

## **Spatial Planning + Best Practices + European Territorial Cooperation = Convergence?**

**Dr Dominic Stead**

Delft University of Technology

OTB Research Institute for Housing, Urban and Mobility Studies

PO Box 5030

2600 GA Delft

The Netherlands

t: +31-15-2783005

f: +31-15-2783450

e: d.stead@tudelft.nl

### **Abstract**

Spatial planning, in both western and eastern Europe, has recently undergone reform in response to the common challenges of globalization, sustainable development, economic competitiveness, European integration, economic reforms and demographic change. A diversity of cross-border and inter-territorial cooperation and networking initiatives (e.g. INTERREG programmes) has also helped to influence the processes of reform by exposing policy-makers to policies and practices in other contexts. Both the current and previous European Territorial Cooperation programmes are in fact founded on the assumption that best practices are equally applicable and effective in another setting, and that the development and dissemination of best practice will help to lead to improvements in policy and practice in other countries, regions or cities. This paper argues that such a belief is too simplistic.

Despite the common challenges facing almost all spatial planning systems, there are also deeply embedded differences between European countries in terms of political and administrative cultures and structures, particularly between north and south and western and eastern Europe. These differences call into question the applicability of the direct transposition of 'best practices' and potentially put a brake on the idea of the 'Europeanisation' and convergence of spatial planning. Indeed, changes to spatial planning systems based on experience from elsewhere but which do not address the underlying cultures may reduce the local relevance and effectiveness of the formal planning system. The reality is that best practices have a more limited role in shaping national spatial planning systems: other influences are more important. This is particularly true when considering the transfer of best practices between 'new' and 'old' member states (east and west for short), where the

social and economic situation, as well as the institutional frameworks, are often very different in the 'borrowing' and 'lending' countries.

This paper focuses on the implications and importance of best practices for spatial planning. The paper begins by reviewing recent European policy documents on cross-border and inter-territorial cooperation, and examines the importance these documents attach to the identification and dissemination of best practices. Next, the paper identifies some of the main reasons why governments have been increasingly active in developing (or claiming) innovative policies that represent best practice: reasons include image, prestige, power and funding. The paper then reviews literature on how best practices are actually viewed and used by government officials, and examines the extent to which best practices are influential in changing the direction of policy. This paper examines the extent to which best practices in spatial planning are transferable, especially between eastern and western Europe.

### **Introduction – best practices in European policies and programmes**

*“To what extent are... policy instruments, which have proved to be successful in one urban area, transferable to another, given that the latter has a different historical, cultural or political background, or is in another phase of economic development? Are there ‘best practices’ which are convertible like currencies? If not, how and to what extent must one take account of specific circumstances?”*  
(Güller, 1996: 25)

The concept of best practice (or good practice) is rife in European policies and programmes. In the area of spatial planning, best practices have been developed under a range of European programmes and projects. The underlying belief is that identifying, promoting and disseminating good practice will help contribute to transnational learning and lead to improvements in policy and practice. This paper questions this underlying belief: it examines the *validity* of European best practices, particularly given the fact that there are huge differences in the technological, economic, political or social situation between countries in Europe, and it investigates the *role* of European best practices in influencing policy-making processes. The paper then outlines some conclusions in the form of directions for future activity in the area of best practice. The paper begins by considering some of the key European policies and programmes that promulgate the development or use of best practice in areas related to spatial planning.

Recent attention to best practice in European policy documents is undeniably high. Frequent mention of best practice can be found in diverse European policies relevant to spatial planning: examples

include the 1999 European Spatial Development Perspective, or ESDP, (CSD, 1999), the 2001 White Paper on European Governance (CEC, 2001), the 2005 revised sustainable development strategy (CEC, 2005), the 2006 Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment (CEC, 2006), the 2007 Green Paper on Urban Mobility (CEC, 2007), the 2007 Leipzig Charter on Sustainable Urban Cities (German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, 2007b) and the 2007 Territorial Agenda of the European Union (German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, 2007b).

