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Abstract

“Regional governance” has become a focusing issue among areas of politics, administration practices and spatial/space design. The emergences of various regional governance concepts have initiated some political evolution either in global or local levels. Theoretically, the philosophy underpin these changes are mainly related to the discourse of New Public Management (NPM). In practice, countries have somehow adjusted their political rules, social institutions or spatial structure to cope with changes result from global economic integration. This paper argues the EU pursues a “meso-level” governance mechanism for harmonizing political and economic interests among member states in the integration process. Various modes of regional alliance, for instance the Euregion (or known as Euroregions, euregios), or arrangements for promoting cross-border cooperation, have enhanced the bond of affections among European people, it may also respond to the changing global economic environment more promptly and effectively than European or national level organizations.

This paper describes a multi-method approach for exploring the spatial restructure and institutional alignments of contemporary regional governance. It uses both documentary analysis and cases study to find out developments of regional governance in the European Union as well as in Taiwan. The study identifies the cases of “North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” and eastern Taiwan (Hua-Tung) regional governance platform as examples. It concludes the EU case may give inspiration for designing institutional arrangements to Taiwan for resolving problems resulting from cross boundaries governance.
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I. Introduction

Under trends of globalization, regionalization and localization, increasingly complex public issues constantly impact and penetrate borders of public governance, accordingly bring about the expected or unexpected changes and displacements. Governments bear the growing roles on the account of democratic accountability and policy effectiveness, especially under the constraint of limited resources and bureaucratic system, to have renewed their thinking and finding new mechanisms for governance in response to the coming competitive era.

First of all, based on the philosophy of public management, governments around the world have tried to take series of competitive, strategic and integrated movements or reforms in order to respond to the rapidly changing environment. They brought about many governance modes of strategic-oriented, citizen-oriented, customer-oriented, privatization and innovative financial methods which make government changed. Meanwhile, the devolution of central authority or power has become an inevitable trend. But, local governments must to seek financial support from outside while reduced funding from the central government. (Beckett-Camarata, 2003)

Secondly, the fiscal stress and economic crisis are challenges that central and local governments have shared. To consider worsening fiscal and budgetary difficulties, public managers should not only let their people understand and even participate in the budget allocation decisions, and also relocated priorities of their services to avoid a small number of group “kidnapping” decision-making process so that can balance the budget fundamentally. (Bovaird, 2005; Linn and Padufala, 2008)

This paper starts from aspect of the NPM, particularly the financial crisis management, to explore contemporary regional development and cooperation. The case study examines whether Taiwan and the European Union had a similar response to the global challenges of policy or practice. In particular, the European Union has carried out the “multi-level governance” (MLG) structure to expand its range of policymaking participation, especially uses in its regional policy, namely the proportion of leading role of the member states’ central government in policy process to reduce, and the role of local and regional government are relatively increased. Member states’ budget cuts and decentralization at the national level, therefore the EU has created new ways of governance, such as direct funding to the regions, more participatory governance from the bottom upwards, etc. They are not only contributing to interaction and exchange between the public and private sectors, and managers in the public sector must have the spirit of entrepreneurship and
innovation for leading the development and progress of the country. Besides, this model of governance also requires local governments to have their financial and strategic objectives, and have proper policy making capacity as well. EU’s practice of “Euregions\(^1\),” through various “Fund” of grants and resources distribution, then through audit process and performance management, to obtain EU’s general objectives, regional development targets, and mutual coordination of member states’ targets. These are not only let the MLG mode into practice, also introduce participatory type of governance, enterprise competition and management to the public sectors. So that could be described as the invention of modern public management.

In Taiwan, for resolving the problem result from administrative divisions too small led to resources cannot integration and lack of competitiveness, passed the amendment of “Local Government Act”, and have also promoted to merge or restructuring counties to upgrade became municipality cities. Up to December 25, 2014, there have 6 municipality cities: the Taipei City, New Taipei City, Taichung City, Tainan City, Kaohsiung City and the Taoyuan City. In 2009, the Executive Yuan announced “County/City Government Restructuring” program, from aspect of spatial planning further proposed “3 Living Circles” (the North Taiwan, the Middle Taiwan, and the South Taiwan) and “7 Developmental Areas” (pei-pei-kee-yi, tao-chu-miao, chung-chang-tou, yun-chia-nan, kao-kao-ping, hua-tung and peng-kim-ma) spatial development plans. It is recommended that cities and counties within the same region should establish a cross-boundaries cooperation platform to jointly plan overall regional issues at stake (Executive Yuan, ROC, 2010: Chapter 8).

Since 2009, the Executive Yuan approved in succession and announced the “National Spatial Development Strategy Plan,” “the Comprehensive Assessment Program of National Construction of Med-Range Plans, 2102-2017” and “Across-Regional Program of Value-Added to Financial Planning of Public Works”, leading local governments through the establishment of regional cooperation platforms to strengthen mutual dialogue, exchanges and cooperation across boundaries. Through application and implements of national-development plans, the ad hoc planning agency - the National Development Council - joined forces across regions value-added ideas into planning of public works, financial innovation, etc. As well as the financial incentives provided by the Central Government, helps public works to meet local development needs then to achieve their maximum benefits

\(^{1}\) In European politics, the term Euregion or Euroregion usually refers to a transnational cooperation structure between two (or more) contiguous territories located in different European countries. They represent a specific type of cross-border region.
Underpin the “Central assists Local” mode, Taiwan began established regional cooperation platform and operation mechanism actively, and guide the existing local/regional unions to transform to regional cooperation platform, such as: to promote establishing of the “Yun-Chia-Nan Regional Sustainable Development Promoted Committee,” to assist the “Central Taiwan Industrial Union” transformed to “Central Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee,” and to help original of “Kao-Kao-Ping Magistrate/Mayors’ Meeting” transformed to “Kao-Ping Regional Cooperation Platform.” By contrast, the “North Taiwan Regional Development Board” which began shape in 2003 is relatively larger one. In January 2006, statement “Northern Taiwan Regional Cooperation Declaration” made by the heads of northern Taiwan cities and counties, and then signed the “Organizational Charter of North Regional Development Promoted Board” to form present cooperation mode of eight Northern Taiwan cities and counties. In June 2011, the “Hua-Tung Area Development Act” has brought into force, the Eastern Taiwan regional governance entering a different paths compare with other areas in Taiwan, which features a high degree of formalization. The regulations stipulated both Hualien and Taitung governments shall put forward the “Eastern Region Sustainable Development Strategy Plan” and “Comprehensive Implement Development Programs,” as the area of Eastern upper guiding principles interact with County governments and people. And, these are also responsible for coordinating, review, monitoring and guide the construction and development of Hualien and Taitung. According to the Comprehensive Implement Development Programs, the central government should subsidies annually budgeted cover or a wide column to the area, and set up in “Hua-Tung Regional Sustainable Development Fund” total of NT. $ 40 billion.

