Abstract

There is a critical spatial component in the emerging cooperative Russian planning model for economic growth across the federation. Although in Russia, as in the EU, this spatial modeling for joint action and cooperation has not entirely displaced the older model of competitive fiscal federalism and public policy doctrine of the 1980s, the newer cooperative model, emerging from the globalization of supply chains and cross-regional externalities, encourages integration rather than competition within larger functional macro-spaces. It embraces both cross-regional and cross-national pooling of human and other resources. There has been considerable Russian research on regional integration (Shishkov, 2001; Butorina, 2011; Kolesov, 1996; Kulikov, 2002) and internationalization (Vardomskiy, 2002; Kosolapov, 2005; Belousov, 2011; Skatershchikova et al., 2002; Tsygankov, 2004). This paper contributes to the existing research by developing a new database to map the strategies of regional authorities. In this paper, we develop three case studies to show program development and implementation of bilateral and multi-lateral strategies. Our information represents a complete survey of selected regions from the material available at this time, showing design and strategy, and some implementation. Our survey is the first attempt we are aware of that traces the new cross-regional arrangements.
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Introduction

There is a critical spatial component in the emerging cooperative Russian model for economic growth across the federation. Although in Russia, as in the EU, this spatial modeling for joint action and cooperation has not entirely displaced the older model of competitive fiscal federalism and public policy doctrine of the 1980s, the newer cooperative model, emerging from the globalization of supply chains and cross-regional externalities, encourages integration rather than competition within larger functional macro-spaces. It embraces both cross-regional and cross-national pooling of human and other resources. Key works have described recent developments in regional integration (Shishkov, 2001; Butorina, 2011; Kolesov, 1996; Kulikov, 2002) and internationalization (Vardomskiy, 2002; Kosolapov, 2005; Belousov, 2011; Skatershchikova et al., 2002; Tsygankov, 2004). This paper contributes to this literature by developing a new database to map the strategies of regional authorities. In this paper, we develop three case studies to show program development and the implementation of bilateral and multi-lateral strategies. Our information represents a complete survey of selected regions from the material available at this time, showing design and strategy and some implementation. Our survey is the first attempt we are aware of that traces the new cross-regional arrangements.

In the 1990s, regional isolation in the Russian Federation was encouraged by what was then called “the Parade of Sovereignties’ reflected in the highly decentralized 1992 Confederation Treaty. The 1993 Constitution, however, did not support the extremes of this prior document, although it reflected a core consensus at that time on the importance of regional autonomy. Gradually, the Russian government reestablished institutions which had been strengthening the central government, by means of a promulgation of decrees and the passing of laws on federalist economic security (e.g., the Presidential Decree of 29.04.1996 N 608 «On the State strategy of economic security of the Russian Federation Basic Provisions).» Its objective was to identify effective instruments for the establishment of uniformity of law and the economic recovery of the regions, along with their linkages across industries and supply chains comprising the Russian internal market. After 2000, when a period of rapid growth began, the cross-regional benefits of this internal market would result, if encouraged, in having an effect on a wider spread of regions. Massive fiscal recentralization took place over the next fifteen years, in part to encourage returns to scale and also to guarantee improved social services for all citizens, regardless of location (Uskova, 2009; Ilyin, 2013; Unusov, 2009).

Since 2000 researchers have observed increasing integration in regional markets, although the income gap among regions has not significantly diminished (Artobolevsky, 2001; Granberg et al., 1997; Grinchel, 2014; Gelvanovskiy, 2008; Marshalalova, 1998; Yudanov, 2004). For that reason, and because of important theoretical shifts in the understanding of policies fostering economic growth in large federations, strategic planning is now oriented toward bringing governance levels together to coordinate, synchronize and help pool costs and benefits of budgeting for growth, while continuing to foster diversity (see the
Russian Federal Law 'On Strategic Planning' [28.06. 2014], N 172-FZ). The law calls for closer cooperation between federal, regional and municipal levels and creates a legal basis for the planning and programming of cross-level, cross-regional socio-economic development.

