



Széchenyi István University
Doctoral School of
Regional and Business Administration Sciences

Gyula Ocskay

The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation as the
producer of a new discourse on borders

The case of Ister-Granum EGTC

Theses of dissertation

Supervisors: Tamás Hardi PhD professor

Dávid Fekete assistant professor

Győr, June 2021

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	2
1.1	On motivations	2
1.2	What is at stake?.....	3
2	Research questions, hypotheses	6
3	Methodology of the research	8
4	Results of the research	11
4.1	Evaluation of the research questions and hypotheses	11
4.2	Outlook, perspectives for further elaboration..	20
5	Literature for the Theses Booklet	22
6	The author's relevant publications.....	25

1 Introduction

1.1 *On motivations*

The author has been dealing with cross-border cooperation since 1999. That was the time when, after the signature of the intergovernmental agreement on the reconstruction of the Mária Valéria Bridge, I started working on the development of a regional cross-border cooperation structure at the Hungarian-Slovak border around Esztergom and Štúrovo. In my dissertation I applied the then developed Ister-Granum Euroregion and the subsequent European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation as an example to justify in practice those thoughts and theoretical frames which have matured in my mind during the last 20 years. Although it takes more than 10 years that I left the Ister-Granum region, due to my current job I am still committed to the topic and, in the meanwhile, I have had the opportunity also to gain European experiences therein.

I wrote my first study on the subject in 1991 to the call targeting the challenges that Europe and Hungary was facing. The main message of the study awarded with the first prize was that if the Central European countries can join the European Union which is committed to the elimination of the borders, this will make an end to their

centuries-long border-redrawing conflicts and will enable the Hungarian communities living in different states for 100 years to live in one joint political entity and to visit each other without limitations. My above naive belief has not changed by now.

1.2 What is at stake?

The starting point of the research was given by the observation that the cross-border (INTERREG) programmes which have no large budgets indeed, contribute to the decrease of the separating effects of the borders with very limited effectiveness.

Numerous monitoring reports highlight that within the framework of cross-border projects „the partnerships were maintained only for the duration of the projects” (EC 2016b, 17), „[m]ost projects have been implemented in isolation from each other” (Ibid., 24), „the programmes had important impacts at immediate and intermediate levels, but low cross-border effects” (EC 2007, 13), because the beneficiaries „tended to view CBC as simply another source of funding” (Ibid., 19). Therefore they have realised but domestic developments (Ibid., 20). The borderlands’ actors „pursue their own agendas” (Leibenath et al. 2008, 190): although „while parties on both sides of the border apply jointly for subsidies, they then use them for their own purposes” (van Houtum – Eker 2017, 46), „the partners play[ed] a mere formal role”

(Ramírez 2018, 33), which results in „'back to back' rather than genuinely integrated projects” (O'Dowd 2003, 23).

My experiences show that the main reason behind the above failures is that it is impossible to successfully popularise the integrated approach reaching beyond state borders. Cross-border programmes are settled for normalised reporting of the indicators and absorbed amounts but they have little interest in decreasing the separating effects of borders.

With a view to changing this practice, there is a need for a new discourse on border areas where the local stakeholders start working on the development of a new territorial identity. For the purposes of cross-border cooperation both the Council of Europe (see the Madrid Outline Convention and its Protocols) and the European Union (see European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation, EGTCs) offer appropriate governance models matching the theoretical frames of multi-level governance, MLG.

One of the main messages of the dissertation is that people experience and understand space with its bounds in a discursive manner. On the one hand, we cannot communicate what we think, live through about the world around us but in narratives; on the other hand meanings related to the space where we live in are also textual by nature. It means that those dimensions of meanings which by an individual or a group are connected to space may be interpreted with hermeneutical methods. At the same time,

textuality also implies that space and border are discursive facts; and if we modify the discourse, also the meaning of space and border will be modified. The changes of the discourse may have an impact upon our perceptions, our thinking and our spatial behaviour: our practices of utilisation of space.

The instruments of today's European multi-level governance can be applicable for changing the discourse on space what can bring about perspective and the strengthening of integrated strategic approach for the potential cross-border cooperation initiatives. By this, even the effectiveness of the use of EU funds can be improved.

