



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Romanian-Hungarian cross-border
cooperation at various territorial levels,
with a particular study of the
Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis
(European Grouping of Territorial
Cooperation-EGTC)**

Toca, Constantin-Vasile

University of Oradea

2013

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/62805/>

MPRA Paper No. 62805, posted 13 Mar 2015 11:24 UTC

A stylized map of Romania and Hungary is shown in light gray. A thick, multi-colored wavy line, resembling a rainbow, runs along the border between the two countries. The colors of the line include red, white, green, yellow, and blue.

Constantin Vasile Țoca

ROMANIAN-HUNGARIAN
cross-border cooperation
at various territorial levels,
with a particular study
of the **Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis**
(European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation-EGTC)



Editura
Universității
din Oradea
2013

Constantin Vasile Țoca

**Romanian-Hungarian cross-border cooperation
at various territorial levels, with a particular study
of the Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis
(*European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation-EGTC*)**

Constantin Vasile Țoca

**Romanian-Hungarian cross-border cooperation
at various territorial levels, with a particular study
of the Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis
(*European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation-EGTC*)**

Supplement of Eurolimes



Editura Universității din Oradea
2013

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României
ȚOCA, CONSTANTIN VASILE

**Romanian-Hungarian cross-border cooperation
at various territorial levels, with a particular study of
the Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis : (European
Grouping of Territorial Cooperation-EGTC) /**

Constantin Vasile Țoca. - Oradea : Editura Universității
din Oradea, 2013

Bibliogr.

ISBN 978-606-10-1160-5

341.222:341.24(498+439)+339.92(498+439)

Editura Universității din Oradea este recunoscută de
CNCS.

Acknowledgements

For the years of support throughout the doctoral school, I want to thank Professor István Süli-Zakar, my Ph.D. supervisor, who helped me tremendously with his experience and advice on the development of my doctoral research thesis. I also want to thank Professor Ioan Horga who, together with my Ph.D. supervisor, have been promoting the idea of Debrecen-Oradea cross-border cooperation, idea that I took further and developed it to the best of my abilities.

Special thanks to my wife and family who were with me all the time.

1. Introduction

1.1. Aim, topicality, importance and utility

The objective of the doctoral thesis “Research on different territorial levels of Romanian-Hungarian Cross-Border Cooperation with special emphasis on Debrecen – Oradea Eurometropolis (European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation EGTC)” is to emphasize the importance of the cross border cooperation dimension, and has as the target area the Romanian – Hungarian cooperation, the counties of Bihor, Hajdu Bihar, and last but not least the communities of Debrecen and Oradea. For achieving this objective we studied the theories and concepts relevant to this field of study using methods and instruments of research on the basis of which we intend to bring forward and to emphasize an innovative and actual element of the thesis, and also a possible future European Group of Cross border cooperation Eurometropolis Debrecen – Oradea (we analysed documents in order for us to be able to constructively defend our point of view).

The chosen subject is strictly connected to the creation of the new legal instrument, officially applicable to the area of the European Union (EGTC), which function at the level of cross border cooperation, at the frontier of the states of the European Union¹. This instrument is a new one, actual, and it is

¹ There is a case of European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation EGTC (showing a country placed at an external border of the EU, i.e. Ukraine), Ung-Tisza-Túr-Sajó (Hernád-Bódva-Szinva) European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation with Limited

especially interesting for the European states because of the elements that can be put to good use (the first Eurometropolis which functions on the basis of EGTC is Eurometropolis Lille –Kortrijk-Tournai, LKT) created in January 28 2008). On the other hand, another dimension of this instrument importance is represented by the possibility of the development of the communities situated on both sides of the border, thus a field of interest of the involved communities in such a structure of cross border cooperation.

At the margins of the interest of our study there is a series of other authors which made research oriented in different fields of interests which has as target the Romanian – Hungarian cross border cooperation: István Süli-Zakar, Ioan Horga, Kozma Gábor, Zsolt Radics, Alexandru Ilieș, Klára Czimre, Károly Teperics, János Péntzes, Ernő Molnár, Luminița Șoproni, Adrian-Claudiu Popoviciu, Attila Ambrus, Mircea Brie, Csülög Gábor (Eurolimes, vol. I-XII; Analele RISE, vol. I-II; Süli-Zakar I., 2003a, b, c, d; Süli-Zakar I., 2004; Süli-Zakar I., 2005; Süli-Zakar I. – Horga I., 2006; Horga I. - Süli-Zakar István, 2006; Süli-Zakar I., 2008; Horga I. - Süli-Zakar I., 2010; Horga I. - Bărbulescu I. Gh. - Ivan A. - Palinchak M. - Süli-Zakar I., 2010; Süli-Zakar I., 2010; Süli-Zakar I., 2011; Șoproni L. - Horga I., 2010; Ilieș A., 2010; Ilieș A. - Wendt J., 2001).

Among major domains approached by the studies of the above mentioned researchers we nominate: objectives and regional development in border regions, cooperation of towns on the two sides of the border, interethnic connections, Euroregions along the Eastern borders of the EU, cultural “pathways”, cross-border cooperation of educational institutions, borders and tourism, common infrastructure, cross-border cooperation, human

Liability, the involved counties being: Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Ukraine (which is not member of EU), territory SK: Košice and Prešov counties, HU: Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg and Hajdú-Bihar counties, RO: Satu Mare and Arad counties, UA: the Subcarpathian territories , Cf. METIS GmbH, *The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC): state of play and prospects*, Printed in Belgium, pp.75-78

resources, economy in the border regions, transport, regional development, regionalism, regional difference, migration, cross-border law, development.

Our doctoral thesis intends to combine in an efficient way the theoretical dimension and the practical dimension, so as through this domain to obtain new, innovative results which can be utilized by our decision making factors: local, county authorities, national, regional, euroregional and European actors.

Our thesis is structured in 4 major chapters and annexes through which we will try to justify the theoretical dimension of the theories concerning the cross border cooperation and the concepts specific to the field, our basis for our enterprise research, our studies, and, in the end, we can debate the final result, which is actual and innovative in the same time at the level of Romanian – Hungarian boundary, especially for the cities Debrecen and Oradea.

During the chapter “Different territorial levels of Hungarian – Romanian Cross-Border Cooperation CBC”, we describe the conceptual and theoretical delimitations where we used concepts like regional, euroregional, regions of development, politics of regional development, institutions with an area of action in regional and euroregional field.

A subchapter refers to a successful Eurometropolis at European level proposes the analyses of three such structures of success: Regio Basiliensis, Lille Kortrijk Tournai - LKT and Metropolis Maastricht which can represent efficient models for the future structures of cross border cooperation.

We will detail the proposed subject at the level of communities Debrecen and Oradea “Agglomeration of the Communities Debrecen and Oradea” as a previous step, a project for strengthening cross border cooperation, which in time transformed itself proposing as a type of project a possible European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation Debrecen – Oradea.

The results of our research are detailed in Chapter III; it is the result obtained from the socio-geographical analysis run in the target area of Debrecen –Oradea and on the target groups selected for this purpose, as well

as the analysis and interpretation of existing data bases from Romanian and Hungarian institutions.

Finally, we will present the conclusions of the approached topics, trying to bring positive arguments in the favour of proposed innovation at the Hungarian-Romanian border, the utility of this cooperation under this umbrella based on the instrument of EGTC and last, but not least, the awareness of the authorised institutions, so that the model proposed and constructed by us, i.e. to transit from a project stage to a functional stage, offers a series of viable solutions for a common development of neighbouring cross border communities of Debrecen and Oradea.

1.2. Research hypotheses

Hypothesis 1.

After the WW I but particularly after WW II – it was revealed by the regional literature – that Europe became divided, many new political borders cut the continent. New states emerged, thus increasing the number of countries of this small continent.

The far-sighted politicians from Western Europe established Euroregional organizations, aiming at the creation of a unified Europe.

According to our hypothesis, the correct practical European examples after the collapse of communism also influenced our region, and after the takeover of the positive practice many forms of cross-border relations unfolded in South-Eastern Europe as well.

Hypothesis 2.

The transition period taking place in the former socialist countries – on the long term - brought us the EU membership (Hungary in 2004, Romania in 2007).

Our hypothesis is that the occurred positive political changes opened the possibility, at the Hungarian-Romanian border, on different territorial levels, to unfold a varied Euroregional activity, all of which contributing in our days to the evolution of the former strictly closed borders into permeable and linked ones.

Hypothesis 3.

From the Western European regional literature we conclude that in our days among the cross-border relations and institutions the Eurometropolis-type of organizations exert the highest activity, and today these are the most successful forms of CBC. In our view, at the Hungarian-Romanian border, the Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis has the biggest perspective.

Hypothesis 4.

Based on the compared socio-geographical examinations we assume that the Debrecen and Oradea regional centres' rich urban functions feature collaboration and the potential for a number of joint actions.

1.3. Research methodology

For the practical part of the thesis, we turned to the sociological survey research methods, quantitative method (here taking into account the social survey) (Chelcea S. – Mărginean I – Cauc I. 1998 ; Rotariu T – Iluț P. 1997). For the sociological survey method that we used in our investigation, we selected the sociological questionnaire as the research tool

.As research tools, meeting the requirements of the chosen methods, we turned to the questionnaire. The geographical dimension will be analysed with the help of geographical and statistical data, followed by the ARCGIS Software program that we used for building the necessary maps.

According to the standard sociological research stages, several important steps should be taken in order to reach the final conclusions, and we, on each stage of the sociological research, have added the data from the project that we developed on the concept of Cross-Border Agglomeration Debrecen - Oradea: establishment of social problems, dimensional analysis of concepts, determining the population within the sociological research or the research sample, establishing the research methods, constructing the research tool, the actual field research, processing information, data analysis and explanation of processes and phenomena studied, writing the research report .

The questionnaire can have a series of constructed scales . The main types of scales used in research can be grouped into two broad categories (Chelcea S. – Mărginean I. – Cauc I. 1998):simple scales, composite scales.

For a much better view of the main dimensions involved in constructing the research instrument, namely the sociological survey, we will present a drawing with types, dimensions and indicators, so that one could easily see the logic of the questionnaire construction (Annexe 1).

1.3.1. Target groups

Our research sample is divided into three major categories of population, as follows :

- ❖ the students; we assign for this category a 50% share from the total number of questionnaires applied to this research area.
- ❖ the public opinion of the people over 25 years of age; we deal with students enrolled in various stages of education (BA, MA, PhD); we assign for this category a 40% share from the total number of questionnaires applied to this research area
- ❖ the institutions; here allocating 10% of total questionnaires.

For each of the two localities subject to our investigation, we kept the three target groups mentioned above, and the total number of 1,000 questionnaires for each city in our sample was distributed as follows:

Table 1. Target groups from Debrecen and Oradea cities. *Own elaboration*

Locality	Total no. of questionnaires	Target Group					
		Students		> 25 years old		Institutions	
		no. of questionnaires	%	no. of questionnaires	%	no. of questionnaires	%
Oradea	1000	500	50	400	40	100	10
Debrecen	1000	500	50	400	40	100	10

Graph 1. Target groups (students, people over 25 years of age, institutions / Debrecen and Oradea)

2. Different territorial levels of Romanian – Hungarian Cross-Border Cooperation

2.1. Regional dimensions

2.1.1. Regions. Types of regions

As the cities of Oradea and Debrecen lie at the Romanian-Hungarian border, they refer to different NUTS (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics), levels, as follows: local, county, regional, national.

We will debate on the Euroregional level as well, although it does not officially belong to the NUTS.

In order to join the European Union, Romania had to join the European system of the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) in 2002.

Consequently, after Romania's harmonisation to the European requirements, we can speak of the following NUTS levels (Ilieş A. 2003): Level NUTS I – Romania, Level NUTS II – 8 development regions, Level NUTS III – 41 counties and the municipality of Bucharest, Level NUTS IV – not applicable, Level NUTS V - 265 municipalities and towns; 2,686 communes made up of 13,902 villages.

The two cities analysed from the point of view of the Debrecen-Oradea Cross-border Agglomeration are at the centre, considering that they reach several levels such as:

- there is a local level in both municipalities; these are the most important cities in the area from the point of view of the political,

administrative, and economic points of view; here we can find the highest concentration of people; they are both border cities and regional points

- the county level; here we remind the counties of Bihor and Hajdú-Bihar, where Oradea and Debrecen are the most important cities

- from the point of view of the regional level, the two development regions to which the two centres belong, North-Western Development Region and Eszak-Alfold Development Region, are representative

- the Euroregional level is represented by the Bihor – Hajdú-Bihar Euroregion (according to NUTS, there is no such level in Romania)

- the national level is represented by the two neighbouring countries: Romania and Hungary.

Vidal de la Blanche proposes the way in which he wants regions to be conceived as areas organised around towns. He sees the passage from the region as part of an area to the region as space organisation, which turns the notion of landscape into a functional notion, as it considers towns as basic elements for regional development and conceives the idea according to which regions should develop around towns, a place for economic development and means of access (Barna R. C. 2008).

Besides cross-border cooperation tools where the Euroregion can be identified, we propose as a transitory element another level of cooperation by approaching a type of collaboration strictly based on the most important centres in the counties of Bihor and Hajdú-Bihar, Oradea and Debrecen. Considering the Debrecen-Oradea Cross-border Agglomeration with its specifics as an efficient cross-border cooperation concept in the two communities with similar functional examples in Europe, the model we suggest is a concept of “cross-border agglomeration”. Once the evolution of the European thought on the development of cross-border cooperation relations, a new instrument can be implemented, that is EGTC.

In Europe, the idea of a continent of regions was first issued in the 1960s, when the Swiss essayist Denis de Rougemont criticised the nation-state as it blocked the affirmation of internal entities. The first collaboration between neighbouring regions (at the border between France, Switzerland, and Germany) dates back to the same time.

The concept of region has been analysed by the literature in the field with different approaches (Eurolimes, vol I, 2006). It is an evasive concept covering a variety of territorial levels and range of social content. Thus, our initiative prior to this chapter has taken several forms, functions and meanings along European treaties from CECO regions to common market regions through the regional objects of the Treaty of Rome pursuing the unification of economic forces for harmonious economic development at the same time with regional differences, following joint policies where regions are one of the objectives of the Common Agricultural Policy and Common Transport Policy reaching Regional Policy, the Single European Act, the reform of structural funds (Vandersanden G. 1997), and regional changes nowadays.

In the process of defining regions, the territorial element is the central point, while the social, economic and political content of regionalism varies according to the results of political processes.

Region can be fundamentally defined as the group of places where man can come and go within a day that is without spending the night over (Guy Di Meo. 1998).

Regions may acquire six main meanings as follows (Levy J. - Lussault M. 2003): natural region, economic region and administrative region; Lucien Gallois speaks of homogeneous economic region and industrial region in 1908, political-administrative region, regional combination, where the principle of homogeneity, regional uniqueness and historical specific of the region take precedence, geographical region, functional region.

The region may stand for a notion that can define part of a country in general (North-Western Romania), a definite territorial administrative unit, a geographically specific area (geographical region), an area with certain cultural-historical characteristics (Transylvania in Romania), or an area making up an economic structure, an economic region, such as Ruhr in Germany (Serebrian O. 2006).

An economic definition of a region considers some core criteria such as (Keating M. 2008): common manufacturing models, interdependence, commercial connections, labour market, etc.

Aiming at delimiting regions based on the economic criteria, C. Engel distinguishes between three main types of regions (Barna R. C. 2008):

- homogeneous regions easy to delimit due to the features distinguishing them from neighbouring regions giving birth to region specifics and having their own issues: industrial region, rural region
- heterogeneous or complementary region, where central access degree and number of inhabitants are predominant
- plan region consisting of putting together all means to achieve socio-economic aims

In 1882, the Paris Geographical Society promotes the survey on natural regions. The region is considered as belonging to an area differing from the neighbouring areas .

Passi points out that regions are social construct that are created in political, economic, cultural and administrative practice and discourse, regions are territorially shaped by clearly recognizable borders, they are shaped symbolically by a name, they are shaped institutionally by administrative bodies, and they are shaped by a regional identity and recognized by the shared opinions of their inhabitants (GeoJournal 61, 2004).

From the perspective of the European Regions Association, region is an entity under central government with a representative political power

rooted in an elected council or a group or association representing the authority on a regional level (www.a-e-r.org).

In order to have a functional definition, we have to consider models of social interaction, such as leisure, recreation and trip models. Consequently, such functional regions are to be found in metropolitan areas concentrated in cities or cities made up of several towns, conurbation (Keating M. 2008).

The European Commission considers the region as an instrument for structural promotion focused on regional economy and Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, NUTS.

From the point of view of region identification criteria, we can notice the following two main criteria (Sauron J. L. 2010):

1.1 NUTS statistic identification criterion

1.2 Geographical and sociologic identification criterion with other four sub-criteria:

1.2.a. Facilitating the distinction between peripheral, central, insular, border or matone regions

1.2.b. Degree of development, where developed, poor or retarded regions can be found

1.2.c. Sectorial dimension, where there is a delimitation between industrial and agricultural regions

1.2.d. Difference between urban and rural regions.

As we have noticed when speaking about the theory on Euroregions with Romanian participation, on the level of each cross-border and Euroregional cooperation structure there are at least two territorial-administrative units on both sides of the border. Each of the counties in Romania belongs to a certain development region. In Romania, we can speak about eight development regions comprising the counties belonging to the development region and establishing a Euroregional cooperation relation with another territorial structure in the neighbouring country.

We will further identify other categories of regions as follows (Sauron J. L. 2010):

- a) Retarded regions from the point of view of development; these can belong to the objective 1 of structural funds
- b) Declining industrial regions benefit from priority objective 2
- c) Rural regions
- d) Very low density regions are envisaged by objective 6 established at the time when three countries joined the European Community: Austria, Sweden, and Finland
- e) Border regions that have been identified by the Commission report in 2000; these are regions lying along borderlines having different features from several points of view: linguistic, economic, cultural, geographic, laying stress on improving infrastructure and cross-border cooperation between local and regional communities.

The Community has sought to organise cross-border cooperation between different regions through INTERREG, which is meant for regions with the aim of supporting the development of cooperation on both sides of the internal and external borders of the European Community.

The functional role of regions stands out due to principles showing regions' activities and competences: partnership, synergy, subsidiarity, additionality


Another type is political region (Committee of the Regions, 2004; Eurolimes, vol 6, 2008; Eurolimes, vol 11, 2011), lying at the crossroads of two distinct yet representative processes: regionalisation and regionalism.

Surveys on cross-border cooperation on local and regional levels show that the main means of cooperation are found in the following fields: infrastructure, environmental protection, cultural exchange, administrative cooperation, research, and development (Committee of the Regions, 2004).


On the level of NTUS II, the eight development regions in Romania are the following (Eurolimes, vol 2, 2006):

- 1) Region 1: North-East; Suceava, Botoșani, Neamț, Iași, Bacău, Vaslui
- 2) Region 2 South-East; Vrancea, Galați, Buzău, Brăila, Tulcea and Constanța
- 3) Region 3 South Muntenia; Ialomița, Călărași, Giurgiu, Prahova, Dâmbovița, Argeș, Teleorman
- 4) Region 4 South - West Oltenia; Vâlcea, Olt, Gorj, Dolj, Mehedinți
- 5) Region 5 Western ; Arad, Timiș, Caraș - Severin, Hunedoara
- 6) Region 6 North-West made up of the following counties: Bihor, Sălaj, Satu Mare, Maramureș, Bistrița – Năsăud, Cluj
- 7) Region 7 Center; Alba, Mureș, Harghita, Sibiu, Brașov, Covasna
- 8) Region 8 Bucharest – Ilfov: București and the Ilfov County

Map.1 Romania - NUTS II and NUTS III .*Own elaboration*



Map 2. Bihor County - NUTS system. *Own elaboration*



In Hungary, there are seven NUTS II Regions (www.nfu.hu):

1. Észak Alföld made up of the following counties: Hajdú – Bihar, Jász – Nagykun – Szolnok, Szabolcs – Szatmár - Bereg
2. Dél Alföld: Békés, Csongrád, Bács - Kiskun
3. Dél Dunántúl: Baranya, Somogy, Tolna
4. Nyugat Dunántúl: Győr – Moson – Sopron, Vas, Zala
5. Közép Dunántúl: Fejér, Komárom – Esztergom, Veszprém
6. Közép Magyarország: Budapest, Pest
7. Észak Magyarország: Borsod – Abaúj – Zemplén, Heves, Nógrád

Map 3. Hungary - NUTS II and NUTS III. *Own elaboration*



Map 4. Hajdú Bihar county-NUTS system. *Own elaboration*




Table 2. Classification of the regions

Management and central institutional regions	Administrative regions			
Study regions	Regions as physical areas	Natural region	Geographical regions	Space ↓
	Living regions	Cultural region Social region Historical region		Territory ↓
	Functional regions	Key region Agricultural region Industrial region Economic region Functional region Urban region Metropolitan region		System

Source: Barna R.C., p. 15

When speaking about vertical relations, P. Schmitt – Egner distinguishes between three types of regions (Barna R. C. 2008): national region, international region, transnational region.

As examples for the three types of regions mentioned above and applied to our research area, we could mention for the first category as a national region (when speaking about sub-national units) the North-Western Development Region. The second category envisages intergovernmental interaction, where we can mention the European Union, or international organisations. International organisations are definite tangible structures with specific role and mission (Goldstein J. S. - Pevehouse J. C., 2008). From the point of view of international organisations, the European Union can be considered a regional intergovernmental organisation.

As an example for the transnational category, we could mention Euroregions, such as the Carpathian Euroregion and the Bihor – Hajdú Bihar Euroregion that are relevant for our research.

2.1.1.1. *Észak Alföld Region*

Table 3. Statistic data for the Eszak Alföld – NUTS II Region, Hungary

Észak-Alföld Regio	Inhabitants	%
Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok	415917	27%
Hajdú-Bihar	552998	36%
Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg	582256	37%
Total Region	1551171	100%

Source:

<http://www.nepszamlalas.hu/hun/kotetek/04/tabhun/maptoc09000.html>

Map 5. Hungarian NUTS II Regio. *Own elaboration*



Partnerships of the **Észak-Alföld Region**: Valencia Régió - Spain, Szász-Anhalt Régió – Germany, Centre Régió – France, Champagne-Ardenne Régió France, Flevoland- Holland, Észak-Nyugat Régió- Romania

Table 4. Eszak Alföl – NUTS II Region : legislation and objectives

Regional Development Council of the Northern Great Plain	
Legislation	By the Parliament's 35/1998 (III. 20.) Decision regarding the administrative territory of Hajdú-Bihar, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok and Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg counties, simultaneously with the country's other planning and statistical regions, the Northern Great Plain Region was established..
A Tanács feladat- és hatóköre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - examine and evaluate the socio-economic status, environmental condition, facilities, it gives the information used during the monitoring and the results of it to the territorial information system - accepts –in conformity with the National Concept of Regional Policy– the region's long-and medium-term regional development concept and the regional development program and its strategic and operational parts of the work - provides the economic development's territorial coordination tasks, conciliates the administrative and territorial interests, ensures the coordination between the territorial actors in the region - adopts a financial plan in order to realise development programs, proposes suggestions for the national (local, regional, central), communal and other international sources' composition and their utilization in time schedule, in this context: - it can collect funds for the operation and for implementation of development programs, - to promote regional development it can establish agreements with foreign regions, it can participate in international cooperation, it can make proposal regarding the representative of the region to the Government Committee of the Regions (CoR), it can create groups of experts to help the Committee Region's representatives in their work - the Council can establish association to provide development tasks, even beyond the region's frontiers - the Council co-operates in its work with sub-regional development councils, with the regional development councils in the county, with regional development councils, with regional state administration bodies which are involved in the regional development directly or indirectly, with the regional economic chambers and also with the social organizations operating in the region.

Source: <http://www.eszakalfold.hu/hirek.php?hirek&menu=2>

2.1.1.2. North-Western Development Region

The North-Western Development Region (Northern Transylvania) was established by Law 151/1998 with subsequent alteration by Law 315/2004 by voluntary association of local public administration. For the time being, it is not a territorial-administrative unit with legal status. The law settles the institutional framework, the objectives, the competences and instruments specific for regional development policy in Romania.

Table 5. Demography in North-Western Development Region in 2004

Counties of the North-Western Development Region	Inhabitants	Percentage
Cluj	686825	25.07%
Bihor	596961	21.8%
Maramureș	516562	18.86%
Satu Mare	371759	13.58%
Bistrița Năsăud	318558	11.62%
Sălaj	247796	9.06%
Total Region	2738461	100%

Source: <http://www.nord-vest.ro/genpage.aspx?pc=prezentarepdr.aspx,pp 60-61>

Map 6. North-Western Region, *Own elaboration*



Partnerships of the North-Western Development Region with similar regions.

Cooperation agreements with: Veneto, Sicilia, and Lazio Regions in Italy, Northern Stateline (Illinois, USA), Auvergne Region (France) .

The cooperation protocol between the counties of Bihor, Bistrița – Năsăud, Cluj, Maramureș, Satu – Mare, Sălaj making up the North-Western Development Region (Romania) and the Northern Great Plain Region (Észak-Alföldi Régió), Hungary, aims at supporting political, economic, social and cultural cooperation between the North-Western Region in Romania and Northern Great Plain Region in Hungary.

The protocol shows the commitment of both parties to promote partnership and understanding for mutual benefits. The parties have undertaken to develop a joint contact and cooperation area focusing on tourism, environmental protection, agriculture, rural development, human resource development, economy, business development, research – development – innovation, access and infrastructure, culture and sports, institutional cooperation, structural funds and project management. (<http://www.nord-vest.ro/GenPage.aspx?pc=regiunipartenere.aspx>)

After drawing up the plan for the North-Western Region, three sets of core options to outline a development model for the Region have been settled:

1. Horizontal options: focusing on economic growth or solving social and environmental issues;
2. Territorial options: adopting a polycentric or monocentric territorial development model;
3. Sectorial options: focusing on the functional specialisation of the North-Western Region or promoting its economic diversification.

Table 6. North-Western Development Agency

North-Western Development Agency	
Legal status	ADR Nord-Vest was established according to Law 151/1998 and Decision no. 4/16.12.1998 of the Council for Regional Development (CDR) of the North-Western Development Region as a public body with legal status acting in fields specific to regional development. It is also the executive body of the Council for Regional Development of the North-Western Development Region.
Tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - elaborates and proposes the regional development strategy, plan and programmes, as well as fund management plans to the Council for Regional Development - pursues the achievement of regional development programmes and fund management plans - searches for funding to achieve the goals - submits the projects selected under the regional development programmes for approval to the Council for Regional Development - provides and is in charge with the implementation, technical and financial monitoring and control of projects funded by the European Union under regional development programmes - draws up semester reports and the annual implementation report on activities achieved - shows the stages, implementation difficulties and the impact of regional development programmes/projects and proposes improvement measures - organises and develops regional partnerships - identifies and promotes in partnership local and regional projects for intraregional cooperation
Mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strategic planning is the basis of sustainable development in the region - development and local community's development interest - implementing social and economic cohesion policies in the region, promoting and implementing development programmes and providing services to communities and investors to maximize social and economic benefits in the region
Fields	<p>Strategic activity fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - services for regional development - regional programmes management - horizontal activities

Source: <http://www.nord-vest.ro/>

2.1.1.3. Comparative analysis of Észak Alföld and Nord-West Development Regio

Table 7. Distribution of population in the two regions by origin

Region	Urban	Rural	Population
North-Western	52%	48%	2738461
Ejszak Alföld	62%	38%	1551171

Source:

<http://www.nepszamlalas.hu/hun/kotetek/04/tabhun/maptoc09000.html> and
<http://www.nord-est.ro/genpage.aspx?pc=prezentarepdr.aspx>

When we comparatively analyse the structure of inhabitants in the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) in the North-Western Development Region in Romania and Észak Alföld Region in Hungary, we can notice the following:

- Distribution of population by origin (urban – rural): the Hungarian region has a percentage of 62% urban population, while rural environment is inhabited by 38% of the population. This shows a more pregnant urban development and a lower weight of rural population specialised in agriculture, while in Romania, the comparison between the two favours the urban origin (52%) as compared to the 48% rural population. Rural population has increased in Romania mainly due to migration from the urban to the rural areas based on high living conditions in the city and the disappearance of companies, thus leading to mass dismissal and migration to the countryside.
- There are six counties in the North-Western Development Region with 2,738,461 inhabitants and three counties in Eszak Alföld Region with 1,551,171 inhabitants. We can see that the number of inhabitants is higher in Romania, also considering the size of the two regions.

Table 8. Comparative analysis of Észak-Alföld Region and North-Western Development Region

	Eszak-Alföld Region	North-Western Development Region
Borders with	Slovakia, Ukraine and Romania	Hugary, Ukraine
Territory: Percent of the whole territory of Hungary and Romania	19,1%	14,4%,
Population	1551171	2738461
County	3	6
The unemployment rate	6,8 %	5,6%
GDP, percent of the EU25 average	37,5%	27%

Source: <http://www.nord-vest.ro/> and <http://preserve.aer.eu/about-the-partners/eszak-alfold.html>

2.1.2. Regional Policy

Through regional development policy , regional disparities have to be eliminated², first on national level then on community level. Therefore, it is necessary that all institutional elements on the regional and national levels cooperate (Ionescu C. - Toderaş N. 2007) with a view to provide dynamic and sustainable economic growth by efficiently using the local and regional potential with a view to improve living conditions by resorting to specific instruments such as structural funds (FEDR, FSE, FEOGA, IFOP and the cohesion fund) to finance projects in the field of environmental protection and transport infrastructure (Bărbulescu I. Gh. - Răpan D. 2009; Bertoncini Y. 2008). The main focus in regional policies aims at: enterprise development, labour market, investments, technological transfer, SME development, improved infrastructure, quality of environment, rural development, health,

² Regions with issues are generally characterised by backwards industrial development and wide and low developed agriculture, where introducing productive and modern means is no longer needed. For instance, the main issue in Great Britain is traditional hard industry, where technological backwardness and overseas competition lead to economic decline, Cf. Michael Keating, 2008, p. 59

education, and culture. Considering the impact on common market, reducing these differences is a major objective of the European Union acquiring further importance with each enlargement (Ghica L. A. 2007).

In specialised literature, regional policy also has other two denominations: cohesion policy or structural policy.

In order to seize the chronological development of regional policy, we have to review the main moments in the evolution of the European Union, when some alterations and improvements are made.

The Treaty of Rome establishes the European Investment Bank and the European Social Fund, which only starts to work in 1973. FEOGA is established in 1962 with the aim to financially support rural development. FEDER for regional development is established in 1975.

The Delors packs play an important role in Regional Policy due to two main packs:

- a. Delors Pack I (1988-1993), when Regional Policy is structured in four main principles: long-term, focus on support, additionality, and partnership
- b. Delors Pack II (1994-1999, 2000-2006), strengthening Regional Policy, focus on regions in difficulty. It is confirmed by the 2007-2013 programmes.

Once the Treaty of Maastricht is signed, social and economic cohesion has a central role. In 1993, one year after the treaty, the Cohesion Fund is created.

According to the 2007-2013 programmes, Regional Policy has three main objectives (Thurian J., 2009):

1. Convergence: support to retarded territories, regions with a GDP below 75% as compared to the European Union average and a RNB 90% lower than the European average
2. Regional competitiveness and employment: support to competitiveness and attraction of regions and employment (on a territory with no objective or convergence)

3. European territorial cooperation: support to cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation.

There are three types of funding within Regional Policy:

- FEDER meant to finance the three objectives mentioned above
- FSE funds the first two objectives
- Convergence objective, the fund for cohesion finances projects for transport infrastructure and environmental protection.

There are other funds that can be mentioned, such as: Urban focused on urban areas with difficulties, Leader+ for agriculture in mountainous areas, Equal for equal gender chances, and Interreg aiming at cross-border cooperation.

IFOP and FEOGA disappeared from the 2007-2013 programme. They are replaced by two new types of funding that are not included to regional policy.

From the point of view of the financial aspect envisaged for the 2007-2013 programme, the budget for regional policy is 3478 billion euro as compared to the 2000-2006 period, when it only provided 213 billion euro (Thurian J. 2009).

