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Report on the first Connex Thematic Conference: 1
"Towards a European administrative space" held in London, 16 – 18 November 2006

1. Opening

Morten Egeberg, ARENA, University of Oslo.

After greeting the conference participants, Morten Egeberg directly addressed the question of what is meant by “the European administrative space”. He commented that the European administrative space has actually existed for quite a long time; in fact, it may be traced back to the seventeenth century 2 . However, the actual emancipation of the Commission from national governments has placed the development of such a space on a radically different trajectory. This new space seems to complement a basically intergovernmental order with highly visible elements of a Union administration that spans levels of governance, partly circumventing national ministries.

Therefore, the focus of the conference was related largely to the long-term transformations affecting the role of the Commission, the Council and the emerging European regulatory agencies. Specifically, the question was raised whether EU-level agencies are triggering the development of European-wide administrative networks, in which EU agencies and particularly the Commission might assume a coordinating role among national agencies in various policy sectors. Furthermore, since the Union has relatively few competences and resources in the domain of policy implementation (it is mainly the task of member states to ensure implementation of policies), the following points were queried. How and to what extent is implementation carried out in practice? Through which mechanisms does implementation occur, and which variables explain national differences as regards the effectiveness of implementation?

The starting point was primarily the multilevel European administrative space that has been triggered by the consolidation of the European Commission as a new executive centre. Thus, the conference focused on the Commission, the executive functions taken care of by the Council secretariat, the coordination problem a partly dual executive might cause, the EU-level agencies often operating in-between the Commission and the Council, the problem of accountability, the issue-specific networks of agencies across national borders and levels of governance, the standardisation and synchronisation of national administrations, the implementation of EU policies as the national level, the national coordination challenge, and, finally, the democratic character (or his lack) of the emerging European administrative space.

To achieve a more coherent understanding of the "potential" European administrative space, this thematic conference addressed all the topics above from various disciplinary perspectives.

---

1 This report is based on notes by Blaise Larpin and Martino Maggetti, University of Lausanne, Switzerland. Both are PhD Students at the University of Lausanne and working about different aspects of regulatory agencies at the Swiss and at the European level. Blaise Larpin is founded by the contribution of the Swiss government to Connex network.

2 The strengthened bilateral diplomacy subsequent to the Peace of Westphalia constituted a kind of common administrative space. Egeberg, Morten, Opening of the connex thematic conference “towards a europe administrative space”, London, 16 November 2006
-mainly law and political science- underlining the true inter-disciplinary and cross-cutting character of this meeting.

The programme committee consisted of Deirdre Curtin, University of Utrecht, Renaud Dehousse, Sciences-Po Paris, and Morten Egebreg, University of Oslo (Chair). The local organizer was Hussein Kassim, Birkbeck College.

2. **Mapping the European administrative space,**  
_Herwig C. H. Hofmann, University of Luxembourg._  
Discussant: _Sverker Gustavsson, University of Uppsala_

The aim of this paper was to understand the geographic peculiarities of the European administrative space. Hofmann thus gave a brief reconstruction of the development of European laws' influence on the structure of its Member States (which ended with a definition of the European administrative space as a space of interaction for the creation and the implementation of EU/EC law).

He pointed out the main actors exercising public authority in the administrative space. For Hofmann, the extent of administrative activity in the European administrative space can only be fully appreciated if the traditional external point of view is supplemented with an internal one. This allows us to take a look behind the implementation activity. It leads to a view of the European administrative space not as being two superimposed territorial structures; rather, this space can be seen to have developed over time, on one hand, a de-territorialisation of the exercise of power, and on the other hand, the establishment of a network of integrated administration. The emergence of integrated administration has an impact on criteria for accountability. Hofmann then sketched some of the major issues of accountability within the model of the European administrative space he developed.

The main conclusions of his paper are:

(i) The European administrative space is a three dimensional concept with complex vertical, horizontal and diagonal relations of the actors therein.
(ii) Despite differentiation in single policy areas, the phenomenon of administrative cooperation has lead to an integrated administration, i.e. an intensive cooperation between administrative actors and activities from each level.
(iii) Integrated administration is what renders the EU system of government and governance unique and distinct from Member States' legal systems.

