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APPENDIX I

SOCIAL-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE THREE INVESTIGATED REGIONS
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APPENDIX II

THE CASE STUDY PROTOCOL

All three cases in all phases of the research were treated according to replicated inquiry patterns and retrievable organization of databases. In all cases, the same techniques were used for data collection and the same procedures of inquiry were conducted to analyze the empirical findings. Both explicit and tacit sources of empirical data was collected and analyzed through the research. The explicit sources included official documents (produced by the regional collaborative associations and their individual members) and codified mass-communication sources (internet sites of relevant stakeholders and local/regional media). Tacit knowledge was exposed and analyzed through the conduction of semi-structured interviews with stakeholders’ representatives, political leadership and practitioners. Respondents’ records provided complementary empirical data for the appraisal of strategic capacity and provided primary sources for revealing and retrieving the power mechanism that influenced it.

I. Appraising regional strategic capacity

Reception capacity – refers to the degree in which information is internalized and knowledge is created as a derivative of the diversity and intensity in which stakeholders are involved during the formation of regional spatial-economic strategies. Potential stakeholders included actors from the public sector (governments), private sector and the non profit sector (see table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>SPECIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR</td>
<td>Intra Regional Governments</td>
<td>Local and regional governments within the RCA’s demarcated area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter Regional Governments</td>
<td>Neighboring municipalities or regional governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Regional Governments</td>
<td>Higher governments (Ministries, EU representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR</td>
<td>Representative organizations</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce and/or employers’ organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Companies, private investors</td>
<td>Local, regional or multinational companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON PROFIT SECTOR</td>
<td>Research and Education centers</td>
<td>Universities, colleges and research centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Societal organizations and interest groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A complementary aspect to stakeholder analysis for appraising the regional base of knowledge was the *multiplicity of policy fields* upon which the regional parties collaborated and for which regional strategies were composed. Those included the themes with direct relevancy to spatial economic developments (spatial planning, housing, transport and economy).

The variety and intensity in which stakeholders were involved got a visual impression with the help of the regional strategic compass (figure 1). The compass reflects the degree of which each type of stakeholders was involved in the regional strategic forming process. The level of inclusion is reflected with four ordinal scales:

0- No participation;
1- Incidental participation: Ad hoc participation over specific regional strategic theme;
2- Enduring participation: continuous involvement in the strategic forming of *specific* regional strategic theme;
3- Permanent participation: continuous involvement in the strategic forming of *all* regional strategic themes.

**Figure 1: Regional strategic compass**
CONSOLIDATION CAPACITY – The degree to which the RCAs manage to define strategies, select between alternatives and create coherent series of actions is appraised along four aspects of the strategic output:

- The formation of well-defined and agreed upon spatial economic strategies;
- The conduction of united collective lobby for regional choices by external parties;
- The coordination and distribution of internal spatial economic investments/projects;
- The coherent integration of different projects and different policy fields.

REALIZATION CAPACITY – The degree to which the regional strategic output was realized focused on the official commitments expressed by external stakeholders in their reaction to regional lobbying campaigns and the official commitment of internal stakeholders with regard to internal coordinating efforts. In both cases the official commitments expressed by external and internal stakeholders provided the empirical data for appraising realization capacity. Realization capacity therefore was derived from the collective success to influence external parties to officially adopt the regional position regarding spatial-economic matters (lobby) and the collective success to bring internal parties to integrate the regional positions in their local policies.

II. Using interviews for generating and examining hypotheses

Interviews with public officials, political figures and representatives of the different stakeholders were used to reveal explanatory mechanisms to explain regional successes or shortcomings during the regional strategic forming process. The questions raised during the interviews occasionally demanded reflection and contemplation by the respondents. Respondents were asked factual, informative questions regarding the strategic output and collaborative practice (What? When? Who?) in order to estimate regional strategic capacity. Complemented questions of more compound nature (Why? How?) were presented to respondents in order to detect influential variables and reveal explanatory mechanisms for the observations.