Literature Review

Conceptually, cross-regional innovation and development policy planning both in the EU and the Russian Federation emerged from evident interdependences across space and between levels of government. In system-terms, “National Innovation Systems” and “Regional Innovation Systems” proponents have argued in the past for a spatial level and reach that is relevant, particularly for innovation policy. In economic geographic terms, regional industrial concentration and core-periphery differences within countries are powerful evidence of knowledge-intensive collaboration and formal and informal institutions active across local and regional levels (Cooke et al. 1998; Howells 1999), where effective partnerships and supply chain relationships benefit from the national regulatory framework. Fromhold-Eisebith (2007, p. 227) identifies that interdependences:

“…usually owe their existence to nationally determined and constructed infrastructure, institutional or political settings (Bathelt & Depner, 2003; Bunnell & Coe, 2001; Cooke, 2002; Freeman, 2002). This is even true for federal nations where central governments still leave their marks on STI regulation and incentive structures, despite a strong role of individual state governments.

Because of interdependencies, OECD cross-regional research concurs, regional policy should span across internal borders; there should be coordination and cooperation among regions and with the federal center.

The shift in regional policy favoring inter-level and across-space coordination is coordinated through a nation's export policy, fostering integration of regional trade and linkage with foreign countries that contribute to the rising value of the internal market, where factors of production are, or can be, a single resource base (Tsygankov, 2004). In this context, cluster policy, along with support for technoparks and economic zones, aims to bring international networks to remote regions via investment, and is an example of taking advantage of interdependent federal and regional systems of innovation (Petrov 2012). Porter (1993) shows that the competitiveness of even very distant regions can have an influence on national competitiveness. From his multi-region models, Krugman (2004) shows the location of competencies to be critical in strategic decision-making in regard to organizational and production innovation and diffusion. Finally, and more directly relevant here, inter-regional cooperation through social spheres can be a source of attracting investment, expanding demand for cross regional consumption of local production. There has been some empirical work on how the expansion and strengthening of commercial and cultural ties among regions of the Russian Federation builds innovation capacity nationally (Saveliev, 2014).
In this paper we find the key avenues of cross-regional cooperation in the Russian Federation to be as follows:

1) Scientific and technical collaboration: cross regional support for professional projects, innovation, joint entrepreneurial exploration;
2) University linkages: Cross-admission of students within sub-national units, student exchanges, cross-regional teacher training;
3) Cultural cooperation: opening cross-cultural communication channels among regions, joint conservation efforts, joint promotion of national-scale achievements of indigenous peoples, exchange in the promotion of Russian language and Russian art;
4) Cross-regional government and private sector infrastructure projects for cross-regional tourism: joint tourist programs and fairs;
5) Youth cooperation: encouragement of exchange among youth organizations in education and recreational and sport activities.

Data and Method

The regulatory framework for assessing regional policies is the Regional Federal Strategy (S) document, which is coordinated in close consultation with the national strategy. The Federal law (17 December 1999) № 211-FZ «On general principles of organization and activity of associations of economic interaction of the subjects of the Russian Federation,» provides guidelines on the inter-regional associations which coordinate economic relations. According to Art. 2 of 211-FZ, these associations, non-profit organizations founded by regional authorities, are intended for inter-regional integration and regional development. Therefore, with these goals, the agencies generate other agencies and structures, the most important of which are interregional «associations» for economic cooperation.1 Since 1991, eight such associations have been formed from the former Soviet-era delineation of «economic regions»: «North-West», «Greater Volga», «Siberian Accord», «Central Russia», «Black Earth», «North Caucasus», «Greater Urals» and «Far East and Trans-Baikal».

From economic cooperation, macroregions are expected to build networks of industrial supply chains across regions with shared services (Rukina. 1998). The Appendix shows export-import data among macro-regions--the Central Federal District, Northwestern Federal District, and Volga Federal District--for just one sector, metallurgy, showing the extent of industrial networks.

