

Table of Contents

Introduction

A. Methodology	3
B. Research Structure and Framing of the Theme in the Economic Area	5
C. Reasons for Theme Choice and Presentation of Research Topic	11

Chapter 1. European Regional Development-Conceptual Boundaries and Evolution over time	13
--	----

1.1 Region, Regionalization, Regionalism	15
1.2 A Historical Journey – Lisbon Agenda 2000	27
1.3 Regional Development – Strategic Orientations	56

Chapter 2. Regional Cohesion and Competitiveness – A Proposal for the Consistency of Approaches	67
---	----

2.1 Regional Competitiveness in terms of the Challenge Launched by the Policies of Economic and Social Cohesion	70
2.2 European Neighbourhood Policy and European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENPI)	73
2.3 Regionalization - European Counter-Offensive to the Phenomenon of Migration	91

Chapter 3. Competitiveness in the Regional Development	112
--	-----

3.1 Regional Competitiveness-Conceptual and Structural Boundaries	113
3.2 Mechanisms for Regional Competitiveness Evaluation	119

3.3 Configurations of Regional Development	123
3.4 Theories on Economic Growth and Regional Development Policies	126
3.5 Updating the Objectives of Competitive Development - Strategy Europe 2020	131
3.6 Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020-Towards an Intelligent, Sustainable, Regionally Organized Europe, favorable to the Inclusion	135
Chapter 4. Romanian Reaction to the Promotion of Competitiveness in terms of Regionalization	152
4.1 The Applicability of Knowledge Management Models in Regional Development	155
4.2 Romania's Development Regions in terms of Entrepreneurial Ability	163
4.3 Regionalization in Romania-Scenario Method	166
Conclusions	
A. Objectives Achieved and Contributions	199
B. Problems Encountered and Future Research Directions	204
Bibliography	206

The theme of this scientific approach is the *regional development of Romania within European context*, with a particular focus on the relationship between *competitiveness and regionalization in terms of the European Union acquis*.

The purpose of this thesis is to perform an analysis on how the European regionalization can positively influence economic growth, also contributing to the reduction of social disparities and discouraging the phenomenon of migration.

Scientific analysis was structured on three levels, and consists in:

- applying the EU regionalization principles to the case of Romania in order to validate the premise that European regionalization can positively influence the economic growth, also contributing to the reduction of social disparities and discouraging the phenomenon of migration;
- presenting regionalization as a strategic measure of counter-offensive to the phenomenon of migration;
- demonstration of the relationship between regionalization and competitiveness in the context of European cohesion policy.

One of the basic principles on which we try to define regional competitiveness is that territorial development is not a product of economic growth but one of the causes of growth. From a vision that incompletely establishes the premises for development on the need for efficiency (economic growth) and on the competitiveness specific to an atomized economic population (individuals, firms, localities), located punctually in territory, this report conducts towards a vision that explains development through the territorial effects of economic activity. Due to the popularity of the concept, as well as the ease of comparison and classification, many agencies monitor the competitiveness, from the World Economic Forum, which publishes the annual *Global Competitiveness Report*, to national bodies such as the Council on Competitiveness of the United States or National Council for Competitiveness from Ireland, developing numerous reports, studies and reviews. Following the model of national competitiveness we can measure competitiveness through the level of regional productivity, both by means of microeconomic

level data and aggregately, this data offering a range of information on the standard of living, both from the perspective of evolution over time and in comparison to other regions.¹ However, the analysis is sometimes hampered, both because of the difficulty of data collection and aggregation process, and because of the multitude of factors that may influence the construction of an analytical model, assuming that the data would be available for relevant periods and at the desired level of aggregation. Productivity is only one aspect of regional competitiveness, or of the competitive advantage alongside other equally important factors, i.e. the employment rate. According to the definition, competitiveness is the ability to achieve high productivity, while maintaining a high level of employment; therefore, it is not enough to achieve an increased productivity for a region to be competitive. There are numerous examples of regions in transition period which have increased substantially in terms of productivity due to massive dismissals, which has had a devastating social impact and led to a dramatic fall in living standards. In addition, the boomerang effect consists in the phenomenon of migration. The migration decision corresponds to differences in income, and migrants tend to have a migration propensity higher than the average.

Migration processes require specific assessment and particular attention, mainly because of the complexity but also because of the multiple implications thereof, and the study, design and implementation of migration policies is a subject of great interest and currently relevant in European research. The analysis of specific literature has shown that migration is a long-term process that requires good management and has to be structured at the level of policies in the field, which means that acceptance policies are subject to international and European conventions for guaranteeing fundamental rights, and the promotion of integration as a dynamic process of long-term negotiation between migrants and natives (economy, the labor market, welfare, education, political participation) is performed through the acceptance of cultural diversity. Traditional sensitivity concerning the threat to migratory flows leads actually to the fear of instability. They involve compensatory programs to be located outside the discriminatory policies, integration policies including complete tools (courses, language learning programs, intercultural dialogue).

¹ Sixth *Interim Report on Economic and Social Cohesion*

http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/interim6/com_2009_295_ro.pdf

The elaboration of this thesis involved both basic techniques of description and scientific analysis, such as the various types of definitions, classifications, explanations and examples, tracing the cause and effect relationship, commenting analysis patterns, making possible for the research to be considered the fundamental method of this scientific approach, as well as advanced techniques such as the analysis of secondary sources, for example official reports of the specialized organizations and institutions, case studies and opinion polls carried out by recognised organizations, as well as other techniques, such as the comparative method, the method of the participant observer, formalized methods, statistical methods — in order to illustrate as faithfully as possible the relevance of the theory that territorial development is not a product of economic growth, but even one of the causes of the growth.

This scientific approach keeps the custom of structuring thesis in a maximum of four chapters. A long period in the elaboration process has been dedicated to the question on what would be more appropriate to start with: classic version of defining the terminology of the fundamental concept *regionalization* or opting for the analysis of the basic premise-outside the economic and social development provided through competitiveness, the territorial modifications would be useless. We decided to choose the first option, in order to clarify from the outset the conceptual apparatus.

In the first chapter, entitled *European Regional Development-Conceptual Boundaries and Evolution over time*-we approached three dimensions of interest for the proper understanding of the concept of *regionalization*:

- theoretical delimitations of fundamental and related terminology,
- a history of European regional development with the fundamental point in the *Lisbon Agenda in 2000*
- strategic guidelines aimed at regional development.

The descriptive character of the chapter would have been impossible to elude, as long as our main objective has been to distinguish, on the one hand, the institutions responsible for regionalization policy at European Union level, but also the tools by which *competitiveness*, *social cohesion* and *mitigation of social and economic disparities* were stimulated at regional

level-items that are the *raison d'être* of European regional policy. The descriptive-analytical approach was necessary in order to subsequently act as a reference for the analytical approach to practical situations in the regions of Romania. More specifically, in chapter IV (1)., *The Applicability of Knowledge Management Models in Regional Development*, we illustrate the development of theories through a practical example, i.e. by the Operational Program Human Resources Development (POSDRU), a Romanian program financed from the European Social Fund (ESF) within the framework of the Convergence Objective.

This program has the overall aim of "human capital development and increasing competitiveness, by linking education and lifelong learning with the labor market and provide increased opportunities for the future participation on a modern, flexible, and inclusive labor market of 1.960.000 persons."² Preliminary clarifications from the second chapter of the thesis relating to the European political-administrative implementation of regional policy, determines subsequent analyses in European institutions, processes and mechanisms to not require explanations to hamper the flow of scientific explanation.

