure or water management projects or in transborder situations; this parallels the critique in the debate of the separate ‘territorial specificities’ narrative, which posed that it involves large transnational projects. When territorial cohesion would be concerned with Territorial Impact Assessment, it therefore might not deal with these “large projects”, because the connecting stories in the concept’s context hardly mentioned these assessments – and when they did, they suggest “an outside” of the European Funds usage area which does deal with this. In so doing the concept’s context could thus be said to hamper a channelling of funds through territorial cohesion.

However, it are the separate narratives (i.e. the same context) that gives territorial cohesion the possibility to channel European funding with Territorial Impact Assessment in the first place. Moreover, the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives even present an alternative route by explaining how to focus funding channels. That is to say, they state that proposals or applications for the approval of European Union programme delivery that are based on ex ante evaluations, which contain qualitative data and the analysis of support measures relating to investment willingness and readiness among public authorities and private beneficiaries, would compel European Commission services to develop truly integrated administrative and financial programming measures. This is a clear opening for territorial cohesion to channel European funds with Territorial Impact Assessment. Hence, the connected narratives do not so much show how the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion with this issue. The connections only narrow down the possibilities the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative gives with Territorial Impact Assessment as badly attached issue. Because they do not treat “large projects”, there is only room left for mundane but perhaps more plentiful “small projects”.

While the separate narratives mostly cut down the ways in which territorial cohesion could channel European funding, another possibility they give is via territorial criteria for the European funds. However, the European funds stories that connect the narratives reduce the scope of this, because they do not often discuss territorial criteria. Those times they do, which is in the connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives, they are concerned with the new Structural Funds objective of (regional) competitiveness and employment. If the concept will channel European funding with its own features of territorial cohesion indicators and/or index by linking to the discussion on territorial criteria in its context, such a usage of the concept might therefore be confined to competitiveness and substantive objectives that relate to this.

A consequence of this substantive focus appears when a side-discussion is taken into account which is scarcely hinted at in the connected narratives. That is, the apparent role of policy makers to select the descriptions of territorial reality when it concerns a European
Territorial Cohesion Index, an index which could give a space to relate technical and political choices. In the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives, European funds stories namely put Member States forward to identify the best indicators for a territorial allocation of funds and/or also regions to choose the appropriate mix of investment according to their assessed strengths and weaknesses. Although both statements assert decentralisation, they leave open whether Member States and/or regions assess their territorial reality through own (more or less direct) descriptive categories or through ones that come from the European Union. When territorial cohesion channels European funding through territorial criteria, this setting of the criteria to assess territories of course influences such a channeling greatly.

In the European Funds usage area, a self-assessment of Member States with descriptive criteria from the European Union seems to be more probable. The European funds story that connects all narratives illustrates this: the thematic eligibility for the appointment of various European objectives would allow States and regions to validate their territories (to reinforce their accessibility). A European funds story then makes an interesting claim when it connects the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives. That is to say, the Structural Funds would have facilitated a bottom-up policy design with descriptions from those in the affected territories. However, these descriptions might not be defined bottom-up, but only be filled-in at lower levels. The question therefore is how bottom-up a policy design is if it uses “building blocks” that are made at the European Union level. In the case of a channeling of European funds through territorial cohesion more downstream with territorial criteria, the focus in descriptions of territorial reality might then lay on competitiveness and related substantive objectives. Still, such conditions do not hamper the possible channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion, they merely narrow down the funding streams. That territorial criteria are less discussed in the concept’s context than appeared in the separate narratives does hamper such a channelling though.

F.5.4 Trailing territorial cohesion’s funding channels by comparing the connected narratives to the separate ones: road towards formality

A condition for territorial cohesion to channel European Funds, besides the need for possibilities to appear for it in the concept’s usage, is the formality of such of the concept. It would be surprising if the connected narratives treat a channeling of European funds more downstream though (e.g. to hamper it). The concept’s paths to formality in the European funds namely consider the substantive objectives of the environment, economic and social cohesion, and services instead of the relevant organisational issues. Still, the connected narratives correct how territorial cohesion can be used with these substantive objectives, which are therefore treated before the formal usage of the concept for agricultural funding is corrected.