On a planning level, economic cooperation associations coordinate inter-regional tourism, mutually developed tax guidelines, credit arrangements, and demographic policies. Inter-regional relations in this sphere are oriented toward scientific and technological cooperation, joint projects in finance and credit, investment, joint activities in communications, mobility of labor, efficient resource use and exploration, and the pooling of transportation costs.

1 http://www.sibacc.ru/en/
The activities and objectives of regional authorities are assessed here by text references in strategy documents, including the monitoring of outcomes. For this paper, we use a comparative case study of three regions to assess the level and direction of outreach from the basic descriptions of strategies provided on the official websites. The official websites of the regions vary in detail, including some with concrete initiatives and their duration. We find both federal and regional innovations, initiatives and priorities. This study forms part of a larger media study from the official Internet regional portals.

The three Federal Districts are the Central, Northwestern and Volga macro-regions. In general, for these regions, strategies give voice to many of the same challenges, areas of concern, and outreach: transport and logistics, tourism, culture development, education and industry. The aspiration is for more cooperation in the spread of SMEs and in the development of cluster initiatives. There is a common theme of agreement in tourism and cultural affairs–jointly developed tourist routes and jointly held international forums and conferences.

Results: Strategies for Cross-Border Relations

Relatively few regions have active international relations as their main strategic goal. Regions aspiring to attract cross border projects tend to establish agency centers for export support, centers for inter-regional and international business, and centers to organize exhibitions and presentations as well as trade and economic missions to partner countries. Overwhelmingly, the focus of such international relations is bilateral.

In regard to cross-border agreements, the enclave of Kaliningrad is particularly active. It participates in multilateral cooperation for the Baltic Sea region, a large-scale project entailing many small initiatives. Since 1993, for example, in support of activities of the Council of the Baltic states, it has implemented cooperation in energy and its efficient use, including the legal framework for cross-border interaction in the electricity sector, infrastructure projects (for energy) coordinated with Poland including a new cable for DC delivery, an increase in bandwidth in the interstate section of 330 kV AC and, with Lithuania, the construction of a joint Baltic nuclear power plant in Kaliningrad region. Also, it leads the way in the development of the International Youth educational complex «Baltic Artek», a project for voluntary cooperation between the universities of the Baltic Sea region, and in various projects for biodiversity conservation including the protection and reproduction of fish species. The project HELCOM in the Kaliningrad region has achieved «Improvement of the protection of the Baltic Sea from land-based threats, sources of pollution: the load of nutrients from agriculture, and the risk of hazardous waste» (including a project reducing hazardous and agricultural discharges in the Baltic Sea – BALTHAZAR).
Finally, there is evidence of long-standing cooperation from the 1990s in agreements with Poland (1992), Lithuania (1999) and Belarus (on 1999). To summarize, Kaliningrad has partnerships with 21 regions, including foreign states, and urban areas of the region have their own agreements.

The Strategy of oil abundant Bashkortostan does emphasize international cooperation, although the main trend reflected here, as elsewhere, is cross-border connections. Similarly, the Far Eastern Federal District, like the North-West Federal District and Bashkortostan, has a clear international orientation with cross-border cooperation. Finally, in the Northwest, the Arkhangelsk and Pskov regions are in the process of developing international agreements.

Results: Strategies for Cross-Regional Relations

In contrast with their relatively limited international orientation, most regions show substantial outreach to other regions in the Russian Federation. The bustling inter-regional commodity exchange, for example, shows the presence of strong ties between the regions and grounds the theoretical expectation that cross-border relations are fruitful in large federations (see Table 2).

In regard to these cross-regional ties, however, strategy documents are primarily bilateral and not «economic zone» or macro economic region oriented. This is presumably because the institutions that are well established for inter-regional relations are mostly located within administrative units.