Broadly, the European Union's *regional policy* consists in activities, programs and development initiatives of Member States, regional participants, authorities and local communities. The policy is coordinated and co-financed by the European Union, and aims at reducing economic and social disparities between European regions and increasing the welfare of the population. As the economic and monetary integration of the European Union has advanced, important changes have been performed on the European regional policy as well. This thesis will show that both the successive reforms of the policy of economic and social cohesion, and decisions to increase its financing were made in the context of negotiations of other European issues, particularly those related to budget, enlargement and integration. At the same time, the integration of the ten countries in Central and Eastern Europe, on May 1, 2004, and then of Romania and Bulgaria on 1 January 2007, has placed the future of the cohesion policy and its reform in the midst of the European debate. In the context of discussions about "enlargement over depth", this wave of enlargement has disturbed the pace and direction of the European regional policy, which is amplified by the process of economic restructuring and globalization the Union faces currently.

² Sectoral Operational Program Human Resources Development (POSDRU 2007-2013), http://www.fonduri-structurale.ro/Document_Files//resurseumane/00000030/1bjbd_pos_dru_romana.pdf, p.3

All these challenges have prompted rethinking policy on economic and social cohesion and a more precise definition of its priorities for the programming period 2007-2013.

In the second chapter- *Regional Cohesion and Competitiveness – A Proposal for the Consistency of Approaches*-are presented the theories about economic growth and regional development policies by reference to the phenomenon of migration, since it constitutes a decisive factor for 21st century Europe, when it comes to considering the consistency of approaches on one hand and social cohesion on the other hand, often translated as social economy.

Sub-chapter 2.2. *European Neighbourhood Policy and European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENPI)* discusses the theme of regionalization, extended this time to a new type of region, which transcends both national borders and those of the European Union, indicating intense economic, social and cultural exchanges, between territories within the cross-border regions. Sub-chapter 2.3. *Regionalization - European Counter-Offensive to the Phenomenon of Migration* is directly dedicated to Romania's situation through a cleavage from the intersection of a chronological abscissa, Romania's circumstances before and after integration into the European Union, with a qualitative ordinate as a supplier country of immigrants and the condition of country of adoption. One of the arguments that have been highlighted by the proponents of the proposal relating to restrictions on migration between the EU and the countries that have entered the EU in the latest wave refers to the so-called demographic pressure. Moreover, both the significant proportion of the population included in the category of the population capable of work and unemployment rate have had an important influence on the migration potential of the region. An important issue relates to demographic vitality of the region and the possible consequences on the international mobility, since on a relatively long period of time, the demographic factor is likely to contribute significantly to the high mobility of the population.

The third chapter- *Competitiveness in the Regional Development* -frontally addresses the problem of *regional competitiveness* as a fundamental element for the territorial development of economic and social type. An extra dimension which increases the difficulty of regional competitiveness comes from the specificity of the analyzed entity, which lays at the intersection of macro and micro economy, and which cannot be considered any national economy at a small scale and no amount of companies that compose the economy. At the same time, we must take into account the fact that regional competitiveness depends on a number of specific factors of

local economic and social development, often very different from one region to another, yet more than the sum of its components. The difficulty lies, therefore, in the identification of those common traits that affect both the competitive and noncompetitive companies in a region, and how they act.

These "common features" can be viewed as being "regional externalities"³, meaning resources attracted by companies which influence the effectiveness, innovation, flexibility, dynamism. Increasingly more, explaining regional competitiveness is explained by concepts much more "fluid", such as local knowledge, learning and creativity. In this sense, we consider highly relevant the new concept of "creative city", according to which such cities attract and retain creative people, which in turn lead and contribute to the formation of an innovative economy, flexible and adaptable to global changes.⁴ The main argument for these explanations is that in a globalized economy, key resources for regional and urban competitiveness depend on localized knowledge creation processes, by means of which people and businesses learn new technologies, to trust each other, share and exchange information.

At EU level, the concept of regional competitiveness has been outlined as far back as 1999 in conjunction with another fundamental concept of development: economic and social cohesion. For a long time the two concepts have evolved in a dichotomist manner, and artificially joint at public policy level. Gradually, it became increasingly clear that they can only evolve together.⁵ The definition of regional competitiveness accepted as a starting point in this material is that given by the European Commission in the Sixth Periodic Report on the Regions: *"Competitiveness is defined as the ability to produce goods and services that pass the test of international markets, while maintaining high levels of income and sustainable or, more generally, the ability of regions to generate, how long you are exposed to foreign competition, relatively high levels of income and employment"*. *"In order for a region to be competitive, it is*

³ Martin, R.L., "A Study on the Factors of Regional Competitiveness", raport final destinat Comisiei Europene, Directoratul General – Politică Regională, 2004, pp.27

⁴ Cortright, Joe, "The Economic Importance of Being Different: Regional Variations in Tastes, Increasing Returns, and the Dynamics of Development" în *Economic Development Quarterly*, February 2002, vol. 16 no. 13-16, respectiv Richard Florida, "The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life" în *Paperback*, 23 December, 2003, *Cities and the Creative Class*, Taylor & Francis, 2004 și *The Flight of the Creative Class*, HarperCollins Publishers, 2007

⁵ *Sixth Interim Report on Economic and Social Cohesion*,
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/interim6/com_2009_295_ro.pdf.

important as it ensures both the quality and quantity of jobs". The difficulty lies not in the assessment of the effects of welfare, but in determining the competitive advantages that lead to obtaining them. In this respect, there are countless variables that can influence competitiveness (or lack thereof), from economic structure and resources to sophisticated factors, such as governance or entrepreneurial capacity.

The issue of migrations, integrated in territorial planning, is addressed at the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities, which was approved at the informal meeting of European ministers responsible for urban development and territorial cohesion in Leipzig on 24-25 May 2007, stating the importance of strengthening coordination between the local and the regional level. The aim of this agreement is to establish a balanced partnership at regional and metropolitan level between both cities and rural areas and small, medium or large cities.⁶ Problems and urban policy decisions can no longer be viewed in isolation; each town, taking into account the fact that cities must be concentration points for developing regions and assume responsibility for territorial cohesion.⁷ They facilitate the advantageous in-time coordination between economic development, infrastructure, real estate and services, taking into account, *inter alia*, the impact of the existing social trends on migration trends and the ageing of population, and of the conditions of energy policy.

Sub-chapter 3.5 - *Updating the Objectives of Competitive Development - Strategy Europe 2020* - presents the perspective of the future (stretched by 2020) of the European Union, on the key element of the thesis: the competitiveness (Strategy Europe 2020), and the Sub-chapter 3.6- *Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020-Towards an Intelligent, Sustainable, Regionally Organized Europe, favorable to the Inclusion*-establishes the connection with the other two fundamental concepts for this thesis: regional development in inclusive context.

The territorial agenda of the European Union 2020 "Towards smart, sustainable Europe and favorable to the inclusion of various regions", approved by the Member States in the year 2011

⁶ *Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities* has been adopted at the informal meeting of European ministers responsible for urban development and territorial cohesion in Leipzig on 24-25 May 2007, <http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=143879>

⁷ *Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities* has been adopted at the informal meeting of European ministers responsible for urban development and territorial cohesion in Leipzig on 24-25 May 2007, <http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=143879>

that Europe is faced with demographic challenges increasingly higher, varying from the territorial point of view. Depopulation and population ageing will lead to changes in many regions, including rural and peripheral ones, major influence and social cohesion and territorial, the provision of public services, the labor market and housing.

