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Functional areas: challenges

- Functional areas / functional linkages = abstract concept, not tangible
  - difficult to understand and to communicate to the general public
- Often reduced to cross-border work commuter
- Functional linkages are often seen as the 'indirect product' of the behaviour, decisions and daily activities of all actors in a region
  - little awareness that these linkages can also be actively developed
- Lack of responsibility and lack of focus in cross-border context
- European Commission: Functional areas ≠ analytical spaces
  - Idea is to use it as policy objective and to actively establish / improve such linkages in different policy fields (not just transport connections!)
  - Functional linkages in border context: enabling flows and connection of people, goods, materials and knowledge
Key CPS features for functional linkages

• address a **shared problem** or **development opportunity**
• include **actors** from **both sides** of the **border** (incl. commitment to jointly provide a service)
• have **target groups** on **both sides** of the **border**
• establish **tangible services** that are **visible** (‘materialization‘ of funct. linkages)
• implemented in **various policy fields** (transport, labour market and employment, environment protection, education, health care, spatial planning, tourism, civil protection and disaster management etc.)
• designed to **sustain over a long time** (unlike time-limited projects or events)
• service provision at **one or several locations** on both sides of the border
• **flexibility** in implementation, delivery and management models
• are **evolvable** and **dynamic** (start with „low hanging fruits“, then grow & extend)
• developable and manageable by **regional actors** (bottom-up approach)
CPS a new instrument?

Cross-border Public Services …

• … are no new instruments
• … first services already implemented in the 1960s…
• … boost in services in the 1990s with launch of Interreg programmes
• … but still CPS are not well known among regions
• … until recently, no common definition of the concept of CPS and of the number and scope of services were available
• … that’s why ESPON launched the empirical study on CPS in Europe
CPS at Czech borders
CPS along Czech borders: a total of 47 CPS

- Most CPS are bilateral in nature
- But also examples for trinational or multi-national CPS exist
- Geographical focus towards west
CPS along Czech borders: density
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Cross-border public services (CPS): Number of CPS per border segment.
Most Czech CPS with Germany

- **CPS inventory**: total of 559 CPS
- **Highest densities** along borders between the 6 founding EU Member States and in Nordic countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech border with ... *</th>
<th>CPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* double counting of some CPS as they cover more than one border
With focus on 4 dominating fields

CPS along Czech borders:
- CPS address many policy fields, but clear focus given on four fields
- ... with transport clearly dominating
- ... followed by environment protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy fields</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment protection</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil protection, disaster management</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare and social inclusion</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial planning, tourism and culture</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market and employment</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship, justice, public security</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, broadband</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And tourists being the main target group

- CPS may address **unspecific** as well as very **specific target groups**
- One CPS may address **different target groups** at the same time (example: cross-border trains address workers, tourists, apprentices etc)
- Direct beneficiaries and end users can be different
- Target groups may also be involved as actors and/or service providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils, students and apprentices</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border workers</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job seekers</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic actors</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People requiring medical / permanent care</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholder groups</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other person groups</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General observationa (European level)

- **CPS inventory**: total of 559 CPS
- **Distribution**: CPS can be found all over Europe, but are spread in a rather imbalanced way
- **Type of borders**: CPS primarily exist along borders that
  - have a long tradition of cross-border cooperation (experiences, trust, existing networks),
  - in areas with high population densities (i.e. high demand), or
  - with extremely low population densities and long distances (maintaining public services)

  **New**: instrument to establish functional linkages
CPS shaping functional areas
CPS shaping functional linkages

CPS enhance functionality in border regions by

• ... contributing to raise **awareness** of cross-border **possibilities**
• ... addressing **gaps** / shortcomings in **domestic service provision**
• ... creating (thematic) **functional linkages** / functional areas
• ... making service provision less costly and raise its **efficiency**, thereby helping to maintain services in areas with low demand
• ... enabling **cross-border flows** of **people** (goods, materials, knowledge, ...)
• ... generating **better connections**
• ... contributing to **reducing negative border effects**
• ... **bundling** different **services delineates a functional area**
• ... **sustaining** Interreg projects
# Implementation models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Networking model</th>
<th>Centralised model</th>
<th>Integrated model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Cooperative task delivery through a division of labour between different public administrations (local, regional, national) or service providing organisations on both sides of a border</td>
<td>Unilateral task delivery through an existing public administration (local, regional, national) or service providing organisation on one side of the border, acting for the benefit of both sides.</td>
<td>Delegated task delivery &amp; joint management of the service, by using an already existing cross-border structure / body with own legal personality, seconded or own staff and an own budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>Shared management of the service through a newly created informal network or formalised network structure involving the relevant organisations from both sides of the border (with or without a joint coordination unit).</td>
<td>One-sided management of the service through the concerned public authority or service provider, either by not involving actors from the other side in domestic management or by involving such actors.</td>
<td>Integrated task delivery &amp; integrated management of the service, by transferring responsibilities for decision making and operational service management to a newly established cross-border structure / body with own public-law based legal personality, directly employed personnel and an own budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPS building blocks

Common understanding
- Objectives & border realities

Define and decide the tasks
- e.g. target group, service area, fees

Agree on infrastructure use
- e.g. normative frameworks, maintenance

Assess and adjust legal frameworks
- e.g. EU, national or regional provisions

Define management arrangements
- e.g. degree of formalisation
CPS and Interreg
Relation CPS & Interreg projects

1. Sustaining Interreg projects
   - CPS follows Interreg project ('successor'), CPS means to perpetuate temporary Interreg projects

2. Interreg lays outlines for CPS
   - Interreg project strategically used to develop foundations for a CPS

3. CPS supports Interreg
   - Specific CPS set up in order to support future Interreg activities

As a reminder:
Interreg project ≠ CPS
Interreg Secretariat ≠ CPS
New Interreg regulations

Possibilities to use Interreg support to establish CPS or to use CPS to sustain Interreg projects within the “5+1” policy priorities

- PO 2 – Energy and risk prevention
- PO 3 – Transport
- PO 4 – Health and education
- Interreg PO – Governance

New regulations stress the importance of “functional linkages” within border regions.

CPS could be an instrument to strengthening/establish such functional linkages.

Good practice CPS already exist for all these policy objectives
Products by „ESPON CPS“

For further support & apart from 'standard' ESPON output …

• 29 good practice fact sheets in 8 thematic fields
• Practical guide for CPS development
• 10 case study reports on existing & future CPS

ESPON website: www.espon.eu
Thank you.

Contact info for further support:

Carsten Schürrmann, TCP International  cs@tcp-international.de