Table 9. European Regional Policy

2000-2006		2007-2013	
Objective	Instrument	Objective	Instrument
Cohesion Fund	Cohesion fund		
Objective 1	FERER, FSE, FEOGA, IFOP	Convergence	FEDER, FSE, Cohesion Fund
Objective 2	FEDER, FSE	Regional competitiveness and employment	FEDER, FSE
Objective 3	FSE	European territorial cooperation	FEDER
Interreg	FEDER		
Urban	FEDER		
Equal	FSE		
Leader	FEOGA		
Rural development and restructuration of fishing outside objective 1	FEOGA- IFOP		

Source: Renaud Dehouse, *Politiques Europeennes*, Presse des Sciences Po, Paris, 2009, p. 272

Regional development is a new concept pursuing the stimulation and diversification of economic activities, investments in private sector, and contribution to decreasing unemployment leading to an improved living standard. Eight development regions have been established throughout Romania in order to enforce Regional Policy. Each development region is made up of several counties. These are no administrative-territorial units and have no legal status. They are the result of a free agreement between local and county councils (www.mdrt.ro).

Yet this statement on reducing disparities needs qualified addition (European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON)³:

- First, it refers to infrastructure, access to services, quality of environment, social assistance services and facilitating access to education and training. It refers less to income level and even less to employability. From this point of view, gaps between countries and regions might even increase.
- Secondly, economic development quota as a whole is still relatively low in this scenario. Yet it is not as low as the scenario of “re-nationalisation”. However, they are reduced as compared to expectations. Decreasing regional gaps are partly due to the failure of penetrating in developed regions.

2.1.2.1. European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC)

According to Regional Policy, in the period between 2007 and 2013 3 new objectives have been addressed: convergence, regional competitiveness and employment, territorial cooperation; the third objective addresses aimed at

³ European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) is a network providing information and statistic data on territorial development and cohesion of the European area. The activities of this network are implemented through a programme funded by Structural Funds under the European Territorial Cooperation Objective and supports cooperation in the field of research on territorial planning.

encouraging cities and regions within EU Member States to work and learn from each other through various programs and projects within European Territorial Co-operation objective: Cross-border Cooperation, Interregional co-operation, Transnational co-operation.

The concept of cross-border cooperation and favourite areas in which this transnational relationship can solve the communities' problems in a much more efficient measure, we will also analyze the institutional arrangements under which national state creates the legal framework conducive to conduct cross-border relations. The European Outline Convention on Cross-border Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities is the process of developing cross-border cooperation, representing it in a legal act of reference for any possible cross-border cooperation is the realization of several years of reflection and efforts Council of Europe (Popoviciu A.C. - Țoca C.V. 2011).

At the Community level, an unreasonably high period was characterized by the lack of an adequate legal framework for the establishment of such joint management structure. But this problem has been corrected by the Community institutions for the current budget year, threw the proposals made in the EU cohesion policy. Therefore, the need to create a suitable tool to pressure the European Commission to propose, on July 14, 2004, a regulation to achieve the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC).

In accordance with Art.175 TFEU (ex 159 EC), the Committee of the Regions has promoted and supported the EU initiative to establish the "European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation" (Panara C. - De Becker. 2011)

EGTC Regulation refers to a legal instrument, although the validity is not limited to the 2007-2013 programming period is meant to be used for: should be able to act, either for the purpose of implementing territorial cooperation programs or projects co-financed by the Community, notably under the Structural Funds in conformity with Regulation (EC) No

1082/2006 and Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the European Regional Development Fund, or for the purpose of carrying out actions of territorial cooperation which are at the sole initiative of the Member States and their regional and local authorities with or without a financial contribution from the Community (Popoviciu - Țoca 2011). Another reason for creating this common mechanism for integrated management refers to the principle of non-cooperation that should not be more difficult between two partners from different Member States, only between partners in the same Member State.

The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) was founded by the treaty establishing the European Community and has the goal of promoting and facilitating cross-border, trans-national and interregional cooperation between the member states of UE (Giurgi P. 2009).

The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) is like the Euro regions a border entity, but unlike the latter, the group has legal personality recognized both at EU Member State and EU level. According to Article 4, paragraph 4 of the Regulation, an EGTC has in all Member States the most extensive legal capacity accorded to legal persons of the Member State law. In particular, EGTC may acquire or dispose of tangible or intangible immobilizations can hire staff and may sue and be sued (Eurolimes, vol 10, 2010).

According to the rules of organization and functioning of the group we can identify four main models of organization of this legal instrument (Popoviciu - Țoca, 2011):

1. The formation of a group in order to implement territorial cooperation programs. Example: EGTC as Managing Authority and / or the Joint Technical Secretariat INTERREG IVA Program;
2. The achievement for implementation of projects co-financed in the field of territorial cooperation within the Structural Funds (ERDF,

- ESF, Cohesion Fund). Example: it could cover the development of cross-border transport services or health in a program of cooperation objective or the convergence of two national programs;
3. The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation created in order to develop and implement projects financed by the European Union other than those listed above; Example: 7th Framework Program for Research and Technological Development, or CIP (Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Program) may co-finance projects cooperation submitted by entities in two Member States
 4. The European grouping of territorial cooperation to achieve common goals achieved communities outside any EU funding.

On a synthetic view, we can say that EGTC is a legal instrument under Community law, not under international law as the Madrid Framework Convention. Like other regulations, do not require ratification or negotiating bilateral or multilateral treaties, it is binding and directly applicable in all Member States. As a result, the self-regulation allows local and regional authorities in different Member States and certain bodies governed by public law authorities or associations of all these groups to establish common legal personality to implement programs and projects of cooperation. Another aspect of the above analysis concerns the legal personality of the group, which can be private or public, depending on the applicable national law (this possibility was left open by regulation). In particular, the EGTC has the most extensive legal capacity accorded to legal entities within Member States through national legislation (Țoca – Popoviciu 2010).

An EGTC can act performing the following tasks (Horga I. - Barbulescu I. Gh. - Ivan A. - Palinchak M. - Süli-Zakar I. 2011):

- To implement territorial cooperation programs of projects co-financed by the Community, notably under the Structural Funds.

- To carry out actions of territorial cooperation which are the sole initiative of the Member States and their regional and local authorities with or without a financial contribution from the Community.

A very important aspect that we must emphasize is the fact that EGTC has not created an intermediate administrative level, and its members do not transfer all their powers by the group, but only those which are necessary for the implementation of the mission undertaken. This instrument of territorial cooperation has also the goal of eliminating the discriminatory realities within the EU internal market governed by different ratio feature cooperation between two partners from different countries to cooperation between two partners from the same country. EGTC does not eliminate all existing legal forms of cooperation, but comes as a new alternative is really much more enhanced. Unlike the lack of legal protection of the concept of Euro region, the EGTC is officially recognized by the European Commission as a "tag", protected by the European Union. One last point that we would like to emphasize concerns the possibility that these cooperative groups, due to many variants of association members, but also due to the existence of a junction between the Community and national legislation in achieving these groups, to get, in a long or short period of time, to a certain heterogeneity of realizing their forms, which then affect the major objectives of EU regional policy. Perhaps this was also one of the reasons for the Regulation stipulates a review clause, which allows the review of regulations on this instrument. Today in EU working only 15 European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation, and another 20 groups are in various stages of implementation (Popoviciu - Țoca 2011).

EGTC is a very important instrument for interregional cooperation and we need to admit that the European Institutions with this initiative has taken a decisive step forward in promoting and supporting in many ways the role of the territorial constituencies in favour of socio-economic

development and it is in fact generally acknowledged from all the relevant organizations that this instrument will build up a new dimension of interregional cooperation and have the potential to make existing interregional projects even more effective (Horga I. - Barbulescu I. Gh. - Ivan A. - Palinchak M. - Süli-Zakar I. 2011).

In conclusion, we can identify the main characteristics of the EGTC, as follows (Committee of the Regions, 2007):

- a) the cross-border nature of the organization, which requires that it has members in at least two Member States
- b) the EGTC has a legal personality under the Community law and may, on a case by case basis, be given a legal personality under public or private national law
- c) EGTC enjoys the most extensive legal capacity granted to legal persons under national law
- d) EGTC must be governed by a convention and statutes
- e) EGTCs have a single registered office
- f) In order to be able properly to express its wishes as legal entity in its own right, the EGTC must have organs and EGTCs have an annual budget.

2.1.3. Regional institutions

2.1.3.1. The Committee of the Regions (CoR) is a consultative structure (Sauron J. L. 2010) of the European Union whose main role is to represent local and regional communities, thus providing the opportunity to get them involved in elaborating the European law, drawing European citizens closer, encouraging the enforcement of the principle of subsidiarity and providing an area of communication between representatives of local and regional communities, and the European Union as well.

The Committee of the Regions was established by the Treaty of Maastricht, articles 263-265 of the Treaty on European Union (Harald R - Lescot C. 2009) in 1992 and became operational as of 1994. It is a founding institution of the European Union in Brussels. Its main role is to support decision-making processes within the Union through opinions relating to issues influencing the European citizens on local or regional levels (Ghica L. A.). Nowadays, it is made up of 344 members appointed by the Council with a qualified majority by adopting a list of members and deputies according to the proposals of Member States for a period of at least five years (Sauron 2010). The members enjoy full independence for the general interest of the European Community (Pertek J. 2004).

The Treaty of Amsterdam strengthens the structure of CoR by increasing the number of fields where its members have to be consulted and facilitates direct requests by the European Parliament.

Chapter 3 of the Treaty of Lisbon introduces the Committee of the Regions as a consultative body of the European Union made up of representatives of local and regional communities either as holders of electoral mandate within a local or regional authority, or by politically accountable to an elected assembly (http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/full_text/index_ro.htm). Yet we should not forget that the Treaty of Lisbon is not a simplified treaty. It brings some amendments to the European treaties into force (Brosset E. - Chevallier – Govers C - Edjaharian V. - Schneider C. 2009).

Due to this treaty, the Committee of the Regions has some new tasks such as: guidelines regarding labour force, social measures, European social fund, social, economic and territorial cohesion, European fund for regional development, environment, joint transport policy, maritime and aerial navigation, energy, public health, education, youth and sports, professional education, and cross-border cooperation (Sauron 2010).

The Treaty of Nice establishes the number of members to 350. The Treaty of Lisbon stipulates an equal number of members without overcoming the settled number (Zarka J. C. 2010).

The Committee of the Regions is based on three main principles:

(<http://www.cor.europa.eu/en/presentation/Role.htm>)

- Subsidiarity: citizen-oriented
- Proximity: all governmental levels have to be close to the citizens, activities have to be transparent, so that the citizens may be aware of members' responsibilities to express their opinion
- Partnership: local, regional, national and European governmental levels have to cooperate to reach efficient common decisions.

In 2003, the Treaty of Nice settles that CoR members have to be appointed by elected mandate within a local or regional authority and politically account to an elected assembly. In 2004, the Treaty for a European Constitution stipulates the strengthening of its institutional status and increases CoR's political role.

The Plenary General Assembly's tasks consist of certain permanent commissions (Zarka J. C. 2010). There are six specialised commissions within the CoR (Ghica L. A.): Commission for Territorial Cohesion Policy COTER, Commission for Economic and Social Policy ECOS, Commission for Sustainable Development DEVE, Commission for Education and Culture EDUC, Commission for Constitutional Affairs and European Governance CONST, Commission for External Relations RELEX. To these we have to add the Commission for Financial and Administrative Affairs CFAA.

CoR has two types of consultancy: Compulsory and optional; Compulsory consultancy aims at: social and economic cohesion, education and youth, culture, public health, trans-European networks, transportation, labour force, social affairs, environment, European Social Fund,

professional education. (http://www.cor.europa.eu/document/presentation/r_cdr385-2005_pt5_fin_nb_en.pdf)

Optional consultancy generally focuses on recommendations.

The procedures for elaborating recommendations begin with the request of the Office for the recommendation to a certain commission depending on the field and topic. The commission appoints a reporter and the project for the recommendation is presented to the commission. Thus, the reporter is brought to the foreground.

CoR commission debates, amends and adopts the recommendation, a process taking place in a Plenary Assembly that is subsequently published in the Official Journal of the European Union. Types of consultancy (http://www.cor.europa.eu/document/documents/int_reg_ro.pdf): Consultative recommendations; Resolutions – declarations adopted through urgent procedures; Exploratory recommendations – recommendations outlined by the CoR before the Commission publishes a green/white charter on the topic; Exploratory reports – preliminary reports drawn up before the European Commission's proposals are made public; Impact reports – analyse the impact of a certain policy on local and regional levels; Surveys – regarding different aspects of local and regional dimensions of the EU.


CoR has the right to have opinions of their own and all decisions are published in the Official Journal of the European Union (Ghica L. A.)

2.1.3.2. Association of European Border Regions AEBR

Association of European Border Regions (AEBR) was established due to the need to have cross-border structures facilitating the collaboration between regions and their representation in relation with other institutions. In time, this organisation has steadily developed. For the time being, it plays an

important role in the life of cross-border cooperation pursuing well-defined objectives with a functional organisational structure in the regions.

AEBR organisational structure:



Source: Klara Czimre, *Cross – Border Co – operation - Theory and practice*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debrecen, 2006, p.67

AEBR has periodical meetings with the European Union institutions debating on several issues of major interest regarding future development of regional policies, cohesion funds, discussions on territorial planning, trans-European networks, social issues, and cross-border cooperation. AEBR has contributed in a significant way to lead the European Institutions towards initiatives in favour of cooperation in and with border regions

AEBR is the main spokesperson that makes Europe aware of issues specific to border and cross-border regions. It contributes to solving those issues by identifying common interests and opportunities (Boar N. 2005). It has several members represented in the Annex on AEBR member list.

Objectives of AEBR (Czimre K. 2006): representing issues of national and international interest on higher political levels, initiating, supporting and coordinating cooperation in Europe, accessing and supporting interested institutions with information, understanding opportunities, issues and projects

AEBR tasks: implementing projects, organising events focused on cross-border issues, assistance in cross-border issues, joint campaigns within networks, informing European institutions on cross-border issues

AEBR has a system of Euroregional criteria divided into three main directions (Czimre K. 2006):

- organisation
- working methods
- content of cross-border cooperation in the following fields: regional development, economic development, transport, environmental protection and nature preservation, culture and sports, business, energy, tourism, development of agriculture, innovation and technology transfer, education, social cooperation, emergency services and disaster prevention, communication and public security.

2.2. Euroregional dimensions

2.2.1. Definitions, functions and types of Euroregions

The idea of Euroregion occurs at the same time with the evolving process of local autonomy and regionalisation. The aim is to set direct connections between regions and communities on both sides of state borders by virtue of local authorities' competences as they are defined in national and European law. The conditions for optimal development of a Euroregion are minimal economic balance, cultural similarities despite ethnic diversity,

geographical proximity and common historical heritage. Cooperation develops mainly in these fields.

Originally, the Euroregion refers to cooperation between authorities at the border while the Council of Europe shows that cross-border regions have a certain homogeneity and functional interdependence, otherwise cooperation would not be needed. Yet it begins to reconsider cross-border region as a potential inherent region from the geographical, historical environmental, economic or ethnic points of view interrupted by sovereignty of some governments holding the power on both sides of the border (Barna R. C.).

Association of European Border Regions states that “within the limits of the geographical aim of cooperation, cross-border structures are cooperation arrangements for cooperation between local or regional governmental structures lying along the border in agreement with the promotion of common interest to increase the standard of living of border populations”(Ilieş A. 2004).

Euroregions can be identified as territorial structures established with the aim to strengthen interregional and cross-border cooperation to reach a coherent area for economic, scientific, social and cultural development (Ilieş A. 2004).

Corneliu L. Popescu presents Euroregions as “particular forms of super-border cooperation of local territorial communities. They involve the association of local territorial communities from two or more neighbouring countries making up a uniform area with several particularities or common interests (Ilieş A. 2004).

Euroregions do not have political power. Their activity is represented by common actions initiated by local and regional authorities belonging to that Euroregion, so that many Euroregions have the responsibility to restore socio-geographical unity of certain regions that used to belong together at a certain epoch (Serebrian O. 2006).

Cross-border cooperation Euroregion is a voluntary association respecting national and international law, territorial and administrative structures of the countries at different levels with the aim to eliminate territorial isolation and to settle the framework for cultural connection or to rebuild typical groups, and to set up economic development nuclei to achieve a balance between the centre and the periphery at an advanced stage of functional territorial systems .

Cross-border cooperation region aims at facilitating dialogue between state governmental structures and local or regional interstate structures. The aim is to achieve a coherent development area and an international partnership to develop border people's standard of living. In fact, they are competing structures in one or several states belonging to the cross-border cooperation region (Simileanu V. 2006).

Cross-border cooperation regions aim at reducing border conflicts in convergence and good neighbourhood areas, eliminating isolation and reaching confidence between neighbouring states.

They make up a specific type of political-administrative regions comprising administrative communities from two or several countries. The basic elements of a cross-border region are as follows: territory, inhabitants and cross-border institutions (Boar N. 2005).

The territory is the solid support of population where people live and work. The size of cross-border regions differ a lot, which can be explained by the lack of accuracy in delimiting it as a complex geographical entity .

People are the content of cross-border regions. They are the measure of cross-border relations' improvement concerning the development of standard of living and activities of residents in the region.

Institutions are important actors in cross-border cooperation regions due to which cross-border projects can be implemented to strengthen cross-border positions on both sides of the border to the benefit of cross-border communities.

The idea of cross-border cooperation against the background of European integration has conferred new dimensions to the concept of good neighbourhood thus showing its viability and utility on the one hand, and identifying new fields and walks of life where neighbourhood relations can and have to be affirmed on the other hand (Ciocan V. M. 2007).

Further to analysing the dimensions of the Euroregions, we can identify the following elements that are essentials and defining for an Euroregion: cross-border structure, cooperation between governmental structures, interregional cooperation, economic development, scientific development, social development, cultural development, cross-border cooperation, pursuing common interests, territorial-administrative structure, association of communities, compact area, development of functional territorial systems, promoting common interests, promoting joint projects, respect for national and international law, developing common projects and partnerships in different directions that are a priority for Euroregions, Euroregional actors, supporting good neighbourhood, eliminating isolation

In special literature, several authors have identified a range of features of Euroregions based on surveys carried out on different types of Euroregions.

Sucha shows the main elements of Euroregions as follows (Czimre K. 2006): core forms of cross-border cooperation, instruments to diminish differences between border regions, strong confidence and cooperation with the citizens, studies in the field of good neighbourhood and integration, preventing negative heritage, important elements for the Central European countries' integration to the European Union.

There are two types of factors generating cooperation. They are as follows (Czimre K. 2006):

- ❖ Unifying factors: geographical position, climate, common history, common culture, economic development, trade, linguistic competences, common strategies

- ❖ Inhibiting factors: differences envisaging the administrative system and responsibilities, tax system, territorial planning and regional development, legal and executive methods, environmental protection and territorial planning, linguistic elements.

AEBR resorts to the following criteria to identify the content and competences of Euroregions (Ilieș A. 2004):

- ❖ Associations of local or regional authorities on both sides of state border. In certain cases, they are led by General Assemblies.
- ❖ Cross-border association with permanent secretariat and administrative and technical teams with resources.
- ❖ Associations based on private law. They are non-profit organisations or foundations on both sides of the border according to national legislation into force.
- ❖ Associations based on public law and interstate agreements with participation of territorial authorities regarding other issues.

A successful Euroregion has to meet certain prerequisites, such as: the interest of inhabitants is vital and has to be considered; institutions and organisations that are involved on both sides of the border; the representatives of political life have to be involved at all levels; establishing bodies that efficiently carry out their tasks.

There are several types of Euroregions in Romania's relations with border regions abroad. Depending on criteria, they can be categorised as follows:

- a) Number of Euroregions and regional cross-border cooperation structures with the following subcategories (Ilieș A. 2004):
 - 4 Euroregional structures and 3 Euroregional structures
- b) Number of countries participating to the development of regional cooperation cross-border structures (Ilieș A. 2004): with bilateral anticipation, with trilateral participation, with the participation of five state structures

c) Position of structures: border Euroregions as such, Euroregions with internal structures participation

Euroregions can also be categorised from the point of view of cross-border cooperation as follows: Cooperation along internal borders, Cooperation along external borders.

The two categories of cooperation develop other six types of cross-border cooperation, so that there are three types of cooperation for each category:

Category A (Czimre K. 2006):

A 1 cooperation between less developed border regions;

A 2 cooperation between well developed border regions;

A 3 cooperation along internal borders.

Category B :

B 1 cooperation of border regions with EFTA countries;

B 2 cooperation of border regions with member states, candidate countries and potential candidate countries;

B 3 cooperation of border regions with less developed countries.

If we consider the type of border dividing two countries belonging to the same cross-border region, we can define the following types of regions (Boar N. 2005):

- a. Cross-border regions in mountainous border areas, where the borderline follows the water flows. More often than not, they follow the line of higher ground. The main aims of this type of regions are preventing depopulation, developing transport infrastructure, developing tourism and preserving ecologic system;
- b. Cross-border regions in border river area. Here, the main concern is supporting infrastructure;

- c. Regions in border lake dwelling areas; the main concerns are supporting the use of water through fishing, transport and tourism, as well as preventing water pollution;
- d. Cross-border regions in sea strait areas; the main concern for cooperation is transportation, infrastructure (bridges, tunnels, float boats, ferry-boats), using the economic resources in the fields of fishing and tourism;
- e. Cross-border regions in anthro-geographical border areas based on linguistic, religious and cultural criteria.

Cross-border regions can also be classified according to structural investments in envisaged areas such as (Boar N. 2005):

- a. Regions aiming at structural development and adjustment of retarded regions by providing infrastructure and encouraging investments in business activities;
- b. Regions supporting social and economic conversion of areas facing structural changes;
- c. Regions focusing on topic areas (education, training and employment).

A very important classification is based on the position of the cross-border region as compared to the borders of the European Union. The following types of regions can be found here (Boar N.):


- a. Cross-border regions at the internal border of the European Union Member States. These are the oldest cross-border regions facing the following issues: professional conversion, waste management, development of agriculture, tourism and transportation;
- b. Cross-border regions at the external border of the European Union with specific issues and aspects depending on their position. One of the issues these regions face is that local and regional actors cannot express themselves appropriately;

- c. Cross-border regions at the borders with candidate countries;
- d. Cross-border regions at the external borders of the candidate countries. Here, stress is laid on opening new crossing points, decreasing gaps between the two sides of the border, strengthening democratic institutions and economic development.

To substantiate a powerful and functional Euroregion, an algorithm was proposed to justify some essential elements of such region (Annex 2).

2.2.2. Euroregional efficient integration and performance mechanisms

Borders should be interpreted from four main points of view:




Source: Czímre Klara, *Studia Geografica. Euroregionalis fejlődés az EU csatlakozás kuszobán különös tekintettel Magyarorszag euroregioira*, Debrecen, 2005, p.9

According to this chart, we can say that in a Euroregion we have to consider political, economic, cultural and regional geography when proceeding to a detailed analysis, as well as the elements making up these aspects.

At the same time, the sub-elements of these aspects can each follow a research priority contributing to their understanding and providing solutions for Euroregional development.

The cultural aspects envisage the process of disseminating and mingling symbols, significances, cultural values towards gradual development of something resembling global culture or at least an agreed global awareness around a minimal set of globally shared cultural values (Apahideanu I. 2006).

Remigio Ratti provides a typology of cross-border cooperation and identifies four main dimensions:



Source: István Süli – Zakar,
Társadalomfoldrajz – területfejlesztés II, 2003, p. 443

Legend:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. national economy | 2. colonialism |
| 3. liberalism, multilateral exchanges | 4. integration, cooperation |

As we can see, in order to enforce the mechanisms for integration mentioned above, we nowadays need cross-border cooperation at the limit between borderline and fixed border, where we can find socio-cultural border.

From the point of view of globalisation, the social element means geographical extension of social interaction and reflexivity, uniform lifestyle, increasing mobility of people stressing migration, the development of transnational social movements and generally the compression of space and time from the point of view of social involvement if not concerning the symbolism of history, at least that of geography (Apahideanu I. 2006).

In order to have an efficient cooperation and communication on the regional and Euroregional levels, we have to consider a wide range of aspects (Lunden T. 2004): space, time, technology, rules, policies, power exercise, economy, communication: language, symbols, culture, identity, human resources, social aspect.

Space and time belong to natural laws that are intrinsic to daily life. Space is also the natural size of a region or Euroregion. Another important feature is the line dividing two spaces, the border acquiring new forms in time from strong borders difficult to penetrate to mental and symbolic borders delimiting regions and states yet having access and communication points easy to cross.

Technology is defined as the “art of knowledge”. As we can see, regions and states that are powerful from a technological point of view are on a higher level of development as compared to others. A relevant example in point is the major difference between global north and south, as the north has the technology.

2.2.3. Euroregions with participation of Bihor and Hajdu Bihar County

2.2.3.1. The Bihor-Hajdú-Bihar Euroregion

The Bihor-Hajdú-Bihar Euroregion was established at the end of 2002 upon the initiative of the Bihor County Council (Romania) and the Hajdú-Bihar Local Government (Hungary) (Súli-Zakar I. 2003c). They seized the important role of cross-border cooperation in fields of common interest for European integration.

The Euroregion aims at stimulating new ways for cooperation between the communities in the two countries according to the following objectives: preserving and developing good neighbourhood relations; identifying potential fields of cross-border cooperation; organising and coordinating activities meant to promote cooperation in certain fields; implementing programmes in fields of mutual interest; promoting the collaboration of the Euroregion with other international organisations and supporting the members of the Euroregion in the process of European integration.

From the legal point of view of collaboration, the Euroregion is an open association for cross-border cooperation with no legal status.

The management of the Bihor – Hajdú-Bihar Euroregion (Ilieș A. 2004): Co-presidents, Council of the Euroregion, Steering Board, Secretariats, Working Commissions. The Council is the main decision-maker of the Euroregion. (<http://www.cjbihor.ro/index.php?act=euroregiune>)

Tasks of the Euroregion Council:

1. discusses and approves the strategic priorities of the Euroregion for the following year;
2. Decides on changes to the association's legal status;

3. Approves the budget of the Euroregion that is equally supported by the members, as well as the changes to the budget;
4. Approves the report on activities funded by the Euroregion;
5. Debates and approves the changes to the internal Regulations of the Euroregion;
6. Decides on admission new members or withdrawal of existing members;
7. Elects the Board members;
8. Approves the Board report;
9. Appoints the members of the Working Commissions;
9. Appoints the Secretariats;

The Council appoints a working commission in each Euroregion member state meant to act as a secretariat. The representatives of the secretariats can participate to the Council and Board meetings and are entitled to an opinion.

The duties of the secretariats are the following (<http://www.cjbihor.ro/index.php?act=euroregiune>):

1. preparing the meetings of the Council and Board, multiplying and distributing the documents;
2. Forwarding invitations, providing accommodation and the conditions appropriate for a successful meeting;
3. Draws up and submits the minutes of the Council and Board meetings to all members;
4. Archives the decisions of the Council and Board;
5. Provides assistance to working commissions;
6. The Romanian secretariat will make payments to the members of the Euroregion in Romania, while the Hungarian secretariat will make payments to the members of the Euroregion in Hungary using the expertise of the Budget and Monitoring Commission;

7. Draws up an annual report regarding the financial aspects of the Euroregion and other funds and submits it to the Budget and Monitoring Commissions and the Board before the latest annual meeting of the Council.

The Euroregion has three permanent commissions. Some of their activities include preparing and elaborating proposals in specific fields and providing the expertise in the field:

Commission for international cooperation: is in charge with the international cooperation of the Euroregion.

Budget and Monitoring Commission: analyses the use of funds for the activities of the Euroregion, as well as other funding.

Commission for Cooperation and Sustainable Development: pursues and tracks funding opportunities and other financial resources based on annual strategic priorities settled by the Council of the Euroregion; expresses opinions on individual projects and fund allowance forwarding them to the Board. Considering the structure of the Bihor – Hajdú-Bihar Euroregion, we will review some characteristics of the administrative units making up the Euroregion in the Bihor County and the Hajdú-Bihar County.

Table 10. From the point of view of communication between the two counties, we will mention the crossing points between them:

Pos	Crossing point	Traffic type	Means of transport
1	Valea lui Mihai/Nyirabrany	International	Vehicle
2	Valea lui Mihai/Nyirabrany	International	Railway
3	Episcopia Bihor/Beretyoufalu	International	Railway
4	Borș/Artand	International	Vehicle
5	Salonta/Mehkerek	International	Vehicle
6	Salonta/Mehkerek	International	Railway
7	Oradea	International	Airport
8	Debrecen	International	Airport


Source: Alexandru Ilieș, *România. Euroregiuni*, Oradea, 2004, p.174

Map 7 : Type of border crossing: Bihor and Hajdú Bihar County



Source: Table 10, p.48. Own elaboration

Map 8. Ethnic groups in Bihor-Hajdú Bihar Euroregions



Sourc: Annexe 3. Own elaboration

2.2.3.2. Carpathian Euroregion


The Carpathian Euroregion was established on 14 February 1993 at the proposal of Hungary, two Polish voivodships and a Ukrainian oblast (Süli-Zakar I. 2006), during the meeting of foreign affairs ministers and representatives of local administrations from Poland, Ukraine and Hungary (Ilieș A. 2004; Süli-Zakar I. 2008).

Romania's official participation to the Carpathian Euroregion structure through county councils took place on 29 April 1997. Slovakia joined it on 25 November 1999 (Ilieș A. 2004).

The Carpathian Euroregion's main aims and tasks are defined in the basic documents (The Founder Agreement and the Joint Declaration) as follows (Süli-Zakar I., 2003a):

- a) To organize and coordinate those activities which promote economic, ecological, cultural, scientific and educational co-operation between the members.
- b) To promote between the members of the association the elaboration of concrete plans regarding the matters of joint concernment
- c) To promote and facilitate the relations between people, including relations between experts in various fields
- d) To promote good neighbourly relations between the members
- e) To promote regional development
- f) To determine the multilateral collaboration's potential fields among the members
- g) To connect and facilitate co-operation between the members and other international organizations, institutions and agencies

Map 9. Carpathian Euroregion



Source: Annexe 4. Own elaboration

2.3. Successful Eurometropolis in Europe

2.3.1. Regio Basiliensis

Regio Basiliensis was established in 1963. It is the Swiss partner within the Upper Rhine (Regio TriRhena, 2,1 mil inhabitants), cooperation which is supported nowadays by 400 individual members and 200 collective members, with an actual budget of 1,2 million Swiss Francs.

Some of the main fields of interest for cooperation by fields of interest include the following: economy, tourism, youth, sports and leisure, civil society, environment, transportation, education, training, research and innovation, territorial planning, disaster response, culture and health.

Partners in the Regio Basiliensis cooperation

1. Regio du Haut-Rhin, RegioGesellschaft Schwarzwald-Oberrhein, Association des régions frontalières européennes (ARFE) Assemblée des régions d'Europe (ARE)

Depending on the three participant countries in the Upper Rhine cooperation, there are the following partners:

Germany: Land Baden-Württemberg, Regierungspräsidien Freiburg und Karlsruhe, Land Rheinland-Pfalz, Staatskanzlei



France: Préfecture de la Région Alsace et du Bas-Rhin, Préfecture du Haut-Rhin, Région Alsace, Département du Haut-Rhin, Département du Bas-Rhin

Switzerland : Canton de Bâle-ville, Canton de Bâle-campagne, Canton d'Argovie, Canton du Jura, Canton de Soleure

The diverse characteristics of the upper Rhine region that excels in science and education, with the presence of great universities and established research institutes, recommend the region as one of the most performing region within Europe.

These qualities and recommendations have thus been put to work: Confédération Européenne des Universités du Rhin supérieur (EUCOR) was established in 1989, representing an important area for cooperation.

In fact this area is one of the basic pillars of cooperation, in total being four pillars (Annex 5): political, economic, science / university and civil society. For the area of science there is a need for a common strategy towards research, training and innovation, in order to access structural funds.