Other regions with growing populations face different problems. Intra-European significant migration as a result of EU enlargement and immigration coming mostly from third countries, the least developed, are the specific challenges and opportunities, especially in urban areas.

Chapter 4-*The Romanian Response to promote competitiveness in the regionalization*-referred to the desirability of applying knowledge management models in regional development and entrepreneurial capacity of the eight regions in Romania, they represent a barometer of the level of competitiveness and potential for economic and social development of Romania.

Addressing a region as a "peculiar organization" open the possibility of applying the theories of knowledge creation for regional development. Development of organizational knowledge through partnership relations, the impact of products and services on the way of life of the citizens and their involvement in the creation of knowledge lead us to conclude that the limits of knowledge of different organizations-enterprises, universities, research centers or administrative institutions-in excess of their internal space. Knowledge is disseminated in the economic and social environment of the Organization and changes the way of creative work and lifestyles of those who come into contact with them. The region is considered to be any entity directed toward cooperation, having regard to their own development goals, we must establish a framework for relations and formal or informal dependencies between organizations in the region. International or national policies for regional development are most often directed towards the Elimination of gaps in development between regions, support the conversion of industrial areas in structural difficulties, modernizing the education system and the promotion of employment. In this way, it is desirable to strengthen the cohesion of the economic, social and territorial. Theoretical models of knowledge management are in close correlation with the current issues of regional development and provide the opportunity to clarify some important aspects of it. Clusters and nodes, as well as assessing the intellectual capital of a region are, in this view, the essential concepts, put to work in this scientific endeavor.

The importance of knowledge, innovation and research is undoubtedly recognized for economic development. Theories refer to regions such as "nodes of knowledge" based on Schumpeterian theory and Evolutionary Economics, innovation development center brings to the interactive learning process. The innovation activity of a firm is influenced by the environment: partners, competition, human capital, infrastructure, knowledge institutions, regulations and legislation, etc. Combined, all of these factors can be defined as the regional innovation system.⁸ From the items listed above several features of competitiveness can be highlighted. We can speak such economic trends as well, based on efficiency, but that is not sufficient, it is competitive to the extent that it is accompanied by raising living standards and/or real incomes of the population. At the same time, goods and services produced by the country/region concerned has to cope with foreign competition success (competition on a free market). At the same time, competitive development in the short term should not affect the development of future generations, the component of sustainability as a *sine qua non* condition of competitive development at the macroeconomic level. Equally, however, we can notice that the measurement of competitiveness, according to the current methodology does not include aspects of sustainability—a weakness when it comes down to extensive analysis and relevant to a region or a sector of activity. The current trend is to measure competitiveness depending on welfare effects it generates (standard of living) and not according to the factors that determine or any negative effects that could result in social or in terms of damage to the environment. Moreover, the competitiveness is more often regarded in dichotomy with another fundamental factor of regional development, which is the economical and social cohesion. Having in mind these things, it has been agreed at the European political level the fact that the political cohesion can't be limited to reaching the Lisbon objectives (growth and occupation), this one ought to include also a territorial dimension, which allows to take into account the regional specific⁹. Whatever the definition, competitiveness is usually linked to tangible results, such as continued growth in productivity, real wages and high standard of living and innovative processes to drive effects. The conditions of competitiveness at the national level may have elements in common with the necessary analysis at regional level, although in the

⁸ The concept of innovation in regional/ territorial plan is mostly based on the success of an industrial specialised aggregation or of some industrial clusters concentrated at regional level.

⁹ Sixth *Interim Report on Economic and Social Cohesion*,
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/interim6/com_2009_295_ro.pdf.

latter case, the usual constraints-membership in a monetary Union, the mobility of production factors, barriers to trade, macroeconomic shock absorbing-are far more relaxed. At the same time, it should be taken into consideration and mutual relationship, especially relative to the conduct of international cooperation. Therefore, throughout the thesis, it allows us to define reported regional competitiveness as the ability of a region, understood as a functional area of coordinated development of public authorities concerned to increase the productivity of the resources employed (macroeconomic component) and to maintain the local business base and skilled workforce, as well as to attract investment (microeconomics and employment component) in terms of a better standard of living. Which means, in addition to all those mentioned, the average revenue growth across households, improves quality of life and preserving habitat.

Since the onset of the research at this time, the polemics upon the privatization theme of regional development of Romania, accompanied by a territorial reform, have been kept alive by intensifying its conformable with the alterations. The current form of regionalization in Romania should be seen as a consequence of our integration in the European Union, namely the compulsory condition for accessing the Structural Funds. We weren't at the first action of regionalization, each of them having in common a territorial organization closely related to historical and political events. Another common element of repeated reorganizations, which began in 1938 and continued in 1950, 1968 and 1983 respectively represent the trend of excessive centralization. Overwhelmingly of the decisions taken at the Center, backed by the powers for managing finances, while local structures have a minor role. We believe that the current division by region (without legal personality and administrative role) was done essentially to finalize a negotiation with the European Union-regional policy-taking in a small degree in computing issues to traditional ties, cultural identity, with repercussions on the social and economic in nature. It should not mean, however, that this territorial organization was made to EU pressure, but that is a choice that belongs to the ruling of the Romanian political class at that time. This regionalization process ended up being formal, while avoiding the time, changing the essence of things.

With the hope of avoiding an overly theoretical approach, we consider that we have reviewed, exemplifying a fundamental scientific field addressed, how are the groups of theories of growth

and regional development, and current trends of regional development. The fundamental concept in the center of these theoretical concerns is the region, building around it to delimit the classifications, patterns and evolutionary comparative analysis, with special reference to specific regions of the European Union and Romania respectively.

The novelty of the work is represented by the three-dimensional perspective of regional development, an approach that was coherent, including the desired and the possibility of a long-term analysis aimed at sustainability component. More specific, this thesis examines the phenomenon of territorial development not only in terms of regional science, and spatial aspects of nature and not solely from the perspective of regional economy to competitiveness and economic growth, but also through a merge with European social theories on the development of cohesive and reducing disparities. A fourth factor under consideration which makes the work specific, is the phenomenon of migration in conjunction with regional development. This decisive element appears in our analysis from a variety of reasons: specificity of the State Member which is on the border of the European Union, and to double as a country of adoption, as well as providing migrants (including "grey matter"). We attained to this kind of approach determined to take steps contributing to the situation concerning the regionalization of Romania, specifically analyzing the ways in which administrative and territorial divisions were made in Romania, starting with the 20th century-the formal and political criteria-and excited about the present opportunity to remedy the situation of Romania's regions Division, to constitute the polarization around some big cities-growth poles but aiming to the cultural and historical criteria.

We consider that the main objective of this thesis, is to do an analysis of how the European regionalization can positively influence the economic growth, thus contributing to the reduction of social disparities, and thus discouraging the phenomenon of migration, has been reached. This scientific approach has been structured to reveal the interrelationship of space, society and economy, in which economic and social phenomena are increasingly required to explain from the angle of reporting on a scale beginning with the simplest forms of human Association and ending with the most impersonal form of conglomeration in space: globalization. In this new context, after a thorough analytical reading of the thesis, we can conclude that regionalization can be understood as a process of muster centripetal small communities at the alienation produced by

globalization: specific regions, be it by cities, regions, States, or else, they may assume an answer and a role to play in the changes that occur.

