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This chapter presents the results of the analysis of boundary work in an experiment with deliberative governance in the Middle East of the Netherlands: the Protein Corridor Project: Make it Happen. This policy project ran from the end of 2002 until June 2005 and involved farmers’ representatives, retailers, environmental and animal welfare organizations, and financiers in building scenarios for the region. The plan of the consultants was to include citizens in this process too, but this did not happen (see attachment 5.1 for a timeline).

5.1. INTRODUCTION TO A DUTCH CONTEXT

“If the agro-sector of Gelderland wants to continue to be of importance in the long run, radical change is necessary” (ATO: Goossens, 2003, p.3).

The Province of Gelderland and the Province of Overijssel, in cooperation with academic experts, constructed the “A1 Protein Corridor” as a region. This region covers an area of approximately twenty kilometers on each site of the A1 artery between Amersfoort in the middle of the Netherlands and Hengelo in the East. In comparison to the Dairy Gateway, the area around the A1 between Amersfoort and Hengelo is densely populated and houses many modernized industrial agriculture businesses. There are almost 4500 relatively small-scale farms in the area. Pig farms for pork production are located mostly in the east of the area, calf farms for the production of veal in the middle, and chicken farms for eggs and meat in the west around Barneveld. Slaughterhouses, meat processors, animal feed production, and transporters are located close to the highway on which one out of every three trucks transports agricultural products (LEI: Jahae, 1999, quoted in Platform Agrologistiek, 2007; KLICKT Chain networks, 2004). Although modernization, regulations and rural planning in this area can be regarded as one step beyond those in the Dairy Gateway area, along the A1 “Protein Highway” there still are small country roads that run through meadows, over dikes, through the polders, and through the heather fields in the “De Hoge Veluwe” national park. This natural park intersects with the A1 artery (see figure 5.1 with a map of the area).

The issues with nature conservation, land use, and agrobusinesses in this region resemble those of many rural areas in the Netherlands. Over the last 10 years the additional value to the gross national product of the agricultural sector in the Netherlands, especially the intensive livestock farming, decreased by 12% (LNV, 2004, p. 8). Even though only the United States and France export more agricultural products, and the transport and processing of agricultural products still slowly increases, the sector has a difficult time competing on the European and global markets (LNV, 2004, p. 5 and 8). This decline of the economic value of the sector together with an increase in strains on land use in this “differentiated landscape” (Reten, 1999; Lachapelle et al., 2003) have been reasons for Dutch planners to speculate about a disappearance of the agricultural sector from the Netherlands (Vereijken, 2004; RPB, 2005). The projected “economic implosion” (economische implosie) of the countryside made it possible for governmental actors and planners to think of new scenarios for Dutch rural areas. If these areas were no longer to be used as agricultural landscapes — production landscapes —, they might be used as
consumer landscapes with means for recreation, housing, and combined functions such as farming and recreation, or farming and social or medical care.

Plattelandsvernieuwing (“innovation of rural areas”) is what the Dutch government calls this. It is the answer of the National Ministry of Agriculture and Food Quality, and the agricultural sector to an increase in its importance. Agriculture should become more sustainable and combine several functions to revitalize the Dutch countryside (LNV, 2004; LNV et al. 2004). In addition, in 2001 the Ministry of Agriculture in the Agro-Logistics Vision proposed agro-logistical innovations to reduce the strains on land use by the agricultural sector. Among these innovations were clustering of the remaining agrobusinesses, and a facilitation of cooperation in networks and chains (LNV, 2001). On top of that, in 2002 the Reconstruction Law became operational. This law was initiated in response to animal welfare and food quality issues, for example, an outbreak of swine fever (1997/1998) or bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), in combination with the difficulties of preventing this and other diseases from spreading. With this law the Dutch National government instigated a process in which governmental actors in cooperation with other societal actors developed “Reconstruction Plans.” These plans took care of zoning and planning for development of agriculture and businesses, or for nature conservation.

In 2004 the provinces of Gelderland and Overijssel presented the results of their coproduced reconstruction plans. Stakeholders and shareholders from the areas, including representatives of the agro-sector (LTO), nature conservationists, environmentalists, and representatives from the tourist industry deliberated over these plans and cooperated intensively to reach consensus. In response to the issues addressed in the plans the province of Gelderland together with its development agency and researchers from Wageningen University Research began a process in the middle eastern part of the country that established the A1 Protein Corridor as a region. According to them, this area had specific problems with spatial differentiation that could be solved with the help of clustering of agribusinesses.

The construction of the A1 Protein Corridor as a region was an incremental process that involved many actors. I reconstructed three steps in this process that each relate to provincial and national policy developments. Each of these steps increased the deliberations between government, academia, businesses, and other societal stakeholders. The last step, scenario-building in “Protein Highway: Make it Happen” was the most deliberative part. I analyzed boundary work in this part. Before we turn to the results of this analysis, I will shortly describe the two preceding steps that illustrate the cooperative culture in which the attempt to innovate policy formation took place.

**Step 1: The Protein Corridor as a region**

In the first step, the Departments of Economic Affairs and Rural Development of the Province of Gelderland applied what they called an “expert approach” (ATO: Peter Smeets, 2003, p. 10). They hired scientists from Wageningen University Research (Agrotechnologisch onderzoeksinstituut (ATO), Alterra, and Landbouw Economisch Instituut (LEI)) to collaborate with “experienced experts of consultancy firms” to “facilitate and stimulate a process of change” (ATO: Goossens, 2003, p. 3). The experts produced a document in which they developed two scenarios for the region: one with cluster development and one without. With help of images of the region, the scientists claimed that cluster development was inevitable whether or not the agro-industry was to be maintained in the region. Not only a diminishing of the primary sector — the farms — was a risk, so was a diminishing of the sector of agro-processors and transporters. Moreover, the quality of the landscape and scenery (ruimtelijke kwaliteit) were under pressure. The scientists concluded that governmental actors had to stimulate and facilitate cluster development and the formation of three types of agroparks, the agro-production park, the agro-production satellite park, and the rural park (see pictures 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3). The Province of Gelderland took up the gauntlet and declared itself a “catalyst” for these developments (ATO: Goossens, 2003).

These types of cluster development should work as a “space-pump” (ruimtepomp) (ATO: Goossens, 2003, p. 3) and were intended to create more land for nature conservation,
housing, and recreation, and also for other types of economic activities. The suggestions in this scholarly document not incidentally resembled solutions presented in the national Agrologistics Vision: Cluster, Connect, Direct (Ministry of LNV and V&W, 2001). Provincial government and the academics from WUR were looking for a way to promote and implement the ideas in this Vision, as well as ways to receive financial support for these efforts, for example, from the national government.

**Step 2: Agroparks in the Protein Corridor**

The results from the first step were used in a proposal for a project called the KLICT program (Wagenberg, 2003). KLICT is an abbreviation for Ketennetwerken, Logistiek & ICT (Klín), which translates into “Chain-networks, Logistics and Information Communication Technology.” This national program was created to stimulate implementation of the Agrologistics Vision. In the proposal to KLICT, governmental actors and academic experts continued the planned construction of the region in two ways. The first was the expert approach in which they produced three academic positioning papers, and they introduced what they called “action research” (WUR et al., 2003, p. 11).

In the three positioning papers, the researchers presented a problem analysis of agriculture and land use issues in the region. They addressed the tension between the economical and social significance of the agro-food sector on one hand, and the increasing economical and societal problems on the other (WUR, 2003, p. 22). Moreover, the academic experts spoke of the A1 Corridor in which a “blanket of odor circles” (deken van stankcirkels) “locks development in the region” (regio zit op slot) (ATO: Goossens, 2003, p. 3). In contrast to the “policy gaps” in the USA, in the Netherlands the experts blamed an abundance of government rules and regulations for the increase in economic growth in this sector.

The researchers also presented alternative solutions for the region: the A1 Protein Corridor concept and cluster development that included cooperation in (business) networks (Broeze, 2003a, p. 9). They addressed these issues as “systems innovation” that they defined as “complex innovations” in the sense that “a variety of stakeholders (operations, social organizations, governments) together have to innovate” (Broeze, 2003b, p. 5). In other words, it would be innovative not to depend solely on government but to cooperate with other businesses, societal actors, and with government to increase efficient use of energy and land and to reduce waste. The academics invited entrepreneurs, government and societal actors to engage in deliberations in five thematic arenas (see attachment 5.2. for participants in these arenas). They called this “network-steering.” The arenas facilitated “coalition-formation,” an “inventory of questions,” and “a test of feasibility” of concepts (WUR, 2003, p. 34).

From the above I can reconstruct the elements of deliberative governance discourse as they had been established so far (see figure 5.2 for an overview). The normal situation was that the importance of Dutch agriculture and related industry declines; government usually contributes to this process as it limits entrepreneurship and technological innovations by rules and regulations that protect the spatial quality, environment and animals. Moreover, businesses do contribute to this process since they do not cooperate or share knowledge. Subsequently, environmental and welfare organizations contribute to this decline as they form coalitions with government to further protect the environment, animal, and spatial quality. A new situation might be systems innovation that includes cooperation in networks, coalition formation and the further elaboration of the ideas for cluster development to improve the spatial quality of the area and the prospects for businesses that university faculty had come up with.

![Figure 5.2. Government discourse (left), deliberative governance discourse (right), and boundary concepts (middle) as defined in the first two steps of regional development](image)

In the third step, the participants of the five arenas continued to be involved and the organizers asked them to take up an even more active role in cluster development. The struggles over the interpretation of the elements of deliberative governance discourse evolved.

### 5.2. AN EXPERIMENT: A1 PROTEIN HIGHWAY: MAKE IT HAPPEN!

The third step that I reconstructed in the development of the Protein Corridor region was the project “Protein Highway: Make it Happen.” In this step, the regional development increasingly became part of the implementation of the provincial Reconstruction Zoning Plans. As we saw, in 2002 the Reconstruction Law became effective which meant that the southern and eastern provinces of the Netherlands commenced a process of collaborative planning. Stakeholders in the rural areas on sandy soil were involved in the designation of agricultural “intensifying” (intensivering) and “extensifying” (extensivering) areas, areas respectively in which agricultural activities were to be further developed and areas in which nature conservation and recreation should be stimulated. The provincial actors wanted to develop and test options for cluster development in pilot projects. They considered cluster development as a way to implement the zoning plans. They instigated a process of “voluntary relocation” of agrobusinesses — another term for cluster development — that not only would benefit the scenery, land use, nature conservation and the environment but also agrobusinesses in the area. Protein Highway: Make it Happen was one of the ways to test and implement the relocations, and to test other ways to improve the “spatial quality” of the area.
5. A1 Protein Corridor Project: credible governance by entrepreneurs

At the start of this third step, a steering committee was formed by academics, consultants and the two provinces Overijssel and Gelderland, with help from their economic development agency Oost NV, several (non-paying) supporters from agrobusinesses, and a bank. They mobilized more financial resources and drafted a proposal for the project. Subsequently, the Innovation Network, a national governmental body that was formed to stimulate system innovation and sustainability in agriculture, got involved. Besides these financial resources, the project also received support from the Platform Agrologistics that is a joint effort of the agricultural corporate world and the Ministry of Agriculture to implement the Agrologistics Vision (LNV, 2003). Both the Innovation Network and the Platform became members of the steering committee. I consider this steering committee, together with the two consultants, Oost NV, and the academics that participated in KLICT to be the change coalition in this case.