At the same time, the ultimate aim of cross-border cooperation is not to ensure the balanced development of the borderland, not even to improve the convergence indicators of peripheral border areas, but to create a new discourse on space; to draft a new narrative which generates a new borderscape in the minds of the border people, thus weakening the fear from the Other, the suspicion and, in parallel, enhancing mutual trust without which every investment, every development policy intervention remain ephemeral and ineffective.

2 Research questions, hypotheses

The author carried out the research along the following questions and hypotheses.

Q_1 To what extent does the Ister-Granum EGTC follow the European model of cross-border governance?

H_1 My first hypothesis was that regardless of the delayed commencement, the Ister-Granum EGTC as the second grouping of the EU, from a structural point of view follows the pan-European trends and it can be considered a typical EGTC.

Q_2 To what extent do the existence and operation of the Ister-Granum EGTC influence the discourse on space and state border?

H_2 My second hypothesis consisted of that thanks to the thematisation and institutionalisation of the cross-border region, the grouping would represent a transition between soft and hard spaces, and therefore it would be able to modify the discourse on space and border.

H_3 Thirdly, I assumed that although the EGTC was an unknown instrument for the wide public, major part of my interviewees would be aware of the potentials provided by the EGTC for cross-border governance.

Q_3 How can the EGTC's democratic participatory aspect be enhanced – taken the limiting criteria of the EU Regulation into account?

H_4 In this, my hypothesis was that Western European EGTCs had already developed governance methods facilitating wider participation which could be applied by the Hungarian groupings as models in the future.

3 Methodology of the research

During the preparation of the dissertation, the author applied diverse methods. The two first theoretical chapters should be considered an analytical work based on secondary sources whose aim is to clarify the conceptual frames and to generate a theoretical synthesis. The methodology can mostly be identified genealogic as the author, through studying the relevant policy papers and scientific literature, makes an attempt to reconstruct the historical background of the selected terms and their theoretical matrixes.

For drafting the empirical chapter, I used and analysed four types of resources.

First, I conducted semi-structured interviews with 22 persons having deep insight in the history and operation of Ister-Granum. Through the interviews I intended to get a picture on the interviewees' opinion regarding the following topics:

- What do they know about the EGTC as an EU governance solution?
- What is their opinion on the operation of the Ister-Granum EGTC? What do they know about it? Where do they get information therefrom?
- Are they aware of alternative forms of governance? If they do, how they evaluate them?
- To what extent do the citizens know the EGTC according to interviewees' opinion?

- By which ways the citizens could be better involved in cross-border cooperation?
- To what extent is the EGTC considered able to decrease the separating effects of the border?

To validate the information gained from the interviews, the author conducted a survey among the EGTCs focusing on cross-border spatial development registered in Europe. In total, I addressed 53 groupings with the questionnaire: 21 from among the EGTCs established with Hungarian participation (one is already wound up, two of them are in the phase of liquidation, and the only Hungarian member left another one EGTC), while 32 EGTCs operating outside Hungary. 11 Hungarian EGTCs replied the call but seven groupings which did not answer have not realised any activities during the last 3-4 years. Consequently they can be identified unoperational. 12 European EGTCs filled-in the questionnaire from among the addressed 32 between 22 June and 20 July, 2020.

The third type of resources included those documents connected to the operation of the Ister-Granum Euroregion and the EGTC. Some of them were dug from the PC and other data carriers and were completely unknown for the scholars so far.

Finally, I studied a diverse set of studies (more than 50 in total) on Ister-Granum published during the last 20 years. One of the conclusions of the dissertation is the substantiation of the internal contradiction which consists of, on the one hand, the process by which, as a result of the

institutionalisation of cross-border cooperation, borderlands become harder and harder spaces and thanks to the network governance-based EGTC solution their representation becomes more and more visible; on the other hand, the loss of wider societal background of cooperation in the course of the creation of highly developed models.

In the dissertation this phenomenon is called as the 'paradox of representation': while the soft space is represented as an own entity, it loses its direct relationship with the citizens living there.

4 Results of the research

4.1 Evaluation of the research questions and hypotheses

Q_1 H_1

The research and the analysis of the literature justify that the Ister-Granum EGTC more or less follows the general European model: in its status of an elite organisation, it manages cross-border projects and some of them show stronger integration than the ordinary INTERREG projects. It is a unique aspect that the EGTC registered in Hungary takes part in the construction of the ferry connection between Neszmély and Radvaň nad Dunajom as the Slovak partner, and it is also the grouping who will operate the ferry port in Slovakia.

