

INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR – *TERRITORY, POLICIES AND GOVERNANCE*

12 March 2018, Rectory of the Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisboa

Conclusions – Afternoon

Panel 2 - Territorial governance: institutions, scales and policies

The diversity of the institutional positions present in this panel in terms of territorial governance shows that, despite the different perspectives, there is knowledge and learning maturity that represent a relevant asset that could not be wasted. Despite the uncertainties that the systematic and repeated postponement of regionalization brings, generating different positions depending on whether it is a lost battle or with prospects of concretization, there is a clear perception among regional and local actors (and partly also in the sectoral ones, although not represented in the panel) that the intermediate territorial level (whether regional or subregional) has a role to play, with recognized advantages in the effectiveness of planning and above all in the capacity to formulate public policies that are closer and identified with the real needs of territories. It is a fact that the actors represented in the panel do not hide inconsistencies or disarticulations witnessed in a daily basis of their participatory processes of multilevel territorial governance. They also recognize that this governance is demanding and strongly consuming process in resources (e.g. coordination, human and technical), particularly in a difficult context in the different levels of administrations.

Nevertheless the local and the supramunicipal levels have shown the capacity for understanding the advantages of intermunicipal cooperation and other forms of horizontal cooperation, especially in terms of acquiescent on investment solutions and projects, particularly in the financial framework of the Structural Funds.

In a context of this nature there is enough room for deepening these processes, particularly if there is no temptation to systematically disrupt, during the programming period, the organizational model which will jeopardize ongoing learning. One of the opportunity for deepening the process will be the achievement of coherence gains in the territorial organization of the decentralized services. The local and supramunicipal levels and the diversity of the actors that populate them will gain substantially with the clarification of the positioning of their interlocutors both, of central and deconcentrated administration. The widespread democratic legitimacy of the CCDR was not

focused during the debate as a major need. On the contrary, it was mentioned the need for these CCDRs to contribute to deepening the coherence of the State institutions present in the territories.

Therefore, it seems to have a scope for, even if the question of regionalization in terms of the possible horizon of implementation of the constitutional precept, in a scenario where there is no political will to solve the yes or no, a substantially improvement in the current context of multilevel territorial governance, providing new fields of solution and experimentation at the subregional level. More precisely, there seems to be knowledge, maturity, learning assets and willingness of local and subregional actors towards a greater intensity of decentralized governance, without evident necessity of great disruptive changes.

Facing the level of centralization in Portugal, largely mentioned by the panelists, the existence of multilevel territorial governance is an European comparative case study, to which we should pay more attention, at least from the point of view of self-esteem for the myriad of actors who participate in it with recognized context of scarce resources.

Lisboa, 14 march 2018

O moderador do painel

António Manuel Figueiredo

Quatenaire Portugal