Even though it does not have to do with organisational concern, an increase in weight of the sustainability issue due to the connected narratives could benefit the formalisation of territorial cohesion nonetheless. That is to say, the concept’s context does not so much focus on environmental concerns other than this issue. A European funds story that connects all narratives for instance claims that Cohesion policy has strong indirect territorial impacts with ‘sustainable development’ as a governance concept which is introduced and/or promoted by the European Union; hereby a manner to channel funds more downstream of particular importance for territorial cohesion comes to the fore as well: with governance concepts. Moreover, although the connecting stories never link sustainability to the organisational concern of the territorial dimension as the territorial cohesion stories do, its context does not hamper a channelling of funds with this linkage either. Although a linkage of sustainability and the territorial dimension seems a feature of the concept, here these two concerns thus
regularly appear separately. The connected narratives therefore appear to support the environment as a path to formalise territorial cohesion, and consequentially show a way in which the concept’s context provides a possibility to channel European funding with it.

The connected narratives reflect a way in which the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion as shown in the separate narratives as well. This is by hardly discussing economic and social cohesion. What is more, here the stories even point out how important this outside of the European Funds usage area is in which the connecting stories of the concept’s context put these twin cohesion concerns, and thus how insignificant territorial cohesion is for the European funds. That is to say, a report which connects the ‘substantive objective’ and ‘governal organisation of territory’ narratives held that the Community Strategic Guidelines deal with the territorial dimension in passing while economic and social cohesion are central. The connected narratives thus appear to remove economic and social cohesion as a path to formalise territorial cohesion, and therefore reflect a way in which the concept’s context can hamper a channelling of European funds with it.

The connected narratives do not only support and remove paths towards the formalisation of territorial cohesion, they also point to an awkward situation. Services namely came up pretty regularly in the European funds stories that connect the narratives. Although this does not make the issue dominate the debate, it does correct the picture drawn by the separate narratives: the formal status of services for a usage of territorial cohesion is not out of place in the European funds at all. The awkwardness of the situation then lies in that the concept does not focus on services in the European funds usage area. Moreover, even though services often appear as one of the many concerns when all narratives connect (as with infrastructure as substantive objective), it was also often about the provision of services in (e.g. peripheral, rural, urban) or between (i.e. urban and rural) certain territories; this in the connections between the ‘substantive objectives’ and territorial specificities’ narratives. This doubles the awkwardness of the situation, because such a linkage coheres with a ‘territories/accessibility’ metanarrative of the Regional/Cohesion policy usage area. The presented possibilities to use the appropriate formal status of services are thus not used by territorial cohesion to channel of European funding.

Hence, the connected narratives do not by themselves show how the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion by blocking its paths to formality. However, they do reflect the separate narratives by showing how the relevant issues of economic and social cohesion are discussed outside the European Funds usage area. They also display how, despite this, the context might nevertheless support the concept’s path to formality via the issue of sustainability. This even even relates to governance concepts as a way to channel funds more downstream. Yet, most strange here is that territorial cohesion does not take the path to formality of services, not even when related to specific territories.

Just as for the possibilities for a formal usage of territorial cohesion in the European funds, the connected narratives also correct the picture of the concept’s existing formal usage, that is, for agricultural funding. Where the separate narratives portray such a usage as isolated, it rather appears to have an own separate part in the connected narratives, especially so since the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development were published in 2006. The European funds stories that connect the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives characterise this part. This by seldom combining the issues of the concept’s minor but official (i.e. services) and main formal usage (i.e. agricultural funding), but often relating rural areas to the environment (already in 1999), economic diversification, and territorial balance. Perhaps the role of territorial cohesion therefore would not diminish as the separate narratives portray, but schism in the European funds instead. The consequences of this of course increase when a channeling of European funds through the
concept depends on the relationship it has with agricultural funding and the more urban Structural Funds. In its context the concept can namely strongly lean on both kinds of funds while they are differing further.