The grouping has created the simplest possible structure including only the board as an additional body beyond the requirements of the Regulation. Decision-making falls within the competence of the General Assembly convened once or twice a year. This is also in line with the European trends.

At the same time, as Engl (2016) underlines, the annual budget of the Ister-Granum EGTC cannot be compared to the average Western European EGTCs' budgets, and this remarkably limits the room for manoeuvre of the grouping

in the field of developments. The Ister-Granum EGTC has implemented numerous projects of small value (1 to 2 million HUF) but e.g. the exchange loss generated by the ferry project imposed such a burden on the EGTC that it was able to resolve it with an external intervention only. The implementation of larger investments and interventions affecting several settlements (which would be one of the main missions and a basis for legitimacy of the grouping) is strongly hampered by this scarcity of resources. Western European EGTCs do not face similar problems. Still, Ister-Granum belongs to thriving Central European groupings.

Similarly, regarding participation, the groupings rarely demonstrate serious achievements.

To sum up, the Ister-Granum EGTC stands out when speaking about Central European groupings but falls short of the European trends in several aspects.

K_2

Research showed that the history of the Ister-Granum initiative included different levels of socialisation. In compliance with the study classifying network governance models by Provan and Kenis (2008), after the inauguration of the bridge when according to the model of *shared governance* the relationships were characterised by a consultative cooperation solution and by outstanding mutual trust, the inclusion of the civil society actors was extremely strong. Obviously, this fact was unfavourable

for effectiveness, the partners were not very successful at calls for proposals, but the internal and external legitimacy of the quasi-institution was very strong. Although the then consultative model lacked stability but for the same reason it was flexible enough to quickly and successfully react on lifelike challenges.

In other words, the initiative was characterised by strong societal background and by exploiting the euphoria caused by the inauguration of the Mária Valéria Bridge, it was able to contribute to the shaping of a new discourse on space.

The second period was about a new step, that of the euroregion. This was a much more complex governance model, excluding the direct representation of the civil society. The mayors of the euroregion prioritised the results of the projects against trust building.

However, the management of the euroregion purposely strove to ensure the ownership also for the civil organisations through two regional development foundations. Accordingly, during this period the direct inclusion of the civil society was not anymore a reality but the euroregion was popular enough and numerous initiatives and events took the name 'Ister-Granum' whose daily newspaper was also read by several hundreds of people, every day. The news published in the columns of the newspaper enhanced the feeling of belonging and through these narratives, they contributed to the shaping of a regional identity.

The establishment of the EGTC had an opposite impact compared to the previous trends. Taking into account that the relevant EU Regulation excludes the civil associations from the EGTCs, wider involvement was not feasible within the frames of the Ister-Granum initiative: in parallel with the institutionalisation, the societal basis of the cooperation has been reduced. This is the starting point of the conclusions of the second hypothesis.

H_2

In line with the general European discourse it was expected that compared to more informal models, the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation as the governance model institutionalised at the highest level would play a more effective role in the production of a new discourse on space. In reality, the tool is the least appropriate one for this aim among the examined forms. This is reasoned by the fact that the relevant regulation does not make possible for the civil society actors to directly take part in the decision-making process of the grouping. While shared governance favours participatory solutions, in parallel with the solidifying of the institutional background, the grouping gets a more and more inflexible container-type character.

This means that unlike the flexibility of the preliminary form, the EGTC is a governance form of a much harder space, which accordingly becomes interested in the production of exclusive discourses, or, at least, it is able to

more hardly compensate the gravity of this type of narratives.

As a consequence, groupings can fulfil their mission in space production only if they voluntarily involve the representatives of the civil sphere and they perform massive communication activities for the sake of discourse production. The dissertation presents some examples of involvement and *wide participation* (Davoudi et al. 2008) which make the institution of the EGTC visible. However, also the attitude presented by one of the EGTCs filling out the questionnaire is acceptable, namely: it is not important whether the border citizens know the name of the institutions and what potential the EGTC owns but that someone resolves their everyday life's problems. This, of course, can be the EGTC as well.