The ESDP states that *'the exchange of good practices in sustainable urban policy... offers an interesting approach for applying ESDP policy options'* (CSD, 1999: 22). The 2001 White Paper on European Governance highlights the role of the 'open method of coordination' (OMC) as a key factor in improving European governance, stating that OMC involves *'encouraging co-operation, the exchange of best practice and agreeing common targets and guidelines'* (CEC, 2001: 21). The 2005 revised sustainable development strategy considers *'the exchange best practices'*, together with the organization of events and stakeholder meetings and the dissemination of new ideas, as important ways of mainstreaming sustainable development (CEC, 2005: 25). The 2007 Green Paper on Urban Mobility asserts that *'European towns and cities are all different, but they face similar challenges and are trying to find common solutions'* (CEC, 2007: 1) and argues that *'the exchange of good practice at all levels (local, regional or national)'* (p5) provides an important way of finding common solutions to these challenges at the European level. The Leipzig Charter on Sustainable Urban Cities (German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, 2007a: 7) calls for *'a European platform to pool and develop best practice, statistics, benchmarking studies, evaluations, peer reviews and other urban research to support actors involved in urban development'*. The Territorial Agenda of the European Union contains a whole annex of examples of 'best practices of territorial cooperation' (German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, 2007b).

The EU's 2006 Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment (CEC, 2006) has perhaps the most to say about best practices concerning spatial planning and development. In fact, the exchange of best practices forms one of the four main actions of the strategy. The strategy states that *'many solutions already exist in certain cities but are not sufficiently disseminated or implemented'* and that *'the EU can best support Member States and local authorities by promoting Europe's best practices, facilitating their widespread use throughout Europe and encouraging effective networking and exchange of experiences between cities'* (CEC, 2006: 3). The document argues that *'improving local authorities' access to existing solutions is important to allow them to learn from each other and develop solutions adapted to their specific situation'* and highlights that *'the Commission will offer support for the exchange of good practice and for demonstration projects on urban issues for local and regional authorities'* (CEC, 2006: 6).

Examples of best practice in European research programmes and cooperation initiatives are widespread. Examples include programmes funded under the European Regional Development Fund (e.g. INTERACT, ETC/INTERREG, URBACT), pre-accession funding programmes (e.g. IPA – the successor of Phare, ISPA and SAPARD), research programmes, environmental programmes (e.g. LIFE+) and rural development programmes (e.g. LEADER+, which ran from 2000-2006). The European Research Framework Programme (and particularly the Energy, Environment and Sustainable Development thematic programme of the Fifth Framework Programme – EESD) has led to a number of projects that have developed best practice guides/comparisons concerning spatial planning and governance (see Table 1 for an indicative list of examples). The extent to which these projects have considered the applicability of best practices in another context and the transferability of these examples, especially to new member states of the European Union, has however been rather limited.

Attention to best practice at the global level is also high. Activities concerning best practices (primarily in the form of publications) can for example be found within the OECD and the World Bank. These include the OECD report 'Best Practices in Local Development' (OECD, 2001) and the World Bank working paper entitled 'Local Economic Development: Good Practice from the European Union (and beyond)' (World Bank, 2000). UN-Habitat supports the Best Practices and Local Leadership Programme, '*dedicated to the identification and exchange of successful solutions for sustainable development*' (UN-Habitat, 2008) and aims to '*raise awareness of decision-makers on critical social, economic and environmental issues and to better inform them of the practical means and policy options for improving the living environment... by identifying, disseminating and applying lessons learned from best practices to ongoing training, leadership and policy development activities*' (UN-Habitat, 2008).

These various European and global policies, programmes and initiatives all serve to illustrate that the development and dissemination of best practice is widely considered to be an effective means of promoting policy transfer and learning. According to Bulkeley (2006: 1030), the assumption that the dissemination of best practice can lead to policy change '*has become an accepted wisdom within national policies and programmes, as well as in international arenas and networks*'. The logic seems to be that by providing information or knowledge about specific initiatives, other individuals and/or organisations will be able to undertake similar projects or processes, or learn from the experience, which will lead to policy change (ibid). Nevertheless, despite all the attention on best practice in policies, programmes and projects, little is known about the ways in which best practices are produced and used, and their role in processes of policymaking.

