Михайлова Е.В.

Теоретические основы трансграничного управления: от возникновения понятия к его современному прочтению

Михайлова Екатерина Владимировна — аспирант, факультет государственного и муниципального управления, Научно-исследовательский Университет «Высшая Школа Экономики», Москва, РФ.
E-mail: mikhaylovaev@yandex.ru
SPIN-код РИНЦ: 9765-0944

Аннотация
Обобщив подходы отечественных и зарубежных ученых к концепции трансграничного управления, автор выявил уклон в сторону политологического прочтения изучаемого понятия. В качестве причины неоднородности определений трансграничного управления называется недостаточное внимание к управленческой составляющей изучаемого явления. Возникновение идеи скоординированного управления трансграничными территориальными образованиями автор объясняет через эволюцию понимания контактной функции приграничья. Обращая внимание читателя на то, что выстраивание отношений на принципах трансграничного управления чаще всего постулируется на уровне приграничных регионов или приграничных муниципалитетов, автор подчеркивает необходимость учета преимуществ и ограничений управленческих практик для каждого из этих уровней.

Ключевые слова
Трансграничное управление, трансграничное территориальное образование, управление приграничными регионами, управление приграничными муниципалитетами.

Introduction

In the latter half of the twentieth century the trend of convergence of border regions, their potential to stimulate contacts, overweighed the divergence process and the barrier function of said boundaries[1]. Such a tendency provided a ground, firstly, for government interpenetration of border regions and, secondly, for the emergence and elaboration of cross-border governance of trans-border regions and adjacent settlements.

Although the reality of cross-border governance is quite recent, it encompasses several decades; there is a clear lack of academic reflection on this phenomenon. That shortage of comprehension of governance beyond the borders exists alongside with the current boom in managerial literature on such issues as multi-level governance, networks and clusters. Taking into account the above stated tendencies; the author has tried to identify the gap between theorizing the governance-related issues in border studies and applying the managerial point of view in the literature on cross-border cooperation.

From the methodological perspective, the paper is based on literature review. Selected secondary sources include articles and book chapters from 1992 till 2014 with at

---

[1] *Martinez O.* The Dynamics of Border Interaction: New approaches to border analysis // World Boundaries / Ed.: C. Schofield. London: Routledge Publishing, 1994. Vol. 1: Global Boundaries. P. 1.

least one piece for each year (except for years 1993 and 1995 as no relevant literature was detected from these periods). Given that within two decades there was no drastic change in conceptualization of cross-border governance, the author interprets this theoretical development as an accumulative process. Thus, the consecutive literature review follows the gradual evolution of the term in question and its current understanding.

The paper comprises four parts: 1) analysis of the prerequisites of cross-border governance emergence; 2) review of existing definitions of cross-border governance; 3) investigation of the indirect interpretations of the concept under the scrutiny; 4) concluding chapter specifying two levels of cross-border governance and addressing the perspectives of their exploration.

How Cross-Border Governance Started: Evolution of the Border Regions Role

Some scholars who provided a historical overview of the role of border regions in the interstate relations pointed out the change in the central government treatment from abruption of border regions — due to considering them rather a buffer territory constantly involved in political conflicts and wars than a part of the state — to embracing them as areas of contact[2]. At the same time the contact function of borderlands is not a frozen characteristic: it is neither homogenous nor stable.

In this chapter, the author describes the emergence of cross-border governance as a result of the evolutionary process of understanding the contact function of the borderlands that comprises three milestones:

(1) treating borderlands as the beginning of the state and using them as a place of encounters and dialog with representatives of border regions of neighboring countries;

(2) giving borderlands the role of conversion zones or laboratories where the central state is adapting to rules and norms of its neighbors, allowing compartmentalized regulation of international regional organizations;

(3) emphasizing the need for sustainable development of transborder regions.

Since the end of World War II understanding of borders as places where the contacts can flourish has evolved significantly: cross-border cooperation (subsequently referred to as *CBC*) in Europe started in a form of meetings between representatives of border regions (1) discussing the ways to eliminate the barriers, in particular along the borders of Germany. At that early stage of European regions development, pragmatic motives for cooperation were dominating, in particular the desire of German authorities to form a positive image of their country. For other countries

---

[2] *Anderson J., O'Dowd L.* Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance // Regional Studies. 1999. Vol. 33. Issue 7. P. 593–604.

peacekeeping and peace promoting were relevant motives to interact. It is not a coincidence that the first (1958 — EUROREGIO) and several next European regions (so called «euroregions») appeared on the state border between Germany and Benelux countries[3].

Later on border regions got a new role of areas of transition (2) for the states applying to access the European Union. That historical period was marked with profound political changes in the 80s for Spain, Portugal and Greece, and in the 90s for Central and Eastern European countries when their democratic systems were launched and integration into the EU began.

