



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Regional Policy in European Regions. A Survey of Regional Development Agency Policies and Their Knowledge Implications

Halkier, Henrik

Publication date:
2010

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Halkier, H. (2010). *Regional Policy in European Regions. A Survey of Regional Development Agency Policies and Their Knowledge Implications*. Center for Regional Udvikling (CRU), Aalborg Universitet.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.


- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

WP1c FINAL REPORT

REGIONAL POLICY IN EUROPEAN REGIONS
A SURVEY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY POLICIES
AND THEIR KNOWLEDGE IMPLICATIONS



Henrik Halkier
halkier@ihis.aau.dk

CRU Centre for Regional Development
Aalborg University, Denmark
July 2010

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Conceptual framework and empirical methods.....	6
2.1. An institutionalist perspective on regional policy	6
2.2. Empirical methods.....	10
3. Contexts of regional policy	13
4. Regional policies: Key dimensions	16
4.1. Organisation and strategies	16
4.2. Targets and instruments	18
4.3. Knowledge implications of RDA policies	20
4.4. RDAs and their regional policy context.....	21
5. Patterns of regional policy.....	24
5.1. Patterns of RDA sponsorship	24
5.2. Patterns of RDA strategies	25
5.3. Patterns of RDA policy targets and instruments	26
5.4. Patterns of RDA policy knowledge types	27
5.5. Patterns of RDA policies: Overlapping influences	27
6. Conclusion and confrontation with WP8 hypotheses	29
6.1. RDA profiling	29
6.2. Confrontation with WP8 policy hypotheses.....	30
6.3. Policy scoping	31
7. Appendix 1: RDAs included in the survey.....	33
8. Appendix 2: Figuring out policy patterns	38
9. Appendix 3: European and regional survey results compared.....	44
10. Appendix 4: RDA policies and WP8 hypotheses.....	48
References	49

1. Introduction

In most regions firms and organisations are subject to many different attempts to influence their activities in order to bring them closer to public political priorities with regards to e.g. more and better jobs, increased competitiveness, sectoral change, more knowledge-intensive networking etc. These policies are sponsored both from within the region and from the national/European level, and they are implemented by a wide range of public or semi-public bodies, stretching from government department via semi-autonomous “arm’s-length” regional development agencies to public-private partnerships or private-sector organisations acting on behalf of public authorities. In Europe policies for regional economic development have existed for nearly half a century, but while the interest in influencing economic activity along spatial lines have been persistent, the form taken by public intervention has changed significantly several times both with regard to coverage and organisation, as illustrated by Table 1.1.

Table 1.1. The political geography of regional policy.

		<i>Spatial coverage</i>	
		<i>Selective</i>	<i>Unselective</i>
<i>Spatial organisation</i>	<i>Single-tier</i>	National top-down	Regional bottom-up
	<i>Multi-level</i>	EU Structural Funds	Growth partnerships

In the 1960s and 1970s regional policy was an unambiguous phenomenon, dominated by central government measures top-down programmes in which financial and other ‘hard’ resources were employed to achieve interregional equality through redistribution of economic growth, especially through diversion of firms and investment from more prosperous part of the country to designated problem regions with high levels of unemployment (Bachtler 1997; Halkier 2006 ch. 2). Policy programmes were generally not selective, i.e. they did not focus on particular industries or types of firms, and they operated in a reactive manner with government offices considering applications from individual firms for e.g. financial support for particular investments.

From the 1980s onwards other actors, both regional and European, came to play important roles in regional development alongside central government, and an increasing number of policy programmes, not least those emanating from the European level, came to

involve cooperation between several tiers of government. The regional subsidy programmes of central government were maintained in most countries with reduced levels of expenditure: in e.g. Britain real term expenditure in 1990/91 constituted only 13% of the maximum recorded in 1975/76 (calculated on the basis of Wren 1996 p 328). Parallel to this, an explosive growth occurred in what became known as ‘bottom-up’ regional policy, initiatives specific to individual regions which often involved the setting up of separate development bodies. Regionally-based institutions were perceived to be able to target the specific needs of individual areas and operate in a more proactive manner in devising programmes and projects, and policies tended to focus mainly on attempts to strengthen the competitiveness of the region by supporting indigenous firms by means of ‘soft’ policy instruments like advisory services, although in many cases ‘harder’ forms of support, such as technological infrastructure or venture capital, were part of the armoury too (Halkier and Danson 1997). In parallel with this mushrooming of economic development initiatives ‘from below’, the European level also emerged as a major actor in regional policy, the European Structural Funds came to constitute a regional policy programme in its own right with a separate system of designated ‘problem areas’ and development programmes. Although ‘hard’ policy instruments such as infrastructure and investment subsidies continued to play a major role, support for ‘softer’ measures such as advisory services and network building gradually became increasingly important, and regionally-based bodies were often involved in designing and implementing development initiative sponsored by the EU Structural Funds (Bachtler 1997; Bachtler and Taylor 1997). Finally, from the late 1990s onwards the emergence of a fourth paradigm has been seen in a growing number of member states, namely what could be called growth partnerships, where central government together with sub-national actors pool resources in order to promote economic growth in regions throughout the country; examples of this transmutation of regional policy into regionalised industrial policy can be found in e.g. Sweden, Austria, England and Denmark (Downes 2000; Benneworth 2001; Svensson and Östholl 2002; Halkier 2008). In short, while regional economic development has continued to be a political concern, the political geography has shifted significantly: regional policy is no longer the exclusive domain of central government, and instead the regional level has achieved prominence, albeit often heavily embedded in European and national programmes and regulation.

Both European, national, and regional development initiatives have been extensively researched. For all three levels case studies of individual programmes, nations, or regions abound – often originating in policy evaluation – but the extent to which systematic

comparisons have been undertaken is uneven. While national policies for regional development have been systematically compared since 1980 (Yuill et al. 1981-99; Bachtler and Yuill 2007), and Structural Funds activities for decades have been subject to evaluations and international comparisons since the late 1980s (Bachtler and Turok 1997; Bachtler and Wren 2006), regionally-based initiatives have rarely been compared in a systematic manner on a European scale, with previous surveys being either relative small-scale (Yuill 1982; Halkier and Danson 1997) or limited by organisational affiliation (EURADA 1995).

This text reports the findings of the first major survey of regionally-based development bodies and their policies, attempting in particular to illuminate their role in relation to the emerging knowledge economy and their interactions with the wider economic and political context in which they operate. By doing so the text provides a framework for understanding the policies involved in individual *EURODITE* case studies by situating them in relation to trends within regional policy in Europe. The following section sets out the conceptual framework for analysis and the empirical methods employed, after which the three contexts in which regionally-based economic development initiatives operate are briefly introduced (economic structure/performance, governance, national and European policies). The main body of the text presents the findings of the empirical survey with regard to the organisation, policies and knowledge implications of regional development initiatives in Europe. Following this, the patterns of policy variation are discussed in relation to the three main contexts in order to get a first indication of the relative importance of the factors shaping regionally-based development initiatives, i.e. the balance between ‘problem logic’ (similar economic challenges result in similar policies), ‘governance logic’ (similar forms of governance result in similar policies), and ‘policy logic’ (involvement in national/European programmes result in similar policies). Finally the concluding section sums up the findings and relates them to the *EURODITE* policy hypotheses.

2. Conceptual framework and empirical methods

2.1. An institutionalist perspective on regional policy

Giving an in-depth account of a particular policy paradigm – or even the operation of an individual development body – involves attention to a vast array of features of individual organisations, the ways in which they interact with other organisations, and the overall structure of the policy network (see Halkier 2006, ch. 3). But in order to identify key features that set different approaches to economic development apart between regions in the context of a large-scale survey, focusing on three relationships in particular would seem to make sense, namely

- the relationship between the region and its wider geographical context in terms of private economic competitiveness, public governance structures, and involvement in national/European regional policy programmes,
- the relationship between the region and the policy-making organisation (for the sake of brevity referred to as the regional development agency (RDA) in the following) in terms of the resources being made available for policy activities, and
- the policies of the RDA which are designed to influence, directly or indirectly, the behaviour of firms, citizens and other public organisations in ways that are conducive to achieving regional development goals.




Figure 2.1. Regional policy: An institutionalist perspective.

As illustrated by Figure 2.1, this creates a three-step sequence of analytical dimensions which will be introduced briefly in the following.

The regional context of regionally-based economic development activities is of course multidimensional, but here focus is on three important dimensions that can be measured in relatively simplistic ways in order to be able to function in the context of a large-scale empirical survey. Firstly, the *economic context* which situate the region vis-à-vis other regions in terms of the competitiveness of its firms operating there and thus defines the ‘problem logic’, i.e. the economic challenges in terms of growth and employment that policy-makers

may want to address through various forms of public intervention. In order to maintain a focus on dynamic economic development and knowledge processes, this is measured using the synthetic index developed as part of WP4 of the *EURODITE* project for Western European countries for which data has been available (Carrincazeaux et al. 2007), and using a more simplistic GDP measure for CEE member states where data for the synthetic *EURODITE* index has not been available. Secondly, the ability of individual regions to respond to perceived economic challenges is circumscribed by the *governance context*, i.e. the extent to which they have powers to institute and finance policy initiatives and hence define the ‘governance logic’ of what can be done by policy-makers at the regional level. This can be measured in many different ways, but for the purpose of this survey the general degree of decision-making capacity enjoyed by individual regions is illuminated through the comprehensive synthetic index developed by Lisbeth Hooghe and her collaborators (Hooghe et al. 2008). Thirdly, the adoption of particular policy initiatives also depend on the *policy context*, i.e. parallel policies instituted by other tiers of government attempting to address similar issues that institute a ‘policy logic’ because their presence will either inspire or preclude particular forms of intervention. For the purpose of this survey, the indicator used was the extent to which regions have were designated by national and/or European regional programmes, as recorded on the DG Regional Policy website.

The organisational context of the regional development body concerns the sponsorship relation between the RDA and its sponsors within and/or outside the region. This describes its freedom of action in terms of being able to decide on the aims and methods in promoting regional development, and the resources at its disposal to translate strategies into implemented policies. Following Halkier (2006, ch. 3), this has been translated into three analytical dimensions, namely

- sponsor relationships (the overall degree of autonomy enjoyed by the RDA)
- resources (staff, budget)
- development strategies (the direction of economic changes seen as desirable)

Regarding the latter, key aspects are the nature of change sought and the organisations targeted as the carriers of economic change, as illustrated by Table 2.1. While the shift from quantitative (“more of the same”) to qualitative (“something new”) change is clearly a gradual scale, in practice this is also the case with regard to organisational change because early-stage development of firms are closely linked to the original act of entrepreneurship. However, still the four basic options and the accompanying policy examples aims sketch out important

differences with regard to what kind of change is sought, what actors will be involved, and what knowledge will be required in order to achieve the outcome desired.