	<p>Eurodistrikte (local/municipal)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1 Eurodistrikt Regio PAMINA2 Eurodistrikt Strasbourg-Ortenau3 Eurodistrikt Region Freiburg/Centre et Sud Alsace4 Trinationaler Eurodistrikt Basel mit je einer INFOBEST-Bürgerberatungsstelle <p>Trinationale Metropolregion Oberrhein (regional)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Oberrheinkonferenz (regionalstaatliche Regierungen)- Oberrheinrat (regionale Abgeordnete)- INTERREG IVA Oberrhein (Programm zur Förderung von grenzüberschreitenden Projekten)- EURES-T Oberrhein (Netzwerk zur Förderung des grenzüberschreitenden Arbeitsmarktes)- Dreiländerkongresse <p>RegioTriRhena e. V. --- Plattform der Gebietskörperschaften, Städten, Kommunen, Wirtschaftsverbänden, Hochschulen und Vereinen am südlichen Oberrhein</p>	<p>CONFÉRENCE DU RHIN SUPÉRIEUR</p> <p>Espace de la Conférence du Rhin Supérieur</p> <p>Mandatsgebiet der Oberrheinkonferenz</p>  <p>Oberrheinkonferenz</p> <p>Letzte gemeinsame Sitzung des 11. September 2006 am 11. September 2006 am 11. September 2006 am 11. September 2006</p> <p>Land: Frankreich, Deutschland, Schweiz Gebiet: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein</p> <p>Land: Frankreich, Deutschland, Schweiz Gebiet: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein Mandat: Oberrhein</p>
Map 10.Source: http://www.regbas.ch/f_activites_zones.cfm		
Cooperation areas		
Map 11. http://www.regbas.ch/f_activites_conference.cfm		

2.3.2. Lille – Kortrijk – Tournai Eurometropolis (LKT)

Lille – Kortrijk – Tournai Eurometropolis was officially established on 28 January 2008 as the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperations (EGTC) between France and Belgium (Duhr S., Colomb C., Nadin V. 2010). It is the first group of the kind on a European level. Deeply rooted due to its 15 years of existence, it stands for the endeavours of Pierre Mauroy. During all this time, several actions on cross-border cooperation have been implemented.

Tracing back the history of cross-border cooperation, we will present the main moments leading to the establishment of LKT Eurometropolis:

- 1991 Cross-border Standing Conference of Inter-municipal Organisations
- Interreg projects implemented in the '90s
- 2002 – signature of the French-Belgian treaty on cross-border cooperation at the level of local authorities
- 2005-2006, working group made up of 12 members represented by French and Belgian members of the Parliament (6 French, 6 Belgian)
- June 2006, proposal to build cross-border cooperation with 14 members
- July 2006, EGCT Regulations
- 19 March 2006, Common Statement on the establishment of LKT Eurometropolis (EGCT)
- 21 January 2008, establishment of the legal body by the French Regional Prefect
- 28 January 2008, first meeting of the LKT Eurometropolis Council

Throughout the 15 years of cross-border cooperation, we can remind some examples in certain fields such as:

- transport, 13 cross-border bus lines
- urban planning

- economy, cross-border competitiveness centres, economic promotion
- human resources
- environment
- waters, navigation on the Deule-Escaut channel, Pont Rouge cross-border bridge for pedestrians, Roubaix channel management
- communication: cross-border television
- cultural – educational cooperation between the Metropolis Museum of Modern Art in Lille and the Grand Hornu Museum of Contemporary Art, cultural-tourist promotion of Eurometropolis
- health

Four major objectives have been settled in the Eurometropolis:

- cross-border consistency
- consultancy, dialogue and political debate
- facilitation, project management and implementation
- quality of citizens' life

Lille – Kortrijk – Tournai LKT Eurometropolis is the greatest European cross-border conurbation due to the following statistic information: 3544 sq km, 2 millions inhabitants, 574 inhabitants / sq. km.

The figures mentioned above corroborated with the position of the LKT Eurometropolis central to the Brussels-Paris-London triangle recommends it as the greatest cross-border agglomeration in Europe (METIS GmbH 2009).

There are 14 actors from France and Belgium laying the bases of the LKT Eurometropolis:

- in France: state level, Region Nord-Pas-de- Calais, Departement du Nord, Lille Métropole Communauté Urbain
- in Belgium: federal state, Flemish and Community, the Province of Western Flanders, the Leiedal intercommunal association on behalf of the communes of the Districts of Roeselare, Ieper and Tielt, the Wallon

Region, the French Community of Belgium, the Province of Hainaut, the Ideta intercommunal association on behalf of the municipalities of the District of Tournai, an the district of Ath and the communes of Lessines, Silly and Enghien, the leg intercommunal association on behalf of the municipalities of the district of Mouscron and the commune of Estaimpuis

In total, it consists of 145 municipalities. FR: Lille Métropole Communauté urbaine (87 cities); BE Walloon Region: 3 arrondissements (Mouscron, Tournai, Ath); communes de Lessines, Silly et Enghien. BE-Flanders: 4 arrondissements (Kortrijk, Leper, Roeselare, Tielt) Territories, cities and municipalities which are not situated in the reference area and are either bordering or near may become “associate working members”.

There are two political bodies, a technical and an administrative structure making up the leading structure of the LKT Eurometropolis. Their structure is as follows:


- ❖ Management Executive Committee with a President and three Vice-Presidents
- ❖ Executive Authority made up of 32 members
- ❖ The Committee made up of 84 members

Table 11. The Cross-border Agency as a technical and administrative instrument

Budget of LKT Eurometropolis		
2008	2009	2010
989.900 Euro	1.493.300 Euro	1.485.300 Euro
Contributions to budget		
France 50 %		Belgium 50 %
LMCU : 25%		Belgium FL : 21,43 %
Région : 10%		Belgium W : 21,43 %
Département : 10%		
State F : 5 %		State B : 7,140 %

Source: METIS GmbH *The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC): state of play and prospect*, Printed in Belgium, 2009, pp. 71-72

Romanian-Hungarian cross-border cooperation at various territorial levels, with a particular study of the Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis (*European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation-EGTC*)



Map 12. Source: http://www.espaces-transfrontaliers.org/en/conurbations/terri_doc_ag_eurometropole_lille_en.html

Principles of cross-border governance:

- 1 leading body
- 2 budgets
- Application of French/Dutch bilingualism
- Parity between France and Belgium, then within Belgium, between the French- speaking and the Dutch-speaking
- regions;
- No transfer of competences
- Assessment every three years
- Advisory board: mayors conference and cross-border development council

The working languages are French and Dutch. Public documents and products have to be available at least in these two languages.

As a perspective for an efficient and enduring development of the LKT Eurometropolis, several fields of action have been identified: transportation, tourism, culture, economy and networks, tax system, education and citizenship.

2.3.3. Maastricht Metropolis –Maas-Rhin Euroregion

The Mass-Rhin Euroregion was established in 1976. It has been divided into several working groups. It is also one of the oldest cross-border cooperation partnerships. It includes three languages and five cultures and favours cooperation between regional institutions and bodies.


Map 13. *Maas-Rhin Euroregion*



Source: <http://www.euregio-mr.com/fr/euregiomr>

The total number of inhabitants in the Meuse-Rhin Euroregion is 3,982,463. They are spread as follows:

Graphs 1. Number of inhabitants in the Meuse-Rhin Euroregion



Source: <http://www.euregio-mr.com/fr/euregiomr/introduction/population>
Own elaboration

Table 12. Statistical dates: *Own elaboration*

Region	Surface	Country	Language
Province du Limbourg (Pays - Bas)	2209 sq km	Netherlands	Dutch
Regio Aachen	3535 sq km	Germany	German
Province du Limbourg	2422 sq km	Belgium	Dutch
Communauté germanophone	854 sq km	Belgium	German
Province de Liège	3862 sq km	Belgium	French

Source: <http://www.euregio-mr.com/fr/regions-partenaires>,

In 2007, the Mass-Rhin Euroregion defined seven priority fields, such as: economic development, scientific institutions, labour market and training, health, culture and tourism, security and environment.

The seven priority fields are coordinated by seven strategic groups playing an administrative role in cross-border cooperation. They second the Mass-Rhin Euroregion office and the networks settling triennial plans.

Administrative structure of the Mass-Rhin Euroregion:

- Board: according to the statutes, it is the decisional body of the Mass-Rhin Euroregion in charge with financial issues and programmes.

- Euroregional Council: established in Maastricht on 25 January 1995, it is a consultative body.

- Social and Economic Council: is made up of 30 members, six from each partner region. They meet four times a year and have an internal regulation.

- Strategic Groups have been established according to priority fields.

- Temporary Committees: debates on great social issues.

Region of Mass-Rhin, with 6 municipalities in South East of the Netherlands, Parkstad Limburg (250.000 inhabitants), bordering the Aachen Region in Germanz (570.000 inhabitants), decided to form a new development agenda, called the Pact van Parkstad, both regions wish to be connected through a European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGTC).

The agenda mainly consists of a plans for economic and spatial developments in the area of Parkstad Limburg, including the restructuring of the housing volume and public provision, adapting in to a sharply shrinking population and household base, the construction of new railways lines and 27 km ring road, the redevelopment of industrial estates and the development of several new tourist attractions, the content of the Pact van Parkstd agenda is not only interesting from a governance perspective , but also from an economic perspective.

2.4. Project on the Debrecen – Oradea Agglomeration

2.4.1. The phenomenon of double cities, also called twin cities

There are discussions about the phenomenon of double cities, also called twin cities, where a double city is a pair of two cities of about equal size that are situated close to each other (GeoJournal 54, 2002).

Another descriptions of a bi-national city, those double cities that are divided by a national border, that share a common hinterland and whose inhabitants have a belonging together (GeoJournal 54, 2002).

Also when talking about the concept of bi-national cities population plays an important role. Furthermore, real interaction elements like cross-border integration, immigrants and minorities can become factors that lead to truly bi-national cities, or, on the contrary, can be barriers in that direction.


Bi-national cities could become a suitable name for such paired border cities, a name that, moreover, does not suffer from the European connotation peculiar to the Euroregions concept (GeoJournal, 2001).

Next we will try to offer on the notion of bi-national cities a number of other conceptual boundaries that relate to this notion, as follows (GeoJournal 54, 2002):

- a border city is a place that is more or less dependent on the border for existence

- duplicated border cities, duplicated referring to the situation where the establishment of one border settlement on the other side of the border (along the borders between USA and Mexico, and USA and Canada)
- partitioned border cities, partition occurring mainly in Central Europe, after World War II, when previously united cities were divided into two different entities by drawing new boundaries
- connected cities could be used as a name of border cities that have been paired by new infrastructure (see Heddebaut on Dover and Calais⁴ and Bucken-Knapp on Copenhagen and Malmo)
- cities that have been brought close to each other by new physical infrastructure, adjacency

Map. 14



Source: *GeoJournal* 54, p.64

⁴ Dover and Calais cities are located at each part of an international border and are an example of binational cities because they have recently been connected by the Channel Tunnel, the fixed link, and the inner state borders of the European Union have disappeared, Odile Heddebaut, *The binational cities of Dover and Calais and their region*, in *GeoJournal* 54, 2002 Kluwer Academic Publisher, Printed in Netherland, p.61

Split-up cities along the:

- German - Polish border: the cooperation experienced a further qualitative appreciation both cities were named European City of Gorliz (62.000 inhabitants)/Zgorzelec(37.000 inhabitants)

Baltic region:

- Estonian city of Navra (75.000 inhabitants) and the Russian city of Ivangorod (12.000 inhabitants)

- The city of Valga/Valka that was split up between Estonia and Latvia in 1920, when both countries were disjoined from the former Russian Empire and became independent nations

- sister cities or twin cities: pairs of border cities found along the US-Mexico border

Bartels concept of neighbouring cities is very suited with regard to cases where the physical distance between two cities is too large to think of twin cities or double cities.

At the same time, the twin city concept aims to develop a functionally coherent region characterized by the synergic utilisation of socio-economic potential of both cities (Liebenath M., Korcelli Olejniczak E., Knippschild R. 2008).

For the specific situation of San Diego and Tijuana, two cities that in no respect whatever could be called twins but that nevertheless try to have contact, he proposes the name of companion cities. The cities may well be moving toward becoming a binational economic region but they have not reached the level of integration existing in European economic regions, interpersonal relations across this international border driven by factors of economy not friendship or trust (Sparow G. 2001), transportation and competitiveness (Cohn T. H., 2005).

The concept of transborder cities is contested, being replaced by the proposal to use the concept of border-crossing cities, the best name for pairs of border cities that make border-crossing contacts irrespective of mutual differences, but inspired by common interest and attractive opportunities.

Table 13. The institutionalisation of a binational cities

Territory - Close distance: core, residential areas - Same size	Territorial shape A territorial unit achieves its boundaries by social practices: settlement and political genesis, separation, reunification
- Use of physical facilities - Social interaction (formal, informal)	Institutional shape. Institutional practice through which individuals and groups are socialised -Informal
Municipality -Administrative unit - Service provider -Government of the community	Institutional shape - Formal Symbolic shape Establishing specific symbols for expressing and demarcating territory: name, traditions, myths, customs, monuments
Community - Being identified - Identification with (we-ness)	Established role Specific structure of expectations frame-work for social classification among the inhabitants and those living outside the region

Source: Nicole Ehlers, *The utopia of the binational city*, in *GeoJournal* 54, 2001, p.28


The notion of bi-national city was first used in reference to 2 border cities, Kerkrade (Holland) and Herzogenrath (Germany), which in 1997 entered upon a far-reaching programme of cooperation and ultimately even a fusion, their final goal was to form a new type of an international municipality called EURODE⁵, with special status, with a population approximately balanced of 51.500 (Kerkrade) and 47.000 respectively (Herzogenrath), apart from these new projects have been developed of which the bilingual educational project at the primary schools under the name "Eurobabel" is the best known.

⁵ The word or the combination of letters EURODE has been created from "EU", standing for the united Europe or the European Union, wich in particular will have the take shape by means of the border.crossing co-operation by local authorities and "Rode", wich stands for the mutual history of the Towns Herzogenrath and Kerkrade in the Land of "(s'Hertogen) Rode"

Source: http://www.eurode.nl/Geschiedte_e.asp?hint=informelle&tab=zus&key=1&Seite=1

An example of bi-national is the cities of Copenhagen (Denmark) and Malmo (Sweden) that were connected in 2000 by the 18 km fixed Oresund Link, and Oresund⁶ Area development towards a bi-national, integrated, functional (GeoJournal 61, 2004), urban region is in progress, but the progress is much slower than expected, with barriers of different cultures and languages, with legal barriers for integration and gave advice on harmonization, dimensions of migrants and their possibility of integration (GeoJournal 61, 2004), Oresund housing the life science cluster of Medicon Valley (Potter J. – Miranda G. 2009)

Map15. The Oresund Area 2003. The map show the area closest to the new fixed link



Source: Wichmann Matthiessen Christian, *The Oresund Area: Pre – and post bridge cross-border functional integration: the bi-national regional question*, in GeoJournal 61, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Netherlands, 2004, p.33

⁶ The Oresund region is a particular case with respect to cross-border cooperation (CBC), it does not have the peripheral nature of many other border regions in Europe and the presence of Copenhagen, the national capital of Denmark, makes it different from other pairs of border cities such as Kerkrade-Herzogenrath (German-Dutch border), Lille-Kortrijk (French-Belgium border), Haparanda-Tornio (Swedish-Finnish border). A fixed link across the maritime border has added to these hopes and constitutes a symbol of cross-border integration, Source: *Torben Dall Schmidt, Cross-border regional enlargement in Oresund*, in GeoJournal 64, 2005, p.249

2.4.2. *Aims and objectives. Project on the Debrecen – Oradea Agglomeration*

The cross-border cooperation Oradea - Debrecen is a topic of current interest at European level and implicitly within the area of the Romanian-Hungarian border area and the urban communities of Debrecen and Oradea as neighbouring cities, with old forms of cooperation in various areas: social, cultural, economic, educational, sports, etc.; the prospects for cooperation is taking a new form, as European cross-border cooperation and more specifically, the form of European cross-border cooperation groupings (EGCC).

With reference to the cooperation between the two cities of Debrecen and Oradea, there is a wide range of perspectives:

- a) The cultural-historical premise
 - Debrecen and Oradea have developed over time as separate but complementary communities, where Oradea was a city with a strong Catholic influence (housing one of the oldest Hungarian Roman-Catholic bishops and one Greek-Catholic bishop, which had a major impact in shaping the identity of the Romanians) and also Orthodox; Debrecen was one of the Reform cradles in Hungary.
 - Oradea played a political-administrative part, while Debrecen played an economic one
 - The communication between the two cities was easy due to the short distance
 - after 1990 the convergence process is relaunched; in the beginning there was a cultural convergence, then an economic one and during the latest years there has also been a political one.
- b) Socio-cultural premises
 - There is a business infrastructure between the two cities, represented by SMEs that cooperate on both markets, the projects carried out on both sides are very dynamic (Eurolimes, vol 8, 2009)

- INTERREG financing tools
- Transylvania highway
- c) The cooperation expertise, based on the existence of an important body of actors participating in the cross-border cooperation.

The beginnings of the idea of cross-border cooperation between Hungary and Romania, namely the cities of Debrecen and Oradea, can be traced to the innovative idea of Prof. dr. István Süli - Zakar (University of Debrecen) and Prof. dr. Ioan Horga (University of Oradea), a project entitled “To prepare a common future: Agglomeration of Communities Debrecen-Oradea 700,000 (2020)” (Analele U.O, vol I, 2009; Horga I. - Silași G. - Süli-Zakar I. – Sagan S. 2009; Țoca C. V. 2009), premises that are found in the development of the Lisbon Strategy, which generates clusters of urban communities and also aims to develop Europe into a knowledgeable society; all of the aforementioned could be achieved in several ways, among which urban concentration and development of scientific and technological research within the centres (poles) of excellence.

As we noted in the current European geography, these poles of excellence are found in the large agglomerations that exercise attraction by means of financial and human investment, due to own power consumption and its impact on a wider region and not least all major investors are looking for strong communities of consumers

These poles are found in the major economic and political capitals with a population greater than 500,000 inhabitants, poles that are developing within regional capitals.

Here are some examples of urban concentrations: Barcelona, Valencia, Bilbao (Spain), Porto (Portugal), Toulouse, Montpellier, Marseille, Bordeaux, Nantes (France), Liverpool (UK), München, Leipzig, Köln (Germany), Kraków, Wrocław, Gdańsk, Katowice (Poland), Rotterdam (the Netherlands), Göteborg (Sweden), Milano, Torino, Bologna (Italy), Salonic (Greece), Zürich (Switzerland)

The European Union is very closely paying attention to one of its important objectives, the European Territorial Cooperation which envisages the following:

- development of cross-border economic and social activities through local and regional initiatives in joint venture
- strengthening transnational cooperation through initiatives that promote integrated territorial development
- bilateral cooperation between maritime regions
- interregional cooperation through networking activities and experience exchange between regional and local authorities.

According to the World Bank criteria for assessing the share of investment in relation to a community, Oradea and Debrecen, in 2007, are cities that can expect a maximum investment of \$ 30,000,000. Through a coherent policy of promoting a common development strategy, they could attract investments of up to 100 million.

Table 14. Investment type - Source: <http://www.worldbank.org/>

Investment type	Value	Community size	Examples
A+ investments (exceptional)	+\$1 billion	+ 5 mil. inhabitants	Shanghai, New York, Paris
AA investments (very great)	\$500 –1 billion	1 – 5 mil. Inhabitants	Vienna, Budapest, Bucharest, Berlin
A- investments (great)	\$100 –500 mil.	700.000 – 1 mil.	Valencia, Bilbao, Toulouse, Nantes, Leipzig, Krakow
B+ investments (average to great)	\$50 – 100 mil	500.000 – 700.000 Inhabitants	Bratislava, Nuremberg, Brescia, Florence, Montpellier
BB investments (average)	\$30 – 50 mil	250.000 – 300.000 Inhabitants	Cluj Napoca, Timisoara, Graz
B- investments (under average)	\$10 – 30 mil	150.000 – 250.000 Inhabitants	Oradea, Debrecen, Kosice
C+ investments (small or average)	\$5 – 10 mil	100.000 – 150.000 Inhabitants	Satu Mare, Arad
CC investments (small)	\$1 – 5 mil	50.000 – 100.000 Inhabitants	
C- very small investments	Less than \$1 mil.	Under 50.000 inhabitants	

Complying with this model, i.e. to build a strategy for cross-border cooperation, we will approach two major dimensions of the PhD Thesis:

- the theoretical dimension
- the practical dimension

The theoretical dimension shall cover the following elements: historical approach at the level of the two communities

The practical dimension reflects a methodology drawn from sociology, with the sociological survey method and the sociological questionnaire as the sociological instrument (this questionnaire contains also a SWOT analysis), using a stratified sample on three target groups.

The sociological survey will be applied in the two communities under discussion, Oradea and Debrecen, this being a first essential and important step after which we will have a solid database, with supporting results and a SWOT analysis, all of which giving us a starting point for our research.

The wide range of results will allow us to have a broader vision, but the same time, accurate in the opinion of both communities citizens on the background for an effective cross-border cooperation, while being able to set goals and priorities.


To implement the proposed plan, we will seek to identify those measures and projects through which we can develop the model that we have proposed to be done.

An important financial dimension of the integration mechanisms are the Structural Funds, among which we name a few:

- European Social Fund (ESF)
- Regional Development Fund (ERDF)
- European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF)
- Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG)

2.4.3. *Development strategies*

In the perspective of a real, efficient and functional approach for building the cross-border cooperation between Debrecen and Oradea, certain essential stages should be covered for the construction of a cross-border strategy (Boar N.):



As shown above, in order to achieve an efficient strategy for cross-border cooperation and in order to develop an integration mechanism meeting the maximum European requirements, six main conditions that represent the Euroregional success shall be met:

- SWOT analysis
- General vision
- Objectives and priorities
- Measures and projects
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Implementation

An important step that must be taken further to implementing the project is the monitoring and evaluation, so that we could move to efficient

implementation and achievement of objectives and priorities set for a sustained cross-border cooperation.

For an efficient cooperation, both sides of the border must meet the following dimensions:


- Running a SWOT analysis;
- Implication of Euroregional authorities;
- Ideas and support from the NGOs;
- Constructing centres of Euroregional information to cover various domains;
- Identifications and accessing the funds that can develop various Euroregional components;
- Human resources specialized for accessing the Euroregional funds;
- Specialized training within the Euroregional area;
- Organizing international conferences and workshops;
- Internships on both sides of the border;
- Team promotion of different strengths and opportunities of each part of the Euroregion to find common strategies in the short, medium and long terms
- creating teams of Euroregional specialists in different areas of activity who can research and provide accurate results and effective solutions for a functional Euroregion.

2.4.4. A working model – Oradea Metropolitan Area ZMO

Oradea Metropolitan Area Association was formed in May 9, 2005 as a legal person of public interest, with private, non-profit character, based on the legislation that attest the establishment of community development associative organizations of territorial administrative units in Romania. The OMA objectives are:

- Aligning OMA to the economic and social Euro-Atlantic standards, in agreements with the national standards;
- Establishment within OMA of a market climate aligned with the international competition procedures
- Increase of the economic-social cohesion within the OMA.


Map. 16 Population of OMA



Source: www.zmo.ro (Annexe 6)

The “Oradea Metropolitan Area” Association management is structured on three levels. The first one is deliberative and is represented by the General Assembly. The second level is administrative in nature and is provided by the Board of Directors. The third level, executive, is managed by a technical and operational unit that implements measures adopted in the first two levels.

Organigram ZMO - Source: www.zmo.ro



3. Results of the sociological and socio-geographical research

3.1. Applying questionnaires. Results

The research undertaken was structured so that for the size of each dimension we identified a number of indicators on which we focused.

The four major dimensions of our research, with the indicators relating to each dimensions could be summarised as follows:

- Crossborder communication
- Crossborder aspects of socio-economio-institutional life
- Development perspective in Debrecen and Oradea communities
- SWOT analysis of the two target communities

Previous research

The previous research, focused on but not limited to the main 4 directions, directly related to our research, reveal a series of results proving the previous existence of connections and cooperation between the Romanian and the Hungarian sides; the area of interest relevant to our study are the communities of Debrecen –Hajdú Bihar County and Oradea – Bihor County.

Following an analysis of mass media contents from Bihor county in 2006, one year before the Romanian-Hungarian border became an internal

EU border Luminița Șoproni identifies the main areas of interest of the mass media were in the communication - crossborder cooperation in the counties of Bihor and Hajdu-Bihar: crossborder values, cooperation between authorities, cultural cooperation, crossborder financing programmes that reach some crossborder areas of interest among which we would like to bring to attention the education and research, the rural development, tourism, business, the consumers protection, and the quality and environmental protection (Șoproni L. 2007).

Looking in the mirror, for the Hungarian side there is similar research on the mass media in Hungary, but the research period is more extensive, i.e. 1990-2005; the research done by Béla Baranyi captures a few items, topics of Romanian-Hungarian crossborder interest.

An important research indicator is the life happening at the border crossing points, which is also a possible way of cross-border development and prospects for increased cooperation by its permeability (Baranyi B. 2007). In addition to this indicator there have been identified other indicators such as inter-regionale organizations, community connections near the border, cultural-educational cooperation, economic cooperation, environment protection (in the cases of pollution of the great rivers).

Keeping at the environment protection dimensions, there is a research done on the quality of environmental factors in Bihor - Hajdu Bihar Euroregion, where a number of businesses were identified as pollutants, sources of pollution that affect the environmental quality in the two counties that make up the analysed Euroregion. The statistical analysis of data shows that most of the polluting sectors are: oil exploitation and mining, ore and oil processing industries, heat power industry, chemical industry, wood and pulp processing industry, metallurgy, electrical and mechanical engineering industry, cement industry, transport, municipal household and agricultural industries (Ambrus L. A. 2010); on the other hand, the air and water quality

is normal, pointing out improvements. An important role is played by the limitation of activity in the case of various economic agents, application of various regulations and laws (Ambrus L. A. 2010). A SWOT analysis of the Euroregion offers a series of general conclusions and suggestions regarding the possibilities of development of Bihor – Hajdu – Bihar Euroregion, an central position being given to the amplification of a common development policy, accessing funding that lead to sustainable development, organization of scientific events, round tables, a development of institutional ties between the two counties, all of the aforementioned focused on mitigating the negatively impacting factors on the population health (Ambrus L. A. 2010).

From an economic perspective, the access of Romania to the European Union family made the Romanian-Hungarian border become history and thus we witness the premises of economic development opportunities in the counties of Bihor and Hajdú Bihar, and the possibility of Oradea and Debrecen agglomeration. The analysis undertaken in the target area with focus on indicators such as number of employees and business income shows that the cities of Debrecen and Oradea economically dominate the space of the two counties and their closest neighbouring towns present opportunities for an even higher economic development in comparison with the farthest (Pénzes J. - Molnár E. 2007).

On the Hungarian-Serbian border, as initiatives, as prospects for development, due to geographical proximity, and political and economic situations, a series of forms of crossborder cooperation are identified: economic, educational, medical tourism, shopping tourism and friendship-family relations in the area (Szónokyné A. G. 2008).

In the case of the neighbouring towns of Miskolc and Kosice, due to various factors unfavorable to the two cities, the different data analysis identified a number of common directions that can be developed: infrastructure, transport, industry, creation of new employment

opportunities, services, tourism, education, management of urban development, communications, relationships between towns (Nagy Z. 2008).

Inter-institutional cooperation in the neighboring counties of Bihar and Hajdú Bihar is an important dimension of the crossborder cooperation; as examples of good practice we will single out police cooperation, cooperation in tax matters, and education. The police cooperation between Romania and Hungary dates back to 1998 (Mátyás S. 2007), thanks to good cooperation relations, with agreements periodically renewed. In 2001, the counties of Bihor and Hajdú Bihar signed an agreement that was materialised in conferences, and common actions⁷ or mirror actions⁸ (Mátyás S. 2008).

The interinstitutional cooperation in the finance business, especially the fiscal business, is facilitated by the Agreement signed between the National Agency for Fiscal Administration from Romania (A.N.A.F) and the Administration of Fiscal and Financial Control from Hungary (A.P.E.H.), which set out bilateral cooperation, experience exchange, fiscal information exchange, fighting fiscal fraud (Cîrmăciu D. 2010).

The academic cooperation between the two university centres in Debrecen and Oradea was materialised in conferences dating back to 1993, when a first conference was organised by the geographers from Oradea (Ilieș A. 2010). More international conferences presenting common research and studies followed (Süli – Zakar I. - Horga I. - Ilieș A. - Tömöri M. - Țoca

⁷ The police officers from Bihor and from Hajdu-Bihar held a simultaneous action to prevent and combat road accidents, and law enforcement and public safety. The action in the „mirror” is the one that opens the series of actions organized jointly by the Police in the two neighboring counties, preparing them for cooperation, after Romania’s accession to the Schengen Area. These actions were run in the country for the first time in Bihor county, the good practice model was then extended to other counties. Source: <http://www.bihon.ro/euroregiunea-bihor-hajdu-bihar-pazita/972935>

⁸ The Police in Bihor and its Hungarian police counterparts from Hajdu Bihar acted in the mirror at the weekend, for road traffic safety during winter holidays and to deter crime rate. Source: http://www.adevarul.ro/locale/oradea/Politistii-maghiari-actioneaza-impreuna-weekend_0_605939772.html

C.V. 2011). The maturity of cooperation between the academic institutions of Oradea and Debrecen translated into the Center of Excellence Jean Monnet “Institute of Euroregional Studies” Oradea – Debrecen, with the official opening held in 2006.

The latest Romanian-Hungarian cooperation agreement was signed in Oradea on 09/02/2012 by the Romanian Chief of Police, Dr. Liviu Popa and by the High Commissioner of the Hungarian National Police, Lieutenant General Dr. József Hatala, by signing the Cooperation Plan on reducing the number of recorded accidents on public roads in Romania and Hungary, especially near the common state border (<http://crisana.ro>).

The cooperation between the two municipalities, Debrecen and Oradea, translated into a twinning agreement signed in 1992, focusing on developing the sector of business and human relations. In 2003 the Townhall of Oradea benefitted from a Phare CBC 2000 project at the level of the two sister cities named “Cultural Bridge Oradea - Debrecen”(Biró R. 2006), project that was continued annually, the final bilateral event taking place in 2011.

The touristic potential of the area under our research, where the neighbouring towns of Debrecen and Oradea are at the very heart, is shown by the studies run within the Carpatica Euroregion (Nadova M. 2010), and Bihor – Hajdú Bihar Euroregion (Lóránt D. - Bujdosó Z. - Tóth G. 2008).

Corroborated with the touristic potential of the area is a series of other tourism types that can be practised in the counties of Bihor and Hajdú Bihar, at the level of Debrecen and Oradea:

- a) health tourism: medical, fitness and wellness tourism, profesional tourism,eco tourism, heritage and cultural tourism, country-hunting-and fishing tourism, bicycle-water-and equestrian tourisme, mountain tourism, caving (Dávid L. - Bujdosó Z. - Tóth G. 2008);
- b) for health tourisme we can include the spa tourism, a form of of tourism that came to Europe in the nineteenth century, being based on the spa

culture of the Roman Empire (Várhelyi T. - Müller A. 2008). Two resorsts that attract health tourism are Băile Felix and Hajdúszoboszló; please note the study that analyses the infrastructure, the accessibility and the quality of the geo-thermal water⁹ of these two resorsts (Bántó N. 2011; Ambrus L.A. 2007);

- c) educational tourism: general educational tourism, adult study tours, international and domestic university and school students travel, foreign study trips and excursion organized by language schools, school excursion, student exchange programs, international student mobility (Árva L. - Könyves E. 2008);
- d) shopping tourism. It can become a very important indicator for crossborder cooperation (Tömöri M. 2008). A particular study is dedicated to the expansion of Metro CC network in Romania and Hungary (Tömöri M. 2010); the percentage of people living in Oradea in report to the entire population of Romania who choose to shop in Debrecen is 59.28% (Süli – Zakar I. - Horga I. - Ilieș A. - Tömöri M. - Țoca C.V. 2011), to which it adds the shopping population from Germany 35%, Ukraine 6%, Poland 5%, Slovakia 3% (Tömöri M. 2007).