An opportunity to be engaged in wider supranational processes was provided to borderlands largely due to the adoption of the European Outline Convention on Trans-frontier Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities of 1980 (subsequently referred to as the *Madrid Convention*). That universal legal framework of CBC opened possibilities to use border regions as an effective adaptation tool to the EU rules and regulations. Available CBC programs through selection and financing of specific cooperation projects in the field of culture, ecology and science made the states-candidates aware of the EU procedures and logics.

After decades of attributing peripheral location and depressive character of economic development to border regions[4], the inherent nature of these features has recently been questioned. For the first time it was suggested to call border regions «challenged to become central»[5], «an important destination in its own right»[6] or «new motors of competitiveness in the globalized economy»[7]. Such a wording emphasizes understanding of the intrinsic value of borderlands development (3). This idea goes in line with the concept of re-territorialisation — forming new centres of regional economies.

Moving the focus from using border regions for purposes of outsiders to achieving the sustainable welfare of border regions or even to letting border regions to drive regional economy could be better understood in the context of regionalization process. The sum of diminishing importance of central governments and nation-states, increasing empowerment of sub-national governments for various kinds of public services delivery and redistribution of other functions between levels of power stimulated genesis of new economic and political

---

[3] *Бусыгина И.М.* Политическая регионалистика. М.: РОССПЭН, 2006. С. 159.

[4] Borders and Border Regions in Europe & North America / Eds.: P. Ganster, J.W. Scott, A. Sweedler, W. Dieter-Eberwein. San Diego: University of San Diego Press, 1997. P. 7.

[5] *Houtum H., van.* An overview of European geographical research on borders and border regions // Journal of Borderlands Studies. 2000. Vol. 15 (1). P. 73.

[6] *Dear M.J., Leclerc G., Berelowitz J.* Postborder City: Cultural Spaces of Bajalta California / University of Southern California. New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 138.

[7] *Nelles J., Durand F.* Political rescaling and metropolitan governance in cross-border regions: comparing the cross-border metropolitan areas of Lille and Luxemburg //European Urban and Regional Studies. 2014. Vol. 21. No 1. P. 120.

decision-making capacities of cities and sub-national regions. From that third step of understanding the CBC, we can speak about switching from the idea of governing border regions to the cross-border governance in Europe.

Understanding of Cross-Border Governance

Starting the section of terminological analysis, we should admit that even though the papers on the issue of cross-border governance are few and fragmented, it is striking that there is no consent on understanding this concept yet. Out of 30 academic articles dealing with matters of governance in border regions and municipalities only eight provided a direct definition of the cross-border governance (plus one of them[8] was using the earlier published definition) while the majority of papers tend to determine this notion indirectly through pointing out its peculiar traits. Ten publications using the term «cross-border governance» did not define it at all. In short, a thorough scientific understanding of cross-border governance has not yet occurred.

Direct definitions

Decompounding of the direct definitions of cross-border governance has shown that they were based on different perspectives and often mixing terms from various professional areas. Given that border studies are the multi-disciplinary field, this finding is easy to justify. However, as it is demonstrated in Table 1, the political science paradigm is a dominating discourse in the polyphony of collected cross-border governance definitions.

Division into disciplines was carried out according to terms that were used in the definition. For examle, Political Science was conferred when the pillars of explanation were notions of power (national, international or supranational), decision-making process, political culture and institutions. If the definition was based on concepts of market and flows of resources, it was classified as Economics. If the theme of social groups, identity and social infrastructure was touched, the Sociology was assigned. The markers of managerial interpretations contained expressions related to goal achievement process[9], territorial interdependencies[10] and structure of actors' interrelations[11].

---

[8] *Janczak J.* Cross-border governance in border twin towns. Central European case / Paper presented at the CEU HPSA Conference, May 2011. URL: http://studentunion.ceu.hu/sites/default/files/publications/janczak-paper.pdf (24.09.2014).

[9] *Gualini E.* Cross-border Governance: Inventing Regions in a Trans-national Multi-level Polity // DISP. 2003. Vol. 39 (152). P. 43–52; *Scott J.W.* European and North American Contexts for Cross-border Regionalism // Regional studies. 1999. Vol. 33. P. 605–707; *Scott J.W.* Euroregions, governance and transborder cooperation within the EU // Borders, Border regions and People / Eds.: M. van der Velde, H. van Houtum. London: Pion Limited, 2000. P. 91–106.

[10] *Perkmann M.* Euroregions. Institutional entrepreneurship in the European Union // Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions / Eds.: M. Perkmann, N.-G. Sum. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2002. P. 103–

Among few of managerial remarks on cross-border governance, one can conclude that this process has a stadial nature, complex multi-level and matrix internal structure and challenging external milieu with the need to take into account all existing cross-border interdependencies, political, legislative and administrative cultures.