With such schisming, it could become more relevant how still to relate these kinds of funding. It therefore is no surprise that the European funds stories which connect the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives stress the inconsistence between the financial allocations of Agricultural and Cohesion policies and debate horizontal substantive coordination (e.g. as un/solvable); the only deviation hereby was that the introduction of direct payments and the allocation of a larger share of resources to rural development would have had improved their coordination.445 The schisming between agricultural and Structural funding therefore appears to be well noted in the context of territorial cohesion.

What could complex matters for territorial cohesion even beyond such a tense coordination, is that there is clearly pointed to the situation more downstream. That is to say, not only the territorial impacts of European agricultural funding are labelled as strong, but the completely territorial axis of the Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development are put forward as meant to be decentral per Member State – this while different approaches to rural areas in the European Union are acknowledged as well.446 The possibilities to channel agricultural funds with territorial cohesion which hereby open up more downstream therefore leave much room for variation.

An approach that could be suiting for a schmising, complex, and possibly varying situation is often mentioned in these connecting stories: the Leader approach. The Leader approach was thereby asserted as being bottom-up, integrated, innovative, and concerned with local governance.447 When it is considered that the Leader Community Initiative will be financed through the mainstream rural development programmes, something of the connected narratives becomes the more telling for an extension of the concept between Agricultural funding and the more urban Structural Funds. That is, the connecting stories even cater for both the horizontal substantive coordination and the opening up of the complexity more downstream by regularly bringing forward the issue of urban-rural relationships.448 When the Structural Funds are more urban, agricultural funding more rural, and this difference lower levels could have the task of coordination them, a focus un urban-rural relationships thereby seems sensible indeed. A development in this focus is that until 2004 urban-rural relationships were fittingly concerned with balanced (territorial) development, in territorial cooperation for instance (e.g. as a spatial development strategy), but since then they are mostly seen as to be managed or coordinated.449 Insofar territorial cohesion also channels agricultural funding downstreams, the concept’s context thus offers the Leader approach, urban-rural relationships, and their management to fill in the room for varying coordination.

Hence, the connected narratives do not show how the context of territorial cohesion hampers a channelling of agricultural funding through the formal usage of the concept. Still, by supporting such a channeling of European funds they do turn the risk of overstretching the concept into the risks of schisming and complexing instead. The connected narratives namely portray an own separate agricultural funding part for territorial cohesion to lean on. This part of the concept’s context might also emphasise a tense substantive horizontal coordination between different financial allocations, open up of many choices to be made more downstream (e.g. with the Leader approach), and develop towards a managing of urban-rural relationships. All and each of these features could be useful in the complex and schismed context of territorial cohesion.
F.5.5 Trailing territorial cohesion’s channelling of funds by comparing ways of doing in the separate and connected narratives

The warm welcome for territorial cohesion pictured by the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative returns somewhat in the European funds stories that connect this narrative to the others. However, here the territorially tainted organisational issues do not so much present French ways of doing, but debate similar “un-State-like” territorial divisions and suiting territorial ways of managing funds. To add the findings hereon below we touch upon several issues, that is, consecutively: territorial divisions, territorial and substantive ways, more and less business ways of doing, and European spatial planning.

Territorially wise the connection with the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative includes the debate on creating new territorial divisions. Various arguments were put forward in this against the existing borders of States and linguistic, legal or cultural barriers. The connecting stories instead wanted to base territorial divisions on economic and social reality, or more specific: the development of cross-border conurbations, and posed that regional development requires strategic alliances across administrative boundaries or that an understanding of transnational synergies is needed. The trans-European dimension was also given a role in the strengthening of the structure of the European territory, what signifies the importance of this debate. However, even if it is important, how this debate in the context of territorial cohesion would change how the concept channels European funding is not clear.

A well-known issue shows a possibility for this, that is, the effect of changing territorial divisions on statistic and cartographic results (i.e. as base for the re/presented territorial reality). These results can have effects on the channelling of the European Funds and vice versa, as it is even said that the Structural Funds regime led to reconfigurations of the administrative boundaries in some key beneficiaries (e.g. different statistics lead to different allocations). Again the connected narratives thus do not show how the context of territorial cohesion hampers a channelling of European funds through the concept. Instead, here they show a room for choices to be made on territorial divisions more downstream.