Even though interviews within the same case had different rhythms and emphasized different inquiry angles some question regarding three components of the research were raised in all of them. Those questions regarded the actual regional strategic capacity, the mode of regional governance and the search and understandings of potential explanatory mechanisms (See table 2).
Table 2: Questions asked during interviews with respondents from the region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS REGARDING REGIONAL STRATEGIC CAPACITY</th>
<th>QUESTIONS REGARDING MODES OF REGIONAL GOVERNANCE</th>
<th>QUESTIONS REGARDING EXPLANATORY MECHANISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is taking part of the RCA?</td>
<td>Do you consider the voluntary/compulsory character of the RCA constructive to the quality of the regional collaboration?</td>
<td>How did the collaborative practice started?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do the collaborative parties come together?</td>
<td>Would you favor a more hierarchic model of governance in the region to increase capacity for strategic decision-making?</td>
<td>Why did ‘X’ were not involved in the regional strategic forming process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the voices of other public/private/non profit are brought to the regional consultations?</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>How does the RCA make its decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does the RCA wishes to achieve within the collaboration?</td>
<td>Would you favor including more parties in the RCA? Which? Why?</td>
<td>Why didn’t you step out of the collaboration when disappointed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the spatial/economic strategies the RCA produced to achieve the regional aim?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why did you join the collaboration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which decisions were most disputable and challenging?</td>
<td></td>
<td>How do you explain this specific success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the RCA dealt with the conflicts among members?</td>
<td></td>
<td>How do you explain that on this issue the RCA did not manage to agree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the result of the conflict?</td>
<td></td>
<td>What was missing for the RCA in order to agree on the issue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the RCA ensured participating parties would commit to the agreements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>What would you consider a crucial condition for successful collaborative practice in the region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider the greatest achievement of the RCA? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td>How did ‘X” influenced the regional collaboration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which issue appeared to be too hard for the RCA members to agree on? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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III. Data analysis

The answers given by respondents were codified with the help of qualitative research software (Atlas.Ti) in order to retrieve and detect repetitive patterns that could explain variation in the degree of regional strategic capacity. All recorded interviews were typed and labeled according to the meta-groups of codes referring to regional strategic capacity, regional governance and conditions of success. Table 3 specifies codified arguments as identified in interviews.

Table 3: Coded arguments as identified in interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SPECIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector dominance</td>
<td>Regional collaboration in the fields of spatial-economic strategies are strongly predominated by local and regional governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty to attract private sector</td>
<td>Local private companies have usually no capacity to participate in spatial economic strategic forming in the region. Multinationals show limited interest in participating in generic regional strategic forming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of selectivity</td>
<td>The collaboration must focus on specific issues and joint resources around limited number of projects in order to be effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization uncertainty</td>
<td>There is a gap between declared policies and agreements and the actual realization of those in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not structure but issue</td>
<td>The search for an ideal governmental structure to provide efficient and complete answers to regional challenges is doomed to fail. It is better to learn to collaborate within the given structures on the issues at stake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary modes of governance</td>
<td>The voluntary character of the collaboration is complementary to the official relations between stakeholders. The two modes complement rather than compete with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary is awkward</td>
<td>The voluntary practice entails long and intensive consultations in which all parties need to be persuaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion delays decision-making</td>
<td>Wide involvement of stakeholders leads to delayed decision making procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion delays implementation</td>
<td>Exclusion of parties from the decision-making process leads to delays and objection during realization of regional policies/projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity as critical mass</td>
<td>It is important for the collaborating parties to radiate unity behind regional positions towards external parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The power to collaborate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of selectivity</th>
<th>It is important to show selectivity and focus on limited number of issues the region wishes to promote when communicating with external parties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central government crucial</td>
<td>The central government (ministries) have crucial role in igniting and shaping the regional collaboration as it holds financial resources and it makes strategic decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-regional rivalry</td>
<td>The intra-regional rivalry between cities reduces the capacity to drive clear and coherent spatial economic strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central city</td>
<td>The influence of larger cities within the region is higher than the influence of the smaller ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better in than out</td>
<td>Municipalities adhere to collaborative approach even in times their interests are not optimally served since the alternative of being excluded is perceived as more threatening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human factor</td>
<td>The level to which individuals in key positions are able to work with each other is crucial for the regional collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue oriented</td>
<td>Fruitful collaboration is dependent on the issue at stake. Different issues demand different stakeholders and different arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-oriented</td>
<td>Fruitful collaboration is dependent on tangible problem(s) acknowledged by all regional parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogance is the enemy</td>
<td>Arrogance and paternalistic approach of certain party or person within the region reduces the willingness of other parties to collaborate or adopt its position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of success</td>
<td>Creating a sense of success is crucial for keeping the collaboration in tact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive effect</td>
<td>Perceived success by internal and external parties stimulates intensification of the collaboration as more parties join and new issues are tackled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

OVERVIEW RESPONDENTS OF THE THREE CASES

BRABANTSTAD

Steven Adriaansen
Alderman Spatial Planning and Housing, Roosendaal Municipality 25-10-2007

M.H.W Bredeschneyder & J. Bemelmans
Administrative advisors, Eindhoven Municipality 14-11-2007

Guy Kepen
Head government relations, Philips 21-06-2007

Herman Klitsie
Mayor of Oss municipality 21-11-2007

Gertjan Koolen
Project leader Studio BrabantStad, North-Brabant Province 31-01-2007