The consultants attempted to gain support for the continuation of the development of the Protein Highway among participants from the five arenas from the previous KLICT project. In order to keep these entrepreneurs involved and have them engaged in pilot project that had been developed in the KLICT program, the consultants organized three “entrepreneurial deliberations.” These formed a bridge between the KLICT project and Protein Highway: Make it Happen. The consultants included input from these deliberations in the proposal for Make it Happen. Moreover, some of the entrepreneurs that agreed to start experimenting with cluster development in pilot projects stayed involved in “plenary sessions” (plenaire bijeenkomsten), also referred to as kwartiermakers. These sessions formed a bridge between the steering committee and their vision project and the implementation and tests of cluster development in the pilot projects.

The A1 Protein Highway project ran from the end of 2002, when the consultants drafted the first proposals, until June 2005. The steering committee agreed that in Protein Highway: Make it Happen the three concepts that concerned the agro-clusters and the pilot projects from the position papers and the arenas of the KLICT project had to be developed and more support (draagvlak) had to be created (see attachment 5.3. for an overview of the pilot projects and attachment 5.4. for the project-structure). Moreover, scenario development in the Shell tradition in which possible futures are explored together with stakeholders from the region, had to result in “a seductive perspective” that is recognizable for citizens and other users of land (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003). The change coalition also agreed that special attention had to be paid to the “inclusion of more stakeholders, also from outside agriculture.” The ambition was to “find pacesetters that are oriented toward new solutions and not to “more of the same” (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003). Two consultants, Van de Bunt and Rijnconsult, who specialized in scenario development and the agricultural sector respectively, convened and facilitated the scenario development. They organized a one-day scenario workshop that resulted in policy options for this region. From these scenarios the consultants subtracted a seductive perspective that was supposed to be, but never was, deliberated in arenas with all kinds of stakeholders.

I analyzed this stage of the project in greater detail starting at the end of 2002 through the end of 2005 (see attachment 5.5. for an overview of interviewees and observed meetings). I started the analysis with deliberations of governmental actors with businesses that had been involved in KLICT. At the same time the formation of a steering committee took place. I ended the analysis of boundary work when Oost NV and LTO-Oost erected a Platform for the Protein Highway. As in the case of the Bijlmerpark and Dairy Gateway projects, I analyzed this project in two stages: the drafting of the proposal and the implementation of the deliberative design. Next, I analyzed boundary work at three research sites:

- Interactions between government and advisors (these interactions took place solely in the first stage, the drafting of the proposal);
- Interactions between government and businesses that included an analysis of the meetings of the entrepreneurs (interactions in the first stage were the deliberations of entrepreneurs and in the second stage this included an analysis of plenary sessions);
- Interactions between government and society that included a detailed analysis of the scenario development.

5.3. BOUNDARY WORK IN THE PROTEIN HIGHWAY: MAKE IT HAPPEN PROJECT

This section first presents the results of boundary work within the change coalition, the “entrepreneurial deliberations” that led to the final proposal. In this stage the change coalition defined and enacted elements of deliberative governance discourse. Second, this section presents boundary work at the deliberative venues that consultants organized for the scenario workshop. These venues had a deliberative design. Besides these deliberative venues, I have also analyzed boundary work in the plenary sessions and steering committee meetings in which interactions took place without a deliberative design.

BOUNDARY WORK IN THE FIRST STAGE: INNOVATION AND SCENARIOS SAVE THE PROJECT

When the KLICT program finished, the Province of Gelderland together with a consultant and Oost NV — at the time still the Gelderse Ontwikkelings Maatschappij (GOM) and the Overijtselse Ontwikkelings Maatschappij (OOM) — undertook several activities to commence the third step in the development of the region. As we saw, they mobilized the business leaders from the area; they mobilized other policy actors; and they drafted a proposal for an organizational continuation of the collaborations that had been initiated by the KLICT program. The consultants Rijnconsult and Van de Bunt reworked this “multiple-year framework” (meerjarenkader), into a proposal for a scenario study in the region.

Business-leaders in the lead: cluster development for entrepreneurs

In this stage deliberations with business leaders from the region took place at three meetings. At the first meeting, the development agency presented the results of KLICT (GOM, 2003, 28 January 2003 Huis Nieuwe Rande; Oost NV, 2003). At the second meeting the facilitator evoked a discussion amongst GOM and the businesses about proposed solutions in KLICT (GOM, 2003, 6 June 2003 Huis Nieuwe Rande). At the third meeting on the 4th of November 2003 at the Hotel Hoog Holte (Oost, 2003) two consultants of Buck and Arcadis were invited to present their ideas on cluster development. They presented
three of the pilot projects from the KLICT project: “Rural Park,” “Agro-logistics,” and “Optimization of feedstreams.”

The analysis demonstrated a pattern of boundary work that led to the acceptance of one element of governance rather than deliberative governance discourse: businesses should take the lead in cluster development. Their entrepreneurship should be stimulated. In greater detail boundary work at the three meetings took place as follows: At all three meetings, first the province of Gelderland and Oost NV presented a doomsday scenario. At all three meetings, Oost NV presented a “shrink scenario” for the agro-sector. This scenario, as Oost NV argued:

“can lead to a disappearance of all cattle farms from the area and with them to the economic downfall of processing and food industries that depend on those farms” (Oost NV, 2003).

Second, Oost NV and academics presented innovation and cluster development as possible solutions. These new solutions transcended organizational, knowledge, spatial and discursive boundaries. They were multi-interpretable. Therefore I will consider them boundary concepts. For example, at one meeting with the entrepreneurs a consultant made this boundary spanning explicit:

“Economic interests and land use/planning in rural areas are always on strained terms. We have to bring these two worlds together. This group can play a role in that” (Oost, 2003).

The concepts that Oost NV and consultants introduced encouraged participants to transcend boundaries between three different agro-sectors, those of calves, poultry and pigs, for the benefit of all. Moreover, Oost NV attempted to span the boundary between government discourse in which spatial clustering would be a government responsibility and governance discourse in which entrepreneurs also might take up responsibility for the spatial quality.

Hence, Oost NV argued that innovations of all kinds were necessary to prevent the doomsday scenario from coming true. Business-leaders could interpret these possible solutions, innovation and cluster development, to mean various things. For example, cluster development meant working together in the region; it meant the development of agroparks; it meant spatial cluster-development; it meant organizational cluster development. Participants could interpret innovations as systems innovations but these could also be all sorts of technological innovations to improve the economic and spatial quality of the region (Oost NV, 2003).

Third, in response to the introduction of these concepts, some of the business leaders contested the concepts. The business leaders marked a business subdiscourse in which government is considered to limit entrepreneurship and innovation. For example, the business leaders would argue that government should withdraw. The rules, regulations, and zoning were the cause of the problems in the region. Therefore, businesses should be leading in cluster development.

Dumeco: “The initiative has to come from industry. Politics is the greatest threat to agriculture in the Netherlands” (GOM, 2003).

Or zoning had to be less strict. It should be easier for agrobusinesses to expand:

Nutreco Holding NV: “The scale of the companies and their space for innovation are crucial. Moving and clustering of businesses are not the only answers. Entrepreneurs should get land/space at places where it is already possible” (GOM, 2003).

Thus, business leaders did not accept the boundary concepts immediately, but contested them.

Fourth, in response to these demarcations of entrepreneurial subdiscourse, Oost NV argued that the relationships between government and businesses could change. Government no longer wants restrict entrepreneurs but wants to facilitate them. For example, the development agency of the province of Gelderland cited itself as an example of this change in government:

GOM: “But something is changing. In Gelderland one is thinking of a development agency for rural areas. We want to stimulate entrepreneurship” (GOM, 2003).

This demonstration by example of the possibility of this element of governance discourse, namely, “government facilitates rather than restricts,” continued in a collaborative search for how government can help businesses through cluster development. Oost NV: “What do you need, for example, for cluster development?”

Dumeco: “You can choose cluster development from two points of view: on the one hand, to reduce the cost (the closer together the better). On the other hand from a marketing point of view as PR for the region” (GOM, 2003).

Cluster development functioned as a boundary concept as it allowed governmental actors, Oost NV, to introduce their changed role as facilitators rather than restrictors of entrepreneurship. The participating businesses leaders interpreted this concept as something that governmental actors introduced to benefit their entrepreneurship, their business and sector.

In these interactions, the participants also established that cluster development did not mean active involvement of businesses in spatial planning/reconstruction. This more ambitious element of deliberative governance discourse did not gain credibility:

Van Drie Groep: “It has nothing to do with the reconstruction?”

GOM: “The reconstruction was not a reason to start this project. In fact it has nothing to do with it. We are focussed on the primary industry” (GOM, 2003).

Hence, while the change coalition argued and demonstrated that government is changing toward facilitation rather than restriction of “entrepreneurship,” businesses did not want to be involved in spatial planning. That was considered government’s job. While the business leaders acknowledged that cluster and chain development might be in their own interests, they also claimed this was nothing new and they wished to remain far from spatial development.

Thus, the change coalition made an effort to introduce a new element of governance discourse: government facilitates (schept voorwaarden) and most business leaders were convinced. However, participants rejected elements of deliberative governance discourse that pointed toward a direction that businesses together with government would be able to improve the use of land and the spatial quality in the area. They rejected this deliberative governance interpretation of cluster development. Governmental actors argued with the business leaders that the most important objective was to facilitate entrepreneurship. In this setting actors formed a coalition around this idea of entrepreneurship which was a boundary concept in this setting (see figure 5.3. for an overview).
The steering committee silently disagrees about scenarios and innovation

The steering committee members were entangled in an interpretation struggle similar to the entrepreneurs. Members interpreted cluster development in the protein corridor in different ways. For example, they discussed whether the scenarios for the protein corridor were to be seductive perspectives to convince business-leaders to instigate relocations or whether they were to be developed into several possible scenarios in which relocation might be one feature but other solutions for an improvement of the region might also come up? The Innovation Network interpreted the development of the protein corridor to include an improvement of the spatial and environmental quality as well as economic viability as a shared responsibility of businesses, government and other stakeholders in the region. As one of the people from the Innovation Network argued:

"In vision development, in our interpretation, you have to start as broad as possible. You will have to include stakeholders in the area, try to create a movement. The agro sector will not be able to convince the rest of the world that they are doing the right thing. Then it is a PR story. You have to dare to really discuss. The conclusion of these deliberations might be that it is not such a great idea to develop clusters. But the people have to come up with these ideas themselves."