A territorial way of doing might be needed to choose between territorial divisions. When the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative connects to the other ones there appears a contradiction between more substantive and more territorial ways of managing funds though. On the one hand the connections with the ‘substantive objectives’ narrative demonstrate that downstream (i.e. mostly nationally) European Union programmes might not be receptive to territorial ways of doing as a part of territorial cohesion. This because the connecting European funds stories explicitly mention that these programmes, including integrated ones for better economic performance, do not have territorial space as main frame of reference or even lack a spatial focus; this lack was indirectly indicated as increasing due to the reduction of resources for non-convergence programmes, which would thus be more territorially oriented (e.g. with an all-region approach). In the connections with the ‘territorial specificities’ narrative on the other hand, such territorial ways of doing do come up. Once even with a given territory and field of action as ground for this, as same Interreg cooperation areas could base new alliances in the European Parliament. This extreme thus clearly alludes to the abovementioned debate on territorial divisions. Still, the question is which ways for territorial ways of doing come forward, other than via territorial divisions that is, that could influence a channeling of European funds with territorial cohesion.

Besides territorial ways, also substantive ways of doing return in the connections between the ‘territorial specificities’ and ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narratives. They namely appear to outline the range between these polies more organisationally wise and downstream too. Nonetheless, although the relevant connecting stories thereby often mention the management of natural and cultural resources or heritage (e.g. with territorial
cooperation), most were less substantive and concerned with the tensions of vertical substantive coordination. The processual scope thereby goes from side to side. On one side you have the statement that the top-down stream of European funds to the regions creates and needs room for management activities on the national level (e.g. horizontal substantive coordination); often the partnership with cities came forward for this, what goes well with the observation that the approach adopted for urban development in the Structural Funds is often a function of domestic policies. The other side is that the regions are said to come up with their own priorities in the management of European funds (e.g. in cooperation). For a more or less territorial way of doing the discussion on who has to do what in the management of funds thus adds to the debate on the demarcation of these actors (i.e. territorial divisions). Yet, the question on how this channels European funding with territorial cohesion remains.

One way in which the concept’s context touches upon this question, is that Cohesion policy would have strong indirect impacts on the selection of priorities and with governance concepts promoted by the European Union. When Cohesion policy can impact the priorities for European funding with governance concepts, a territorial way of doing with territorial cohesion can do too. While such an impact might be top-down, what has impact as governance concepts in this too, are the implementation principles – shown in the general stories on implementation – which more accord with decentralisation. The tension framed by the general stories on the political organisation comes to the fore here, that is, the one between European intervention and decentralisation. Besides that this tension similarly returns in the territorial cohesion stories, it could for a usage of this European Union concept thus even indicate its possible influence more downstream.

Hence, a picture of the concept’s context appears in which not only the multi-level management structure of European funding is discussed, but where the reorganisations of this work through these same structures that run counter to it (e.g. top-down supporting decentralisation). A territorial way of doing might therefore not only be needed for the abovementioned room more downstream to make choices on territorial divisions, but also for the management structure within the set territorial entities and levels. The only way for territorial cohesion to channel European funding which appears thereby is if it is understood as a governance concept that impacts the selection of priorities. How this would happen remains unclear though.

In any case, such a territorial way of doing might not totally follow the frames that are set by the general stories on the European Union as business. This because in these connecting stories the entrepreneurship territorial pact, here mentioned for actual business practices on the regional level, merely played a minor role. The separate ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative does fit these general stories, as it shows that the idea of the European Union as a business mostly frames leeways for territorial cohesion in its context instead of the concept itself. Yet, when this narrative connects to the others, a situation appears that might not so much hamper this way in which the concept could channel European funds. That is to say, the connecting stories emphasise the business-like way of doing by often discussing management, but do not follow this course all the way. The context of territorial cohesion thus calls for manoeuvres for the concept to channel European funding with ways of doing, because it emphasises business-like ways of doing that the concept might have to link with territorial ways of doing.