The study argues both the EU and Taiwan tend to form “meso-level⁡” governance structures for solving their current political and economic problems, although the structures may vary in content and level. The EU uses the Euregion to join up and harmonize the 27 Member States and the European people; Taiwan is committed to the construction of various types of regional governance platform across counties or cities, to address governance defects of the Central and local governments. Despite the different jurisdictional levels, experience of the European

---

⁡In general, a meso-level indicates a population size that falls between the micro- and macro-levels, such as a community, organization or association. However, meso-level may also refer to analyses that are specifically designed to reveal connections between micro- and macro-levels. Here in this paper, it can be defined as alliance or association among cities or areas under the supra-national EU institutions. In Taiwan, it can be seen as some cross boundary governance mechanism that size between the Central and local governments. Both of them appear as “regional” combination, but Euregions are often cross-national border associations.
Union remains an important reference to Taiwanese regional governance, particularly, operations of the EU’s multi-level system of governance and its cross-regional cooperation on political and economic affairs. The study also introduces Taiwan’s regional development policies and practices, for the purpose of exploring how the EU case can provide references to Taiwanese regional governance. Due to the complexity of issues, the case will mainly focus on the institutional and system construction, as well as on the funding grants aspect.

II. Literature Reviews

1. Governance under globalization

As public administrative issues become more complex, dynamic and diverse in the world, how to search for a more efficient and effective mode of governance is necessary. Face governance era of comes, Politicians and political scholars have faced several problem: first, is with national characteristics of public administrative have gradually changed to more comprehensive, even global of governance; second, is level of administrative system has gradually become to more complex of governance network; third, is “ungovernable” situation among governments is getting worse. And the so-called “public governance,” is regarded as an integrated framework which satisfied the institutional structure of traditional public administration theory in preference, and the NPM’s emphasis on organization and management techniques, and also added a macro-political context and policy process to complement or strengthen traditional public administrative and public management as well.

On a practical level, this term of governance is used to refer to multiple levels of governance and rapidly growing international communications network, and the transnational nature of the mechanism or the new kind of transnational civil society and democracy. The efforts of institutional attempt most important purpose is being to combine forces to deal with the growing new type crisis. Such management and control structures apparently have gone beyond the traditional “government” that can control and towards a global, market and multiple level of “network.” The World Trade Organization (WTO), NAFTA and the ASEAN Free Trade Area, are clear examples of this development.

2. Regionalism and regional governance

Regionalism can be defined in terms of both socio-cultural factors internal and political factors external to the region. Louis Cantori and L. Spiegel (1970:6-7) emphasizes geographic proximity, international interaction, common bonds (ethnic, linguistic, cultural, social and historical) and a sense of identity that is sometimes
accentuated by the actions and attitudes of states external to the region. Similarly, Bruce Russett (1967:11) identifies five criteria: social and cultural homogeneity, political attitudes or external behavior, political institutions, economic interdependence and geographical proximity, also illustrate the ambiguity of region as an organizing concept. Based on the work of 22 scholars, Thompson’s (1973) composite definition lists 21 commonly cited attributes which he condenses to a list of three necessary and sufficient conditions for defining a regional subsystem: general geographic proximity, regularity and intensity of interactions, and shared perceptions of the regional subsystem as a distinctive theater of operations.

However, regional and global factors are closely intertwined during these years. The increasing globalization and deregulation of markets describes an erosion of national economic control that industrial states in the North seek to compensate for through regional integration schemes. These differ in form. As Peter Katzenstein (1996) has argued, regional integration can occur in *de jure* (as in Europe) or *de facto* (as in Asia). And it occurs also in sub-regional groupings within and between states, as for example in Southeast Asia and along the South China coast.

Under double stress of time and space, the metropolitan will usually rise because of globalization effects (Hsia, 2002); regardless of the concepts of “city-region” or “metropolitan,” a most important proposition assumed is their core position of regional development, and they provide a quite number of elements of regional development (Lee, 2011; Sun and Lin, 2011). Sun Tong-wen et al. (2011) continuing observation of the globalization impact on the competence of state organs, and argue resources and information should be considered gathered in many important nodes of the network society, and thus constitutes the development of metro area. Due to industrialization and rapid economic development, people are likely moved to industrial and commercial center of the city. Consequently, constant development of urban centers and their surrounding increasing changes in the environment and growth pressures. As cities continue to expand, local governments inevitably face throughout how the metropolitan area should be “effective development” or “smart growth”? How to adapt themself to such changing phenomenon? (Sun and Lin, 2011).

Allen Scott (2006: 371-73) argues that the globalization process resulting in a geo-political entity began disintegrating, many significant transformation occurred in the old world order. In order to find a capable governance structure to safeguard and strengthen its competitive advantage, so many large “City-region” has emerged. Meanwhile, Scott (2006: 373) predicted there will be more and more cross-regional or interregional forums or organizations appear for “problem-solving” purpose.Lee
Chang-yen (2011) has argued that “City-region” on the governance model of meaning beyond the traditional concept of local governance, and added strategic spatial planning of towns with a goal-oriented governance. This development allows local authority has clear development objectives in the region, therefore easily to achieve regional governance functions. Lee points out the case of UK local governance as example, concludes that if the regional unit size is too large, it cannot be a proper link of network, and resources also cannot to achieve efficiency; but the scale is too small, they are not effectively integrated resources across areas, also is not conducive to dealing with major policy and strategic planning. Sun Tong-wen et al. (2011) also points out that the metropolitan area is a functional area, they cause more problems than a single local government jurisdiction, direct and primary responsibility for solutions to local problems shall be jointly by the relevant local governments. Therefore, the “regional governance” model or platform, which is building on the existing system of governance reform, under the operation of these mechanisms, both status and functions of local governments has not been much of an impact, and even have the opportunity to play a more active role in the new model (Wilson and Game, 2011).

