



AUTHOR(S):

TITLE:

YEAR:

Publisher citation:

OpenAIR citation:

Publisher copyright statement:

This is the _____ version of an article originally published by _____
in _____
(ISSN _____; eISSN _____).

OpenAIR takedown statement:

Section 6 of the "Repository policy for OpenAIR @ RGU" (available from <http://www.rgu.ac.uk/staff-and-current-students/library/library-policies/repository-policies>) provides guidance on the criteria under which RGU will consider withdrawing material from OpenAIR. If you believe that this item is subject to any of these criteria, or for any other reason should not be held on OpenAIR, then please contact openair-help@rgu.ac.uk with the details of the item and the nature of your complaint.

This publication is distributed under a CC _____ license.

The regional offices in Brussels:

From 'push and pull' to 'people and place'

Justin Greenwood

Robert Gordon University

Abstract

The potential of 'people and place' is assessed as a means to broaden research about regional political actors into key questions about their role in European integration, largely dormant since the European Commission's 2001 White Paper on Governance raised the potential for territorial authorities to bridge EU institutions with territorial civil society. Interviews were conducted with a sub-set of executives from EU liaison offices performing leading roles in the formation and maintenance of a cluster of cognate networks. A key driver involves differences in their working constraints, assessed by a dual typology of offices in conjunction with literature applied to lobbyists in outreach contexts. A tendency to 'go native' over time, coupled with the opportunities for long-time post holders to control their own working agendas, may lead to activities orientated towards bringing the EU to regions, rather than just promoting their regions in EU institutions.

Keywords: European integration; regional liaison offices; networks.

Introduction: push, pull, people and place

Whilst regions have no formal role in EU legislative decision-making, more than 200 liaison offices from the regions are to be found in Brussels in close proximity to EU institutions (Donas and Beyers, 2013), accounting for around two-thirds of regional general governing authorities in Europe (Tatham, 2013). Their presence has resulted in a substantial legacy of research, shifting in focus over time from questions about their mobilization and organizational characteristics in the 1990s (Hooghe, 1995; Marks et al, 1996; Jeffery, 1997; Keating 1999) to the varying pathways of activities trodden by different types of offices (Marks et al, 2002; MacNeil et al, 2007; Huysseune and Jans, 2008; Moore 2008; Tatham, 2008; Rowe 2011). Whilst we now know much about characteristics of the offices, why they came to Brussels and what different types of offices do, we are surprisingly less informed about how their activities connect with questions of wider interest to scholars of European integration. For instance, whilst the landmark 2001 White Paper on Governance (Commission of the European Communities, 2001) devoted much consideration to the potential of regions in the quest to find ways to increase the democratic legitimacy of the EU, there are few subsequent accounts of how this might be achieved, and none as to whether the activities of EU regional offices in Brussels might in any way connect with such an ambition. This article therefore explores whether established frameworks of reference for research about regional offices can usefully be shifted to inform wider questions surrounding the role of a key set of regional political actors in European integration, and, if so, what other frameworks of analysis these might draw upon, and the ways in which they might usefully do so.

A standard frame used to inform research on regional offices has been arranged around ‘pull’ (the draw of the EU) and ‘push’ factors (e.g. resources, geopolitical features of a region). This framework has served its purpose to provide information about the offices, mobilization and activities, and to make some distinctions between them, but has evident limits of application to contexts broader in focus than the offices themselves. Yet because the numbers who work in these offices are relatively small (on average, a little over six staff - Tatham, 2013), understanding ‘where people are coming from’ offers the prospect of examining what else offices might be doing, or interested in doing. Two established traditions of understanding actor motivations derive from frameworks involving the amount of discretion available to agents viz. their principals, and the influences under which actors have been socialized. A comprehensive examination of such perspectives would involve extensive use of research resources to sample a sufficiently large number of policy executives in regional offices and in parent international departments back home, but before committing such a large scale deployment it would be useful to know more about the potential such an avenue of enquiry might yield. The analysis below provides a pilot study aimed at exploring whether, and how, a study centered on actors in the Brussels regional offices might broaden the study of such offices into a wider set of questions touching on issues of European integration.