Then again, perhaps territorial cohesion could channel funds more downstream with a less business-like alternative of managing for the way of doing. A specific and – if not all-then – much-encompassing example of a contextual possibility for this comes up in a European funds story that connects all narratives. It namely poses that the to the Structural Funds related regulations that account for the specificity of territories with natural handicaps and urban and rural areas would have meant to promote a more integrated approach. This
traversally through the reinforcement of the strategic dimension that prevails in the design of
the programme documents, which thereby become the place of synthesis between the
Communitarian priorities shown in the Community Strategic Guidelines and the national
development objective that respects territorial balance. 468 This story’s possibility refers to
many issues that are also found in the (connected) metanarratives and separate narratives (e.g.
specific territories, an integrated approach, the above noted tensions and room for
management activities). Yet, for territorial ways of doing with territorial cohesion it more
gives a territorial objective to act for (i.e. territorial balance) instead of a territorial ground to
act on. This thus does not clarify how territorial cohesion would channel European funding
with a way of doing.

Hence, when the ‘governal organisation of the territory’ narrative connects to the
other narratives, it somewhat shows how the context of the concept can hamper – not the
channelling through territorial cohesion itself, but – the ways in which territorial cohesion
could channel European funds insofar it entails a territorial way of doing. This because these
connections harbour a contradiction between more substantive and, more suiting for
territorial cohesion, more territorial ways of doing, a contradiction which in extreme ranges
from the lack of a spatial focus to a given territory as ground for action. Also a way in which
this context of the concept does not hamper such a channelling but might nonetheless give
rise to some complications appears. For the management of funds it namely links the leeways
that see the European Union as a business to a channelling of funds without totally following
this course. What is more, these connected narratives also give possibilities for how territorial
cohesion can channel funds. This by outlining a range of possible territorial ways of doing
more downstream that deal with the tension of vertical substantive coordination. Once there
is thereby even referred to trails of influence on lower levels from other European Union
concepts. Therefore the discussions on the ways of doing in the European funds in the context
of territorial cohesion which is formed by the connected narratives give no clarity on a
channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion.

The connect narratives appear to give both no closure and many undefined in-between
or even hybrid possibilities for a channeling of European funds. What makes it even more
multifaceted is that their stories add European spatial planning in the mix. 469 Explicit chances
that European spatial planning could give here for territorial cohesion to channel European
funds otherwise than through ways of doing seem negligible though, just as the information
coming from the ‘substantive objectives’ and ‘territorial specificities’ narratives in these
connections. Hence, if the connected narratives do give such chances, it is through ways of
doing.

It was since the European Commission’s Interreg guidelines incorporated the ESDP in
2000 that ways of doing for territorial cohesion appear with European spatial planning on the
usage area’s fuzzy line of in/formality – thereby not only noting the Community level (e.g.
such as the (post-)ESDP process), but processual issues more downstream as well. 470 Not
surprisingly, European spatial planning especially comes forward in the connected narratives
with transnational territorial cooperation, as both are linked from the start. 471 More specific
was the coordinating role given in the European funds for (trans)national spatial planning
(e.g. even as land use policy) and, more planning-minded, that this (instrumental) link
between spatial planning and funds appeared vice versa as well. 472 That is to say, some of
these European funds stories describe European spatial planning as grabbing territorial
cooperation to play a key role in this or as its practical evidence base. 473 These European
spatial planning options thus keep in/formal ways of doing, especially transnational ones,
open in the European funds’ context of territorial cohesion.

Yet, notwithstanding this room to postpone decisions on informality or formality, the
support for European spatial planning seems to be low in this usage area (high in the (post-
This because the stories that connect the narratives do not often mention it, and in those few times they do, they even report a lack of financial support (e.g. from the national governments).\textsuperscript{474} Moreover, the development in the connecting stories even goes against spatial planning more downstream at the time of the debates on the new Structural Funds period.\textsuperscript{475} They namely did not only vary, but for territorial cooperation also noticed a decreasing focus on spatial planning in interregional practices and that in transnational practices the cohesion of Europe and territorial cohesion are more talked about than spatial planning; the latter development is in line with the framing and structuring stories.\textsuperscript{476} Hence, European spatial planning might play a role as an in/formal way of doing more downstream in the European funds’ context of territorial cohesion through (trans)national coordination for funds or transnational territorial cooperation. However, here none of these possibilities appeared as being backed up by finances and they seem to fade away too.