Table 2.1. Policy aims: Changes desired.

		<i>Target organisations</i>	
		<i>Existing firms</i>	<i>New firms</i>
<i>Change in economic activity</i>	<i>Quantitative</i>	Expansion (e.g. new markets)	Duplication (e.g. enterprise)
	<i>Qualitative</i>	Modernisation (e.g. new technology)	Creativity (e.g. new products)

Source: Reworked on the basis of Halkier 2006, Table 3.12.

The policies aiming to influence regional development in line with strategic priorities can be characterised through four dimensions that, taken together, delineate the specific aims of public intervention, the instruments used, and the knowledge implications of regional policy. Firstly, the aims of individual policies need to be established as these may of course deviate from the general strategic thrust of the RDA, and here the categories in Table 2.1 will again be used. Secondly, the policy targets must be considered in order to establish how the specific aims are translated in concrete objectives for change, i.e. who/what is going to change in which way as a result of public intervention. Although both dimensions of the table could be subdivided further for non-survey purposes, Table 2.2 (inspired by Nauwelaers 2001) still identifies the changing capabilities sought – material, immaterial or organisational – in relation to different types of targets, and hence highlights the different sites of new knowledge that is associated with particular policies.

Table 2.2. Targets of change.

		<i>Target capabilities</i>		
		<i>Hardware</i>	<i>Software</i>	<i>Orgware</i>
<i>Target institutions</i>	<i>Individuals</i>	<i>Example:</i> Attraction of qualified labour	<i>Example:</i> Training of employees	<i>Example:</i> Creation of professional network
	<i>Firms/ organisations</i>	<i>Example:</i> Investment promotion	<i>Example:</i> Advisory services	<i>Example:</i> Creation of network between firms
	<i>System</i>	<i>Example:</i> Infrastructure improvement	<i>Example:</i> Development of knowledge institutions	<i>Example:</i> Creation of RDA or cluster organisation

Thirdly, the policy instruments, i.e. the means through which policymakers attempt to bring about desirable changes among economic actors, must be identified. Policy instruments combine resources and rules: in order to make actors behave in ways conducive to policy goals, resources are made available on more or less stringent conditions. While the concept of

resources is largely self explanatory, it is worth noting that the notion of rules, inspired by the work of Adrienne Windhoff-Héritier (1987), institutes a hierarchy of constraint between policy instruments: mandatory rules can effectively be imposed in the sense that attempts to avoid them will carry legal sanctions, while private actors can choose either to accept or decline the terms on offer when policy instruments are conditional, and no strings are attached to the resources on offer through voluntary policy instruments, thereby giving ingenious private actors the possibility to use these resources for purposes than other those originally envisaged by policy-makers. As illustrated by Table 2.3, most of the 12 basic policy instruments have been used on a regular basis to promote regional development, and thus this dimension highlights the variety of levers policymakers can consider employing.

Table 2.3. Policy instruments.

		<i>Policy resources</i>			
		<i>Authority</i>	<i>Information</i>	<i>Finance</i>	<i>Organisation</i>
<i>Policy rules</i>	<i>Mandatory</i>	<i>Example:</i> Land-use planning	<i>Example:</i> (primary education)	<i>Example:</i> Taxation	<i>Example:</i> Chamber of commerce
	<i>Conditional</i>	<i>Example:</i> Quality certification	<i>Example:</i> Specialist advice	<i>Example:</i> Investment grants	<i>Example:</i> Cluster organisation
	<i>Voluntary</i>	<i>Example:</i> (Summer time)	<i>Example:</i> Websites, marketing	<i>Example:</i> (Social security)	<i>Example:</i> General infrastructure provision

Note: General welfare policy examples are given in brackets where regional policy examples are unavailable.

Finally, the knowledge impacts of regional policy can be gauged by identifying the extent to which existing knowledge dynamics have been influenced by public policies along two dimensions: knowledge moments that denotes the purpose of knowledge activities, and knowledge types referring to the nature of knowledge involved. Although both dimensions are depicted as containing discrete categories in Table 2.4, in practice considerable overlaps will occur. With regard to knowledge moments (Cooke 2005) , activities become more and more oriented towards practical application purposes as we move from exploration (searching for new knowledge) via examination (testing the usefulness of knowledge) to exploitation (the economic use of knowledge). Concerning the distinction between knowledge types (Asheim and Coenen 2005; Cooke 2005; Asheim et al. 2007; Halkier 2009), they have been developed by combining different approached to knowledge generation (deduction/induction) and different objects of knowledge (relational/normative) so that a distinction is made between analytical (natural science) knowledge, synthetic (engineering and social science) knowledge, and symbolic (arts and communicative) knowledge. As illustrated by Table 2.4, the introduction of this two-dimension knowledge typology has the advantage of avoiding to give a priori preference to one particular type of knowledge (natural-science-based R&D

undertaken in laboratories) and instead include more pragmatic and creative forms of knowledges and combinations thereof that can be equally important to the economic success of individual firms and regions.

Table 2.4. Knowledge types and moments.

		<i>Knowledge types</i>		
		<i>Analytical</i>	<i>Synthetic</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
<i>Knowledge moments</i>	<i>Exploration</i>	<i>Example:</i> Optical research	<i>Example:</i> Academic studies of agglomerations	<i>Example:</i> Academic studies of tourist motivations
	<i>Examination</i>	<i>Example:</i> Clinical laser trials	<i>Example:</i> Clustering as experimental policy	<i>Example:</i> Development of promotional websites
	<i>Exploitation</i>	<i>Example:</i> Therapeutic treatment	<i>Example:</i> Porter’ esque consulting by KIBS	<i>Example:</i> Marketing campaign

2.2. Empirical methods

An empirical survey of RDAs in Europe was undertaken in 2006/2007, covering 22 EU member states¹ and in each of these focusing on the most important organisation at the most important meso-level. Research was undertaken by Susanne Bendtsen in the form of a web-based survey that relied on the websites of individual development organisations as the primary source of information. This search procedure identified 273 RDAs as potential objects of investigation, but around one-third of these proved on closer inspection to have only rudimentary websites or to be inaccessible to the language skills of the researchers (weak on Slavonic and Finno-Ugric). Eventually a total number of 181 organisations were included in the survey, as illustrated by Figure 2.2 – a full list of the organisations included can be found in Appendix 1. For each organisation a range of dimensions corresponding to the conceptual framework outlined above were recorded in a tailor-made database, including data relating to its four most important policies.

Compared to surveying each and every RDA in Europe – something that would have demanded access to very extensive staff resources – the current study clearly has some limitations. Regional policy has become a multi-level and multi-actor activity, and thus restricting the focus to one organisation at one intermediate level of governance will undoubtedly have excluded the majority of regional development bodies currently operating in Europe. An alternative strategy that would also have resulted in a manageable number of organisations would have been to focus on the members of an international trade association

¹ EU 27 except the two most recent members (Bulgaria, Romania) and the three micro states (Luxembourg, Malta, Cyprus).

like e.g. *Eurada*, but this would also have introduced uncertainty (bias via self-selection), and eventually organising the survey in a way that could highlight the potential importance of different governance arrangement was preferred.




Figure 2.2. RDAs surveyed (actual/potential).

With the fast growing importance of websites as means of communication for RDAs with their customers, political sponsors, and the general public, conducting the survey primarily on the basis of information made public via websites has now become an option, and although around on third of the organisations originally identified as relevant turned out not to have websites suitable for the purposes of this study, the remainder contained sufficient detail and often provided additional information in response to specific e-mail enquiries. In relation to the analytical dimensions of the survey, the predominance of factual information (funding, board membership, etc.) and simple classification of factual information (policy targets and instruments) meant that relatively few dimensions had to be established through more complex interpretations by the research team (e.g. strategies, knowledge implications). The most important discretionary decision that had to be taken for each of the RDAs surveyed was to choose the four policies to analyse; as ‘mechanical’ criteria (e.g. programme expenditure) would create a selection bias towards programmes passing on money to client firms or involving construction of extensive infrastructures (see Dunleavy 1989), it was instead decided to select policies on the basis of their overall prominence, assuming that this

would best reflect the importance attached to particular initiatives by the organisation and its political sponsors.

Finally, in order to identify development trends and provide a fuller picture of the multi-level multi-actor regional policy set-up in European regions, two complementary analyses were carried out. On the one hand comparisons with previous research undertaken on a smaller scale in the mid-1990s (Halkier and Danson 1997) will be used to introduce a time dimension wherever possible. On the other hand the geographical and organisational scope of the study can be enhanced on the basis of a policy-profiling exercise undertaken by *EURODITE* research teams which replicated the survey in 12 case study regions but included a larger number of regional organisations as well as the role of national and European programmes.

These caveats notwithstanding, the research underlying this report is still by some distance the most extensive systematic survey of regionally-based economic development activities undertaken on a Europe-wide basis, and with its focus on knowledge implications of public intervention of course also an important part of the context for understanding the relationship between regional policy and the knowledge economy.

3. Contexts of regional policy

Regional policies operate in a number of socio-economic contexts, and here focus is on three important contextual dimensions that can be measured in relatively simplistic ways in order to be able to function in the context of a large-scale empirical survey.

As the aim of regional policy is to influence economic development within the region, an important context is the structure and performance of the regional economy because different types of challenges are likely to elicit different policy responses. In order to capture not just the current position of regions but also maintain a focus on economic dynamics and knowledge processes, the synthetic index developed as part of WP4 of the *EURODITE* project (Carrincazeaux, Gaschet et al. 2007) has been used where data has been available, while a much more simplistic GDP measure has been used for CEE member states where sufficient regional data has not been available. As illustrated by Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2, the organisations surveyed are distributed throughout all the sixteen western European regional profiles identified in WP4, and likewise the organisations operation in CEE countries can be found in both relatively wealthy and relative poor regions. In terms of economic context the survey is in other words covering the economic diversity in Europe, from globally-competitive metropolitan regions, knowledge-intensive high-tech scientific regions, industrial regions having undergone structural change, and rural areas with relatively low standards of living.




Figure 3.1. Economic profile of Western European regions surveyed. Classification of regions with RDA in survey according to the synthetic WP4 index.




Figure 3.2. Economic development of CEE regions surveyed. Regional GDP per capita in 2006 in percent of EU27 average according to EUROSTAT website.

The ability of individual regions to respond to perceived economic challenges is circumscribed by the governance context, i.e. the extent to which they have powers to institute and finance policy initiatives. For the purpose of this survey the general degree of decision-making capacity enjoyed by individual regions is illuminated through the comprehensive synthetic index developed by Lisbeth Hooghe and her collaborators that provides a general indication of the ability of individual region to institute measures to stimulate e.g. economic development within the region (Hooghe, Marks et al. 2008). Also in this respect a high degree of variation is in evidence, as illustrated by Figure 3.3. The German länder, unsurprisingly, score highly and above regions in other decentralised countries (Spain, Italy, Scotland, the Netherlands), while at the other end some countries allow very little room for regional manoeuvre (Portugal, Estonia, Slovenia), and the great majority of regions find themselves in a position with varying degrees of authority circumscribed by the national system of governance.