Table 1. Direct Definitions of Cross-Border Governance

№	The author	Year of presenting the definition	Definition of Cross-Border Governance	Discipline to which the definition could fit
1	Scott	2000	*Milieu* in which different *national political, legislative and administrative cultures* should come together and enable actors involved *to assess trajectories of development, envision common goals, and determine means of achieving these.*	Political science and *Strategic Management*
2	Kramsh	2003	Fluid, transversal *forms of decision-making* operating *above, below and within* the racks of *inter-state hierarchies* and *markets.*	Political science and Economics
3	Gualini	2003	*An institutional construct* resulting from complex processes of co-evolution that consists of three dimensions: political-economic (is related to the process of *strategic selectivity of aims*), institutional (involves *institutional aspects of collaboration*) and symbolic-cognitive (deals with *creation of trans-border communities and invention of a cross-border identity*).	Political Science, *Strategic Management*, Sociology
4	Perkman	2007	Perceived need for *policy co-ordination* or the *management of cross-border interdependencies.*	Political Science and *Territorial Management*
5	Pikner	2008	*A social infrastructure across the state borders* which create *channels for the transfer or flow of* material and non-material *resources.*	Sociology and Economics
6	Terlouw	2012	*New form of governance* where *horizontal cross-border linkages* are closely connected with *vertical linkages between different administrative levels* ranging from the local to the European.	*Public Administration* and Political Science
7	García-Álvarez, Trillo-Santamaría	2013	*Continuous process of overlapping* not only of *local, regional and state governments and administrations*, but also of *different cultures*, *discourses* and *objectives of the territorial agents*.	*Territorial Management*, Political Science
8	Nelles, Durand	2014	A *political process* that is built through *innovation, experimentation, error, and re-evaluation* within the unique *set of institutional constraints imposed by the fragmented international context*. Each region invents «its own» method of coordinating political action in a «its own» cross-border space.	Political Science

124; *Perkmann M.* Policy entrepreneurship and multi-level governance: a comparative study of European cross-border regions // Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy. 2007. Vol. 25 (6). P. 861–879. URL: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1133126 (20.02.2014).

[11] *Terlouw K.* Border surfers and euroregions: unplanned cross-border behavior and planned territorial structures of cross-border governance // Planning Practice and Research. 2012. Vol. 27. No 3. P. 351–366; *García-Álvarez J., Trillo-Santamaría J.-M.* Between regional spaces and spaces of regionalism: cross-border region building in the Spanish «state of autonomies» // Regional Studies. 2013. Vol. 47. No 1. P. 104–115.

Indirect definitions

The author has distinguished several types of indirect contributions to understanding of the cross-border governance phenomenon: a) listing its peculiarities; b) classifying it; c) analysing particular elements of the concept, for instance: actors, relations among them, criterion to assess the performance of cross-border governance structures; and d) inscribing cross-border governance in the system of border studies and regional integration theories.

The list of cross-border governance features (a) by Perkman[12] included 1) being a realm of public agency with protagonists from contiguous sub-national public authorities on local, district or regional levels from two or more countries; 2) an abundance of informal or «quasi-juridical» arrangements among the participating authorities; and 3) focus on practical problem-solving in local policy areas.

Classifying governance over the borders (b) is quite a popular way of dissecting cross-border governance. Let us name two most robust breakdowns. Hooghe and Marks subdivided multi-level governance into two categories — Type I and Type II, the latter sharing the same key traits as cross-border governance. These distinctive features postulated for the Type II are: task-specific jurisdictions, intersecting memberships, many jurisdictional levels and flexible design[13]. It is not surprising that Hooghe and Marks have chosen «densely populated frontier regions in North America and Western Europe» as an areal of existence of their Type II of multi-level governance.

Blatter suggests two models of governance that are territorial governance characterized by «vertical interaction lines and information flow within national units where the border is crossed at the top of the hierarchy» and functional governance that consists of «direct contacts between different level actors across a border»[14].

Rosenau has not developed a full system of classification for cross-border governance but he has described its profound form with a concept of «fragmegration» — a combination of fragmentation and integration[15]. According to him, «fragmegration» presupposes a wide range of public and private actors cooperating and competing in shifting coalitions without entering into subordinate relations. This definition also has a clear preponderance to the Political Science.

---

[12] *Perkmann M.* Policy entrepreneurship and multi-level governance: a comparative study of European cross-border regions.

[13] *Hooghe L., Marks G.* Types of multi-level governance // Types of Multilevel Governance / Eds.: H. Enderlein, S. Walti, M. Zurn. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2010. P. 18.

[14] *Blatter J.* «From Spaces of Place» to «Spaces of Flows»? Territorial and Functional Governance in Cross-border Regions in Europe and North America // International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. 2004. Vol. 28 (3). P. 40.

[15] *Rosenau J.N.* Along the Domestic–Foreign Frontier. Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Speaking about certain dimensions of cross-border governance, with high probability one should start from such a serious aspect as subjects involved in governance activities (c). This aspect includes three main trends: first, the role of government has changed, second, the set of actors has enlarged, and third, engagement of private, public and non-profit sectors has strengthened and intertwined[16].