H_3

When drafting the third hypothesis, the starting point was that those people paying attention to the gradual institutionalisation of the cooperation and witnessing the difficulties caused by the lack of institutional competences of the former models; and even more those people taking today active part in the work of the EGTC will be aware of the novelty of this governance solution. This expectation was not justified. Even some members of the Senate (board) had difficulties to formulate the difference between an EGTC and a euroregion. Two of the interviewees highlighted that: the grouping is enabled to

participate in direct EU calls for proposals meaning that they rather connected the material advantages with the tool while they failed to understand the essence of its legal capacities.

This implies that regardless of the strong commitment to the cooperation initiative and the result of mental modelling which showed that the interviewees could quite well identify the euroregional space, they were not able to link that with the existence of the grouping. To put it differently: EGTC has not a discursive power even for those directly taking part in its work. At the same time, the EGTC still plays a role in the modification of their perceptions on space since the frontiers of their mental maps more or less coincide with those of the euroregion which again roughly covers the urban influencing zone of the twin-towns Esztergom and Štúrovo.

K_3

As due to the rules set by Art 3. of the EU Regulation only governmental, self-governmental bodies and their associations as well as public undertakings can be members of an EGTC, inclusion should be ensured differently. As Svensson puts it: „the EGTC is one policy actor within a network of actors” (Svensson 2014, 86). It means that although the role of the groupings in diminishing the separating effects of the borders is decisive but they are not alone. In this context, the EGTC is a member of a broader network within which it is a stakeholder of shared

participatory governance including other actors. The extremely complex structure which characterises the operation of the EGTC Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai or the Upper Rhine Council indicates that at this level of institutionalisation, the NAO (Network Administrative Organisation) model of Provan and Kenis can hardly be accommodated with the shared governance model. At the same time, there are no many further alternatives for the involvement of civil society actors.

Another issue is wide participation. In this context, the methods of direct democracy can apply which are easily available – thanks to the achievements of the digital revolution. The citizens of the region may even directly be informed on the news or the upcoming events of the region with the help of an application. What is more, through one-question polls their opinion can be collected before making decisions. The launch of a regional program in the local televisions or the publication of a regional newspaper may have similar impacts. While younger generations can be reached via the mobile application, the newspaper could rather address the older ones. The set-up of a regional news agency may enable the permanent circulation of local news within the region bringing closer the citizens to each other.

By the above solutions the regional identity and commitment can remarkably be strengthened which can lay the ground for the new discourse.

H_4

This hypothesis is only partly justified. On the one hand, the major part of the groupings did not strive to establish bodies beyond those prescribed by the Regulation (i.e. the General Assembly and the Director). As a result, in many cases, the groupings have been set up and are operated as an elite organisation.

At the same time, some EGTCs which participated in the survey, voluntarily keep trying to ensure the largest possible partnership, and in some cases even the civil society actors can take part in the work of region building. However, as the respondents wrote, this openness was not accompanied with the public awareness of the EGTC. It implies that the presumed direct connection between the new governance model and the ability of discourse making does not exist. In order to achieve this, there is a need for conscious and well-designed communication of the management. But, as we have already mentioned, it is not surely necessary: it might be sufficient if the EGTC does its job well and by this contributes to the changes in the citizens's space utilising habits.

On the other hand, the research shows that for those groupings applying participatory forms, these solutions generate serious needs for resources and energy which may make the outsider wonder if it is worth adapting the model.

Taking into account that each EGTC has been developing and operates among different conditions (context), it

might not be purposeful to imitate the Western European models. The EGTC can find its own way to create a cross-border discourse.

The main message of the dissertation is that the European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation represent a decentered governance model within the EU's multi-level governance frames, which, unlike previous cooperation forms, bear the stability and autonomous discourse-making power and competences that, with the application of the tool-kit of partnership and participatory democracy in a longer term, may result in a new, borderless, interpretative context (Lissandrello 2004), „new spatial imaginaries” (Allmendinger et al. 2015, 3), new spaces (Heddebaut 2004). These institutions are stable enough for shaping an alternative discourse on space. Since they intersect but not neglect state borders, they are active participants of re-scaling the nation state system and gradual softening (de-bordering) of centuries-long bordering processes (Durand 2015); and with the involvement of the regional actors they are enabled to offer a new, long-term dimension for the borderland in the development of which they can also invite the citizens.