The two provinces interpreted these concepts mainly as a way to convince businesses to take the initiative to relocate to designated intensifying areas that were designed in coproduction to improve the spatial quality and economic viability of the area. They wanted "practical results". As one of the consultants said:

"The administrator argued: 'yes, we need both feet on the ground.' The elected official needs to be able to score with this project."

Thus, Innovation Network wanted to continue coproduction in networks to implement the reconstruction plans. The provinces wanted to activate businesses to take up responsibility to implement the reconstruction plans. These different interpretations can be understood to represent elements, first, of deliberative governance discourse in which a broader network of actors, especially “counter-power” actors (Grin, 2007) such as animal welfare organizations should be included in a bottom up development of the problem definition and solutions, and second, as an element of normal government discourse in which communication of academic and governmental solutions came from the top down.

On several occasions members of the steering committee demarcated these two interpretations when they discussed the proposal. Two critical moments that resembled a critical moment in the Dairy Gateway project occurred when, first, the financiers formalized their financial contributions and second, when they selected the consultants. These consultants were to represent the steering committee, draw up the deliberative design, and facilitate the deliberations. Innovation Network demanded the inclusion of a consultant that was less involved with the agro-sector and specialized in scenario development in the tradition of the Shell oil company in which possible scenarios rather than one vision were developed together with a broad range of stakeholders. As Oost NV argued:

"[Innovation Network] thought that Van de Bunt would do better on this. I do not necessarily agree on that. But [they] thought that Rijiconsult was focussed too much on the businesses and too little on other important stakeholders and interests."

On the other hand, one of the provinces did not want to finance the visioning part of the project but only the implementation of the pilot projects. As, among others, the Innovation Network argued in an interview:

"Well, [the province of] Gelderland did not like a vision. They did like the concrete projects. But they thought the vision too vague. It was most of all elected official Aalderink, he had had some bad experiences with ICES/KIS projects in which a lot of consultants had been involved. He thought there were too many consultants and wondered where the businesses were."

To overcome these demarcations, Oost NV proposed some practical solutions, for example, to hire an extra consultant, and the provinces proposed to change the finance structure into one in which they province of Gelderland financed the project indirectly through the development agency. Next to the practical solutions, the consultants introduced two new boundary concepts, scenarios and innovation, that spanned the government-governance boundary that divided the steering committee.

Boundary concept scenarios

In the three positioning papers the university experts had already developed scenarios. They constructed a doomsday scenario for the region, and they provided solutions in a possible scenario of cluster development in the protein corridor. In the proposal for Protein Highway: Make it Happen, yet a different possible interpretation of scenarios was introduced: plausible scenarios that could be used as a tool in deliberations. Thus, at this point members of the steering committee could interpret the concept “scenarios” in at least three ways:

1. As the seductive perspective: created by academics in cooperation with government and some businesses in previous steps of development of the region;
2. As a fearful perspective: predictions were used to convince other stakeholders of the seductive perspective and proposed solutions in it;
3. Finally, scenarios were a tool to induce deliberations and explorations of possible futures and options in those futures.

To start with the first two interpretations: this is how scenarios had been interpreted in the two previous stages. Academics developed the doomsday scenario as well as the seductive perspective to raise “awareness” of the problems and solutions in the area. At the same time these scenarios had to convince the actors of the necessity of the proposed scientific solutions for this region already in the position papers. The consultants presented the "seductive perspective" of the protein corridor to convince other actors. They wanted to create support (draagvlak) for this perspective through deliberations.
“Elements that need to be elaborated are a clear vision of the spatial, economic and social developments of the area that result in a 'seductive perspective' in which citizens and other land-users can recognize themselves, a good integration and coordination with current initiatives and policy frameworks” (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003, p.2). The consultants presented the third interpretation of scenarios as a way to organize the deliberations. They designed the scenario workshops in the tradition of the “Shell” scenarios that are plausible but uncertain futures rather than predictions or desirable perspectives. Participants at the scenario workshops had to develop a shared understanding of the possible future of this region in deliberations, and they had to develop possible innovative actions and options. In this stage, the goal was to let a broad range of actors be part of the problem analysis and solution for the region:

“The ambition is to create a communal awareness about what might happen in the A1 corridor, what is plausible, what cannot be prevented, what is to be feared. In the scenarios we will look primarily at developments in which actors do not have any influence (the cases that we can influence are part of the next step). In fact it is problem-recognition and problem-acknowledgement but from a much broader perspective” (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003).

According to the consultants, a communal deliberative development of the scenarios would focus the discussion not on conflicting interests but on a possible common future.

“In an interview one of the consultants elaborated this. According to this consultant, scenarios encouraged a discussion on what might happen and what might be done rather than a negotiation of interests or desirable futures: “Because of how we work with those [scenarios], we are not engaging in a discussion of interests. So, we say: what if this happens and that, what does the world look like at that moment according to you? What will happen? So, we keep those two things apart in the scenarios: the policy-making part and the . . . ehm . . . You can say, the scenarios are not normative” (Interview-VanWaes, 2004).

Subsequently, the consultants argued that different types of stakeholders needed to be included to develop new options for the future of the region. These “unusual suspects” might introduce different views and ideas. This interpretation contradicts the first interpretation in which the ambition is to create support for the perspectives and solutions already developed.

In what the consultants offered, two of the above interpretations of scenarios were present: the seductive perspective as well as a tool to induce deliberations and explorations of possible futures and policy options. The multi-interpretability aligned the elements of government discourse with elements of deliberative governance discourse and as such enabled a coalition of the provinces with the Innovation Network. In hindsight I can conclude that the two provinces and the business leaders interpreted scenarios as a way to convince stakeholders of the seductive perspective and solutions they had developed in previous steps. The Innovation Network had the ambition to deliberate with a broad range of stakeholders and not to produce “more of the same.”

**Boundary concept innovation**

“It is important that the vision and actions are highly innovative, for example, concerning the spatial, technological and institutional aspects. We must prevent that we only sanitize [the agricultural sector in the area] or choose more of the same. We need real innovation with sustainable solutions to bend the current problematic situation into a strategic advance with international allure.” (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003, p. 2).

University experts introduced the idea of innovation in the previous steps in the development of the protein corridor. In the positioning papers they distinguished three types of innovation of product, process and system (Broeze, 2003b). In the proposal for PH: MiiH, the consultants did not define these three types of innovation. As we will see below, this created room for participants to interpret them in at least two ways: as practical innovations of product and processes, and as systems innovation of interactions among actors in the region.

From the analysis of boundary work, I can reconstruct that business leaders and the two provinces desired first and foremost to develop and implement *product and process innovation* that would benefit the agricultural sector. As an employee of one of the provinces argued:

“The hypothesis behind the A1 protein corridor is that you should not accept what is going on, not accept a ‘cold’ sanitization. Innovation can offer new chances to the sector to make it blossom and grow again” (Interview-De Jager Dick, 2004).

On the other hand, the Innovation Network and later on, the Platform Agrologistics, interpreted innovation as the desire to cooperate in new ways. They aimed at *systems innovation*. They wanted innovation that was going beyond technological innovations of products and beyond innovation of cooperation between the usual business partners or even between normally competing agricultural businesses. Systems innovation included attempts to no longer impose top-down technological innovations to society whether from government, academia, or the agricultural sector. Based on their experiences with the public debate on piggery apartments, which are controversial high-rise buildings that contain clustered pig farms (see artistic design in picture 5.4.), the Innovation Network wished to include other societal actors in the development of product and process innovations. This was to prevent societal resistance in a later stage. The next quote illustrates that the consultants also included this interpretation of innovation in the offer:

“...a form of network government with rules of the games, systems and abilities other than the usual” (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003, p. 6).

In the final proposal both interpretations of innovation were possible. The consultants did not specify the meaning of *innovation* and its vagueness was a way to bring together the actors who had argued in favor of one element of government discourse with the other actor who had emphasized one element from deliberative governance discourse: that of systems innovation.

In November 2003 the consultants presented the final proposal. All financiers accepted it. A financial structure in which one of the provinces indirectly participated through its development agency (Oost NV) was necessary to proceed, as was the hiring of a second consultant. Finally, the introduction of two boundary concepts, *scenarios* and *innovation* aligned government and deliberative governance discourse (see figure 5.4. for enacted elements of government and deliberative governance discourse in the steering committee).
In the drafting of the proposal for the PH: MiH consultants planned a more deliberative approach than in the previous steps of regional development. This third step included deliberations with other stakeholders from the area. In preparation for this step, the economic development agency organized three meetings with business leaders to keep them involved and continue their efforts from the KLICT Program. These meetings did not have a deliberative design. The provincial development agency, Oost NV, attempted to convince business leaders of the idea of cluster development. The business leaders interpreted this as a helpful way to reorganize their businesses but not as a way to contribute to spatial development. In their opinion this was the task of government. Most of the business leaders agreed to continue to work on pilot projects for cluster development and accepted the idea that government could also facilitate entrepreneurship and innovation.

In addition, Rijnconsult drafted a proposal for the project Protein Highway: Make it Happen. A second consultant, Van de Bunt, got involved. The deliberations with entrepreneurs were directly linked to the first document that Oost NV drafted, but not directly related to the drafting of the consultants’ proposal. The members of the steering committee and the consultants discussed about the content of the proposal. At the start of this third step in the construction of the protein highway as a region, the two provinces, the Innovation Network, Oost NV, the RaboBank, the Platform Agrologistics and the consultants defined what I understand to be deliberative governance discourse.

In the discussions about the draft proposal a critical moment in the pattern of boundary work occurred almost immediately. The provinces and business leaders both desired practical innovations. This collided with the desire of the Innovation Network to create a new system of interactions between government, businesses, and citizens. The Innovation Network wanted to include a broader group of societal actors, not just agricultural businesses. To overcome these differences, the consultants — in addition to a financial arrangement — introduced two multi-interpretable concepts: *scenarios* and *innovations*. The provinces and business leaders interpreted scenarios as a seductive perspective which I consider to be an interpretation from a government discourse perspective as it is top-down communication of a perspective developed by government and academia. The Innovation Network interpreted the concept scenarios as plausible futures that needed to be developed in deliberations. The provinces and business leaders interpreted innovation as product and process innovation. The Innovation Network interpreted it as systems innovation. Hence, the vagueness of these two concepts made it possible to span boundaries between actors and their different interpretations. This enabled the consultants to proceed with the experiment. The change coalition was expanded and they defined the following elements of deliberative governance discourse (see figure 5.5.).