F.5.6 Additional findings from the connected narratives

The treatment of the connected narratives above leads to consequential adjustments to the before depicted context of territorial cohesion in the European Funds usage area. Some of these are major, such as a changing of the risk of overstretching the concept with an extension to agricultural funding towards one of schisming and complexing instead. Most are minor though, such as the difficulties for channelling European funds through territorial cohesion with Territorial Impact Assessment or territorial criteria. Perhaps this is characteristic for such a detailed and well-connect context. The connect narratives would then show that the concept’s context hampers n/or supports such a channelling more downstream. Still, some opportunities and obstacles for this do arise.

These of course come to the for by comparing the connected narratives to the connected metanarratives. The connected narratives also do this by correcting the by the separate narratives described context of territorial cohesion. Yet, such corrections do not necessarily relate to the concept’s (possible) channelling of European funds, because issues can have a negligible role in the usage of the concept. The concern with partnership for example appears to be less important, as it is not well-knit into the usage area, and infrastructure more important, as it has a regular role. Corrections are relevant, for instance, when the context of territorial cohesion would plainly hamper a channelling of funds by blocking roads to formality. The connected narratives do not so much appear to block but merely to cross the concept’s usage in this though. Another way in which corrections are relevant is when the connected narratives retouch the pictured usage area with a main finding. The connections between the narratives for instance increase the role for territorial organisational issues. This highlighting the possibilities for territorial cohesion to influence the ways in which the multidirectional funds will be channelled. First the opportunities and then the obstacles that come from the connected narratives for this are then treated below insofar they respectively come forth from comparisons with the metanarratives and separate narratives and deal with in/formality and ways of doing.

Just as the comparison of the separate narratives and metanarratives cut down the own features of the concept, the comparison of the connected ones shows that the own dynamics of all the connected issues more dug (potential) funding channels than territorial cohesion did. Yet, three opportunities fo the concept to channel European funding do come forward through: i) the portrayal of an all-region approach as a wave on national and European levels for territorial cohesion to ride on (to channel funds for competitiveness) instead of a disputed trait of the concept, ii) the support for the ways in which European funds can be channelled more downstream to debate territorial cohesion with the backing up of how territorial cooperation links to the other two 2007-2013 Structural Funds objectives, and ii) the
replication of also the urban bias in territorial cooperation. As the concept’s context the connecting stories thus also present opportunities for territorial cohesion to channel funds.

Other opportunities for a channeling of European funding with territorial cohesion come forward when it concerns possible formal usages of the concept. While correcting the separate ‘substantive objectives’ narrative, the connected narratives namely offer concerns with services (related to specific territories) as official opportunities. However, these are strangely enough not (yet) used by the concept. What is more, even though the connected narratives expose that the linkage of sustainability and the territorial dimension is typical for territorial cohesion, they basically back the sustainability issue for territorial cohesion’s formal usage in the European funds as well. By offering these opportunities (towards formality), the connected narratives thus refute that the concept’s context simply hampers a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis).

Many obstacles for territorial cohesion to channel European funding appear in the concept’s context though. The connect narratives for instance remove a path for this by unfolding that if territorial cohesion would indirectly channel funds through (regional) State aid more downstream this has minor financial weight. The also take away opportunities that are presented by the separate ‘territorial specificities’ narrative. For Territorial Impact Assessment they namely place the discussed larger projects outside this context. Moreover, these connections narrow down possibilities for territorial criteria to channel funds (more downstream) due to their focus on competitiveness and related substantive objectives in descriptions of territorial reality. By hardly discussing a targeting of funds the connected narratives therefore also corroborate that the concept’s context hampers a channelling of European Funds through territorial cohesion more downstream (i.e. this section’s working hypothesis). This could signify that such a feature of the concept would not fall that good in the European funds.