4.2 Outlook, perspectives for further elaboration

Within the framework of the present dissertation, the theoretical frames were adapted to a Hungarian-Slovak EGTC. During the elaboration of the study, the following further perspectives have been shaped.

- (1) Comparative analysis involving further EGTCs. By using the approach and the methodology applied for the case of Ister-Granum to further European EGTCs even recommendations targeting the further development of the instrument can be drafted. E.g. in the context of the pandemic, one of the Western European EGTCs raised the problem that the groupings had no appropriate competences what prevented them from independently acting in the borderland. Instead, they had to implement the governmental decisions.
- (2) Broadening of the discourse analysis of Ister-Granum. The author did not analyse such potential resources of narratives like the websites of the member municipalities and the local newspapers. In both cases, the contextual analysis should be carried out from 2008 onwards (if the website already existed that time) at municipality level on the topics of the Mária Valéria Bridge and the Ister-Granum initiative and their changes in time; as well as on the frequency of mentionings. This

analysis can also be carried out in other groupings but it would require remarkable capacities taking the linguistic differences into account.

- (3) The development of a tool-kit facilitating the involvement of public actors in EGTCs' work might represent further possibility. This would offer a kind of practical outcome of the present research.

5 Literature of the Theses Booklet

Allmendinger, P. – Houghton, G. – Knieling, J. – Othengrafen F. (2015): Soft spaces, planning and emerging practices of territorial governance. Allmendinger, P. – Houghton, G. – Knieling, J. – Othengrafen F. (eds.): *Soft Spaces in Europe. Re-negotiating governance, boundaries and borders*. Routledge, London – New York. pp. 3–22.

Davoudi, S. – Evans, N. – Governa, F. – Santangelo, M. (2008): Territorial Governance in the Making. Approaches, Methodologies, Practicies. *Boletin de la A.G.E.*, N° 46. pp. 33–52. <http://www.age-geografia.es/ojs/index.php/bage/article/viewFile/677/631> [Letöltve: 2020.05.27.]

Durand, F. (2015): Theoretical framework of the cross-border space production – the case of the Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 30:3. pp. 309–328.

EC (2007): *Phare Ex Post Evaluation. Phase 3, Thematic Evaluations – Cross-Border Cooperation. Thematic Evaluation. Phare Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes 1999-2003*. European Commission, Brussels.

EC (2016b): *Ex post evaluation of Cohesion Policy programmes 2007-2013 financed by the European regional development Fund (ERDF) and Cohesion Fund (CF). Case study: Hungary-Slovakia Cross-border*

Cooperation Programme 2007-2013. European Commission, Brussels.

Engl, A. (2016): Bridging borders through institution-building: the EGTC as a facilitator of institutional integration in cross-border regions. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 26:2. pp. 143–169.

Heddebaut, O. (2004): The EUROREGION from 1991 to 2020. An ephemeral stamp? Kramsch, O. – Hooper, B. (eds.): *Cross-Border Governance in the European Union*. Routledge, Abingdon – New York. pp. 70–87.

Leibenath, M. – Korcelli-Olejniczak, E. – Knippschild, R. (2008): Bridging the gap? Leibenath, M. – Korcelli-Olejniczak, E. – Knippschild, R. (eds.): *Cross-border Governance and Sustainable Spatial Development*. Springer, Berlin – Heidelberg. pp. 187–193.

Lissandrello, E. (2004): Cross-border region Espace Mont-Blanc. A territorial ‘not-yet’? Kramsch, O. – Hooper, B. (eds.): *Cross-Border Governance in the European Union*. Routledge, Abingdon – New York. pp. 88–103.

O’Dowd, L. (2003): The Changing Significance of European Borders. Anderson, J. – O’Dowd, L. – Wilson, T. M. (eds.): *New Borders for a Changing Europe. Cross-Border Cooperation and Governance*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, London – New York. pp. 13–36.

Provan, K. G. – Kenis, P. N. (2008): Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness.

Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18:2. pp. 229–252.

Ramírez, M. G. (2018): The Added Value of European Territorial Cooperation. Drawing from Case Studies. Medeiros, E. (ed.): *European Territorial Cooperation. Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to the Process and Impacts of Cross-Border and Transnational Cooperation in Europe*. Springer, Cham. pp. 25–47.