3. EU mechanism - beyond the nation state?

As noted, the contemporary nation state is facing many challenges, as manifest in increased interdependence and incorporation into an emerging global economy, and through the establishment of international, transnational and supranational organizations and structures of governance. The state is under heightened pressure also because of important changes in the public sphere, such as the internationalization of social movements, transnational epistemic communities and the emergence of some semblance of a “global public opinion”. These developments have raised questions as to the continued relevance of core state attributes such as territorial bounds and formal and de facto state sovereignty.

The state has been seen as accountable to its citizens, whereas its obligations to non-citizens have been seen as weak, at best. It is from this notion of the state as a geographically confined and sovereign entity with clearly defined demos that most standards of democratic governance have been derived. The doctrine of national sovereignty ensured that the interstate arena was seen as marked by anarchy, not in the sense of disorder, but in the sense of absence of an authoritative system of governance. This notion of accountability was wholly compatible with protection of borders and nationally based difference.

In the EU, a set of institutions are established over and above the member
states which citizens of member states, as well as aliens and denizens, have recourse to, as an added set of outlets for settling their grievances. The EU is a complex entity without a clearly defined core and, compared to a state, with a far less hierarchical system of governance (Schmitter, 1996). It is a mix of supranational, transnational, trans-governmental, and intergovernmental structures. Institutions such as the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice are “supranational.” Supra-nationality refers to a system of law-making which exists and operates independently of the Member States and which supports and is supported by an accommodating process or style of decision-making. The particular nature of supra-nationality in the EU (dynamic, non-hierarchical, and open to different kinds of cooperation and policy solutions) points us in the direction of the discourse theoretical perspective of deliberative democracy because those involved are compelled to sort out their disagreements and commonalities with reference to arguments. In order to reach an agreement and decisions that are binding, they cannot simply rely on power or resort to procedures that terminate in voting or bargaining.

4. “Euregion” and cross-border cooperation

The new mode of governance of devolution, multi-center, networking and participation, leaving a vast room for local governments to coordinate and resolving conflicts in the community. Magone observes this “hybridization” process has made government structure more flexible, it may also help the government closer with its environment together. Huang Rong-yang (2013) identifies across border cooperation that occurred between Euregions, has considered as a part of local governance, except introduced civil power inputs, it enable results of governance closer to needs of public. The European Commission via Structural Fund and Cohesion Fund to obtain several of widely targets contains on upgrading European social tolerance and cohesion that contributes to efficiency, effectiveness of governance.

Richard Uijen (2000) has concluded that cross-border cooperation agreements can be divided into five stages, each new stage, toward a more institutionalized, legitimized and accountability pattern. In recent years, with increasingly close European integration, member states’ border features a new style, which emerges a variety of new units of local self-government were established, as well as more and more cross-border cooperation among governments was promoted. Therefore, many new political and administrative arrangements have appeared, of which the sub-national community or lots of cross-border cooperation agreement between official bodies as the main form. These regional joint actions have a clear economic background. In the era of globalization, the behaviors of production, logistics and
investment become more and more flexible and convenience. Moreover, small-medium enterprises (SMEs) become the engines of industrial development, in the context of the overall economic environment tends to be decentralized, regional joint or union can not only complement each other, but also can respond to the rapidly changing economic situation more quickly and effectively than agencies at EU level and national levels.

In the past, the border area of a country has, more or less, some political problems because of its geographical location, such as border disputes, out of range by vandalism, as well as the penetration of border areas by other neighbor countries. Usually, the border area is facing low development, instability, as well as difficult to obtain or reach the resources or markets. However, as the importance of the European integration has been perceived, the interests of all member states in border regions have been highlighted. In 1980, an international meeting in Madrid for discussing on the issue of cross-border cooperation in European countries, and made many cooperation agreement models. In 1986, the “Benelux Economic Union” held another meeting in Brussels to talk cross-border cooperation program and then reach cooperation agreement among the Netherlands, Germany and two Euregions - the Land Lower Saxony and Land North-Rhine Westphalia - which providing a possibility of cooperation based on public law. To the period of the European Union, development of the border areas are valued, especially in the begging of the 1990s, part of the “Structural Funds” has begun to be used in the development of some EU cross-border cooperation in the project of construction. Afterward, more and more different types of cross-border cooperation have appeared in the area. Since the Single European Act (SEA) effected in January 1993, the implementation of cross-border cooperation among European countries has become more frequently.

In the process of European integration have been encouraging member states to develop new modes of governance. Starting from the European Community period, it work for promote social and economic cohesion through cross-border development. Beginning in the early 1990s, the “Euregions” between the EU member states and their external borders between neighboring countries are appearing their specific importance, especially after the economic integration and enlargement, these Euregions, as parasites or vine, attached to traditional sovereign states, has become potential key sites of EU’s economic momentum (Kramsch, 2001).

III. Cases and Analysis

1. “Euregions” of the EU

With the evolution of global environment, the EU is also facing the political and
social changes; especially the emphasis on regionalism and the rapid development of civil society are more prominent. Currently, the European Union is no longer facing a simple integration of national resources or, deepens the collective identity of the Europe, but that facing new tasks and challenge of pluralism and decentralization of political and social resources. The more pluralistic the European integration does the greater participation and democracy of the European Union public governance is needed.

European regional policy was pretty much scattered and not integrated before the United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark joined the European Community in 1973. The 1980s, due to horizontal integration among member states, and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) was established; the European regional policy began to be effective and has certain financial support. However, the Fund grant program was based on individual countries’ central government to propose objects, regional organizations or local governments were still an assistance role, and its quota was allocated on a national basis. (Mawson et al., 1985: 22) Before the mid-1980s, the role of region remains a part of “chain of command” in individual countries.