The civil society, namely such local institutions as environmental groups, cultural associations, chambers of commerce, trade unions and other NGOs[17] have recently become the essential part of governance beyond the borders. Universities got a special role in cooperation too: after becoming a part of the «triple helix cooperation» model, they got more involved in strategic planning activities of bordering territories[18]. In addition to this bunch of municipal agents, the residents also need to be considered as an active and participating side of cross-border governance, not just an object that is governed or that is living in the governed space. To build up a more integrated community across the border, inhabitants should participate in CBC matters on daily basis[19] and adopt a certain type of behaviour[20].

In the 90s the idea of «governing without government»[21] was remarkably popular in public administration, but in the context of border regions applying the term «cross-border governance» does not exclude governmental actors. Perhaps, the opposite is true — the structure of governmental actors in the cross-border dialog has been complicated by more intense involvement of different levels of the politico-administrative system. The other outcome of the shift from «government to governance» is the rising need for network structure of interactions and higher demand for self-organisation of public agencies[22]. Such a demand for «shared governance initiatives»[23] is usually interpreted as an engine of

---

[16] *Konrad V.* Imagining and imaging borders: understanding borderlands for global sustainability // The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences. 2013. Vol. XL-4/W3. P. 29.

[17] *Scott J.W.* European and North American Contexts for Cross-border Regionalism. P. 608.

[18] *Lepik K.-L.* Euroregions as mechanisms for strengthening cross-border cooperation in the Baltic Sea region // Trames. 2009. Vol. 13 (63/58). No 3. P. 278.

[19] *Trillo-Santamaría J.-M.* Cross-border regions: the gap between the elite's projects and people's awareness. Reflections from the Galicia-North Portugal Euroregion // Journal of Borderlands Studies. 2014. Vol. 29. No 2. P. 266.

[20] *Bucken-Knapp G.* Just a train-ride away, but still worlds apart: Prospects for the Øresund region as a binational city // GeoJournal, 2001. Vol. 54 (1). P. 51.

[21] See: Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics / Eds.: J.N. Rosenau, O.C. Ernst. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992; *Rhodes R.A.W.* The New Governance: Governing without Government // Political Studies. 1996. Vol. 44. P. 652–667.
URL: http://graduateinstitute.ch/files/live/sites/iheid/files/sites/developpement/shared/developpement/mdev/soutienauxcours0809/E721_gouvernance/2.2.Rhodes_1996.pdf (25.02.2014).

[22] See: *Perkmann M.* Euroregions. Institutional entrepreneurship in the European Union; *Perkmann M.* Policy entrepreneurship and multi-level governance: a comparative study of European cross-border regions.

[23] *Covarrubias D.* Highlighting the People Factor; Analyzing how a Social Base Impacts Economic

constructive joint work across the border.

However, not every governmental structure is ready to get involved in cross-border governance activities. As the analysis of governance capacity of the Spanish autonomous communities has shown[24], the level of maturity of regional governmental system influences the ability to use EU structural Funds on CBC and to facilitate governing beyond the borders to a great extent.

The other challenge of developing coordinated management of border regions is a discrepancy between the long process of cross-border governance and the relatively «short» life of the actors engaged[25]. Interests of involved governmental institutions are even «shorter» if their heads are not appointed but elected. Under this circumstance, concerns about new elections might interrupt smooth joint work.

Another component of cross-border governance worth touching upon, is the relations between various cross-border governance actors. To map potential playgrounds of cross-border governance, a notion of «political arena» was introduced[26]. It contains nine dimensions of negotiations: 1) the cross-border arena on subnational level; 2) the international / continental arena; 3) the vertical intergovernmental arena; 4) the intrastate horizontal arena; 5) the intraborderlands arena; 6) the intersectoral arena; 7) the relationship between executive and legislative branch; 8) the ideological / partisan competition; 9) the public-private relationship. One could argue that not all of these arenas could be seen as parts of cross-border governance. The most probable objects of critique would be the forth and seventh arenas because of their domestic character. However, as practice has repeatedly shown, «the main dispute is not across the border but between different governments on one side of the border». These conflicts are usually caused by competition, enmity and envy among authorities or administrative entities[27] within the same state.

As a justification of the political arenas concept, Newman and Paasi pointed out that the triad of «centre — semi-periphery — periphery» widely used by the world-system theory

Development and Competitiveness Strategies in a Cross-Border Context — The Case of the Aquitaine — Euskadi Cross-Border Space. Paper presented at the Association of Borderlands Studies World Conference, 2014, Albuquerque, USA. P. 9.

[24] *Harguindeguy J.-B., Bray Z.* Does cross-border cooperation empower European regions? The case of INTERREG III-A France — Spain // Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy. 2009. Vol. 27. P. 747–760.