Studies directed towards educational crossborder cooperation show an attractiveness of Romanians towards the educational system in Hungary, especially after the 90s; the institutional target is mainly the University of Debrecen. The first dating the existence of forms of education in Debrecen is the Reformed College that goes back to the XIV century (1538), the College providing continuity of the town of Debrecen in terms of education (Teperics K. 2009). A series of educational institutions followed: The Institute of Agrarian Education, The Hungarian University of Agrarian Sciences,

⁹ From the category of geo-thermal deep waters from: Debrecen, Hajdúszoboszló, Hajdúböszörmény, Berettyóújfalu, Biharnagzbajom, Komádi, Körössegapáti, Hencida, Sárrétudvari, Balmazújváros, Oradea, Baile Felix, Băile 1 Mai, Răbăgani, Marghita, Tămășeu, Chișlaz, Săcuieni, Balc, etc. (Ambrus L. A. 2010, p.21)

Debrecen Agrarian Academy, The Superior School of Agricultural Sciences of Debrecen, Debrecen University of Agricultural Sciences (Szogi L. 1994). In 1921 the University of Sciences Magyar Kiraly is founded in Debrecen; subsequently, the name changes to, the University of Sciences Tisa Istvan (Teperics K. 2009).

Following the results on the number of foreign students studying in Hungary, we see that their number increases considerably from primary to university cycle, Romanians representing in 2005, 3171 out of 13,594 students in total (Teperics, K. 2007). From the perspective of students from countries that compose the Carpathian Euroregion who show attraction towards the educational dimension in Hungary there are Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine, out of the three Romania being the most active in number of students who choose crossborder study (Teperics, K. 2007; Eurolimes, vol 12, 201; Czimre K, 2005, Süli-Zakar I. 2005). As a percentage of foreign students in Hungary, between 2005 and 2007, Romania has 24%, Slovakia 19%, Ukraine 9% and Serbia 8%, so Romania takes the first positions at the level of university education in Hungary (Beracs J. - Hrubos I. - Temesi J. 2010.). Of the neighboring countries listed above giving the largest number of students in Hungary, their distribution in the University of Debrecen shows an evolution starting with the academic year 2004-2005, when 1,177 foreign students, reaching in 2008 -2009 to 2390 foreign students, Romania referring to study at the University of Debrecen 561 students, Ukraine 255, and Slovakia 112.

At the level of the University of Oradea, the educational relationship with Europe can be quantified through inter-university cooperation agreements; Table 2.3 shows a significant increase of these agreements, including the mobility of students and teachers from the University of Oradea towards the European universities. The university education cooperation shows in statistics that the Romanian - Hungarian relations

began to take shape with the academic year of 2005-2006; the 2010-2011 academic year brings a significant increase of Erasmus agreements, with spectacular development in agreements with countries such as Italy, Spain, Poland, France, Portugal, Hungary with 79 agreements, compared to 38 in 2007 -2008, according to the Report for the period March 2008 - January 2011 of the Rector of the University of Oradea.

Table 15. – Evolution of number of agreements of the University of Oradea in the period 2004 - 2010

Types of relations	2004 2005	2005 2006	2006 2007	2007 2008	2008 2009	2009 2010	2010 2011
No. of bilateral agreements	34	36	38	37	39	44	48
No. of Erasmus agreements	182	217	227	313	370	455	571

Source: www.uoradea.ro

Mobilities for students and faculty were run within the programmes: Erasmus, Thematic Network and Leonardo da Vinci. The evolution of the total number of mobilities is shown in tables for mobilities 16 and 17.

Table 16. – Student mobility

Mobilities for students	2003 2004	2004 2005	2005 2006	2006 2007	2007 2008	2008 2009	2009 2010	Total
Mobilities - Sub-programme Erasmus (studies)	100	138	167	123	127	113	113	881
Mobilities - Sub-programme Erasmus (placements)	-	-	-	-	30	15	23	68
Total of mobilities	100	138	167	123	157	128	136	949

Source: www.uoradea.ro

Table 17. – Mobilities for faculty

Mobilities for teachers	2003 2004	2004 2005	2005 2006	2006 2007	2007 2008	2008 2009	2009 2010	Total
Mobilities - Erasmus (teaching)	87	100	98	133	101	121	156	796
Mobilities - Erasmus (staff training)	-	-	-	-	35	45	83	163
Total of mobilities	87	100	98	133	136	166	239	959


Source: www.uoradea.ro

Results. Verification of research hypotheses.

The results of our research hypotheses prove the communication quality of the Romanian-Hungarian border and of the two communities of Oradea and Debrecen. We can observe a high frequency of visits from Oradea to the neighbouring city of Debrecen (Graph 2), with a rate of over 50% in all three target groups; in the opposite direction, from Debrecen to Oradea the ratio is much lower, ranging from 35% to 48.5% (Annexe 12, Table 1). We can say that Debrecen is more attractive to the people living in Oradea than vice-versa, continuing by tracking the interests, scopes of visiting on both sides of the Romanian-Hungarian border.

What can be seen in the results is that all three target groups from Romania compared with those of Hungary visit in a much larger percentage the neighbouring country. From this we can extract a much greater interest of Romanians compared with that of their neighbors in Hungary.

Graph 2. The number of visits ranges: Oradea, Debrecen



Source: own elaboration based on research results

As we commented on the question about visiting the neighbour city (Annexe 12 – Table 2; the target group: the students) the number of visits ranges from one visit where the percentage is higher, Oradea (30.2%) and Debrecen (25%), 30 visits but in a very small percentage, less than 1%. The Debrecen population visited the neighbouring city of Oradea in a much

smaller proportion (64% of Debrecen citizens have not visited Oradea), but the Romanian citizens visiting the neighbour is city ever more often (47% of them visited the neighbouring city). The other categories of visits have an increasingly smaller percentage as the number of visits to the neighbouring city grows, we can say that the category between 1-3 visits combined occupy the largest percentage, 44.8% for Oradea and a much smaller proportion for Debrecen 32.1 %. If we look at the percentages for the other two target groups we still see that large amounts of visits among the neighbouring city of Oradea in Debrecen are being stored, but the similarities in the institutional balance is kept (the only discrepancy being the indicator 2 visits) here it can be stated that the two visits at the two communities level are reciprocal, which shows a close cooperation.

By this question we remark that links exist between the residents of the two towns just by the number of visits was made by citizens of both cities in the neighbouring city, are prevalent in a considerable number of visits that start in Oradea, i.e. the Romanian citizens to the Hungarian i.e. Debrecen.

If we consider visiting the cross-border neighbouring city, Debrecen or Oradea, one time only, it is noticeable that at the level of all three target groups only 25 % to 32.5 % answered "yes", which indicates that at least a quarter and a maximum one third of the inhabitants have had contact with the neighbouring city; we noted a slight increase of the number of visits in the case of students and population with ages over 25 (an increase of 2-3%). As for the institutions respondents, we noted an increase of 3% in visits towards Oradea and a decrease up to 29.1% towards Debrecen. The results obtained for the indicators "What means of transport you used to go to Hungary - Romania", there were a number of possible answers: car, minibus or coach, train or other means of transport, not applicable.

In the first two indicators related to visiting the neighbouring town on both sides of the border, Oradea vs. Debrecen, the results showed us that

there is a cross-border communication and also an interest of the two communities for visiting the neighbouring city, and mainly people from Oradea, who cross the border in a higher percentage than their neighbours who visit Oradea.


In this case we used a question with five response options where we chose three basic variants (own car, minibus and train), plus a variable that refers to other means of transport (bicycle, motorcycle), the final version is the number of people who have not ever visited Oradea and/or Debrecen (Annexe 12 – Table 3).

Of all the options given, the most used by the residents of both communities is the car, with the lowest percentage at students, and the highest percentage of the target group, institutions, employees of the institutions for visiting Debrecen, where the private car is used in 44.1% cases, and for visiting Oradea in 38.3% cases.

In the second place we found the van used for business purposes, with values ranging between 5% and 16.2%, while the train falls into the third position with a percentage between 0.75 and 3.3%; other means of transportation recorded the smallest value, i.e. between 15 and 2.2%. However, let us not forget the significant number of people in the two cities that have never visited the neighbouring city, the lowest percentage being recorded at the target group of students visiting Oradea from Debrecen, with a rate of 39%; in contrast, the highest percentage was recorded in the case of target group institutions, namely the representatives of institutions in Romania that visit the neighbouring city and country at a rate of 64.6%.


The answers regarding the purposes of the visits made in the neighbouring country (Annexe 12 – Table 4) with the possibility of choosing between the purposes: tourism, transit, shopping, business, family, finally existing the option - other purposes where it could be noted other purpose than those mentioned above (Graph 3 and Graph 4).

Graph 3. The purposes of the visits:Oradea to Debrecen %



Source: Own elaboration

Graph 4. The purposes of the visits:Debrecen to Oradea %



Source: Own elaboration

Other purposes: cultural – amusement events, medical, competitions, educational programs, conferences, seminars, teachers’ exchanger, Erasmus and Leonardo da Vinci projects.

The purposes: tourism, transit, shopping are the most important goals, in terms of the identified percentages. Travel is an affinity for one side of the citizens of both countries to visit the neighbouring country, with tourist attractions, traditions, customs and cuisine of different regions, all in one place and develop an attraction, there are stations at both the Hajdúszabolcszló Hungarian and Romanian side Baile Felix.

The purpose of business is also represented because there are many firms in the two cities of the Bihor - Hajdú-Bihar Euro-region which includes the two cities partnerships are developed, international cooperation, even multinational companies with some involvement on both sides of the border.

The Romanian - Hungarian border is filled with history, there were a series of historical moments that led to the cultural influences of various types and therefore the final demarcation of the border of the two neighbouring countries has brought about the separation of peoples and two states by drawing the state border, this leaving a wide part of the border and citizens which have different degrees of kinship and this influences more the visits in the neighbouring state.

In addition to these pre-coded answer options there was a response option open where they showed more choices where we can observe that there is cooperation at institutional level that are transformed in conferences, international seminars, school projects, even contests, all responses identifying the existence of cross border communication both into the past, present and future, prospect of identifying the possibility to access structural funds in order to develop the cross-border cooperation.

From the medical point of view we can say that the two cities have one academic medical centre, forming specialists in this field,


centres that will appeal to students from all over Europe and other continents.

From the point of view of the dimensions of cooperation and crossborder communication, at different levels of communication (NUTS), we can see that the *Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 4* of our research, based on the data gathered, check out through the indicators of the first dimensions, emphasizing the effect of opening the borders after 1989, the evolution of crossborder forms of cooperation and the identification of interest points Debrecen – Oradea, which could generate a sphere of positive influence in the area.

As a particularity, we noticed that the crossborder communication is more intense on the direction Oradea towards Debrecen, according to Graph 5, where where by making an average of results from the three target groups, the number of visits to the neighboring city predominate (60.8%) compared with those from Debrecen to Oradea (39.2%), the main purpose of communication being the tourism (highlighted in previous research emphasising the tourism potential of existing resorts and existing geo-thermal water quality in both cities and counties), the shopping being another indicator that mediates the crossborder communication, with a complementary shopping in the two cities.

In conclusion to the first dimension analyzed in our research, the results verify the hypotheses proposed by us to be tested, plus a number of other research run by Romanian or Hungarian researchers show the existence of cooperation, crossborder communication in the communities of Debrecen and Oradea, the most relevant indicators being the crossborder tourism and crossborder shopping. As the frequency of visits to the neighbouring town, we note an interest from Oradea to Debrecen interest at the rate of 56.5%, and 42.3% in the opposite direction.

Graph 5. Comparative analysis Debrecen – Oradea, crossborder communication



Source: own elaboration

Another dimension addressed by our research on the two towns of Debrecen and Oradea refers to the indicators (Annexe 12 – Table5, 6, 7): problems, situations encountered by the communities (quality of housing, public lighting, provision of jobs, sewage system, addressing and solving citizens' problems, central heating, hot water, cold water, cleaning, roads, and transport). On the scale of 5 values we cumulated the big values and the very big values, after which we identified the most important ones.

According to the results presented in Table18, the most balanced indicator, we can discuss here about a common problem of the two communities, assurance of jobs, a situation which finds causes in the global crisis as well, crisis that has affected two neighboring cities. Other indicators in the table below show a number of representative problems(over 50%),for

Oradea in the case of: sewerage, solving the citizen issues, roads (the percentage over 70% is justified by the modernization of the roads in Oradea, due to the funds attracted by the Town Hall), cleaning.

Table 18. Comparative analysis Debrecen Oradea. The most important problems of the two communities

Oradea /Debrecen %	Students		> 25 years		Institutions	
	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
Assurance of jobs	58.7	48.4	49.2	43.5	42	45.5
Sewerage	50.4	18.8	49.8	35	68.3	31.7
Solving the citizen issues	50.9	33.4	57.2	32.3	51.7	37.8
Roads	70.6	46.7	74.9	47.2	70.3	46.6
Cleaning	64.4	46.7	61	45.3	73.8	48.7

Source: Own elaboration

The importance of the main sectors of activity (with this indicator we sought to identify the main areas of activity: industry, construction, transport, agriculture, tourism and services), using a scale of order, rank order, for each field of activity by ranking them between 1 and 7, the latter indicator being the institutional one.


The results for the seven main areas which exist in two neighbouring towns, was achieved after gathering the elections made by respondents for the first three places for each area (Graph 7, Graph 8, Graph 9).

Following the cummulation of the first 3 positions obtained by each area of activity, we can see that from the perspective of the target group, namely the students in Oradea, the first three positions are occupied by the fields of commerce, tourism and construction; the first three positions for Debrecen are represented by the fields of trade, services and tourism.

For the other two target groups the first three positions are distributed as follows, for the target group > 25 years old, industry, commerce and construction (Oradea), services, trade and industry (Debrecen), and not least for the target group we trade institutions, construction, services (Oradea), and services, tourism and trade (Debrecen), (Annexe 12 - Table 8).


For example the Transmanche Region (Map 17, Graph 6), like a new entity undertaken many different join actions since it has been twinned and this will be scrutinized, this cooperation is more effective in tourism and in commercial sectors (Heddebaut O., 2002, p.61).

Map 17. The Trans-Manche euroregion




Source: *GeoJournal* 54, p.65

Graph 6. Cross Channel Market Passenger markets. Regional Tourism Committee of Nord-Pas-de-Calais




Source: *GeoJournal* 54, p.70

Graph 7. Areas of activity: target group-students




Source: *own elaboration*

Graph 8. Areas of activity: target group-public opinion



Source: own elaboration

Graph 9. Areas of activity: target group-institutions




Source: own elaboration

Making an average of three target groups (Graph 10) we found that there is a similarity in the importance of trade and industry; there is on the other hand a relevant discrepancy identified among the fields of services and tourism in the favour of Debrecen.

Graph 10. Comparative Analysis Debrecen – Oradea.

Importance of fields of activity



Source: own elaboration

The indicator through which we sought to identify key institutions and organizations (in various fields of activity, representative for the good of both communities: Debrecen and Oradea), as a confidence level on a scale with four degrees of intensity (very high, high, small, very small).


The indicator regarding the degree of confidence on institutions operating in the range of cities where the research was done, we tried to capture the views of citizens of both communities reported to the main public institutions that manage the city, recalling here, the City Hall, Prefecture, City Council, County council and the confidence in: religious institutions, educational institutions, media - not least the media and NGOs (Annexe 12 - Table 9,10,11).

The highest confidence level has enjoyed the Church and the University for the answers offered by the three target groups in Oradea (here we used a scale with four degrees of intensity: very high, high, low and very low and have accumulated the most important degrees of intensity threw

which we can capture the citizens' trust in the analyzed institutions gaining confidence in institutions as the Church and the academic institution, the Universities of Debrecen and Oradea) two basic institutions of the society, a religious institution and on the other hand an education one, with clear principles and an important role of forming a religious culture, fair and general knowledge in special time for every member of the society according to his desire, its orientation in various fields.

A significant confidence, far from the two above-mentioned ranges also the NGOs, the civil society side can play an important role in the two companies in the direction of strengthening the effective and lasting the Romanian-Hungarian border (Graph 11).


Graph 11. The highest confidence level for Oradea s institutions, %



Source: own elaboration based on research results

By comparison with the Hungarian side of the border, in Debrecen, the degree of trust in institutions is changed. The local institutions together with the county institutions are well represented: Town Hall, Local Council, County Council, and Mass Media – the fourth most important institution in a state (Graph 12).


Graph 12. The highest confidence level for Debrecen institutions, %



Source: own elaboration based on research results

The level of trust of the two communities in the institutional dimensions varies from one town to another; the highly trusted institutions differ, there are institutions with various functions, attributions, objectives, what is present in a town does not show the same degree of similarity in the other town (Graph 13). If the town of Oradea has the Church (75.6%), the University-Academia (45.3%), NGOs (43.03%), on the other side of the border, in Debrecen, there are different institutions with high trust, namely the mass media (82.5%), Councils: Local (50.1%) and County (515) and Debrecen Town Hall (62.76%).

Graph 13. Comparative analysis of the citizens’ level of trust in the institutions from Debrecen and Oradea



Source: Own elaboration

The central indicator of the research undertaken at the community level aimed at Debrecen and Oradea consider the interests of the three target groups for the project on "To prepare a common future: The Debrecen – Oradea Cross-border Agglomeration 700 000 (2020)" is welcome to joint development of the cities of Debrecen and Oradea?, and as answer options: YES, NO, I DON'T KNOW (Table 19).

Table 19. The interest for a future Debrecen –Oradea project

Indicator		<i>Students</i>	<i>>25 years</i>	<i>Institutions</i>
YES	Oradea	66%	64.5%	73.1%
	Debrecen	51.7%	63.1%	60.2%
NO	Oradea	13.1%	10.3%	15.7%
	Debrecen	5.4%	4.9%	5.8%
I don't know	Oradea	20.9%	25.1%	11.2%
	Debrecen	42.9%	32%	34%

Source: own elaboration based on research results

One of the central questions of the research was oriented to capture the views on the draft on "To prepare a common future: The Debrecen – Oradea Cross-border Agglomeration, 700 000 (2020)", for joint development of Debrecen and Oradea city, building a three - choice question.

The affirmative answer of the three target groups showed support of the joint project The Debrecen – Oradea Agglomeration.


From the answers given by the respondents we noticed that the students in Oradea welcome the proposed project for the joint development of the two communities that can jam into a functional and

efficient Congestion, since it works very well across Europe such cross-border conurbations such as: Lille/FR – Roubaix – Tournai – Tourcoing – Kortrijk/ BE that reunites over 2.2 millions inhabitants, The Basel – Mulhouse Congestion 600.000 inhabitants, developed common projects, of which the best known is the common international airport.

The greater percentage that resulted in Oradea city compared to Debrecen it is probably because of the fact that the project was done at Oradea and a media campaign through which we tried to inform people and nature for a for decision able to implement a long term project that can have many advantages as well as it may be viewed at the existing cross-border congestions across Europe. An issue that should be taken into consideration is the mutual understanding between the local authorities and the local population; the inhabitants do not always follow administrators in their efforts to draw closer to each other.


Following the answers, it is noted that for a harmonious development of the two neighbouring cities (Annexe 12 – Table 12), from the students' answers there are three essential elements which refer to a percentage representing over 50% and that we believe as relevant to this positive outlook on the future, these are: information points, exchange programs, joint projects threw which can be obtained a lot of local, Euro-regional, regional, national funds and last but not least European structural funds that can represent an essential element for a harmonious construction of The Debrecen – Oradea Cross-border Agglomeration (Graph 12, Graph 13).

Graph 14. Oradea



Source: own elaboration based on research results


Graph 15. Debrecen



Source: own elaboration based on research results

In addition to relevant indicators resulting from the answers of the three target groups, we can single out three more indicators that cumulated an additional 50%: for organization of joint job fairs (54.7% for the target group public opinion and 57.6% for the target group institutions), communication points at institutions 50% and not least for the indicator daily transport 57.4% at the target group public opinion (Graph 14).

Graphs 16. Comparative analysis of possible directions of common development Debrecen – Oradea



Source: own elaboration

According to the results of our research we note a very high percentage both in Oradea (59,5%) and in Debrecen (60.2%), that addresses the issue of developing crossborder projects for a common and efficient development of the two communities. The interest in setting up information points is directly related to the existing tourist side at the level of the two towns and counties that can be better showcased through a more sustained promotion. On the other hand, organizing mobilities considers the educational and institutional environment identifying the exchange of experience by crossborder mobility, the last two indicators being supported by our research on previous cooperation in the two areas in the two communities, Debrecen and Oradea.

Based on Western European models of best practices discussed in the chapter on case studies on various forms of crossborder, territorial and

Euro cooperation, we have demonstrated the importance and the area of influence: social, economic, institutional, educational of Debrecen and Oradea, town that can become an entity for Romanian-Hungarian territorial cooperation cooperation that brings value to the target area by ensuring welfare to the fields of activity and quality of human life.


The indicator we obtained further our research is sustained even from the perspective of Romanian - Hungarian border cooperation, with the two target communities of Debrecen and Oradea, counties of Bihor, Hajdú - Bihar, we notice the development of cooperation and in this sense we provide a number of data confirming the interrelationship areas subject to our study, focusing mainly on the period in which the Hungarian and Romanian are state-members of the European Union; the research directions that we turned to are the initiatives of Debrecen and Oradea municipalities through the common project titled "Window to Europe" and through the cross-border cooperation programme part of the Hungary-Romania Cross Border Cooperation Programmes 2007-2013 CBC implemented in the past within the region (Interreg IIIA in Hungary and Phare CBC in Romania) in order to stimulate cross-border cooperation in 2007-2013, through the European Regional Development Fund and the contribution of the two Member States (Annexe 7).

In terms of the annual joint project of the two communities of Debrecen and Oradea, where the main attraction is the pageant exhibition, organizing a conference with a very wide array of topics that relate primarily to an effective cooperation with results such as: support for joint projects for a joint development of the communities of Debrecen and Oradea, regional and Euro Dimensions of the two communities are part of joint development strategies and identify common points of cooperation between the two cities.

The second analysed dimension is the cross-border projects, based on the published statistical data about Romanian-Hungarian cross-border

cooperation with a target on 4 Romanian counties (Satu-Mare, Bihor, Arad and Timișoara) and 4 Hungarian counties (Szabolcs-Szatmar Bereg, Hajdú-Bihar, Bekes, Csongrad). We noted that the counties of Bihor (Ro) and Hajdú-Bihar (HU) are the most active on the Romanian and Hungarian sides, with a total of 36 implemented projects on the two financing priorities; the amount of implemented projects is 5761400 Euro, which is 37% of the European funding attracted for the Romanian-Hungarian border (Graph 15).

Graphs 17. HU-RO projects




Source : http://www.huro-cbc.eu/en/financed_projects, *Own elaboration*

Of the total funds raised towards the two big priorities where there is a balance of funding attracted on both sides of the border for Bihor and Hajdú – Bihar, we single out: 1.2.3 Cross-border news programmes, 2.2.2 Joint research projects, 2.3.1 Cooperation between education institutions,

2.5.1 Cooperation between communities (Graph 16). Based on the abovementioned data, we can say that the communities and counties of Debrecen-Oradea and the counties of Bihor-Hajdú-Bihar entered cooperation between the initiated projects (Annexe 8 Debrecen – Oradea Project).

Graphs 18. HU/RO Projects: Bihor and Hajdú Bihar County



Source : http://www.huro-cbc.eu/en/financed_projects

According to our work hypothesis that the Romanian-Hungarian border was before 1989 a closed border, since 1989 the border was opening and that brought free access (only passport) to the neighboring Hungary. After 1989 the Romanian-Hungarian border becomes a more open and more communicative border between the two nations and also between the two neighboring cities Debrecen and Oradea. Proximity, similar structure, common elements and similar interests led to a sustained cooperation and a common tool was the crossborder projects, beginning with the Phare CBC projects and followed by HU-RO, which based on the following statistical analysis Hajdu Bihar and Bihor and are most active on the Romanian-Hungarian border.

Finally to conclude the verification of the four hypotheses proposed at the beginning of our research we will bring in support of their validity the following elements:

According to hypothesis 1, after the first and the second world war, because of ideas of important personalities of the time and because of the evolution of forms of cooperation a number of European organizational, functional institutional forms appeared, Western European examples of good practice, in conjunction with the evolution of various crossborder cooperation, leading to the newest European instrument EGTC

With Hypothesis 2 we showed the evolution of various forms of NUTS cooperation between Romania and Hungary (levels: national, regional, county and local), based on the European model, identifying those NUTS levels and representative institutions of those levels, where there was cooperation in the past, and in the present with a good chance to develop these relations of cooperation for the benefit of local administrative units surveyed during our analysis. We also identify the Euroregional level which, although not part of NUTS, demonstrated the models of sustainable crossborder cooperation.

With Hypothesis 3 we showed that with the evolution of European legal instruments of cooperation, with the appearance and operation of EGTC Eurometropolis under this instrument, the towns Debrecen and Oradea, based on previous experience on crossborder cooperation, taking into account various forms and areas of cooperation, and not least the socio-geographical study, enables us to promote and propose the construction of a possible Eurometropolis Debrecen - Oradea with the help of the EGTC tool.

Going forward, Hypothesis 4 is confirmed by studies, database analyses and research findings in the towns of Debrecen - Oradea, that these towns are powerful centres in the area and also true urban centers with different functions, which can cooperate in the joint development, supported in order to produce value-added in the two communities and last but not least, a common development.

3.2. *SWOT analysis*

SWOT analysis method, analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats has been approached in various fields and is a tool for analyzing an organization's competitive position in relation to its competitor (Basu R. 2004).

In formulating marketing plans and programs, an organization follows a three-stage process involving: a SWOT analysis matching strengths and weaknesses to market opportunities and threats, a statement of strategic intent, preparation of a formal marketing plan (Sandhusen R. L. 2008).

Strength is an internal factor. Any source, skill or special capability in relation to the competition represents the company's strength. As opposed to strengths, a company's weaknesses represent an inadequacy in resources, skills or capabilities in relation to the competition. Factors such as lack of financial resources or marketing skills represent weaknesses. An opportunity is a favourable situation in the environment and the company should make best use of it. Further, developments like identification of a hitherto overlooked market segment change in competitive or regulatory circumstances, technological changes, improvement in the company's relationship with players at both ends of its value chain, etc. A threat is an unfavourable development in the environment which can adversely affect the company. SWOT analysis enables systematic identification of these factors and facilitates the best match between them (Stapleton J – Thomas M. J. 1997)

Based on the SWOT analysis we will try to capture the four fundamental dimensions of the analysis: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, categorized on two levels, which are internal factors and external factors of the two communities.

Another central element of the research was the SWOT analysis through which we wanted to capture the views of three target groups for internal and external elements of Debrecen and Oradea city.

The SWOT Analysis of Oradea revealed 52 indicators at the level of Debrecen and were identified 37 indicators of the most diverse which are found as internal factors (strengths, weaknesses), or external factors (opportunities, threats) (Annexe 9).

Looking at the results of the two neighbouring cities we can extract the common points that we can assign according to the following criteria: cultural, educational, neighbourhood, transport, tourism, modernization of the city

As we can see at Debrecen and Oradea cities level we can talk about six major common criteria, which can be taken into consideration for the thought of common development strategy of the two communities.

But of the six major criteria two of them come out, through the cumulative answers: cultural and educational criteria, here we can speak of two powerful cultural - educational cities where we can find two major university centres.

Among the common weaknesses we distinguish the following criteria: infrastructure and transport and jobs.

Regarding the weaknesses in the application period of the questionnaires in the Oradea city, the work on infrastructure was strengthened, circulation was more difficult and there was agglomeration, and the frequency of responses was very high due to this reason.

Although the two cities, counties put under sociological research have a strong economy in the development regions, they are 2 strong centres, with a low rate of unemployment, therefore an employment high, and it seems that this direction would a need to improve.

Analyzing the opportunities seen by respondents to the research, we observe that some of the indicators that are found on common strengths and opportunities are: tourism, city development, neighbourhood, infrastructure, and expressway.

Tourism is an important opportunity because of the existing touristic attractions at the two cities level, in addition if it showed the value of the cultural dimension that has been identified as strengths it would result an efficient Euroregional tourism which could grow. If we stick to the tourism, another opportunity for development could be the cross-border projects, Phare CBC on the Romanian side and the Interreg on the Hungarian which have a role in border development, while there is the possibility of developing the road infrastructure between the two communities.

Jobs represent the only common element for the two cities, a higher frequency encountered at Oradea city level, while in Debrecen the frequency is much lower, as for the rest there are different indicators for the two areas.

In the perspective of building a commune development strategy for Debrecen - Oradea the crossborder communities, the internal factors that relate directly to the two communities (strengths and weaknesses) must be taken into consideration as well as the external factors (opportunities that may exist for a harmonious development and last but not least the prevention of potential external threats).

Therefore it must be taken advantage over the cultural dimension - educational, neighbourhood size, proximity, tourism size and strengths, highlighting these, with the purpose of sustainable and strategic development, the use and the attraction of European funds for crossborder development.

From the weaknesses point of view, once identified, it is necessary for them finding elimination solutions or even the realisation of achievements with the purpose to turn them into strengths.

One of the strengths mentioned, tourism that appears to be opportunity must be exploited, taken advantage of the two neighbouring cities, in the same time with taking into consideration the cultural dimensions and the existing tourism resources by attracting grants, implementation of joint programs, integrated in tourism.

4. Conclusions, theses

During this doctoral work in the two dimensions that we approached, theoretical and practical, together with the results of this research, a statistical analysis of databases and maps in this chapter we will develop in this chapter the thesis, thus checking the hypotheses proposed at the beginning of our scientific research, justifying and also empowering all points of view issued on the topic being studied.

Thesis 1:

As I mentioned, Europe went through a series of transformations in terms of boundaries (Kocsis K. 2007; Kocsis K. – Schweitzer F. 2009; Picouet P. - Renard J.P. 2007; Rhen O. 2006; Süli-Zakar I. 2006; Süli-Zakar I. 2002), due to conflicts and European interests that have made their mark throughout history towards harmonious development of regions (Glenny M. 2000; Castellan G., 1991; Pecout F. 2004).

From this point of view, Romania and Hungary in terms of socio-economic and political systems that manifested in this area have encountered a series of difficulties in the direction of cross-border cooperation, but after 1990 we can observe a series of gradual improvements, noting at the same successful models for European cross-border cooperation, examples of good practice on both sides of the border, which had had as main goal to ensure a high quality of life in various areas of specific interest to the regions under discussion. We singled out three forms of successful cooperation: Regio Basiliensis, Rhin and Eurometropole Maastricht Lille - Kortrijk - Tournai, the latter form of cooperation is the first form of cooperation using the new legal instrument called

EGCT. In view of this fact, we bring in discussion an evolution of various forms of cross-border cooperation, but territorial at the European level.

Table 20. The most important legal documents of the European Union related to CBC

1974	Resolution on Co-operation between Local Communities in Frontier Areas (Resolution 74)
1980	European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities (with outline agreements, contract and statutes)
1983	European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter (The Torremolinos Charter)
1985	European Charter of Local Self – Government
1987	Legal Declaration on Cross-border Co-operation
1988	Community Charter for Regionalization
1995	European Convention on Transfrontier Television
1998	Additional Protocol to the European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities
2002	Strategies for Promoting Cross-Border and International Co-operation in an Enlarged EU
2004	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European grouping of cross – border co – operation (EGCC)


Source: Klara Czimre, *Cross-Border Co-operation – Theory and Practice*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, 2006, p.45

In addition of the legal instruments existing until 2004, listed in the table above, there is a new bound instrument, for the purpose of implementing territorial cooperation programs or projects co-financed by the Community, notably under the Structural Funds in conformity with Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 and Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006, EGTC, LKT Eurometropolis first in this direction has been established based on the new European instrument in 2008.