Bas Pollman
Director Chamber of Commerce, Eindhoven 27-11-2006

W.A.L Reijlink
Coordinator BrabantStad, Breda Municipality 14-02-2007

Paul Rüpp
Board Executive Spatial Planning and BrabantStad, North-Brabant Province 07-05-2007

Myrna Spil
Senior strategist, Tilburg Municipality 18-10-2007

Frank van der Wende
Program manager South-east Brabant-North Limburg, Ministry of Economic Affairs 22-05-2007

Vincent van der Werff
Account manager South (DG Ruimte), Ministry of Spatial Planning 26-06-2007
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Ruud van Heugten  
*Alderman Spatial Planning and Mobility, Helmond municipality*  
15-11-2006

Edgar van Leest  
*Senior advisor, City Region Eindhoven*  
17-08-2006

Eric van Merrienboer  
*Alderman of mobility and environment, Eindhoven municipality*  
04-12-2006

Hans van Oerle  
*Adviser BrabantStad, 's-Hertogenbosch Municipality*  
22-10-2007

Pieter van Ree  
*Program Manager BrabantStad*  
19-09-2006

Jean van Zeeland  
*Project leader A2-axis development, City Region Eindhoven*  
28-11-2006

**CITY REGION ARNHEM-NIJMEGEN**

Carina Basten  
*Process and project manager, City Region Arnhem-Nijmegen*  
18-08-2008

Han Bert  
*Senior strategist, Nijmegen municipality*  
18-08-2008

Paul Boel  
*Regional account manager, Ministry of Spatial Planning*  
03-09-2008

Alain de Haar  
*Director Chamber of Commerce, Arnhem-Nijmegen*  
28-08-2008

Bart de Jong  
*Advisor ‘Tempo Kan’, City Region Arnhem- Nijmegen*  
29-08-2008

Harry de Vries  
*Mayor Lingerwaarde Municipality*  
08-09-2008

Gert Kroon  
*Chairman employers’ organization VNO NOW, Arnhem-Nijmegen*  
28-08-2008

Jaap Modder  
*Chairman City Region Arnhem-Nijmegen*  
01-10-2008
Marcel Robbens  
*Senior Strategist, Arnhem Municipality* 
05-09-2008

Rob Roskes  
*Head department regional coordination and strategy*  
*Gelderland Province*  
01-09-2008

Carol van Eert  
*Director secretary, City Region Arnhem-Nijmegen*  
03-09-2008

Marieke van Haaren  
*Executive Councilor Mobility & Economy, Gelderland Province*  
01-09-2008

Pieter van Ree  
*Head sector spatial development, City Region Arnhem-Nijmegen*  
15-07-2008

Petra Wingerden-Boers  
*Mayor Rheden Municipality*  
*Executive Councilor Work & Economy, City Region Arnhem-Nijmegen*  
14-07-2008

**AMSTERDAM METROPOLITAN AREA**

Michel Bezuijen  
*Alderman Haarlemmermeer municipality*  
*Executive Spatial Planning, City Region Amsterdam*  
13-09-2006

CJ Dippel  
*Coordinator Plabeka, Economic Department Amsterdam municipality*  
08-12-2007

Dick Hulsebosch  
*Adjunct director Regional Stimulation Program*  
*Chamber of Commerce, Amsterdam*  
14-09-2006

Kees Joustra  
*Program manager North Wing, North-Holland Province*  
20-04-2007

Jaap Meindersma  
*Program manager city strategy, Almere Municipality*  
23-11-2007

Cees Jan Pen  
*Advisor Economic Affairs, Zaandstad Municipality*  
08-10-2007
Han Quast  
*Head of managerial department, Amsterdam municipality*  
11-02-2007

Marijke Rombouts  
*Advisor governmental affairs North Wing, Amsterdam municipality*  
22-02-2007

Michiel Ruis  
*Program manager National Program to the North Wing*  
*Ministry of Transport, Public Works & Water Management*  
09-11-2006

Pieter Tordoir  
*Professor Economic Geography, University of Amsterdam*  
*Director Chamber of Commerce Amsterdam*  
22-11-2006

Fike van der Burght  
*Project leader project management bureau, Amsterdam Municipality*  
11-02-2007

Gerrit van der Plas  
*Senior policy advisor, City Region Amsterdam*  
08-07-2006

Barbara Verbeek  
*Project leader, North-Holland Province*  
20-04-2007

Ton Verheijden  
*General secretary Inter-Municipal collaboration Waterland (ISW)*  
23-04-2007

San Verschuren  
*Team leader strategies, Amsterdam Municipality*  
19-02-2008

Marijn Willems  
*Advisor urban planning, Diemen Municipality*  
23-04-2007