In our opinion, the regions as territorial entities, mostly, are products of history, not of political pressures or globalization, and therefore cannot be explained in a sense, be strictly geographically, be strictly economically. The boundaries are not always clearly demarcated and sometimes it changes throughout a development process. Establishment of the regions resulted in different epochs of the evolution of financial interests and the social classes and with power ties into a socio-spatial context. Moreover, in addition to regions such as physical territory, to be taken into account and communities with their various identities and beliefs or partially different regions and Nations which are separated. People live in a community on the basis of non-material values and things that we share: goals, beliefs, aspirations, or the "common understanding" of the place and life. This status of the community certainly can be applied to the 1st level of human organization, locality. Hence conclude that it is necessary to make the difference between the regional and local dimension. The different national and regional characteristics are described as the geographical area defined by reporting people to the same institutions and practices, and which produces a certain system of relationships. It was useful throughout the works, to make the distinction between these dimensions and especially where certain levels of human cohabitation may overlap.

The work of the integrated analysis of economic regionalism, including the model, given that this regional organization of Romania is a consequence of the entry into the European Union—a basic condition in order to be able to access EU Structural Funds—and paradigm in question appeared and a result of the strengthening of the welfare State in post-war Europe. What has also contributed at the benefit of the public administration, it reached in the meantime to providing services. So, indirectly, the regional development agencies in Romania, which, although lacking in administrative duties and just having the developer role, providing not only the Agency's coordination, approval of the regional development strategy etc., but also the provision of information services, training, consultancy, evaluation, monitoring, editing, etc. To streamline these services, it looked at the problem of decentralization of administration, such as the evaluation and monitoring of projects financed by the Structural Funds. Like any model, it aims at streamlining the public administration from the citizen's point of view. The difference is given

by the fact that if, for example, in the case of political-administrative regionalism, efficiency is an indirect result of the exercise of the purpose of creating a deeper democracy, in terms of this model, efficiency is itself the main aim. In addition, the concept of efficiency here holds a different meaning, which can be determined using the terms, costs and benefits from the efficiency of the previous point that was a purely political concept. There is, however, an obvious, clear delineation between the two forms of efficiency, as long as the content is very likely generated by the proper use of public money, in other words, if citizens feel that they benefited from adequate services in return for the taxes they have paid. However, it is not the case, given the fact that although we talk of major projects at the regional level (highways, airports, hospitals, etc.), we cannot talk about the possibility to assess directly the competence of regional authorities, because they do not exist.

Some countries in the European Union (France, Germany, Netherlands, Romania) have separate regional structures in line with the public function. These distribution lists might or not be the delimitation of administrative regions together. In fact, they fit only in countries with mainly centralist patterns. Therefore, the first problem that one encounters the decentralization management is the optimal structure of local government and the optimal proportion of the regions. The Regional Development Agencies of Romania put out of reach of local/county echelon, only the analyses of situation and goals to achieve, but does not have administrative attributions to put them into practice. Political and financial decision is found chiefly at a central level. We can say the same about the Structural Funds, including those from the Regional operational program, which the ADR manages them just at the level of promoting them, without being able to decide which projects are of greatest interest for the region to give a funding. The current trend of regional reform takes into account surmount of the matter concerning the lack of administrative attributions from the RDA.

The literature surveyed indicates the presence of two criteria to delimit the territorial entities to which it offers this administrative autonomy, public interest and respectively financial (tax). *The extent of the public interest* shows that while certain interests are linked to the national community as a whole, others are just local interests. For example, national defense depends on national public interest as a whole, while maintaining local roads is a matter of local interest. The difficulty with this requirement stems from the fact that it cannot be used in a very precise

manner. In fact, since there are different types of interests, we cannot gain an *optimum administrative entity*. On the other hand, it would be possible to set up for every interest in part a different political body. In the same way, the second criterion, i.e. the most efficient dimensions of the autonomous entity providing public services may not always provide satisfactory solutions to propose for each type of service to the public.

In our opinion, theoretically, the best jurisdiction would be that territory which offers optimum service at the lowest possible costs. From this simple definition it can be concluded that intuitively and in this case, public services cannot hold the same optimal jurisdiction because public services are related to numerous factors such as population and population characteristics, the object that you are serving, the type of service, season, climate, etc. To illustrate, the medical services have a certain degree of institutional management which is not identical to the optimal snow removal service roads. In the same way, agriculture, forestry, water management, transport on different categories of infrastructure will correspond to an optimum. In this respect, the administration on regions of avail of public functions represents a model of regionalization itself. Although it is continually discussed over effective allocations, it was never taken into account but the existing regional structure. However, it is possible, at least at theoretical level, to consider all of the factors that lead to an efficient allocation, including the conditions of existence of an optimal population or of the optimal length of the region. As long as the utility of individuals can be increased through restructuring the territorial limits, there is also motivation for improvement.

That is precisely why, throughout the thesis, we have considered necessary the references about *the theory of clubs* (the optimal size of a club and material costs necessary for each Member to make available only the expenses for the club's goods, including marginal congestion cost internalization), taken in its various forms from theorists like Tiebout (1956), Berglas (1976), Wooders and Scotchmer (1987) concerning the method of optimum size of regions (the jurisdictions). Needless to say, in this context, was the theorem of Henry George, according to whom the size of the population of a region in terms of maximizing the utility is reached when the aggregate land rent plus other users' fees for marginal cost internalization of congestion of local public goods are equal to the total costs of providing local public good. This theorem provides the optimal size for a good target audience.

As to schematize, we can consider the Administration as being that public good. However, in reality, the regions cannot report to a singular good, while more goods presents different sectors of optimization, depending on the type of supply and preferences, therefore a possible practical application would require a complex modeling in a multivariate function.

As a conclusion based on theoretical explanations of the thesis, we believe that in order to determine the optimal size of a region is required to correlate very well the public goods with the market. Each public good corresponds to an area of the market, where it follows that each public good must be provided at the level of governance that encompasses the entire population in that market, following the principle of fiscal equivalence of Oates. The problem stems from the fact that markets sometimes coincide partially public goods and cannot be achieved a level of governance for each good separately. The two practice problems will crop up: the Division of jurisdictions between the unit and the rents' effects of "overflow" between jurisdictions (externalities). An alternative solution to manage these spillovers (externalities) may be increasing the size of jurisdictions to the extent to which we no longer have externalities or internalizing all costs and benefits that have emerged from the externalities. The difficulty that we hit when we are referring to enlargement would be a loss of well-being as a consequence of reduced capacity to differentiate local outputs (it would be as if we waive the regionalization). Moreover, in reality, the regions have historical and cultural boundaries that have very little in common with the economic realities, but whose change is difficult to accept. In theory, if we refer to a "tabula rasa" which has no set of boundaries already determined and which we must define both a set of levels of Government, as well as limits for jurisdictions, it could easily create quite an optimal structure.

We can notice in newspapers and television a lively debate at the political level to promote the competition between regions as a factor of stimulating growth and reducing gaps, which requires shifting funds from rich regions to underdeveloped regions. Such a case is wide, the two cities of Sibiu, Braşov and currently with the poles of growth and which doesn't want to debate the supremacy in a common region, believes that the solution is to be placed in different regions.

Central State, according to certain expectations, a trend towards a further redeployment, as well as poor regions, but heavily developed regions may concern, naturally, other interests. From the angle of these interests, the regionalization must find a balance, otherwise the stability State

becomes vulnerable. Even a centralized state cannot take into account the wishes of those who produce more.