Thesis 2:

The following thesis is based on assumptions 2; in the direction we wish to highlight the various types of territorial administrative units - NUTS, operating at Romanian-Hungarian border, our central point of maximum interest

and communities being Debrecen and Oradea, and through the NUTS system we will be make a sketch where the diversity of these units are shown especially in the area where in particular Romania and Hungary intersect. This sketch highlights the euroregional dimension, which is not captured by NUTS, including the territorial cooperation form Eurometropolis Debrecen - Oradea.



Source: own elaboration based on research results

The scope of the building the sketch is to highlight the outlined levels: local, county, regional and national, through the various NUTS elements functional on both sides of the Romanian-Hungarian border; this sketch focuses on the Debrecen and Oradea neighbouring communities, which are the basis of our innovative construction shaped as the instrument that is Eurometropolis EGCT Debrecen – Oradea.

¹⁰ Euroregional Level: Carpathian Euroregion

¹¹ Hungary – National Level

¹² Regional Level: The Ejszak Alföld Development Region (HU)

¹³ Bihor – Hajdu Bihar Euroregion

¹⁴ Bihor County (RO), Hajdu Bihar county (HU)

¹⁵ North – West Development Region , North Transylvania

¹⁶ Romania – National Level

In terms of communication between counties (Bihor-Hajdú Bihar county), and local level (Debrecen - Oradea), if before 1990 when the border was very closed, very few Romanians or Hungarians were able to visit the neighbouring country or city, after 1990 the data is radically changed, and the confirmation comes even from the research run in Oradea and Debrecen. Thus we can observe an increase in the visits by Oradea inhabitants, starting off the target group students 52 %, public opinion 61%, and institutions 69%. On the other side of the border, in Debrecen, students 37%, public opinion 47%, institutions 48,5%. In conclusion, we can note an increase in increments in the number and frequency of visits in direct relation with the age groups.

The main scopes for which visits take place are: tourism (with percentages between 10.3%, students and 18% institutions), transit (with maximum 12.7% for institutions, from Oradea to Debrecen), shopping (the lowest percentage, 13.6%, for students and the highest, 24.6%, for the public opinion, over 25 years old). Another relevant result proves us that at least between one quarter and 32% of the populations of the two cities have visited the correspondent city at least once, by using their own car: 25.8% by the Hungarians, and 44.1% by the Romanians.


The cross border communication does not stop here; at the Romanian-Hungarian NUTS level there is collaboration recorded on various levels:

- national level: there is relevant collaboration between governments and ministries for developing common solutions
- development regions level: there is a collaboration protocol between the North-West Development Region (Regiunea de Dezvoltare Nord-Vest) and Eszák Alföld Region, oriented towards tourism, environment protection, rural and agricultural developments, development of human resources, economy and business, research-development-innovation, accessibility and infrastructure, culture and sports, institutional cooperation, Structural Funds and project management (<http://www.nord->

vest.ro/DESPRE-NOIAgentia-de-Dezvoltare-Regionala-Nord-Vest/
REGIUNEA-TRANSILVANIA-DE-NORD/Regiuni-partenere.html).

The counties of Bihor and Hajdú Bihar are represented at the cross border communication level through the HU-RO projects, an area where the two counties are most active on the Romanian-Hungarian border, visible both in the number of implemented projects, and funding attracted within various areas of interest and priorities.

Map. 18 Budget and number of HU-RO Projects



Source : http://www.huro-cbc.eu/en/financed_projects

At the level of cooperation between the two cities, there is a project, currently running since 2005, with continuity up to 2011 (Annexe 8).

Thesis 3:

Based on examples of good practice in the cross-border cooperation from Western Europe, in time, with developing various European instruments for cross-border cooperation, a new instrument has arisen: an

instrument for territorial cooperation EGTC, Eurometropolis, cooperation that can be carried out at the border of at least two states, at the level of two or more cities, at a much higher dimension

Comparatively between the forms of cooperation: Euro-regions and Eurometropolis, as cooperation and level of development, the Eurometropolis prevails because we are talking about communities, cities, much more developed, with different functions, with a very diverse range of cooperation areas.

In this respect, our proposal for territorial cooperation in the form of EGTC, Eurometropolis Debrecen - Oradea, may represent a much more efficient by comparison with previous forms of cooperation (and we mention here the euroregional cooperation).


Eurometropolis Debrecen – Oradea (EGTC)

In recent years, co-operation between border-side cities intensified in the eastern periphery of the EU as well in the course of which near border towns are intended to make steps in order to harmonize their economic, medical and educational activities and services. There are fine examples in Western Europe for successful co-operation of near border cities like Basel-Mulhouse-Freiburg in the core are of Regio Baseliensis, or border-side metropolises, Maastricht-Aachen-Liege-Hasselt of Euroregio Mass-Rhein. Similar good example of co-operation is found in the Goodstadt (Lille-Tourcoing-Roubaix-Ieper-Kotrijk-Tournai) Eurometropolis where measures in order to solve border-side and cross-border problems (e.g. mass transport, economic development, health care, development of human resources, air quality and waste management). Joint cross-border plans and aims of these Eurometropolises are supported strongly by the cohesion politics of the EU (Süli-Zakar I. 2008).

Among the CBC institutions of Hungary and Romania it is regarded to be a novelty to work for a successful Eurometropolis by Debrecen and Oradea (Map19. Debrecen-Oradea cross-border Eurometropolis (2007-2013)).

A very good reason for a sustained cooperation, common for Debrecen and Oradea communities is found in the very idea of the project for Debrecen – Oradea Agglomeration where all three target groups gave favourable answers for the cross border cooperation, the percentages being representative: the lowest percentage was 51.7% for students in Debrecen, and the highest percentage was recorded by the people working within representative institutions in Oradea (Graph 17).

Graph 19. The interest for a future Debrecen –Oradea project




Source: own elaboration based on research results

On the other hand it is beneficial that the two close cities separated by a border try to harmonize their activity in several fields. There are already – or currently under establishment – workgroups that intend to help to harmonize human resource development, to improve accessibility, to develop joint infrastructure, to harmonize tourism and health, to develop inter-ethnic connections and common economy. This may lead to the establishment – with the help of EU cohesion support – of the educational, R+D and health tourism innovative cluster of Debrecen-Oradea. In forming the cross-border innovative

cluster of Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis the co-operating universities of the two cities will have an important role (Süli-Zakar I. 2009).

Map 19. Debrecen-Oradea cross-border Eurometropolis (2007-2013)



Source, *István SÜLI-ZAKAR*, The Role of the Euroregions and Eurimetropolises in the Etheralisation of the Borders in the Eastern Periphery of the European Union, in *Eurolimes 7*, Edited By Dorin Ioan Dolghi, Gilles Rouet, Zsolt Radics, Bruylant, 2009, p.144.

We believe in two reasons for a possible Debrecen – Oradea Eurometropolis.

The first reason concerns the sustainable competitive advantage which creates an economic cluster is the result "economies of agglomeration and proximity", that economies of scale and scope achieved by grouping the firms in the cluster, derivative, or very low cost / further investment, using only the existing resources of the cluster members. The second reason is based on the advantage of the Hungarian work zone in the activity of identifying and

accrediting of emerging clusters of at least two years from the Romanian border (Popoviciu - Țoca 201) based on the Debrecen – Oradea SWOT analysis we identified 6 major fields of interest for Debrecen and Oradea: cultural, educational, neighbourhood, transport, tourism, modernization of the city.

Considering that the common needs of both communities from both sides of the Romanian-Hungarian border could be better handled by creating a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation between the two poles of urban development Oradea - Debrecen, we propose below some elements that we consider indicative of a potential project of this kind (Annexe10).

Thesis 4:

In completion of the objectives of a future Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis, looking at the results of the two neighbouring cities we can extract the common points that we can assign according to the following criteria:

Table 21. The objectives of a future Debrecen – Oradea Eurometropolis

Criteria	Oradea	Debrecen
Cultural ¹⁷	Cultural Objectives Buildings Architecture, Churches	Culture Religion ¹⁸
Educational	Academic background High school background	Academic background
Neighbourhood	Geographical position Frontier, Custom/house	Regional Point ¹⁹
Transport	Transport Infrastructure	Transport Infrastructure
Tourism and Modernization of the city		

Source: own elaboration based on research results

¹⁷ Edited by Stoica A. – Francfort D. - Csoba Simonne J. (2010): *The Cultural Frontiers of Europe*, Volume 9, Oradea University Press, Spring, pp.5-8

¹⁸ Edited by Sipos S. – Banus E. – Kocsis K. (2008): *Religious Frontiers of Europe*, Volume 5, Oradea University Press, Spring, pp.56-63

¹⁹Süli-Zakar I., *Debrecen Megyei Jogú Város Makroregionális Szerepköre*, MTA Regionális Kutatások Központja, Pecs-Debrecen,1994, pp.171-201


All objectives proposed for a future Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis focus on common actions for the two neighbouring cities on both sides of the border. The main scope would be to provide for the citizens optimum conditions and lifestyle and not least, a common, sustainable and harmonious development of the Eurometropolis.

The Regulation on EGTC, Council 2006b, enables regional and local authorities from different EU countries to set up grouping of territorial authorities across the UE to create a transboundary authority with legal personality (Duhr S., Colomb C., Nadin V. 2010). The arguments we make in support of the Eurometropolis Debrecen - Oradea in its EGTC form rely primarily on the results of research conducted in the target cities on three target groups and the indicators derived from studies identifying the six major focus common areas supporting such form of territorial cooperation:

- the cultural dimension is represented in the opinions issued by the three target groups of Debrecen and Oradea: cultural objectives, buildings architecture, churches, religion and culture. As argument to support this field we bring for the Romanian side the map of Oradea Metropolitan Area (Map 20-21, p.115) and for the Hungarian side a number of elements showing evidence for cultural heritage, both Hajdu Bihar County and the city of Debrecen (Map 22-23, p.116). The cultural factor can have a triple significance, with three substantial and divergent roles within the multilateral context of the political action: identity politics, trans-cultural and transnational cooperation (Telo M. 2009).

Thus, from the political perspective we need to follow the next strategies in order to support the cultural factor (Telo M. 2009): the recognition of diverse cultural identities, the recognition of democracy under the rule of law and universal basic rights as a binding legal framework by all cultural communities, the fair participation of all in the social and economic resources and opportunities both of their own society and of the global society, a fair multilateralism in the making of those political decision that affect all of them.


Map 22. Debrecen cultural heritage



21. Bihartorda – Református templom
22. Bojt – Református Templom
23. Borsos – Református templom
24. Darvas – Görögkeleti templom
25. Eber – Református templom
26. Erdős – Református templom
27. Földes – Református templom
28. Fülöp – Római katolikus templom
29. Fülöp – Római katolikus templom
30. Furta – Református templom
31. Furta – Református templom
32. Gerbelyháza – Római katolikus templom
33. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
34. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
35. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
36. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
37. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
38. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
39. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
40. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
41. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
42. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
43. Hajdúbagos – Református templom
44. Kismaja – Református templom
45. Kismaja – Református templom
46. Kismaja – Református templom
47. Kismaja – Református templom
48. Kismaja – Református templom
49. Kismaja – Református templom
50. Kismaja – Református templom
51. Kismaja – Református templom
52. Kismaja – Református templom
53. Kismaja – Református templom
54. Kismaja – Református templom
55. Kismaja – Református templom
56. Kismaja – Református templom
57. Kismaja – Református templom
58. Kismaja – Református templom
59. Kismaja – Református templom
60. Kismaja – Református templom
61. Kismaja – Református templom
62. Kismaja – Református templom
63. Kismaja – Református templom
64. Kismaja – Református templom
65. Kismaja – Református templom
66. Kismaja – Református templom
67. Kismaja – Református templom

Map 23. Hajdú Bihar cultural heritage

- DEBRECEN
1. Csisz Grand Hotel Aranybika
2. Csokonai Színház – Főépülete
3. Debrecen Fodalmi Múzeum
4. Erdőssy Múzeum
5. Erdőssy Múzeum
6. Kossuth tért
7. Medgyessy Ferenc Emlékmúzeum
8. MODERN Modern és Kortárs Művészeti Központ
9. Református Kollégium
10. Református Kollégium
11. Szent Anna-templom
12. Szent Anna-templom
13. „Cion-templom” – Református káptalan
- HAJDÚ-BIHAR
14. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
15. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
16. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
17. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
18. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
19. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
20. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
21. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
22. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
23. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
24. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
25. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
26. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
27. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
28. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
29. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
30. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
31. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
32. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
33. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
34. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
35. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
36. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
37. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
38. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
39. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
40. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
41. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
42. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
43. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
44. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
45. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
46. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
47. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
48. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
49. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
50. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
51. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
52. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
53. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
54. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
55. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
56. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
57. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
58. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
59. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
60. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
61. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
62. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
63. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
64. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
65. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
66. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom
67. Berekbelsőszőlő – Református templom



Source: <http://www.bihar-bihar.eu/en-hajdu-bihar-county-9.html> and 11.html - Own elaboration

- education is the most important dimension of the SWOT analysis of Debrecen and Oradea, being the indicator that received the most nominations in both Debrecen and Oradea, with two major universities within this region, with historical tradition and long-term cooperation in this field: the University of Oradea and the University of Debrecen (Kozma G. 2011).

For question 7 of the research instrument there have been listed more representative institutions for Oradea and Debrecen, and for our study the representative institution for the cultural - educational field we have selected the University of Oradea and the University of Debrecen, showing the high degree of trust of the two institutions, which can constitute an engine for development within the cross border educational field and not only.

Tabel 22. The responses of the three target groups on confidence in the University of Oradea and University of Debrecen

No crt	University	<i>Very big</i>		<i>Big</i>		<i>Small</i>		<i>Very small</i>	
		Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
A	Students	20.4 %	39.6%	37.1%	38.3%	29.3%	16.7%	13.1%	5.4%
B	Public opinion	6.9%	31.9%	31%	51.1%	43.8%	14.9%	18.2%	2.1%
C	Institutions	6.9%	31.7%	31%	54.9%	43.8%	9.8%	18.2%	3.7%

Source: Constantin – Vasile Țoca, Cultural-educational development strategies at the level of the Debrecen – Oradea communities, in New Results of Cross-Border Co-Operation, Edited by Kozma Gabor, 2011, Didakt Kft, p.34

Another example of good practice EUCOR is an interuniversity cooperation of great success that brings together the universities

from Bâle, Freiburg, Karlsruhe, Strasbourg and Mulhouse, so that within the pillar of science-university there is a common effort, sustained according to a mutual development strategy.

Another example of educational cooperation is given by the cities of Kerkrade (Holland) and Herzogenrath (Germany), which through the international municipality called EURODE, with special status, has developed a bilingual educational project at the primary schools under the name "Eurobabel".

Frankfurt and Sublice created the Viadrina European University with a common programme for German and Polish students (GeoJournal 54, 2001)

- The dimension of the neighbourhood highlights the indicators: geographical position, border, custom / house, regional point, substantiation of these indicators can be done by a small distance linking the two villages - 70 km, the diversity of access points in the neighbouring country, which allows the existence of close links between the two cities and it is a viable perspective for a common sustainable development
- transport infrastructure is another joint strong argument
- the tourist potential highlights the potential of the two cities and we can even extend to the two neighbouring counties that have a number of advantages which can be turned into strong points in terms of attracting European tourists together with non-European ones; this fact, if transformed into an operational element, may attract financial funding in the region, leading to joint regional tourism and development. In support of this argument, we bring to your attention the joint cross-border cooperation project that promotes tourism in the counties of Hajdu-Bihar and Bihor (<http://www.bihar-bihor.eu/en>)

- the last dimension highlighted by the SWOT analysis is the development and modernization of cities. We can remind here both local funds and European funds raised in the above mentioned directions for sustainable development.

Debrecen and Oradea are authorized to create and develop a joint territorial cross-border cooperation, starting off from historical inheritances, and here we can talk about a historical cooperation with the two counties being found under the form of Bihor County, the two cities representing two true and also powerful centres: economic, educational, cultural, religious or administrative ones, so that, while relying on the historical legacy and cooperation, we could say that the two communities can develop a new form of territorial cooperation under the new European territorial instrument EGTC, Eurometropolis Debrecen - Oradea.

To highlight this new form of cooperation we will bring the support of a brief SWOT analysis.

Table 23. SWOT analysis of a new form of cooperation

Strong points Previous research Previous cooperation Joint project NUTS elements Ethnic and cultural diversities Accessibility of border (internal border of the EU) Making of EGTC	Weak points There is no EGTC in Romania Low political interest for this issue Lack of lobby
Opportunities EGTC instrument Structural funds, Projects HU-RO	Threats Interest groups

Source: own elaboration based on research results

In conclusion, the new EGTC that we are proposing at the Romanian - Hungarian border, at the level of Debrecen and Oradea cities as the

Eurometropolis Debrecen - Oradea, is a form of territorial cross-border cooperation, from more points of view:

- novelty – because it adapts to new EU legal instruments, using EGTC for that purpose
- essentiality – it might be the first EGTC at the Romanian - Hungarian border
- Previous cross-border cooperation - there was a number of ideas, projects that have developed in the cities of Debrecen - Oradea, as well as at the level Bihor - Hajdú Bihar Euroregion, which have resulted in visible outcomes and relations including the contemporary period (here we mention the education and cooperation area, conducted under the management of the Institute for Studies Euroregional (Horga I. - Süli-Zakar I. 2010; Süli-Zakar I. 2011; Analele U.O., vol II, 2010).
- example of good practice – the form of cooperation that we proposed can easily become a successful model for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe
- innovative element – an essential element near the Romanian-Hungarian border – even the national level can be innovative because no one at this level can find a shape similar to what we proposed.
- usefulness of research – our studies conducted by Romanian and Hungarian researchers in the direction of cross-border cooperation in various fields of interest

Thesis

1st, thesis: During our research, we have demonstrated that in the case of our countries, the borders and border regions in the past two decades have undergone a series of transformations, which heavily influenced the harmonious development of the regions and cross-border relations. We have

proved in several studies that in the past decades, the border between Hungary and Romania is crossed by Euroregions and Eurometropolises, which are contributing effectively to the development of cross-border relations. During our research we have studied the positive examples from Western Europe, and we have examined how we can apply and introduce them (for example the EGTC) in our region.

2nd, thesis: In recent years, our researches have demonstrated that in the areas along the Romanian-Hungarian border effective forms of cooperation have been established, of which the Carpathian Euroregion stands out for the '90s, and later on the Danube - Tisa - Kris-Mures Euroregion, the Hajdu-Bihar - Bihor Euroregion, and in recent years the Debrecen-Oradea Eurometropolis, showing a particularly distinctive activity. (DebOra project).

3rd thesis: In our studies carried out in the recent years we have demonstrated that Debrecen and Oradea with its more than 700 hundred years relationship provides a good basis, that between the two cities located along border, besides the objectively present competition, to be also considerable space for cooperation. In case of the multi-functional large cities, the cross-border relations – we have demonstrated with our comparative inquiries –have more possibilities, than in the case of regions, counties or municipalities.

4th, thesis: Based on our scientific research the two cities can work successfully in the following areas: such as education, culture, transport, tourism, urban modernization-urban rehabilitation and the (international) migration between various regions. We have also examined these during our doctoral research, we have proven their feasibility, serving with scientific foundation for future developments. In addition, however, there are still various areas – such as environmental protection, or security policy, which may be subject to further investigations.

Különböző területi szinteken működő – a román-magyar határon átnyúló – együttműködések, különös tekintettel a Debrecen – Nagyvárad Eurometropoliszra (European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation - EGTC)

(magyar nyelvű összefoglaló)

Az elmúlt évtizedekben Európában a határon átnyúló kapcsolatok elismert és tudományos módszerekkel is kutatott jelenségcsoporthoz tartozott. Az egységesülő Európában a nemzetállami határok jelentős akadályt jelentettek, amelyek gátolták az egyének, a gondolatok, a tőke és az áruk szabad áramlását. Ezért a formálódó Európai Unió vezetői támogatták a határok lebontását és ennek elsőszámú szervezeti formáit az eurorégiók és az utóbbi években az eurometropoliszok tevékenységét. Nyugat-európai példák alapján szerveződtek meg a mi térségünkben is az eurorégiók, majd az első eurometropoliszok.

A határon átnyúló kapcsolatok kutatása különösen aktuális a mi térségünkben, kitüntetetten a magyar-román határ mentén, amely hosszú időn át Európa egyik legzártabb határa volt (Süli-Zakar, 2003; Ilieș A, 2010). A rendszerváltásokat követően fokozatosan áteresztővé vált a magyar – román határ, amely mindkét ország számára alapvető jelentőséggel bír. A magyar-román határon átnyúló kapcsolatok fejlesztése különösen aktuális, hiszen a trianoni békeszerződés következtében létrejött határok kettévágták például

Debrecen és Nagyvárad vonzáskörzeteit, melyek újjáélesztésére napjainkban az európai integráció és különösen pedig az eumetropolisz program (DebOra-projekt) kínál történelmi lehetőséget. (Süli-Zakar – Horga, 2003)

H1. Az I. világháború után Európa megosztottá vált, új politikai határokat rajzoltak, új államok jöttek létre, így megnőtt Európa államainak száma. A törpe és mini-államokat is beleszámítva félszáz kis- és közepes államterületre szabdalódott fel kontinensünk. A sok politikai államhatár az együttműködés, és egységesülés legfontosabb akadályá lett.

Sir Winston Churchill a II. világháború után az Egyesült Államokban lévő Fultonban megtartott beszédében mondta, hogy „vasfüggöny ereszkedett le Európára, mely szétválasztja a kontinenst”. Ennek következtében Nyugat-Európában a kor számos személyisége – köztük Robert Schumann, Jean Monnet, Konrad Adenauer, Paul-Henri Spaak és mások – elméletek egész sorát dolgozták ki az Egyesült Európa létrehozására, mely párosult a határok felszámolásának gondolatával is.

Hipotézisünkkel hangsúlyozni szeretnénk a Nyugat-európai példák pozitív hatásait, a történelmi személyiségek 1990-es rendszerváltások után megfogalmazott véleményeit, melyek hatottak Közép- és Kelet-Európa, mindenek előtt a Magyarország és Románia között húzódó elzáró jellegű határ fokozatos megszüntetésére és a hosszú távú fenntartható fejlődéssel szemben álló társadalmi-gazdasági akadályok felszámolására. A helyes, európai szintű gyakorlati példák megjelenésével és fejlődésével a határon átnyúló kapcsolatok számos formája bontakozott ki a magyar-román határ mentén is.

Mint korábban említett tettünk róla, a határok szempontjából a konfliktusok és az európai érdekek következtében Európa az átalakulások sorozatán ment keresztül, melyek rányomták bélyegüket a régiók harmonikus fejlődése felé vezető folyamat egészére (végeredményben az egységesülő EU-27 megszületésére).

Ebből a szempontból, a társadalmi-gazdasági és politikai rendszereikből fakadóan a Románia és Magyarország közötti határon átnyúló kapcsolatok nehézségek egész sorával voltak terhelve. 1990 után azonban több, fokozatos előrelépés történt, melyek ugyanakkor figyelembe vették az európai határon átnyúló kapcsolatok sikeres példáit, amelyek, jó gyakorlatot kínáltak a határ mindkét oldala számára. Ezek legfontosabb célja az volt, hogy az érintett régiókban különböző területeken biztosítsanak magasabb életminőséget. A sikeres együttműködések három formáját választottuk ki: Regio Basiliensis, Maas-Rhein and Eurometropole Maastricht, Lille – Kortrijk – Tournai (LKT). Az utóbbi együttműködés az első olyan, amelyik az EGTC-nek nevezett új EU-s támogatási eszközt használja fel. E tény alapján, nemcsak a határon átnyúló kapcsolatok különböző formáit elemezzük a dolgozatban, hanem területileg is kiterjesztjük vizsgálatainkat kontinensünk jelentős területeire.

A 2004-ig született jogi eszközökön kívül egy újonnan elfogadott eszköz is létrejött a Közösség által társfinanszírozott területi együttműködési programok és projektek megvalósítása érdekében. Nevezetesen a Strukturális Alapok alá tartozó, 2006 júliusában elfogadott, a 1083/2006-os és 1080/2006-os számú Európai parlamenti és tanácsi (EK) rendelettel összhangban lévő EGTC képviseli azt az új európai támogatási eszközt, amelyet ily módon elsőként, a 2008-ban létrehozott LKT Eurometropolisz használta fel (EGTC, 2008: Comittee of Regions, 2007).

1., tézis: Kutatómunkánk során bizonyítottuk, hogy országain esetében a határok és a határtérségek az elmúlt két évtizedben átalakulások sorozatán mentek keresztül, melyek rányomták bélyegüket a régiók, és a határon átnyúló kapcsolatok harmonikus fejlődésére. Számos tanulmányban igazoltuk, hogy az elmúlt évtizedekben a Magyarország és a Románia

közötti határt eurorégiók valamint eurometropoliszok szelik át, melyek eredményesen működnek közre a határon átnyúló kapcsolatok fejlesztésében. Kutatásaink során tanulmányoztuk a Nyugat-európai pozitív példákat, s vizsgáltuk, hogy hogyan tudjuk azokat (pl. az EGTC-t) a mi térségünkben is alkalmazni, ill. bevezetni.

H2. A volt szocialista országok körében végbement rendszerváltás – hosszabb távon – elhozta az EU tagságot is számukra (Magyarország esetében 2004-ben, Románia esetében 2007-ben).

Ezekben az országokban 1993. február 14-én jelent meg először az euroregionalizmus, amikor Debrecenben Lengyelország, Ukrajna és Magyarország külügyminisztereinek és helyi önkormányzati képviselőinek részvételével lezajlott találkozón megalapították a Kárpátok Eurorégiót (Süli-Zakar I., 2008). Az esemény után számos eurorégió jött létre követve ezt a jó európai példát, mely meghonosodott Nyugat-Európában, később Közép- és Kelet-Európát is, ahol a határok elválasztó szerepe számottevően csökkent.

Véleményünk szerint, a román-magyar határ az eurorégiók működésének következtében 1990 után szintén átalakult: Bihar – Hajdú-Bihar Eurorégió (2002. október 11-én Nagyváradon írta alá a romániai Bihar Megyei Tanács és a magyar Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Önkormányzat elnöke) (Ilieș A., 2004), a Kárpátok Eurorégió (1993-ban), a Duna-Körös-Maros-Tisza Eurorégió (Dél-Nyugat-Romániában a határon átnyúló együttműködés első formái 1992-ig nyúlnak vissza és az Eurorégió 2003. május 24-én történt hivatalos bejelentését követően kezdték meg irodáinak működését Szegeden és Dunărea de Jos-ban). Jól látható eredmény a magyar-román határ esetében – mely például a kommunizmus időszaka alatt az egyik legzártabb és leginkább elszigetelt határ volt, azonban napjainkra nyitott határrá vált (az EU csatlakozás következtében). Köszönhetően elsősorban annak, hogy a két ország, Hajdú-Bihar és Bihar megye, valamint a két szomszédos város,

Debrecen és Nagyvárad között jó a kommunikáció, és mindez segíti a partnerországokat abban, hogy közös politikai, gazdasági és szociális fejlődést érjenek el, mely tovább erősíti a fenntartható és hatékony együttműködést.

Ez a tézis a második feltételezésünkön alapul, mellyel szeretnénk rávilágítani a román-magyar határ mentén lévő, különböző területi közigazgatási NUTS-egységek helyzetére és szerepére, központi figyelmet szentelve a Debrecen és Nagyvárad közötti közösségeknek. A NUTS-rendszer áttekintésével készítünk elemzést Románia és Magyarország érintkezési területéről, mely településhálózati szempontból különösen elaprózott. Kutatásunk rávilágít az euroregionális dimenzióra, mely – beleértve a Debrecen-Nagyvárad Eurometropolisz területi együttműködési formát is – nem része a NUTS-rendszernek.

Kutatásunk a következő kiemelt szintekre terjedt ki: lokális/települési, megyei, regionális és országos szintek. A különböző funkcionális NUTS elemeken keresztül a román-magyar határ mindkét oldalát be kívánjuk mutatni, elsősorban a Debrecen és Nagyvárad szomszédságában fekvő településekre koncentrálva, mely terület alkotja a jövőben létrehozandó Debrecen-Nagyvárad EGTC eurometropolisz innovatív kezdeményezés alapját.

A két (Bihar és Hajdú-Bihar) megye közötti, valamint a lokális szinten zajló (Debrecen – Nagyvárad) kommunikáció 1990 előtt – amikor a határ igen zártnak tekinthető – meglehetősen csekély mértékű volt, szerény számú román, illetve magyar állampolgárnak volt lehetősége átlátogatni a szomszédos országba, illetve városba. Ez a helyzet azonban 1990 után nagymértékben megváltozott, melyet a Nagyváradra és Debrecenre vonatkozó kutatás eredményei is megerősítenek. Ennek következtében a nagyvárad lakosok magyarországi látogatásainak számában jelentős növekedést lehetett megfigyelni, a megkérdezett tanulói célcsoport 52%-a, a lakossági célcsoport 61%-a és az intézményi célcsoport 69%-a már járt Magyarországon. A határ másik oldalán fekvő Debrecenben megkérdezett diákok 37%-a, a lakosok 47%-a

és az intézmények válaszadóinak 47%-a látogatott át Nagyváradra. Konklúzióként megjegyezhetjük, hogy a látogatások száma és gyakorisága közvetlen és erősödő kapcsolatban van a korcsoporti megoszlással.

A látogatás célja a következőképpen alakult a megkérdezettek körében: turizmus (10,3% a diákok és 18% az intézmények esetében), tranzit (az intézmények esetében volt a maximális érték, 12,7%); bevásárlás (a diákok esetében volt a legalacsonyabb 13,6%-os érték, a 25 év feletti lakosság esetében pedig a legmagasabb – 24,6%-os – részesedés). Egy másik lényeges eredmény azt bizonyítja, hogy a vizsgált két város lakosságának legalább negyede, illetve 32%-a minimum egyszer már átlátogatott a másik városba. Ennek során a magyarok 25,8%-a, a románoknak pedig 44,1% saját autóval tette meg az utat.

A határon átnyúló kommunikáció azonban túlmutat a településközi kapcsolatokon, s román-magyar együttműködésben különböző NUTS-szinteken is megjelenik:

- országos szint: lényeges együttműködés van a kormányzatok és minisztériumok között a különböző problémák közös megoldásának kidolgozása érdekében
- fejlesztési régiók szintje: együttműködési megállapodás van az Északnyugati Fejlesztési Régió (Regiunea de Dezvoltare Nord-Vest) és az Észak-alföldi Régió között, mely az idegenforgalom, a környezetvédelem, a mezőgazdasági és vidékfejlesztés, a humánerőforrás-fejlesztés, a gazdaság, a kutatás-fejlesztés-innováció, az elérhetőség és az infrastruktúra, a kultúra és a sport, intézményi együttműködés, valamint a Strukturális Alapok és projektmenedzsment témakörére terjed ki (<http://www.nord-vest.ro/DESPRE-NOIAgentia-de-Dezvoltare-Regionala-Nord-Vest/REGIUNEA-TRANSILVANIA-DE-NORD/Regiuni-partenere.html>).
- Bihor és Hajdú-Bihar megye határon átnyúló együttműködés kommunikációja elsősorban a HU-RO projekteken keresztül jelenik meg, olyan területen, ahol a

H3. Nyugat-Európában az eurorégiók jó gyakorlatának példáján túl a fejlődés eredményeként más funkcionális koncepciók is megjelentek, melyek közül elsősorban az eurometropoliszokat lehet megemlíteni. Ez az együttműködési forma legalább két állam határán, két vagy több nagyváros szintjén megjelenő magas szintű és különböző mértékű kooperáció kifejlődését jelenti.

Az eurometropoliszok és az eurorégiók együttműködési és fejlettségi szintjének összehasonlítása során az előbbi van előnyösebb helyzetben, mivel sokkal magasabb átlagos fejlettségű közösségek és városok, magasabb funkciókra kiterjedő és igen széles skálán mozgó kooperációjáról lehet beszélni.