Svensson, S. (2014): Cross-border Regions in Policy Networks: The EGTC as a Tool of Interest Representation. Engl, A. – Zwilling C. (eds.): *Functional and more? : New potential for the European grouping of territorial cooperation – EGTC*. Eurac Research, Bolzano. pp. 83–97.

van Houtum, H. – Eker, M. (2017): Redesigning Borderlands: Using the Janus-Face of Borders as a Resource. Brambilla, C. – Laine, J. – Scott, J. W. – Bocchi, G. (eds.): *Borderscaping: Imaginations and Practices of Border Making*. Routledge, London – New York. pp. 41–51.

Zumbusch, K. – Scherer, R. (2015): Cross-Border Governance: Balancing Formalized and Less Formalized Co-Operations. *Soc. Sci*, 2015:4. pp. 499–519.

6 The author's relevant publications

Ocskay Gy. – Hardi T. (2021): Határon átnyúló kultúragazdaság integrált fejlesztése a magyar-szlovák határon. *Földrajzi Közlemények*, 145/2. pp. 154–169. <https://doi.org/10.32643/fk.145.2.5>

Jaschitz, M. – Ocskay, Gy. (2021a): XI. fejezet: Határmenti kapcsolatok. 1. Történelmi előzmények és a mai határon átnyúló kapcsolatok. Kocziszky Gy. (ed.): *Észak-Magyarország*. HVG-ORAC, Budapest. pp. 668–685.

Jaschitz, M. – Ocskay, Gy. (2021b): XI. fejezet: Határmenti kapcsolatok. 2. Az Észak-magyarországi Régió határtérségének tipológiája. Kocziszky Gy. (ed.): *Észak-Magyarország*. HVG-ORAC, Budapest. pp. 686–703.

Medeiros, E. – Guillermo Ramírez, M. – Ocskay, Gy. – Peyrony, J. (2021): Covidfencing effects on cross-border deterritorialism: the case of Europe. *European Planning Studies*, 29/5. pp. 962–982. DOI: 10.1080/09654313.2020.1818185

Ocskay, Gy. (2021): XI. fejezet: Határmenti kapcsolatok. 3. A határon átnyúló együttműködés története, jelene és perspektívái. Kocziszky Gy. (ed.): *Észak-Magyarország*. HVG-ORAC, Budapest. pp. 704–728.

Gyelník, T. – Ocskay, Gy. (2020): System error. Reflections on the permanent failure of territoriality of the European Cohesion Policy. *Europa XXI*, 39. <https://doi.org/10.7163/Eu21.2020.39.7>

dr. Jankai N. – Ocskay Gy. (2020): II. fejezet. Az európai területi társulások európai jogi keretei. Dr. Jankai N. – Fetyko, J.I. – Jacenko, Sz.Sz. – Lazur, J.V. – Ocskay, Gy. – Szancsenko, A.J.; – Usztimenko, V.A.: *Ukrajna európai területi társulásokban való részvételének intézményi és jogi dimenziója*. Tisza Korlátolt Felelősségű Európai Területi Társulás, Ungvár. pp. 13–71.

Ocskay Gy. (2020a): Central European Service for Cross-Border Initiatives (CESCI) [article]. Wassenberg, B. – Reitel, B. (eds.): *Critical Dictionary on Borders, Cross-Border Cooperation and European Integration*. Peter Lang, Brussels. pp. 164–166.

Ocskay Gy. (2020b): Changing interpretation of the EGTC tool. Ocskay Gy. (ed.): *15 years of the EGTCs. Lessons learnt and future perspectives*. CESCI, Budapest. pp. 37–62.

Ocskay Gy. (2020c): Cross-border territorial impact assessment. Medeiros, E. (ed.): *Territorial Impact Assessment*. Springer, Basel. pp. 123–142.

Ocskay Gy. (2020d): Euroregion Ipeľ-Ipoly [szócikk]. Wassenberg, B. – Reitel, B. (eds.): *Critical Dictionary on Borders, Cross-Border Cooperation and European Integration*. Peter Lang, Brussels. pp. 418–419.

Ocskay Gy. (2020e): Ister-Granum [article]. Wassenberg, B. – Reitel, B. (eds.): *Critical Dictionary on Borders, Cross-Border Cooperation and European Integration*. Peter Lang, Brussels. pp. 564–565.