The structure of Brussels regional offices

Whilst there is substantial variation among Brussels regional offices, many of their characteristics can be drawn from a two-type classification. The first type, accounting for around three-quarters of regional offices in Brussels (Donas and Beyers, 2013), represent a single territorial authority, primarily from countries with powerful tiers of regional

government. An office in Brussels allows such authorities to increase their access to political, and technical, information which impact on their policy responsibilities. Many of the day to day tasks which fall to territorial governing authorities originate in policy decisions shaped in Brussels, such that their presence increases the ability of regions to solve technical issues involving policy implementation, as well as aspiring to share with member states some of the decision making which affects them (Jeffery, 2005). When many regions first established offices in Brussels their presence was often a point of friction with national governments. In Germany, Italy and Spain these tensions were settled by constitutional court cases during the early 1990s, which recognized the right of regions to establish an office in Brussels provided their activities did not infringe upon matters which fall as the sole responsibility of member states (such as foreign policy). For smaller federal countries (e.g. Austria, Belgium) the involvement of regional governments in EU policy making arrangements could hardly be avoided. In the case of other countries with significant territorial levels a settled arrangement evolved allowing territorial governing authorities access to permanent representations in exchange for compliance with confidentiality, even where the political colors were not matched (Scully and Wyn Jones, 2010). In this relatively relaxed setting, many member states were willing to use their discretion to allow territorial authorities to take their seat at the Council of Ministers in appropriate cases. In consequence, much of the work of Brussels regional offices representing single territorial authorities has become focused upon national permanent representations and the Council of Ministers, coupled with information collection. These offices have the greatest numbers of staff, mainly originating from the regional authorities themselves. Many of these territorial authorities are already well integrated into member state decision making and administrative disbursement arrangements for EU structural funds, such that 'chasing the money in Brussels' does not account for a significant amount of their activities.

Once center-region relations for EU policy making purposes had taken on a more settled trajectory, offices from federal/quasi-federal countries experienced a significant growth in size, with 30-40 staff in the outliers (Bavaria and Valencia). The most powerful (west) German Länder acquired the feel of diplomatic missions, and distinguished by a practice of seconding staff for limited time periods, typically around four years, aimed at limiting the possibility for staff to progressively 'go native' in their outreach environment. These offices kept mainly focused on the Council of Ministers, whereas regional offices from Italy and Spain used their resources in pursuit of a more diverse range of activities, often hosting a chamber of commerce resident, and using the opportunity to network with other territorial authorities in Brussels as a means to acquire new approaches to apply to entrenched problems. The EU structural funds also include a range of socio-economic measures aimed at regional economic development which provide an opportunity for affected regions to network together to explore specific approaches and fields of interests. With powerful regional tiers of authority, as well as regions experiencing development challenges, Spanish and Italian regions are likely to feature prominently in such networks.

Regions from countries with more limited degrees of territorial authority have had to find their own niche in the EU political system because of the lack of 'pull' which an orientation towards the Council of Ministers might otherwise provide. These are well represented among the second main type of regional office in Brussels, which are membership service providers for organizations within a designated region, and/or a regional development agency or similar. These realities mean the networks these offices participate in are orientated by the particularities of their client base as well as their origin in regional development. Subscription fees do not usually reflect the full costs of running the office, but

tend to be subsidized by a regional development agency (or similar) which in turn receives central government funding. These realities result in noticeably smaller staff sizes for this type of regional office, and which limits their ability to participate in a wider range of networks beyond a core focus of economic development. Nonetheless, they are able to draw their staff directly from the Brussels/EU labor market pool, often recruiting those trained in higher education institutions nearby offering specialist EU Masters courses. Whilst this type of recruit tends to have an interest in the deepening of European integration, they have less freedom of choice over network participation because of the client focus of a membership service office.

