

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Welcome to the second edition</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Foreword to the second edition</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>23</b>
 <b>1 Set down in a formula: successful representation of interests in complex decision-making processes</b>	 <b>31</b>
1.1 Ways out of the complexity trap of political decision-making structures	31
1.1.1 Problem-solving in complex situations: process trumps content	31
1.1.2 Stakeholder versus shareholder approach	32
1.1.3 Decisions without decision-makers: complex multi-level system of the European Union (EU)	33
1.2 Political rebirth of the EU	33
1.2.1 Treaty of Lisbon as the background to a paradigm shift	33
1.2.2 Reorganisation of decision-making processes due to the Treaty of Lisbon	34
1.2.3 Effects on interest representation from the changed framework conditions of the Treaty of Lisbon	35
1.3 Successful representation of interests in the complex EU decision-making system	36
1.3.1 Formula for success	36
1.3.2 Example of applying the formula for success – the “mountain example”	37
1.3.2.1 Pre-Lisbon: successes for content-oriented interest representation	40
1.3.2.2 Post-Lisbon: process barriers to content-oriented interest representation	40
1.3.2.3 Overcoming the process barrier through process-oriented interest representation	43
1.3.2.4 Elements of process competence	45
1.3.2.5 Importance of process structure competence (PStC)	45
1.3.2.6 Importance of perspective change competence (PCC)	47
1.3.2.7 Importance of process support competence (PSuC)	53
1.4 Conclusion	55
 <b>2 Fundamental thoughts on the topic of interest representation and stakeholders</b>	 <b>57</b>
2.1 Differences of interest, stakeholders and translation conflicts	57
2.1.1 Complexity and differentiation	58
2.1.2 One theory of the “stakeholder”	64
2.1.3 Translation conflicts	65

2.2 Stakeholder orientation: perspectives of corporate management beyond the classic shareholder value approach in the face of more complex framework conditions	66
2.2.1 “Be ahead of <i>change</i> ”: challenge of stakeholder orientation	66
2.2.2 Drivers of stakeholder orientation	67
2.2.2.1 Internet and digitisation	67
2.2.2.2 Climate change and demographic trend	69
2.2.2.3 Critical trends and globalisation and in a fully networked economic and financial world	70
2.2.2.4 New organisational structures for the representation of civil interests	71
2.2.2.5 Interim result	72
2.2.3 Ideal of the honourable merchant: a stakeholder-oriented concept?	73
2.2.4 Complex and dynamic perspectives of stakeholder orientation	74
2.2.5 Stakeholder theory: central contributions, development stages and selected key findings	76
2.2.5.1 Central contributions to the stakeholder theory	76
2.2.5.2 Three stakeholder theory development stages	77
2.2.5.3 Maturity phase as part of stakeholder management	83
2.2.6 Stakeholder management and strategies	89
2.2.7 Example applications of the stakeholder view in marketing	95
2.2.8 Summary and outlook	99
2.2.9 Closing remarks	100
2.3 Importance of the intermediary in interest representation derived from mutual market relationship theories	101
2.3.1 Intermediaries	101
2.3.1.1 Definitions	101
2.3.1.2 Intermediaries explained using economic theories	103
2.3.1.2.1 Transaction cost theory	104
2.3.1.2.2 Search theory	106
2.3.1.2.3 Intermediation theory of the firm	107
2.3.1.2.4 Principal agent theory	108
2.3.1.3 Behavioural theories	110
2.3.1.3.1 Structural hole theory	110
2.3.1.3.2 Social exchange theory	111
2.3.2 Summary	112
<b>3 Representation of interests: an approach. Fundamentals and introduction . . .</b>	<b>115</b>
3.1 Introduction	115
3.2 The representation of interests as a structured communication process	116
3.2.1 Question and definition	116