Table 1. Selected examples of European projects containing best practices on spatial planning

Project title	Funding Programme	Description
AGORA – Cities for People	FP5 EESD	Identifies best practice for urban planning and design. Studies the transferability/ applicability of best practice.
COST Action C8 – Best practice in sustainable urban infra-structure	ESF-COST Programme	Identifies best practices concerning sustainable urban infrastructure.
COST Action A26 – European city regions in an age of multi-level governance	ESF-COST Programme	Identifies best practice examples for reconciling competitiveness and social cohesion in different contexts.
GRIDS – Best practice guidelines for instruments of regional development and spatial planning in an enlarged EU	INTERREG IIIC West	Produces best practice guidelines for Regional Development Strategies and Spatial Plans.
LASALA – Eco-efficient urban management and new models of urban governance	FP5 EESD	Identifies best practices in urban governance and eco-efficient urban management.
RESCUE – Regeneration of European sites in cities and urban environments	FP5 EESD	Identifies examples of best practice in the regeneration of 'brownfield' land in Europe.
SCATTER – Sprawling cities and transport: from evaluation to recommendations	FP5 EESD	Identifies best practices for managing urban sprawl in western European cities.
SELMA – Spatial deconcentration of economic land use and quality of life in European metropolitan areas	FP5 EESD	Produces a best practice guide based on collective experience in dealing with deconcentration of economic land use.
SURE – A time-oriented model for Sustainable Urban Regeneration	FP5 EESD	Collects best practices of urban renewal policies.
TRANSLAND – Integration of transport and land-use planning	FP4 Transport	Identifies best practice in the field of integrating transport and land-use planning, and analyses their transferability, including legal and regulatory requirements.
TRANSPLUS – Transport planning, land use and sustainability	FP5 EESD	Identifies best practices for integrating land use and transport planning.
URGE – Development of Urban Green Spaces to Improve the Quality of Life in Cities and Urban Regions	FP5 EESD	Identifies good practice for developing urban green spaces and improving the quality of life in cities and urban regions.

## The validity of European best practices

A common assumption behind best practices is that they are equally applicable and effective in another setting. However, the large number and diversity of European member states, where there are substantial differences in governance, administrative cultures and professional capacities, make such an assumption questionable. This assumption is particularly questionable in the case of transposing best practices between dissimilar countries, such as from west to east Europe ('old' to 'new' member states of the EU), where the social and economic situation, as well as the institutional frameworks, are often very different in the 'borrowing' and 'lending' countries. Nevertheless, examples can be found where countries in eastern Europe have used best practices from western Europe as a way of trying to catch up politically and/or economically (Rose, 1993). Randma-Liiv (2005: 472) states that *'policy transfer has become a fact of everyday life in various countries'* and that *'post-communist countries have been especially willing to emulate the West'*.

Various factors, including European initiatives for research, territorial cooperation and development assistance (see above), have inspired these processes of policy transfer from west to east Europe. Politicians often see policy transfer as the quickest solution to many problems without having to reinvent the wheel (Rose, 2005; Tavits, 2003). In eastern Europe, policy transfer is frequently regarded as a means of avoiding newcomer costs: using the experience of other countries is cheaper because they have already borne the costs of policy planning and analysis, whereas creating original policies requires substantial financial resources (Randma-Liiv, 2005). The availability of financial resources to support these processes of west-east policy transfer is of course another (and perhaps the most important) factor behind these processes taking place, especially where funding from other levels is limited. However, as the OECD report 'Best Practices in Local Development' recognises, best practices is not without its complexities and challenges because *'the possibilities of what can be achieved by policy may vary between different areas and different times'* and because there is *'no single model of how to implement local development or of what strategies or actions to adopt'* (OECD, 2001: 29).