On June 24, 1988, the European Union Council set up the Council of the Regions and Local Authorities which comprising 42 regional and local representatives from 12 EC member states. This important step, allow regional and local have stronger representation on the supra-national level in the European Union. It enables regions has substantial rights of decision-making during the discussion of EU regional policy, rather than the subordinate units of the country. (Magone, 2006: 209) The 1988 reform of Structural Funds is an important milestone to the EU regional policy. New regional and local bodies are incorporated into decision-making framework of the European regional policy; the organization, as sub-national actor, has become a rightful decision-maker. In addition, the decision-making relationships have been defined as a partnership and subsidiarity principles. This principles make the regional unit has more dialogue with the EU Council and governments. Even after the 1988 reform of the Structural Funds, the EU Council will direct subsidies in some projects (Single Programming Documents, SPD) to specific regional units. (Magone, 2006: 210)

(1). Role of the Committee of Region (CoR)

After the 1992 Maastricht Treaty, the Council of the Regions and Local Authorities became a new mechanism subordinate to European Union, but the formal name was changed to “Committee of the Regional and local Authorities,” or
simply named the “Committee of the Region” (CoR) and held its first meeting in 1994. After several enlargements of the European Union, the CoR has played an important role in the process of reconciling differences between core member states and the peripheries. Up to 2007, a total of 344 members, 209 of them are local governments, the Mayor or Speaker of council as representatives; another 135 members representing different regions in Europe. These members nominated respectively by the Governments of the 27 EU member states, and appointed by the European Council for a term of four years. The Chairman or Deputy Chairman elected by all members of the Committee for a term of two years. Committees set up an Executive Bureau, responsible for implementation of the CoR’s political proposals and plans, and its members are elected 60 representatives from all the members, including the Chairman or Deputy Chairman.

The original CoR’s tasks were aimed at five areas: economic and social cohesion, trans-European transport networks, energy and telecommunications, public health, education and youth, and culture to provide free consultation. After the Amsterdam Treaty of 1999, has added training and employment, social policy, environment, holiday traffic and other projects. Up to 2007, CoR total has six subsidiary Commissions: “Regional Solidarity Commission” (OTER), “Economic and Social Policy Commission” (ECOS), “Sustainable Development Commission” (DEVE), “Culture, Education and Research Commission” (EDUC), “Constitutional, Governance and Regional Free Security Commission” (CONST), and “External Relationship and Decentralization Cooperation Commission” (RELEX), to discuss and deal with related issues. In addition to above work, the CoR on “the European Regional Development Fund” and other structural funds have an important influence. (Magone, 2006: 211) In the EU’s supranational levels thus appears more sub-national institutes, such regional or local governments have set up their office in Brussels are also increasing in number. Their main task, is lobbying the Council of Europe. Some of them even play the role of a political representative.

The importance of CoR is it played a filter device of local governance, and also an important pipeline for bring the most grass-roots of voice into the EU decision process. The members of CoR also let their people knows what does the EU do? How does it operate? More and more regional groups in EU supranational levels become active, by displayed of a “multiple crack strategy” to effects the EU regional policy. It means each regional or local government can through a multiple access points participate in European governance, whereby the breakthrough with the central government in the past as only goalkeeper role between national and supra-national

3 See http://www.COR.europa.EU.
levels, use the multiple access channel strategies, regional units can bypass the
central and directly involved in the EU decision-making, and also allow regional
interests was demonstrated in the supranational EU level more easily. (Marks et al.,
1996) In short, regional mobilization function made the CoR has become increasingly
important in the EU institutional framework, and its status was formalized.

As Magone (2006: 225; 231) has argued, conventional frontiers have been
replaced by “core areas,” a diverse and flexible “Euregion” like so many “island” that
scattered around the continent, they make further integration in Europe, and making
it easier for European civil society to build. According to the CoR’s development
experience, the EU seems to be consciously or unconsciously seeking a meso-level
governance mechanism, so as to bridge the countries in the process of European
integration between economic interests and political divide. All kind of Euregions, as
infrastructure of the EU governance system, also played an intermediary role help
members from nation-state governance transits to innovation governance of the
European Union. Thus, increasingly frequent cross-border cooperation within the
area, like a “parasite”, become new modes of governance in a sovereign state, such
as vines, toward a kind of supranational governance models.

(2). Cross-border governance of the Euregion

From the Structural Funds have begun in 1998, to establish a multi-level
governance model become the main theme of European integration. In order to
prevent misappropriation use of grants go towards the national goal by the EU
member states, the EU Commission developed a “multi-scalar implementation
system” to facilitate political cohesion. The system will do an effective distribution
base on the role of economic responsibility in multi-level governance system, and
allow most of the benefits being express in a more democratic form. For example of
EU across border cooperation case, the initial implement procedure and limit did not
clear, but after the former two stage of implementation experience, such process
become more strictly. Since the third period, the European Community added some
new rules to across border cooperation, such as: cooperation must occur between
public sector and private sector; units of cooperation must contain local, regional,
national and EU institutions; and transnational of cooperation plans between
neighbors will be the best.

In academic discussions, scholars’ understanding of EU cross-border
cooperation policy, broadly divided into two categories: first, some think that
cooperation only a temporary expedient for easy access to get Structural Fund
subsidies. Therefore, local elites or governments still do not have political autonomy,
is still primarily based the frontier across national borders. Second, some scholars argue more and more cross-border cooperation would weakening the Westphalia system, the border area become a new region for capital spread, thus, the traditional boundaries of identity has been challenged. However, Kramsch and Hooper (2006) argue that the claims are too general and subjective, it should not to view cross-border cooperation too complicate, but should be examined in each case as if it is a specific “border regime,” that is: look at them as a flexible network of multilevel governance, a system of a nested system of government which continued negotiation in the territory level of supranational, national and regional.

According to Kramsch (2001), the outcomes of governance in some regions are relatively effective, such as the “Dutch-German-Belgian Euregios.” But the effect is still not satisfactory in general, mainly because of the lack of compatible system of taxation, employment situation uneven, inconsistent on social security control, of representative accountability problems, and divergence of views to the degree of institutionalization of governance institutions, but cultural and linguistic differences remain the biggest constraints to subsequent cross-border cooperation. In short, EU cross-border cooperation established at all levels in order to integrate governments or organizations, but national administrations did not declare to renounce its territorial sovereignty, the cross-border cooperation is not simply because their location in the border area, but better to focus on the fact whether there have function or requirement. While cross-border cooperation in Europe has a long tradition, but this kind of collaboration basically needs to have a common historical interest and ideas towards a common future in Europe. In order to achieve these results, often cross-border cooperation was given three expectations: first, it must overcome mutual hostility and prejudice due to history; Secondly, strengthening democracy, eliminating marginalization and alienation; third, to promote economic development, improve living conditions, to facilitate the completion of European integration.