3.2.2	Concepts of interest representation: from investor relations to governmental relations	119
3.2.3	Representation of interests as an indispensable element of corporate communication	123
3.2.3.1	Representation of interests as an early warning system: identification of issues and trends	123
3.2.3.2	The representation of interests as a long-term project: structural support of decision-making processes	127
3.2.3.2.1	General	127
3.2.3.2.2	Information management	128
3.2.3.2.3	Strategy consulting	129
3.2.3.2.4	Events	130
3.2.3.2.5	Integration of corporate interests	131
3.2.3.3	The representation of interests as political crisis management: interest representation as “fire-fighting”	131
3.3	Legitimation of interest representation	134
3.3.1	Politics as the contest between various interests with the objective of consensual solutions	137
3.3.2	Interest representation as the aggregation of interests	140
3.3.3	Interest representation as a tool for forming communication interfaces between politics and the affected parties: necessity of an intermediary	142
3.3.4	Political science concepts for analysing and evaluating interest representation: overview	146
3.3.4.1	Neo-pluralism	146
3.3.4.2	Neo-corporatism	148
3.3.4.3	Exchange theory	150
3.3.4.4	Governance approach	152
3.3.5	Fundamentals of European law	154
3.3.5.1	Primary legal fundamentals	155
3.3.5.2	Regulations for lobbyists (code of conduct) and European Union officials	155
3.3.5.2.1	Regulations for lobbyists	156
3.3.5.2.2	Regulations for European Union officials	157
3.3.5.3	Further legal regulations and voluntary commitment of lobbyists	159
3.4	Summary	160
4	<b>Politics as a process: paradigm shift from content competence to process competence in interest representation . . . . .</b>	<b>165</b>
4.1	Introduction and question	165
4.2	Content as the key element of politics?	167
4.3	Classic dimensions of politics: polity, policy, politics	170

4.4	Procedural dimension of politics	173
4.4.1	“Complexity trap” of polity: process competence for the political system in the European Union	173
4.4.2	Policy cycle	174
4.4.2.1	Problem definition	176
4.4.2.2	Agenda setting	177
4.4.2.3	Policy formulation and decision	178
4.4.2.4	Policy implementation	179
4.4.2.5	Policy evaluation	180
4.4.2.6	Policy termination	181
4.5	Temporal dimension of politics	182
4.5.1	Endogenous time slots	183
4.5.2	Exogenous time slots	184
4.5.3	Structural time slots	185
4.6	Political actors	186
4.6.1	Individual actors	188
4.6.2	Collective and corporate actors	190
4.6.3	Institutional actors	191
4.7	Political networks	194
4.8	Laws of (political) decisions	198
4.8.1	Homo economicus or homo politicus?	199
4.8.2	Decision-making by homo politicus	203
4.9	Summary	211
<b>5</b>	<b>European Union as the target of interest representation: political system and peculiarities in comparison with member state systems . . . . .</b>	<b>217</b>
5.1	Introduction and question	217
5.2	Short history of European integration	218
5.3	Fundamental changes due to the Treaty of Lisbon	226
5.3.1	“Lisbon”: Treaty or Constitution?	227
5.3.1.1	Genesis of the Treaty of Lisbon	228
5.3.1.1.1	Context: genesis of the Constitutional Treaty and constitutional crisis	228
5.3.1.1.2	Way out of the constitutional crisis	230
5.3.1.2	How the chosen process determined the substance of the Treaty of Lisbon	232
5.3.1.2.1	Base camp and game of chess	233
5.3.1.2.2	Berlin Declaration and Sherpa consultations: informal processes as the way to success	234
5.3.1.2.3	A negotiating mandate without freedom to negotiate	236
5.3.1.2.4	Conclusion	238
5.3.1.3	Evaluation of the differences between the Constitutional Treaty and the Treaty of Lisbon	238

5.3.2	Strengthening the EU externally: the EU as a global player	241
5.3.3	Strengthening the EU internally: transition from the principle of unanimity to the majority principle in the Council of the EU is becoming the usual case	245
5.3.4	Strengthening of the European Parliament	248
5.4	Integration theories and the multi-level system of the European Union	249
5.4.1	Federalism	250
5.4.1.1	Federalism as a political objective	251
5.4.1.2	Federalism as a political science integration theory	251
5.4.2	Neo-functionalism	252
5.4.3	Liberal intergovernmentalism	255
5.4.4	Supranationalism	257
5.4.5	Multi-level governance	258
5.4.6	Conclusion	263
5.5	Political stakeholders in the European Union	263
5.5.1	European (supranational) level: overview of the institutions of the European Union	264
5.5.1.1	European Parliament	264
5.5.1.2	European Council	269
5.5.1.3	Council of the European Union (Council of Ministers)	269
5.5.1.4	European Commission	272
5.5.1.5	Court of Justice of the European Union	276
5.5.1.6	European Central Bank	276
5.5.1.7	European Court of Auditors	277
5.5.1.8	Other institutions	278
5.5.1.8.1	European Economic and Social Committee	278
5.5.1.8.2	Committee of the Regions	280
5.5.2	Member state (national) level	280
5.5.2.1	Member state (“permanent”) representations	282
5.5.2.2	Regional representations	283
5.5.3	Civil society (non-state) level	286
5.5.3.1	Associations	288
5.5.3.2	Organisations and public interest groups	289
5.5.3.3	Media	291
5.6	Summary	293
6	<b>Legislative procedure and other legal regulations as the framework of interest representation in the European Union . . . . .</b>	<b>297</b>
6.1	Introduction and question	297
6.2	Bases of legislation in the EU after Lisbon	297
6.2.1	General	298
6.2.2	Classification of legislative acts after the Treaty of Lisbon	299