We believe that a particular model of functional/economic regionalism (which aims to optimize the functioning of economics) is represented by the territories' assignation from centers of influence. The objective was pursued in this form of regionalization, embodied by the presence of the situation of the Structural Funds, distributed via the Regional Operational Program, in the framework of calls for "cities-growth poles". The distinction of this criterion compared with the theoretical model enshrined consists in the modification of the calculation method of functional jurisdiction on the basis of the principles of functioning in the network. Using the theory of influence areas (central place Theory, Christaller, Losch, Thiessen) major centers are established economically that draw connections and streams and they receive the divided territories of influence, theoretical rules, taking into account the realities of the territory (natural barriers, path dependency, etc.). As we have taken into account the map shape and arrangement of the great cities in the territory, when I presented the North East development region, we can say that it is a feasible alternative. In addition, it is compatible with historical provinces and variations similar to the proposed efficiency. However, we believe that the sole criterion is the presence of a functional Centre, and shaping it in greater detail will raise the difficulty of determining the jurisdictions. Overlapping areas can be seen and a high correlation with actual development regions. In addition to the functionalism, we believe that a substantial amount of other criteria should be included in the analysis in the specific case of regionalization of our country: the reorganization costs (costs, time and potential losses of opportunity cost/feasibility of administrative autonomy/decentralization guaranteed through regionalization (concern for a degree of decentralization and autonomy as well as higher), traditions, political acceptability.

As stated previously, there was the concern theoretical for the import of models of good practice, taking it over in the traditional way, on the French connection. At EU level we find four models of regionalization, each with the listed advantages and disadvantages: model based on centralization of authority, uniformity, consistency and balance (found in countries such as France, Italy, Spain, Greece, Central and Eastern Europe); the strong State model, which has intermediate values of authority (such as Germany, Austria, Netherlands); Anglo-Saxon model (United Kingdom), in which the State is not perceived as a legal person and the Scandinavian

model (in the Nordic countries, Sweden, Finland), where the principle of uniformity applies, used in a decentralized framework.

Regional Government of Romania may accordingly take various shapes, starting from the lowest form of Government (represented in the form of a functional decentralization to enhance the level of absorption of EU funds and to put into practice the ongoing development projects at the regional level) and the decentralized governance arrangements, which may even lead to a regionalization policy.

Since the onset of the research and until this moment, the polemics upon the privatization theme of regional development of Romania, accompanied by a territorial reform, have been kept alive by intensifying the concordance with the power alternations. The current form of regionalization in Romania should be seen as a consequence of our integration in the European Union, namely the compulsory condition for accessing the Structural Funds. We weren't at the first attempt of regionalization, each of them having in common a territorial organization closely related to historical and political events. Another common element of repeated reorganizations, which began in 1938 and continued in 1950, 1968 and 1983 respectively, represent the trend of excessive centralization. An overwhelmingly majority of the decisions is taken at the center, doubled by the attributions of the finances management, while the local structures have a minor role. We believe that the current division in regions (without legal personality and administrative role) was done essentially to finalize this negotiating with European Union medium size regions NUTS 2 -taking into account, the issues regarding traditional liaisons, cultural identity, with repercussions on the social and economic complexions. However, we shouldn't understand that this territorial organization was made to EU pressure, but that is a choice that belongs to the ruling Romanian political class at that time. This regionalization process ended up being formal, while avoiding at that time, changing the essence of things.

With the hope of avoiding an overly theoretical approach, we consider that we have reviewed, exemplifying a fundamental scientific field for the domain approached, how are the theory groups of growth and regional development, and current trends of regional development.

The main problem encountered in the analysis of regions of Romania, is the lack of studies on the real competitiveness, taking into account the entire complex of factors proposed by GEA

(soft and hard matrix), for each of the regions, caused by the lack of effective tools for measuring it, needed to be implemented at central and regional level.

Future directions of research are moving either towards the implementation of the pilot evaluation matrix of regional competitiveness, on the guidelines of the Europe 2020 strategy, either to analyze potential regional configurations appropriate to the programming period 2014-2020.

Bibliography

General bibliography

- Angelescu, Coralia (coord.), *Economia României și Uniunea Europeană: vol. 4*. București, Editura ASE, 2006.
- Anghel, Remus Gabriel, Horvath, Istvan (coord.), *Sociologia migrației. Teorii și studii de caz românești*, Editura Polirom, 2009
- Ahonen, G., *Generative and commercially exploitable intangible asset*, în Grojer, JE și Stolowy, H. (editori), "Classification of Intangibles", Groupe HEC, Jouy-en-Josas, 2000.
- Amisse, S., Baulant, C., Muller, P., Vargas-Prieto, A., *The concept of cluster and its two logics*, EAEPE Conference "Labour, Institutions and Growth in a Global Knowledge Economy", Roma, 6-8 noiembrie, 2008.
- Andersson, Th.; Schwaag, S.; Sörvik, J. și Wise Hansson E., *The Cluster Policies Whitebook*, IKED, Malmö, 2004.
- Antonescu, D., *Dezvoltarea Regională în România – concept, mecanisme, instituții*, Editura Oscar Print, București, 2003.
- Armstrong C., Saint-Onge H., *The Conductive Organization Building Beyond Sustainability*, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2004.
- Asian Development Bank (ADB), *City cluster development: toward an urban-led development strategy for Asia*, Mandaluyong City, 2008.
- „Guvernare și democrație în Moldova”, în *E-journal*, Anul VII, Nr. 145, 19 septembrie-18 octombrie 2009, Asociația pentru Democrație Participativă ADEPT Chișinău.
- Attali, G.J., *L'anti-économique*, Paris, PUF, 1974.
- Auriac, F., „Region-systeme. Region etsystemes économiques”, *L'Espace Geographique*, nr. 4, 1986, pp. 272-277.
- Bachtler, J.; Yuill, D., *New Directions in Regional Policies in Europe*, European Policy Research Centre, Universitatea Strathclyde, 2002.
- Bachtler, J., Grupul Metis, *Ex-post evaluation of the implementation of Structural Funds during 2000-2006 - analize preliminare*, Comisia Europeană, 2008.

- Bahra N., *Competitive Knowledge Management*, Palgrave, New York, 2001.
- Bal, A. (coord.); Luțaș, M.; Jora, O., Topan, V., *Scenarii privind evoluțiile comunitare în domeniul competitivității, politicii de coeziune și politicii de dezvoltare regională*, Proiect SPOS-2007, Studii de strategie și politici, Institutul European din România, 2007.
- Baldwin, Richard; Wyplosz, Charles, *Economia integrării europene*, Editura Economică, București, 2006.
- Barna, R. C., *Dezvoltare Regională în Europa*, Editura Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2007.
- Bărbulescu, Iordan Gheorghe, *Uniunea Europeană: de la național la federal*, Tritonic, București, 2005.
- Bărbulescu, Iordan Gheorghe, *Uniunea Europeană: politicile extinderii*, Tritonic, București, 2006.
- Belloubet-Frier, Nicole, „Vers un model european d'administration locale?”, în *Revue française d'administration publique*, Ecole Națională D'Administration, CERA, nr. 121-122, Strassbourg, 2007.
- Bodonea, Adrian; Mugureanu, Traian, „Viitorul politicii regionale în spațiul U.E.” în *Tribuna economică*, vol. 16, 2005, pp. 75-76.
- Borislavova Spendzharova, Aneta, „Bringing Europe In? The Impact of EU Conditionality on Bulgarian and Romanian Politics”, în *Southeast European Politics*, Vol. IV, Nr. 2-3, noiembrie 2003.
- Boutellier R., Gassmann O., von Zedtwitz M., *Managing global innovation: uncovering the secrets of future competitiveness*, Springer, Berlin, 2000.
- Bukovski, Vladimir, *Uniunea Europeană...o nouă URSS*, Editura Vremea, București, 2006.
- Burton, J. A., *Knowledge capitalism. Business, Work and Learning in the New Economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999.
- Busek, Erhard; Mikulitsch, Werner, *Uniunea Europeană și drumul spre Răsărit*, Institutul European, Iași, 2005.
- Cameron, Fraser, *An Introduction to European Foreign Policy*, Routledge, London & New York, 2007.
- Charle, Ch., „Region et conscience regionale en France”, în *ARSS*, nr. 35, 1980.