Huang Rong-yang (2013) studies the case “Ireland/United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) Border Region” of cross-border cooperation, to discuss the development of the EU governance model in recent years. The research from the EU, national, local government and social community levels to analyze the process and outcomes of cross-border cooperation between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. It attempts to understand the model of multi-level governance for explaining the effect of cross-border cooperation. First, financial incentives became the momentum of across border cooperation of the area, main because EU provides large of funding encourages both sides cooperation across border, and it became the cornerstone of
regional peace; second, in order to meet EU Commission’s criterion on regional fund grants, six Irish border counties have composited a new of units - the “Objective One region” - to obtained EU maximum amount of funding grants. While the EU’s financial aid program in the region was focused on PEACE 1, PEACE 2, and ongoing PEACE 3. Utilization and management of such funds for the plan also fully demonstrated the principle of multi-level governance, including central ministries of both governments, regional partners, as well as an arbitration bodies (IFBs) which composed of the 11 voluntary organizations to share responsibility for allocation funds. Overall, the “Special EU programs Body” has more of the representativeness and accountability of the Government, allow it to establish a platform for both parties can coordinate their policies in cross-border cooperation. In addition, local partner organizations of the PEACE plan also play an important role, in some parliamentary coalition to form a new Parliament (including Northern Ireland), while others are still dominated by the existing parliamentary working group continue to operate (such as Ireland). These new partners include national institutions, local governments, society and the third sectors. In short, Ireland’s “Objective One” status changes, an increase in EU financial assistance, and the establishment of new administrations, have substantially impact on cross-border cooperation in the region. However, the two sides’ closer cooperation and coordination at the border during the period does not mean the bilateral political cooperation from now on has no contradiction, especially the conflict of interests in the civil service system and between departments.

Huang (2013) observes from the case above and concludes two results: first of all, cross-border cooperation in Ireland/Northern Ireland case has resulted in high-level administrative cooperation. It has reached the main goal of European Union has set – “mechanism establishment,” but because it is too much of a political nature, rather than the natural integration of economic needs. There remains a gap to the expectation of EU Commission. Secondly, commercial and tourism in the area was not as effective as expected, after many years of cross-border cooperation. However, after programs implemented, the facts and figures were not too different from the past. These results are likely to make the utility of cross-border cooperation being questioned. Huang (2013) further argues, cross-border cooperation in the utilization and management of funds has fully demonstrated the principle of multi-level governance; cross-border cooperation between the both parties has shown different groups or actors may for different incentives to change behavior. These incentives, some are local, some are central, whereas others are supra-national design. Therefore, a combination of local, national and EU hybrid incentive systems are essential needs of cross-border cooperation, but this kind of
multi-pronged strategy is unlikely to appear spontaneously, so the possible strategies should be a “cross-governmental” instead of “multi-level” decision-making process. How much will it helps to set up European civil society? It remains to be observed.

Overall, the Council of Europe plays an important role in the development of EU regional policy and on promoting cross-border cooperation between member states. Such the “bottom up” form of governance and the operation of “Euregion” become foundation of the European integration process. “Regions” concept is undoubtedly an important mechanism for promoting cross-regional development, although the process included various forms of cooperation, but the Euregion is certainly one of the most effective forms (Tsuji, 2002).

(3). Function of regional funds and European regional policy

The covers of area of European Union and its predecessor could be one of developed and rich areas in the world. But it is not in EU internal of all members are average developed. For example, the richest of member states-Belgium-is seven times richer than Romania and Bulgaria. Therefore, how to balance each regional of development differences, so makes all regions in the EU territory can play their maximum benefits, to promote EU overall development and welfare has become important subject.

To this aim, the EU’s framework has set the contents of regional policy, as early as the era of the European Community, the EU has been attention to the issue of regional development disparity, so set up a fund to distribute resources and budgets to reduce regional disparities in income, wealth, opportunities and assist regional developments. They are actually financial tools set up to implement the regional policy of the European Union. Most important funds are the “European Structural Fund” and the “Cohesion Fund”:

A. “European Social Fund” which was first established in 1958 and “the European Regional Development Fund” (ERDF) was established in 1975, both jointly referred to as “European Structural Fund” (ESF). The Maastricht Treaty of 1993, the official regional policy was written into the Treaty, making the use of the Fund has a basic legitimacy.

B. The “Cohesion Fund” that established in 1994. After the Lisbon Treaty in December 2009, the existing EU regional policy and its related funds, then functioning under “the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union”, Articles 162 to 164, and Articles 174 to 178, as sources of their legitimacy, on the basis of the law, European Commission, that is in accordance with European Union institutions
with regional policy directions, requests or comments to set the “Regulation” in order to promote regional policy, and put forward dynamic policies and investment to balance the differences in development between various regions within the EU.


The Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund make up one of the largest items of the budget of the European Union. It presents information about objectives that have been defined for the current programming period, which runs from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013. The overall budget for this period is €347bn: €201bn for the European Regional Development Fund, €76bn for the European Social Fund, and €70bn for the Cohesion Fund. The objectives setup shapes the main focus of interventions (eligible activities and costs) and the overall allocations of funds from the EU budget.

According to EU of analysis, imbalance of regional development causes including: differences and hinder of geography; social economic of changes; problems left from the former Eastern European planned system and other factors of combination, and these results often caused the EU internal social imbalances, such as social class difference and regional deprivation, bad quality of school and education quality, high percentage of unemployment and the lack of infrastructure. So, some evaluation principles as follows are essential for the EU in considering the applications of Fund for plans:

A. Will it to create growth and jobs?

B. Can it provide better services or offers so that can attract more investment?

C. Is it able to promote industrial innovation, increase business and the knowledge economy?

D. Whether it effective use of EU, national and local public finance, to promote development and growth?

E. Could it create more quality jobs, and to promote talent of human?

In sum, European regional policy and creation of the Funds are to balance the uneven of regional developments, and hopefully to achieve the main objectives of: (a) help regions to play its potential of abilities; (b) developing regional potential, to promote regional competitiveness and employment through various investments at the regional level, then creating the EU value; (c) promoting living standard of the East European member states that joined the EU after 2004, to the EU average as quickly as possible.