**Discussion**

The discussant of the paper, Sverker Gustavsson, noticed two major problems or questions. First of all, if he agreed with the heterogeneous structure of the European administrative space, he questioned the necessity to understand this complexity (why is it so?). Second, he pointed out the problem of transparency in such a delegation chain. Gustavsson proposes two departure points to explore these problems: to compare the European administrative space with administrative spaces in federal systems, and maybe, to joint this phenomenon with other international institutions.
3. From agent to principal: The European Commission and EU Administrative Agencies

Renaud Dehousse, Sciences-Po, Paris
Discussant: Luc Verhey, University of Maastricht

This paper proposes to re-examine the principal-agent theory, according to the emergence and the multiplication of (regulatory) agencies in the European administrative space. Renaud Dehousse’s main contention is that in order to make sense of the decision to delegate powers to, and the institutional design of EU agencies, one has to keep in mind the absence of a clear hegemon in the EU, which is itself a by-product of the multilevel character of that system.

In the first part of his presentation Dehousse reviewed the two kinds of principal-agent models that have been used so far to analyze the delegation of powers either to supranational bodies in general or to European agencies in particular. For him, the delegation issue cannot be analyzed without considering the basic principles underpinning the European Union's institutional architecture, which is characterized by the absence of a principal, and by the presence of principals with variety of preferences. He argued that the alternative model proposed here may enable us to understand a number of features which are at odds with the "standard" delegation model, in which there is, in principle, a clear chain of command leading to governments and political parties. The multiplicity of principals explains the politics of agency creation and the multiplicity of resulting tensions, such as the fight over the heads of agencies or the dilution of responsibility.

Discussion

The discussant Luc Verhey noticed that, theoretically, Dehousse's approach seems to be very innovative, in practice it may raise quite a few problems; because the principal is "de facto" an aggregate of actors which evolve in an unsettled environment. Likewise, one might doubt whether the multiplicity of principals is able to explain the multiplicity and the variety of controls.

4. Four Features of the European Administrative Space

Sabino Cassese, University of Rome and Italian Constitutional Court
Discussant: Johan P. Olsen, ARENA, University of Oslo

Sabino Cassese was the first speaker on Friday the 17th. He started off his presentation by pointing out four features of the European administrative space and comparing them with domestic administrative orders.

First of all, while domestic administrations depend on one centre (i.e. the president or the cabinet) the European administration has not just one centre of power. The European executive has two "heads" and there is a great difference between these two heads; the Council is an intergovernmental body, while the Commission is a purely European institution. The second feature is the following: while domestic administrations have exclusive powers of implementation, the European administration is not the only implementing authority of the EU. The European administration has the power to implement European law only if the scale or the effects of the proposed action make State powers insufficient. The implementing power of the EU is consequently residual and not monopolistic. Domestic administration is top-down; European administration is, by contrast, bottom-up. So, domestic administrations must facilitate and implement European law.
Thirdly, while domestic administrative law is binomial (i.e. there are relations between two poles, the executive and a private party), European administrative law is trinomial. There are relations among the European Commission, national administrations and private parties, and each may play multiple roles. This multiplicity of players generates "polycentric adjudication processes".

Finally, while domestic administrative law is usually a privileged branch of law, full of executive prerogatives, in European administrative law the administration does not generally enjoy special rights and privileges.

Cassese concluded his presentation with an exhortation. These essential differences between the European administrative space and the national administrative orders show that all political scientists and lawyers have to forsake the traditional state paradigm to understand the reality of the European administrative space.

Discussion

The main purpose of the discussant was to point out the high level of convergence between political science and law. Olsen went further by stimulating the collaboration between these two fundamental sciences for a real understanding of the European administrative science. He also revealed the role played by the law as a decisive instrument for a cultural revolution in the EU. But he also had one open question: how can a political scientist take the law into account as a normative power? Finally and more particularly, Olsen pointed out some deficiencies on Cassese's presentation, especially about the comparative dimension of his paper. The EU isn't a UFO. We don't have to overestimate its uniqueness. A clear synchronic (with other "international" institutions as the UN) or diachronic (with old empires) comparison might possibly increase the explanatory potential of such studies.