- Cheatle, M., *Global Environment Outlook 2000*, Geo-2000, UNEP, Earthscan Publication Ltd., Londra, 1999.
- Ciccarone, A. (coord.), *L'etat de la regionalisation en Europe. Rapport de l'ARE*, Strasbourg, Iunie, 2010.
- Cojanu, V., Bîrsan M., Unguru M., *Competitivitatea Economiei Românești – Ajustări necesare pentru atingerea obiectivelor Lisabona*, Institutul European din România, 2006.
- Cojanu, V., „A Discussion on Competitive Groups of Countries Within the European Area of Integration”, *South- East European Journal of Economics*, vol. 5, nr. 2, 2007.
- Cojanu, V., „The Case for Competitive Areas of Integration: A Literature Review”, *Studia Europaea*, vol. II, nr. 2, 2007.
- Constantin, D-L., (coord.), *Dezvoltare regională și avantaje competitive*, Editura Oscar Print, București, 2004.
- Constantin, D-L., *Challenges to Romania's regional policy in the perspective of accession to the European Union*, European Regional Studies Association Conference, Leuven, 2006.
- Constantin, D-L. (coord.), *Economic and Social Cohesion and Regional Policy*, Editura ASE, București, 2007.
- Cristal, Oleg, „Viitorul cadru juridic RM-UE: Moldova-Stat Asociat Uniunii Europene”, în *Policy Brief no.7*, ADEPT-Asociația pentru Democrație Participativă, Chișinău, 29 octombrie 2009.
- Cristureanu, Cristiana, (coord. Proiect), *Construirea politicii de dezvoltare regională în conformitate cu normele europene: raport de cercetare*, Editura ASE, București, 2002.
- Constantin, Luminița-Daniela (coord.); Frenzt, Gabriela; Răducu, Aura; Scheele, Jonathan, *Coeziunea economico-socială și politica regională: contribuția fondurilor europene la finanțarea programelor*, București, Editura ASE, 2007.
- Csorba, Luiela, „Dezvoltare regională durabilă”, în *Revista de comerț*, vol. 7, nr. 7, 2006.
- David P.A., Foray D., „Economic Fundamentals of the Knowledge Society”, în *Policy Futures In Education. An e-Journal*, 1(1): Special Issue: Education and the Knowledge Economy, 2003.
- Diaconescu, Mirela, *Economie europeană: fundamente și etape ale construcției europene*, Uranus, București, 2004.

- Dinu, Marin; Socol, Cristian, *Fundamentarea și coordonarea politicilor economice în Uniunea Europeană*, Editura Economică, București, 2006.
- Drăgan, Gabriela; Atanasiu, Isabela, *Compatibilitați între cadrul românesc al politicii regionale și reglementările UE privind ajutorul de stat - Romanian special development zones and UE state*, Institutul European, Iași, 2002.
- Drăgan, Gabriela, *Uniunea Europeană între federalism și interguvernamentalism: politici comune ale UE*, Editura ASE, București, 2005.
- Drăgănescu, M., *Societatea informațională și a cunoașterii. Vectorii societății cunoașterii*, în F. G. Filip (coord.) *Societatea Informațională – Societatea Cunoașterii. Concepte, soluții și strategii pentru România*. Academia Română, Editura Expert, 2001.
- Drucker, P., *The Age of Discontinuity; Guidelines to Our changing Society*, Harper and Row, New York, 1969.
- Duke, Simon, *Uniunea Europeană și managementul crizelor: evoluții și perspective*, București, Editura Economică, 2002.
- Dura, George, „EU membership gives Romania new opportunities in its relations with Moldova”, CEPS commentary, Brussels, 10 ianuarie 2007.
- El-Agraa, A.M., *The European Union: Economics and Policies*, Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2004.
- EUROMONITOR Nr. 7 (16), Ed.V, Implementarea reformelor inițiate conform Planului de Acțiune UE-RM, Evaluarea progresului în perioada iulie-septembrie 2009, ADEPT și Expert-Grup.
- Florida, Richard, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, Washington Monthly, 2002.
- Florida, Richard, *Cities and the Creative Class*, Routledge, 2004.
- Florida, Richard, *The Flight of the Creative Class*, HarperCollins, New York, 2007.
- Gardiner, B., „Competitiveness, productivity and economic growth across the European regions”, în *Regional Studies*, vol. 38, nr. 9, 2004.
- Gardiner, B., *Competitiveness Indicators for Europe - Audit, Database and Analysis*, Studies Association Regional International Conference, Pisa, 2003.
- Gheorghita, Virgil; Cociuban, Aristide, *Economie mondială*, Editura Politeia – SNSPA, București, 2002.

- Grupul de Economie Aplicată, *Demersul GEA privind necesitatea de a susține o nouă abordare a politicii industriale*, Camera de Comerț și Industrie a României și a Municipiului București, 2005.
- *Manual de evaluare a competitivității regionale* - realizat de Grupul de Economie Aplicată în cadrul proiectului GOF „Romania - Building Regional Assessment Capacity in Line with the Lisbon Agenda”, București, 2007.
- *Politica de dezvoltare regională*, Seria Micromonografii - Politici Europene, Institutul European din România, 2004.
- Hix, Simon, *The Political System of the EU*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 1999.
- Hoover, E. M., Giarratani F., *An Introduction to Regional Economics*, Regional Research Institute, West Virginia University, 1999.
- Eijffinger, Sylvester C.W.; Haan, Jakob, *European monetary and fiscal policy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.
- Faludi, A., „Territorial Cohesion Policy and the European Model of Society”, *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 15, Nr. 4, 2007, pp. 567-58.
- Hen, Christian, *Uniunea Europeană*, Coresi, București, 2002.
- Iancu, A., *Creșterea economică și mediul înconjurător*, Editura Politică, București, 1979.
- Jakubiak, Malgorzata (ed.), „Prospects for EU-Moldova economic relations”, în *Report from the project financed by Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs Foreign Aid Programme 2006*, CASE-Center for Social and Economic Research and Case Moldova.
- Keating, M., *Noul regionalism în Europa Occidentală: restructurare teritorială și schimbare politică*, Institutul European, Iași, 2009.
- Kocourek, A., *Stimulating Regional Economy Competitiveness through the Formation of Clusters*, ISI Thompson, 2009, pp. 253-259.
- Lee, Moosung, *How do small states affect the future development of EU*, Nova Science Publishers, New York, 2006.
- Leontief, W., *Analiza input-output*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1970.
- Lutzeler, Paul Michael, *Europa după Maastricht. Perspective americane și europene*, Institutul European, Iași, 2004.