Figure 3.3. Regional governance in regions surveyed. Scores according to the synthetic regional authority index of Hooghe et al.

The adoption of particular policy initiatives is also influenced by the policy context, i.e. parallel policies instituted by other tiers of government attempting to address similar issues, and for the purpose of this survey, the indicator used is the extent to which regions have been designated by European and/or national regional programmes. As indicated by Figure 3.4, the increasing regulation of state aid within the EU (see Wishlade 2008) has produced a high degree of correlation between national and European regional policy designations, and a region-by-region investigation reveals that within the survey 78 per cent of the organisations

operation in a region that has been similarly designated by the two supra-regional tiers of government for regional policy purposes (calculated on the basis of the RDA survey 2007 database).




Figure 3.4. Regional policy designations of surveyed regions. Based on 2007 information on DG Regional Policy website.

Finally it is worth noting that the three principal policy contexts of the 181 RDAs in the survey would appear to be linked, but only to some extent. As could be expected, regions with relatively poor economic performances are more likely to be completely designated for regional policy purposes,² but it is also worth noting that although the average synthetic authority score of the regions surveyed is lower in the completely designated regions than the overall average, the partly designated regions are in fact slightly above the overall average.³ Moreover, the variation in each policy designation category with regard to regional authority is pronounced: the undesignated Paris region is below the overall average, among the partly designated regions are both the relatively weak English regions and the much more powerful Austrian *länder*, while the group of completely designated regions range from weak Portuguese regions to the strong German *länder*. There are, in other words, plenty of reasons to pursue several lines of inquiry when looking into the factors that influence regionally-based economic development initiatives, because it does not seem to be possible to reduce ‘problem logic’, ‘governance logic’, and ‘policy logic’ to one and the same thing.

² If the 16 regional profiles in the synthetic WP4 index are given numerical values starting with 1 for ‘metropolitan’ through to 16 for ‘south agricultural’, then the average profile score of the regions surveyed is 8.3 while the average of the fully designated regions is 12.4.

³ The average Hooghe-index governance score of the regions surveyed is 9.8, while the averages for the completely, partly, and un-designated regions are 7.8, 10.9 and 13.3 respectively.

4. Regional policies: Key dimensions

4.1. Organisation and strategies

The organisational context of the regional development body concerns the relation between the RDA and its political and financial sponsors within and/or outside the region. This describes its freedom of action in terms of being able to decide on the aims and methods in promoting regional development, and the resources at its disposal to translate strategies into implemented policies.

In terms of sponsorship it could be expected that RDAs would be primarily be sponsored by regions, but, as illustrated by Figure 4.1, this is the case for less than half the organisations surveyed, while central government is the sole sponsor for nearly 20 per cent of the RDAs for which sponsorship data was available. Interestingly, multiple sponsorship characterises no less than 40 per cent of the organisations, and as this conclusion is in line with the results of an earlier small-scale pilot study of the situation in the early 1990s (Halkier and Danson 1997), multi-level governance would appear to have become a prominent and permanent feature in the current governance of regional economic development.




Figure 4.1. Sponsors of RDAs. Number of organisations (N = 178). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.




Figure 4.2. Sponsorship relations of RDAs. Number of organisations (N = 165). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

For the vast majority of organisations for which data was available, the relation between the RDA and its political sponsors could be characterised as arm's-length, i.e. that the sponsor only oversees development in general terms and leaves considerable discretionary powers with regard to strategic initiatives and implantation to the development body itself. As illustrated by Figure 4.2, the number of arm's-length sponsors varies, and this is likely to affect the RDA's room for manoeuvre, because one or few sponsors being more likely to

wield detailed influence and ‘shorten the sponsorship arm’. Still, a sizeable minority of organisations are directly incorporated into the administrative structures of mainstream government, albeit in most cases somewhat sheltered in a semi-departmental position through the presence of e.g. a separate (advisory) board of directors. With regard to individual policy initiatives it is, however, also worth noting that nearly half of the policies for which data was available were sponsored by supra-regional levels of government (calculated on the basis of the RDA survey 2007 database) so that, although the RDA had been established to promote development within a particular region, a significant part of its activities involved implementing policies that to a greater or lesser extent had been designed elsewhere to address issues of national or European concern.




Figure 4.3. Resources of RDAs. Number of organisations. Small organisations have less than 20 staff and a budget of less than 5 €m, large organisations have more than 100 staff and a budget of more than 50 €m (N/staff = 112, N/funding = 48). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.




Figure 4.4. Strategic values of RDAs. Number of organisations (N/corporate = 165, N/policies = 586). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

In terms of resources, the organisations surveyed differ in size, as illustrated by Figure 4.3. This will not necessarily influence the ‘policy intensity’ because the size of the regions also varies considerably, from large German *Länder* at one extreme to e.g. small rural regions in the Czech Republic and Slovenia at the other. Nonetheless, the differences in financial and human resources must still affect the possibilities of individual RDAs in terms of engaging in large and complex projects, but this does not prevent regional development bodies across Europe from being almost unison in terms of their objectives, both in terms of their overall corporate goals and the aims associated with individual policy initiatives, as illustrated by Figure 4.4. In terms of setting the official aims for regional policy, the competitiveness-oriented EU Lisbon strategy has clearly established what could be termed discursive hegemony, and at least in terms of how the aims of regional policy are being talked about, this

differs from the situation in the early 1990s where equality-oriented goals like employment creation/safeguarding accounted for more than a quarter of the, admittedly much smaller, sample (Halkier and Danson 1997). Also with regard to more detailed strategic policy aims, the predominance of policies that aim to bring about qualitative change in the regional economy is evident: seven of the ten most frequent policies appear to involve attempts to improve things rather than simply bolster existing activities, as do nearly of 75 per cent of all the policies surveyed, as illustrated by Figure 4.5. Similar figures were recorded in the early 1990s (Halkier and Danson 1997), and thus the dominance of policies oriented towards qualitative change in the regional economy would by now seem to be firmly entrenched.




Figure 4.5. RDA policy aims. Number of policies (N = 670). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

4.2. Targets and instruments

In order to characterise the policies in greater detail, the following paragraphs will focus on the specific aims of public intervention and the instruments used, before turning to the knowledge implications of regional policy and the broader patterns of regional economic governance into which they are inscribed.

Considering the policy targets is necessary in order to establish how strategic aims are translated in concrete objectives for change, i.e. who/what is going to change in which way as a result of public intervention in order for the policy measure to achieve its aims. Figure 4.6

charts the changes in capabilities sought – material, immaterial or organisational – in relation to different types of institutional targets. Although many policies target more than one capability/institution and this can lead to an overestimation of the importance of especially some of the less common targets, it is immediate clear obvious that organisations – most often private firms – remain by far the most important institutional target of regional policy in European regions, and also that the capacity most often targeted relates to software, i.e. boosting the economically useful information available. It is, however also noticeable that both training of individual persons and various system-level measures (infrastructure, cluster formation) also play a significant role, and, indeed, that around a quarter of all the measures targeting firms actually attempt to improve their orgware, e.g. by encouraging them to participate in networks with other firms or knowledge institutions. Compared to the, albeit much smaller, survey of RDAs undertaken in the 1990s, the two most important changes are clearly the increased importance of training of the potential/present workforce and, not least, the explosive growth in network-oriented measures from the 1990s onwards (Halkier and Danson 1997). All in all this documents a gradual shift in policy targets in new, and clearly knowledge-intensive, directions, not just for the policy targets but certainly also for the RDAs developing and implementing these new types of development initiatives.




Figure 4.6. RDA policy targets. Number of policies (N = 692). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.




Figure 4.7. RDA policy instruments. Number of policies (N = 692). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

The policy instruments used to bring about change combine resources and rules: in order to make actors behave in ways conducive to policy goals, resources are made available on more or less stringent conditions. As illustrated by Figure 4.7, only 6 of the 12 basic policy instruments have been used by the RDAs surveyed to promote regional development, and the patterns of absence are unambiguous: no policy instruments relying on authority as its primary resource or prescribing mandatory used of other resources were in evidence. What is

equally striking, however, is the fact that the direct transfer of financial resources plays a relatively limited role, although of course the unconditional availability of resources does in itself automatically entail a significant indirect financial subsidy. The main instruments of European RDAs are therefore now clearly organisational and informational resources made available either conditionally and unconditionally, and perhaps unsurprisingly given the importance of software as the main target of capacity change (cf. Figure 4.6), information is the most important policy resource. Furthermore, it is common for individual policies to combine different policy rules by making some resources available unconditionally while other, presumably more complex or ‘advanced’, resources are only available if firms meet certain conditions, e.g. sign up to participate in more extensive interactions with the RDA or undertake to invest some of their own resources in particular ways – in fact more than two-thirds of the policies surveyed entail both unconditional and conditional access to resources in order to influence the behaviour of economic actors within their region.

4.3. Knowledge implications of RDA policies

The vast majority of the RDA policies surveyed are in other words ‘knowledge explicit’ in the sense that they either intend to influence the software or orgware capacities of their targets, or that they employ informational or organisational resources in order to bring about changes within the regional economic that are seen as desirable. Compared to previous regional policy paradigms, especially traditional top-down central government grant schemes, the current knowledge-intensive policy profile greatly increases the demands on individual RDAs in terms of knowledge resources, both in-house in terms of the competences of their employees, and externally through access to regional, national and international networks.




Figure 4.8. RDA policies: Knowledge moments and types. Number of policies (N = 691). Source:

In relation to the firms and other targets of regional development, it is, however, also interesting to note what kind of knowledge is being influenced by RDA policies: what is the balance between more or less immediately useful knowledges, and are some forms of knowledge given particular attention at the expense of others? As illustrated by Figure 4.8, the focus of the policies surveyed is near exclusively on knowledge exploitation, i.e. using existing knowledge for economic purposes – in fact only three policies were identified where knowledge examination in order to establish the economic potential of existing knowledge was in focus, while, perhaps less surprising, no instances were found where generation of knowledge through less use-oriented exploration like in e.g. basic research was supported (calculated on the basis of the RDA survey 2007 database). Similarly, the limited importance of analytical knowledge is noticeable: only two cases have been identified, but given the widespread interest in biotech among policy-makers across Europe, this is likely to reflect that such initiatives have not generally been given sufficient prominence on the RDA websites to be selected for analysis. Still, the predominance of synthetic knowledge is striking, reflecting a dominant focus on manufacturing and business skills, but at the same time it is also noticeable that symbolic knowledge plays an important role in connection with communication-oriented policies such as attraction of inward investment and advice on markets and marketing. Compared to the small survey undertaken in the early 1990s, the relative role of symbolic knowledge would appear to have decreased somewhat, but again this may simply reflect the fact that especially more low-key advisory services have not been given prominence on RDA websites. All in all it is obvious that the knowledges necessary for regional development bodies are marshalling in order to promote economic development remain heterogeneous, and hence, by implication, that small organisations will need to be well networked in order to compensate for limited in-house resources.