The lack of integration of regions with limited degrees of devolved authority into member state decision making mechanisms means that their membership services offices tend towards a greater funding orientation than do offices representing a single territorial authority. Nonetheless, an established paradox is that the disbursement of structural funds is often inversely proportional to the strength of territorial authorities in the member states, such that regions from countries which receive some of the highest amounts of funding are some of the less well represented by regional offices in Brussels (Marks et al, 2002). There are smaller elements in EU structural funds which can be accessed independently of member states, often focused on cross-border collaboration. Some of the networks formed by regions in Brussels do support the ability of regions to meet pre-conditions for application to these schemes, but few (if any) are orientated entirely by 'chasing the money' because of the diversity of focus across regional offices, and because there are other significant tasks to undertake (Sykes and Lord, 2011; Chalmers, 2013; Donas, Beyers and Fraussen, 2013). The pattern of networks and regional participation in them cannot be explained only by fund seeking, but by a range of perspectives which takes in needs to share technical expertise in

policy implementation, lobbying over EU policy and support measures, and the interests of participants themselves.

The establishment of some regional offices of both types (tied to a single regional government or a membership service entity) may in some way have reflected competition among regions to model ‘the latest in Euro chic’ (Moore, 2011, p.794), and once up and running had to justify their existence by finding useful things to do. The Committee of the Regions has also needed to find its place in EU policy making, and to an extent discussed at a later stage in this article some regional offices have followed its discourse of ‘working to bring citizens closer to the European Union’ (CoR, 2013). From the reasoning thus far, it can be expected that staff from offices tied to regional governments have more scope for choice to follow these types of agendas than those from offices tied to a subscribing client base. What features of offices might explain the pattern of choices for networks with orientations towards linking EU institutions with civil society, and what wider implications might this have?

Research design and methodology

Researching actor based perspectives as explanations for political behavior raises a variety of challenges. Agents benefiting from asymmetric relations with their principals can hardly be expected to reveal all, leaving researchers with a choice between participant observation in which access is likely to prove problematic, or plausible deduction. Judgments about the effects of institutional socialization similarly require reasonable deduction. Where ‘socialization’ has been investigated in the context of EU regional offices, it has only been operationalized by using the indicator of duration of establishment of an

office in Brussels (see, for instance, Donas, Beyers and Fraussen, 2013), rather than from the perspective of actors themselves. Yet the places in which key policy officers in the regional offices have been primarily socialized – whether the ‘Brussels EU circuit’ or in the headquarters of the regional authorities themselves – might be expected to influence their outlooks. Those which have spent much of their professional careers in the ‘Brussels bubble’ might themselves have developed affiliations in favor of European integration. In short, they may have ‘gone native’ on questions such as how to deepen European integration, and which can be expected to have influenced their working agendas.

Whilst there is no central information source about EU territorial thematic networks, the nearest thing to it (a Committee of the Regions/European Commission DG Regional Policy ‘Open Days’ Directory, last published in 2008) lists formal territorial associations and topic networks in which regional offices participate (Committee of the Regions/European Commission DG Regional Policy, 2008). It is quickly apparent from the ‘Open Days’ directory that most of the 81 networks listed reflect the orientation towards economic development issues of membership services offices. But what might lie behind networks with orientations towards topics such as social inclusion or a GMO free Europe? A high level of commitment to a particular type of network, such as hosting, may reflect a political choice by a governing territorial authority. But when a sub-set of participating regions can be identified which have no apparent geopolitical connections, shared topographical features, or alignment of competencies, and which expend time and effort on the establishment and maintenance of networks which may not be core to their functions, and in which other regions which might potentially be participants but do not do so, something else seems to be involved. This directs the spotlight onto the Brussels regional offices rather than upon characteristics of the regions themselves.