5. At a critical Juncture: present and future challenges facing the council Secretariat

Thomas Christiansen, European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht, and Sophie van Hoonacker, University of Maastricht
Discussant: Michel Mangenot, University of Strasbourg

Christiansen and van Hoonacker’s goal was to show the historical trajectory and current challenges of a European institution that has remained largely under-researched: the General Secretariat of the Council of Ministers of the European Union.

Their aim in writing their paper was three-fold. First, they assessed the nature of the previous path of institutional development in order to be able to make statements about the logic according to which this development has occurred; second, they examined the impact of the more recent developments to see whether these changes do indeed represent a critical juncture for the institution. Finally, building on this analysis of both the long-term evolution and recent developments, they discussed the future challenges that the Council Secretariat will be facing.

After having placed the Secretariat in the wider context of EU politics today, Christiansen and Hoonacker reviewed historical institutionalism with a theoretical approach. In their view, introducing the concept of "critical juncture" to explain the transformations of the Council Secretariat adds value to their research.

Their main conclusions can be summed up as follows. It should be noted that there have been significant changes to the way in which the EU made its policies in the 1950s, but that the adaptation of the Council Secretariat has not followed a clear path of rational decisions about this process, but has rather been determined by the gradual adaptation, the unintended
consequences and the internal processes within the Secretariat itself. Finally, they have identified the period around 1999, and the Cologne European Council in particular, as decisive in terms of a shift of the institutional development. Given the very different logics that have entered the Council Secretariat since then, this may indeed be seen as the kind of critical juncture that historical institutionalism regards as the point at which there is a departure from path-dependency.

Discussion

Michel Mangenot, started off the discussion by putting forward two points. First, he wanted to congratulate the duo on their research topic. He noted that the Council Secretariat is an under-explored institution whose influence is growing quickly. He also emphasised the necessity to adopt a more sociological approach to understand power conflicts underlying such institutions. In that sense, further developments of Christiansen and Hoonacker's research will be a real benefit to the comprehension of emergence, development and changes in the European administrative space. Mangenot’s second point, following his own research, proposed to find a comparative point which could aid a better understanding of the way the Council Secretariat functions. As far as he is concerned, taking into account the development of the French Matignon's Secretariat SGCi (a sort of secretariat "d'Etat Major") as a reference could help the researchers develop further hypotheses.

6. Coordinating the EU

Hussein Kassim, Birkbeck College, University of London
Discussant: Anchrit Wille, University of Utrecht

The central purpose of Kassim's presentation (there is no corresponding paper) was chiefly concerned with coordination. What he presented was a part of a research project in development. Throughout his speech, he emphasized the importance of this concept to understand the underlying mechanisms of the EU, especially the underlying mechanisms of the European administrative space. The European Union can be seen as a system through coordination and thus, it sheds new light on the interactions between the multiplicity of actors involved in European politics. Kassim is interested in coordination between, first of all, institutions at the European level, second between policies sectors, and thirdly coordination between European, national, regional and local actors during the implementation phase. He started by exposing the traditional European coordination dilemma. The European Union needs a high level of coordination, but coordination is problematic because of its costs, its opponents, and because of the institutional structure of the EU (above all the multiplication of veto points). Thus, his main assumption is that coordination is all the more difficult, that resources are weak and constraints are numerous. For Kassim, this impossibility to develop formal coordination mechanisms is balanced by the growth of informal coordination structures, with their inherent problems, such as accountability and legitimacy. He concluded his presentation by accentuating the lack of institutional mechanisms which would allow for the optimisation of coordination. This tension is symptomatic of the gap between political ambitions and institutional structures at the European level.

Discussion

Anchrit Wille’s main point of criticism concerned the lack of definitional precision around the concept of coordination. For Wille, coordination cannot be well understood without taking
into account the multiplicity of its forms. Coordination differs according to the nature of involved actors. In addition she called for a better definition of the difference between formal and informal coordination; the border between these two concepts is often unclear and unsettled. In conclusion, Wille also remarked that coordination is an available solution only when conflicts are present. Thus talking about coordination mechanisms in the European Union means that one has to identify these conflicts and identify the failure of other conflict management devices.