**Conclusions: the Protein Highway: Make it Happen continues due to boundary concepts**

In the second stage of the Protein Highway: Make it Happen project governmental actors deliberated with businesses and farmers’ representatives. This second stage was made up of steering committee meetings and the “plenary sessions” in which business leaders and governmental actors discussed the pilot projects (see attachment 5.6. for an overview of participants). Participants in the plenary sessions talked about the progress in the pilot projects and how these related to the scenario development. They related concrete
examples of cluster development to a strategic vision. Subsequently, in this second stage, the consultants organized a one-day scenario workshop with a deliberative design. At this workshop consultants included animal welfare and environmental stakeholders in the deliberations between governmental actors, financiers, retailers and farmers' representatives (see attachment 5.7 for a list of participants).

This section is based on an analysis of the minutes of meetings, observations and transcripts, documents, and interviews. The results of the analysis in this chapter are exploratory and limited because I could only observe a one-day meeting with a deliberative design, the scenario workshop. The consultants had planned for four public meetings to deliberate over these scenarios. However, the consultants argued that the financial resources were absorbed by the organization of the steering committee meetings and bilateral conversations with business leaders. The majority of the analysis is based on meetings without a deliberative design.\(^{(1)}\) I had access to minutes of three steering group meetings out of the four that were all organized in 2004. The last meeting in early 2005 was cancelled. I also analyzed the minutes of three plenary sessions that were all organized in 2004. I observed and transcribed one of these plenary sessions. On the 9th of July 2004 consultants organized four plenary sessions and six workshops in which participants built scenarios. I analyzed observations and transcripts from the four plenary sessions, and two out of the six workshops. There were no minutes of the four other workshops. I had access to the questionnaires that the consultants used to prepare the scenario workshops. They also had bilateral conversations with business leaders but no minutes were kept of these.

**Demarcating practical results from system innovation.**

Boundary work at the steering committee meetings and the plenary sessions followed a similar pattern: transcending in boundary concepts; contestation through demarcations; silent enactment of the boundary concepts, and in one instance enactment of the concepts after a reflective conversation.

**Boundary concepts innovation and cluster development**

At both types of meetings, the consultants or other actors first presented a plan that included the boundary concept *innovation*, or a translation of the boundary concept *cluster development*. For example, consultants “translated” cluster development into a rural park. At the steering committee meetings, the consultants introduced the more generic boundary concepts of innovation and scenarios, although they often interpreted scenarios to mean the seductive perspective of an “A1 Protein Highway.” For example, at the first meeting, one of the steering committee members introduced the A1 Corridor as an area that needs to be developed based on its strengths: “what are features of the A1 Corridor, what distinguishes it from other regions? We need to use existing assets for innovations”\(^{(2)}\) (Rijnconsult, 2004b). At the plenary sessions, the consultants or other participants translated the more generic boundary concepts *protein corridor* and *innovation* into contextualized boundary concepts relevant to participating business leaders. These were examples of the different types of agroparks and cluster development such as “poultry center” and “rural park” (Provincie Gelderland, 2004b). The consultants introduced these concepts to seduce participants to cooperate together, and to gain credibility for the idea that the region could benefit from cooperation between business sectors. Moreover, they presented possible solutions for the regions problems.

---

**Demarcation of practical results from too much deliberation**

After these presentations, participants in the two types of meetings demarcated their interpretation of the boundary concepts. The steering committee members especially struggled over two possible interpretations. For example, at the steering committee meetings, members, especially the business leaders and the two provinces, demarcated “practical results” as something that should be different from what they called “normal government planning.” They were concerned that the project would remain in a planning stage and would include “too much deliberation” with other societal actors as had been the case in the development of reconstruction plans. For example, the elected official of the province of Overijssel emphasized that it is important:

“not to repeat parts of the reconstruction process. This reconstruction plan is a given. The Project A1 Protein Corridor should generate dynamics within the chain to help realize the goals of the reconstruction (such as physical relocation of functions)”\(^{(3)}\) (Rijnconsult, 2004b).

The steering committee members wanted businesses to take the lead in cluster development and the development of agroparks. They wanted businesses “to act as leaders of innovation.”\(^{(4)}\) (Rijnconsult, 2004a). A majority of the steering committee members interpreted innovation and scenarios as concepts that enable support to be gained from businesses for cluster development. They believed this was the fastest way to have practical results.

This contrasted with the interpretation of the Innovation Network that had the desire to innovate the system, which meant that not only businesses but other societal actors needed to be included in cluster development. They wanted to continue deliberations that had been started in the reconstruction process. According to the Innovation Network, this was necessary to create societal support for the implementation of agro clusters and agroparks. At the steering committee meetings, the Innovation Network stressed this point. However, the majority of steering committee members wanted practical results and to achieve them, they were convinced that businesses needed to take the initiative for cluster development. The dominant interpretation of cluster development was government was no longer to take the lead, businesses should do it. The steering committee members rejected one element of deliberative governance discourse — system innovation — but they accepted another: business involvement as innovators.

At the plenary sessions, participants immediately enacted a similar dominant interpretation of the boundary concepts. They agreed that businesses should take the lead in cluster development, the development of agroparks and therefore, of the region. It should not be a “government top-down plan,” participants argued. They agreed that the “real innovations have to come from the pilot projects” (Provincie Gelderland, 2003). The participants in the plenary sessions, mostly business leaders and some governmental actors, were convinced that plans should lead to practical results and should not be developed together with other societal actors. The participants at the plenary sessions more or less silently agreed that businesses should be allowed to further develop their plans to make them more concrete. They never discussed the possible interpretation of innovation to include environmental or spatial quality. In the end, both the steering group members and the participants in the plenary sessions agreed that businesses should take the lead in the innovations in the region. They enacted one element of deliberative governance discourse: businesses had to cooperate with government. They did not think,
however, that it was a good idea to include other societal actors and ideas. The Innovation Network could not stretch the governance idea that businesses had to lead the innovations. Deliberative governance discourse that includes other non-governmental organizations did not gain credibility.

**Government discourse enacted: Businesses develop clusters and govern the area**

A next step at the steering committee meetings was that consultants attempted to gain credibility for the desirable scenario that had been developed for the region (see below for the way the scenarios had been developed). At the plenary sessions, the next step was that consultants gained credibility for cluster development and the various forms it could take: the agroparks.

The participants engaged in the collaborative exploration of cluster development that had been fleshed out in projects such as the rural park. Moreover, at one meeting the participants engaged in a reflective conversation about how government and businesses interacted in this project and how it was different from their normal interactions. In this conversation, participants demarcated practical results from a top-down government approach. Furthermore, they acknowledged that they could interpret cluster development in various ways. From a government top-down perspective, they argued, the protein corridor was the “development of an area”. Or, it could be considered the “development of business chains” (Provincie Gelderland, 2004a). The participants briefly deliberated these two interpretations. They all agreed that area development was the responsibility of government and that the development of the business chain was the responsibility of businesses. This interpretation made clear that in this project cluster development would not include spatial development and that societal actors would not be included in cluster development by businesses.

At the steering committee meetings, the consultants and Oost NV either created urgency to cooperate with the help of the doomsday scenario or they demarcated expertise of academics or of participants in the scenario workshop. In an attempt to gain more credibility for both interpretations the consultants sketched the doomsday scenario and they argued that a seductive perspective and innovations were necessary to prevent this scenario from coming true. Subsequently, they demarcated expertise of academics and of participants of the scenario workshop to convince the steering committee of the credibility of the scenarios and innovations. For example, the consultants would claim that:

“At the base of this project lies a report of WUR, in which scenarios have been developed based on statistical information. Also within the current trajectory a lot of attention is being paid to scenario development and in connection with that, to the ‘mediale verbeelding’ [video representation]” (Rijnconsult, 2004b).

Or the claim was made that “experts” that participated at the scenario workshop had contributed to the scenario development, and that they had not “fallen from the sky” (Rijnconsult, 2004c) which means that these did not appear out of the blue. At three out of four meetings, the steering committee members accepted these demarcations of expertise. This can be understood to mean that “expertise” is part of dominant government discourse, or is an element of a dominant discourse on science or learning.

At the last steering committee meeting, the consultants attempted to find out whether the innovations they aspired to should include systems innovation. The steering committee members engaged in a reflective conversation. For example, in response to a statement of one of the elected officials that the “green and blue [environmental and water] services are very important but should not be involved in the A1 cooperation” (Rijnconsult, 2004c), one of the consultants argued that it might be necessary to “include these issues, since the way in which they will be involved depends on the choice of scenario (Rijnconsult, 2004c).” When the conversation continued, the elected official agreed that societal organizations needed to be included, but questioned in what way. He was afraid that “half the world needed to sit at the table” (Rijnconsult, 2004c). The steering committee member that represented Platform Agrologistics agreed with the elected official and argued that “the inclusion of nature conservation and environmental organizations does not guarantee that problems will occur later on in the process” (Rijnconsult, 2004c). The representative of the Innovation Network argued that it was not necessary to invite these organizations as members of the change coalition, but that some other type of involvement might be the solution. The conclusion of this reflective conversation was: “Keep the platform lean and mean and organize it around the pilot projects” (Rijnconsult, 2004c). In other words: involvement of actors outside the agricultural sector is not desirable in the opinion of the steering committee. All actors agreed that the project did not aim at system innovation in which countervailing powers are included. The project focussed on helping businesses to innovate in products and processes. Hence, the steering committee agreed that businesses needed to initiate cluster development and agroparks, rather than government. This can be considered governance discourse. However, the exclusion of other societal actors in these developments also meant that deliberative governance discourse was only partially enacted. As a consequence, scenarios were only to be interpreted as seductive perspectives that needed promulgation.

**Conclusions: countervailing powers excluded due to practical results**

At both type of meetings, the participants’ biggest ambition was to achieve practical results, in contrast to all the plans that had been made in the previous steps of the redevelopment of the area AND in the deliberations with societal actors that had led to the reconstruction plans. Participants agreed that businesses had to take up responsibility for cluster development to achieve these practical results. At the steering committee meetings, members struggled with two different interpretations of the boundary concept innovation. Was it also system innovation? At the plenary sessions this possibility remained unspoken. At the last steering committee meeting, the consultants invited the members to engage in a reflective conversation about this question. As a result, actors agreed that societal actors need not be included. Moreover, cluster development in this project was interpreted as cooperation in business chains and not necessarily as spatial clustering. From this I conclude that system innovation were no longer a credible interpretation of innovation, nor was spatial development. At the plenary sessions, these demarcations did not take place. Actors immediately but silently agreed that participation of social actors was out of the question and that businesses had to take the lead for practical results on cluster development.