In fact, the key indicator for the division of regions under singular objectives is the Gross National Product per capita (GNP p.c.) level. This is subject to criticism based on the fact that GDP p.c. is unable to reflect the real socio-economic reality of regions. Some groups (e.g. the Beyond GDP) and organizations propose the creation of a set of alternative indicators that could substitute the GDP and it’s derivate.

2. The development of Taiwan’s regional governance

Since Taiwan has brought into practice local autonomy in 1950, the cross-boundaries cooperation between local governments has not been enough attention, the reasons apart from the laws and regulations were inadequate, heads of local governments or their representatives may have concerned their own political interests or partisan conflict, resulting in mutual cooperation is fraught with difficulties. However, Taiwanese administrative jurisdiction division is too small and the current governance model has made it unable to effectively respond to international competition and challenges in the era of globalization. Particularly in industrial planning, transportation construction, land and water management and the metro development also facing a lot of difficulties (Executive Yuan, ROC, 2010). So, how to achieve and integrate domestic resources in order to enhance the competitiveness of the country are being the main efforts in recent years.

In fact, Taiwan has had some of experience in regional governance and cooperation. Though limited, but it can be used as reference for regional governance in Taiwan. These tools of regional governance can be categorized as six types: informal cooperation, committee, administrative contract or authorized public body, quasi-governmental organization or regional federation, and regional government. The magnitude of its management strength is orderly by weak turned strong. Of which by place led established organization, including Taichung County and City Liaison Council (1993), Kao-Kao-Ping 3 County/City Heads and Directors Council (1999), the Northern Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee (2006), the Chung-Chung-Chang-Tou Heads Breakfast Meeting (2008), and Yun-Chia-Nan Regional Construction Implementation Committee (2010), these organizations are
types of informal cooperation. Other organizations which set up by the central government are: The Southern Taiwan Joint Services Center, Executive Yuan (1998), Central Taiwan Joint Services Center, Executive Yuan (2003), Eastern Taiwan Joint Services Center, Executive Yuan, and the Kao-Ping River Basin Management Committee (2001), the former three organizations for the commission, the last is the first specific river management institutions, and the nature of the organization is regional federation.

These regional organizations, in the different type of organization have different management magnitude, while each management mechanism has followed of public organizational theory also different. The stronger that may accord traditional Reformism, while the weaker that may accord the Public Choice Theory. And, between the middle may be according to New Regionalism. After the deactivated of Taiwan Province, there have no functional similar organization or mechanism substituted for it. While lacking the buffer of Provincial Government, the Central Government needed to face 23 Counties/Cities directly, such as the Taichung Scientific Industrial Park Fourth Section Development Plans, and also in the Miaoli Dapu agricultural land controversy, was managed by the Premier in person to solve the problems. Although the Central regularly meet Counties/Cities heads, and the Executive Yuan continually established the Southern, Central and the Eastern Joint Services Centers in 1998, 2003 and 2007, in order to meet and coordinate regional needs regularly. Yet, often local and cross-boundaries affairs seemed no comprehensive planning and discussion, the existing mechanism mainly to resolve problems simply as garbage cleaning, community security and disaster relieve, platform itself planning function is weak, seldom proposed regional development strategic plan to guide public construction or industry of investment.

According to the Executive Yuan for approval of 2009 “National Spatial Development Strategy Plan,” Taiwan’s spatial structure in the Western region towards the 3 largest city areas for development, and the North, Central and South metro areas have their core city respectively. Except to promote three metro cities for across boundaries cooperation, also divided land space for “7 Developmental Areas” as: pei-pei-kee-yi, tao-chu-miao, chung-chang-tou, yun-chia-nan, kao-kao-ping, hua-tung and peng-kim-ma. It applies from the concept of “economic district” (or “basin district”) to promote regional cooperation. Also actively developed the so-called “3 Living Circles” to integrate the partnership relations among local governments. Government jointly participates in the regional cooperation organization, assist coordination resources distribution, and to balance regional development. Meanwhile, the counties and cities were merged and completed in
2010, this, opening the new era of Taiwan administrative area reform.

The following section is focusing the rational planning and use of homeland, then to discuss the Taiwan regional integration and governance practices across boundaries. And, will explore the cases of “North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” and Eastern Taiwan (Hua-Tung) regional governance and cooperation platform as examples.

(1). North Taiwan Regional Cooperation Mode

In 2003, Taipei Municipal Government in the basis of “North Taiwan Regional County/City Urban Development across Boundaries Cooperation Plan”, gradually build-up the common matters of regional cooperation program including 6 County/City in north Taiwan area of Keelung, Taipei City, Taipei County, Taoyuan County, Hsinchu County and the Hsinchu City. In 2005, 6 County or City Mayors jointly signed to establish the “North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee,” officially established the northern Taiwan regional development cooperation mechanism and platform. In the late 2005, Yilan County, Miaoli County Government participated in the Committee, and in January 2006, the heads of 8 northern Taiwan cities and counties, announced the “Northern Taiwan Regional Cooperation Declaration” and signed up the “Organizational Statutes of the North Regional Development Promoted Committee” to form a cooperation organization by eight northern Taiwan cities and counties.

The establishment of “North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” was self-organizing and independently composition by local governments, for its operation has a distinguishing feature. In addition, the North Taiwan regional development has important and pointer status for overall economic growth of Taiwan. Therefore, the governance mode of the Committee is considered a significant example for the other regional cooperation case; its experience can also be a reference for other existing regional platforms.

In the structure of organization, the “North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” is an informal regional cooperation organization. It signed by the heads of cities and counties in 2005, and the “Organizational Charter of North Regional Development Promoted Board” as the basis of operation of the Committee. In the Charter, clearly states that the Committee set the “Natural Member,” “Director of Member” and “General Members.” The Natural Members have 8, held by 8 heads of City and County; General Members have 8 to 16, recommended by the mayors, and other 1 to 2 industry representatives referred to the Committee by appointment. The Director of Member for 1 each annual year by the heads of eight Northern
Taiwan cities and counties to take turns to act.