Kieran Bradley, European Parliament
Discussant: Christian Joerges, European University Institute, Florence

Kieran Bradley gave a presentation on the 2006 comitology reforms. According to Bradley, the functioning of the comitology is shaped by two legal ambiguities. Firstly, in some circumstances this term refers in fact to "the legislature", meaning either "Parliament and the Council" or "the Council acting alone", depending on the legislative procedure applied for adopting the basic legislation. A possible ambiguity arises in relation to the right to directly exercise implementing powers. If "the Council" is here taken to refer to the legislature, then, acting jointly with the Council, Parliament could exercise such implementing powers directly. Alternatively, if "the Council" were interpreted as meaning "the Council acting alone", then Parliament would be excluded from exercising any such powers, which is the view traditionally ascribed to the Council.

Concretely, until the latest round of reforms, Parliament was excluded, not only from the exercise of implementing powers, but even from passing judgement on the measures being proposed except with regards to their legality.

The second ambiguity arises when one considers the term "implementing powers", which the EC Treaty does not define, even in outline, at any point.
Bradley declared that these ambiguities have had a significant impact on the debate around the proper role of the European Parliament in the comitology system. The absence of any clear definition of implementing powers was first used as an argument to exclude Parliament from any role in their supervision, on the grounds that the legislature should not interfere with the executive. Subsequently, the distinction between implementing measures which amend the basic act and other implementing measures provided the opening which both allowed Parliament some supervisory role beyond that of controlling the ultra vires of proposed measures, and marked out the limits of the material scope of this role it was finally granted in the 2006 reforms.

For the first time in its decision on the 17 July 2006, the Council recognised the legitimacy of Parliament's playing an active role in the supervision of the exercise of implementing powers beyond the rather technical issue of vires. Apart from restricting the grant of such powers in individual acts of basic legislation, Parliament had heretofore only been able to use its powers of budgetary management and control and, occasionally, its standing before the Court, to exercise some influence on the policy line being pursued by the Commission.

Discussion

The discussant, Christian Joerges, highlighted first of all the need for conceptualizing implementation as a process. Moreover he affirmed that, in this context, it is necessary to consider the empowerment of the European administration as well, which is an older
development. During the discussion, three further crucial questions were suggested, following the claims concerning the growth of the power of the European Parliament. Firstly, the accountability of the European Parliament appears to be uncertain. Secondly, some doubts have been evoked in relation to the competencies of the Parliament and especially to the capacity to deal with technical matters. Thirdly, it seems that the Parliament may be at risk of being under the influence of particular interests and lobbyists. At the end, Professor Olsen again expressed in this respect the necessity to improve the collaboration between lawyers and political scientists.

8. Network Governance and Delegation: European Networks of Regulatory Agencies

David Coen, University College London and Mark Thatcher, London School of Economics and Political Science
Discussant: Alberta Sbragia, University of Pittsburgh

In the presentation on Network governance and delegation, the speakers examined why the European Commission, national governments and independent regulatory agencies have driven the creation of networks of regulators, the institutional character of these networks and their implications for regulatory governance in Europe. It was said that European networks of regulators have been created in several industries for example telecommunications, securities, energy and transport. They have been used as important examples of the growth of ‘network governance’ in Europe.

Following a principal – agent framework, the authors argue that problems of coordination were the main factor advanced to justify establishing networks of regulators. The new networks have been given wide tasks and membership, but enjoy few formal powers or resources.

The central argument of the presentation was that the networks represent a new round of delegation designed to respond to the multiplication of regulators and their irregular development by co-ordinating member state regulatory implementation and harmonizing regulatory governance. Nevertheless, at the formal level, the networks of regulators remain highly constrained by existing actors. Specifically, the European Commission and national regulators maintain many controls over the networks, which lack resources. The weakness of the networks and controls of their principals help to explain why delegation was agreed both by national and EU actors. It also suggests that if the networks are to have an impact on regulatory governance in Europe, they must develop informal resources and influence, since their formal institutional position is weak. Moreover, it is worth to note that the creation of ERNs only took place after another solution, the creation of Euro-regulators, had been rejected. ERNs can indeed be seen as a ‘second best’ method of dealing with implementation of EU regulation. They appear a compromise between actors pressing for greater European integration and those fearing it, especially national governments.