As a result of these debates at the site of interaction between government and businesses, governance discourse gained credibility. Actors agreed that businesses had to take over part of the government’s responsibilities. However, the change of government discourse
did not go as far as the Innovation Network had wanted. From the fourth steering committee meeting onwards, the Protein Highway: Make it Happen project is no longer an experiment with deliberative governance if judged by the criteria formulated in the introduction and in chapter 2. It has become an experiment with governance. Up until this point the steering committee members blurred the concepts of scenarios and innovation to include the interpretation of the Innovation Network. The reflective conversation made clear that dominant discourse in the steering committee was the facilitation of businesses to help initiate and implement cluster development. Figure 5.6. summarizes the outcomes of the interpretative struggles so far. As we will see at the site of interaction between government and society, a similar thing happened at the scenario workshop.

![Figure 5.6. Government discourse (left), governance discourse (right), and boundary concepts (middle) as defined in steering committee and plenary sessions of PH:MiH](image)

**Boundary work in the scenario workshop**

The research site of “government and society” interaction consisted of a one-day scenario workshop. This was the only workshop with a deliberative design. Consultants applied a design for the meeting to enhance deliberations with a deliberative quality among participants. The consultant had planned for four more meetings (keuzeconferenties) (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003). These meetings never took place and neither did the preparatory sessions with stakeholders.

The one day workshop consisted of four plenary sessions and two blocks of parallel sessions that each consisted of three parallel groups. In the morning, participants explored certain and uncertain trends and they further explored three scenarios that the consultants had prepared in advance based on interviews with participants. First, the consultants asked participants to name certain and uncertain trends for the region. “Certain” trends, for example were: 50% reduction of intensive farms; liberalization of spatial planning and land use; the Netherlands will go from high to low population density; rural areas will be used more and more for tourism (Bunt and Rijnconsult, 2003). “Uncertain” trends were, for example: (no) technological innovation; consumer behaviour ((no) willingness to pay); (no) changes in the production chain; and (no) changes in rural scenery and rural living. Second, the consultants clustered these trends and asked experts what trends would have the most impact on the region (Oost NV, 2005, p. 9). The consultants placed the uncertainties with the most impact on the region on two axes. This quadrant produced four possible scenarios:

![Figure 5.7. Quadrant of two uncertain trends in the agro-sector in the Protein Highway area (Oost NV, 2005, p. 13)](image)

In the afternoon participants developed several actions and policy options for governmental actors and businesses in the area within the three possible futures. I observed and transcribed four plenary sessions, and two out of six parallel sessions. I did not have access to the four other parallel sessions other than through the reports in the plenary sessions. The consultants presented the results in a trend report and in the final report “Oost Nederland zet in op Vitale Veehouderij-Ketens: A1 eiwitcorridor brengt nieuw élan in de productiekolom” (Oost NV, 2004). In English: “The Eastern Netherlands aims for a Vital Livestock chain: the A1 Protein Highway brings new élan in the production column.” Moreover, the consultants produced a DVD to further promote the vision of the region.

As we will see, the overall pattern of boundary work of the one-day workshop, and of each individual workshop, was that consultants demarcate academic expertise or experiential expertise of participants to gain credibility for boundary concepts; participants engaged in a collaborative inquiry in which they demarcated interpretations of the boundary concepts that related to government discourse or deliberative governance discourse. In all sessions, a majority of participants enacted the boundary concept scenarios from a government perspective which means they interpreted a scenario for the region as a seductive perspective that governmental actors gained support for in a top-down approach; and the participants slightly changed the meaning of cluster development toward a (partly) voluntary relocation and clustering of businesses in agroparks, for example, which adds up to the enactment of government discourse with the addition of one element of governance discourse.

**Consultants gain credibility for scenarios and cluster development**

At the start of the deliberations in the parallel morning session, the consultants blurred what sort of scenarios they presented. This blurring had commenced in the drafted proposal and it continued in the deliberations. The participants could interpret the three scenarios from a deliberative governance discourse or government discourse perspective, as possible scenarios or as desirable scenarios respectively. First of all, the consultant presented the scenarios as possible futures. The scenarios had to simulate a deliberation among “experts” about what should be done in case any of the scenarios would come true:
“It is not a case of the most votes counted. That is irrelevant, but you are all experts in your own field. [...] The question is: if this happens, what will we do?”

(Transcript SWPL1, 2004).

However, the consultant also interpreted the scenarios as desirable outcomes of actions. The names of the scenarios reveal this: “laissez faire,” “act locally,” or — it comes as no surprise — this was the desired scenario: “roll up our sleeves” (handen uit de mouwen) which means action! Moreover, in the presentation the facilitator blurred these two interpretations of the concept scenarios. He argued that they present what the region will look like in five years, but also that they present what MIGHT happen in five years:

“Why do we start this way? We start this way to see whether we can jump into the future. What will it look like in five or ten years? That is what we will do this morning. Why? He who knows the future will be very rich. But also, there are many sectors in the Netherlands, ship building, textile industry, that employed a lot of clever people [...] but still they disappeared or returned in a different guise. Therefore, to think about what might happen to this area is very important.”

(Transcript SWPL1, 2004).

After the facilitators presented the trends and the scenarios, participants asked several questions. First, these questions contested the selection of the trends. Second, participants contested the scope of the scenarios: do they concern the protein highway region or the entire Netherlands? Do they concern just the agro-sector or other policy sectors? The facilitator answered the first question with a demarcation of expertise, of both the participants but also of the people who built the scenario development method. At least six times, for example, the consultant referred to the participants and their role as experts in the development of these documents:

“It is a matter of you together saying: well, if this happens it will have a big impact on the area. [...] We do not want to convince you it is going either way.”

(Transcript SWPL1, 2004).

This type of demarcation of (experiential) expertise was effective and participants did not ask any more questions. Moreover, one of the participants started to explore one of the scenarios a to find out what this scenario would mean for the agro-sector in the Protein Highway-region. This was the moment at which the facilitator closed the plenary session and announced that three groups were going to discuss the three scenarios in parallel session.

**Exploration of the scenarios**

At the one plenary morning session that I observed, six participants in all further explored the scenario schaalvergroting (upscailing) that was also referred to as handen uit de mouwen (“roll up the sleeves”). In this scenario, the assumptions were that technological innovations would be made; that consumers would perpetually exhibit a “willingness to pay” for quality products, including animal welfare and environmental benefits; that there would be an “up-scaling;” an expansion of businesses; and that small businesses would start to cooperate or disappear. Finally, in this scenario the scenery of the area would change due to this up-scaling. There would be larger nature conservation areas and specific concentrated areas for the agro-sector — this coincided with the wishes of the Provincial Reconstruction Plans (Provincie Overijssel, 2005; Provincie Gelderland, 2009a; 2009b).

**Struggles about the interpretation of the boundary concept scenarios**

After a brief introductory round, the facilitator of the WUR encouraged participants to share with the group what kind of images and ideas this scenario evoked, and then to collaboratively explore what this scenario would look like for the region. In this exploratory round, participants interpreted the concept scenarios in two ways that represent a struggle between government discourse and governance discourse.

On one hand, a civil servant from the province of Gelderland and a banker of the RABO-bank demarcated the government interpretation of scenarios. They both interpreted the scenario as a desirable perspective for the region. For example, the banker argued that he would like this scenario to come true:

“So, yes, this quadrant appeals to me. There is no nonsense: the entrepreneur runs a business; government facilitates and determines what the rules of the game are; and the society and consumers introduce ‘emotions’.”

(Transcript SWPA1, 2004).

This excerpt also demonstrates that the banker is in favor of a specific type of cluster development, and thus not only is it an interpretation of the concept scenarios from a government discourse perspective, but also an interpretation of cluster development. This banker enacts government discourse in two ways. As a response, the Innovation Network brought forward the deliberative governance interpretation of the scenario concept. As had been the case in interactions between government and businesses in the steering committee, the Innovation Network considered the scenario as a possible rather than a desirable scenario. For example, they argued that this scenario was possible but not necessarily true or desirable:

“So, all agendas, the political agenda, the provincial agenda, those of the corporate world, of knowledge institutes, of research all point in the same direction. They all agree. So, I think it is a continuation of a one-dimensional techno-economic orientation. There are no image problems, no public debates, no complicated issues with decision making etc. It is a little bit maakbaar [steerable!] and it is the creation of an optimal situation that we assume to be feasible solutions in this (world) context.”

(Transcript SWPA1, 2004).

Both interpretations remained on the table and participants agreed that the scenario is definitely not a prediction. Moreover, in the debates, participants did not have to worry about the feasibility of the scenario. In response to the Innovation Network’s question, the facilitator answered: “We now assume that we can steer everything”.

(Transcript SWPA1, 2004). In the remainder of this workshop, participants considered the scenario as a tool to further develop a desirable scenario where everything is possible. The scenario is interpreted not as an uncertain and imaginable future, but as a desirable and even designable future that all actors need to agree on. As a steering committee member argued:

“Well, in this scenario we would like to make a master plan. This plan needs to be debated and we have to organize together so that we have the guts to say: well, this is the perspective we want to work toward. If we can’t agree on that, than we’d better stop. Throw out the A1 corridor, and work toward different networks.”

(Transcript SWPA1, 2004).

Participants treated the scenario as a tool to deliberate a desirable future. Participants were encouraged to engage in a collaborative inquiry, which turned out to be a collaborative inquiry of the concept of cluster development in the protein corridor region.

**Struggles about the interpretation of the boundary concept cluster development**

When the participants of this parallel session engaged in deliberations over the cluster development concept, a struggle between government and deliberative governance discourse...
again took place. At the heart of the deliberations was a struggle between a government and deliberative governance interpretation of the boundary concept cluster development: was it a voluntary relocation initiated by businesses and facilitated by government, or was it a spatial redevelopment in which other actors, such as the tourism sector and nature conservation agencies should or needed to participate?