4.4. RDAs and their regional policy context

The individual RDAs in the survey operate in policy environments where other public bodies also pursue regional development goals, and therefore the relationship between different economic development bodies is important in its own right because different patterns of cooperation and competition between them may be more or less conducive to achieving the shared goal of regional development. The web-based survey at the centre of this report was chosen as research design in order to be able to cover regions across Europe, but obviously this approach is not well-suited to capture in any great detail the relationship between the RDAs surveyed and the policy environment in which they operate. In order to get a

preliminary idea about the relationship, twelve *EURODITE* partners have surveyed development bodies and activities in their region, using the same conceptual framework and similar methods as the main European survey.⁴ This section presents the findings from this exercise which, in addition to the main goal of illuminating the balance between complementary and overlapping policies within individual regions, can also provide an indication of the extent to which the RDAs chosen for the European survey are similar or different from the majority of development bodies not included.

Starting with the latter issue, key characteristics of the two samples of economic development bodies have been compared, as illustrated by Figures A31-A37 in Annex 3 at the back of the report. With one notable exception, the overall distribution of the development bodies surveyed in the twelve regions is similar to that of the main European survey of RDAs in the sense that the same policy instruments, policy targets and knowledge impacts have been found to be both the most and the least prominent ones. The main difference between the two samples concerns sponsorship; here the dominance of multiple sponsor arrangements in the regional survey is in reality a reversal of the dominance of single-sponsor agencies in the European survey, something which further underlines the importance of multi-level governance patterns in regional economic development in Europe. All in all the comparison clearly suggests that in terms of the public incentives aimed at changing patterns of behaviour among private firms, the two samples are not substantially different, and thus the European RDA survey can be seen as giving a reasonably good indication of key characteristics of bottom-up regional policy across Europe – although an extended, but also very resource-demanding, survey combining geographical scope with depth of coverage would of course have been preferable.

While the average development body in the regional survey is quite similar to the average RDA identified in the European survey, the division of labour within each region may still take different forms: at one extreme all the organisations have similar profiles and support the same kind of activities in similar ways, mutually supporting or competing against each other, and at the other extreme all the organisations have different profiles that complement each other and constitute a well-defined division of labour. For each of the twelve regions a comparison has been undertaken between the RDA included in the European

⁴ In each of the 12 regions the following regional development activities were surveyed: the most important European and national programmes, as well as the four most important policies of the four most important regional or local development bodies. Unlike the main European survey that was conducted by just one researcher, relying on 12 different teams of researchers clearly creates challenges with regard to maintaining the consistency of interpretation, despite the availability of extensive written guidance.

survey on the one hand, and the development bodies and activities covered in the regional survey on the other. As can be seen from Figures A38-A44 in Annex 3, the co-existence of many regional development bodies generally increases the diversity of policy activities in the individual region so that a greater variety of targets are aimed for with a wider range of policy instruments and eventually bring about more heterogeneous knowledge implications.

Complementarity is particularly pronounced with regard to

- *sponsorship*, cf. Figure A38, something which could indicate that the sponsors of the main RDA within a region are less likely to establish parallel organisations than to enter into joint sponsorship arrangements with other actors, and
- *knowledge impacts*, cf. Figures A43 and A44, where the rather one-dimensional picture presented by the RDA survey with predominance of exploitation of synthetic (and to some extent also symbolic) knowledge is substantially modified when the results of the regional survey are taken into account.

The difference between the two samples is least pronounced with regard to policy instruments and targets where a high degree diversity can be seen in most regions. Otherwise it is noticeable that the level of diversity is broadly the same in all the twelve regions, with North Jutland and Niedersachsen as the regions with, respectively, the least and the most differences between the main RDA and other economic development bodies.

All in all this would seem to suggest that while the RDAs in the European survey are generally typical representatives of bottom-up regional policy, the actual diversity in regions across Europe is in fact greater because the co-existence of many economic development bodies and initiatives generates variety in terms of targets, instruments, and, indeed, knowledge impacts of public policy.

5. Patterns of regional policy

In this section the patterns of policy variation will be discussed in relation to the three main contexts in order to get a first indication of the relative importance of the factors shaping regionally-based development initiatives, i.e. the balance between ‘problem logic’ (similar economic challenges result in similar policies), ‘governance logic’ (similar forms of governance result in similar policies), and ‘policy logic’ (involvement in national/European programmes result in similar policies). As argued earlier, the data concerning the three contexts do not make it possible to reduce ‘problem logic’, ‘governance logic’, and ‘policy logic’ to one and the same thing, and thus in the following five aspects of regional policy will be analysed with regard to their inter-regional variation on the basis of economic, governance and policy criteria. It should be stressed that the analysis in the following will be extended during autumn 2009 through exploration of additional patterns of co-variation, but for the time being focus is on the relationship between five key policy dimensions and the three contexts in which they operate. Finally, a fourth context is introduced which charts policies according to which member state the region is part of; this could be seen as a supplement to the general governance context which can give a first indication of the extent to which detailed national regulation – e.g. preference for particular policy instruments – has guided regional policy initiatives in particular directions.

In practice this has resulted in sets of breakdowns by regional contextual variables of the following policy dimensions:

- sponsors of RDAs
- policy aims
- policy targets
- policy instruments, and
- knowledge implications.

This results in 25 figures which for ease of reference and handling have been placed in Annex 2 at the back of the text.

5.1. Patterns of RDA sponsorship

As demonstrated by Figure 4.1, RDAs in Europe are sponsored also by other tiers of government than the regional one; in fact development bodies sponsored exclusively by regional government account for only 40 per cent of the organisations surveyed (calculated on

the basis of the RDA survey 2007 database). Figures A1-A5 in Appendix 2 breaks show the distribution of sponsors distributed according to the four contextual different variables, and two observations are immediately obvious. First and foremost, governance clearly makes a difference: the more extensive authority a region has, the more likely it is to sponsor its own RDA (Figure A3), and, related to this because sub-national governance is symmetrical in the vast majority of European countries, sponsorship arrangements tend to be uniform in each member state, with only one country with three different sponsors and 17 countries where more than 75 per cent of the organisations surveyed were sponsored by the same tiers of government. Conversely, being more or less designated for regional policy purposes does not appear to make much of a difference, while the impact of economic factors is difficult to gauge, and even the obvious importance of multi-level sponsorship in CEE countries may simply reflect the fact that these previously centralised countries became EU members at the same point in time and were pointed in this direction by a raft of EU programmes designed to strengthen democratic governance and build capacity to absorb Structural Funds support in a meaningful and efficient manner.

All in all governance is clearly important in determining who sponsors RDAs, and as this in itself is an issue of governance - who designs and implements regional policy - this is perhaps not a surprising finding, but nonetheless it is useful to have documented that the most powerful regions also have regional economic development as one of their central areas of responsibility.

5.2. Patterns of RDA strategies

As demonstrated by Figure 4.5, RDA strategies are diverse in terms of their aims, but the vast majority of policies aim to bring about qualitative change in the regional economy rather than simply bolstering existing activities. Figures A6-A10 in Appendix 2 show the distribution of strategies according to the four contextual different variables, focusing on four common strategic priorities which are related to the four basic policy aims outlined in Table 2.1 above, with attraction of inward investment representing expansion, support for small/new firms representing duplication, modernisation of firms representing, well, modernisation, and support for network/clusters representing creativity. Although the strategic variation is striking no matter the economic position of the region, it would appear that the network/cluster approach is more common in well-off and dynamic regions than in localities scoring lower in the economic indices, and that efforts to modernise individual firms are most pronounced in old industrial regions. Moreover, the highest degree of variation is found in the

new member states where the four ‘classic’ approached to regional policy account for (sometimes much) less than half of the policy measures of the organisations surveyed (Figure A7); this contrasts sharply with the situation in the old member states where the same policies account for around 80 per cent of the policies in nearly all the WP4 regional profiles (Figure A6), and probably reflects the emphasis on training and infrastructure among the relative small number of regions in the poorest parts of Europe. A similar tendency can be seen in relation to regional policy designation where ‘other measures’ also are more frequent than in the partly or un-designated regions (Figure A9), and in terms of governance in the regions with the lowest score on the synthetic regional authority index (Figure A10). If there is indeed an economic ‘problem logic’ influencing regional policy strategies, this would appear to be sufficiently complex to be difficult to capture using the relatively simplistic methods employed here - and in practice its influence would appear to have been mediated by alternative governance and policy logics. If regional policies are supposed to address the specific needs of individual regions - needs that are not just economic but also interpreted socially and politically - these findings could suggest that this may well be what is happening in Europe today.

5.3. Patterns of RDA policy targets and instruments

As demonstrated by Figure 4.6, RDA policy targets are diverse both in terms of the capabilities and the institutions they aim to change, although organisations and software are the most important targets. Appendix 2 shows the distribution of targets according to the four different contextual variables in Figures A11-A15 (institutional) and Figures A16-A20 (capacity). Although there seems to be a tendency for regions scoring low in the synthetic regional authority index to spend more on person-related measures like training (Figure A13), what is most striking with regard to targets is the extent to which similar institutions and capacities are the object of regional policy across European regions, and here it is particularly interesting to note that changing the orgware through support for e.g. networks and clusters has become commonplace throughout Europe and is no longer the preserve of wealthy and dynamic regions.

A similar picture presents itself with regard to policy instruments, where Figures A21-A25 in Appendix 2 would appear to present a similar picture with finance, information and organisation used as policy resources in regions across Europe with only few examples of possible influence from the four contextual variables: regions scoring high in the synthetic regional authority index tend to rely more on provision of (complex and demanding)

organisational resources, while, perhaps equally unsurprising, regions that have not been nationally designated for regional policy support are more frequently employing financial resources to further economic development, possibly in order to compensate for the absence of national support schemes.

5.4. Patterns of RDA policy knowledge types

As demonstrated by Figure 4.8, RDA policies focus near-exclusively on commercial exploitation of knowledge, primarily synthetic (engineering and business-oriented) knowledge but also to a significant degree symbolic knowledge related to social norms and values that are of importance in relation to e.g. market communication and attraction of inward investment. Figures A21-A25 show the distribution of knowledge types according to the four different contextual variables, and again the most striking result is the extent to which the focus on symbolic knowledge is found throughout Europe where it is present in around 20 per cent of the policies surveyed no matter their position with regard to economic development or governance. At the same time it is also worth noting that this is a characteristic where national differences appear to be fairly pronounced, with some countries with no or a very limited role for symbolic knowledge and others where its share is close to 60 per cent. However, as the number of organisations surveyed in several of the countries that are outliers with regard to knowledge types is relatively low, this finding could, however, be revised later in the light of the findings of the policy profiling exercise to be reported in Section 4.4 above.