[25] *Nelles J., Durand F.* Op. cit. P. 117.

[26] *Blatter J.* Explaining cross-border cooperation: a border-focused and border-external approach // Journal of Borderlands Studies. 1997. Vol. 12 (1 & 2). P. 157.

[27] *García-Álvarez J., Trillo-Santamaría J.-M.* Op. cit. P. 110–111.

has been left in the past[28]. Even together with two more layers — macro-level and regional level — added by these British-Israeli and Finnish scholars, this five-level system quite rarely is sufficient to describe the variety of interactions in cross-border regions.

The growing importance of the second arena was emphasized by Kolossov who embedded cross-border governance in the everyday life of the globe and stressed the role of supranational organizations and international networks that connect all kinds of economic and political actors[29].

The ninth arena was studied more closely by Basque scholars who were among the first addressing the interaction between public and private sectors in terms of receiving «institutional support» provided while setting up a cross-border agency[30]. In the context of «growing international locational competition»[31] such a support is often seen as a tool of enhancing territorial competitiveness.

In the overview of European geographical research on borders and border regions made by Van Houtum (d), cross-border governance was not mentioned among aspects studied within cross-border cooperation approach but after reading the list of other terms studied — «clusters, networks, transaction costs, learning, alliances and so on»[32] — we can assume that it will fit in this enumeration.

As exploration of cross-border governance interpretations has demonstrated, the theory was mainly developed with indirect contributions written from perspectives of various disciplines. Such a promiscuous mixture does not establish a framework for essential understanding of the intricate process of governance beyond the borders and illustrates a need for a better generalized theoretical base.

Conclusions

After using border regions as tools of symbol politics and facilitators in the process of European integration, central governments and supranational organizations have rethought the role of cross-border cooperation and emphasized the ability of border regions to drive

---

[28] *Newman D., Paasi A.* Fences and neighbours in the post-modern world: boundary narratives in political geography // Progress in Human Geography. 1998. Vol. 22 (2). P. 186–207.

[29] *Kollosov V.* Theorizing Borders. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches // Geopolitics. 2005. Vol. 10. P. 612.

[30] *Arando S., Navarro M., Peña I.* Cross-border business networks: the case of the Basque Eurocity Corridor // Entrepreneurship, industrial location and economic growth / Eds.: J.M. Arauzo-Carod, M.C. Manjón-Antolín. Cheltenham: Erward Elgar, 2007. P. 209.

[31] *Roeber J.* Towards an Ever Closer Region? Explaining Administrative Cross-Border (Non-) Cooperation from the Vantage Point of Lake Constance / EGPA Study Group on Regional and Local Government. IEP Toulouse, 2010.

[32] *Houtum H., van.* Op. cit. P. 63.

regional economy beyond the borders. Such a change along with admitting the intrinsic value of the border regions development, helped to spread the idea of governing not on each side of the border separately but on the cross-border area coordinately.

Although examples of successful and stable cross-border governance are rare, there are constant attempts to construct it in various borderlands all over the world. Such a practical demand creates a need for theorizing the cross-border governance. Conceptualization of the term under the scrutiny has been advancing over the last two decades, which inspired the author to gather and systematize relevant research. Using a method of consecutive literature review allowed the author to recapitulate the existent understanding of cross-border governance. While not that many academic articles are utilizing this term, even less of them are trying to define it. So far the majority of contributions to the cross-border governance concept were indirect and written from standpoints of various disciplines. One can say that it is a consequence of being a complex multidimensional phenomenon within a multidisciplinary field of border studies. Albeit the determiner of the whole term is «governance», the managerial remarks on cross-border governance are few and dispersed while the Political Science slant is prevailing.

Summarizing all direct and indirect contributions to cross-border governance understanding, the author would like to underline some repetitive patterns. First, this phenomenon has a stadial nature with setting the goal and planning functional cooperation as necessary steps. Second, cross-border governance is characterized with a complex multi-level and matrix internal structure that encompasses linkages and interdependencies among wide range of subjects. Furthermore, the need to consider all existing political, legislative and administrative cultures creates a demand for self-organization of all actors involved. Such a requirement is imposed simultaneously with an on-going growth of intertwined engagement of public, private and non-profit sectors with civil society and residents' participation. Finally, negotiations between actors on the same side of the border have complicated and became the most problematic area to reach consent due to multiple conflicting interests of the parties.

Bearing in mind the multi-level character of cross-border governance, one should remember that the most active units trying to establish governance beyond the borders are either adjacent settlements or contiguous regions of neighboring states. Taking into account advantages and limitations of managerial practices on regional and municipal level, specificities of cross-border governance on each of them should be investigated more precisely.

References:

1. *Бусыгина И.М.* Политическая регионалистика. М.: РОССПЭН, 2006.