Ocskay Gy. (2020f): Tisza [article]. Wassenberg, B. – Reitel, B. (eds.): *Critical Dictionary on Borders, Cross-Border Cooperation and European Integration*. Peter Lang, Brussels. pp. 767–769.

Jankai, N. – Ocskay, Gy. (2019): Rozdil 1. polozhennya evropeiskogo zakonodastva stosovno evropeiskogo ob’ednannya teritorialnogo spyvrobitnitstva. Jankai, N. – Ocskay, Gy. – Usztyimenko, B.A. – Lazur, J.V. – Szancsenko, A.E. – Fetyko, J.I. – Jacenko, Sz. Sz.: *Insztitucijno-pravovij ucsasztyi Ukraini v evropejszkih ob’ednannjah teritorialnoho szpivrobisztnyisztva*. Tisza Körtőlött Felelősségű Európai Területi Társulás, Uzhgorod. pp. 13–74.

Ocskay, Gy. (2019a): 25 Years of European Territorial Cooperation. A Panorama. [Review: European Territorial Cooperation. Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to the Process and Impacts of Cross-Border and Transnational Cooperation in Europe by (ed) Eduardo Medeiros, Springer, Cham.] Scott, W. J. (ed.): *Cross-Border Review. Yearbook 2019*. CESCO, Budapest. pp. 179–186.

Ocskay, Gy. (2019b): A határok reneszánsza – avagy válságban a schengeni rendszer? Sebestyénné Szép, T. – Nagy Z. (ed.): *Ember – tér – idő. Tanulmányok Kocziszky György tiszteletére. A Miskolci Egyetem Gazdaságtudományi Karának jubileumi tanulmánykötete*. Miskolci Egyetem, Miskolc. pp. 171–177.

Ocskay, Gy. (2019c): Introduction: How to assess territorial impacts through the representations of a borderscape. Bottlik, Zs. – Gyelník, T. – Ocskay, Gy.

(eds.): *Changes in the representation of a borderscape. The case of the Mária Valéria Bridge*. CESCOI, Budapest. pp. 5–15.

Böhm, H. – Fejes, Zs. – Gombos, J. – Hüse-Nyerges, E. – Jeřábek, M. – Ocskay, Gy. – Majerníková, D. – Šindelář M. – Soós, E. – Wojnar, K. (2018): *Proposal on the V4 Mobility Council as intergovernmental structure for border obstacle management*. Central European Service for Cross-Border Initiatives, Budapest. http://legalaccess.cesci-net.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/V4_Proposal_mobility_council-1.pdf

Jaschitz, M. – Ocskay, Gy. (2018): Cohesion-based cross-border planning: a new methodology for integrated cross-border spaces. *The Journal of Cross-Border Studies in Ireland*, 13. pp. 91–102.

Balogh, P. – Ocskay, Gy. – Pete M. (2016): Foreword. Acknowledgements. Introduction, content, research design and methodology. Bottlik, Zs. (ed.): *Crossing the Borders. Studies on cross-border cooperation within the Danube Region*. CESCOI, Budapest. <http://institute.cesci-net.eu/crossing-borders-tanulmanykotet>

Gyelnik, T – Ocskay, Gy. – Pete, M. (2016): A classification of the cross-border cooperation initiatives of the Danube Region. Bottlik, Zs. (ed.): *Crossing the Borders. Studies on Cross-Border Cooperation within the Danube Region*. CESCOI, Bp. <http://institute.cesci-net.eu/crossing-borders-tanulmanykotet>

Jaschitz, M. – Ocskay, Gy. (2016): Cohesion Potentials of the Slovak-Hungarian Borderland (A szlovák-magyar határvidék kohéziós adottságai). Károlyi, E. (ed.): *Régiók Európában. Adminisztratív struktúrák és területi identitás. Konferenciakötet.* Károlyi József Alapítvány – L'Harmattan. pp. 219–237.

Ocskay Gy. (2016a): Helyzetkép a magyarországi európai területi társulásokról. *Falu Város Régió*, 2016:1. pp. 96–103.

Ocskay Gy. (2016b): Policy environment. Svensson, S. – Ocskay Gy. (ed.): *Overview of the EGTCs around Hungary.* CESCO, Budapest. pp. 27–42.