5.5. Patterns of RDA policies: Overlapping influences

All in all the patterns of RDA policies can be seen to reflect the coming together of different influences and cannot simply be seen as the result of economic needs, patterns of governance, or the influence of higher-tier economic development programmes. While governance and the level of authority enjoyed by regions influence patterns of sponsorship and to some extent the choice of policy instruments, the diversity of RDA strategies would appear to reflect different economic challenges, while the impact of policies in terms of targets of and knowledge is not affected by any of the factors investigated in a clear-cut fashion. The overall picture emerging in other words looks like this: politically ‘strong’ regions tend to have their own RDAs and use more complex policy instruments, economic development strategies generally reflect specific challenges, and development bodies spread their efforts across a wide range of targets while having broadly similar impact on knowledge processes. Or to put it differently: the

RDA model emerging in the 1990s as documented by e.g. Halkier & Danson (1997) would now seem to have become widespread across Europe, and hence, at least on the basis of the data produced by the 2007 RDA survey, European regional development bodies would to a large extent seem to comply with the notion of a ‘model RDA’, providing integrated and tailor-made policy delivery that address specific challenges of individual regions within the broader framework of national and European governance of economic development initiatives.

6. Conclusion and confrontation with WP8 hypotheses

Surveying RDAs across the EU in a diversity of regional contexts in terms of governance, policies and (knowledge) economic development has produced a clear picture of the current profile and long-term trends in bottom-up regional policy in Europe. A picture that may be deepened through even more extensive surveys and in-depth case studies, but which nonetheless makes it possible to draw conclusions with regard to the current nature of regional development initiatives, to relate findings to the WP8 policy hypotheses, and to identify some current policy challenges.

6.1. RDA profiling

An important finding of the survey is the fact that multi-level governance of bottom-up regional policy now has become widespread so that most individual development bodies and/or their activities are sponsored by several tiers of government rather than simply by e.g. the region itself. This, in turn, has further strengthened the arm's-length principle so that RDAs, at least from an institutional perspective, operate as semi-autonomous entities outside mainstream government. Taken together this implies that a new generation of regionally based development bodies, networked RDAs, has become a conspicuous feature in regional policy in Europe.

In terms of strategies, the objectives of regional development is now firmly based in Lisbon-style competitiveness-oriented discourse, and this fits well with the fact that current policies focusing on supporting qualitative change in the regional economy now tends to predominate. While private firms remain the most common target, targeting individuals through e.g. training measures has grown in importance, along with the now dominant focus on bringing about change in software and orgware. In short, also regional policy measures themselves have acquired a conspicuous network dimension, with a focus on stimulating inter-firm relations and relations between firms and public knowledge institutions in e.g. clusters.

In the light of this it is hardly surprising that the policy instruments employed by European RDAs are dominated by the use of informational and organisational resources, and thus the vast majority of policies are of a knowledge-explicit and knowledge-intensive character, i.e. either their targets of change or the policy instruments involved required detailed knowledge of particular firms and areas of economic activity. In terms of the

knowledge impact of RDA policies, exploitation of synthetic (business, engineering) knowledge predominates, although symbolic (marketing) knowledge is also clearly a secondary focus.

All in all the 'learning region' envisioned by Cooke & Morgan (Cooke and Morgan 1993; Morgan 1997) and Florida (1995) in the early 1990s is gradually spreading throughout Europe and no longer concentrated in a few well-endowed high-performing regions.

6.2. *Confrontation with WP8 policy hypotheses*

The results of the confrontation of the RDA survey result with the WP8 policy hypotheses are listed in Annex 3, and it is immediately evident that a range of issues cannot be addressed on the basis of the survey, i.e. the roles of combinatorial and extra-regional knowledge, KIBS, growing regulatory pressure, and evidence-based policy-making (although it could of course be argued that knowledge-intensive policies would be difficult to operate with knowledge about the regional economy and its firms). Other hypotheses are, however, confirmed to varying degrees:

- The limited role of symbolic knowledge in general, and particularly concerning the consumption side of the production process, is partly supported, as most knowledge impacts still concern synthetic knowledge and the most important involvement of symbolic knowledge is related to its use in connection with general place marketing initiatives (promotion of inward investment) while examination or production of new symbolic knowledge about demand/consumer trends is virtually absent.
- The multi-level character of RDA sponsorship has been confirmed, both with regard to organisation and individual policy initiatives.
- The knowledge-intensive character of RDA policies has been established in the sense that they constitute the majority of current RDA policies. However, the trend in comparison with early 1990s less certain, but perhaps the apparent lack of growth in knowledge-intensive RDA policies simply reflects new divisions of labour between development organisations: if RDAs have become more prominent as policy organisations, then a relative growth in the role of knowledge-intensive policies will also have taken place even if the knowledge-intensity of their activities remain unchanged.
- The self-proclaimed gender neutrality of policy measures is clearly evident: for more than 70 per cent of organisations surveyed no gender strategy has been identified (calculated

on the basis of the RDA survey 2007 database), while mainstreaming (Sweden) or separate initiatives (UK, Ireland) prevail in only two member states.

6.3. Policy scoping

The survey documents the spreading of a new-model bottom-up regional development policy which appears to be well in tune with the Lisbon visions for a competitive European knowledge economy, and this will undoubtedly appeal to policymakers in Brussels and elsewhere as a sign that regional development is becoming part of a future-oriented political project rather than simply being a political price that had to be paid to maintain member state unity in the face of divisive measures such as the completion of the single European market (Hooghe and Keating 1994). This change in regional policy has, however, also occasionally received more sceptically, because of what is no longer in focus such as e.g. transfer of economic resources (e.g. Hudson 1997), and because of unease about the transferability of practices to less well-off regions and the risk of importing practices without sufficient adaptation to local circumstances (Markusen 1999; Lagendijk 2000; MacLeod 2000; Hassink 2001; Hassink 2005; Rutten and Boekema 2007). These issues are, however, difficult to address through surveys like the current one but require in-depth case studies and evaluation-type research to illuminate, and therefore the contribution to the policy scoping exercise of the current report will be a more limited one, namely to identify some key implications of the current policy profile of European RDAs.

In terms of governance the key finding of the survey was that currently RDAs are operating in a network environment, mostly with a plurality of sponsors for the organisation as such and/or its policy activities. On the one hand this poses the strategic challenges of maintaining the overall direction of activities with different sponsors promoting different development agendas and activities, and with ensuring the integrated policy delivery that has traditionally been one of the arguments for using multi-functional bodies to stimulate regional economic development. On the other hand it poses the organisational challenge of having staff capable of operating effectively in such an environment where it is no longer enough to 'know your stuff' and be able to deal with individual clients but you also need to 'get along' with parallel/competing organisations in order to make things moving in the direction desired.

With regard to regional development strategies, two findings were particularly conspicuous: the limited role of direct financial subsidies as policy instruments, and the predominance of knowledge-explicit policies. The former may reflect a distribution of labour between development organisations - in some countries financial subsidies are always

handled by governmental organisations rather than semi-autonomous bodies like RDAs - and so the challenge is one of coordination between organisations, if, of course, grant aid is available from other sources. The challenge of the latter is, however, crucial because the pivotal role of knowledge with regard to both policy targets and instruments increase the demands on RDAs to have access to relevant knowledge resources, either in-house or through their network to public and private providers.

Finally, in terms of knowledge types, the dominance of synthetic knowledge may suggest room for increasing the focus on symbolic knowledge - and indeed its interplay with synthetic knowledges - in order to make sure that producer-oriented policies are also taking current and emerging trends in market demand into account. If this is not the case, then policies will continue to rely on the perceptions of firms in this regards, thereby running the risk of strengthening existing path dependencies rather than assisting firms in transgressing their current limits of strategic vision.

Taken together current and future challenges for RDAs can be captured in the catchphrase 'better and more knowledge-intensive networking' in order to be able to act as agents of change in the regional knowledge economy. A role that underlines the character of modern RDAs as 'network nodes' rather than 'monopolistic implementers' of regional development initiatives, where successful performance will require not only good working relationships with private-sector clients but also fruitful interaction with private knowledge providers such as KIBS and public knowledge institutions such as universities.

7. Appendix 1: RDAs included in the survey

Country	Region	Organisation	Website
Austria	Burgenland	Wirtschaftsservice Burgenland Aktiengesellschaft – WiBAG	www.wibag.at
Austria	Carinthia	Entwicklungsagentur Kärnten GmbH EAK	www.entwicklungsagentur.at/eak_neu
Austria	Lower Austria	Ecoplus wirtschaftsagentur Niederösterreich	www.ecoplus.at
Austria	Oberösterreich	Technologie und marketinggesellschaft TMG	www.tmg.at
Austria	Salzburg	Salzburg Agentur	www.salzburgagentur.at
Austria	Styria	Steirische Wirtschaftsförderung	www.sfg.at
Austria	Tirol	Tiroler Zukunftstiftung	www.zukunftstiftung.at
Austria	Vienna	Vienna Business Agency	www.wvff.gv.at
Austria	Vorarlberg	Wirtschafts-Standort Vorarlberg GmbH (WISTO)	www.wisto.at
Belgium	Antwerpen	Provinciale ontwikkelingsmaatschappij voor de provincie Antwerpen POM Antwerpen	www.provant.be
Belgium	Brabant Wallon	Intercommunale du Brabant Wallon l'IBW	www.ibw.be
Belgium	Bruxelles	Agence Bruxelloise pour l'Entreprise	www.abe-bao.be
Belgium	Liège	Agence de développement pour la province de Liège SPI+	www.spi.be
Belgium	Namur	Bureau economique de la province de Namur BEP entreprises	www.bep.be
Belgium	Oost Vlaanderen	Provinciale ontwikkelingsmaatschappij Oost Vlaanderen POM	www.pomov.be
Belgium	West Vlaanderen	Provinciale ontwikkelingsmaatschappij West Vlaanderen POM West Vlaanderen	www.pomwvl.be
Czech Rep.	Hradec-Králové	Kralovehradecka agentura regionalního rozvoje - centrum evropského projektování	www.cep-rra.cz
Czech Rep.	Liberec	Agentura regionalního rozvoje, ARR Nisa	www.arr-nisa.cz
Czech Rep.	Moravia-silesia	Agentura pro regionalní rozvoj a.s., Moravskoslezský kraj	www.rdaova.cz
Czech Rep.	South Bohemia	Regionalní rozvojová agentura jižních Čech RERA a.s.	www.rera.cz
Czech Rep.	South Moravia	Regionalní Rozvojová Agentura Jizni Moravy	www.rrajm.cz
Czech Rep.	Usti	Regionalní rozvojová agentura Usteckého kraje	www.rra.cz
Denmark	Bornholm	Bornholms Vækstforum	www.brk.dk
Denmark	Hovedstaden	Vækstforum Region Hovedstaden	www.regionhovedstaden.dk
Denmark	Midtjylland	Vækstforum Region Midtjylland	www.regionmidtjylland.dk
Denmark	Nordjylland	Vækstforum Region Nordjylland	www.rn.dk
Denmark	Sjælland	Vækstforum Region Sjælland	www.vfsj.dk
Denmark	Syddanmark	Vækstforum Region Syddanmark	www.regionsyddanmark.dk
Estonia	Ida-Viru County	Ida-Viru Ettevotluskeskus IVEK	www.ivek.ee
Estonia	Pärnu County	Pärnumaa Ettevotlus ja Arenduskeskus PEAK	www.peak.ee
Estonia	Saaremaa County	Saaremaa Ettevotluse Edendamise sihtasutus SEES	www.sees.ee
Estonia	Tartu County	Tartu Ärinouandla	www.tartu.ee/arinouandla
Finland	Itä-Uusimaa	Itä-Uudenmaan Liitto	www.liitto.ita-uusimaa.fi
Finland	Kymenlaakso	Kymenlaakson Liitto	www.kymenlaakso.fi
Finland	Uusimaa	Uudenmaan liitto	www.uudenmaanliitto.fi