Also other obstacles for a channeling of European funding with territorial cohesion come forward when it concerns possible formal usage of the concept. The connected narratives for instance place the discussion on economic and social cohesion largely outside the European Funds usage area, what decreasing the possibility for the concept to relate to their formal discussion. Moreover, as mentioned above, the connected narratives turn the previously presented risk of overstretching the concept’s existing formal usage in agricultural funding into ones of schisming and complexing. They namely show that the support for a channelling of these funds through territorial cohesion goes beyond just offering opportunities towards an own separate agricultural field for the concept to lean on. These risks increase by that these connecting stories come up with the management of urban-rural relationships. For this they also emphasise the tense substantive horizontal coordination involved and revealed the opening up of many choices to be made more downstream (e.g. with the Leader approach). The risks then increase due to this management, because it could be useful enough for territorial cohesion to depend on it when the concept is both used in agricultural funding and the more urban Structural Funds.

Hence, insofar the connected narratives correct the picture the separate narratives draw of the context of territorial cohesion they both show how it constructs support for (i.e. services, sustainability, agricultural funding) and hampering (i.e. territorial criteria) of a channelling of European funds through territorial cohesion. Yet, the mostly show how neither opportunities nor obstacles are fully constructed in this usage area (i.e. partnership, infrastructure, Territorial Impact Assessment, territorial criteria, economic and social cohesion).

Although the role for territorial organisational issues increases in the European Funds usage area with the mass of connections of the ‘governal organisation of the territory’
narrative to the others, ways of doing hereby for territorial cohesion hardly link to the issues which can channel European funds. For this the connected narratives only reveal the concept’s emphasis on the urban bias of territorial cooperation and the link of territorial cooperation to convergence and (regional) competitiveness and employment. However, there mostly appear various ways of doing that could be part of how territorial cohesion might channel European funds without it being clear which ones will actually be used.

Simply seen the connected narrative indicate an obvious path for territorial cohesion for the ways in which the multidirectional funding streams can be channelled: (governance) concepts of the European Union (such as sustainable development) would influence a channelling of funds on lower levels. However, the concept’s context merely complicates for territorial cohesion. The connected narratives for instance harbour a contradiction between substantive and territorial ways of doing, which range from lacking a spatial focus to a given territory as ground for action, and do not totally follow the outlet of business-like ways of doing. Still, the connected narratives do line out plenty of possible territorial ways of doing more downstream. These deal with the tension of vertical substantive coordination and, notwithstanding the mentioned lack of financial backing for it, European spatial planning as in/formal way of doing through (trans)national coordination for funds or transnational territorial cooperation. The overall deduction in this therefore is that there is no closure on in/formal and more or less territorial and/or business-like ways of doing in the context of territorial cohesion. Instead, there appear many undefined in-between or even hybrid possibilities, with, for instance, implicit overlaps as a consequence.

This mixing mash could both support and hamper how the concept could channel funding streams. This depends on what territorial cohesion’s way and its context’s ways of doing are; to complex this: the way of doing of territorial cohesion could develop as an amalgam of the ways of doing that exist in its context. Hence, it is neither clear if nor how the concept would contribute to a changed attitude towards stakeholders at territorial levels. The relevant choices appear not yet made and the connected narratives seem to suggest that these unsolved tensions transfer downstream. In this transfer of tensions to lower levels the connected narratives do not only show how the concept’s context opens up choices to be made more downstream on agricultural funding, but they show such choices on territorial divisions in a channelling for other funding through territorial cohesion as well (e.g. in the management of urban-rural relationships).

The connect narratives with their additions to and corrections of the connected metanarratives and separate narratives thus finish the picture of the European Funds usage area. This by showing that although it mainly are the own dynamics of the many connections between different kinds of issues in the intricate context of territorial cohesion that (potentially) channel European funding streams, they thereby also leave many suitable ways open in which territorial cohesion might do this.
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