2. *Anderson J., O'Dowd L.* Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance // Regional Studies. 1999. Vol. 33. Issue 7. P. 593–604.

3. *Arando S., Navarro M., Peña I.* Cross-border business networks: the case of the Basque Eurocity Corridor // Entrepreneurship, industrial location and economic growth / Eds.: J.M. Arauzo-Carod, M.C. Manjón-Antolín. Cheltenham: Erward Elgar, 2007. P. 205–229.

4. *Blatter J.* Explaining cross-border cooperation: a border-focused and border-external approach // Journal of Borderlands Studies. 1997. Vol. 12 (1 & 2). P. 151–174.

5. *Blatter J.* «From Spaces of Place» to «Spaces of Flows»? Territorial and Functional Governance in Cross-border Regions in Europe and North America // International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. 2004. Vol. 28 (3). P. 530–548.

6. Borders and Border Regions in Europe & North America / Eds.: P. Ganster, J.W. Scott, A. Sweedler, W. Dieter-Eberwein. San Diego: University of San Diego Press, 1997.

7. *Bucken-Knapp G.* Just a train-ride away, but still worlds apart: Prospects for the Øresund region as a binational city // GeoJournal, 2001. Vol. 54 (1). P. 51–60.

8. *Covarrubias D.* Highlighting the People Factor; Analyzing how a Social Base Impacts Economic Development and Competitiveness Strategies in a Cross-Border Context — The Case of the Aquitaine — Euskadi Cross-Border Space. Paper presented at the Association of Borderlands Studies World Conference, 2014, Albuquerque, USA.

9. *Dear M.J., Leclerc G., Berelowitz J.* Postborder City: Cultural Spaces of Bajalta California / University of Southern California. New York: Routledge, 2003.

10. European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities. Madrid, 21 May 1980 // Council of Europe [Official Site]. URL: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/106.htm (01.02.2014).

11. *García-Álvarez J., Trillo-Santamaría J.-M.* Between regional spaces and spaces of regionalism: cross-border region building in the Spanish «state of autonomies» // Regional Studies. 2013. Vol. 47. No 1. P. 104–115.

12. Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics / Eds.: J.N. Rosenau, O.C. Ernst. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

13. *Gualini E.* Cross-border Governance: Inventing Regions in a Trans-national Multi-level Polity // DISP. 2003. Vol. 39 (152). P. 43–52.

14. *Harguindeguy J.-B., Bray Z.* Does cross-border cooperation empower European regions? The case of INTERREG III-A France — Spain // Environment and Planning C: Government

and Policy. 2009. Vol. 27. P. 747–760.

15. *Hooghe L., Marks G.* Types of multi-level governance // Types of Multilevel Governance / Eds.: H. Enderlein, S. Walti, M. Zurn. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2010. P. 17–31.

16. *Houtum H., van.* An overview of European geographical research on borders and border regions // Journal of Borderlands Studies. 2000. Vol. 15 (1). P. 57–83.

17. *Janczak J.* Cross-border governance in border twin towns. Central European case / Paper presented at the CEU HPSA Conference, May 2011. URL: http://studentunion.ceu.hu/sites/default/files/publications/janczak-paper.pdf (24.09.2014).

18. *Kollosov V.* Theorizing Borders. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches // Geopolitics. 2005. Vol. 10. P. 606–632.

19. *Konrad V.* Imagining and imaging borders: understanding borderlands for global sustainability // The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences. 2013. Vol. XL-4/W3. P. 27–31.

20. *Kramsch O.T.* Re-Imaging the «Scalar fix» of transborder Governance: The case of the Maas-Rhein Euregio // Routing Borders Between Territories, discourses and practices / Eds.: E. Berg, H. Houtum, van. Gateshead: Athenaeum press, Ltd., 2003.

21. *Lepik K.-L.* Euroregions as mechanisms for strengthening cross-border cooperation in the Baltic Sea region // Trames. 2009. Vol. 13 (63/58). No 3. P. 265–284.

22. *Martinez O.* The Dynamics of Border Interaction: New approaches to border analysis // World Boundaries / Ed.: C. Schofield. London: Routledge Publishing, 1994. Vol. 1: Global Boundaries. P. 1–15.

23. *Nelles J., Durand F.* Political rescaling and metropolitan governance in cross-border regions: comparing the cross-border metropolitan areas of Lille and Luxemburg //European Urban and Regional Studies. 2014. Vol. 21. No 1. P. 104–122.

24. *Newman D., Paasi A.* Fences and neighbours in the post-modern world: boundary narratives in political geography // Progress in Human Geography. 1998. Vol. 22 (2). P. 186–207.

25. *Perkmann M.* Euroregions. Institutional entrepreneurship in the European Union // Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions / Eds.: M. Perkmann, N.-G. Sum. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2002. P. 103–124.