When the “North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” was first established, there is a staff group responsible for promoting the cooperation of the Committee and arranging of meetings. In response to the diversity of issues of regional cooperation needed, staff team conducted a number of meetings to discuss 8 jointly developed issues of cooperation, namely: regional disaster prevention, recreation, transportation, industry, health promotion, social welfare, education and culture, ethnic integration and environmental protection. In February 2009, there are added up to 9 issues of governance groups, which has been operation to date. “Development group” members were appointed by the heads of cities and counties, for the windows of the Committee to coordinate horizontally with the various city and county governments. Another “Issue Groups” member are Deputy Mayors or Director of related bureaus, assigned by the city and county heads, whose main task is to promote the resolutions and programs adopted by the Committee, and to liaise and communicate with other counties on various issues.5

The northern Taiwan regional cooperation mechanism is driven by the autonomy of local governments and has gradually taken shape, with “North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” as the highest decision-making unit of regional cooperative matters. Since the Committee was operated, it faced many continuing difficulties due to the lack of official regulations and legitimacy, led the function of the Committee is limited. These difficulties also let North Taiwan regional cooperation platform looks very large, cooperation in a wide range of issues, but it short of effectiveness come into formalism (Shih and Lin, 2014).

Overall, the Committee on regional development will face problems mainly include organizational, personnel, and financial shortage. Therefore, it may trying to form associations prior to legalization, to assist the Committee in establishing a solid operational mechanism, allowing it to raise funds, and has the right of personnel appointments, so that can assist to build a better regional cooperation platform independently and effectively.

5 According to 3rd article of the “Organizational Charter of North Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Board,” tasks of the Commission have 6 as follows: 1. establish Northern Taiwan regional development strategy, development objectives and development policy coordination, integration and promotion governance matters; 2. coordinate and push the major programs in the region associated with cross-boundaries issues; 3. research and recommendations on matters to the North Taiwan region associated with planning and implementing; 4. promote legal act will be required to the local development of the North Taiwan region; 5. to promote and coordinate matters with regard to financing of the North Taiwan regional major programs; 6. other major construction program to the development of North Taiwan regarding elaboration, coordination and implementation of development issues.
(2). Eastern Taiwan Regional Governance Mode

Since the “Hua-Tung Area Development Regulations” has effected June 2011, regional governance and development in the Eastern Taiwan has gradually emerged, especially its formal and continuous subsidy mechanism, are totally different with other inter-regional cooperation platform in the West Taiwan. The Regulations, is the first special act to guide institutionalized regional development and cooperation in Taiwan, which take few points to be explained.:

A. The regulations stipulated both Hualien and Taitung governments shall put forward the “Eastern Region Sustainable Development Strategy Plan,” it responsible for coordinating, review, monitoring and guide the construction and development of Hualien and Taitung.

B. Hualien and Taitung County Government must prepare every four years a period of “Comprehensive Implement Development Programs,” as the area of Eastern upper guiding principles of integration.

C. The central government should subsidies annually budgeted cover or a wide column to the area, providing cheap financing, credit guarantees, industrial development incentives, and promote personnel training and cooperative.

D. To set up the “Hua-Tung Regional Sustainable Development Fund” total of NT. $ 40 billion.

In December 2011, the Central Government formulated the “Hua-Tung Area Development Promotion Plan” that contains the task force, basic principles, work planning, and so on. The key features are: First, to confirm policy implementation guidelines. It will use strategic plans to guide departments’ medium-range plans, and then use medium-range plans to guide the comprehensive development implementation programs, and then based on the needs of comprehensive development program to corporate budget. Second, public budget as foundation, while the Hua-Tung Fund is supplement one. Third, to set up a task force, representatives include the central bodies, experts and professions, and representatives of civil society organizations. At the task force meeting, may invite representatives of the relevant authorities, representatives or experts attend. Fourth, set the “Committee of Organizational Operation Areas Sustainable Development Fund,” members are representatives of the central Departments and county

---

6 See the Official Web Site of “Hua-Tung Regional Sustainable Development.” (http://hdsd.ndc.gov.tw/index.htm)
representatives appointed by the local authorities. (Chu and Chu, 2014)

The “Organization Operational Fund” is mainly used the grants, investments and financial aids. It aims to achieve the principle of sustainable and recurring using. Hopefully, the Fund tries to promote incentives and preferences for encouraging community and private sectors’ participation through financial innovation strategy. In short, the “Hua-Tung Area Development Promotion Plan” as the basis for Hualien County and Taitung County Governments to work out their “Comprehensive Implement Development Programs.” Also, held forums invited the industries, government officials, academics and civil society groups to discuss relevant matters during periods. The aim of these forums, are attempting to collect diverse local views, and then held public hearings by the Executive Yuan Hua-Tung Development Promoted Task Force to build local consensus. (Chu and Chu, 2014)

The Executive Yuan is authority-in-charge of the “Hua-Tung Fund Management Committee”. For the purpose of effective using the Hua-Tung Area Sustainable Development Fund, it set the “Committee of Organizational Operation Areas Sustainable Development Fund,” reset committee members 11 to 15 people, which 1 convener, by Chairman of the Executive Yuan Economic Construction Committee served the post; Additionally, set 2 Deputy conveners, and other members was appointed by the Executive Yuan to serve this position. The Committee team’s meetings and operations specifications by now are in substance on the track with the law.

The difference among Hua-Tung regional governance model and other Taiwanese regional governance and interactive platforms is: it was built as a form of across Ministries, intergovernmental and across public and private sectors. This mechanism is provided by a central “National Development Council” formally serve as aides. While the platform or mechanism became formalized, it facilitates program review and discussion of the Eastern Taiwan regional development policies.

IV. Findings and Conclusion

The biggest challenge to precede cross-country comparisons is not the distance between language and space, but the self-imposed limitations of human thought. People often considered different nation or area cannot be generalized, but liable to miss valuable principles and innovative content between them. Despite the different jurisdictional levels, experience of the European Union to Taiwanese cases of regional governance, remains important reference value.
While EU political system becomes more mature and its integration has become enlarged and deeper, various theories on EU governance are emerging, particularly in the EU gradually shaping a multi-level system of governance in recent years. On July 25, 2001, after the European Commission based on good governance concept and proposed the “European Governance: A White Paper” to address five principles of openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence, hopefully to achieve 3 goals: first, improving the level of city and region to participate in policies making process in the EU; second, the establishment of European identity and European citizenship; third, improving transparency in decision-making.

From examining of different levels of regional governance mechanisms and cooperation platform, the study made some of observations and analysis for the regional governance.

