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THE PLAN OF THE PRESENTATION

1. The roots, evolution, and challenges ahead of the MLG concept

2. Regional & Metropolitan Governance in Poland

3. The processes of formation and implementation of the EU Integrated Territorial Investment mechanism in Poland vs. the MLG framework
1. A framework for the open-minded and inclusive activities and regulations provided by public authorities.

2. A set of guidelines for promoting different actors’ involvement in the public policies.
„(...) In short, the European Community seems to be a part of a new political (dis)order that is multi-layered, constitutionally open-ended, and programmatically diverse.”

Marks, 1992: 221

- dependencies between states within the EU and MLG policies (Marks et al., 1996)
- the powers and representation of regions within the EU (Hooghe & Marks, 1996)
- social movement activities towards EU institutions (Marks & McAdam, 1999)
- actor-centred perspective on decision-making (Marks, 1996)
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THE OTHER GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS

LEGEND: T – territory, S – governance system

THE NEED FOR „STRETCHING” AND PRECISING THE MEANING OF THE MLG THEORY

CONCEPTUAL STRETCHING

MLG as an under-theorised concept:
- with several axes of ambiguity;
- with no clear orientation (a one-sided or omnirelevant notion, including processes & situations, strategies & structures at the same time).


CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

MLG as:
- a level of multi-level policies;
- a theory of the state transformation or as a theory of (EU) public policy;
- a tool for research into the functional aspects of ‘doing policy’;
- an element of metagovernance.
## The Way of Understanding of MLG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multi-Level Governance</th>
<th>Intergovernmental Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td>At least one governmental actor and one or more NGO actors</td>
<td>Involves governmental actors as the primary decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scales</strong></td>
<td>At least one actor is embedded at a different political/territorial scale from the other actor(s)</td>
<td>Actors can be from the same level or from multiple levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Decision-Making and/or Implementation</strong></td>
<td>More inclusive process: governmental and non-governmental actors are co-producers of collective goods</td>
<td>More exclusive process: the state (governmental actors only) produces collective goods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A NORMATIVE DIMENSION OF MLG

“We stand for a multilevel-governance Europe ‘based on coordinated action by the European Union, the Member States and regional and local authorities (...).”

“The objective of this Charter (...) is to connect regions and cities across Europe, whilst promoting MULTI-ACTORSHIP with societal actors such as the social partners, universities, NGOs and representative civil society groupings. (...)

“MLG helps us to (...) SHARE BEST PRACTICES and further develop PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY, bringing the European Union closer to the citizens. (...)

ITI GUIDELINES AND ITS OPERATIONALISATION

ITI EU ASSUMPTIONS – public institutions in the centre, but also cross-sectoral approach

NATIONAL LEVEL – technical approach, no need for cross-sectoral participation as a guideline

ITI STRATEGY – no need for cross sectoral-cooperation or civic participation within the process of governance
MLG STRUCTURE WITHIN THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ITI MECHANISM

- **National Government**: guidelines, monitoring, evaluation
- **Regional Government**: coordination, monitoring, signing agreements with stakeholders, final responsibility
- **Metropolitan Authority**: coordination, monitoring, co-responsibility for the projects’ results
- **Local Governments**: projects’ implementation
OVERESTIMATING THE TERRITORIAL DIMENSION OF INTEGRATION?

Legend
- Founders of the Gdańsk Metropolitan Area Association
- Founders of the NORDA Partnership Agreement
- Founders of GOM&NORDA
- The other LGs

Legend
- Members of the Gdańsk-Gdynia-Sopot Metropolitan Area Association
- The other LGs
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THE WAY OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE ITI VS. MLG FRAMEWORK

1. The Integrated Territorial Investment (Regional Operational Programmes) formation process & governance

2. The process of the ITI (ROP) projects’ implementation

Do we really govern or just implement projects?
### ITI Governance / Implementation vs. MLG „Extended” Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multi-Level Governance</th>
<th>ITI Formation</th>
<th>ITI Governance</th>
<th>ITI Projects’ Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td>At least <strong>one governmental</strong> actor and one or more <strong>NGO</strong> actors</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scales</strong></td>
<td>At least one actor is embedded at a <strong>different political/territorial scale</strong> from the other actor(s)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Decision-Making/Implementation</strong></td>
<td>More <strong>inclusive process</strong>: governmental and NGO actors as co-producers of collective goods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Multi-Level Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTORS</th>
<th>ROP FORMATION</th>
<th>ROP GOVERNANCE</th>
<th>ROP PROJECTS’ GOVERNANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one governmental actor and one or more NGO actors</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALES</th>
<th>ROP FORMATION</th>
<th>ROP GOVERNANCE</th>
<th>ROP PROJECTS’ GOVERNANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one actor is embedded at a different political/territorial scale from the other actor(s)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF DECISION-MAKING/IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>ROP FORMATION</th>
<th>ROP GOVERNANCE</th>
<th>ROP PROJECTS’ GOVERNANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More inclusive process: governmental and NGO actors as co-producers of collective goods</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CHALLENGES AHEAD
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