26. *Perkmann M.* Policy entrepreneurship and multi-level governance: a comparative study of European cross-border regions // Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy. 2007. Vol. 25 (6). P. 861–879. URL: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1133126 (20.02.2014).

27. *Pikner T.* Reorganizing Cross-Border Governance Capacity: The Case of the Helsinki — Tallinn Euregio // European Urban and Regional Studies. 2008. Vol. 15 (3). P. 211–227. URL: http://eur.sagepub.com/content/15/3/211.full.pdf+html (06.03.2014)

28. *Rhodes R.A.W.* The New Governance: Governing without Government // Political Studies. 1996. Vol. 44. P. 652–667.
URL: http://graduateinstitute.ch/files/live/sites/iheid/files/sites/developpement/shared/developpement/mdev/soutienauxcours0809/E721_gouvernance/2.2.Rhodes_1996.pdf (25.02.2014).

29. *Roeber J.* Towards an Ever Closer Region? Explaining Administrative Cross-Border (Non-) Cooperation from the Vantage Point of Lake Constance / EGPA Study Group on Regional and Local Government. IEP Toulouse, 2010.

30. *Rosenau J.N.* Along the Domestic–Foreign Frontier. Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

31. *Scott J.W.* European and North American Contexts for Cross-border Regionalism // Regional studies. 1999. Vol. 33. P. 605–707.

32. *Scott J.W.* Euroregions, governance and transborder cooperation within the EU // Borders, Border regions and People / Eds.: M. van der Velde, H. van Houtum. London: Pion Limited, 2000. P. 91–106.

33. *Terlouw K.* Border surfers and euroregions: unplanned cross-border behavior and planned territorial structures of cross-border governance // Planning Practice and Research. 2012. Vol. 27. No 3. P. 351–366.

34. *Trillo-Santamaría J.-M.* Cross-border regions: the gap between the elite's projects and people's awareness. Reflections from the Galicia-North Portugal Euroregion // Journal of Borderlands Studies. 2014. Vol. 29. No 2. P. 257–273.

Mikhailova E.V.

Theorizing on Cross-Border Governance:
from Emergence of the Concept to its Current Understanding

Ekaterina V. Mikhailova — Ph.D. student, Faculty of Public and Municipal Administration, National Research Institute — Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation.
E-mail: mikhaylovaev@yandex.ru

Annotation
The paper provides an overview of theorizing on the cross-border governance concept. Based on the literature review, the author reveals that albeit the determiner of the whole term is «governance», the managerial remarks on it are few and fragmented while the majority of definitions demonstrate clear Political Science slant. The heterogeneity of interpretations is explained by the complex multidimensional nature of studied phenomenon and attempts to explore it from standpoints of various disciplines. The emergence of the idea of coordinative governance beyond the borders is described as a result of the evolutionary process of understanding the contact function of the borderlands. Border regions and border municipalities are named the chief initiators of project work to implement governance beyond the borders. Taking into consideration peculiarities, advantages and limitations of managerial practices on the sub-national and local level, the author stresses the need for further research and conceptualization of cross-border governance.

Keywords
Cross-border governance, transborder territorial units, sustainable development of the borderland, management of border regions, management of border municipalities.

References:

1. Busygina I.M. *Politicheskaja regionalistika*. Moscow: ROSSPJeN, 2006.

2. Anderson J., O'Dowd L. Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance. *Regional Studies*, 1999, 33 (7), pp. 593–604.

3. Arando S., Navarro M., Peña I. Cross-border business networks: the case of the Basque Eurocity Corridor. *Entrepreneurship, industrial location and economic growth* / Eds.: J.M. Arauzo-Carod, M.C. Manjón-Antolín. Cheltenham: Erward Elgar, 2007. Pp. 205–229.

4. Blatter J. Explaining cross-border cooperation: a border-focused and border-external approach. *Journal of Borderlands Studies,* 1997, 12 (1 & 2), pp. 151–174.

5. Blatter J. «From Spaces of Place» to «Spaces of Flows»? Territorial and Functional Governance in Cross-border Regions in Europe and North America. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 2004, 28 (3), pp. 530–548.

6. *Borders and Border Regions in Europe & North America* / Eds.: P. Ganster, J.W. Scott, A. Sweedler, W. Dieter-Eberwein. San Diego: University of San Diego Press, 1997.

7. Bucken-Knapp G. Just a train-ride away, but still worlds apart: Prospects for the Øresund region as a binational city. *GeoJournal*, 2001, 54 (1), pp. 51–60.

8. Covarrubias D. *Highlighting the People Factor; Analyzing how a Social Base Impacts Economic Development and Competitiveness Strategies in a Cross-Border Context — The Case of the Aquitaine — Euskadi Cross-Border Space*. Paper presented at the Association of Borderlands Studies World Conference, 2014, Albuquerque, USA.

9. Dear M.J., Leclerc G., Berelowitz J. *Postborder City: Cultural Spaces of Bajalta California* / University of Southern California. New York: Routledge, 2003.