Debrecen és Nagyvárád két olyan város, melyek közel nyolcszáz évre visszatekintő közös történelemmel rendelkeznek, ezért úgy véljük, hogy a közeljövőben sokkal szorosabb együttműködést jelentő projektek fognak kibontakozni a két település közösségeinek szintjén, másrészt Közép- és Kelet-Európában ez által lehetne megalapozni a jó gyakorlat példáját, mivel így létrejönne a térség legmodernebb és legmagasabb szintet jelentő határon átnyúló (CBC) szervezete.

A határon átnyúló együttműködések nyugat-európai jó gyakorlati példáit alapul véve, a határon átnyúló kapcsolatokat támogató különböző európai eszközök megjelenése után egy új támogatási forma jött létre: a területi együttműködést támogató EGTC "eszköz" az eurometropoliszok létrehozása érdekében, mely legalább két ország határán, legalább két vagy több város szintjén, magasabb dimenzióban jelenhet meg.

A CBC együttműködések két formáját (eurorégiók – eurometropoliszok) összehasonlítva megállapítható, hogy a kooperáció és a fejlettségi szint tekintetében az eurometropolisz előnyben van, mivel ezek esetében sokkal fejlettebb városokról és közösségekről van szó, nagyobb választékú funkciókkal és szélesebb körű együttműködési területekkel (Süli-Zakar, 2004).

Ebben a tekintetben, az EGTC formájában megvalósuló területi együttműködésre, a Debrecen-Nagyvárad Eurometropolisz létrehozására tett javaslatunk a többi CBC kooperációhoz viszonyítva (pl. az euroregionális együttműködések) sokkal hatékonyabb lehetőséget jelent.

Eurometropolis Debrecen – Oradea (EGTC)


Az elmúlt években, a határ mentén fekvő városok közötti együttműködések az EU keleti perifériáján is intenzívebbé váltak, egymás közelében lévő városok lépéseket szándékoztak tenni annak érdekében, hogy összehangolják gazdasági, egészségügyi és oktatási tevékenységeiket és szolgáltatásaikat. Határ közeli városok sikeres együttműködésére olyan nagyszerű példákat lehet találni Nyugat-Európában, mint a Basel-Mulhouse-Freiburg háromszög a Regio Basiliensis, vagy a Maastricht-Aachen-Liege-Hassel határmenti metropoliszok a Maas-Rajna Eurorégióban. Az együttműködésre hasonlóan jó példát szolgáltat a Goodstadt Eurometropolisz (Lille-Tourcoing-Roubaix-Ieper-Kotrijk-Tournai), ahol különböző módszereket dolgoztak ki annak érdekében, hogy megoldják a határmenti és határon átnyúló problémákat (például közösségi közlekedés, gazdaságfejlesztés, egészségügy, humán erőforrás-fejlesztés, levegőminőség és hulladékkezelés). A közös határon átnyúló terveket és e metropoliszok céljait jelentősen támogatja az EU kohéziós politikája. (Süli-Zakar I., 2009)

A fenntartható együttműködés igen jó indoka, hogy a Debrecen és Nagyvárad agglomerációjára megfogalmazott projekt ötletét a két város közösségeinek mindhárom célcsoportja kedvezően ítélte meg és pozitívan nyilatkoztak a határon átnyúló kapcsolatokról. Az erre vonatkozó százalékos értékek reprezentatívnak bizonyultak: a debreceni diákok válaszai jelentették a legalacsonyabb értéket 51,6%-kal, míg a legmagasabb arányban a nagyváradi képviselői intézményekben dolgozók adtak kedvező választ a kérdésre.

Másrészt az is előnyös, hogy a határ által elválasztott két város számos területen próbálja összehangolni a tevékenységeit (3. ábra). Már

létező – vagy jelenleg formálódó – munkacsoportok próbálják segíteni a humán erőforrások, az interetnikus kapcsolatok, a gazdaság, az idegenforgalom, az egészségügyi szolgáltatások, az elérhetőség és az infrastruktúra közös fejlesztésének harmonizálását. Ez – az EU kohéziós forrásainak támogatásával – elvezethet a Debrecen-Nagyvárad innovatív oktatási, kutatás-fejlesztési és egészségügyi turisztikai klaszter létrehozásához. A Debrecen-Nagyvárad Eurometropolisz határon átnyúló innovatív klaszterének formálódásában fontos szerepe lesz a két város egymással együttműködő egyetemeinek (Süli-Zakar I., 2009).

19. ábra. A Debrecen-Nagyvárad határon átnyúló eurometropolisz (2007-2013)



Forrás: Süli-Zakar I., 2009

Két ok miatt tartjuk megvalósíthatónak a Debrecen-Nagyvárad eurometropolisz elképzelését. Az első ok a fenntartható versenyelőnyre

vonatkozik, mely az agglomerációs gazdaságok és a közelség eredményeképpen gazdasági klasztert formál. A méretgazdaságosság és a nagyobb piaci hatókör a cégek klaszterbe tömörülésével, másodlagos, vagy nagyon olcsó / további befektetésekkel érhető el, melyek pusztán a klaszter tagjainak meglévő erőforrásait használják fel. A második ok az elmúlt legalább két évben a román határ magyar oldalán megjelent klaszterek felismerésének és elfogadásának előnyén alapul (Popoviciu – Țoca, 2011), melyek a Debrecen-Nagyváradra készült SWOT-analízisben azonosított hat fő együttműködési területhez köthetőek (kultúra, oktatás, humán kapcsolatok, közlekedés, idegenforgalom, városmodernizáció) (Annexe 10).

Tekintve, hogy a román-magyar határ különböző oldalán fekvő két közösségnek közös szükségletei vannak, jobban lehetne ezeket kezelni a városi fejlődés két pólusa – Debrecen és Nagyvárad – közötti Európai Területi Együttműködési Csoportosulás létrehozásával. A következő néhány javaslatunkról úgy véljük, hogy kedvező és előremutató az ilyen jellegű potenciális projektek esetében.

3., tézis: Az elmúlt években elvégzett vizsgálatainkkal bizonyítottuk, hogy Debrecen és Nagyvárad több mint hétszáz éves kapcsolata jó alapot szolgáltat arra, hogy a határ mentén fekvő két nagyváros viszonylatában az objektíven meglévő városverseny mellett az együttműködésnek is tág tere van. A multifunkcionális nagyvárosok esetében a határon átnyúló kapcsolatoknak – bizonyítottuk összehasonlító vizsgálatainkkal – sokkal több lehetősége van, mint régiók, megyék vagy településszövetségek esetében.

H4. A jövőbeni Debrecen-Nagyvárad eurometropolisz célkitűzéseinek megvalósítása során a két szomszédos város által elért eredmények közül ki tudunk választani közös elemeket, melyeket a

következő kritériumok alapján ki lehet jelölni és ezeket konkrét lépésekkel meg is lehet valósítani.

Minden, a jövőbeni Debrecen-Nagyvárad eurometropolisz számára javasolt célkitűzés a határ két oldalán fekvő szomszédos városoknak ajánlott közös lépésekre koncentrál. A fő tevékenységi körnek arra kellene irányulnia, hogy a polgárok számára optimális feltételeket, életkörülményeket és nem utolsó sorban egy közös, fenntartható és harmonikusan fejlődő eurometropoliszt tudjanak létrehozni (4. táblázat).

Minden, a jövőbeni Debrecen-Nagyvárad eurometropolisz számára javasolt célkitűzés a határ két oldalán fekvő szomszédos városoknak ajánlott közös lépésekre koncentrál. A fő tevékenységi körnek arra kellene irányulnia, hogy a polgárok számára optimális feltételeket, életkörülményeket és nem utolsó sorban egy közös, fenntartható és harmonikusan fejlődő eurometropoliszt tudjanak létrehozni.

21. táblázat: A megvalósítandó Debrecen-Nagyvárad Eurometropolisz célkitűzései

Kritérium	Nagyvárad	Debrecen
Kulturális	Kulturális célkitűzések Építészeti örökség, Egyházak	Kultúra Vallás
Oktatási	Egyetem Főiskola	Egyetem
Szomszédság	Földrajzi helyzet Határ, vámhivatal	Regionális központ
Közlekedés	Közlekedés Infrastruktúra	Közlekedés Infrastruktúra
Idegenforgalom		
Városmodernizáció		

Forrás: saját szerkesztés a kutatás eredményei alapján

Az EGTC-ről szóló rendelet, Council 2006b a különböző EU országok regionális és helyi önkormányzatai számára lehetővé tette, hogy területi önkormányzatok csoportot alkotva jogi személyiséggel rendelkező

határon átívelő hatóságot hozhassanak létre (Duhr S., Colomb C., Nadin V., 2010). Az EGTC-n belül létrehozandó Debrecen-Nagyvárad eurometropolisz melletti érvek elsősorban a célvárosok három célcsoportja körében végrehajtott kutatások eredményein, és az ilyen jellegű területi együttműködést támogató hat főbb közös tématerületet megállapító tanulmányokból származó indikátorokon alapulnak:

- a kulturális dimenzió megjelent a három megkérdezett debreceni és nagyváradai célcsoport véleményeiben: kulturális objektumok, épített környezet, egyházak, vallás és kultúra. Ezt alátámasztandó a disszertációban mellékelünk egy térképet a Nagyvárad Metropolitan Területről és Hajdú-Bihar megyéről, illetve Debrecen városáról, melyek nagyszámú eleme a gazdag kulturális örökségről tanúskodik. A kulturális faktornak hármasság fontossága van, három alapvető és különböző szereppel rendelkezik a többoldalú politikai tevékenységen belül: lehet identitási kérdés, kultúrák közötti és transznacionális együttműködés (Telo, M., 2009). Így, a politikai perspektívától a kulturális faktor érdekében szükséges a következő stratégiákat követni (Telo, M., 2009): a különböző kulturális identitások elismerése, a demokrácia törvényi keretek közötti és az egyetemes alapvető jogok elismerése, mely elengedhetetlen összekötő elemnek tekinthető minden kulturális közösség számára. Szükség van továbbá mindenki korrekt szerepvállalására a saját közösség és a globális társadalom számára rendelkezésre álló társadalmi és gazdasági erőforrások használatában, és becsületes többoldalúságra a mindenkit érintő politikai döntéshozatal kialakításában, megvalósításában.
- Oktatás. A régió két legnagyobb egyeteme – a Nagyvárad Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem és a Debreceni Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem – történelmi tradíciókkal és hosszú távú együttműködéssel rendelkezik az oktatás-kutatás területén. Egyébként is az oktatási kapcsolatok meghatározó jellegűek esetünkben, ahogyan azt a SWOT analízis is bizonyította.

Külföldi pozitív példák: Az EUCOR egy nagy sikerű egyetemek közötti együttműködés, mely közelebb hozta egymáshoz Bâle, Freiburg, Karlsruhe, Strasbourg és Mulhouse egyetemeit, így a tudományegyetemek pillérén belül létezik együttes és lankadatlan törekvés a közös fejlesztési stratégiának megfelelően.

Az oktatási együttműködés másik példáját Kerkrade (Hollandia) és Herzogenrath (Németország) városok szolgáltatják, melyekben a különleges státuszú EURODE nevű helyhatóság „Eurobabel” elnevezés alatt kifejlesztett egy kétnyelvű oktatási projektet az általános iskolák számára.

Frankfurt és Sublice közös programmal hozta létre a Viadrina Európai Egyetemet német és lengyel diákok számára (GeoJournal 54, 2001).

- A szomszédság dimenziója a következő indikátorokat emeli ki: földrajzi helyzet, határ, vámhivatal, regionális központ. Ezen indikátorok a két város közelsége (távolságuk mindössze 70 km) és szomszédos országok közötti összeköttetések intenzitása – jelentősége folytán bizonyíthatóan teljesülnek, melyek biztosítják a Debrecen és Nagyvárad közötti szoros kapcsolatot, s életképes perspektívát jelentenek a közös fenntartható fejlődéshez.
- szintén erős közös feladatot jelent az összekapcsolódó közlekedési infrastruktúra fejlesztése.
- az idegenforgalmi potenciál kiemeli a két város lehetőségeit és ez a két szomszédos megyére is kiterjeszthető, mivel számos előnyös jellemzőjük van, melyek európai és Európán kívüli turisták számára is fontos vonzó tényezőkké tehetők. Amennyiben ezek valóban működő elemekké válnak, pénzügyi támogatást vonzhatnak a régióba és hosszabb távon közös regionális idegenforgalom és fejlesztés kialakításához vezethetnek. Ennek az érvnek az alátámasztása érdekében, fel lehet hívni a figyelmet a Hajdú-Bihar és Bihor megye idegenforgalmának

előmozdítását célzó közös határon átnyúló projektekre (<http://www.bihar-bihor.eu/en>).

- a SWOT-analízis által kiemelt utolsó dimenzió a két városra vonatkozó fejlesztés és modernizáció. Itt lehet utalni a fenntartható fejlődés korábban említett irányainak megvalósítását szolgáló helyi és európai fejlesztési forrásokra.

Debrecen és Nagyvárad felkészült arra, hogy közös határon átnyúló területi kezdeményezést indítson és fejlesszen, kiindulva a történelmi örökségükből, és ennek kapcsán lehet említést tenni a két megye hosszú múltú együttműködéséről, mely Bihar megye létrejöttéig nyúlik vissza. A két város céljait egyesítve valódi egyben erős központnak tekinthető: gazdasági, oktatási, kulturális, vallási és adminisztratív szempontból, emiatt miközben az együttműködés történelmi örökségére is támaszkodik, azt mondhatjuk, hogy a két közösség az EGTC új európai eszközének köszönhetően a területi együttműködés eddig nem létező formáját hozhatja létre – a Debrecen-Nagyvárad Eurometropoliszt.

Az új együttműködési forma hangsúlyosabbá tétele érdekében egy **SWOT-analízist** készítettünk:

Erősségek: megelőző kutatás, korábbi együttműködés, közös projektek, NUTS-elemek, etnikai és kulturális sokszínűség, határ megközelíthetősége és átjárhatósága (az EU belső határa), EGTC kialakítása

Gyengeségek: Romániában nincsen EGTC, a kérdés iránti csekély a politikai figyelem, lobbi hiánya

Lehetőségek: EGTC pénzügyi eszköz, strukturális alapok, HU-RO projektek

Veszélyek: érdekcsoportok ellentétei

Összességében véve az általunk javasolt román-magyar határ menti új EGTC, mely Debrecen és Nagyvárad szintjén a két város

eurometropoliszaként valósulhatna meg, a területi együttműködés új formájának tekinthető több szempontból is:

- újszerűség – mivel egy új EU eszközt, az EGTC-t használja fel erre a célra;
- fontosság – ez lenne az első EGTC a román-magyar határ mentén (sőt egész Közép- és DK-Európa területén);
- korábbi határon átnyúló kapcsolatok – számos elképzelés, projekt született Debrecen és Nagyvárad, valamint a Bihar – Hajdú-Bihar Eurorégió szintjén, melyek látható eredménnyel jártak, és kapcsolatok kiépüléséhez vezettek, a jelenlegi időszakot is beleértve (itt lehet megemlíteni az oktatási és együttműködési területet, mely az Institute for Studies Euroregional (IERS) irányítása alá tartozik (Horga I. Süli-Zakar I., 2010, I Süli-Zakar, 2011,));
- jó gyakorlati példa – az általunk javasolt együttműködési forma könnyen válhat sikeres modellé a közép- és kelet-európai országok számára;
- innovatív elem – alapvető tényező a román-magyar határ mentén – de még országos szinten is innovatív lehet, mivel az általunk javasolt formához nincsen hasonló ezen a szinten;
- a kutatás hasznosíthatósága – a román és magyar kutatók által irányított kutatásaink a határon átnyúló kapcsolatok különböző területeire terjedtek ki.

4., tézis: Tudományos kutatásunk alapján a következő területeken működhet eredményesen együtt a két város: mint például oktatási, kulturális, közlekedési, turisztikai téren, vagy a városmodernizáció – város rehabilitáció, az egyes térségek közötti (nemzetközi) migráció. Ezeket a doktori kutatásim során magam is vizsgáltam, megvalósíthatóságukat bizonyítottam, és tudományos alappal szolgáltam a jövőbeni fejlesztések számára. Ezen kívül azonban még számos olyan terület van – mint pl. a környezetvédelem, vagy biztonságpolitika, melyek további vizsgálatok tárgyát képezhetik.

PhD disszertációmban tudományos bázison álló kutatási eredményekkel vizsgáltam a magyar-román határon átnyúló kapcsolatokat, kiemelten a Debrecen-Oradea eurometropolisz jellegű CBC szervezet kialakításának feltételeit. Kutatási eredményeimre alapozva fogalmaztam meg fejlesztési javaslataimat az érintett nagyvárosok – megyék – és mindazon intézmények vezetői számára, akik érdekeltek a határon átnyúló kapcsolatok fejlesztése érdekében. Bízom benne, hogy a disszertációmmal hozzájárulok a magyar-román határon átnyúló kapcsolatokról kialakított tudományos ismeretek bővítéséhez, s tudományos eredményeimmel elősegítem azok gyakorlati alkalmazását. Kutatásaim során azonban természetesen csak egy kisebb részét tudtam feltárni ennek a sokszínű és bonyolult jelenségcsoportnak, amely mind számomra, mind a témában kutatók számára is további vizsgálatok elvégzését követeli meg.

Concluzii, teze

Pe parcursul lucrării de doctorat, în cadrul celor două dimensiuni atinse de către noi, dimensiunea teoretică și dimensiunea practică, și a rezultatelor obținute în urma cercetărilor întreprinse, analiza statistică a bazelor de date și a hărților realizate, vom dezvolta, în acest capitol tezele lucrării, verificând astfel ipotezele propuse la începutul demersului nostru științific, justificându-ne și împuternicind totodată punctele de vedere atinse pe marginea temei studiate.

Teza 1:

După cum am menționat anterior, Europa a trecut printr-o serie de schimbări în ceea ce privește granițele (Kocsis K. 2007; Kocsis K. – Schweitzer F. 2009; Picouet P. - Renard J.P. 2007; Rhen O. 2006; Súli-Zakar I. 2006; Súli-Zakar I. 2002), din cauza conflictelor, iar schimbarea intereselor europene au favorizat apariția unor regiuni de dezvoltare omogene (Glenny M. 2000; Castellan G., 1991; Pecout F. 2004).

Din acest punct de vedere, Romania și Ungaria, în termeni socio-economici și politici, au întâmpinat dificultăți în direcția cooperării transfrontaliere; după 1990 se pot observa o serie de îmbunătățiri graduale, luând ca exemplu de bune practici alte zone din Europa, pentru a asigura o creștere a calității vieții în regiunile în cauză. Dintre aceste exemple de success, putem aminti: Regio Basiliensis, Rhin și Eurometropola Maastricht precum și Lille -

Kortrijk - Tournai, astfel, cea din urmă, folosindu-se de cel mai recent instrument numit EGTC. În continuarea acestei idei, e important să aducem în discuție evoluția diverselor forme de cooperare transfrontalieră la nivel european.

Tabelul 20. Cele mai importante documente ale Uniunii Europene cu privire la cooperarea transfrontalieră


1974	Rezoluția privind Cooperarea dintre Comunitățile Locale în Zonele de Frontieră (Rezoluția 74)
1980	Convenția Cadru Europeană privind Cooperarea Transfrontalieră dintre Comunitățile Teritoriale sau Autoritățile (cu acorduri cadru, contract și statute)
1983	Carta Europeană privind Planificarea Regională/Teritorială (Carta Torremolinos)
1985	Carta Europeană privind Autogovernarea Locală
1987	Declarația legală privind Cooperarea Transfrontalieră
1988	Carta Comunitară privind Regionalizarea
1995	Convenția Europeană privind Televiziunea Transfrontalieră
1998	Protocol adițional la Convenția Cadru Europeană privind Cooperarea Transfrontalieră dintre Comunitățile Teritoriale sau Autoritățile
2002	Strategii pentru Promovarea Cooperării Transfrontaliere și Internaționale într-o Uniune Europeană Extinsă
2004	Propunere de Regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului privind stabilirea unor Grupuri de Cooperarea Transfrontalieră (EGCC)

Sursa: Klara Czimre, *Cross-Border Co-operation – Theory and Practice*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debrecen, 2006, p.45

Pe lângă instrumentele disponibile până în 2004, aflate în lista de mai sus, există un nou tip de instrument creat cu scopul de a implementa proiecte și programe de cooperare teritorială, cofinanțate de Comunitate, în mod special, sub egida fondurilor structurale în conformitate cu Regulamentul (EC) Nr 1083/2006 și Regulamentul (EC) Nr 1080/2006, date de Parlamentul European și de Consiliul din 5 iulie 2006 denumit EGTC (Grupare Europeană pentru Cooperare Teritorială); LKT Eurometropolis este prima grupare construită folosind noul instrument în 2006.

Teza 2:

Următoarea teză se construiește pe două direcții: în primul rând, e important de detaliat diversele tipuri de unități teritorial-statistice – NUTS – funcționale la nivelul graniței dintre România și Ungaria, cu precizarea că, aria noastră de interes o reprezintă comunitățile din Oradea și Debrecen. În al doilea rând, vom schița răspândirea acestor unități ale sistemului NUTS, încercând să surprindem diversitatea acestora în zona de intersecție dintre România și Ungaria. Următoarea diagramă surprinde și dimensiunea euroregională, care nu apare la nivelul NUTS, inclusiv cooperarea teritorială din Eurometropola Debrecen – Oradea, plus celelalte nivele NUTS.



Sursa: elaborate pe baza cercetării proprii

²⁰ Nivelul Euroregional: Euroregiunea Carpatica

²¹ Ungaria – Nivelul Național

²² Nivelul Regional: Regiunea Ejszak Alföld (HU)

²³ Euroregiunea Bihor – Hajdu Bihar

²⁴ Județul Bihor (RO), Județul Hajdu Bihar (HU)

²⁵ Regiunea de dezvoltare Nord-Vest , Nordul Transilvaniei

²⁶ România – Nivelul Național

Scopul acestei schițe este să prezinte nivelele cadru: local, național, regional, interconectate prin sistemul NUTS, prin elemente funcționale pe ambele părți ale graniței dintre România și Ungaria; schița se concentrează pe comunitățile vecine, Oradea și Debrecen, grupate într-o structură inovatoare denumită Eurometropola Debrecen – Oradea, construită pe baza instrumentului EGTC.

În ceea ce privește comunicarea între județe (Bihor-Hajdú Bihar) și nivelul local (Oradea - Debrecen), dacă, înainte de 1990, aceasta era limitată, foarte puțini cetățeni, ai ambelor țări, aveau posibilitatea de a trece granița, după 1990 situația se schimbă, aspect confirmat de datele colectate din Oradea și Debrecen. Se poate observa o modificare semnificativă a vizitelor efectuate de orădeni, cu o creștere de 52% în rândul grupului țintă de studenți, precum și, o creștere în ceea ce privește percepția opiniei publice (persoanele peste 25 de ani), cu 61% și, nu în ultimul rând, o creștere la nivelul instituțiilor de 69%. Pe cealaltă parte a graniței, în Debrecen, datele statistice ale grupurilor țintă se prezintă după cum urmează: 37% în rândul studenților, 47% la nivelul opiniei publice și 48.5% la nivelul instituțiilor. În concluzie, din perspectiva comunicării transfrontaliere la nivelele județean și local, se poate observa o creștere unitară în privința vizitelor efectuate la nivelul eșantionului.

Principalele scopuri ale vizitelor sunt: turismul (10.3% în rândul studenților, 18% la nivelul instituțiilor), tranzit (un maxim de 12.7% între instituțiile din Debrecen și Oradea), cumpărături (cel mai mic procentaj de 13.6% pentru studenți, iar cel mai mare procentaj, 24.6%, la nivelul opiniei publice. Un alt rezultat relevant, în acest sens, ne arată că între 25% și 32% din populația unui oraș a vizitat cel puțin o dată orașul vecin; la nivelul mijlocului de transport ales, mașina personală a fost în preferințele a 25.8% dintre maghiari și 44.1% pentru români.


Comunicarea transfrontalieră nu se oprește aici, la nivelul NUTS colaborarea dintre România și Ungaria funcționează pe mai multe registre:

- La nivelul național, există o colaborare între guvern și ministere, pentru dezvoltarea de soluții comune;

- La nivelul regiunilor de dezvoltare, există un protocol de colaborare între Regiunea de Dezvoltare Nord – Vest (România) și Regiunea Eszak Alföld (Ungaria), orientat spre domenii precum turismul, protecția mediului, dezvoltarea rurală și a agriculturii, dezvoltarea resurselor umane, a economiei și a afacerilor, dezvoltarea domeniului de cercetare și inovație, accesibilitate, infrastructură, cultură și sport, cooperarea instituțională, fonduri structurale și management de proiecte (<http://www.nord-vest.ro/DESPRE-NOIAgentia-de-Dezvoltare-Regionala-Nord-Vest/REGIUNEA-TRANSILVANIA-DE-NORD/Regiuni-partenere.html>).

Județele Bihor și Hajdú Bihar sunt reprezentate la nivelul de comunicare transfrontalieră prin proiectele HU-RO; zona se remarcă prin o activitate de colaborare intensă de-a lungul graniței dintre România și Ungaria, activitate vizibilă prin prisma proiectelor implementate ,precum și, prin fondurile atrase spre această zonă și prin prioritățile de dezvoltare alese.

Harta. 18 Bugetul și numărul de proiect HU-RO



Sursa : http://www.huro-cbc.eu/en/financed_projects

La nivelul cooperării, dintre cele două orașe există un proiect, în desfășurare din 2005, ce se continuă până în 2013 (Anexa 8).

Teza 3:

Pe baza exemplelor de bune practici dezvoltate, în timp, la nivelul Europei de vest, s-au concretizat o serie de instrumente pentru cooperare transfrontalieră. Cel mai nou instrument de cooperare teritorială, EGTC (Eurometropolis) funcționează pe baza cooperării dintre cel puțin două state, la nivelul a cel puțin două orașe, cu o dimensiune mult extinsă, în ceea ce privește cooperarea.

Comparând cele două modele de cooperare, cel al Euroregiunilor și cel al Eurometropolis la capitolul dezvoltare, Eurometropolele se dovedesc mai eficiente, pentru că se apropie de comunități și orașe cu diferite funcții și areale de cooperare, cu un grad de dezvoltare mult mai crescut.

În acest sens, propunerea noastră de cooperare teritorială sub forma EGTC, Eurometropola Debrecen – Oradea, reprezintă un model de eficiență în comparație cu precedentele forme de cooperare (Euroregiunile).

Eurometropola Debrecen – Oradea (EGTC)


În ultimii ani, cooperarea dintre orașele apropiate de graniță s-a intensificat în Europa de Est, aceste orașe având ca și obiectiv armonizarea activităților economice, medicale, educaționale și al sectorului serviciilor. Există numeroase exemple de succes în vestul Europei, în ceea ce privește cooperarea dintre orașele de graniță precum Basel-Mulhouse-Freiburg în cadrul Regio Basiliensis sau în cazul metropolelor Maastricht-Aachen-Liege-Hasselt din Euroregiunea Mass-Rhein. Un exemplu similar se poate regăsi și în Eurometropola Goodstadt (Lille-Tourcoing-Roubaix-Ieper-Kotrijk-Tournai), unde s-au întreprins măsuri pentru probleme de natură transfrontalieră (transportul în comun, dezvoltarea economică, sănătate, dezvoltarea resurselor umane, calitatea aerului și managementul deșeurilor). Planurile comune înglobează cooperarea

transfrontalieră de acest gen, iar dezvoltarea Eurometropolelor este puternic susținută de politicile de coeziune ale UE (Sülü-Zakar I. 2008).

Succesul unui proiect de Eurometropolă între Debrecen și Oradea este o noutate la nivelul instituțiilor responsabile cu cooperarea transfrontalieră din Ungaria și România (Aglomerarea comunităților transfrontaliere Debrecen-Oradea (2007-2013).

O motivație bună pentru cooperare susținută o reprezintă percepția comunităților din Oradea și Debrecen vis-a-vis de acest proiect. Toate cele 3 grupuri țintă au dat răspunsuri favorabile privind cooperarea transfrontalieră, procentajele fiind reprezentative: cel mai mic procentaj a fost înregistrat în cadrul studenților din Debrecen cu 51.1%, iar cel mai ridicat procentaj a fost înregistrat în rândul angajaților instituțiilor reprezentative din Oradea (graficul 17).

Graficul 19. Interesul pentru un viitor proiect Debrecen –Oradea



Sursa: elaborare pe baza cercetării proprii

În același timp, este benefic pentru ambele orașe frontaliere să-și armonizeze activitatea în câteva domenii. Există deja, sau se organizează deja, grupuri de lucru axate pe armonizarea dezvoltării resurselor umane, accesibilității, infrastructurii comune, turismului și sănătății, precum și

Debrecen-Oradea cross-border eurometropolis (2007-2013)

Worksgroups:

- regional and urban development
- development poles
- human resources
- accessibility
- infrastructure development
- migration
- tourism
- environmental health
- region and urban marketing
- security
- identity, inter-ethn ic relationship
- CBC cross-border connections

Goal: establishment of joint education-research-development-health tourism (innovative) cluster of Debrecen-Oradea

Legend:

- Motorway
- First class road
- Second class road
- Other road
- Border of the Debrecen-Oradea agglomeration
- Hajdú-Bihar-Bihor Euroregion
- Bihor-Bihar Euroregion
- Small and middle towns belonging to the agglomeration
- Hortobágy National Park

Credem, în două motivații pentru dezvoltarea unei Eurometropole
Debrecen – Oradea.

În primul rând, crearea unui grup economic pe baza unei “economii a aglomerației și proximității” aduce beneficii în direcția unui avantaj competitiv sustenabil; firmele din acest areal își concentrează activitatea spre grup, folosind resursele din interiorul acestuia pentru a crește gradul de eficiență și a putea investi în continuare. În al doilea rând, Ungaria și-a dezvoltat un avantaj de doi

ani în fața României, în ceea ce privește identificarea și acreditarea sectoarelor de lucru emergente din jurul arealului transfrontalier (Popoviciu - Țoca 2011). Pe baza analizei SWOT la nivelul Debrecen – Oradea, am identificat 6 domenii majore de interes pentru cele două orașe: cultură, educație, vecinătate, transport, turism, modernizare urbană.

Luând în considerare faptul că nevoile comunităților de pe ambele părți ale graniței româno-maghiare ar putea fi mai bine satisfăcute prin crearea unui EGTC între cele două poluri de dezvoltare, Oradea respectiv Debrecen, propunem o serie de elemente importante pentru un potențial proiect de acest gen (anexa 10).

Teza 4:

În completarea obiectivelor unei viitoare Eurometropole Debrecen-Oradea, prin analiza datelor specifice fiecărui oraș, se pot extrage o serie de idei organizate în funcție de următoarele criterii:

Tabelul 21. Obiectivele unei viitoare Eurometropolă Debrecen – Oradea

Criteriul	Oradea	Debrecen
Cultural ²⁷	Obiective culturale Clădiri, Arhitectură, Biserici	Cultură Religie ²⁸
Educațional	Învățământ superior Învățământ liceal	Învățământ superior
Vecinătate	Poziția geografică Frontieră, Punct de trecere	Punct regional ²⁹
Transport	Transport Infrastructură	Transport Infrastructură
Turismul și modernizarea urbană		

Sursa: elaborare pe baza cercetării proprii

²⁷ Editat de Stoica A. – Francfort D. - Csoba Simonne J. (2010): *The Cultural Frontiers of Europe*, Volumul 9, Oradea University Press, Primăvara, pp.5-8

²⁸ Editat de Sipos S. – Banus E. – Kocsis K. (2008): *Religious Frontiers of Europe*, Volumul 5, Oradea University Press, Primăvara, pp.56-63

²⁹Süli-Zakar I., *Debrecen Megyei Jogú Város Makroregionális Szerepköre*, MTA Regionális Kutatások Központja, Pecs-Debrecen,1994, pp.171-201


Toate obiectivele propuse pentru o viitoare Eurometropolă Debrecen-Oradea se concentrează pe acțiunea celor două orașe de o parte și de alta a graniței. Scopul principal este asigurarea unor condiții optime pentru a crește calitatea vieții locuitorilor, iar, în același timp, asigurarea unui climat armonios pentru dezvoltarea sustenabilă a Eurometropolei.