- Krugman, P.R., Venables A.J., *The Spatial Economy. Cities. Regions and International Trade*, MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 1999.
- G. Marcou (2000), "La régionalisation en Europe", Parlement européen, Direction générale des Etudes, Série Politique Régionale 108 FR rév.1.
- Martin, R.L., *A Study on the Factors of Regional Competitiveness. A draft final report for The European Commission Directorate-General Regional Policy*, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 2004.
- Martin, Ph., *The geography of inequalities in Europe*, CEPR, 2004.
- Mazilu, S., *Modele de analiză a creativității ca factor de dezvoltare regională și convergentă*, Iași, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, lucrare susținută public în septembrie 2012.
- Mazilu, Dumitru, „Libera circulație a serviciilor - componenta importantă pentru funcționarea pieței unice europene”, în *Revista de drept comercial*, vol. 15, nr. 1, 2005, pp. 134-147.
- Miron, Dumitru; Drăgan, Gabriela, *Economia integrării europene*, Editura ASE, București, 2002.
- Miron, Dumitru, (coord.), *Economia Uniunii Europene*, Luceafărul, București, 2002.
- Mocanu, Oana Mihaela, *Politica Europeană de Vecinătate. Realizări și Perspective*, Ed. Nomina Lex, București, 2010.
- Muntele I., Groza, O., Țurcănașu G., Rusu A., Tudora D., *Coeziune teritorială și disparități în Moldova*, Editura Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iași, 2012.
- Neal, Larry; Barbezat, Daniel, *The economics of the European Union and the economies of Europe*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998.
- Nonaka, I., Takeuchi H., *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- Nonaka, I., Toyama R., Konno N., SECI, *Ba and leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation*, Long Range Planning, vol. 33, 2000.
- Lefter, Cornelia, *Drept comunitar instituțional*, Editura Economică, București, 2001.
- Panayoton, Th., „Economics, Environment and Development”, în *Development Discussion Paper*, nr. 259, Cambridge, Harvard Institute for International Development, 1999.

- Parmetier, Florent, „The reception of EU neighbourhood policy”, în Zaki Laïdi (ed.), *EU Foreign Policy in a Globalized World: Normative power and social preferences*, Routledge/ Garnet Series: Europe in the World, 2008.
- Pelkmans, Jacques, *European integration: methods and economic analysis*, Prentice Hall, Harlow, 2001.
- Petiteville, Franck, *La politique internationale de l'Union Européenne*, Presses de Sciences Po, Collection: Références, Paris, 2006.
- Poggi, Annamaria, „Les *competences administratives et reglementaires des regions italiennes*”, în *Revue francais d'administration publique*, Ecole Nationale D'Administration, CERA, nr. 121-122, Strassbourg, 2007.
- Polese, M., *From regional development to local development: on the life, death and rebirth of regional science as a policy relevant science*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1998.
- Pop, Adrian (Coord.), Manoleli, Dan, „Spre o strategie europeană în bazinul Mării Negre. Cooperarea teritorială”, în *Studiul nr. 4*, Colecția Studii de strategie și politici, 2008.
- Porter, M.E., *Regional Foundations of Competitiveness: Issues for Wales*, lucrare prezentată la conferința ‘Future competitiveness of Wales: Innovation, entrepreneurship and technology change’ în Aprilie 2002.
- Porter, M.E., *Competitive Advantage*, Free Press, New York, 1985.
- Porter, M.E., *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, The Free Press, New York, 1998.
- Porter, M.E., „The Economic Performance of Regions”, *Regional Studies*, Vol. 37, Nr. 6-7, 2003.
- Porter, M.E., *Clusters and the new economics of competition*, Harvard Business Review, Boston, 1998.
- Rakutiene, Sima, „The Web of the EU's Neighbourhood Policy: Between Bilateralism and Multilateralism”, în *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics*, Vol. 2, Nr. 1, 2009.
- Rodriguez-Pose, A., „Socioeconomic restructuring and regional change: Rethinking growth in the European Community”, *Economic Geography*, vol. 70, nr. 4, 1994.
- Ron M.; Sunley, P., „Paul Krugman's Geographical Economics and Its Implications for Regional Development Theory: A Critical Assessment”, *Economic Geography*, vol. 72, nr. 3, 1996.

- Seidelmann, Reimund, „The EU's neighbourhood policies”, în Mario Tel. (ed.), *The European Union and Global Governance*, Routledge/ Garnet Series: Europe in the World, London & New York, 2009.
- Skyrme, D., *Measuring the Value of knowledge – Metrics for the Knowledge Based Business*, Business Intelligence, London, 1997.
- Solvell, O.; Lindqvist, G.; Ketels, C., *The Cluster Initiative Greenbook*, Ivory Tower, Stockholm, 2003.
- Sölvell, Ö., *Clusters, Balancing Evolutionary and Constructive Forces*, Ivory Tower Publishing, Stockholm, 2008.
- Scăunaș, Stelian, *Uniunea Europeană: construcție, reformă, instituții, drept*, Editura C.H. Beck, București, 2008.
- Stewart, T.A., *Intellectual Capital – The New Wealth of Organizations*, Doubleday, New York, 1997.
- Stoica, Camelia, *Libera circulație a persoanelor în Uniunea Europeană*, Editura Oscar Print, București, 2001.
- Stoicescu, Ioana-Laura, „Fondurile structurale - temei al politicii regionale”, în *Revista de comerț*, vol. 8, nr. 11-12, 2007.
- Sveiby K.E., *La nouvelle richesse des entreprises. Savoir tirer profit des actifs immatériels de sa société*, Maxima, Paris, 2000.
- Sveiby, K.E., *The New Organizational Wealth. Managing & Measuring Knowledge-Based Assets*, Barrett-Hoehler Publishers, Inc., San Francisco, 1997.
- Șerban, Radu, „Libera circulație a forței de muncă în Uniunea Europeană”, în *Raporturi de muncă*, vol. 8, nr. 6, 2004, pp. 57-64.
- Tudora, Daniel, *Distribuția spațială a indicilor stării sociale a populației rurale din Moldova Apuseană*, Editura Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iași, 2012.
- Thünen, Johann Heinrich von, *Isolated state; an English edition of Der isolierte Staat*, Oxford, New York, Pergamon Press, 1966.
- Vaishar, A., „Regional Periphery: What Does it Mean? ”, în Komornicki, T., Czapiewski, K. (eds.), *Europa XXI. Regional periphery in Central and Eastern Europe*, Polish Academy of Sciences, Varșovia, Nr. 15, 2006, pp. 7-12.
- Valeri V.P., *Regiunile Administrative în Istoria României 1862-2002*, Craiova, 2003.

- Vasilescu, Victoria, „Dilemele atractivității economiei Republicii Moldova în contextul perspectivelor de integrare europeană a țării”, *Policy Brief* No. 6, ADEPT, Asociația pentru Democrație Participativă, Chișinău, 22 Octombrie 2009.
- Vickerman, R., Spickermann K., Wegener, M., „Accessibility and Economic Development in Europe”, în *Regional Studies*, vol. 33, nr. 1, 1999.
- Viedma Marti J.M., „RICBS: Regions Intellectual Capital Benchmarking System - A methodology and a framework for measuring and managing intellectual capital of regions”, în *The First World Congress on Intellectual Capital for Communities*, Paris, 2005.
- Voicu, Marin, *Drept comunitar: teorie și jurisprudență*, Editura Ex Ponto, Constanța, 2002.
- Von Breska, E., „Al cincilea raport privind coeziunea economică, socială și teritorială”, în *Oficiul pentru publicații al U.E., Luxemburg, 2010*.
- Wagstaff, P., *Regionalism in the European Union*, Intellect, Exeter, 1999.
- Wallace, Helen; Wallace, William, *Elaborarea politicilor în Uniunea Europeană*, ediția a 5-a, Institutul European din România, București, 2005.
- Wanlin, A., *The Lisbon Scorecard VI – Will Europe Economy Rise Again?*, CER, Londra, 2006.