Ocskay Gy. – Svensson, S. (2016): General evaluation of the operation of the Hungarian EGTCs. Svensson, S. – Ocskay Gy. (ed.): *Overview of the EGTCs around Hungary.* CESCO, Budapest. pp. 93–120.

Ocskay, Gy. (2015): A határ – valóban gazdasági hátrány? Ricz, A. – Takács, Z. (eds.): *A régió TÍZpróbája.* Regionális Tudományi Társaság, Szabadka. pp. 77–87.

Kuttor, D. – Ocskay, Gy. (2015): A határok változó szerepe, határ menti kapcsolatok. Fábián, A. (ed.): *Otthon a Kárpát-medencében. Területfejlesztési Szabadegyetem 2011–2015.* Nyugat-Magyarországi Egyetem Kiadó, Sopron. pp. 485–512.

Ocskay, Gy. (2014a): Frontier incident or metamorphoses of normality. Bottlik, Zs. (ed.): *Cross-Border Review.* Yearbook of the European Institute, Esztergom. pp. 9–20.

Ocskay, Gy. (2014b): ICT-enabled cross-border governance. Nemeslaki, A. (ed.): *ICT driven public service innovation: Comparative approach focusing on Hungary*. National University of Public Service, Institute of International Studies, Budapest. pp. 123–136.

Ocskay, Gy. (2013): Határsértés. Gondolatok a több szintű kormányzás határ-eseteiről. Ágh A. – Kaiser, T. – Koller, B. (eds.): *Többsebességű vagy többemeletes? A differenciált integráció változatos formái az EU-ban*. Blue Ribbon Research Centre, Zsigmond Király Főiskola, Budapest. pp. 149–163.

Ocskay, Gy. (2011): Innovativeness in cross-border cooperation: the EGTC. *Innovative aspects in the legislation of public acquisitions. Consequences on accessing and managing Structural Funds. Conference volume*. Universul Juridic, București. pp. 290–298.

Jaschitz, M. – Ocskay, Gy. (2010): Tradicionális vonzaskörzeti és funkcionális kapcsolatok a Kárpát-medencében – a kiterjedő térkapcsolatok új perspektívái. *Falu Város Régió*, 2010:2–3. pp. 80–85.

Ocskay, Gy. (2009): Az M 11-es és az új esztergomi Duna-híd. Ocskay, Gy. (ed.): *Hiányzó kapcsolatok. Konferencia a közlekedési hálózatok térségfejlesztési szempontú határon átnyúló tervezéséről*. Ister-Granum Regionális Fejlesztési Ügynökség Kft., Esztergom. pp. 130–136.

Ocskay, Gy. (2008): Ister-Granum: Európában az elsők között. Az EGTC mint a határon átnyúló együttműködés új modellje. *Európai Tükör*, 2008:7–8. pp. 115–129.

Ocskay, Gy. (2006): A szabadság térbelisége. Tocqueville és Foucault a hatalom dekoncentrációjáról. Fülöp, E. – Ocskay, Gy. – Pogonyi, Sz. (eds.): *Szabadság és/vagy egyenlőség. Tocqueville-tanulmányok*. Politikai Filozófia Közhasznú Alapítvány, Pilismarót. pp. 147–158.

Ocskay, Gy. (2002): A lokális diskurzusok és a globális hatalom. Egy hálózatépítési modellprogramról. *Tér és Társadalom*, 2002:1. pp. 17–40.

Ocskay, Gy. (1993): A régiók Európája a XX. században. *Történelem*, 1993. okt. pp. 7–8.

Ocskay, Gy. (1992): Európa jövője. A kiút: az "újráfoganás". *Új Magyarország*, 1992. okt. 19.; nov. 19.; 1993. jan. 7.; febr. 18.

Before publication:

Jaschitz, M. – Ocskay, Gy. – Scott, J.W. (2021): Borderland formation processes: Cross-border agglomeration tendencies between Hungary and Slovakia. Medeiros, E. (ed.): *Border Cities and Territorial Development*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis, Abingdon (UK).

Ocskay Gy. (2021): Europeanisation of the Western Ukrainian Border: The Case of the Tisza EGTC. Lačný, M. (ed.): *The EU-Ukraine Association Agreement and its impacts on cross-border cooperation on the external EU border*. Cambridge Scholars, Newcastle Upon Tyne (UK).