Nine networks were identified from a mixture of the *Open Days* directory, websites, and in discussion with practitioners, with strong discourse orientated towards linking EU institutions with territorial civil society. Using self-descriptions drawn from documents available on the websites of these networks, as well as literature supplied by the networks themselves, it is possible to draw a working categorization between those in which discourse about linking EU institutions with territorial civil society plays a pivotal role ('a high 'citizen' discourse') and those for whom the discourse appears at a more contextual ('medium') level. The networks, their activities and categorization are listed in Table 1, together with information about the role of the Brussels regional offices in them:

--TABLE 1 HERE--

Table 1 identifies eight Brussels regional offices which have membership of three or more networks with a civil society orientation based around the participation of these offices themselves. Six of these are offices which represent a single territorial authority. These are: Andalucía; Catalunya; Lower Austria; Tuscany; Valencia; and Veneto. The other two offices, Vlewa (Flanders) and West Sweden, are membership services entities. An additional network founder from Table 1 is Emilia Romagna, an established office on the Brussels scene with a record of entrepreneurship in network activities, included in two of the networks in Table 1, and which also participates in a number of other networks with producer orientations. For shorthand, this group of Brussels regional offices under analysis is denoted the 'G9'.

Networks of Brussels regional offices

Facilitated by a common location and the pre-requisite for staff to be able to converse in the principal languages used by EU institutions, Brussels regional offices form extensive networks between themselves, with varying levels of participation from regions back home. These networks either have a technical or political character. The former are aimed at best-practice sharing and have mostly been institutionalized by a legal personality because of their need to incur expenditure for their activities (events, mutual visits, secretariat, studies, etc.), and because some member states require local legislation before formal participation in outside organizations is possible. Networks with a more political character often have no formal legal personality because they are less likely to require expenditure. By virtue of their common location and linguistic capabilities, the Brussels offices play a key role in both of these types of networks, either by participating themselves or in facilitating participation by the territorial authorities they represent.

Thematic networks can generally be distinguished from territorially based associations by their extent of institutional establishment. Thus, whilst *Eurocities* has almost 40 staff, thematic networks typically draw upon a rotating secretariat, often hosted (or facilitated) by participating Brussels regional offices. Whilst the time required of participating in the breadth of activities of large territorial associations requires an active role from territorial government headquarters in the member states, the logistics of Brussels offices makes them well suited to play a key role in the formation and maintenance of less formalized networks. As participating in networks is resource intensive (Nielsen and Salk, 1998; Salk et al, 2001) relative to the average number of staff in Brussels regional offices,

the choices of which networks to participate in clearly reveals something of the activities are interested in. Whilst this will in part reflect the functions which regions undertake in different countries (Moore, 2011) and the degree to which they face particular issues, variation in network participation between regions similarly affected suggests other factors are involved (Crieckemans 2010, in Donas and Beyers, 2013). Participation in networks might well reflect topographical features of regions, historical trajectories of industry and agriculture, socio-economic composition, characteristics of functional devolved authority, and political choices. But to what degree are actor based perspectives likely to play a role in explaining the network choices which offices make?

The networks identified in Table 1 are primarily political networks, although technical tasks concerned with sharing best practice for implementation also features among these. Variable durability, participation, and activity levels are a feature of most networks, with political networks in particular prone to instability due to changes of administration following elections, and the need to avoid sensitivities during critical election times. Yet the durability of the political networks in Table 1 is a prominent feature of them. The choice of some networks not to adopt a legal personality seems to suggest a different orientation than fund seeking. In the *establishment* of both types of networks, political and technical, the Brussels offices seem to have taken a leading role. In network *maintenance* there is no clear pattern as to whether the Brussels offices of the regions play a lead, or supporting, role relative to the administrations back home amongst the political networks. Table 2 demonstrates that the G9 offices display strong networking orientations, with around two and a half times more affiliations to all types of networks than the sector average, and Toscana and Catalunya as notable outliers with 29 and 23 network affiliations respectively. Having sufficient staff resources to undertake such an extent of network activities is clearly part of the story;

together, the group of offices under examination has an average staff number which is around two and a half times higher than the average staffing level for the constituency of Brussels regional offices as a whole.

The G9 played a role as founder members in most of the nine networks in Table 1, and continue to play a key role in maintaining the network, mainly by providing the secretariat.