The Innovation Network made these two interpretations visible when it claimed that there are two domains for clustering:

\[
\ldots \text{the domain of food-production in large clusters and the domain of the quality of life. In the latter, combinations can be made: zorgboerderij [this is an operational farm that also provides care to, for example, elderly or disabled persons] [... ] are a business but they also provide a function that exists in society} \text{“嵌” (Transcript SWPA1, 2004).} \]

Moreover, this same employee argued that these two domains also entail two different interpretations of the landscapes in the region: production landscapes and consumer landscapes. Actors in the domain on food production consider landscapes as production-landscapes that are “oriented toward food production and the consumer.” Actors in the domain of the quality of life consider a consumer landscape oriented “toward green and the citizen” “嵌” (Transcript SWPA1, 2004). It is interesting that the Innovation Network defined both landscapes in economic terms—consumers and food production—but that this did not prevent an employee of the Province of Gelderland from arguing that cluster development in this project is a challenge for actors in food production. As a response, all other participants, including the representative of the agrarians (LTO) argued that a one-sided focus on large-scale food production in the area would be impossible. Society would not accept a clustering without further enhancement of the “quality of life” in the area:

\[
\ldots \text{You will not get these clusters accepted in society. You will have to take into account the other story} \text{“嵌” (Transcript SWPA1, 2004).} \]

A compromise was reached and all participants concluded that cluster development, interpreted as the relocation and cooperation of businesses, needed to be “well embedded in the scenery” (Transcript SWPA1, 2004). Businesses from the food domain should initiate and implement cluster development and these should have “esthetic qualities” and be “socially accepted” (Transcript SWPA1, 2004). Actors agreed that this “embedding” (Transcript SWPA1, 2004) of large clusters of businesses in the landscape was a business responsibility.

As had been the case in the steering committee and in the plenary sessions, participants interpreted cluster development as something businesses could initiate and implement. They also agreed that government remained responsible for spatial clustering. However, businesses should also be made aware that their clustering should be “ingebed” (integrated) to be acceptable to other societal actors. In other words, government sets the conditions for cluster development, but it was not the responsibility of business to initiate it.

During the last ten minutes of the session the H+N+S landscape architect took up a pencil and in deliberation with the others started to draw an artist’s impression of the region. The actors engaged in a conversation in which they put together a scenario, the master plan that resembled very much the scenario for the region that professors from WUR had created in previous steps of the development of the protein corridor.

H+N+S: “I had just started [drawing]. Perhaps we can, but we have to […] It is simple: can we draw a diagram that represents the A1 and how we imagine it to be?”

Innovation Network: “a charcoal-sketch.""[...] For me there are three blocks [...] pigs, calves, and chickens. And between those we have connections”"（Transcript SWPA1, 2004）.
exaggerating, stays out of the picture. What you attempt to do in scenarios is to create a broader picture which allows things from outside to come into the picture. O.K.?” (Transcript SWPA2, 2004).

However, the provincial delegate from Oost NV wanted to be able to choose one of the scenarios as the most desirable and answer the questions for that scenario. This is in line with a government discourse interpretation of scenarios. This struggle was not settled in the short plenary introduction and both interpretations remained credible.

**Parallel workshop: financial instruments for cluster development**

At the afternoon parallel session that I observed, four people participated.289 The objective of the conversation was the “how question” and how to organize “financing of desirable developments, whatever these may be.”290 (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). These deliberations were first and foremost a collaborative inquiry into financial instruments. Participants in this session did not engage in a credibility struggle between government discourse or deliberative governance discourse. They enacted dominant government discourse with one additional element: businesses needed to take initiative in cluster development. The consultants had designed this collaborative inquiry. One of the facilitators of the deliberations introduced the boundary concept innovation. The desirable developments had to be innovations. In a short conversation, participants explored what the innovation concept meant and set the agenda for the afternoon. They agreed that it concerned financial innovation for cluster development; it concerned financial instruments for blue and green services — blauwe groene diensten — that is, water and nature conservation by agrobusinesses. In other words, “how to keep the cow in the meadow?” (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). Third, participants agreed that in the afternoon they would try to develop financial instruments to finance product innovation or technological innovation. Participants contextualized the boundary concept innovation. They translated innovation into more specific financial instruments that would facilitate businesses in their attempts to improve the region. Each of the translated boundary concepts induced a discussion among participants about who should pay for what: government or businesses? Again, actors struggled between two interpretations of these contextualized boundary concepts: on one hand interpretations from a government discourse in which government would pay for the demanded cluster development or product innovations (either through traditional government instruments or more governance-like market mechanisms), or on the other hand, government discourse in which businesses, government and societal actors would initiate and finance these innovations.

**Struggles about the interpretation of the contextualized boundary concepts**

First of all, the WUR professor proposed as a more specific form of innovation in financial instruments the “transferable development rights.” This is a governmental instrument that builds on the logic of scarcity that is part of a market mechanism to finance relocations of businesses through cluster development. As such it is a boundary concept that aligns traditional governmental steering and financing with market-driven financing. According to the WUR expert these transferable development rights would enable government to “capitalize space” (kapitaliseren van ruimte) (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). It works as follows: within designated areas that government wants to be developed there are set limits to the volume (per lot), in other words, limits to how big the homes may be. Government can sell rights to develop more than these limits in specific areas—for example, by building an extra story on a house. This extra money might be used to improve the landscape by relocating businesses and remove them from areas that are designated as residential or nature conservation areas. As the researcher explained:

“In ten years time this many houses will be build. You can estimate how many of those are vrijstaande [single] homes in the rural areas and what the limit to the volume [per home] is. Over ten years there is more than a hundred million per province [in euros] to capitalize space”291 (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). The researcher argued that transferable development rights are a way to generate extra financial resources for government to compensate relocations of businesses:

“It is about extra willingness to pay. You [government] command additional planning limits and this creates scarcity [of space] for citizens.”292 (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). The facilitator attempted to gain credibility for this instrument by demarcating “foreign (US) experience” with these rights that are “being implemented at more than 140 locations”293 (Transcript SWPA2, 2004).

However, this demarcation of foreign experience was not convincing, and the provincial actor together with the financier opposed the idea of transferable development rights as a solution to finance relocations of businesses. This provincial actor argued that these financial resources usually are used to cover shortages in the balance of local communities. He claimed that it would be difficult to use that money for relocations of agrobusinesses:

“Towns, especially those that have built a lot in recent years, are in the habit of covering shortages in their own budgets with this money, to put it in simple terms. If we tell those people that we will direct that money stream somewhere else it will temper the optimism”294 (Transcript SWPA2, 2004).

Moreover, the provincial actor argued that rather than government, businesses, especially the business chain, in cooperation with banks and other financiers, and with help of government, should finance relocations of businesses. He argued that these businesses have known for many years that they cannot expand at these locations, so they are partly responsible for the move. Moreover it is to the benefit of the whole business chain to support these relocations, he argued:

“Those companies have been located at the wrong place for 10 to 15 years. The reconstruction plans bring nothing new. These are generic rules and regulations. These farmers have bad luck but more parties need to have a willingness to pay. The whole chain needs to know that these farmers — the primary sector — is of importance to them. They all have a stake”295 (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). The provincial representative attempted to gain credibility for this argument, not by bringing in outside expertise, but by example. He gave an example of a business initiative of ABCTA that partly financed relocations with help from the government. Moreover, the province argued that the national government supports this approach, and that some government money and other resources (e.g. help with the permit process) is available to facilitate the cluster development that is initiated and perhaps co-financed by members of the same business chain. The province called this institutional innovation, in which government no longer commands and controls (or subsidizes) these relocations but in which chain partners initiate cluster development on its own interests (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). The provincial proposal disrupts traditional government discourse slightly more than the proposed transferable rights in which government still takes the lead. The provincial actor, backed up by other participants, proposed a shift to governance: businesses should be partners with government rather than be commanded or taxed by government. Participating actors agreed that the latter was the preferable, more convincing alternative.
Thus they collaboratively enacted governance discourse with regards to innovation in financial instruments for cluster development.

Second, a financier introduced labelling, taxing and excises as means for government to finance blue and green services of farmers. The financier argued that this was different from the normal situation in which “public” money goes into nature conservation or recreational services delivered by the agrarian sector. In the new situation, the consumers needed to pay directly for these services. This “willingness to pay,” as the WUR academic called it, needed to be used to finance nature conservation and the maintenance of the traditional rural scenery. Participants did not contest these proposed instruments. Participants agreed that there were several possibilities. These were summarized as follows:

“There are three variants for the green and blue services: type of labelling [...]; membership as “friends of” [this or that farmer]; developmental rights” (Transcript SWPA2, 2004).

An addition was made by the financier. He argued there were a fourth and fifth possibility that were less vulnerable to free-riders: taxes, for example, a tourist tax in a fund for nature conservation, exercises on products. Thus, at the start of this deliberation, the financier demarcated the solutions that he proposed from normal government discourse, in my terms, in which public money, money from citizens was used to finance nature conservation. He introduced new government instruments that would use consumer money to finance these same goals. However, both types of financial resources would go through government. Government would have to initiate, command and control both the collection of money and its spending. Thus, the proposal of the financier that other participants agreed with only slightly disrupted government discourse and can be considered an enactment of governance discourse.

Thirdly, the financier introduced “knowledge brokers” as a possible solution for more innovation. On this subject, participants together established that in the normal situation, the OVO triangle — Onderzoek (research), Voorlichting (communication and PR), Onderwijis (education) — used to take care of the innovation power in the sector (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). This means that in agriculture the university and businesses cooperate closely to innovate and promote the sector. The participants also agreed that this system is no longer operational, although there are still close ties between Wageningen University Research and the agricultural sector. In the new situation, national government still finances a lot of research, either through the universities or through special programs such as ICES/KIS. However, the participants agreed that this knowledge is often “left on the shelves” (Transcript SWPA2, 2004). In the case of stimulating product innovations and technological innovations for the agro-sector businesses, government does not have to intervene. Rather, businesses should be more willing to adopt new technologies, and researchers should be stimulated to market their knowledge. “Knowledge brokers” might enable this dissemination of knowledge. In this case, the participants concluded, it is not so much a financing problem as it is a problem of knowledge distribution. On this subject, actors agreed and I did not construct struggles between interpretations from either government discourse or deliberative governance discourse.

Finally, at the end of the meeting, the facilitator took ten minutes to sum up. He concluded that:

- Cluster development needs to be a business initiative, partly financed, that government can facilitate (with planning space);
- Government might use “willingness to pay” and not consider people as citizens that pay general taxes for nature conservation but as consumers that pay specific taxes through labels, as members of “friends of” organizations, or for specific “services”;
- Government might finance “knowledge brokers” to stimulate a knowledge exchange between universities and businesses for product innovation.

In the last ten minutes, elements of governance discourse were enacted. In cluster development and relocations of businesses, the chain initiates, government facilitates, businesses invest, and banks and financiers finance. This was different from normal government discourse in which government would finance these relocations since it was their reconstruction plans that demanded the relocations.