6.2.3	Legislative procedures in the European Union	300
6.2.3.1	General	300
6.2.3.2	Ordinary legislative procedure	301
6.2.3.2.1	Introduction of the legislative procedure: right of initiative of the EU Commission	302
6.2.3.2.2	Further procedure in the Council and Parliament: readings, opinions and conciliation procedures	304
6.2.3.2.3	First reading in the European Parliament	304
6.2.3.2.4	First reading in the Council	305
6.2.3.2.5	Second reading in the Parliament and Council, opinion of the Commission	305
6.2.3.2.6	Procedure in the conciliation committee	307
6.2.3.2.7	Third reading in the Council and Parliament	307
6.2.3.2.8	Publication, announcement and entry into force	308
6.2.3.3	Legislation by the EU Commission according to Articles 290 and 291 TFEU, particularly comitology	308
6.2.3.3.1	Delegated legislation (Article 290 TFEU)	309
6.2.3.3.2	Implementing legislation by the EU Commission according to Article 291 (2) TFEU	310
6.3	Access to the institutions of the European Union	312
6.3.1	General	312
6.3.2	Legal bases of regulation	314
6.3.3	Legal framework of access to the individual institutions	316
6.3.3.1	Regulation of access to the Council of the EU	316
6.3.3.2	Regulation of access to Commission members and civil servants	316
6.3.3.3	Transparency Initiative/Transparency Register	317
6.3.3.3.1	Boundary conditions and content of the Transparency Register	317
6.3.3.3.2	Alternatives to the Transparency Register: binding quality criteria for interest representation	319
6.3.3.4	Regulation of access to Members of the European Parliament	321
6.3.3.5	Regulation of access to the Committee of the Regions (CoR) and the Economic and Social Committee (EESC)	322
6.3.4	Consequences for the practice of interest representation	322
6.3.4.1	Decisions without decision-makers?	323
6.3.4.1.1	European Union “complexity trap”: is there the one decision-maker?	323

6.3.4.1.2	Ordinary legislative procedure (Article 294 TFEU): the number of decision-makers is increasing	323
6.3.4.1.3	Informal trialogue as an additional – informal – decision-making level	324
6.3.4.1.4	Complexity and multi-dimensionality of the procedures and process competence in interest representation	326
6.3.4.2	Majority decisions amongst 27 member states as a strategic risk for companies: necessity of “European coalition building”?	326
6.4	Summary	329
<b>7</b>	<b>Governmental relations: process management in practice . . . . .</b>	<b>331</b>
7.1	Introduction and question	331
7.2	General	331
7.3	Essential element of successful interest representation: stakeholder management	334
7.3.1	Concept of stakeholder management in the area of political interest representation	334
7.3.2	Stakeholder management in practice	337
7.3.2.1	Step 1: identification of relevant stakeholders	338
7.3.2.2	Step 2: stakeholder mapping – categorisation and hierarchical structure	341
7.3.2.3	Step 3: information management – establishment and administration of a stakeholder database	342
7.4	Interest representation instruments	344
7.4.1	Structural instruments	345
7.4.1.1	Collective forms of organisation: interest representation through associations	345
7.4.1.1.1	General heterogeneity problem	345
7.4.1.1.1.1	Compulsion to reach a compromise at association level	345
7.4.1.1.1.2	Consequence: conflict between membership logic and influence logic	348
7.4.1.1.2	Association-based interest representation “from the inside” and “from the outside”	350
7.4.1.1.3	Cultural differences between the EU level and member states as a problem for associations	351
7.4.1.1.4	European and national associations	351
7.4.1.1.4.1	European associations	351
7.4.1.1.4.2	National associations	353