France	Alsace	L'agence de Développement de L'Alsace (ADA)	www.ada-alsace.com
France	Aquitaine	2ADI L'agence Aquitaine de développement industriel	www.2adi.fr
France	Auvergne-Limousin	Association pour le Développement Industriel et Economique du Massif Central ADIMAC	www.adimac.com
France	Bourgogne	Bourgogne développement	www.bourgognedeveloppement.com
France	Centre	Centreco l'agence de développement économique de la région Centre	www.centreco.regioncentre.fr
France	Champagne-Ardenne	Champagne-Ardenne developpement CADEV	www.cadev.fr
France	Franche-Comté	L'Agence Régionale de Développement de Franche- Comté	www.ardfc.org
France	Haute Normandie + Basse Normandie	Normandie développement	www.normandydev.com
France	Languedoc-Roussillon	Invest Languedoc Roussillon	www.invest-lr.com
France	Lorraine	Agence pour le Developpement des Investissements Exterieurs en Lorraine Adielor	www.adielor.com
France	Midi-pyrénées	Midi-pyrénées Expansion L'agence de Développement de lan Region Midi-pyrénées	www.midipyrenees-expansion.fr
France	Nord -Pas-de-Calais	NFX Nord France eXperts	www.nfx.fr
France	Paris	Paris Ile-de-France Agence Régionale de Développement (ARD)	www.paris-region.com
France	Pays de la Loire + Poitou-Charentes	Ouest atlantique	www.western-france.org
France	Picardie	Conseil Regional de la Picardie	www.cr-picardie.fr
France	Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	Mission de développement économique régional Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur MDER PACA	www.mder-paca.com
France	Rhône-Aples	Association Rhône-Aples des professionnels du développement economique local ARADEL	www.aradel.asso.fr
Germany	Baden-Württemberg	Baden-Württemberg International	www.bw-i.de
Germany	Bayern	Bayerische staatsministerium für wirtschaft, infrastruktur, verkehr und technologie	www.stmwivt.bayern.de
Germany	Berlin	Berlin Partner GmbH	www.berlin-partner.de
Germany	Brandenburg	ZukunftAgentur Brandenbrg GmbH ZAB	www.zab-brandenburg.de
Germany	Bremen	BIG Bremen - die wirtschaftsförderer	www.big-bremen.de
Germany	Hamburg	HWF Hamburgischen Gesellschaft für Wirtschaftsförderung mbH	www.hwf-hamburg.de
Germany	Hessen	Hessen Agentur	www.feh-hessen.de
Germany	Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	Gesellschaft für wirtschaftsförderung Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	www.gfw-mv.de
Germany	Niedersachsen	IPA Niedersachsen Investment Promotiopn Agency	www.ipa-niedersachsen.de
Germany	Nordrhein-Westphalen	Gesellschaft für Wirtschaftsförderung Nordrhein-Westphalen	www.gfw-nrw.de
Germany	Rheinland-Pfalz	Investitions- und Strukturbank Rheinland-Pfalz (ISB) GmbH	www.isb.rlp.de
Germany	Sachsen	Wirtschaftsförderung Sachsen	www.wfs.sachsen.de
Germany	Sachsen-Anhalt	IMG Investitions- und marketing gesellschaft Sachsen-Anhalt mbH	www.img-sachsen-anhalt.de
Germany	Schleswig-Holstein	Wirtschaftsförderung und technologietransfer Schleswig-Holstein WTSH	www.wtsh.de
Germany	Saarland	Gesellschaft für Wirtschaftsförderung Saar mbH	www.gwsaar.com
Germany	Thüringen	Landesentwicklungsgesellschaft (LEG) Thüringen mbH	www.leg-thuringen.de
Greece	Heraklion	Development agency of Heraklion SA	www.anher.gr
Greece	Ilia	Development agency of Olympia SA	www.anol.gr
Greece	Karditsa	Development Agency of Karditsa SA ANKA	www.anka.gr
Greece	Kozani	West Macedonia Development Company ANKO	www.anko.gr
Greece	Pella	Development agency of Pella SA	www.anpe.gr
Greece	Pieriki	Pieriki Anaptyxiaki SA Local development company	www.pieriki-anaptyxiaki.gr
Greece	Rodopi	Rodopi Development SA ANRO SA	www.anro.gr
Greece	Serres	Development Agency of Serres SA	www.aneser.gr

Hungary	Central Hungary	Pro régió Agency	www.proregio.hu
Hungary	Central Transdanubia	Közep Dunantuli Régió	www.kdrfu.hu
Hungary	North great plain	Eszak-Alföldi Regionális Fejlesztési Ügynökség	www.eszakalfold.hu
Hungary	North Hungary	Eszak-Magyarországi regionális fejlesztési tanács	www.norda.hu
Hungary	West Pannon	Nyugat-dunantuli Regionális Fejlesztési Tanács és Ügynöksége	www.westpa.hu
Ireland	Donegal	Donegal county enterprise board	www.donegalenterprise.ie
Ireland	Dublin	Dublin city enterprise board	www.dceb.ie
Ireland	Galway	Galway County and City Enterprise Board	www.galwayenterprise.ie
Ireland	Kilkenny	Kilkenny County enterprise board	www.kceb.ie
Ireland	Mayo	Mayo county enterprise board	www.mayoceb.com
Ireland	Shannon	Shannon Development	www.shannondev.ie
Ireland	Sligo	Sligo county enterpriseboard	www.sligoenterprise.ie
Ireland	Waterford	Waterford county Enterpriseboard	www.enterpriseboard.ie
Ireland	Wexford	Wexford County enterprise board	www.wexfordceb.ie
Ireland	Wicklow	Wicklow County enterprise board	www.wicklowceb.ie
Italy	Abruzzi	Finanziaria regionale abruzzese FIRA	www.fira.it
Italy	Calabria	Società Finanziaria Regional per lo sviluppo economico della Calabria FINCALABRA	www.fincalabra.it
Italy	Emilia-Romagna	Emilia-Romagna Valorizzazione Economica del Territorio ERVET	www.ervet.it
Italy	Lazio	Sviluppo Lazio	www.sviluppo.lazio.it
Italy	Liguria	Filse Finanziaria Ligure per lo sviluppo economico	www.filse.it
Italy	Lombardia	Finlombarda Finanziaria per lo sviluppo della Lombardia	www.finlombarda.it
Italy	Marche	Sviluppo Marche SpA SVIM	www.svimspa.it
Italy	Piemonte	Finpiemonte SPA	www.finpiemonte.it
Italy	Puglia	Istituto Finanziario Regionale Pugliese FINPUGLIA	www.finpuglia.it www.pmion.net
Italy	Trentino	Agenzia per lo sviluppo del trentino Spa	www.agenziasviluppo.tn.it
Italy	Umbria	Sviluppumbria SPA società regionale per la promozione dello sviluppo economico dell'Umbria	www.sviluppumbria.it
Italy	Valle d'Aosta	Centro Sviluppo L'agenzia di sviluppo regionale della Valle d'Aosta	www.centrosviluppo.it
Latvia	Latgale	Latgales regiona attistibas agentura	www.latgale.lv/en/lraa
Latvia	Riga	Rigas regiona attistibas agenturas	www.rigaregion.lv
Latvia	Vidzeme	Vidzemes Attistibas Agentura	www.vidzemes-regions.lv
Latvia	Zemgale	Zemgales attistibas agentura	www.zemgale.lv
Lithuania	Kaunas	Kauno Regiono Plėtros Agentura	www.krda.lt
Lithuania	Klaipeda	Klaipėdos ekonomines plėtros agentura	www.kepa.lt
Netherlands	Drenthe + Fryslan + Groningen	Investerings- en ontwikkelingsmaatschappij vor Nord Nederland NV NOM	www.nvnom.eu
Netherlands	Limburg	NV Industriebank LIOF	www.liof.nl
Netherlands	North Brabant	NV Brabantse ontwikkelings maatschappij	www.bom.nl
Netherlands	Overijssel + Gelderland	Ontwikkelingsmaatschappij oost Nederland NV	www.oostnv.nl
Poland	Lubelskie	Lubelska Fundacja rozwoju	www.lfr.lublin.pl
Poland	Malopolskie	Małopolska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A.	www.marr.pl
Poland	Podkarpackie	Rzeszowskiej Agencji rozwoju regionalnego SA	www.rarr.rzeszow.pl
Poland	Podlaskie	Podlaska fundacja rozwoju regionalnego	www.pfr.bialystok.pl
Poland	Pomorskie	Agencja Rozwoju Pomorza SA	www.arp.gda.pl
Poland	Warminsko-Mazurska	Warmińsko-Mazurska Agencja rozwoju regionalnego SA	www.wmarr.olsztyn.pl
Poland	Wielkopolskie	Agencja rozwoju regionalnego SA w Koninie	www.arrkonin.org.pl
Portugal	Alto Tamega	Associacao de desenvolvimento da regio do Alto	www.adrat.pt