All regions in the Russian Federation have bilateral agreements, many with up to 20 and some up to 80. One example is the agreement drawn up at the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum (2015) for cooperation between Kaluga and Leningrad oblasts in the spheres of commerce, the economy, science and technology, and culture, and envisioning joint innovation and investment projects. The strategy announced business ties and networking along with joint concerns over the environment and in sports. The two regions have strong existing ties in the automotive industry, with a holding company in St Petersburg having its machine building operation in Kaluga, and they aspire toward connections in pharmaceutical clustering, agricultural supply chain development, tourism and communications. Kaluga also has an agreement for coordination with Ryazan and Tula in the development of industrial standards. Leningrad has a framework agreement with Murmansk region for linkages in commerce, the economy, scientific-technical and cultural cooperation; this has been active from 1997.

In the Central Federal District, six regions have cross-regional strategies of significance: Belgorod, Bryansk, Ivanovo, Kursk, Lipetsk, and Orel. These six have identified specific projects for the implementation of inter-regional cooperation. Ivanovo, Kaluga, Kursk, Lipetsk, Orel, and Tambov spelled out especially clear strategies. Belgorod is among three— with Bryansk and Kursk—which have evidence of numerous projects with other regions of the Russian Federation, as well as with foreign countries. By contrast, Kostroma, Smolensk, Tver’ and Yaroslavl’ take no more than a formal approach to inter-regional cooperation.
Results: Themes of Cross-regional Relations

It is important to observe that regions anticipate that the major impacts of cross-regional policies and interactions will be felt through the diffusion of technology and externalities—benefits—among regions along the supply chain. Some regions aim for a technology strategy—to get government grants for cross-regional cluster initiatives—that will, they aspire, result in information infrastructure which, at a minimum, will assist in the building of more technologically oriented inter-regional connections (Petrova, 2012).

It should be noted that regions in the Central Federal District have far more complete documentation available in their strategies than other regions. About half describe the exact mechanisms of inter-regional cooperation, or specific projects, by area. Thus, Ivanovo describes the joint cluster initiatives, shared technological communications companies and close cooperation of public authorities to realize their Transport Strategy. In the Central Federal District it is common to cite shared cross-documentation with neighboring regions designed to identify new common areas of potential cooperation. Tambov, for example, prioritizing interregional cooperation, has both joint infrastructure and industrial projects, and it is developing cross-regional cultural projects. Karelia prioritizes transit and large transport and logistics corridors, along with joint industrial production in coordination with regions of the North-West and neighboring Nordic countries.

Briefly, a comparative assessment of the quality of specification in expectation of future cooperation in Figure 1, shows the more specified arrangements of longer duration existing among regions of the Central Federal District:

In the Central Federal District, as can be seen in Figure 2 below, innovation support and transport coordination are the most important spheres for cooperation with neighboring regions:
The North-West Federal District also exhibits evidence of extensive interregional cooperation, although mostly in aspiration, among Vologda, Kaliningrad, Murmansk, Novgorod, St. Petersburg city, and the Komi Republic. Only in Kaliningrad was there any mention of concrete projects. Novgorod and St. Petersburg express goals for an inter-regional migration policy.

Kaliningrad Oblast, Republic of Karelia and the Nenets Autonomous District provide descriptions of measures to implement inter-regional cooperation. For Nenets, Arkhangelsk and Pskov, however, interregional cooperation is at the stage of formal study rather than results. Five regions have cooperation agreements: Vologda, Kaliningrad, Murmansk, Republic of Komi, and the city of St. Petersburg. Their proximity shows its importance in linkages that create aspirations for further agreement. However, only Kaliningrad, already ahead in international connections, has concrete projects listed.

In the six regions, there also is some interest (Kaliningrad, Karelia and Nenets) in migration policy coordination, as below.
In the Volga Federal District, Kirov, Penza, Mari El Republic and Perm, there is formal declaration of support for inter-regional collaboration. Strategically, in the Volga Federal District, only three regions – the Republic of Bashkortostan, Chuvashia and Samara, are going ahead with plans for interregional cooperation. The Republic of Chuvashia, for example, specifies some mechanisms of inter-regional migration policy. Specific projects are also noted in the Strategy documents of the Orenburg region and Kirov.