--TABLE 2 HERE--

Undoubtedly, offices which affiliate to civil society networks are from organizations which are leading networkers. But their activities in networks with a civil society orientation make them leaders in the field; the G9 together have more than eight times the level of affiliations to civil society networks than the sector norm. Interviews were therefore conducted with personnel from the offices of the G9 responsible for network participation, as well as with the secretariat of the networks (where different) concerned, in order to try to identify factors of commonality. Prior to including insights from these, there are some circumstantial factors which help to identify some factors of linkage between the G9.

A clear feature of the list of network activists is a strong Italian-Spanish flavor, from where the top five network participants originate. Nonetheless, the socio-economic profile, as well as the political orientation, of these regions is highly mixed, making it difficult to explain the pattern of participation in the networks selected. The participating Italian regions are among the most prosperous, and do not fit the profile of those most likely to be interested in underlying structural problems of social exclusion, a theme prominent in many of the

networks. Andalucía, Tuscany and Emilia Romagna have long-established left-wing traditions, Valencia an established right-wing tradition, while Veneto and Catalunya have a center-right or nationalist-right tradition, with some years of center/nationalist-left exception, and coalition governments. Of interest is the reference to its Brussels office in the new regional constitution of Andalucía, which, unlike its predecessors, is no longer restricted only to the promotion of regional socio-economic and professional interests, thus providing it with the ability to develop into a wider range of activities (Andalucía en Bruselas, 2010). As well as participating together in a number of networks, Andalucía (lead partner) and Veneto are also linked by their participation in the INTERREG (IV C) funded 'People Project', linking seven regions, where sub-projects include social and e-inclusion, E-health, the reconciliation of work and private life, and 'Civil Society empowerment', involving 'all those organizations through which citizens participate in social life,' (PEOPLE handbook 2009, p.110) in which such organizations are invited to participate in interventions aimed at their capacity building. Participation in these projects reflects both the emphasis and priorities of the participating regions as well as the work of specific staff from Brussels offices and their leadership role in cognate networks.

The absence of regions from other countries also suggests something specific to the G9. Addressing social exclusion is a recurring theme about many of the networks, yet the lack of common participation from other regions facing similar problems is noteworthy, particularly in the case of offices not tied to subscription clients. The G9 Brussels offices have made a choice to incur the leadership costs involved in establishing and maintaining these networks. A feature common to all of the participating regions in the specialist thematic networks identified in Table 1 involves the commitment of a key individual from the Brussels office. A striking feature which emerged from interviews with all of the offices

involved a head of office, or a head of social affairs, who had spent most of a lengthy career on the Brussels circuit. The duration of time spent on the Brussels circuit makes it difficult not to develop commitments to European integration, and the absence of short-term secondment arrangements among the key G9 individuals is notable. In the case of one regional office, a journalist was retained by the head of office with the covert task of placing positive EU stories in local media back home; the head of office concerned had spent an entire career on the 'Brussels circuit', mostly in lobbying related posts prior to taking up a position with the regional office concerned. In three of the G9 Brussels offices the individuals responsible for the networks involved had been in their present post for over 15 years. With such longevity comes an enhanced ability to control personal working agendas established through trust, deference to expertise, and an ability to control the flow of information enhanced by skills in a number of different European languages. With longevity of position also comes an assumed responsibility for network leadership.

Another feature of the G9 regions involves a linkage to postgraduate Masters courses with strong reputations as training centers for EU orientated careers, such as the College of Europe and the University of Maastricht, either through provision of a scholarship linked to an internship in the Brussels regional office (two of the G9), or simply through the presence of staff in these offices with qualifications from these courses. The latter was a feature common to the only two participating membership service offices in the G9, where two of the five staff in the West Sweden office qualified from the College of Europe, while the coordinator of SIRG (Vleva) graduated from a course with a similar orientation at the University of Maastricht. Particular significance can be attached to these linkages because this type of office is more tied to servicing the interests of its subscription clients.

Conclusions

The analysis of network participation by Brussels regional offices does firmly identify a small sub-set of offices which are highly active in a core group of networks operating with discourse frames linking EU institutions to territorial civil society. Their participation is disproportionately greater than their generally higher tendency to participate in networks, as well as their higher staff levels relative to the population of offices as a whole. These offices do much more than facilitate participation by others from their territories; rather, they take an active part in these networks, often leading their formation and maintenance. Their entrepreneurship reflects an ambition among network participants about linking the EU political system with territorial civil society.