		Tamega ADRAT	
Portugal	Douro e Vouga	Agencia de desenvolvimento regional de Entre Douro e Vouga ADReDV	www.adredv.pt
Portugal	Grande Porto	Primus Promocao e desenvolvimento Regional SA	www.primus-dr.pt
Portugal	Setubal	Cooperacao e desenvolvimento Regional SA CDR	www.cdr.pt
Portugal	Vale do Ave	Agencia de desenvolvimento regional do Vale do Ave ADRAVE	www.adrave.pt
Portugal	Vale do Cavado	Plataforma Minho - Agencia de desenvolvimento regional	www.plataformaminho.pt
Slovakia	Kosice	Spisska regionalna rozvojova agentura SRRA	www.srra.sk
Slovakia	Nitra	Regionalna rozvojova agentura Nitra	www.rra-nitra.sk
Slovenia	Obalno-Krasna	Regionalni razvojni center Koper	www.rrc-kp.si
Slovenia	Osrednjeslovenka	Regionalna razvojna agencija Ljublanske urbane regije	www.rralur.si
Slovenia	Podravje	Mariborska Razvojna Agencija	www.mra.si
Slovenia	Pomurje	Regionalna razvojna agencija Mura doo	www.rra-mura.si
Slovenia	Spodnje posavska	Center za razvoj podezelja posavje	www.rra-posavje.si
Slovenia	Zasavska	Regionalni center za razvoj	www.rcr.zasavje.si
Spain	Andalusia	Agencia de innovacion y desarrollo de Andalucia IDEA	www.agenciaidea.es
Spain	Aragon	Instituto Aragonés de Fomento	www.iaf.es
Spain	Asturias	Instituto de desarrollo economico del principado de Asturias	www.idepa.es
Spain	Cantabria	Sociedad para el desarrollo regional de cantabria SODERCAN	www.sodercan.es
Spain	Castile - La Mancha	Instituto de promocion exterior de Castilla- La Mancha IPEX	www.ipex.jccm.es
Spain	Castile-Leon	La Agencia de Inversiones y servicios de Castila Y León (ADE)	www.jcyl.es/ade
Spain	Catalonia	El centro de innovation y desarrollo empresarial CIDEM	www.cidem.com
Spain	Extremadura	Fundación para el Desarrollo de la Ciencia y la Tecnología en Extremadura FUNDECYT	www.fundecyt.es
Spain	Galicia	Instituto galego de promocion economica	www.igape.es
Spain	Madrid	Instituto madrileño de desarrollo y su grupo empresarial	www.imade.es
Spain	Murcia	Instituto de fomento region de Murcia INFO	www.ifrm-murcia.es
Spain	Navarre	Sociedad de desarrollo de Navarre SODENA	www.sodena.com
Spain	País vasco/Basque County	Sociedad para la promocion y reconversion industrial	www.spri.es
Spain	Rioja	Agencia de Desarrollo economica de la Rioja ADER	www.ader.es
Spain	Valencia	Instituto de la Mediana Pequeña industria Valenciana IMPIVA	www.impiva.es
Sweden	Blekinge	Region Blekinge	www.regionblekinge.se
Sweden	Dalarna	Region Dalarna	www.regiondalarna.se
Sweden	Gävleborg	Tilväxt Gävleborg Länsstyrelsen	www.tillvaxtgavleborg.se
Sweden	Halland	Region Halland	www.regionhalland.se
Sweden	Jämtland	Länsstyrelsen Jämtlands län - afdelning för Regional utveckling	www.z.lst.se
Sweden	Jönköping	Regionförbundet Jönköping län	www.regionjonkoping.se
Sweden	Kalmar	Kalmar Regionförbund	www.kalmar.regionforbund.se
Sweden	Kronoberg	Länsstyrelsen i Kronobergs län, Regional Utveckling	www.g.lst.se
Sweden	Norrbottn	Länsstyrelsen i Norrbottens län, Afdelning näringsliv	www.bd.lst.se www.utvecklinginorrbotten.se
Sweden	Skåne	Region Skåne	www.skane.se
Sweden	Stockholm	Länsstyrelsen i Stockholm Län, Regional Utveckling	www.ab.lst.se
Sweden	Sörmland	Regionförbundet Sörmland	www.region.sormland.se
Sweden	Uppsala	Regionförbundet Uppsala län	www.region uppsala.se


Sweden	Värmland	Region Värmland	www.regionvarmland.se
Sweden	Västerbotten	Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten - Näringslivs avdelling	www.ac.lst.se
Sweden	Västernorrland	Länsstyrelsen Västernorrlands län, Näringslivsafdelning	www.ytillvaxt.se www.y.lst.se
Sweden	Västmanland	Länsstyrelsen i Västmanlands län, Näringslivsenheten	www.u.lst.se
Sweden	Västra Götaland	Västra Götalandsregionen	www.vgregion.se
Sweden	Örebro	Regionförbundet Örebro län	www.regionorebro.se www.orebrolan.se
Sweden	Östergötland	Regionförbundet Östsam	www.ostsam.se
UK	East Midlands	East Midlands Development Agency	www.emda.org.uk
UK	East of England	East of England development agency	www.eeda.org.uk
UK	London	London development agency	www.lda.gov.uk
UK	North East England	One North East development agency	www.onenortheast.co.uk
UK	North West	North West Regional development Agency	www.nwda.co.uk
UK	Northern Ireland	Invest Northern Ireland	www.investni.com
UK	Scotland	Scottish Enterprise	www.scottish-enterprise.com
UK	South East of England	South East England Development agency	www.seeda.co.uk
UK	South West of England	South West of England Regional development agency	www.southwestrda.org.uk
UK	Wales	Welsh Assemlby government, department of enterprise, innovation and network	www.new.wales.gov.uk
UK	West Midlands	Advantage West Midlands	www.advantagewm.co.uk
UK	Yorkshire-Humber	Yorkshire Forward	www.yorkshire-forward.com






8. Appendix 2: Figuring out policy patterns



Figures A1-A5: RDA sponsorship patterns. Number of organisations (N = 178). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.






- A1: Sponsorship and economic profile (west)
- A2: Sponsorship and economic profile (CEE)
- A3: Sponsorship and regional governance
- A4: Sponsorship and national designation
- A5: Sponsorship and member states










Figures A11-A15: Institutional target patterns. Number of organisations (N = 692). Source: RDA survey 2007 database.

- A11: Institutional targets and economic profile (west)
- A12: Institutional targets and economic profile (CEE)
- A13: Institutional targets and regional governance
- A14: Institutional targets and national designation
- A15: Institutional targets and member states




Figures A16-A20: Capacity target patterns. Number of organisations (N = 692). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

- A16: Capacity targets and economic profile (west)
- A17: Capacity targets and economic profile (CEE)
- A18: Capacity targets and regional governance
- A19: Capacity targets and national designation
- A20: Capacity targets and member states



Figures A21-A25: Policy resource patterns.
 Number of organisations (N = 692). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.


A21: Policy resources and economic profile (west)
 A22: Policy resources and economic profile (CEE)
 A23: Policy resources and regional governance
 A24: Policy resources and national designation
 A25: Policy resources and member states



Figures A26-A30: Knowledge type patterns. Number of organisations (N = 691). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

- A26: Knowledge types and economic profile (west)
- A27: Knowledge types and economic profile (CEE)
- A28: Knowledge types and regional governance
- A29: Knowledge types and national designation
- A30: Knowledge types and member states

9. Appendix 3: European and regional survey results compared



		<i>Regional</i>	<i>Central</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Multi</i>
GE	<i>Baden-Württemberg</i>	•••		••	•••••
GE	<i>Bayern</i>	•••••	••		••
GE	<i>Niedersachsen</i>	•••	••		•••
GE	<i>Nordrhein-Westphalen</i>	•••		••	•••
DK	<i>Bornholm</i>		•••		•••
DK	<i>Nordjylland</i>		•••	•••	•••
ES	<i>Catalonia</i>	•••••	••		•••
FR	<i>Aquitaine</i>	••	••		•••••
NL	<i>Gelderland</i>		••		•••••
SE	<i>Skåne</i>	•••			•••
SE	<i>Västra Götaland</i>	•••		•••	•••
UK	<i>West Midlands</i>		•••••	••	•••

Figure A38: European and regional survey results compared: Sponsorship. Relative prominence of characteristics within regions (red dots for European survey, blue dots for regional survey).
Source: RDA survey 2007 database.

		<i>Persons</i>	<i>Organisations</i>	<i>System</i>
GE	<i>Baden-Württemberg</i>	••	•••••	••
GE	<i>Bayern</i>	•	•••••	••
GE	<i>Niedersachsen</i>		•••••	••
GE	<i>Nordrhein-Westphalen</i>	••	•••••	•
DK	<i>Bornholm</i>	•••	•••••	••
DK	<i>Nordjylland</i>	•••	•••••	
ES	<i>Catalonia</i>	•••	•••••	•••
FR	<i>Aquitaine</i>	•	•••••	•••
NL	<i>Gelderland</i>	•	•••••	•••
SE	<i>Skåne</i>	•••••	•••••	••
SE	<i>Västra Götaland</i>	••••	•••••	•
UK	<i>West Midlands</i>	•••	•••••	••

Figure A39: European and regional survey results compared: Target institutions. Relative prominence of characteristics within regions (red dots for European survey, blue dots for regional survey).
Source: RDA survey 2007 database.

		<i>Hardware</i>	<i>Software</i>	<i>Orgware</i>
GE	<i>Baden-Württemberg</i>	••••	••••	••••
GE	<i>Bayern</i>	•••••	•••••	••
GE	<i>Niedersachsen</i>	•••••	•••••	•••
GE	<i>Nordrhein-Westphalen</i>	•••	•••••	••
DK	<i>Bornholm</i>	••	•••••	•••
DK	<i>Nordjylland</i>	•	•••••	••••
ES	<i>Catalonia</i>	•	•••••	•••••
FR	<i>Aquitaine</i>	•••	••••	•••••
NL	<i>Gelderland</i>	•••••	••	•••••
SE	<i>Skåne</i>	•	•••••	•••••
SE	<i>Västra Götaland</i>	••••	••	•••••
UK	<i>West Midlands</i>	•••••	•••••	••

Figure A40: European and regional survey results compared: Target capabilities. Relative prominence of characteristics within regions (red dots for European survey, blue dots for regional survey).
Source: RDA survey 2007 database.