10. European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities. Madrid, 21 May 1980. *Council of Europe* [Official Site]. URL: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/106.htm (01.02.2014).

11. García-Álvarez J., Trillo-Santamaría J.-M. Between regional spaces and spaces of regionalism: cross-border region building in the Spanish «state of autonomies». *Regional Studies,* 2013, 47 (1), pp. 104–115.

12. *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* / Eds.: J.N. Rosenau, O.C. Ernst. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

13. Gualini E. Cross-border Governance: Inventing Regions in a Trans-national Multi-level Polity. *DISP*, 2003, 39 (152), pp. 43–52.

14. Harguindeguy J.-B., Bray Z. Does cross-border cooperation empower European regions? The case of INTERREG III-A France — Spain. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 2009, 27, pp. 747–760.

15. Hooghe L., Marks G. Types of multi-level governance. *Types of Multilevel Governance* / Eds.: H. Enderlein, S. Walti, M. Zurn. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2010. Pp. 17–31.

16. Houtum H., van. An overview of European geographical research on borders and border regions. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 2000, 15 (1), pp. 57–83.

17. Janczak J. *Cross-border governance in border twin towns. Central European case.* Paper presented at the CEU HPSA Conference, May 2011. URL: http://studentunion.ceu.hu/sites/default/files/publications/janczak-paper.pdf (24.09.2014).

18. Kollosov V. Theorizing Borders. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches. *Geopolitics*, 2005, 10, pp. 606–632.

19. Konrad V. Imagining and imaging borders: understanding borderlands for global sustainability. *The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, 2013, vol. XL-4/W3, pp. 27–31.

20. Kramsch O.T. Re-Imaging the «Scalar fix» of transborder Governance: The case of the Maas-Rhein Euregio. *Routing Borders Between Territories, discourses and practices* / Eds.: E. Berg, H. Houtum, van. Gateshead: Athenaeum press, Ltd., 2003.

21. Lepik K.-L. Euroregions as mechanisms for strengthening cross-border cooperation in the Baltic Sea region. *Trames,* 2009, vol. 13 (63/58), no 3, pp. 265–284.

22. Martinez O. The Dynamics of Border Interaction: New approaches to border analysis. *World Boundaries* / Ed.: C. Schofield. London: Routledge Publishing, 1994. Vol. 1: Global Boundaries. Pp. 1–15.

23. Nelles J., Durand F. Political rescaling and metropolitan governance in cross-border regions: comparing the cross-border metropolitan areas of Lille and Luxemburg. European *Urban and Regional Studies,* 2014, 21 (1), pp. 104–122.

24. Newman D., Paasi A. Fences and neighbours in the post-modern world: boundary narratives in political geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 1998, 22 (2), pp. 186–207.

25. Perkmann M. Euroregions. Institutional entrepreneurship in the European Union. *Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions* / Eds.: M. Perkmann, N.-G. Sum. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2002. Pp. 103–124.

26. Perkmann M. Policy entrepreneurship and multi-level governance: a comparative study of European cross-border regions. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 2007, 25 (6), pp. 861–879. URL: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1133126 (20.02.2014).

27. Pikner T. Reorganizing Cross-Border Governance Capacity: The Case of the Helsinki — Tallinn Euregio. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 2008, 15 (3), pp. 211–227.

URL: http://eur.sagepub.com/content/15/3/211.full.pdf+html (06.03.2014)

28. Rhodes R.A.W. The New Governance: Governing without Government. *Political Studies*, 1996, 44, pp. 652–667.

URL: http://graduateinstitute.ch/files/live/sites/iheid/files/sites/developpement/shared/developpement/mdev/soutienauxcours0809/E721_gouvernance/2.2.Rhodes_1996.pdf (25.02.2014).

29. Roeber J. *Towards an Ever Closer Region? Explaining Administrative Cross-Border (Non-) Cooperation from the Vantage Point of Lake Constance* / EGPA Study Group on Regional and Local Government. IEP Toulouse, 2010.

30. Rosenau J.N. *Along the Domestic–Foreign Frontier. Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

31. Scott J.W. European and North American Contexts for Cross-border Regionalism. *Regional studies*, 1999, 33, pp. 605–707.

32. Scott J.W. Euroregions, governance and transborder cooperation within the EU. *Borders, Border regions and People* / Eds.: M. van der Velde, H. van Houtum. London: Pion Limited, 2000. Pp. 91–106.

33. Terlouw K. Border surfers and euroregions: unplanned cross-border behavior and planned territorial structures of cross-border governance. *Planning Practice and Research*, 2012, 27 (3), pp. 351–366.

34. Trillo-Santamaría J.-M. Cross-border regions: the gap between the elite's projects and people's awareness. Reflections from the Galicia-North Portugal Euroregion. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 2014, 29 (2), pp. 257–273.