**Figure 4**

*Orientation of Cross-Regional Cooperation in the Volga Federal District, outreach direction as a share of all strategy documents, %*

Conclusion

With the adoption of the major new Federal Law (28 June 2014) No 172-FZ, «On Strategic Planning», regional authorities are now beginning their own analysis of the success of prior strategies, a review mandated in the new law. They are to seek new and revised instruments to improve social and economic development by, first, analyzing existing strategic planning documents in terms of their targets and priorities and improving them for the further development of sectors and spheres of governance. We looked at these analytic materials for our three federal districts – Central, Northwestern and the Volga.

On the whole, depiction of the result of over twenty years of governance for integrating the internal market shows sustained county-wide aspirations yet active connection being sought only in the Central Federal District and some parts of the Northwest. Thus, to overcome the splintering impact of the early post-transition years, when regional policies became more isolationist, there has been a strong counter effort by the central and regional authorities to cooperate cross-regionally, at least in formal declarations. The key area of intended and actual cooperation is industrial production. From the mid-1990s, across
these three districts, regions have revived the industrial connections from the
Soviet–era «economic regions», when centrally planned supply and transport
chains linked «territorial complexes» one part of the Russian Federation to ano-
ther. More actively and more recently, these regions are exploring cultural and
tourism connections, showing embedded cultural ties among these central dis-
tricts that go back centuries. In their current review process, there is sustained
prioritization of technological advancement by clusters, showing widely shared
global understanding associating growth with technological innovation and its
diffusion.

Even if for some districts the documents are mostly aspirational, they show
locally assigned importance of priority areas of transport, logistics and com-
munications, particularly near export nodes. This communication of outreach
interests addresses the general problem of connectivity in Russia and the need
for joint action and programs to overcome it. The near universal aspiration for
cooperation in cluster initiatives reinforces the understanding that science and
technology are viewed as crucial for capturing value in production; the key part-
ners in the field of interregional cooperation in this regard, however, are located
mainly in the Central Federal District. Regions aim at stronger ties with Mos-
cow and its surrounding regional complex.
### Table 1

#### Export/Import of goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Export of rolled ferrous metals, thousand tons</th>
<th>Import of rolled ferrous metals, thousand tons</th>
<th>The ratio of export of rolled ferrous metals to import, thousand tons (Export minus import)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgorod region</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostroma region</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipetsk region</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>3101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Moscow</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smolensk region</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tula region</td>
<td>93,7</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow region</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vologda region</td>
<td>3536</td>
<td>3845</td>
<td>3765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Petersburg</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Republic of Bashkortostan</td>
<td>15,9</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>33,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Udmurt Republic</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm region</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirov region</td>
<td>80,4</td>
<td>84,1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizhny Novgorod region</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orenburg region</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Commodity Structure of Exports and Imports in 2013 ($mln USD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food products and agricultural raw materials</th>
<th>The products of the fuel and energy complex</th>
<th>Chemical products, rubber</th>
<th>Wood and pulp and paper products</th>
<th>Metals and products from them</th>
<th>Machinery, equipment and vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exporter</td>
<td>Importer</td>
<td>Exporter</td>
<td>Importer</td>
<td>Exporter</td>
<td>Importer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia, total</td>
<td>16196,2</td>
<td>43075,9</td>
<td>371791,8</td>
<td>3613,6</td>
<td>30739,2</td>
<td>50129,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central federal district</td>
<td>4552,9</td>
<td>22953,7</td>
<td>204331,7</td>
<td>1660,3</td>
<td>8442,7</td>
<td>34870,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern West federal district</td>
<td>2485,2</td>
<td>12527</td>
<td>29969,4</td>
<td>332,7</td>
<td>4104,8</td>
<td>6002,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volga federal district</td>
<td>836,8</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>45600,8</td>
<td>475,1</td>
<td>11688,4</td>
<td>3321,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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