A search for the common features of the Brussels offices key to the sub-set of networks examined lies in factors related to the structure of the offices themselves and the people working in them. One of the contributory factors involves the education and training background, and linkages to cultural attitudes to European integration. But a central issue appears to be that of autonomy. The most striking common feature is the length of time which key staff spend on the Brussels circuit. A long length of service in post is a notable feature among the leading participants. In such cases, the establishment of 'goals' for such offices by principals can be highly influenced by the expertise of agents, and the trust invested in them by principals as a result of the development of long-term relationships. In turn, this capacity for agents to lead their principals provides the autonomy for such actors to pursue acquired interests in deepening European integration. In sum, a tendency to 'go native', coupled with the opportunities for long-time post holders to control their own working agendas are the conditions most likely to lead to activities orientated towards

bringing the EU to regions, rather than just promoting their regions in EU institutions. It demonstrates how a focus on 'people and place' can broaden a hitherto inward looking focus on the Brussels regional offices themselves into wider questions about their potential role in the political system in which they are embedded. In turn, this has scope to re-open a set of issues dormant since the European Commission's 2001 White Paper on Governance raised the potential for territorial political actors to bridge EU institutions with territorial civil society.

References

- Andalucía en Bruselas (2010). *La Junta de Andalucía en Bruselas*. Brussels: Junta de Andalucía.
- Beyers, J and Donas, T (2013) *Trans-regional networks in Brussels: analyzing the informational exchanges among regional offices*. Paper prepared for presentation to the Council for European Studies 20th International Conference of Europeanists, Amsterdam, June 25-27 2013.
- Chalmers, A. (2013). Regional Authority, Transnational Lobbying and the Allocation of Structural Funds in the European Union, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51, 815-831.
- Commission of the European Communities. (2001). European Governance: a White Paper, COM(2001) 428 final. Retrieved from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0428en01.pdf
- Committee of the Regions (2009). *Associations/Bureaux de Representation Regionale et Communale a Bruxelles: Répertoire* (Brussels: Committee of the Regions). Retrieved from www.cor.europa.eu/cor_cms/ui/ViewDocument.aspx?contentid...af19
- Committee of the Regions/European Commission DG Regional Policy (2008). Regional Offices Contact Directory. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/conferences/od2008/doc/pdf/catalogue_en.pdf
- Committee of the Regions (2013) 'Key facts.' Retrieved from <http://cor.europa.eu/en/about/Pages/key-facts.aspx>
- Donas, T. and Beyers, J. (2013) How Regions Assemble in Brussels: the organizational form of territorial representation in the EU. *Publius*, 43, 527-550.

- Donas, Beyers and Fraussen (2013). *It's not all about the Money. Explaining varying Policy Portfolios of Regional Representations in Brussels*. Paper prepared for presentation to the Council for European Studies 20th International Conference of Europeanists, Amsterdam, June 25-27 2013.
- European Commission DG Regional Policy/Committee of the Regions (2009). Regional Offices Contact Directory: Open Days: European Week of Regions and Cities Brussels, 6-9 October. Retrieved from http://www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/conferences/.../catalogue_en.pdf
- Happaerts S, Van den Brande K. and Bruyninckx, H (2011). Subnational governments in transnational networks for sustainable development. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 11,4, 321-339.
- Hart, D. (2010). The Political Theory of the Firm. In D. Coen, W. Grant and G. Wilson (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Business and Government* (pp173-190). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heinelt, H and Niederhafner, S (2008). Cities and Organized Interest Intermediation in the EU Multi-Level System. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 15, 2, 173 – 187.
- Hooghe, L. (1995). Subnational Mobilization in the European Union, *West European Politics*, 18, 175-198.
- Huyseune, M. and Jans, T. (2008). Brussels as the capital of a Europe of the regions? Regional offices as European policy actors. *Brussels Studies*, 16, 25 February. Retrieved from http://www.brusselsstudies.be/PDF/EN_57_BruS16EN.pdf
- Jeffery, C (1997). *The Regional Dimension of the European Union*. London: Frank Cass.