First, would be the institutionalization and legitimization of the regional governance organizations or cross-boundaries governance platform. The “Northern Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” has operated for 10 years; due to its informal status so that has less substantial power for binding members that lead the Committee was difficult to propose and advance plans. Not every case is like the Hua-Tung governance mode with a unique background and characteristic\(^7\), could be enforced by law or formal mechanism to assist. Particularly in light of election interests and the Central grant programs shall consists city and county governments to apply for. Therefore, the problem eventually has return to the original point – local governments disposed of their own policy priorities and plans. Thus, it considered that the most important features to set up the regional governance mechanism have to be legalization of organization, personnel and budget. However, this goes back to the traditional bureaucratic administration of stereotypes, and the hope of using “governance” and “cross-boundaries” concepts or methods to break through this predicament has come into a dilemma. Would legalization or formalization solve the dilemma of governance? Can it find a new mode to operate? Some have ever suggested to establishing a statutory office, Committee, or the Public Body for administrative corporation, but, these may still find a way within traditional agonies, eventually the problems such as lack of money, overlapping organizations, etc. will continued.

At present, regional governance and development issues, apart from the organization, personnel and financial matters, should also think about what are the

---

\(^7\) It has a multiracial character of the area, and also less development in economic than the West Taiwan. So what used to be called “Back Mountain”.
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interests of the stakeholders and their participation of governance into account. Certainly, cooperation plan should conform to the practical, necessary to meet the people’s demand, that is, to be more important than access to unstable funding. The creation of “Northern Taiwan Regional Development Promoted Committee” was driven by local governments; autonomy is also a major feature of its operations. If it could make good use of the regional development for Taiwan with its pointer and key position of economic growth of Taiwan, then, appropriately introduce of community or international partners to join the management scope of cooperation, it will have a more powerful effect.

To considering the operational predicament of the Committee, relied on the central provision of aid is not a good way for operation. The example in the EU’s Structural Funds or Cohesion Fund may be a feasible policy tool for grants use in trans-regional governance programs. The short-term program can use of existing subsidy mechanisms, such as the “Local Industrial Development Fund” (by The Ministry of Economy) mode of operation, to funds for regional cooperation with specific budgets, and must cooperate across cities and counties plans to apply for the funding. Progressively, it becomes exclusive funds for regional development. In addition, it suggests that the use of the funds earmarked for this budget, have to establish a feedback mechanism, such as revenues obtained from cooperative plan need to give the callback percentage to such budgetary accounts, thus enabling the budget can sustainable support of promotion of co-operation across areas.

Second, and Hua-Tung regional governance has developed a unique feature, that highlights the importance of multiple participation and multi-level governance spirit. As Haslam-McKenzie (2003) has argued, regional governance and cooperation cannot completed alone to individual department or government of force, more needs other department, other levels governments, and civil society of support to succeed. Hua-Tung regional governance, for example, interagency coordination of regional policies on the region of Eastern Taiwan developed 25-man team to promote tasks, about 15 are representative of the Executive Yuan, accounted for 62%, others contains 2 county magistrates, 5 academic professions, and 3 representatives of the civil society. This seems to imply that, the Eastern Taiwan Regional Governance platform, better use for cross-boundaries coordinated functions.

Since the “Hua-Tung Area Development Act” has brought into force in June 2011, legitimacy of the cross-regional governance in the area allowed Hua-Tung regional governance have institutional and budgetary advance. The Central leads to develop a clear and definite hierarchical relationship; and the Eastern Construction
Seeking a “Meso-level” Mechanism for Governance

Funding is mainly based on the annual budget system, and the operation of Funds can be “principle of subsidiarity.” These features, assist the area can obtain the formal supports and more stable resources and budget for operating developmental programs. (Lee, 2006; Lee and Tseng, 2013).

The third, after review governance process of the Eastern Taiwan Developmental Fund against the European Union case, the Eastern Taiwan regional governance (Hua-Tung area) has displayed in some way of multi-level governance structure, which including the central, local, public and private, and a combination of social forces and market forces. In addition, through openness and citizen participation to build better governance quality that integrated investment and innovation makes governance results sustainable and inexhaustible. Finally, it also encourages entrepreneurship through subsidy mechanism to strengthen investment benefit appraisal for improving the decision-making structures and processes. So that to achieve desired benefits and objectives of governance. In addition, the Eastern Taiwan regional governance experience, partly answers to the EU emphasized principle of “multi-speed integration,” namely: objectives of integration are consistent, while the speed and method may not necessarily require the same. This spirit, can also serve as reference for policy formulation and practice of regional governance in Taiwan. Overall, Taiwanese cross-boundaries or regional governance need to enhance relevant legal and institution system, in addition to strengthen cross-boundaries cooperation in a reasonable administrative division.
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尋求一個中觀層次的治理機制：「歐洲區域」
模式對台灣區域治理的啟示

黃榮源

摘要

區域治理（regional governance）是各國近年來政治學、行政學、都市與空間規劃界日益關注的研究議題。各類區域治理形式及概念的出現，反映了這種全球和地方層次的治理空間變化。美國都會治理已走向新區域主義途徑，透過政策行動者的網絡合作，達到區域治理的目標。英國的區域治理與區域經濟發展和競爭力息息相關，不管是中央主導型或地方主導型區域治理模式，已朝向一種公、私、非營利組織及其它公共服務機構的協力夥伴方式進行。在歐洲，歐盟會員國亦在尋求一個「中觀層次」（meso-level）的治理機制，藉由「歐洲區域」（Euregion）建構及「跨境合作」（Cross-border cooperation）方式，企圖拉近各會員國在歐洲統合過程中政治與經濟利益之間的距離。上述域各種區域政府體系，或跨境治理的制度安排，其共同的特色是一種「全球在地化」的浮現，更強調居民的政治授權，更多緊密的社區角色，以及更多元且彈性的協調方式。

本文主要探討歐盟之「歐洲區域」及北臺灣和東臺灣兩個個區域治理模式的制度建構與發展；藉由文獻分析與個案研究，瞭解和掌握當前區域治理變遷的趨勢，期能：一、對上述發展和機制建構作較有系統之梳理，以作為下一階段實證研究的基礎；二，研析上述機制的運作實務及缺失，以期對當前我國國土空間規劃或跨域治理平台之建構，提供可參照的架構或模式。
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