Regulamentul privind EGTC, elaborat de Consiliu în 2006, permite autorităților locale sau regionale din țările membre UE să creeze grupuri teritoriale care pot avea inclusiv autoritate în zonele transfrontaliere și personalitate juridică (Duhr S., Colomb C., Nadin V. 2010). Argumentele susținute de noi în favoarea unei Eurometropole Debrecen-Oradea, pe modelul EGTC, se bazează, în principal, pe rezultatele cercetării întreprinse în cele două orașe pe cele trei grupuri țintă. Indicatorii folosiți în cadrul acestei cercetări se grupează în 6 dimensiuni importante în cadrul unei astfel de cooperare teritorială:

- Dimensiunea culturală se regăsește în opiniile emise de cei interogați în cadrul celor trei grupuri țintă din Oradea și Debrecen prin asocieri cu: obiective culturale, arhitectură, biserici, religie și cultură. În suportul acestui argument prezentăm o hartă a Zonei Metropolitane Oradea (hartă 20-21, p.115), iar, pe cealaltă parte a graniței, o serie de elemente, ce scot în evidență moștenirea culturală a județului Hajdu Bihar și al orașului Debrecen (Hărțile: 22-23, p.116). Factorul cultural are și o a treia semnificație, îndeplinind trei roluri semnificative, dar divergente, în contextul acțiunii politice din zonă: politici identitare, cooperare transculturală și transnațională (Telo M. 2009). Astfel, din perspectivă politică, cultura trebuie urmărită și sprijinită cu atenție (Telo M. 2009), pentru a putea susține identități culturale, democrația și statul de drept și drepturi universale într-un cadru legislativ care să includă toate comunitățile culturale, să se poată asigura accesul echitabil la resursele economice și sociale și la oportunitățile oferite de societatea comunităților cât și de societatea globală, un multilateralism echitabil în ceea ce privește deciziile politice care afectează toți locuitorii.

Harta 20. Patrimoniul cultural din Oradea

Harta.21 Patrimoniul cultural din ZMO



Sursa: <http://www.igri.ro/ro/cercetare/proiecte>

- Educația reprezintă cea mai importantă dimensiune, cuprinsă în analiza SWOT realizată în arealul Debrecen și Oradea, deoarece este indicatorul care a apărut cel mai frecvent atât în Debrecen cât și în Oradea, cu atât mai mult, în mediul academic, la Universitatea din Oradea și Universitatea din Debrecen care au un istorie bogată la nivelul acestei cooperări (Kozma G. 2011).

Pentru cea de-a 7-a întrebare din cadrul instrumentului de lucru, am inclus o listă mai mare de instituții reprezentative din Oradea și Debrecen, iar pentru instituții reprezentative pentru dimensiunea cultural – educațională, am selectat Universitatea din Oradea și Universitatea din Debrecen, ținând cont de gradul ridicat de încredere al celor două instituții, ce poate constitui un motor pentru dezvoltarea acestor dimensiuni în zona transfrontalieră și nu numai.

Tabelul 22. Nivelul de încredere al grupurilor țintă la nivelul Universității din Oradea și a Universității din Debrecen

Nr. crt	University	Foarte mare		Mare		Puțină		Foarte puțină	
		Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
A	Studenti	20.4 %	39.6%	37.1%	38.3%	29.3%	16.7%	13.1%	5.4%
B	Opinia publică	6.9%	31.9%	31%	51.1%	43.8%	14.9%	18.2%	2.1%
C	Instituții	6.9%	31.7%	31%	54.9%	43.8%	9.8%	18.2%	3.7%

Sursa: Constantin – Vasile Țoca, Cultural-educational development strategies at the level of the Debrecen – Oradea communities, in New Results of Cross-Border Co-Operation, Edited by Kozma Gabor, 2011, Didakt Kft, p.34

Un alt exemplu de bune practice EUCOR e coopearea interuniversitară dintre universitățile din Bâle, Freiburg, Karlsruhe, Strasbourg and Mulhouse unde efortul comun, susținut, a dus la

dezvolarea unui pilon în domeniul cercetării pe baza unei strategii de dezvoltare comună.

Cooperarea dintre orașele Kerkrade (Olanda) și Herzogenrath (Germania) reprezintă un alt exemplu. Prin intermediul unui instrument de coordonare intermunicipală numit EURODE, cu statut special, cele două orașe au dezvoltat un proiect de educație bilingv pentru clasele primare denumit "Eurobabel".

Orașele Frankfurt și Sublice au creat Viadrina European University, un program comun pentru studenții germani și polonezi (GeoJournal 54, 2001).

- Dimensiunea vecinătății cuprinde următorii indicatori: poziția geografică, frontiera, punctele de trecere a frontierei, punctele regionale; aceste aspecte se materializează printr-o apropiere, dintre cele două orașe, de numai 70 km și, de diversitatea punctelor de acces, care asigură existența unei legături strânse și a unei perspective pentru dezvoltare comună, sustenabilă.
- Infrastructura de transport e un alt argument important.
- Potențialul turistic al celor două orașe e strâns corelat cu potențialul celor două țări, prezentând numeroase avantaje, ce se pot transforma ușor în atragerea de turiști europeni și din afara Europei; operaționalizarea acestui element poate atrage și fonduri în regiune, spre a dezvolta un turism regional. Pentru a întări acest argument, aducem în discuție proiectul transfrontalier privind promovarea turismului în județele Hajdu-Bihar și Bihor (<http://www.bihar-bihor.eu/en>)
- Ultima dimensiune, prezentată în cadrul analizei SWOT ține de dezvoltarea și modernizarea orașelor. În acest sens, au fost atrase fonduri locale și europene pentru a crea un climat de dezvoltare sustenabilă.

Debrecen și Oradea au posibilitatea de a crea și de a dezvolta o cooperare teritorială transfrontalieră pornind de la o moștenire istorică. În această direcție se poate vorbi despre o cooperare istorică, ambele orașe având elemente comune, în același timp prezentând atuuri proprii ca și puternice centre economice, educaționale, culturale, religioase sau administrative. Pornind de la această moștenire, cele două comunități, pot dezvolta o nouă formă de cooperare teritorială, folosindu-se de noul instrument European, EGTC, sub construcția unei Eurometropole Debrecen-Oradea.

Pentru a sublinia acest instrument de cooperare, vom prezenta o scurtă analiză SWOT.

Tabelul 23. Analiză SWOT a modelului EGTC de cooperare

Puncte tari Cercetări anterioare Cooperare anterioară Proiecte comune Elementele NUTS Diversitate culturală și etnică Frontieră accesibilă (frontieră internă a UE) Existența cadrului pentru EGTC	Puncte slabe Nu există o structură EGTC în România Interes politic limitat pentru subiect Lipsa acțiunii de lobby
Oportunități Instrumentul EGTC Fondurile structurale, Proiectele HU-RO	Amenințări Grupuri de interese

Sursa: elaborare pe baza cercetării proprii

În concluzie, noul instrument propus de noi, EGTC, la nivelul graniței dintre România și Ungaria, ulterior la nivelul orașelor Debrecen și Oradea sub forma unei Eurometropole prezintă următoarele caracteristici:

- Noutate – adoptă noi instrumente europene, folosindu-se de EGTC în acest scop.

- Esențialitate – primul EGTC la nivelul graniței dintre România și Ungaria.
- Experiența unei cooperări anterioare – există un număr important de idei, proiecte care s-au dezvoltat între orașele Debrecen – Oradea, și chiar la nivelul Euroregiunii Bihor - Hajdú Bihar, care au avut rezultate vizibile continue (merită menționată cooperarea educațională, în acest sens, prin proiectul Institutului de Studii Euroregionale (Horga I. - Süli-Zakar I. 2010; Süli-Zakar I. 2011; Analele U.O., vol II, 2010).
- Exemple de bune practici - forma de cooperare propusă poate deveni, cu ușurință, un succes în Europa Centrală și de Est.
- Inovația - un element esențial la nivelul graniței dintre România și Ungaria.
- Utilitatea cercetării – studiile susținute de cercetătorii români și maghiari în direcția cooperării transfrontaliere, în diverse domenii de interes.

Teze

Prima teză: Pe parcursul cercetării noastre, am demonstrat că, în cazul celor două țări, granița și zonele aferente ei, au cunoscut o serie de transformări în ultimele două decade, care au influențat puternic dezvoltarea armonioasă a regiunii și a relațiilor transfrontaliere. Am dovedit, prin studiile noastre, că granița dintre România și Ungaria, prin intermediul Euroregiunilor și Eurometropolelor, poate dezvolta relațiile transfrontaliere într-un mod mai eficient. Pe parcursul cercetării noastre, am studiat exemplele pozitive din Europa de Vest, pentru a vedea cum noțiunile aplicate acolo se pot introduce și în această zonă sub forma EGTC.

A doua teză: Cercetările ultimilor ani descriu nivelul eficienței cooperării la granița dintre România și Ungaria prin modelele de cooperare adoptate: Euroregiunea Carpatica ce funcționează din anii 1990, iar mai târziu Euroregiunea Dunăre – Tisa – Criș - Mureș, Euroregiunea Hajdu-Bihar – Bihor și Eurometropola Debrecen – Oradea foarte activă în ultimii ani (proiectul DebOra).

A treia teză: Prin studiile realizate, am demonstrat, că Debrecen și Oradea, prin prisma unei relații istorice de mai bine de 700 ani, reprezintă o bază potrivită pentru cooperare, ca și orașe competitive, de graniță. În cazul orașelor mari, multifuncționale, relațiile transfrontaliere au mai multe șanse decât în regiuni, județe sau municipii – după cum au arătat studiile noastre.

A patra teză: Pe baza cercetării științifice, cele două orașe lucrează cu succes în următoarele domenii: educație, cultură, transport, turism, modernizare urbană, reabilitare urbană și migrație regională (sau internațională). Am dovedit, de asemenea, gradul de fezabilitate al dezvoltării viitoare bazate pe cercetare. Există, în același timp, domenii, precum protecția mediului sau politicile de securitate, care prezintă oportunități pentru studii ulterioare..

Bibliography

- Ambrus L. A. (2010) : *Calitatea Factorilor De Mediu Din Euroregiunea Bihor – Hajdú-Bihar Și Influența Acestora Asupra Stării de Sănătate a Populației*, Editura Universității din Oradea, Oradea, pp.27-68, pp.124-130
- Apahideanu I. (2006): *Globalizarea între concept și realitatea desemnată*, în Manual de Relații Internaționale (coord. Miroiu A., Radu – Ungureanu S.), Editura Polirom, Iași, p.307
- Árva L. - Könyves E. (2008): *Educational Tourism And Its Effects on regional Economy*, in Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border (edited by Süli – Zakar I.), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.289-291
- Barna R.C. (2008): *Economie regională*, Editura Fundației pentru Studii Euroregionale, Cluj-Napoca, pp.14-25, p.238
- Baranyi B. (2007): *The Hungarian – Romanian border region in the Hungarian national and local press (1990 - 2005)*, in Eurolimes, Vol. III, Oradea University Press, Oradea, p.97
- Basu R. (2004): *Implementing quality*, Cengage Learning EMEA, pp.97-98
- Bántó N. (2011): *The Comparative Research of Tourism in Hajdúszoboszló (HU) and Băile Felix (RO) Resort*, in New Results Of Cross-Border Co-Operation (edited by Kozma Gábor), Didakt Kft, Debrecen, pp.167-173
- Bărbulescu I.G. - Răpan D. (2009): *Trilingual Dictionary of the European Union*, Polirom, Iași, p.571

- Berács J. - Hrubos I. - Temesi J. (2010.), Magyar Felsőoktatás 2009, NFKK
Füzetek 4. Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, p.75
- Bertoncini Y. - Chopin T. - Dulphy A. - Kahn S. - Manigand C. (2008):
Dictionnaire critique de L Union européenne, Armand Colin, Paris,
pp.187-188
- Biró R. (2006): *Twinning Relations And Friendships Of Oradea Municipality*, in *Regional Development In The Roumanian – Hungarian Cross – Border Space – From National To European Perspective* (edited by Istvan Süli – Zakar, Ioan Horga), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.381-382
- Boar N. (2005): *Regiunea transfrontalieră româno – ucraineană a Maramureșului*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj – Napoca, pp.36-53
- Brosset E. - Chevallier – Govers C. – Edjaharian - Schneider C., (2009) : *Le traite de Lisbonne. Reconfiguration ou deconstitutionalisation de l Union europeenne?*, Bruylant, Bruxelles, p.5
- Buursink J. (2002): *The binational reality of border-crossing cities*, in *Geo Journal* 54, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Netherland, p.13
- Castellan G. (1991): *Histoire des Balkans XIV – XX siècle*, Librairie Artheme Fayard, pp.475-480
- Chelcea S. - Mărginean I. - Cauc I. (1998): *Cercetarea sociologică. Metode și Tehnici*, Editura Destin, Deva, p.161, p.308
- Ciocan V. (2007): *Drept European. Instituții Europene. Politici Europene. Fonduri Structurale*, Editura GrafNet, Oradea, p.99
- Cîrmaciu D. (2010): *Consideration Regarding To The Intensification Of The Romanian –Hungarian Cooperation In The Domain Of Fiscal Administration*, in *Cross – Border Partnership With Special Regard To The Hungarian - Romanian – Ukrainian Tripartite Border* (edited by Horga I-Süli – Zakar I.) University of Oradea Press and University of Debrecen Press, pp.248-252

- Cohn T. H. (2005): *Transportation and Competitiveness in North America: The Cascadian and San Diego-Tijuana Border Regions*, in *Holding the Line Borders in a Global World* (edited by Heather N. N. - Townsend-Gault I.) UBC Press Vancouver Toronto, pp.200-218
- Committee of the Regions (2004): *Committee Of The Regions 1996-2003*, European Communities, p.9, p.116
- Committee of the Regions (2007): *The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation – EGTC*, Belgium, pp.3-4
- Czimre K. (2005): *Kisközségtől Az Eurorégióig*, Didakt Kft, Debrecen, pp.65-69
- Czimre K. (2006): *Cross – Border Co – operation - Theory and Practice*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debrecen, pp.67-91
- Czimre K. (2005): *Studia Geografica. Euroregionalis fejlődés az EU csatlakozás kuszobán különös tekintettel Magyarorszag euroregioira*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debrecen, p.9
- Duhr S. - Colomb C. - Nadin V. (2010): *European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation*, Routledge, p.246
- Dehouse R. (2009): *Politiques Europeennes*, Presse des Sciences Po, Paris, p. 272
- Ehlers N. (2001): *The utopia of the binational city*, in *GeoJournal* 54, p.28
- Ehlers N. - Buursink J. - Boekema F. (2002): *Binational cities and their regions: From diverging cases to common research agenda*, in *GeoJournal* 54, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Netherland, pp.1-5
- GeoJournal* 54 (2001): Kluwer Academic Publisher, Printed in Netherland, pp.1-18 , p.64, p.82
- Glenny M. (2000): *Balkans 1804-1999. Nationalism, War And The Great Powers*, Granta Books, London, xxii-xxvi
- Ghica L. A. (2007): *Enciclopedia Uniunii Europene*, Editura Meronia, București, pp. 82-135

- Giurgi P. (2009): *Factors of Social and Economic Rural development*, Grin Verlag, p.34
- Goldstein J. S. - Pevehouse J. C. (2008): *Relații Internaționale*, Editura Polirom, Iași, p.339
- Guy Di Meo (1998): *Geographie Sociale Et Territoires*, Editions Nathan, Paris, p.132
- Heddebaut O. (2002): *The binational cities of Dover and Calais and their region*, in GeoJournal 54, Kluwer Academic Publisher, Printed in Netherland, p.61
- Harald R. – Lescot C. (2009): *Institutions Europeennes*, 12 e edition, Editions Paradigme, Orleans, p.221
- Horga I. Suli-Zakar I. (2006): *Challenges and Perspectives in the Regional and Euroregional Issues in the New Europe*, Institutte for Euroregional Studies Oradea-Debrecen, p.192
- Horga I. - Silași G. - Süli-Zakar I. – Sagan S. (2009): *Intercultural Dialogue And European Neighbourhood Policy*, University of Oradea Press, Oradea, pp.253-256
- Horga I. - Suli-Zakar I. (2010): *Cross-border Partnership With Special Regard To The Hungarian-Romanian-Ukrainian Tripartite Border*, University of Oradea Press - University of Debrecen Press, pp. 170-177
- Horga I. - Bărbulescu I. Gh. - Ivan A. - Palinchak M. - Süli-Zakar I. (2011): *Regional and Cohesion Policy Insight into the role of the New Policy Design*, Univesity of Debrecen Press, University of Oradea Press, pp.177-178
- Ilieș A. (2003): *România între milenii. Frontiere, areale frontaliere și cooperare transfrontalieră*, Editura Universității din Oradea, Oradea, p.96
- Ilieș A. (2004): *România. Euroregiuni*, Editura Univesrității din Oradea, Oradea, pp.23-42, p.163

- Ilieş A. (2012): *Euroregional cross-border cooperation premises at the eastern external border of EU. Romania – borders and borderlands*, Drukarina Wydawnictwa „Bernardinum” Sp.z.o.o., Peplin, p.15
- Ionescu C. - Toderaş N. (2007): *Politica de Dezvoltare Regională*, Editura Tritonic, Bucureşti, p. 63
- Keating M. (2008): *Noul Regionalism În Europa Occidentală*, Institutul European, Iaşi, p.21
- Kocsis K. (2007): *South Eastern Europe in Maps*, 2nd, Revised & Expanded Edition, Geografical Research Institute, Hungarian Academy of Science, Budapest, pp.26-36
- Kocsis K. – Schweitzer F. (2009): *Hungary in Maps*, HAS Geographical Institute, pp.21-28
- Kozma G. (2011): *New Results Of Cross-Border Co-Operation*, Didakt Kft, Debrecen, p.34
- Levy J. - Lussault M. (2003): *Dictionnaire De La Geographie Et De L Espace Des Societes*, Edition Belin, Paris, pp.776-778
- Liebenath M. – Korcelli Olejniczak E. - Knippschild (2008): *Cross-border Governance and Sustainable Spatial Development. Mind the Gaps!*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, p.97
- Lóránt D. - Bujdosó Z. - Tóth G. (2008): *Tourism Planning In The Hajdu Bihar – Bihor Euroregion*, in *Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border* (edited by István Süli – Zakar), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.323-325, pp.328-332
- Lunden T. (2004): *On the Boundary. About humans at the end of territory*, Elanders Gotab, Stockholm, pp.25-125
- Mátyás S. (2007): *A Rendvédelemi Együttműködés Szerepe Az Európai Unió, Illetve A Hajdú-Bihar-Bihor Eurorégió Területén*, in *A Határok És A Határon Átnyúló (CBC) Kapcsolatok Szerepe a Kibővült Európai Unió Keleti Perifériáján* (szerkesztette Prof. Dr. Süli-Zakar István,

- DSc), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.112-113
- Mátyás S. (2008): *Police Collaboration Of Hungarian And Romanian Counties On The Frontier*, in *Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border* (edited by István Süli – Zakar), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.203-204
- METIS GmbH (2009): *The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC): state of play and prospects*, Printed in Belgium, p.73
- Nadova M. (2010): *Tourist Potentials in Carpathian Euroregion*, in *Cross – Border Partnership With Special Regard To The Hungarian - Romanian – Ukrainian Tripartite Border* (edited by Horga I. - Süli – Zakar I.), University of Oradea Press and University of Debrecen Press, pp.219-222
- Nagy Z. (2008): *Similar or Different: Miskolc and Kosice*, in *Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border* (edited by Süli – Zakar I.), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, p.106
- Panara C. - De Becker A. (2011): *The Role of the Regions in EU Governance*, Springer, p.123
- Pecout G. (2004): *Penser les frontieres de l'Europe du XIX au XXI siecle*, Presses Universitaires de France, pp. 311-329
- Pertek J. (2004): *Droit des institutions de l Union europeenne*, Press Universitaires de France, Paris, p.344
- Pénzes J. - Molnár E. (2007) *Analysis of the economical potential in Bihor and Hajdu Bihar counties*, in *Eurolimes*, Vol. IV, Oradea University Press, Oradea, pp.25-36
- Picouet P. – Renard J. P. (2007) : *Les Frontieres Mondiales Origines et Dynamiques*, Editions Du Temps, pp.7-9
- Popovoiciu A. C. – Țoca C.V. (2011), *Roumanian – Hungarian Cross Border Cooperation Trouht a Possible EGTC Oradea-Debrecen*, in

- Regional and Cohesion Policy. Insight into the role of the Partnership Principle in the New Policy Design (edited by Horga I. - Bărbulescu I. Gh. - Ivan A. - Palinchak M. - Süli-Zakar I.), Oradea University Press, Oradea, pp.240-256
- Potter J. - Miranda G. (2009): *Clusters, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, OECD Publications, p.132
- Rehn O. (2006): *Europe's Next Frontiers*, Nomos, pp.13-76
- Rotariu T. - Iluț P. (1997): *Ancheta sociologică și sondajul de opinie*, Editura Polirom, Iași, pp.54-61
- Sandhusen R. L. (2008): *Marketing*, Barron's Educational Series, New York, p.164
- Sauron J. L. (2010): *Le Puzzle des institutions europeennes*, 4e édition, Gualino Editeur, Paris, pp.36-42, p.80, p.335-336
- Serebrian O. (2006): *Dicționar de Geopolitică*, Editura Polirom, Iași, p.84
- Simileanu V. (2006): *Regiunile de cooperare transfrontalieră*, in *GeoPolitica*, Regiunile de cooperare transfrontalieră, Surse de conflict sau de stabilitate?, Anul IV, Nr. 20, Editura Top Form, București, p.5
- Sparrow G. (2002): *San Diego-Tijuana: Not quite a binational city or region*, in *GeoJournal* 53, Kluwer Academic Publisher, Printed in Netherland, p. 83
- Stapleton J. - Michael J. T. (1997): *How to prepare a Marketing Plan: A Guide to Reaching the Consumer Market*, Fifth Edition, Gower Publishing, pp.78-80
- Süli-Zakar I. (1994): *Debrecen Megyei Jogú Város Makroregionális Szerepköre*, MTA Regionális Kutatások Központja, Pecs-Debrecen, 1994, pp.171-201
- Süli Zakar I. (2002) *Borders and Cross-border Co-operations In the Central European Transformation Countries*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debrecen, pp.44-46

- Süli Zakar I. (2003a) *A Karpatok Euroregio Interregionalis Szovetseg Tiz Eve*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, p.111
- Süli – Zakar I. (2003b): *Tarsadalomfoldrajz – területfejlesztés II*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, p. 443
- Süli Zakar I. (2003c): *Határok És Határmentiség az átalakuló Közép-Európában*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, pp.87-88
- Süli-Zakar I. (2004) *Cross-border Co-operation. Schengen Challenges*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, pp.19-25
- Süli-Zakar I. (2005): *Tájak-Regiók-Települések*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, pp.325-331
- Süli – Zakar I. – Horga I. (2006): *Regional Development in the Romanian / Hungarian Cross – Border Space – From National to European Perspective*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, p.27
- Süli Zakar I. (2008): *A Karpatok Euroregio 15 év ahatarokon ativelo kapcsolatok fejleszteseert*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, pp.97-112
- Süli-Zakar I. (2008): *Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border*, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, p.143
- Süli-Zakar,I.(2009): *The Role of the Euroregions and Eurimetropolises in the Etheralisation of the Borders in the Eastern Periphery of the European Union*, in *Eurolimes 7*, Edited By Dorin Ioan Dolghi, Gilles Rouet, Zsolt Radics, Bruylant, pp.143-144
- Suli-Zakar I. (2011): „Falvaink sorsa” es „A varosnovekedes szakasai”, Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadoja, Debecen, pp.15-36
- Szónokyné A. G. (2008): *At The External Border Of The European Union*, in *Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border* (edited

- by Süli – Zakar I.), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.185-189
- Szogi L. (1994): *Hat Evszazad Magyar Ehyetemi Es Foiskolai*, Muvelodesi es Kozoktatasi Ministeriun, p.241
- Soproni L. – Horga I. (2010): *Media and European Diversity*, Ed. Bruylant, Belgium, pp.203-208
- Şoproni L. (2007): *The Romanian – Hungarian Cross – border Cooperation in the Regional Press of Bihor County*, in Eurolimes, Vol. III, Oradea University Press, Oradea, p.77
- Telo M. (2009): *European Union and New Regionalism. Regional Actors and Global Governance in a Post – Hegemonic Era*, Second Edition, Ashgate, pp.63-73
- Teperics K. (2007): *Educational co-operations along the Hungarian – Romanian – Ukrainian border*, in Eurolimes, Vol. IV, Oradea University Press, Oradea, pp.44-45
- Teperics K. (2009): *A Debreceni oktatás területi kapcsolatainak történelemi elozmeny*, in Fols es Ember. Earth & Peoples, I.(XI), Tavasy-Nyar (1-2.), Didakt Kiado-DE Neprajzi Tansyek, Debrecen, pp.62-65
- Țoca C. V. (2009): *Perspectives for a development Strategy of Debrecen – Oradea Cross-Border Agglomeration*, in Analele Universității din Oradea, Relații Internaționale și Studii Europene, TOM I, Editura Universității din Oradea, pp.75-80
- Țoca C.V.- Popovicu A.C. (2010): *TheEuropean Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC), Instrument of Cross-borderCooperation. Case Study Romania – Hungary*, in Eurolimes 10 (edited by Dolghi D. I. – Ilieş A. - Savvas Katsikides S - SÜLI-ZAKAR I.), Oradea University Press, Oradea, p.91
- Tömöri M. (2007): *A Bevásárlóturizmus Vizsgálata Debreceni Üzletközpontokan*, in in A Határok És A Határon Átnyúló (CBC)

- Kapcsolatok Szerepe a Kibővült Európai Unió Keleti Perifériáján (szerkesztette Süli-Zakar I. DSc), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen
- Tömöri M. (2008): *Strengthening Cross-Border Cooperations: A Case Study Of Shopping Tourism in Debrecen*, , in Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border (edited by Süli – Zakar I.), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.345-357
- Tömöri M. (2010) *Spatial Diffusion of Metro Cash & Carry Focusing an Hungary and Romania*, in Cross – Border Partnership With Special Regard To The Hungarian - Romanian – Ukrainian Tripartite Border (edited by Horga I. -Süli – Zakar I.), University of Oradea Press and University of Debrecen Press, pp.131-135
- Schmidt T. D. (2005): *Cross-border regional enlargment in Oresund*, in GeoJournal 64, DOI 10.1007/s10708-006-6874-5
- Tourian J. (2009): *Questions europeennes. Les droit et les politiques de l Union*, Press Universitaire de France, Paris, pp. 569-570
- Vandersanden G. (1997): *L Europe Et Les Regions. Aspects Juridiques*, Editions de l Universite de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, pp.19-35
- Várhelyi T. - Müller A. (2008): *Spa Tourism And regional Development: It Can Be More Successful With Cross-Border Cooperation*, in Neighbours and Partners: On The Two Sides Of The Border (edited by Süli – Zakar I.), Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemy Kiadó, Debrecen, pp.309-314
- Wichmann Matthiensen C. (2004): *The Oresund Area: Pre – and post bridge cross-border functional integration: the bi-national regional question*, in GeoJournal 61, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Netherland, p.31-39
- Zarka J. C. (2010): *L'essentiel des Institutions de l'Union Européenne*, Gualino Editeur, p.109

Eurolimes - Journal of the Institute for Euroregional Studies Oradea-Debrecen "Jean Monnet" European Center of Excellence

Edited by HORGA I. - SIPOS S. (2006): *Europe and Its Borders: Theoretical and Historical Perspective*, Volume 1, Oradea University Press, Spring, pp.16-21

Edited by BRIE M & KOZMA G. (2006): *From Smaller to Greater Europe: Border Identitary Testimonies*, Volume 2, Oradea University Press, Autumn, pp. 54-55

Edited by DELANTY G. – PANTEA D. - TEPERICS K. (2007): *Europe from Exclusive Borders to Inclusive Frontiers*, Volume 4, Oradea University Press, Autumn, pp.45-46

Edited by SIPOS S. – BANUS E. – KOCSIS K. (2008): *Religious Frontiers of Europe*, Volume 5, Oradea University Press, Spring

Edited by DOGOT C. M. – SZABO G. - GIMENO UGALDE E. (2008): *Intercultural Dialogue and the European Space*, Volume 6, Oradea University Press, Autumn, pp. 130-132

Edited by DOLGHI D. I. – ROUET G. – RADICS Z. (2009): *Europe and the Neighbourhood*, Volume 7, Oradea University Press, Spring, pp.143-144

Edited by ŞOPRONI L. – SANTAGOSTINO A. – MOLNAR E. (2009): *Europe and its Economic Frontiers*, Volume 8, Oradea University Press, Autumn

Edited by STOICA A. – FRANCFORT D. - CSOBA SIMONNE J. (2010): *The Cultural Frontiers of Europe*, Volume 9, Oradea University Press, Spring, pp. 5-8

Edited by DOLGHI D. I. – ILIEŞ A. - KATSIKIDES S. - SÜLI-ZAKAR I. (2010), *The Geopolitics of European Frontiers*, Volume 10, Oradea University Press, Autumn, pp.89-91

Edited by DOGOT C. M. – PERCHOC P. - TOKES T. (2011): *Leaders of the Borders, Borders of the Leaders* , Volume 11, Oradea University Press, Spring, pp.179-187

Edited by SOPRONI L. - TSOURVAKAS G. – CZIMRE K. (2011):

Communication and European Frontiers Volume 12, Autumn, pp.148-160

The Annals of University of Oradea. International Relations and European Studies

Analele Universității din Oradea, Relații Internaționale și Studii Europene,

TOM I, Editura Universității din Oradea, Oradea, 2009, p.75

Analele Universității din Oradea, Relații Internaționale și Studii Europene,

TOM II, Editura Universității din Oradea, Oradea, 2010, pp.170-177

Sites

www.a-e-r.org/main-issue/regionalism.html

<http://www.fonduri-structurale-europene.ro/legislatie/legea-315-2004.html>

<http://www.nord-vest.ro>

http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/full_text/index_ro.htm, Jurnalul Oficiilor al
Uniunii Europene, C306, anul 50, 17 decembrie 2007, ISSN 1830-3668

<http://www.eszakalfold.hu>

www.mdrt.ro

www.cjbihor.ro

www.igri.ro

www.nfu.hu

<http://www.cor.europa.eu>

<http://www.euregio-mr.com>

<http://www.espaces-transfrontaliers.org/en>

<http://www.regbas.ch>

<http://www.eurode.nl>

Annexe 1: Dimensions and indicators of research

Dimensions	Indicators
Cross-border communication	Visits in the neighbouring country, city Used means of transport Frequency of visits on the neighbouring territory
Purpose of the visit	Tourist, transit, shopping, business, relatives, other purpose
Aspects of community social life	Quality of housing, public lighting, provision of jobs, infrastructure, addressing and solving the citizens' problems, cleaning
Main areas of activity	Industry, commerce, constructions, transport, agriculture, tourism , services
Institutions, organizations	Town Hall, Prefecture, City Council, County Council, Justice, Church, Police, Media, NGOs, University
Project “To prepare a common future: Agglomeration of Communities Debrecen-Oradea 700,000 (2020)”	Importance of developing the communities of Debrecen – Oradea
Development directions for Debrecen – Oradea communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – opening new border communication – development of information points (economic, tourist, administrative, Euroregional, transport, etc.) – daily flights Oradea - Debrecen (bus, train) – schedule of regular meetings between officials – training of managers, experts, employees – the organization of mobility (exchange), teachers, students and pupils – developing joint projects – organizing joint job fairs – organize meetings between experts from different fields of activity – other activities
Socio-demographic data	age, gender, nationality, marital status, religion, educational level, employment status
<i>Source: Own elaboration</i>	

Annexe 2

Algorithm of a good Euroregion according to A-L. Sanguin, 2004

Pos	Motivation	Characteristics
1	Geographical position	In a cross-border area that can become a centre for economic development
2	When does such initiative take place?	1. There is a tradition for collaboration without implementing a Euroregional institutions 2. Identifying institutions of a Euroregional type that might generate tradition in collaboration
3	Extension	Not very large. The optimal surface is 3,000 to 10,000 sq meters
4	Population	Average. The optimal number of inhabitants is 500,000 to 1,000,000.
5	Internal and external networks	Depending on the extension and density, territory may be adjacent or continuous.
6	Euroregional institutions	a) Short-term objective: achieving, mobilising and turning the organisation into a working institution within the Euroregion b) Using internal and external resources c) General perspective for readjustment
7	Functions	Settling the meaning is indispensable for cooperation followed by the feeling of security provided by the Euroregion.
8	Working stages and institutions	a) There are five chronological sequences: mutually active knowledge + indispensability of cross-border cooperation + tangible cooperation + cultural actions + Euroregional feeling of security b) Implementing institutional instruments and actions in the field
9	Territorial coverage	The ability of the Euroregion to react in the local, national and European contexts.