There are also limitations of best practice in terms of the ability to transfer sufficient detailed knowledge and information in the form of case-study reports, policy documents, policy guidance notes or databases. In effect, best practice seeks to make the contextual, or tacit, knowledge about a process or instrument explicit by means of codification (Bulkeley, 2006). However, this process is not as straightforward as the production of best practices might make it seem because *'expressing tacit knowledge in formal language is often clumsy and imprecisely articulated'* (Hartley & Allison, 2002: 105). Wolman et al (1994) make a similar point in relation to the difficulty in conveying the full picture of best practice. They report that *'delegations from distressed cities are frequent visitors to...*

*'successful' cities, hoping to learn from them and to emulate their success' but 'these visitors – and others who herald these 'urban success stories' – are frequently quite unclear about the nature of these successes and the benefits they produce' (Wolman et al, 1994: 835).*

In terms of the transferability of best practice, the OECD report on Best Practices in Local Development (OECD, 2001) differentiates between various components of best practice and identifies the extent to which each of these can be transferred (Figure 1). At one end of the spectrum of components are ideas, principles and philosophies which have low visibility (since they can be difficult for the outside to fully understand and specify) and difficult to transfer because it can be difficult for others to make them relevant to their own situation. At the other end of the spectrum are programmes, institutions, modes of organisation and practitioners which tend to have high visibility and are relatively easy to understand but are not very transferable since they tend to be specific to particular areas or contexts. According to the OECD report, it is components such as methods, techniques, know-how and operating rules, with medium visibility, that make the most sense to exchange or transfer. The report on Best Practices in Local Development also highlights the need to examine who is involved in the process of transfer in order to gauge transferability of best practices. It distinguishes between top-down transfer processes initiated by promoters (e.g. national agencies) seeking to disseminate best practices and bottom-up processes initiated by 'recipients' in response to a need that they have recognised themselves. It argues that the latter is likely to work best. This is very much linked to the notions of demand and supply led processes of policy transfer: demand-based policy transfer is based on the initiative and acknowledged need of a recipient administration, whilst supply-led policy transfer is based on the initiative of the donor and the donor's perception of the needs of the recipient such as foreign aid initiatives (Randma-Liiv, 2005).

Planners across Europe are now routinely involved in trans-boundary cooperation networks and inter-regional collaboration initiatives and thus subject to foreign experiences and exposed to a variety of planning approaches from other member states (Dühr et al, 2007). Nevertheless, literature on the Europeanization of spatial planning suggests that different policy concepts take root in different ways across the European territory (see for example Böhme & Waterhout, 2007; Dabinett & Richardson, 2005; Giannakourou, 2005; Janin Rivolin & Faludi, 2005; Tewdwr-Jones & Williams, 2001). It is thus unlikely that best practices will lead to the same outcomes across different European member states, no matter how faithfully transferred.

Figure 1. Components of local development practices and their transferability (source: OECD, 2001)

Visibility	Component for exchange	Transferability
Low	Ideas	Low
	Principles for action	
	Philosophy	
Medium	Methods	High
	Techniques	
	Know-how	
	Operating rules	
High	Programmes	Low
	Institutions	
	Modes of organisation	
	Practitioners	
	Joint projects	

How are best practices identified? Wolman et al (2004) take a very critical view about this, arguing that best practice in urban public policy is frequently built around perceptions without evaluation.<sup>1</sup> They conclude that identifying best practice is often '*an exercise in informal polling*' (p992) and argue that the reputations of so-called best practice simply snowball as observers become self-referential. Best practice, they suggest, may just represent '*the manifestation of the best advertising and most effective programmatic or municipal spin doctoring*' (p992). Benz (2007) argues that sub-national governments in Germany are becoming increasingly active in developing (or claiming) innovative policies, which they then try to sell as 'success stories' and best practices. According to Lidström (2007: 505), '*in this new competitive world of territorial governance, most units depict themselves as winners*'. To be highly ranked and used as a benchmark is not only a good image for the locality, but can also attract additional money from the federal government. It is equally likely that this is also the case in other countries and also at the EU level with sub-national governments competing for EU funding by promoting 'success stories' and best practices. In so doing, they not only attract additional national and regional funding, they can also use EU funding to partly bypass traditional structures of domestic policy making and vertical power relations, should they so wish (Carmichael, 2005; Heinelt & Niederhafner, 2008; Le Galès, 2002).

<sup>1</sup> Wolman & Page (2002) also discuss the lack of evaluation of best practice. They argue that both receivers and producers of best practices have virtually no means of assessing the validity of the information they receive, and that most do not even recognize this as a problem.