Discussion

The discussant raised three questions that deserve further attention in order to deepen the knowledge of the governance of networks. The first was about the explanation of the rejection of the EU regulators. The second question related to the motivations for the members states to accept the network. Two concurrent reasons are plausible: to improve the capacity of weak national regulators, and to export the features of the strong national regulators. Thirdly, the question of the differential strength of networks was raised. Participants made several other
points. The accountability of those networks seems unclear. In particular the role of the Commission may vary according to each network. In certain networks the Commission is a member, in other the Commission holds the chair, and sometimes it is simply absent. Moreover, complexity is growing, because certain networks were settled by the Commission and others by the Council or the Parliament.

A second series of remarks was related to the personnel of the networks. It was questioned whether they are experts or rather “second choice” officials? This distinction appears to be crucial to understand the role and the effects of networks.

Finally, it was suggested that the actual role of the networks, especially concerning the means they employ to foster the collaboration among agencies should be studied.

9. Temporality and the European Administrative Space

Klaus Goetz, University of Potsdam

Discussant: Michelle Cini, University of Bristol

Klaus Goetz focused on temporal aspects of governing in his presentation. His intention was to show that temporality is central to the analysis of the evolving European administrative order and to European governance. Analyses of the European administrative space had up until Goetz' studies, focused on its territorial and functional dimensions.

Goetz introduced two broad perspectives on temporality: firstly, the ‘time of governing’ perspective, which is concerned with understanding the development of temporal rules (such as time, sequence, speed, duration) that structure governmental-administrative action. Secondly, the ‘governing with time’ perspective, which inquires into the use of temporal rules and ‘temporal governing devices’, such as calendars, timetables or roadmaps.

Several crucial problems were addressed and put into question, specifically concerning: problems of synchronicity; contestation over synchronisation; extensive recourse to temporal governing devices; administrative and judicial capacity, which have been dominant concerns; the emergence of and European administrative policy; the variation of time rules and temporal governing devices across countries.

The conclusion highlighted that ‘governing with time’ may constitute a distinctive feature of European governance that responds to the weakness of conventional co-ordination and compliance mechanisms; and that its effects on ‘time of governing’ may trigger important institutional shifts at both domestic and EU levels.

Discussion

The discussant asked whether governing with time is a European distinctive feature. Moreover, he suggested that temporality might also be used to inject flexibility within the European process.

Furthermore, she drew attention to the implications for European governance, especially regarding Europeanization. Moreover, other participants noted that causality is initially not so clear: which are the dependent and independent variables? The risk of over-stretching the concept was also mentioned. Indeed, the concept of “time” was judged underspecified: is it an exogenous factor, is it related to the idea of duration or to the idea of timing? At the end of the day, the role of chance was also evoked, as a key factor beyond choice and destiny.
10. National Termination Effects of EU Policies: The Impact of Different Implementation Modes

Michael Bauer and Christoph Knill, University of Konstanz
Discussant: Ulrich Sedelmeier, London School of Economics and Political Science

Michael Bauer and Christoph Knill spoke on their examination of the “termination effects” of European policy-making on national policies. The main focus was placed on European behavioural incentives such as compliance, maximizing resources, mutual adjustment as well as securing legitimacy. Using examples from current policy analysis studies, the speakers offer an illustration of various constellations with unequal termination potentials with regard to the implementation of European policies. Starting with a critique of the “classical” approach of the policy termination research, preliminary hypotheses were drawn up on the expected national policy termination effects of European policy-making. The main conclusion was that the observed change of national policies under the influence of the EU does in fact contain a systematic termination component. However, the expected termination results greatly vary depending on the implementation mode and the respectively examined policy dimension. The effects are most pronounced for the compliance mode, if the EU prescribes concrete national policy imperatives “by decree”, which typically lead to the elimination of national policies without replacement.