Source: A. Ilieș, 2004, p. 27

Annexe 3

The main towns in the Bihor County according to the 2002 statistics

	Total	Romanian	Hungarian	German	Other	Jewish	Rrom	Ucrainian	Serbian	Slovakian
Total	600246	404468	155829	1163	38786	224	30089	198	35	7379
Oradea	206614	145284	56985	563	3782	166	2449	93	20	474
Salonta	18074	7267	10335	29	443	3	379	9	1	45
Aleșd	7387	4503	1566	9	1309	3	938	3	-	360
Beiuș	10996	9849	930	19	198	3	169	0	2	3
Marghita	17291	9167	7468	33	623	2	485	3	1	82
Nucet	2399	2275	66	8	50		44			
Ștei	8637	8272	319	8	38	2	18	4		2
Vale lui Mihai	10324	1442	8757	10	115	4	95	4		5
Vășcău	2854	2804	15	5	30		20	9		
Săcuieni	11665	891	9010	3	1761	1	1747	1		2

Source: <http://www.kia.hu/konyvtar/erdely/erd2002/bhetn02.pdf>

Towns in the Hajdu Bihar County					
Locality	Inhabitants	Locality	Inhabitants	Locality	Inhabitants
Debrecen	211 034	Hajdúszoboszló	23 425	Téglás	6 213
Balmazújváros	17 974	Létavértes	7 045	Hajdúdorog	9 463
Berettyóújfalu	16 116	Nádudvar	9 074	Hajdúhadház	12 709
Biharkeresztes	4 230	Nyíradony	7 701	Hajdúnánás	18 055
Derecske	9 136	Polgár	8 373	Tiszacsege	4 975
Hajdúböszörmény	31 993	Püspökladány	15 946		

Vilages Bihor – Hajdu Bihar					
Locality	Inhabitants	Locality	Inhabitants	Locality	Inhabitants
Álmosd	1 694	Görbeháza	2 641	Nyírábrány	3 952
Ártánd	550	Hajdúbajos	1 972	Nyíracsád	3 982
Bagamér	2 418	Hajdúsámson	10 677	Nyírmártonfalva	2 165
Bakonszeg	1 240	Hajdúszovát	3 149	Pocsaj	2 733
Báránd	2 692	Hencida	1 318	Sáp	1 051
Bedő / Bedeu	317	Hortobágy	1 772	Sáránd	2 310
Berekböszörmény	1 849	Hosszúpályi	5 471	Sárrétudvari	3 009
Bihardancsháza	218	Kaba	6 369	Szentpéterszeg	1 252
Biharnagybajom	2 936	Kismarja	1 400	Szerep	1 628
Bihartorda	988	Kokad	701	Tépe	1 175
Bocskai kert	2 410	Komádi	6 015	Tététlen	1 463
Bojt	590	Konyár	2 263	Tiszagyulaháza	828
Csökmő	2 171	Körösszakál / Sácal	911	Told	353
Darvas	650	Körösszegapáti / Apateu	984	Újiráz	596
Ebes	4 480	Magyarhomorog	917	Újléta	1 071
Egyek	5 535	Mezőpeterd	586	Újszentmargita	1 602
Esztár	1 367	Mezősas	680	Újtikos	931
Folyás	430	Mikepércs	3 465	Vámospércs	5 465
Földes	4 338	Monostorpályi	2 191	Váncsod	1 348
Furta	1 182	Nagyhegyes	2 665	Vekerd / Veherd	167
Fülöp	1 895	Nagykereké	1 361	Zsáka	1 702
Gáborján	928	Nagyrábé	2 367		

Source: <http://www.nepszamlalas.hu/hun/kotetek/04/tartalom.html>

Ethnic structure in the Bihor – Hajdú Bihar Euroregion in 2002

Year	Region NTUS 3	Total	Romanian	Hungarian	Rrom	German	Slovak	Ucrainian	Other
2002	Bihor	600246	404468	155829	30089	1163	7370	198	1304
	%	100	67.38	25.96	5.01	0.19	1.22	0.03	0.21
2001	Hajdú Bihar	553043	669	540721	10836	319	48	208	242
	%	100	0.12	98.77	1.96	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.03
2001 2002	Bihor- Hajdú Bihar Euroregion	1153266	405137	696570	40925	1482	7418	406	1546
	%	100	35.13	60.39	3.54	0.13	0.64	0.04	0.13

Annexe 4.


Inhabitants in the Carpathian Euroregion on 1 January 2008

No	Partner regions	<i>Surface</i> km ²	People
	Poland	17.926	2.112.000
1	Wojewodztwo	17.926	2.112.000
	Magyarország	28.639	2.616.000
1	Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén county	7247	746.000
2	Hajdu-Bihar county	6211	550.000
3	Heves county	3637	328.000
4	Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok county	5607	420.000
5	Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg county	5937	572.000
	România	42.281	3.351.00
1	Bihor	7544	634.000
2	Botoşani	4986	462.000
3	Harghita	6610	344.000
4	Maramureş	6304	540.000
5	Suceava	8555	709.000
6	Satu Mare	4418	398.000
7	Sălaj	3864	264.000
	Szlovakia	15746	1543000
1	Eperjesi kraj	6573	763.000
2	Kassai kraj	8993	780.000
	Ukrajna	56.600	642900
1	Csernyivci oblaszty	8100	938.000
2	Ivano-Frankivski oblaszty	13900	1.464.000
3	Karpataljai oblaszty	12860	1.288.000
4	Lvivi (Iembergi) oblaszty	21800	2.739.000
	Osszesen:	161.192	16.051.00

Source: Suli – Zakar Istvan, *Karpatok Euroregio, 15 év a határon átívelő kapcsolatok fejlesztéséért, Debrecen, 2008, p.*


Annexe 5

Gouvernance de la Région métropolitaine trinationale du Rhin supérieur




http://www.regbas.ch/f_activites_oberrhein.cfm

Annexe 6.



Source: www.zmo.ro



Source: www.zmo.ro

Annexe 7.

Source: http://www.huro-cbc.eu/ro/objective_si_prioritati

Priority 1: Improve the key conditions of joint, sustainable development of the cooperation area (Improvement of cross-border transport, communication and environmental protection)

Major areas of intervention:

Key area of intervention 1.1: Improvement of cross-border transport facilities

1.1.1 Road development: construction, rehabilitation of roads, bicycle paths, etc.

1.1.2 Railway development: modernization of stations, harmonization of timetables, etc.

1.1.3 Preparation of studies and plans

Key area of intervention 1.2: Improvement of cross-border communication

1.2.1 Development of cross-border broadband internet infrastructure: distribution points and networks, user accessibility

1.2.2 Community access programmes: development of IT knowledge, development of public services

1.2.3 Cross-border newscast: CBC publications, TV and radio programmes, training

1.2.4 Preparation of studies

Key area of intervention 1.3: Protection of the environment

1.3.1 Protection of nature and natural values: harmonization of regulations, environmental friendly land exploitation, etc.

1.3.2 Water management: rehabilitation of river basins, wetland fields, etc.

1.3.3 Reducing pollution – waste management: rehabilitation of sites, selective waste collection, exchange of good practices, etc.

1.3.4 Preparation of studies and plans

Priority 2: Strengthen social and economic cohesion of the border area (Cooperation in the fields of business, RTD, education, labour market, health care and risk management)

Key area of intervention 2.1: Support for cross-border business cooperation

2.1.1 Development of business infrastructure: modernization of facilities, elaboration of studies, plans, etc.

2.1.2 Cooperation between businesses: business events, CB networks and partnerships, etc.

2.1.3 Development of tourism: tourism attractions and infrastructure, etc

Key area of intervention 2.2: Promotion of co-operation in the field of R+D and innovation

2.2.1 Joint research infrastructure development: development of R&D and innovation infrastructure serving CBC, etc.

2.2.2 Cooperation between sectors involved in R&D: exchange and training programmes, partnerships, etc.

2.2.3. Realization of joint research projects

2.2.4 Elaboration of studies, plans

Key area of intervention 2.3: Cooperation in the labour market and education – joint development of skills and knowledge

2.3.1 Cooperation between educational institutions: development of training and educational facilities, for knowledge transfer, etc.

2.3.2 Cooperation on the labour market: distance learning, training courses, co-operation of employment services, etc.

Key area of intervention 2.4: Health care and prevention of common threat

2.4.1 Development of infrastructure for common health and risk prevention: cooperation between health-care service providers, joint mechanisms for intervention, purchase of equipments, etc.

2.4.2 Joint institution building, coordination and training: cross-border ambulance centres, joint trainings, etc.

Key area of intervention 2.5: Cooperation between communities

People to people actions: joint cultural and sport events, institution building, co-operation networks, co-operation between educational institutions, etc.

Annexe 8.

Debrecen – Oradea Project : Window Open to Europe

Year	Conference	Themes	Personalities
2005	Introducing the "Debrecen 2010 - Cultural Capital of Europe"	Project presentation by the community of Oradea	Deputy Mayor of Debrecen, Gabor Turi, Project Manager, Zoltan Korosy, Mayor of Oradea, Petru Filip, Deputy Mayor Biro Rozalia
2006	Future cooperation between the towns of Oradea and Debrecen	Think a Common Future - Oradea-Debrecen 2020	Centre of Excellence "Jean Monnet" in universities in Debrecen and Oradea, Oradea Vice Biro Rozalia
2007	Pageant exhibition	Cultural and educational activities	Reprezentanți ai mediului universitar, administrativ și societatea civilă
2008	Euroregional conference "The role of public administration in the Euroregions	Presentation of Bihor – Hajdú-Bihar Euroregion	Prof. Ioan Horga PhD.
		Regionalism in Europa	Prof. Istvan Suli-Zakar PhD.
		Eligible regions in Europe	MEP Iuliu Winkler
		Regional Development Agency-Alföld Észak	Laszlo Buzas, director of Department of Regional Development Agency-Alföld Észak
2009	Debrecen and Oradea in the European Union - developing strategies	Debrecen and Oradea in the European Union - developing strategies	Marcel Bolos, Executive Director of the Division for Sustainable Development and External Financing and Bak Ferenc Oradea City Hall, Financial Director at the Society of Commercial Management Debrecen Patrimony
2010	The development potential for the Euro-region Bihor-Hajdú-Bihar	Identification of common collaboration points between the two regions	Prof. Ioan Horga PhD. Prof. Istvan Suli-Zakar PhD.
2011	The fortress of Oradea as touristic objective of major importance with Bihor- Hajdú-Bihar Euroregion	Identification if efficient promotion means for the Fortress of Oradea, and issuance of a municipal strategy of marketing for the Fortress	Prof. Ioan Horga PhD, Prof. Istvan Suli-Zakar PhD, MEP Iuliu Winkler, Ilosvai Péter, Executiv Manager IT Services Hungary, Búzás László, Department Manager Eszak-Alfold Regio

Source: www.bihon.ro and www.crisana.ro

Annexe 9.

SWOT Analysis comparative communities Debrecen (D) Oradea (O)

S Strengths-Internal Factors			W Weakness-Internal Factors			O Opportunities- External factors			T Threats-External Factors		
Indicator	O	D	Indicator	O	D	Indicator	O	D	Indicator	O	D
Cultural objectives	5 4	19	Infrastructure	7 8	2 6	Tourism	5 5	3 9	Infrastructure	7 9	-
Institutions	4 5	-	Local administration	2 9	-	City development	4 6	7	Local administration	2 9	-
Building Architecture	4 0	-	Transport	2 8	7 4	Investors	4 4	-	Transport	2 8	-
Shopping centre	4 4	-	Justice	2 4		Crossborder projects	3 2	5	Justice	2 4	-
Academic background. University	3 9	10 8	Jobs	2 4	5 4	Jobs	2 5	6	Jobs	2 4	1 2
Commerce	4 0	-	Green spaces	2 4	-	Frontier	2 2	5	Green spaces	1 4	-
Border, Custom-house	2 2	-	Old buildings	2 4	-	EU Integration, EU	1 5	6	Old buildings	2 0	-
Geographical location	2 7	10	Agglomeration	7	-	Scholarships	1 0	-	Agglomeration	7	-
Transport	2 0	11	Industry	8	-	Infrastructure	1 0	-	Industry	8	-
Churches	2 3	7	Agriculture	8	-	European Funds	8	-	Agriculture	8	-
Industry	1 6	-	Services	6	-	Academical background	6	-	Services	6	-
Infrastructure	2 2	9	Security	4	8	NGO – s	6	-	Dwellings	7	-
Tourism	1 6	57	Dwellings	7	-	Relations	-	2 4	Politics	-	1 7
Green spaces	1 6	-	Pollution	6	-	Expressway	-	1 4	Geographical position	-	9
City modernization	9	17	Geographical position	-	1 5	Education	-	1 1	Migration	-	7
Highschool background	9	-	Mentality	-	7	Regional point	-	1 0	Big companies	-	5
Services	-	13	Social institutions	-	6	Culture	-	5			
Health	-	13		-	-	Sport	-	6			
The leading of the town	-	18		-	-						
Regional point	-	12		-	-						

Source: Own elaboration

Annexe 10.

Euro-metropolis Oradea –Debrecen (EGTC)

The GECT name	Euro-metropolis Oradea – Debrecen
Acronym	EMOD
Implementing statute	Project proposal
Implicate states	Romania (RO) Hungary (HU)
Territory	The Romanian and Hungarian border area, represented by the space of the Bihor county from the North-West Development Region, at the East of the border and the space of the Hajdu-Bihar county from the Great Plains region of North (Észak-Alföldi Régió) at the West of the border.
Members	16 local authorities: 10 in Bihor County: the city of Oradea and the near villages Biharia, Borş, Cetariu, Girişu de Criş, Nojorid, Oşorhei, Paleu, Sânmartin and Sântandrei 6 in the Hajdu-Bihar County: the city of Debrecen, cities of Berettyóújfalu, Biharkeresztes, Derecske, Hajdúszoboszló, Püspökladány,
Duration	Undefined
Objectives	Creating an area of welfare, employment and sustainable development; The consolidation of cross-border cooperation; The synchronization of the cross-border policies by harmonizing the inter-institutional eurometropolitan dialogue; Realizing a single development strategy for two peoples with common history and future;

Source: Popoviciu, Țoca, 2010, p.101

Annexe11.

Questionnaire

1. Did you visit the neighbouring country Hungary/Romania in 2006?

- a) YES b) NO

2. Which means of transportation did you use for going to Hungary/Romania?

- a) own vehicle
b) minivan or bus
c) train
d) other

3. How many times did you visit Debrecen/Oradea during the last year?

.....

4. What was the purpose for your visit in Hungary/Romania?

- a) tourism
b) transit
c) shopping
d) business
e) relatives
f) other

5. On a scale from 1 to 5 (1= very serious issues, 2 = serious issues, 3 = medium issues, 4 = small issues, 5 = no issues at all), how serious would you describe the issues of social life within the cities of Oradea/Debrecen to be?

No	Aspects of social life	Very serious	Serious	Medium	Small	No issues
A	Quality of housing	1	2	3	4	5
B	Public lighting	1	2	3	4	5
C	Employment availability	1	2	3	4	5
D	Sewage system	1	2	3	4	5
E	Addressing citizens' problems	1	2	3	4	5
F	Central heating	1	2	3	4	5
G	Hot water	1	2	3	4	5
H	Cold water	1	2	3	4	5
I	Roads infrastructure	1	2	3	4	5
J	Cleanness	1	2	3	4	5
K	Transportation	1	2	3	4	5

6. Please classify the most important areas of activity within the cities of Oradea/Debrecen:

No	Area of activity	Place (from 1 to 7)
A	Industry	
B	Commerce	
C	Constructions	
D	Transportation	
E	Agriculture	
F	Tourism	
G	Services	

7. How much do you trust the following institutions within the cities of Oradea/Debrecen?

No	Institution	Very much	Much	Not much	Very little
A	City Hall	1	2	3	4
B	Prefecture	1	2	3	4
C	Local Council	1	2	3	4
D	County Council	1	2	3	4
E	Justice	1	2	3	4
F	Church	1	2	3	4
G	Police	1	2	3	4
H	Mass – media	1	2	3	4
I	NGO's	1	2	3	4
J	University	1	2	3	4

8. Do you think that a project titled “*To prepare a common future: Agglomeration of Communities Debrecen-Oradea -700,000 (2020)*” is beneficial to a mutual development of the cities of Oradea and Debrecen?

- a) YES
- b) NO
- c) I don't know

9. For a harmonious development of the relations between the cities of Oradea and Debrecen what would you find necessary to be implemented from the following proposals?

- a) Opening of new border points – building of new access roads to Debrecen
- b) Building information points (economic, touristic, administrative, euroregional, transportation, etc.)

- c) Daily commute Oradea – Debrecen (bus, train)
 - d) Periodical meetings between the officials of the two cities
 - e) Training courses for managers, experts, employees in Oradea (for the ones in Debrecen) and in Debrecen (for the ones in Oradea)
 - f) Mobilities (exchanges) for professors, students and pupils
 - g) Issuance of joint projects
 - h) Joint job fairs
 - i) Meetings between experts within various fields of activity
 - j) Other activities that you might see fit for collaboration
-

10. Please make a SWOT analysis of Oradea/Debrecen.

SWOT ANALYSIS			
S	W	O	T
Strong points Internal factors	Weak points Internal factors	Opportunities External factors	Threats External factors

Socio – Demographical Data

11) Age

12) Gender: M/F

13) Civil status:

a) married	b) partnership	c) divorced	d) widowed	e) single
------------	----------------	-------------	------------	-----------

14) Nationality:

a) Romanian	b) Hungarian	c) Roma	d) German	e) Slovak	f) Other
-------------	--------------	---------	-----------	-----------	----------

15) Religion:

a) Orthodox

b) Roman – Catholic

- c) Protestant (Calvin, Evangelist, Lutheran, Reformed)
- d) Greek-Catholic
- e) Neo – protestant (Pentecostal, Adventist, Baptist, Evangelist)
- f) No religion
- g) Other

16. Level of studies

- a) primary grades 1- 4
- b) secondary grades 5 -8
- c) vocational schools, apprentice schools
- d) high school 12 grades
- e) post-baccalaureate, foremen school
- f) university college
- g) university honours programmes (BA degree)
- h) post university

17. Employment

.....

Annexe 12.

Research results - Tables

Table 1. The results for the question -Did you visit the neighbouring country Romania-Oradea/Hungary-Debrecen, last year?

Oradea Debrecen	Students %		> 25 yo. %		Institutions %	
	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
YES	52.2%	35%	61.1%	47.5%	69.1%	48.5%
NO	47.8%	65%	38.9%	52.5%	30.9%	51.5%

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 2. "How many times did you visit Debrecen last year?" the respondents noted the number of visits in the neighbouring city

No. Of visits to Oradea- Debrecen	Students		> 25 yo.		Institutions	
	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
1	25%	30.2%	27%	32.5%	30.1%	29.1%
2	4.6%	9.6%	9%	13.3%	8.7%	14.5%
3	2.5%	5.1%	4.9%	7.9%	5.8%	5.5%
4	0.4%	3.1%	0.8%	1.5%	1%	0.9%
5	1.7%	1.1%	1.6%	3.4%	1%	2.7%
7	0.4%	1.1%	0.8%	-	1%	3.6%
10	-	0.75	-	1%	-	2.7%
20	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	1%	-	-
30	0.4%	-	0.8%	1.5%	-	1.8%
Not applicable	64.6%	47.8%	52.5%	38.4%	51.5%	39.1%

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 3. Means of transportation Hungary - Romania

Travel to Hungary Travel to Romania	Students		> 25 yo.		Institutions	
	H	RO	H	RO	H	RO
Personal car	33.3%	25.8%	40.9%	36.2%	44.1%	38.3%
Minibus / coach	16.2%	5%	16.3%	8.5%	14.9%	9.4%
Train	0.7%	3.3%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Other means of transport	2.2%	1.3%	2%	1.1%	1%	1%
Not applicable	47.6%	64.6%	37.9%	53.2%	39%	50.3%

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 4. The purpose of the visits: Oradea to Debrecen and Debrecen to Oradea

Oradea to DB Debrecen to Or	Students		> 25 yo.		Institutions	
	O-D	D-O	O-D	D-O	O-D	D-O
Touristic	13.8%	8.8%	10.3%	13.9%	18%	16.5%
Transit	11.6%	1.3%	11.8%	1.6%	12.7%	2.9%
Shopping	13.6%	15%	24.6%	24.6%	18.3%	23.3%
Business	5.8%	4%	5.4%	1.6%	9%	1%
Family	3.6%	6.7%	4.9%	4.1%	6%	3.9%
Other purpose	47.8%	64.2%	38.4%	52.5%	32%	51.5%

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 5. Aspects of social life: Oradea and Debrecen/students

No	Aspects of social life Students %	Very big		Big		Medium		Small		No problems	
		Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
A	Quality of houses	8	5	19.8	16.7	54	62.9	15.6	13.3	5	2.1
B	public lighting	3.8	3.3	17.8	8.8	41.3	30.4	29.1	44.2	8	13.3
C	Assurance of jobs	27.1	14.2	31.6	34.2	26.9	44.2	12.4	6.7	2	0.8
D	Sewerage	18.4	4.2	32	14.6	33.1	48.8	13.1	26.7	3.3	5.8
E	Solving the citizens' issues	20	6.7	30.9	26.7	36.7	49.2	11.1	12.9	1.3	4.6
F	Central heating	8.4	10.8	16.9	20	39.1	31.3	28.2	28.3	7.3	9.6
G	Hot water	7.3	3.3	9.6	7.1	32.2	22.9	37.3	43.3	13.6	23.3
H	Cold water	6.9	7.1	7.1	12.9	22.7	27.5	40.9	32.5	22.4	20
I	Roads	48.4	17.1	22.2	29.6	18.9	37.5	8	12.9	2.4	2.9
J	Cleaning	34	17.1	30.4	29.6	23.8	40.8	9.6	10.8	2.2	1.7
K	Transport	12.9	17.9	20.4	16.7	36	36.3	22.2	22.9	8.4	6.3

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 6. Aspects of social life: Oradea-Debrecen/> 25 yo.

No	Aspects of social life > 25 yo. %	Very big		Big		Medium		Small		No problems	
		Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
A	Quality of houses	14.8	4.5	28.6	15.9	43.3	68.6	10.3	10.5	3	2.1
B	public lighting	12.8	5.5	18.2	6.5	36	46.6	26.1	37	6.9	4.4
C	Assurance of jobs	25.6	13.5	23.6	30	34	41.5	14.8	7.1	2	7.9
D	Sewerage	23.2	4.1	27.6	30.9	30	46.5	14.3	12.3	4.9	7.2
E	Solving the citizens' issues	20.7	5.6	36.5	26.7	25.6	54.2	13.8	10.8	3.4	3.7
F	Central heating	7.5	9.6	17.2	21.1	38.4	35.4	26.1	26.9	10.3	7
G	Hot water	6.4	3.1	11.3	8.2	23.6	26.4	34	45	24.6	17.3
H	Cold water	4.9	6.7	8.4	13.9	25.6	29.3	34.5	36.1	26.6	14
I	Roads	49.3	18.2	25.6	29	13.3	39.4	8.4	11.7	3.4	1.7
J	Cleaning	42.9	18.1	29.1	27.2	20.2	41.3	6.4	11.5	1.5	1.9
K	Transport	15.3	17.4	21.2	17	41.9	37.2	15.8	23.1	5.9	5.3

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 7. Aspects of social life: Oradea-Debrecen/ Institutions

No	Aspects of social life Institutions %	Very big		Big		Medium		Small		No problems	
		Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
A	Quality of houses	15	6.1	27	13.4	52	57.3	5	18.3	1	4.9
B	public lighting	4	6.1	15	6.1	45	45.1	30	30.5	6	12.2
C	Assurance of jobs	17	14.2	25	31.3	40	40.4	15	8.4	3	5.4
D	Sewerage	26.6	3.7	41.7	28	19	53.7	11	12.2	1	2.4
E	Solving the citizens' issues	18.4	8.5	33.3	29.3	33	48.8	11	8.5	3	4.9
F	Central heating	6	13.4	18	23.2	36.8	31.7	34	22	5	9.8
G	Hot water	2	3.7	8	9.8	20	35.4	45	32.9	15	18.3
H	Cold water	3	4.9	6.9	7.3	20.2	40.2	42	26.8	28	20.7
I	Roads	44.2	19.2	26.1	27.4	17	40	6	10.3	5	3.1
J	Cleaning	38.8	20.7	35	28	15	40.2	5	8.5	6	2.4
K	Transport	25	19.7	21	20	34	40	18	18.7	2	11.6

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 8. The results obtained in classifying the most important industries in the cities of Debrecen and Oradea

<i>The target group</i>	<i>Students</i>		<i>> 25 years</i>		<i>Institutions</i>	
Domain of activity	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
Commerce	70.7%	74.5%	61.6%	51.7%	75.4%	48.6%
Industry	56.9%	44.5%	71.9%	45.9%	46%	46.5%
Constructions	54.9%	22.9%	51.2%	30.3%	56.6%	29.1%
Transport	36%	30.1%	26.6%	26%	305	26.2%
Services	34%	72.1%	41.9%	64%	49%	63.15
Tourism	32.4%	52.5%	31.6%	45.5%	30%	54.7%
Agriculture	15.6%	34.6%	14.2%	34%	19%	36%

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 9. Aims the trust of the Students groups in the following institutions

Institution	Very big		Big		Small		Very small	
	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
The City Hall	5.8	10	38.4	47.1	46.2	36.7	9.6	6.3
The Prefecture	5.3	5.4	32.9	43.3	50.7	42.1	11.1	9.2
The Local Council	2.7	9.6	32.7	42.5	52	36.7	12.6	11.3
The County Council	3.8	16.7	32.2	29.2	51.3	28.8	12.7	25.4
Justice	6.4	7.5	27.6	38.3	39.1	35.8	26.9	18.3
Church	43.3	5.4	38	22.1	11.8	49.2	6.9	23.3
Police	7.1	7.5	37.6	33.3	32.9	47.1	22.4	12.1
Mass – media	8.9	39.6	28	38.3	48.2	16.7	4.9	5.4
NGOs	11.3	12.3	36	35	42.7	42.2	10	10.5
University	20.4	20.4	37.1	37.1	29.3	29.3	13.1	13.1

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 10. Aims the trust of the public opinion groups in the following institutions of Oradea and Debrecen%

Institution	Very big		Big		Small		Very small	
	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
The City Hall	4.1	14.1	24.6	48.8	50.5	34.9	2.1	2.1
The Prefecture	6.2	12	26.5	37	49.9	40.3	10.6	10.6
The Local Council	3.2	12.6	19.7	40.5	55.5	35.4	11.5	11.5
The County Council	4.9	19.1	17.7	40.4	55.7	25.5	14.9	14.9
Justice	6	21.3	24.5	21.3	37.2	46.8	10.6	10.6
Church	37.5	2.1	36.8	23.4	17.6	48.9	25.5	25.5
Police	6.9	4.3	26.1	38.3	46.8	46.7	10.6	10.6
Mass – media	6	31.9	6.5	51.1	47.	14.9	2.1	2.1
NGOs	4.9	5.9	35	37.1	41	39	18.	18.
University	8.9	7.9	32	34.1	41.8	40.8	17.1	17.1

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 11. Aims the trust of the institutions groups in the following institutions of Oradea and Debrecen%

Institution	Very big		Big		Small		Very small	
	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
The City Hall	4.4	18.3	24.6	50	50.2	28	20.7	3.7
The Prefecture	6.4	11	26.6	37.8	49.8	45.1	17.2	6,1
The Local Council	3	8.5	19.7	36.6	55.7	46.3	21.6	8.5
The County Council	4.9	12.2	17.7	35.4	55.7	32.9	21.6	19.5
Justice	6.4	3.7	24.1	45.1	37.4	42.7	32	8.5
Church	37.4	4.9	37.8	18.3	16.8	52.4	7.9	24.4
Police	6.9	4.9	26.1	26.8	46.8	57.3	20.2	11
Mass – media	6.4	31.7	6.1	54.9	47.3	9.8	20.2	3.7
NGOs	4.9	6	37	35.7	39.9	40.8	18.2	17.5
University	6.9	7.9	31	34.2	43.8	40.8	18.2	17

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table 12. For a harmonious development of the relations between the cities of Debrecen and Oradea which of the following proposals do you find necessary to implement?

Oradea /Debrecen %	Students		> 25 years		Institutions	
	Or	Db	Or	Db	Or	Db
communication points	35.1	46.3	37.4	66	34	50
information points	50.4	54.2	53.7	53.2	56	42.7
daily transport	36.4	41.3	36.5	57.4	35	47.6
periodic meetings	32.9	45.4	45.3	46.8	43.4	39
specialized training	40	28.8	41.4	21.3	45	24.4
organisation of mobility	51.8	59.6	49.3	55.3	57	53.7
development of joint projects	56.9	63.8	60.6	59.6	61	57.3
organization of joint job fairs	46	25.8	54.7	17	57.6	26.8
meeting between experts	40.7	36.7	44.3	27.7	48	43.9

Source: own elaboration based on research results

Table of contents

1. Introduction	7
1.1. Aim, topicality, importance and utility	7
1.2. Hypotheses of the research	10
1.3. Research methodology	11
1.3.1. Target groups	12
 2. Different territorial levels of Hungarian – Romanian Cross- Border Cooperation (CBC).....	 15
2.1. Regional dimensions.....	15
2.1.1. Regions/types of regions.....	15
2.1.1.1. Észak Alföld Regio.....	25
2.1.1.2. North Western Development Regio.....	27
2.1.1.3. Comparative analyzes: Eszak Alföld Regio vs. North-Western Development Regio.....	30
2.1.2. Regional Policy.....	31
2.1.2.1. European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGCT).....	34
2.1.3. Regional institutions.....	39
2.1.3.1. Committee of the Regions.....	39
2.1.3.2. Association of European Border Regions.....	42
2.2. Euroregional dimensions.....	44
2.2.1. Definitions, functions and types of Euroregions.....	44

2.2.2. Euroregional efficient integration and performance mechanisms.....	51
2.2.3. Euroregions with participations of Bihor and Hajdu Bihar county.....	54
2.2.3.1. Bihor-Hajdu Bihar Euroregion.....	54
2.2.3.2. The Carpathian Euroregion.....	58
2.3. Successful Eurometropolis in Europe.....	59
2.3.1. Regio Basiliensis.....	59
2.3.2. Goodstadt, LKT.....	62
2.3.3. Metropolis Maastricht.....	66
2.4. Project on the Debrecen – Oradea Agglomeration.....	69
2.4.1. The phenomenon of double cities, also called twin cities.....	69
2.4.2. Aims and objectives. Project on the Debrecen – Oradea Agglomeration.....	74
2.4.3. Development strategies.....	78
2.4.4. A working model – Oradea Metropolitan Area ZMO	79
3. Results of the sociological and socio-geographical research	83
3.1. Applying questionnaires. Results	83
3.2. SWOT Analysis.....	114
4. Conclusions, theses.....	117
Magyar nyelvű összefoglaló.....	135
Concluzii – limba română.....	153
Bibliography.....	171
Annexes.....	183

ISBN 978-606-10-1160-5



Editura Universității
din Oradea