The creation and use of best practice as a means of reward and recognition for particular initiatives, individuals, and places means that only 'good news' stories are disseminated, and that the sometimes murky details of how practices were put into place (and any difficulties or failures along the way) are obscured. Aware that best practices represent sanitised stories, practitioners often pursue their own networks of knowledge in order to gain an understanding of the processes involved (Bulkeley, 2006). Wolman & Page (2002) report that UK local government officials involved in urban regeneration are sceptical about good practice documents, exemplified in the following quotes from some of their interviewees:

*"I've found some of the good practice guides so simplistic that they are almost of no value"*  
(regeneration partnership official)

*"There seems to be a lot of material promoted as good practice that wouldn't stand the light of day if it were seriously evaluated"* (national government official, DETR)

*"Everyone has to be seen as 'succeeding'"* (official from the Government Offices for the Regions)

## **The role of best practice**

### *National and international best practices*

Despite the proliferation of best practice examples, there appears to be some opinion in the academic literature that the practical use and usefulness of best practices are rather limited. While a high proportion of local authority actors agree that learning from the experience of others is important and indicate that they engage in such activity, only a small minority of officials believes that it plays a large or significant role in their decision-making. In a study of urban regeneration policy, Wolman & Page (2002) for example report that officials generally find government documents and conversations with other officials more useful for finding out what is going on than from good practice guides. The results of their questionnaire survey suggests that the majority of officials believes that information about other examples from the *same country* may have some effect on decisions within their own authority, although few think that the effects will be 'significant' or 'large' (Table 2). However, when questioned about the effect of examples from *abroad* on decisions within their own authority, most officials believe that the effects of these examples will be either 'little' or 'none'. Wolman & Page (2002: 484) quote a member of a local authority association who asserts that '*knowing what other authorities are doing is a very low priority for councils*': most authorities want to do things in their own way and not just copy what others are doing. They also quote another official who states that '*there are many factors that are much more important [than best practice]*' and that '*good practices elsewhere don't matter that much*', particularly since '*projects have to be very sensitive to local circumstances*' (Wolman & Page, 2002: 495-496). Informal contacts with peers, according to Wolman

& Page (2002), are the most trusted and useful sources of information among local government officials, while mechanisms such as seminars, conferences and good-practice guides are less useful. One of the most important reasons for looking at examples from elsewhere, they contend, is primarily to gain information about what kind of proposals the government is likely to fund, rather than using best practices as inspiration for new policy or practice.

Table 2. Opinions of local authority officials about the effects of information from elsewhere on decisions in local authorities (source: Wolman & Page, 2002: 495-496)

	From national examples	From international examples
Big effect	2%	1%
A significant effect	11%	1%
Some effect	69%	21%
Very little effect	16%	42%
No effect	1%	35%
Number of respondents	288	286

Wolman & Page (2002) conclude that, despite the enormous effort that has been devoted to disseminating 'good practice', their findings throw cold water over activities concerning the identification and dissemination of best practice, at least in the area of urban regeneration. They acknowledge that the same is not necessarily true for other areas of policy, although there seems little reason to think that the situation may be much different in the area of spatial planning. They also conclude that, even when well resourced and pursued actively, the effects of spreading lessons and 'good practice' are not very well understood by those involved in the processes of dissemination and that this observation is unlikely to be unique to the area of urban regeneration alone. Similarly, Bulkeley (2006: 1041) concludes that the impacts and implications of disseminating best practice on urban sustainability remain poorly understood. According to Wolman & Page (2002: 498) it is '*much easier to offer a compendium of practices and ideas and leave it up to the recipient to decide which is the most appealing than to offer an evaluation of what works best, let alone what works best for highly differentiated audiences*'.

#### *The relevance of best practices for Central and eastern Europe*

While current spatial planning activities in Europe's newer member states are focusing on broadly similar issues to those in Western Europe, there are nevertheless a number of important differences between spatial planning in central and eastern Europe and in Western Europe (UNECE, 2008). These include lower levels of trust in the role of government (van Dijk, 2002; Mason, 1995), the position of

planning which is generally weaker in central and eastern Europe (Maier, 1998) and the fact that spatial planning has had a longer history in Western Europe (Adams, 2008). Each of these factors means that best practices from western Europe are likely to be of less relevance for central and eastern Europe. Two brief examples of east-west transfer of best practice (below) help to illustrate this point.