The pattern of boundary work in this afternoon session evolved as follows: (1) the consultant transcended boundaries in the innovation concept and participants enacted innovation in agenda setting for discussion; (2) innovation of financial instruments for cluster development, nature, water and scenery conservation and product innovation; (3) participants contextualized the boundary concept innovation into new instruments, for example, “transferable development rights”, “labelling” and “taxes” that go into “green funds”; (4) participants struggled with government and governance interpretations of these financial instruments; (5) participants agreed with proposed financial instruments and enacted one element of governance discourse. As a result of this pattern of boundary work, government discourse was altered. Participants no longer considered it the responsibility of governments to finance cluster development; rather it should be cooperation of the businesses together with governmental actors.

**The end of the workshop: plenary interpretative struggles**

At the last plenary session of the workshop, three parallel groups presented the results of their deliberations. The group that had deliberated the concept A1 Protein Corridor kicked off. The second presentation was by the group that had engaged in a collaborative inquiry into coalition formation. Finally, one of the participants presented the possible financial instruments to finance innovation in cluster development, in blue and green services and in products.

**Plenary struggles of steering group members about the interpretation of protein corridor**

In the presentation of the first group, the employee of the Innovation Network contested the “A1 protein corridor.” The group concluded that this concept is perfect to attract intensive livestock farmers. However, other agricultural entrepreneurs, nature conservationists, and the leisure and tourism industry might not be drawn to it. As the InnovationNetwork said:

“The name A1 Protein Corridor, we concluded, is in itself attractive for the original [target group] intensive livestock farming. It is innovative to market to these protein producers and to mobilize them. But, when you take a look at the other target groups: agriculture, leisure, water, and nature, then you need to realize that your objective, namely, to improve the spatial quality, is what you want because that also benefits the agro-sector [...]. If this is your objective, then the A1 protein corridor is very small as a concept and as an angle of approach” (Transcript SWPL4, 2004).

The facilitator of the second group, the consultant of Van de Bunt, responded. He first presented the group’s results and then argued that a broader concept for this region was not necessary. His group on coalition formation had also discussed this concept but had
approached it differently. They had answered the question of who needed to be part of the coalitions in the region to stimulate cluster development. They agreed that the protein corridor needed to focus on cluster development of the primary sector and to focus on activating the business chain.

“The start is the reconstruction that took place in both provinces and in which all parties participated, including nature conservationists and environmentalists. [...] The idea is not to continue a broad spectrum in this project. That is very ambitious. We know what nature conservationists and environmentalists want. But, aim [the project] at the primary sector and processors; there lie the biggest challenges, and then the name is perfect” 287 (Transcript SWPL4, 2004).

Thus, on one hand, the argument of the first group indicates that in a deliberative governance interpretation the protein corridor concept was not successful since it did not transcend boundaries between environmental and animal welfare subdiscourse on one hand, and business subdiscourse on the other. This group’s argument was that the protein corridor reproduced the subdiscourse of the businesses. On the other hand, the facilitator of group two considered the concept to, in our words, transcend boundaries within the agricultural sector. Moreover, he argued that the interests of other actors will be included as well as the primary sector and the processors, because the consultants know what these other actors want and also because the reconstruction plans sketch the framework for development of the region. Both groups interpreted the protein corridor in a governance way. However, the interpretation from a deliberative governance perspective that, in this case includes systems innovations, did not gain credibility.

**Plenary struggles of steering group members about the interpretation of cluster development**

In the conversation, the Innovation Network explained why their group thought it would be difficult to convince the agro-sector of the necessity of initiating cluster development without the inclusion of the “spatial challenges” (ruimtelijke opgave) in the area. The Innovation Network was convinced, from a deliberative governance interpretation of the project, that to stimulate the agro-sector to initiate cluster development, these spatial challenges that society poses to businesses need to be addressed. These create urgency for businesses. As the Innovation Network argued:

“The question is if we can get this movement [to enhance spatial quality TM] from within the agro-sector, or whether we need other functions such as recreation and nature, to stimulate this movement” 288 (Transcript SWPL4, 2004).

A little further into the conversation, the Innovation Network argued more strongly that indeed this “spatial quality,” (ruimtelijke kwaliteit) which will also benefit the agro-sector, can only be defined in combination with other actors:

“If you have the desire to achieve spatial quality, you just need these other groups such as agriculture, recreation, water, nature. This [quality also benefits the agro-sector, through a broadening of functions [of the countryside and agriculture TM]” 289 (Transcript SWPL4, 2004).

The consultant, who had presented the results of the second group, took a different turn and interpreted cluster development differently. He argued that the provinces claim that this “spatial challenge” is taken care of in the reconstruction plans.

“The reconstruction concerns the whole scope. The A1 is solely for the primary sector and the processors. They need to meet some challenges that in the end help nature and environment in the areas of intensifying agriculture.” (Transcript SWPL4, 2004) 290

One representative of the province intervened and argued that the spatial quality is “not taken care of” but that “zoning is in place.” He argued that the province wants to know how the agro-sector will use the space for development in the optimal way (Transcript SWPL4, 2004). The consultant, who also facilitated the deliberations in the plenary session, concluded this discussion on cluster development by summarizing as follows:

“Change and mobility need to be achieved first and foremost in the primary sector and with the processors. We will keep in mind what the other sectors want in terms of nature and environment. They do not need to sit at the table all the time. We can go back to them in a year and ask what they think of it” (Transcript SWPL4, 2004). 291

None of the participants contested this conclusion that re-enacted the consultants’ interpretation of the boundary concepts of protein corridor and cluster development. The consultant wanted to make sure that both provinces would also agree on this. The facilitator directed this question to the provinces, especially the province of Gelderland. This province responded and argued that the “power of the A1 concept lies not only in the processing but also in the logistics.” Both provinces reassured the consultant that indeed their elected officials would also agree that this project focuses on cluster development and network cooperation in the primary sector (Transcript SWPL4, 2004).

The struggle over the interpretation of cluster development that the steering committee members had started in the drafting of the proposal had finally come to an end. In the first stage the consultants introduced the boundary concepts scenarios and innovation that formed a temporary consensus between the steering committee members and the change coalition. In the second stage, the plenary debates between steering committee members and other participants, who were mostly involved as an audience, resulted in an enactment of elements of government discourse and the exclusion of one element of deliberative governance discourse. With the silent approval of participants, the members of the steering committee no longer were able to interpret the boundary concepts of protein corridor and cluster development from a deliberative governance perspective. The Innovation Network, who had defended this interpretation, had lost, and so was system innovation.

**Participants agree on interpretation: Businesses initiate and implement cluster development**

After these struggles on the interpretation of the boundary concepts of protein corridor and cluster development, the deliberations at the last parallel session continued as a collaborative inquiry. The facilitators from the second group on coalition formation and the third group on financial instruments presented several ways to facilitate cluster development among businesses in the primary agro-sector and the processing industry. The second and third group applied the government interpretation and automatically excluded nature and environment in their interpretation of cluster development. For example, the third group presented the financial instruments that they discussed and in this presentation considered cluster development as the relocation of businesses that the businesses chain would initiate, governmental actors were to facilitate, and the entrepreneurs should invest in:

“We designed an engine for relocations: the chain initiates, government facilitates, and the entrepreneur invests” 292 (Transcript SWPL4, 2004).

The second group that had discussed possibilities for coalition formation also focussed on suppliers or consumers that might be able to create and facilitate urgency for this type of cooperation within the primary sector:
Conclusions: Innovation means businesses that initiate cluster development

The pattern of boundary work at the last plenary session was as follows: (1) participants contested boundary transcending in the protein corridor concept: it was not transcending boundary between environmental subdiscourse and entrepreneurial subdiscourse; (2) enactment of government interpretation of the boundary concepts of protein corridor and of cluster development. As a result, one element of governance discourse was added to dominant governance discourse: businesses rather than government should take the initiative to facilitate cluster development. However, they should do so from a business perspective and not with the desire to improve the spatial quality of the region. Up till then, the Innovation Network had interpreted the boundary concepts protein corridor and cluster development to include the improvement of spatial quality as a collaborative effort of governmental, business, and environmental actors in the region.

Conclusions of the plenary afternoon session

The one day scenario workshop was the only meeting with a deliberative design in the Protein Highway: Make It Happen project. At this workshop, the consultants introduced boundary transcending concepts scenarios, cluster development, and innovation.

Participants interpreted the scenarios concept from a governance and government discourse perspective. These interpretations coincided with the different goals. On one hand, the Innovation Network wanted to apply these scenarios as a tool to deliberate on what possible developments could take place in the region in order to develop a broad range of policy options with a broad range of actors. On the other hand, the aim of the provinces and Oost NV was to develop a desirable scenario that would convince businesses to initiate cluster development for their own benefit. These two interpretations had been at hand from the start of the project and continued to be present at the meetings. However, at the end of the morning sessions and in deliberations in the plenary session, what we are calling the government interpretation of scenarios gained most credibility. Participants agreed that the scenarios had to be further developed into a seductive perspective to convince businesses to initiate cluster development.

At the parallel afternoon session participants engaged in a collaborative inquiry on three themes: financial instruments for cluster development, coalition formation for cluster development, and the search for the right name for the project. Two of the three groups interpreted cluster development from a government perspective and searched for ways to stimulate businesses to initiate cluster development. Governmental instruments such as taxes could be applied, but also consumers and suppliers in the business chain could demand relocations and cluster development of farmers. The Innovation Network demarcated an element of deliberative governance discourse, the inclusion of other types of actors for cluster development to innovate the system — e.g. the way organizations cooperate — and to improve the spatial quality of the region in a different way. In response one member of the steering committee argued against the inclusion of this element. This member argued that the reconstruction plans would take care of the spatial quality of the area. There was no need to include this interpretation in innovation or cluster development. The audience did not contest this interpretation of cluster development.

What was interesting is that at the scenario workshop only members of the steering committee engaged in a struggle about the interpretations of the protein corridor and of scenarios. Other participants were not involved. The fracture line between interpretations of the these concepts was not considered, nor did it create a conflict in the drafting of the proposal. This hidden conflict within the steering committee only became manifest and was settled in the plenary sessions of the workshop. At that moment the two conflicting members of the steering committee used the deliberations in the parallel sessions to support their interpretation of the boundary concepts: it was their group that had agreed with the interpretation, for example, of the inclusion of spatial quality in the protein corridor. This turned the outcomes of the deliberations in the parallel sessions into “political” outcomes that were strategically applied in the steering committee’s struggles about a government or deliberative governance interpretation of innovation and cluster development. The interpretation of the provinces and businesses won because the majority of the change coalition was in favour of that interpretation and the Innovation Network stood alone. Moreover, the consultants who had designed and facilitated the deliberative setting had silently agreed and reproduced the interpretation of cluster development, innovation and scenarios from a government perspective. The conversations at the scenario workshop were a collaborative inquiry into these options; however, they lacked deliberative quality as participants did not engage in reflective conversations about different interpretations of the boundary concepts (see figure 5.9 for an overview of the credible interpretations in these deliberations).