Referințe de specialitate:

- Legea nr. 151/1998 privind dezvoltarea regională în România, Monitorul Oficial 204/2001.
- Legea nr. 315/2004 privind dezvoltarea regională în România, Monitorul Oficial 577/2004.
- Cadrul Strategic Național de Referință 2007-2013.
- *Comisia Europeană, Al doilea raport de coeziune economică, socială și teritorială, Oficiul pentru Publicații al Uniunii Europeene, Luxemburg, 2010*.
- *Commission Europeenne, Le dialogue social dans l'administration local et regional: aperçu general, CCRE, Bruxelles, 2009*.

- *Commission Européenne, Regions dans l'Union Européenne. Methodologies and working paper, Eurostat, 2010.*
- Comisia Europeană, Comunicat: *Politica de inovare: actualizarea abordării de către Uniune a contextului Agendei Lisabona*, COM (2003)112.
- Comisia Europeană, Comunicat: *Implementarea programului comunitar de la Lisabona: mai multă cercetare și inovare - investiția pentru creștere și muncă: o abordare comună*, COM(2005) 488 final din 12.10.05.
- Comisia Europeană, Comunicat: *Punerea în practică a cunoștințelor: o abordare comună*, COM(2006) 502 final din 13.09.2006.
- Comisia Europeană - Regulamentul 1059/2008 privind stabilirea Nomenclatorului Unităților Statistice Teritoriale.
- *Creative Cities and Regions for an Innovative Europe*, (2011), Brussels, disponibil online la <http://www.diba.cat/documents/228621/3d6aa83d-92f6-4a63-9f55-31532f14dacd>.
- *Regions for economic change - Fourth report on economic and social cohesion*, Brussels, iulie 2007.
- MDRL - *Detalierea Obiectivelor Conceptului Strategic de Dezvoltare Teritorială a României 2007-2030 în scheme teritoriale directe și pachete de proiecte de relevanță teritorială regională, inter-regională și națională*, București, 2008.
- ESPON, Raport de sinteză nr. 3, *Territory matters for competitiveness and cohesion*, 2006.
- ESPON, Proiect 1.1 *Enlargement of the European Union and the wider European perspective as regards its polycentric spatiality*, 2005.
- ESPON, Proiect 3.3 *Dimensiunea teritorială a Strategiei Lisabona/Goteborg*, disponibil online la <http://www.espon.eu>.
- Cambridge Econometrics, „A Study on the Factors of Regional Competitiveness“, Raport final destinat Comisiei Europene, Directoratul General – Politică Regională, 2004.
- Cel de-al patrulea Raport privind coeziunea economică și socială „Growing Regions, Growing Europe“, mai 2007.
- Cerințe specifice ale gestionării instrumentelor structurale și implicațiile pentru România, Studii de Impact (PAIS III), Studiul nr. 6, Institutul European din România, București, 2004.

- Ecotec Research & Consulting, „A Practical Guide to Cluster Development, A Report to the Department of Trade and Industry and the English RDAs“, 2004.
- ESPON 1.1.3 „Enlargement of the European Union and the wider European Perspective as regards its Polycentric Spatial Structure Final Report“, 2005 (revizuit în august 2006).
- OCDE, *Programme on Technology and the Economy*, 1992.
- European Commission, *Europe in figures*, Eurostat Yearbook, 2011.
- *European Commission, Regions in Europe. Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics, NUTS 2010/EU-27, Eurostat, Methodologies and Working Papers, Luxemburg, 2011.*
- *Journal Officiel de l'Union Europeenne, Reglement (UE) no 31/18.01.2011 de la Commission relatif a l'etablissement d'une nomenclature commune des unites territoriales statistiques (NUTS).*
- Raportul Anual de Analiză și Prognoză - România 2013, elaborat de Societatea Academică din România, disponibil online la http://sar.org.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/RAPQRT-SAR_FINAL.pdf)
- Raportul European asupra Competitivității, 2000.
- Programul Operațional Regional 2007-2013.
- Programul Operațional Sectorial Creșterea Competitivității Economice 2007-2013.
- Programul Operațional Sectorial Transport 2007-2013.
- Programul Operațional Sectorial Mediu 2007-2013.
- Programul Operațional Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane 2007-2013.
- Programul Operațional Dezvoltarea Capacității Administrative 2007-2013.
- Programul Operațional Asistență Tehnică 2007-2013.
- Planul Național de Dezvoltare al României 2007-2013.
- Raportul Președintelui Comisiei pentru Competitivitate, *Global Competition: The New Reality*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984.
- Raportul OECD privind schimbările structurale survenite pe piața forței de muncă, 2007.
- Anuarul Statistic al României, INS, București, 2000-2008.
- Statistică Teritorială, INS, București, 2001-2009.
- Strategia Lisabona revizuită.

- World Bank, World Development Report 2009, „Reshaping Economic Geography“, Washington, 2009.

Referințe web:

- The World Bank, <http://econ.worldbank.org/>
- Global Economic Prospects - June 2013: Less volatile, but slower growth,
- <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTDECPROSPECTS/EXTGBLPROSPECTSAPRIL/0,,menuPK:659178~pagePK:64218926~piPK:64218953~theSitePK:659149,00.html>
- Global Monitoring Report 2013: Rural-Urban Dynamics and the Millennium Development Goals, <http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTDECPROSPECTS/0,,contentMDK:23391146~pagePK:64165401~piPK:64165026~theSitePK:476883,00.html>
- Lisabon Strategy for Growth. Towards a Green and Inovative Economy, http://ec.europa.eu/growthandjobs/pdf/COM2005_330_en.pdf
- EU news and policy debates, <http://www.euractiv.com>
- Uniunea Europeană în România, http://ec.europa.eu/romania/information/publications/359_ro.htm
- Ministerul Dezvoltării Regionale și Turismului, <http://www.mie.ro>
- Ministerul Dezvoltării regionale și Administrației Publice, <http://www.mdrt.ro/>
- Tratatetele Uniunii Europene, http://europa.eu/eu-law/treaties/index_ro.htm
- Direcția Generală Politică Regională și Urbană, http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/regional_policy/index_ro.htm
- Politica regională, http://ec.europa.eu/policies/regions_local_development_ro.htm
- Clusters and City Reagions, <http://www.clusterobservatory.eu/index.html>
- Reports and Information on Clusters, <http://www.cluster-research.org/>
- The Cluster Initiative Greenbook, <http://www.cluster-research.org/greenbook.htm>
- Cluster Initiatives in Developing and Transition Economies, <http://www.cluster-research.org/devtra.htm>

- Clusters - balancing evolutionary and constructive forces, <http://www.cluster-research.org/redbook.htm>
- Global Cluster Initiative Survey (GCIS), <http://www.cluster-research.org/gcis.htm>
- e-democratie, <http://www.businessintegrity.ro/tags/e-democratie>
- European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion (ESPON), <http://www.espon.eu/main/>
- Ministerul Fondurilor Europene, <http://www.fonduri-ue.ro/>
- Eurostat, Statistics, Databases, <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home/>
- Enlargement, <http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/>
- Comitetul Regiunilor, Adunarea UE a reprezentanților locali și regionali, <http://cor.europa.eu/ro/Pages/home.aspx>
- The NUTS classification (Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics), http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/nuts_nomenclature/introduction
- Industrial Competitiveness, http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/industrial-competitiveness/index_en.htm
- Assembly of European Regions, <http://www.aer.eu/>
- EU Regional Competitiveness Index 2010, http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/2010_competitiveness_Index.pdf