7.4.1.2	Non-collective forms of organisation	354
7.4.1.2.1	In-house interest representation: own corporate representative office	355
7.4.1.2.1.1	Role and activities of an in-house lobbyist	356
7.4.1.2.1.2	Personal requirements for a lobbyist	356
7.4.1.2.1.3	Central problem: trust cannot be bequeathed	357
7.4.1.2.2	External service providers	357
7.4.1.2.2.1	Public affairs agencies	358
7.4.1.2.2.2	Law firms	358
7.4.1.2.2.3	Governmental relations agencies	360
7.4.1.2.2.4	Project-related or structural (long-term) approach?	362
7.4.1.2.2.5	Think tanks	363
7.4.1.2.2.6	Posting internal employees to the institutions	364
7.4.1.3	Costs of the various instruments	365
7.4.1.3.1	Costs of an association	365
7.4.1.3.2	Costs of a corporate representative office in Brussels	366
7.4.1.3.3	Costs of an external service provider	369
7.4.1.3.3.1	Public affairs agencies	370
7.4.1.3.3.2	Law firms	371
7.4.1.3.3.3	Governmental relations agencies	371
7.4.2	Process-oriented instruments	374
7.4.2.1	Mono process-oriented instruments	374
7.4.2.1.1	Telephone call	374
7.4.2.1.2	SMS	375
7.4.2.1.3	E-mail	376
7.4.2.1.4	Personal discussion	377
7.4.2.1.5	Briefing	377
7.4.2.1.6	Opinion in the legislative procedure	378
7.4.2.1.7	OnePager	378
7.4.2.2	Poly process-oriented instruments	380
7.4.2.2.1	Workshop	380
7.4.2.2.2	Parliamentary evening	382
7.5	Implementation in practice: overall model for structuring effective and efficient interest representation	383
7.5.1	Setting quality benchmarks: key elements of effective interest representation for a company	383
7.5.2	Co-ordination of the instruments by the company	387



7.5.3	Documentation of the starting point and objective: definition of a general corporate requirement profile in the field of interest representation	389
7.5.4	Implementing and successfully undertaking interest representation projects: fundamental steps	391
7.5.4.1	Documentation of the content-related objective and continuous checking of political feasibility	391
7.5.4.2	Process-oriented situation assessment and strategy planning	393
7.5.4.3	Drafting and submitting one or more OnePagers	393
7.5.4.4	Flanking the OnePager with other structural and process-oriented instruments (mutual information transparency)	394
7.5.4.5	Supporting decision-making processes at legislative and executive level	395
7.5.5	Conclusion	396
7.6	Summary	396
<b>8</b>	<b>Training: ways to becoming a governmental relations manager . . . . .</b>	<b>403</b>
8.1	Introduction and question	403
8.2	Framework conditions and general requirements on a lobbyist	403
8.2.1	Breaking down and controlling increasing complexity	403
8.2.2	Deciphering the complex multi-level system of the European Union	408
8.3	Requirements on a lobbyist	410
8.3.1	Knowledge of the world of politics and the world of stakeholder groups	410
8.3.1.1	Interest representation as an intermediary system	410
8.3.1.2	Requirements on the part of stakeholder groups	413
8.3.1.2.1	Information	413
8.3.1.2.2	Commercial management thinking and implementation of the clients' (political) objectives	414
8.3.1.2.3	Professional representation of clients' interests	415
8.3.1.2.4	Technical know-how and good contacts	416
8.3.1.2.5	Soft skills as essential tools: social skills, intercultural and linguistic skills, integrity	417
8.3.1.2.6	Integrity and compliance	419
8.3.1.3	Requirements on the part of politicians	419
8.3.1.3.1	Information	419
8.3.1.3.2	Information transparency and professional information mediation	421

8.3.1.3.3	Understanding of political processes and culture	422
8.3.1.3.4	Integrity and compliance	423
8.3.1.4	Conclusion	425
8.3.2	Development of skills for the structural and long-term support of political processes	426
8.3.2.1	Process competence and an understanding of complex political systems	427
8.3.2.2	Reduction of complexity for politicians and stakeholder groups	429
8.3.2.3	Revolving door as an answer?	431
8.3.2.3.1	Switch from politics to commerce	432
8.3.2.3.2	Problems of the different socialisation of politicians and decision-makers from commerce	433
8.3.2.3.3	Revolving door as a dead end? Image problems for politicians and stakeholder groups	435
8.4	Status quo of vocational education and further training for lobbyists	436
8.4.1	Existing methods of education and further training	436
8.4.2	Objectives and content of the current education and further training	439
8.5	New approaches in education and further training	441
8.5.1	European law module	443
8.5.2	Political science module	444
8.5.3	Process competence and complexity reduction module	445
8.5.4	Intercultural skills module	446
8.5.5	Language module	446
8.5.6	Practical module	447
8.6	Summary	448
<b>9</b>	<b>Case studies on interest representation projects with structural process support . . . . .</b>	<b>451</b>
9.1	Case 1: “advertising bans for spirits, beer and wine?”	452
9.1.1	Circumstances/initial situation	452
9.1.2	Step 1: documentation of the (content-related) objective and continuous checking of political feasibility	455
9.1.3	Step 2: procedural situation assessment and strategy planning	456
9.1.4	Step 3: drafting a OnePager and submitting it to previously identified addressees at the legislative and executive level	459
9.1.5	Steps 4 and 5: implementation of the OnePager and supporting decision-making processes at legislative and executive level	461
9.1.5.1	Representation of interests vis-à-vis the European Commission	461