In the first example, the development of St. Petersburg's strategic plan was based on experience of the western cities, and the model of the planning process was borrowed from Barcelona and adapted to the local conditions (Jounda, 2004). This was mainly due to the fact that financial and technical assistance was provided by USAID during the first stages of developing St. Petersburg's strategic plan and a condition of this assistance was that the strategy should be formulated according to western democratic standards. The example of Barcelona, with an established system of planning, was chosen as the model to follow, and officials from St. Petersburg were brought into contact with Barcelona's planners involved in preparing the city's strategic plan, as well as officials from various other cities in Europe and the USA. However, neither the process of preparing the strategic plan for St. Petersburg nor the end result itself (i.e. the strategic plan) bore few similarities to Barcelona's best practice model, although inspiration from Barcelona (or influence of foreign financial and technical assistance) did result in the introduction of a participatory approach (ibid).

The second example concerns Wroclaw (Poland) and Riga (Latvia), where two similar projects were funded by the German Federal Environment Agency, primarily drawing on German best practices, to try to establish German-style public transport executives (Verkehrsverbänden) or similar structures as a way of promoting more integrated public transport operation in the two cities and the regions around them. The intention behind the transfer of good practice was more coordinated public transport services and timetables, common information, communication and marketing for transport services, and integrated ticketing across different transport operators. However, the public transport situation was (and still is) quite different in the two cities compared to German cities. The experiences and outcomes of the two projects were quite different and, in both cases, direct transfers of German best practice did not occur (Stead et al, 2008).

Clearly, west east transfers of best practices are complex and certainly not merely a matter of copying or emulation: successful transfer also involves processes of learning and adaptation. Former communist countries in Europe have unique features that restrict the direct applicability of imported tools and methods, require their 'customization', or demand entirely new ones (Nedović-Budić, 2001). Substantial differences in political and administrative cultures across Europe reduce the relevance and applicability of best practices and their transfer from west to east. More specific to spatial planning, distinct planning cultures and social or welfare models in European member states mean that different policies or practices may result in very different outcomes depending on the context. The notions of

path-dependency and path-shaping may also have implications for the effects of policies or practices in different countries.

### **Conclusions – a reappraisal of best practice**

The previous two sections of this paper have identified a number of issues and concerns related to the validity and role of best practice. In terms of validity, there are concerns about issues of transferability, especially between dissimilar situations (e.g. 'old' to 'new' member states of the EU), the lack of detail that best practices are able to convey (and the fact that some are sanitised, good news stories without details of problems, difficulties or failures along the way), the lack of evaluation of many examples of best practice and a certain degree of distrust or scepticism in best practices on the part of practitioners. In terms of the role of best practice, there are concerns about the proliferation of examples and the overload of information for policy officials, the low level of impact that these examples often have, especially in the case of international examples (compared to examples from the same country) and the lack of a wide and systematic assessment of the impacts and implications of disseminating best practice on policy-making. Given these issues and concerns, a reappraisal of the status and use of best practice is perhaps necessary.

First, it is time to reappraise the importance attached to best practice in policies, programmes and projects, particularly at the European level. There are substantial social, economic and institutional differences between EU member states but there is little recognition of the fact that policy options need to be differentiated: the underlying assumption of many European policies and programmes is that best practices are equally applicable and effective in another setting. A study of the way in which best practice examples of spatial planning are used across Europe (building for example on the work of Holman & Page, 2002) would be instructive and help to inform the way in which best practice examples are used in European policies and programmes.

Second, it is time to reappraise the way in which best practice examples are presented and consider whether it would be better to differentiate between various components of best practice according to the extent to which these can be transferred (see also Figure 1). Because of the diversity of member states, institutions, planning instruments and cultures, it is perhaps more appropriate to consider a move away from the idea of best practice examples and refer instead simply to examples of practice, which policy officials can draw on and adapt to their own circumstances (as advocated in OECD, 2001). Similar sentiments are expressed by Nedović-Budić (2001: 49), who recommends that planners in central and eastern Europe should '*stay away from any automatic transfer of Western methods and models, and... consider what is appropriate to keep from their own traditions*'.