- Jeffery, C. (2005). Regions and the European Union: letting them in and leaving them alone. In S. Wetherill and U. Bernitz (eds.) *The role of Regions and sub-national actors in Europe* (pp33-46). Oxford: Hart.
- Keating, M. (1999). Regions and International Affairs: Motives, Opportunities and Strategies. In M. Keating and F. Aldacoa (Eds.) *Paradiplomacy in Action: The Foreign Relations of Subnational Governments* (pp1-16). London: Frank Cass,
- MacNeill S., Jeffery C. and Gibney J. (2007) Changing Dynamics of Regional Representation in Brussels: A case study of Birmingham and the West Midlands, 1984-2004. *Regional Studies* 41, 403-414.
- Marks G, Haesley R. and Mbaye H. (2002). What do Subnational Offices Think They are Doing in Brussels? *Regional and Federal Studies* 12, 1-23.
- Marks, G., Nielsen F., Ray L. and Salk, J. (1996). Competencies, Cracks and Conflicts: Regional Mobilization in the European Union. *Comparative Political Studies* 29, 164-192.
- Moore, C. (2006). Conflicts in representing the regions in Brussels: The case of Wales. *Regional Studies* 40, 793-799.
- Moore, C (2008). A Europe of the Regions vs. the Regions in Europe: Reflections on Regional Engagement in Brussels. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 18, 517-535.
- Nielsen, F. and Salk, J. (1998). The Ecology of Collective Action and Regional Representation in the European Union. *European Sociological Review* 14, 231-254.
- PEOPLE handbook (2009). *Civil Society Empowerment*, Retrieved at http://www.peopleproject.eu/useful_docs.php
- Rowe, C. (2011). *Regional Representations in the EU: Between Diplomacy and Interest Mediation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Salk J., Nielsen F. and Marks G. (2001). Patterns of Cooperation among Regional Offices in Brussels: Homophily, Complementarity and National Embeddedness. Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/~nielsen/sss01/sss01.pdf>
- Scully, R. and Wyn Jones, R. (eds.) *Europe, Regions and European Regionalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sykes, O. and Lord, A. (2011) Whither a Europe of the (English) regions? Reflections on the prospects for the representation of English territorial interests in Europe, *Local Economy* 26. 486-499.
- Tatham, M. (2008). Going Solo: Direct Regional Representation in the EU'. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 18, 493-515.
- Tatham, M. (2010) With or without you? Re-visiting territorial state by-passing in EU interest representation. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17, 76-99.
- Tatham, M. (2013). Paradiplomacy against the state: explaining conflict in state and sub-state interest representation in Brussels, *Comparative Political Studies*, 46, 63-94.

Table 1

Networks of Brussels regional offices with discourse linking EU institutions with territorial civil society