Discussion

The presentation was considered very clear by the discussant, Ulrich Sedelmeier. He did however question the uncertain value added of an analysis focusing on termination, rather then in policy change.

The participants' comments referred then to the necessity of disentangling some elements. The conceptualisation of the process of termination was seen as too vague. It was suggested that a case study be done in order to actually show how it happens. Specifically, the definition of a termination policy has been judged a bit underdeveloped. Finally, it appears that the identification of such policies may represent an empirical problem.

11. Pressures Towards Increased Coordination in the EU Member States

Guy Peters, University of Pittsburgh
Discussant: Jarle Trondal, Agder, University College Kristiansand

Guy Peters then spoke on the horizontal and vertical pressures placed on EU member states to increase coordination. Firstly, there are pressures concerning specialisation and coordination that are as old as governments (or formal organisations) and, secondly, there are pressures concerning decentralisation and uniformity.

The balance between autonomy and control of agencies is also crucial. Concerning this point, a number of crucial questions were raised. How much autonomy should there be? And in which dimensions? Moreover, there is a need for coordinating further administration and policy. In this context pressures (isomorphism and coercion) are maybe opposed to instruments. Therefore, it seems important to ask whether one can succeed on the diagonal by pushing one form of coordination. Nevertheless, we have to notice, that pushing compliance vertically may minimize the horizontal coordination.
Discussion

Jarle Trondal remarked that Peters' presentation a very valuable one and that it develops two streams of research: administrative science and European integration studies. There were however still a couple of questions raised. Has the creation of agencies affected patterns of democratic accountability? How should trade-offs and inconsistencies be governed and managed? What is the effect of a differentiated European system of governance? Is the European administrative space coordinated at high or low level? How can coordination be distinguished from policy-making? Is coordination also competitive? Do the outcomes allow solving the actual problems?

12. Europe’s Statehood: Towards a Republican Order or back to an Executive Oligarchy?

Johannes Pollack and Sonja Puntscher Riekmann, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna
Discussant: Dionyssis Dimitrakopoulos, London school of Economics and Birkbeck College

Pollack and Puntscher Riekmann addressed the question of the European administration-building, according to a parallel with Nation States bureaucratisation process. According to the two, supranational bureaucracy is not exactly a replica of national bureaucracy: Firstly, because the European Commission enjoys rights and powers which go beyond those of national bureaucracies, secondly because it is in many respects far too small to directly and effectively administer a polity of some five hundred millions citizens. It is, to a large degree, dependent on national administrations. European administration is as multi-level as European governance is. In this context, the starting point of European polity-building recalls early modern state-building in that both processes rest on the invention of a special kind of bureaucracy to be defined as “commissarial management” a term which encompasses not only administrative actions, but also a political mission geared towards the “ever closer union” of the members of the would-be polity; second, once a central bureaucracy is established, it often tends to decentralise or “outsource” power to more or less independent agencies in the name of efficient governance. Today, both phenomena are to be witnessed in the European Union as much as they could be observed in the past in the member states. In particular, they are part and parcel of the European polity-building process. However, with regard to the Union it seems difficult to imagine its aims in terms of a full-fledge state.

Nevertheless, the speakers asked: What are all those instances of creating supranational administrative bodies through agencification amounting to? What might be a foreseeable outcome? Where does the creation of a European administrative space, however decentralised and fragmented, ultimately point to?

The thesis proposed here is twofold: First, that the European Union’ creation of an administrative space points to a process of polity-building; second that this process has gained momentum through the creation of agencies in the second and third pillar, security issues being at the core of polity-building.

In conclusion some remedies in terms of democratic standards for European governance were offered by the paper presenters.
Discussion

The discussant specifically addressed problems of change and mismatch. One important question is about how new the focus on agencification is from the point of view of legitimacy. Furthermore, the discussant suggested then that the current phenomenon of agencification may not reflect the sectoral patterns. Then, participants pointed out the idea of continuity of the European development. Finally, it was proposed that there be a deeper inquiry into the topic of the expansion of the central executive level.
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