Third, there is substantial merit in carrying out more detailed examinations of the transferability of spatial planning methods, techniques, operating rules, instruments, programmes and so on. Detailed, systematic work is lacking in this area and research in this area would provide an interesting contribution to debates in both academia and in practice. Related to this, research on the processes of transfer of spatial planning methods, techniques, operating rules, instruments, programmes and so on would be very instructive, particularly in cases where examples have been transferred between dissimilar situations (e.g. between 'old' to 'new' member states of the EU). Such research might include theories and concepts from the policy transfer (and related) literature as well as literature on planning cultures (Sanyal, 2005), social or welfare models (Nadin & Stead, 2008) and path-dependency/path-shaping (see Stead, 2008).

Fourth, further research on the way in which the same best practice can take root in different ways in different settings would be instructive. This might for example draw on the work carried as part of ESPON project 2.3.1 on the application and effects of the ESDP in European member states, which examined how various policy concepts from the ESDP (e.g. polycentric spatial development, urban-rural partnerships) had been adapted to suit different regional and national contexts, and how these concepts were elaborated in policies and programmes at these levels.

Finally, another direction for future work related to the area of best practice might be to examine and test the extent to which there are common principles across all planning systems, irrespective of differences in the economic and social situation, planning cultures, social or welfare models and so on. This might build on the report of the UNECE (2008), which proposes that various principles (democracy, subsidiarity, participation, policy integration, proportionality, and the precautionary approach) are applicable and desirable for all planning systems.

## **References**

- Adams, N. (2008). Convergence and Policy Transfer: An Examination of the Extent to which Approaches to Spatial Planning have Converged within the Context of an Enlarged EU. *International Planning Studies* 13(1) 31-49.
- Benz, A. (2007). Inter-Regional Competition in Co-operative Federalism: New Modes of Multi-level Governance in Germany. *Regional & Federal Studies* 17(4) 421-436.

Böhme, K. & Waterhout, B. (2007). The Europeanization of planning. In: Carbonell, A. & Faludi, A. (eds.). *Gathering the evidence – The way forward for European planning?* Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge MA 1-27.

Bulkeley, H. (2006). Urban sustainability: learning from best practice? *Environment and Planning A* 38(6) 1029-1044.

Carmichael, L. (2005). Cities in the Multi-level Governance of the European Union. In: Haus, M.; Heinelt H. & Stewart M. (eds). *Urban Governance and Democracy. Leadership and Community Involvement.* Routledge, London 129-148.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2001). *European Governance. A White Paper.* COM(2001)428 Final. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2005). *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the Review of the Sustainable Development Strategy. A Platform for Action.* COM(2005)658 Final. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2006). *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment.* COM(2005)718 Final. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2007). *Green Paper. Towards a new culture for urban mobility* COM(2007)551 Final. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Committee on Spatial Development – CSD (1999). *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the EU.* Office for Official Publications of the European Community, Luxembourg.

Dabinett, G. & Richardson, T. (2005). The Europeanisation of spatial strategy: Shaping regions and spatial justice through governmental ideas. *International Planning Studies* 10(3/4) 201-218.

Dijk, T. van (2002). *Export of Planning Knowledge Needs Comparative Analysis: The Case of Applying Western Land Consolidation Experience in Central Europe.* *European Planning Studies* 10(7) 911-922.

Dühr, S.; Stead, D. & Zonneveld, W. (2007). The Europeanization of spatial planning through territorial cooperation. *Planning Practice and Research* 22(3) 291-307.

German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (2007a). *Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities.* Agreed at the occasion of the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban

Development and Territorial Cohesion on 24/25 May 2007 [[www.bmvbs.de/en/dokumente/-1872.982774/Artikel/dokument.htm](http://www.bmvbs.de/en/dokumente/-1872.982774/Artikel/dokument.htm), accessed on 31/03/2009].

German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (2007b). Territorial Agenda of the European Union: Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions. Agreed at the occasion of the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion on 24/25 May 2007 [[www.bmvbs.de/territorial-agenda](http://www.bmvbs.de/territorial-agenda), accessed on 31/03/2009].

Giannakourou, G. (2005). Transforming Spatial Planning Policy in Mediterranean Countries: Europeanization and Domestic Change. *European Planning Studies* 13(2) 319-331.