Overall, I consider the scenario workshop an enactment of the seductive perspective “A1 Protein Corridor.” In previous years, this perspective had been developed by WUR researchers. The scenario workshop can be considered an attempt to have participants internalize and enact what had already been created by this coalition of government and WUR faculty, and later on by a few businesses. Deliberations were applied to create support for the solutions that had already been decided for the region. Most of all, this was cluster development initiated by the business chain. Innovations that included animal welfare and environmental benefits as well as other stakeholders, for example healthcare, tourism and spatial solutions for nature conservation and the improvement of the scenery, were either excluded in reference to the reconstruction plans, or it was argued (and accepted) that the experts at the table would know how to take care of these interests. At this site of interaction, the protein corridor, cluster development, and even innovation were no longer interpreted in such a way as to transcend boundaries between nature conservation and
planning on one hand and business development on the other. The provinces, Oost NV, and businesses, in alliance with the consultants and with mobilized support of participants at the scenario workshop had excluded a deliberative governance interpretation. Governance by entrepreneurs had become credible discourse.

Figure 5.9. Government discourse (left), governance discourse (right), and boundary concepts (middle) as defined in the scenario workshop of PH:MiH

**EPILOGUE OF THE PROTEIN HIGHWAY: MAKE IT HAPPEN!**

In 2005, the Gelderse Agriculture and Horticulture Organization and Oost NV continued the A1 Protein Highway: Make it Happen project and formed a Platform A1 Protein Corridor. To gain support for this Platform they had bilateral conversations with business leaders. The seductive perspective was part of these conversations (Interview-Hoekmans II, 2005; Interview-Roemaat II, 2006). This platform is up and running and the two provinces are still involved. The platform is a network of agribusinesses and it attempts to “stabilize innovation” (Agrologistiek Magazine, 2009). A quick scan of policy documents of the two provinces demonstrated that the Province of Overijssel absorbed (Edelenbos, 2001) the results from the A1 Protein Highway project into the Provincial program of the Province of Overijssel: “Program A1-zone” (Triou, 2007) together with several other projects along the A1.

In August 2007 Wageningen University Research/Alterra made public an evaluation of the Reconstruction Law. It announced that at fourteen places in the Netherlands farmers had made plans to start a cluster of businesses (Boonstra et al., 2007). The researchers demonstrated that many public and societal organizations resisted and still resist mega-businesses. In a press release the researchers argued that this resistance came as no surprise, as government has a double agenda. “Provinces on one hand stimulus clustering of industrial farms, on the other they do not want farms bigger than 20,000 pigs in their province” (Alterra, 2007). Moreover, the researcher found that that elected officials were prepared for these cluster developments even though they publically announced that they had no ideas (Alterra, 2007).

The results of the report were taken up in national newspapers. Those articles argued more strongly against the Reconstruction Law. As the Volkskrant wrote: “failing law leads to mega-pig stables” (Volkskrant, 14 August 2008). In a quick analysis of all major newspapers of the Netherlands and several local ones (in Lexis Nexis), reports were found in the Volkskrant, Eindhovens Dagblad, Financieel Dagblad, Trouw, NRC, AD, AD/Haagse Courant, Telegraaf, Het Parool. These all reported that neighbors as well as other farmers and environmental organization were very critical of cluster development, which the journalists again referred to as “piggery apartments.” Societal resistance against mega-farms, or clusters, had not been prevented through cooperative plan-making in the reconstruction law, nor had it been prevented in the Protein Highway: Make it Happen project.

A possible explanation for this uproar is that opposing views — countervailing powers — had not been further included in the development of the concepts of cluster development and protein corridor. Governmental actors did not continue the collaborative planning under the Reconstruction Law. On the contrary, governmental actors and businesses used this collaborative planning as a legitimization of the idea that other societal actors no longer needed to be included. In the case of cluster development in the Protein Corridor, the two provinces and businesses in the region kept conflict out of the deliberations. As a result at least the same amount and perhaps even more societal resistance against cluster development of industrial farms persisted until at least 2007.

Even though spatial cluster development is still controversial, some of the individual pilot projects that aimed at process and product innovations have been successful. For example, the Dutch Poultry Center stimulated cooperation between five slaughterhouses to utilize meat by-products and generate energy from this process (Agrologistiek Magazine, 2009; Universiteit Twente et al., year of publication unknown).

**5.4. CONCLUSIONS: BOUNDARY WORK AT THE PROTEIN HIGHWAY: MAKE IT HAPPEN PROJECT**

In conclusion, I present the similarities and differences in types and content of boundary work across the two stages of the project, and across the sites of interaction and their various deliberative venues. This provides an answer to the questions of whether participants accepted, reflected upon or rejected boundary work and the results of these conversations. In other words, did participants believe in a deliberative governance discourse?

**CREDIBLE GOVERNANCE BY ENTREPRENEURS**

Throughout the whole project participants, especially steering committee members, struggled between a government and deliberative governance interpretation of the boundary concepts of scenarios, cluster development (and its translated version, agroparks) and innovation. These boundary concepts were a heritage from the two previous steps in the development of the region. University experts had developed those, together with a doomsday scenario. Oost NV, two provinces, the Innovation Network, Platform Agrologistics, and the Rabobank undertook a third step to develop the region. They agreed to the “Protein Corridor: Make it Happen Project” to further develop the A1 Protein Highway as a region and to stimulate cluster development and innovation in it.
In the first stage of the Protein Highway: Make it Happen project, two types of meetings took place: the entrepreneurial deliberations that formed a bridge between earlier regional development and the new project, and the steering committee meetings. In the entrepreneurial meetings it was clear that the business leaders from the region stood united on the interpretation of cluster development. They interpreted it from a government discourse viewpoint and considered, for example, government responsible for the environmental and spatial quality of the region. However, they added one element to this discourse: the business leaders were willing to initiate cluster development through development of agroparks and cooperation in networks but only to their own benefit. They believed in an “entrepreneurial” governance discourse in which government and businesses work together for entrepreneurial benefits.

At the steering committee meetings in this first stage, the consultants enabled the members to interpret cluster development, scenarios and innovation differently. The potential members and potential financiers were divided on what elements of deliberative governance discourse should be introduced: was it only to be business initiative for cluster development that is, innovations of products and processes, or should system innovation through deliberations of possible scenarios be the goal? The steering committee members did not agree whether actors from tourism, environmental organizations, and animal welfare organizations needed to be included to improve the spatial quality of the region in the deliberations in this project. The consultants blurred this struggle about the inclusion of system innovation as an objective of the project. In the offer for the project they introduced two boundary concepts to span the boundaries. These were innovation and scenarios. Rather than speaking of cluster development in a specific way, the boundary concept "innovation" aligned the different interpretations of the provinces, on one hand, and on the other, the Innovation Network. This also happened with the concept scenarios that could be interpreted as a seductive scenario and a doomsday scenario, as well as plausible scenarios that would be developed to prepare for an uncertain future that needed a variety of policy options, not only a specific type of agro-clusters or agroparks.

Boundary work in this first stage took place at several critical moments. First of all, the consultants introduced the boundary concepts to the potential steering committee members and to the entrepreneurs. Second, the two provinces and the Innovation Network, as well as the business leaders, contested the boundary concepts. Third, the consultants and Oost NV introduced scenarios and innovation as boundary concepts to transcend the demarcations of the steering committee members. But in the interactions with business leaders Oost NV had agreed with an interpretation of cluster development as reorganization between businesses to improve their bottom line.

In the second stage, consultants organized a one-day scenario workshop that included deliberations between government and society. In these workshops animal welfare and environmental organizations participated. In this stage, the steering committee members continued to struggle with conflicting interpretations of the boundary concepts. The one-day scenario workshop with a deliberative design turned into a “political” instrument for the steering committee members: they used support of participants in parallel workshops to gain credibility for their conflicting interpretation of the boundary concept. Interesting is to notice that at this point it the consultants did not demarcate “learning” or “innovation” as a strategy to redirect the conversation to a reflective one. The consultants and other members of the change coalition demarcated participants’ expertise and their consent to gain credibility for it. Hence, hidden conflict between two interpretations became manifest and was fought out at these deliberative venues. Deliberative governance never gained credibility. Only some elements of a governance discourse were picked up.

This was best visible in the interpretations and contestations of the name of the project, the protein corridor, and struggles about the meaning of cluster development. Participants easily granted credibility to these concepts and to the scenarios as tools for deliberation. However, at the third plenary session that day, the steering committee members’ struggles between a government and deliberative governance interpretations of protein corridor and cluster development were decided. An employee of the Innovation Network, with support of the outcomes of the discussions in his parallel group, and one of the consultants, with support of the outcomes of discussions in his parallel group, engaged in a public struggle about who and what should or should not be included in cluster development. The discussion started with the name “protein corridor” which, the Innovation Network argued, was not sufficient as it excluded other stakeholders and shareholders in the area that needed to be involved. The Innovation Network attempted to endorse what I consider the deliberative governance interpretation of cluster development that includes a concern for the spatial quality that has to be achieved through involvement of other societal actors. In response one of the consultants argued in favor of the interpretation of cluster development in which businesses needed to take the initiative and it was not necessary to include the aim to improve spatial quality. The reconstruction plans were taken care of that quality. Participants agreed that businesses and the business chain could not be considered responsible for spatial planning, nor for animal welfare or nature conservation. These were government’s responsibilities that were specified in rules and regulations (or in this case spatial plans) that businesses needed to respect but were not required improving further. Businesses did not feel the need to go beyond what is required by government.

The interpretation of the consultants and thus that of the provinces and businesses won. Participants enacted governance discourse but only as a form of network governance in which business and government cooperate to the benefit of businesses. The credible discourse had become governance by entrepreneurs. As had been the case in the interactions with business leaders in the previous stage, spatial cluster development was separated from organizational cluster development in business chains. This helped to gain credibility for cluster development for businesses. At this point, deliberative governance discourse disappeared from the project: inclusion of other stakeholders and shareholders was no longer considered necessary. The governmental actors agreed with this interpretation. Hence, they agreed that the A1 Protein Highway project was to benefit businesses, and that spatial plans and governmental regulations were in place. They agreed with the businesses that there was no need to make businesses feel responsible for the improvement of the spatial layout, animal welfare, or nature conservation of the area with means other than government rules and regulations.

Overall, the scenario workshop made clear that cluster development should first and foremost benefit businesses and the economic viability of the region. Governmental
actors did not attempt to include businesses as contributors to the public good. Nor did they attempt to have these businesses gain a “social license” to operate. In this project a boundary between government and businesses was transcended: government facilitated rather than demanded, and businesses initiated cluster development. Governance by entrepreneurs had become credible and excluded deliberative governance.