		Authority	Finance	Information	Organisation
GE	Baden-Württemberg		•••	••••••	••••
GE	Bayern		••••	••••••	•••
GE	Niedersachsen		••	••••••	••••••
GE	Nordrhein-Westfalen		•••	••••••	••••••
DK	Bornholm	•	•••	••••••	•••
DK	Nordjylland		•	••••••	••••••
ES	Catalonia		•••	••••••	••••
FR	Aquitaine		•••	••••••	•••
NL	Gelderland	•	••••••	••••	••••••
SE	Skåne	•	••••••	••••••	••
SE	Västra Götaland	•	••••••	••••••	•••
UK	West Midlands	•	••••••	••••••	•

Figure A41: European and regional survey results compared: Policy resources. Relative prominence of characteristics within regions (red dots for European survey, blue dots for regional survey). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

		Mandatory	Conditional	Unconditional
GE	Baden-Württemberg		••••••	••••
GE	Bayern		••••••	••••
GE	Niedersachsen	•••	•••	••••
GE	Nordrhein-Westfalen		••••••	••••••
DK	Bornholm		••••••	••••
DK	Nordjylland		••~•••	••~•••
ES	Catalonia		••~•••	••~•••
FR	Aquitaine		••~•••	••~•••
NL	Gelderland		••~•••	••~•••
SE	Skåne		••~•••	••~•••
SE	Västra Götaland		••~•••	••
UK	West Midlands		••~•••	••

Figure A42: European and regional survey results compared: Policy rules. Relative prominence of characteristics within regions (red dots for European survey, blue dots for regional survey). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

		Analytic	Synthetic	Symbolic
GE	Baden-Württemberg	••	••~•••	•
GE	Bayern	•••	••~•••	•
GE	Niedersachsen	•	••~•••	••
GE	Nordrhein-Westfalen		••~•••	•••
DK	Bornholm	•	••~•••	•••
DK	Nordjylland		••~•••	
ES	Catalonia	•	••~•••	•••
FR	Aquitaine	••	••~•••	•
NL	Gelderland	•	••~•••	•
SE	Skåne	••	••~•••	••
SE	Västra Götaland	••	••~•••	••
UK	West Midlands	••	••~•••	••

Figure A43: European and regional survey results compared: Knowledge types. Relative prominence of characteristics within regions (red dots for European survey, blue dots for regional survey). *Source:* RDA survey 2007 database.

		<i>Exploration</i>	<i>Examination</i>	<i>Exploitation</i>
<i>GE</i>	<i>Baden-Württemberg</i>	•••	•••	•••••
<i>GE</i>	<i>Bayern</i>	••		•••••
<i>GE</i>	<i>Niedersachsen</i>	•	•••	•••••
<i>GE</i>	<i>Nordrhein-Westphalen</i>		••	•••••
<i>DK</i>	<i>Bornholm</i>	•	••	•••••
<i>DK</i>	<i>Nordjylland</i>			•••••
<i>ES</i>	<i>Catalonia</i>	••	••	•••••
<i>FR</i>	<i>Aquitaine</i>	•••	•••	•••••
<i>NL</i>	<i>Gelderland</i>	••	•••	•••••
<i>SE</i>	<i>Skåne</i>	•••	•••	•••••
<i>SE</i>	<i>Västra Götaland</i>	••	•••	•••••
<i>UK</i>	<i>West Midlands</i>	••	•••	•••••

Figure A44: European and regional survey results compared: Knowledge moments. Relative prominence of characteristics within regions (red dots for European survey, blue dots for regional survey).
Source: RDA survey 2007 database.

10. Appendix 4: RDA policies and WP8 hypotheses

Hypothesis	RDA survey conclusions
Limited policy attention accorded to symbolic forms of knowledge	Partly supported, as synthetic knowledge still predominates. The most important involvement of symbolic knowledge is related to its use in connection with general place marketing initiatives (promotion of inward investment) while examination or production of new symbolic knowledge is virtually absent.
Limited policy attention accorded to the consumption side of economic knowledge processes	Confirmed, cf. the previous hypothesis.
Limited policy attention accorded to supporting combinatorial knowledge processes	Difficult to assess on the basis of the survey, but should be possible to illuminate on the basis of the seven WP8 Intermediate Reports.
Limited policy attention accorded to supporting extra-regional knowledge processes	Difficult to assess on the basis of the survey, but should be possible to illuminate on the basis of the seven WP8 Intermediate Reports.
An increasing importance of knowledge-intensive policy instruments	Confirmed to constitute the majority of current RDA policies, but trend in comparison with early 1990s less certain. The apparent lack of growth among RDA policies may reflect new divisions of labour between development organisations, if RDAs have become more prominent as policy organisations, then a relative growth in the role of knowledge-intensive policies will also have taken place.
The increasingly multi-level nature of policy-design and implementation	Confirmed.
The growing role of private KIBS (and freelancing academics) in policy design and implementation	Difficult to assess on the basis of the survey, but should be possible to illuminate on the basis of the seven WP8 Intermediate Reports.
The self-proclaimed gender-neutrality of most policies	Clearly evident: for more than 70 per cent of organisations surveyed no gender strategy has been identified, while mainstreaming (Sweden) or separate initiatives (UK, Ireland) prevail in only two member states.
Evidence-based policy-making is of increasing importance	Difficult to assess on the basis of the survey, but should be possible to illuminate on the basis of the seven WP8 Intermediate Reports.
Growing importance of regulatory pressure as creator of knowledge-intensive demand	Difficult to assess on the basis of the survey, but should be possible to illuminate on the basis of the seven WP8 Intermediate Reports.

References

- Asheim, B. and L. Coenen (2005). "Knowledge Bases and Regional Innovation Systems: Comparing Nordic Clusters." Research Policy **34**(8): 1173-90.
- Asheim, B., L. Coenen, et al. (2007). "Face-to-Face, Buzz and Knowledge Bases: Socio-spatial Implications for Learning, Innovation and Innovation Policy." Environment & Planning C: Government and Policy **25**: 655-70.
- Bachtler, J. (1997). New Dimensions of Regional Policy in Western Europe. The Political Economy of Regionalism. M. Keating and J. Loughlin. London, Frank Cass: 77-89.
- Bachtler, J. and S. Taylor (1997). EU Regional Development Strategies: Comparisons and Contrasts Among Objective 2 Programmes. The Coherence of EU Regional Policy. Contrasting Perspectives on the Structural Funds. J. Bachtler and I. e. Turok. London, Jessical Kingsley: 219-45.
- Bachtler, J. and I. Turok, Eds. (1997). The Coherence of EU Policy. Contrasting Perspectives on the Structural Funds. London, Jessica Kingsley Press.
- Bachtler, J. and C. Wren (2006). "Special Issue: The Evaluation of EU Cohesion Policy." Regional Studies **40**(2).
- Bachtler, J. and D. Yuill (2007). "Regional Policy in Western Europe: Taking Stock of the Shift in Paradigm." RUFIS Beiträge zur Ballungsraumforschung **2007**(10).
- Benneworth, P. (2001). Regional Development Agencies - The Early Years. Seaford, RSA.
- Carrincazeaux, C., F. Gaschet, et al. (2007). Typology of European regions - Final report. Birmingham, EURODITE, CURS, University of Birmingham.
- Cooke, P. (2005). Proximities, Knowledges and Innovation Biographies. RSA International Conference. Aalborg.
- Cooke, P. and K. Morgan (1993). "The Network Paradigm: New Departures in Corporate and Regional Development." Environment & Planning D **11**: 543-64.
- Downes, R. (2000). EU and National Regional Policies in Austria. Governance, Institutional Change and Regional Development. M. e. a. e. Danson. Aldershot, Ashgate: 246-65.
- Dunleavy, P. (1989). "The Architecture of the British Central State. Part I: Framework for Analysis." Public Administration **67**: 249-75.
- EURADA (1995). Reflections on the Creation, Development and Management of RDAs. Brussels, EURADA.
- Florida, R. (1995). "Towards the Learning Region." Futures **27**: 527-36.
- Halkier, H. (2006). Institutions, Discourse and Regional Development. The Scottish Development Agency and the Politics of Regional Policy. Brussels, PIE Peter Lang.
- Halkier, H. (2008). Regional Development Policies and Structural Reform in Denmark. From Policy Segmentation towards Strategic Synergy? Towards New Nordic Regionalism. Politics, Administration and Regional Development. O. Bukve, H. Halkier and P. d. Souza. Aalborg, Aalborg University Press: 201-25.
- Halkier, H. (2009). Knowledge typologies - A Brief note on knowledge types. Aalborg: 4.
- Halkier, H. and M. Danson (1997). "Regional Development Agencies in Europe: A Survey of Key Characteristics and Trends." European Urban and Regional Studies **4**(3): 243-56.
- Hassink, R. (2001). "The Learning Region: A Fuzzy Concept or a Sound Theoretical Basis for Modern Regional Innovation Policies?" Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie **45**(3-4): 219-30.
- Hassink, R. (2005). "How to Unlock Regional Economies from Path Dependency? From Learning Region to Learning Cluster." European Planning Studies **13**(4): 521-35.

- Hooghe, L. and M. Keating (1994). "The Politics of European Union Regional Policy." Journal of European Public Policy **1**(3): 369-92.
- Hooghe, L., G. Marks, et al. (2008). "Regional Authority in 42 Countries, 1950-2006: A Measure and Five Hypotheses." Regional & Federal Studies **18**(2-3).
- Hudson, R. e. a. (1997). "Developing Regional Strategies for Economic Success: Lessons from Europe's Economically Successful Regions." European Urban and Regional Studies **4**(4): 365-73.
- Lagendijk, A. (2000). Learning in Non-core Regions: Towards "Intelligent Clusters" Addressing Business and Regional Needs. Learning Regions: Theory, Policy and Practice. R. Rutten. London, Edward Elgar. **90**.
- MacLeod, G. (2000). "The Learning Region in an Age of Austerity: Capitalising on Knowledge, Entrepreneurialism, and Reflexive Capitalism." Geoforum **31**(2): 219-36.
- Markusen, A. (1999). "Fuzzy Concepts, Scanty Evidence, Policy Distance: The Case for Rigour and Policy Relevance in Critical Regional Studies." Regional Studies **33**(9): 869-84.
- Morgan, K. (1997). "The Learning Region: Institutions, Innovation and Regional Renewal." Regional Studies **31**(5): 491-504.
- Nauwelaers, C. (2001). Path-dependency and the Role of Institutions in Cluster Policy Generation. Cluster Policies - Cluster Development. Å. e. Mariussen. Stockholm, Nordregio: 93-108.
- Rutten, R. and F. Boekema, Eds. (2007). The Learning Region. Foundations, State-of-the Art, Future. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- Svensson, B. and A. Östholl (2002). "From Government to Governance: Regional Partnerships in Sweden." Regional & Federal Studies **11**(2): 25-42.
- Windhoff-Héritier, A. (1987). Policy-Analyse - Eine Einführung. Frankfurt, Campus.
- Wishlade, F. G. (2008). "Competition and Cohesion - Coherence or Conflict? European Union Regional State Aid Reform Post-2006." Regional Studies **42**(5): 753-65.
- Wren, C. (1996). "Grant Equivalent Expenditure on Industrial Subsidies in the Post-War UK." Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics **58**(2): 317-53.
- Yuill, D., Ed. (1982). Regional Development Agencies in Europe. Aldershot, Gower.
- Yuill et al. (1981-99). European Regional Incentives, 1981-99. London, Bowker-Saur.