Güller, P. (1996). Urban Travel in East and West: Key Problems and a Framework for Action. In: ECMT (ed) *Sustainable Transport in Central and Eastern European Cities*. ECMT, Paris, 16-43.

Hartley, J. & Allison, M. (2002). Good, better, best? Inter-organizational learning in a network of local authorities. *Public Management Review* 4(1) 101-118.

Heinelt, H. & Niederhafner, S. (2008). Cities and Organized Interest Intermediation in the EU Multi-Level System. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 15(2) 173-187.

Janin Rivolin, U. & Faludi, A. (2005). The hidden face of European spatial planning: Innovations in governance. *European Planning Studies* 13(2) 195-215.

Jounda, N. (2004). Evolution of Local Development Policymaking in Russia: from Administrative Planning to Public Policy? Policy Research Paper, Center for Policy Studies, Central European University, Budapest [[www.policy.hu/jounda/pubs.html](http://www.policy.hu/jounda/pubs.html)], accessed on 31/03/2009].

Le Galès, P. (2002). *European Cities. Social Conflicts and Governance*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lidström, A. (2007). Territorial Governance in Transition. *Regional & Federal Studies* 17(4) 499-508.

Maier, K. (1998). Czech planning in transition: Assets and deficiencies. *International Planning Studies* 3(3) 351-365.

Mason, D. (1995). Attitudes towards the Market and Political Participation in the Post-Communist States. *Slavic Review* 54(2) 385-406.

Nadin, V. & Stead, D. (2008). European Spatial Planning Systems, Social Models and Learning. *disP* 44(1) 35-47.

Nedović-Budić, Z. (2001). Adjustment of Planning Practice to the New Eastern and Central European Context. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 67(1) 38-52.

OECD (2001). *Best Practices in Local Development*. OECD, Paris.

- Randma-Liiv, T. (2005). Demand- and Supply-based Policy Transfer in Estonian Public Administration. *Journal of Baltic Studies* 36(4) 467-487.
- Rose, R. (1993). *Lesson-Drawing in Public Policy: A Guide to Learning across Time and Space*. Chatham House, New Jersey.
- Rose, R. (2005). *Learning from Comparative Public Policy: A Practical Guide*. Routledge, London/New York.
- Sanyal, B. (ed.) (2005). *Comparative Planning Cultures*. Routledge, London/New York.
- Stead, D. (2008). Assessing the convergence of national spatial planning systems in Europe. Paper presented at the joint ACSP/AESOP Conference, 6-11 July 2008, Chicago.
- Stead, D.; de Jong, M. & Reinholde, I. (2008). Urban transport policy transfer in Central and Eastern Europe. *disP* 44(1) 62-73.
- Tavits, M. (2003). Policy Learning and Uncertainty: The Case of Pension Reform in Estonia and Latvia. *Policy Studies Journal* 31(4) 643-660.
- Tewdwr-Jones, M. & Williams, R.H. (2001). *The European Dimension of British Planning*. Spon, London.
- UN-Habitat (2008). *Best Practices and Local Leadership Programme*. UN-Habitat, Nairobi [[www.unhabitat.org/categories.asp?catid=34](http://www.unhabitat.org/categories.asp?catid=34), accessed on 31/03/2009].
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe – UNECE (2008). *Spatial planning. Key instrument for development and effective governance with special reference to countries in transition*. Economic Commission for Europe Report ECE/HBP/146. UNECE, Geneva.
- Wolman, H. & Page, E. (2002). Policy Transfer among Local Governments. An Information Theory Approach. *Governance* 15(4) 477-501.
- Wolman, H.; Hill, E.W. & Furdell K. (2004). Evaluating the Success of Urban Success Stories: Is Reputation a Guide to Best Practice? *Housing Policy Debate* 15(4) 965-997.
- Wolman, H.L.; Ford C.C. & Hill, E.W. (1994). Evaluating the Success of Urban Success Stories. *Urban Studies* 31(6) 835-850.
- World Bank (2000). *Local Economic Development: Good Practice from the European Union (and beyond)*. Urban Development Unit unpublished paper, World Bank, Washington.