9.1.5.2	Representation of interests vis-à-vis the Council	461
9.1.5.3	Representation of interests vis-à-vis the European Parliament	462
9.1.6	Result: achievement of objectives	463
9.2	Case 2: “regulation for defining the modalities for achieving the objective of reducing the CO <sub>2</sub> emissions of new passenger cars by 2020”	463
9.2.1	Circumstances/initial situation	463
9.2.2	Step 1: documentation of the (content-related) objective and continuous checking of political feasibility	465
9.2.3	Step 2: procedural situation assessment and strategy planning	466
9.2.4	Step 3: drafting one or more OnePagers and submitting them to previously identified addressees	467
9.2.5	Step 4: flanking the OnePager with other structural and process-oriented instruments (mutual information transparency)	468
9.2.6	Step 5: supporting decision-making processes at legislative and executive level	469
9.2.6.1	Representation of interests vis-à-vis the European Commission	469
9.2.6.2	Representation of interests vis-à-vis the Council	470
9.2.6.3	Representation of interests vis-à-vis the European Parliament	471
9.2.7	Result: achievement of objectives	472
10	<b>Future challenges . . . . .</b>	<b>473</b>
10.1	Professionalism means translation competence	473
10.1.1	Classic professions	473
10.1.2	A new form of professionalism?	477
10.1.3	Professionalism as translation competence	481
10.1.4	Brief appendix: interest representation re-thought	483
10.2	Knowledge infrastructures	484
10.2.1	Access to external knowledge is now more important than ever before	484
10.2.2	Knowledge infrastructures are the solution, but also the problem at the same time	486
10.2.3	Knowledge infrastructures influence the cohesion and the future viability of our societies	487
10.3	Open policy – on a foundation of interest representation	488
10.3.1	Let’s open up then: everything “open” or what?	488
10.3.1.1	Access	489
10.3.1.2	Epistemic dimension	490
10.3.1.3	Structural dimension	491
10.3.1.4	Dimension of legitimacy	491

- 10.3.2 Then go for it: strategic stimuli for interest representation 492
    - 10.3.2.1 Process 492
    - 10.3.2.2 Opportunity 493
    - 10.3.2.3 Cascade 493
- 11 Summary and outlook . . . . . 495
  - 11.1 Interest representation as a business management asset for companies, associations and organisations 495
  - 11.2 Objectives of interest representation (involvement in decision-making processes) 496
  - 11.3 Framework conditions – reform due to the Treaty of Lisbon 497
    - 11.3.1 Treaty of Lisbon: de facto United States of Europe! 498
    - 11.3.2 Strengthening the European Union 500
      - 11.3.2.1 Outwardly 500
      - 11.3.2.2 Inwardly 501
    - 11.3.3 Multi-level system, ordinary legislative procedure, informal trialogue 501
      - 11.3.3.1 Multi-level system 501
      - 11.3.3.2 Ordinary legislative procedure (Article 294 TFEU): the number of decision-makers is increasing 502
      - 11.3.3.3 Informal trialogue: an additional decision-making level 502
    - 11.3.4 Paradigm shift from content to process competence 503
    - 11.3.5 Conclusion and outcome 504
      - 11.3.5.1 Increase in the complexity of European decision-making processes 504
      - 11.3.5.2 Paradigm shift in interest representation: process competence 505
  - 11.4 Outlook: urgent need for reform to overcome the governance crisis within the EU 507
- Appendix . . . . . 511
- List of abbreviations . . . . . 511
- List of figures . . . . . 515
- References and further reading . . . . . 519
- Index . . . . . 567
- About the authors . . . . . 575