Network name	Type & structure	Contact point	Role of Brussels Office	Other Brussels office network partners	Activities
Type A) High levels of linking discourse					
ELISAN (European Local Inclusion Social Action Network)	Political; legal personality	Veneto Office Brussels (Current Presidency; also Chair of Social Inclusion working group)	Rotating Presidency/secretariat Regions and Brussels offices steering committee	Valencia; Carinthia; Greek Regions	‘maintaining social cohesion...deepening social Europe’; ‘working to develop a social Europe which guarantees the basic rights of all citizens’ ⁱ
ENSA: European Network of Social Authorities	Technical; no formal legal personality	Veneto Office Brussels	Founder & secretariat Brussels offices & regions	Vlewa (Flanders) (ex co- Chair); Andalucía ; Valencia (ex co- Chair); West Sweden (ex co- Chair); Attiki;	Mutual learning; Dialogue with EU institutions on Social Policies; project participation. Five thematic networks in: Social Inclusion; Elderly; Youth; Children & Families; Disability.
SIRG: Social Inclusion Regional Group	Political; no formal legal personality	VLEVA Brussels Office	Co-founder & secretariat Brussels based offices network	Vlewa (Flanders) (co-founder); Veneto; West Sweden; Valencia; Catalunya	‘a regional and local response to the 2010 European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion’ ⁱⁱ Adapts agenda to ‘European Year of..’, with core social inclusion agenda.
Type B) Medium levels of linking discourse					
EARLALL European Association of Regional and Local Authorities for Lifelong Learning	Political; legal personality	Tuscany/ Central Italian Regions Brussels Office	Secretariat. Tuscany founded Regions and Brussels offices support	Catalunya; Andalucía; Lower Austria; Basque; Marche; Tuscany	Information/best practice exchange, policy interface with EU institutions, development of joint projects with EU funding, support for local projects. Includes social exclusion focus.
ERLAI/M: European and Local Authorities for Integration of migrants	Technical and political; no legal personality	Emilia Romagna Brussels Office	Founder & secretariat Brussels based offices network	Valencia; Andalucía; Catalunya; Stockholm; Barcelona province; East Sweden; Nomarchia Illias	‘A platform for dialogue on integration of migrants between European institutions, public authorities at all levels and representatives of civil society and migrant associations.’ ⁱⁱⁱ
ENRICH: European Networks of Regions Improving Citizens Health	Political; no legal personality	Andalucía Office in Brussels	Secretariat Brussels offices driven network	Tuscany (founder); Upper Saxony; Aquitaine	Project brokering & access with EU funding, local project support, thematic expert working groups, best practice sharing, and policy interface with EU institutions. Working group

					on Health Inequalities, and events on Social Inclusion.
EUREGHA: European Regional and Local Health Authorities	Technical; originates from 2006, adopted legal personality in 2012	Lower Austria Brussels Office	Secretariat Brussels office driven network	Vleeva (Flanders); Veneto; Andalucía; Valencia (ex Chair); Catalunya; Zealand; West Sweden; Stockholm; Lower Austria; East Sweden; Styria; Tuscany	Interface with EU institutions, awareness raising of policy implementation role; improvement of collaboration between Brussels regional offices; co-operation with NGOs; information sharing.
GMO-free regions of Europe	Political; no legal personality	Upper Austria Brussels Office	Co-ordinator Brussels office driven network	Emilia Romagna; Tuscany (co-movers); Lower Austria; Aquitaine; Attiki; Basque; Marche; Nomarchia Illias; Styria	Range of NUTS1-III authorities, with Brussels offices, and NGOs (e.g. Friends of the Earth), key participants.
Partenalia	Political & technical; legal personality	Brussels regional offices; currently Barcelona Province;	Secretariat	Valencia (Observer); Alicante (full).	NUTS III intermediate Local Authorities. Social Affairs are a priority thematic sector, with a focus embracing social inclusion.

Sources: European Commission DG Regional Policy/Committee of the Regions (2008); interview data; network websites.

Table 2: Comparing Network Participation and Staff Resources of the G9

Office	n. memberships of networks with linking discourse	All Network participation	Staff Resources
Andalucía	5	9	14
Catalunya	4	23	18
Emilia Romagna	2	12	14
Lower Austria	3	6	4
Toscana	4	29	6
Valencia	6	8	20
Veneto	4	11	15
Vlewa	3	7	13
West Sweden	3	7	5
Total for 9	34	112	109
Average for 9	3.78	12.44	12.11
Sector wide Average	0.45	5.2	4.7
Ratio Average/9	1/8.16	1/2.39	1/2.58

Source^{iv}: European Commission DG Regional Policy/Committee of the Regions (2008)

ⁱ <http://www.elisan.eu/presentation.asp>

ⁱⁱ <http://en.vlewa.eu/sirglauncheventEN>

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://www.regione.emilia-romagna.it/wcm/erlaim/sezioni/Mission/objectives.htm>

^{iv} For the purposes of comparability, the data is primarily drawn from the *Open Days* Directory. Interview data from the offices indicated slightly higher staff levels, but generally triangulates the data presented throughout for these offices in Table 2.