

# **ESPON 2013 PROGRAMME**

## **PROJECT 2013/2/1**

**“The Case for Agglomeration Economies in Europe / CAEE”**

**Contract 024/2009**

### **Inception report**

Prepared by the **Lead Partner** (Institute for Political and Economic Governance, University of Manchester, UK), with assistance from the **Project Partners** (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain, Ecole Normale Supérieure Lettres Sciences Humaines, Lyon, France, and the National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis, National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Republic of Ireland)

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. The research context</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. The research programme</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. Timetable, outputs and dissemination</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>21</b>

## 1. Introduction

The CAEE study forms part of the ESPON 20013 programme that is devoted to ‘targeted analyses’ and falls under category (2), ‘targeted analyses based on user demand’. The user demand, in this instance, came from four key policy-making and delivery bodies based in Manchester (UK), Barcelona (Spain), Dublin (Republic of Ireland) and Lyon (France) which, under the leadership of the Commission for the New Economy in Greater Manchester (formerly Manchester Enterprises), were interested in exploring the impact of agglomeration economies within and beyond the territories they cover and the extent to which the beneficial impacts of recent patterns of agglomeration have been shaped, and might be managed more effectively, by public policies and programmes. The attraction of developing this project within the ESPON framework was that it offered the possibility of using and supplementing the valuable, European ‘big picture’ work undertaken for previous ESPON programmes with additional, user-focused research – in this case specific, detailed, comparative and contextualised case study-based analysis - in a way that provides a basis for the practical assessment and development of strategic policy options.

The users, in co-operation with ESPON, established a challenging brief that was intended to promote the achievement of a number of key objectives, namely:

- To provide an understanding of the sources of agglomeration within the four nominated case study areas, and outline whether there is a policy role for influencing agglomeration economies
- To provide a comparative analysis of agglomeration, including both potential economies and diseconomies, across the case study areas, and
- To develop strategic policy options which ensure that ‘hot spot’/agglomeration growth spill(s) over to benefit the wider regional economy, drawing as appropriate upon lessons from the success and failures of past policy responses

and looking at policy options in light of governance arrangements in the target areas and how this has helped or could potentially help future growth,

It was expected that, in addressing these challenges, the CAEE project could serve the broader purposes of the ESPON programme by:

- Providing added value to specific types of territories (in this case ‘urban’) by offering new comparative insight and understanding on territorial potentials and challenges from a European perspective, and
- Ensuring that similar types of territories/regions can benefit from the output of the analysis.

In the CAEE study partners’ initial proposal, set out in Part B of the application, we argued that a number of open questions lay implicit within the study’s objectives, paramount among which were whether:

- There is clarity about what the term ‘agglomeration’ means and how it and its effects can be measured,
- It is possible to assemble consistent, cross-national evidence on agglomeration economies and diseconomies which can (a) put the case study areas into a broader, European context and (b) identify the ‘sources’ of agglomeration within these areas,
- It is possible not only to identify ‘past policy responses’ to agglomeration processes but also to judge whether they have broadly failed or succeeded,
- It is possible to specify particular policy levers, at various levels within governmental systems, that can be pulled in future in order to maximise the

benign effects of agglomeration and encourage spill-over effects in neighbouring areas,

- It is possible to judge the effect that governance arrangements in the target areas, and not just policy choices, have on spatial economic performance, and
- It is possible, on the basis of case study observations, to set out practical policy and governance implications that can be taken up in other (national) contexts.

Rather than assuming the answers to these questions to be self-evident, we argued that they needed to be addressed directly by the study team through the research process. In order to do that, we argued, the research design needed to have the characteristics identified in the specification – i.e. a review of empirical evidence produced by ESPON and other relevant sources plus bespoke analysis of the four case study areas, delivered to a common format – but it also needed to undertake some vital conceptual development and methodological design work in order to subject these questions to critical scrutiny and ensure that the results were able to inform the empirical elements of the research programme and, ultimately, the practical outputs the project is able to deliver.

Our concern in unpacking the study brief in this way was to make clear, from the outset, that significant challenges are involved in operationalising the rather imprecise notion of agglomeration and in linking it to an equally important but nebulous concept; that of governance, and especially the forms of ‘city-regional governance’ that the user group was clearly interested in. We argued that the research needed to identify the inter-relationships between these two concepts and exemplify how they work, in practice, in the case study areas, if it were to produce realistic proposals about strategic policy options which may have some traction within the case study areas and, especially, outside of the local, regional and/or national contexts in which they operate.

In this inception report, we put the key questions and objectives identified for the study into the context provided by the ‘state of the art’ in terms of existing knowledge about the relationship between agglomeration economics and city-regional governance. We go on to clarify the methodological approach that will be used for the study and describe how the scientific advancements we consider necessary will enable a sharper focus on policy development to be developed and deployed. As part of this, we elaborate upon the issue of data availability and how the study proposes to tackle data identification and data gathering tasks. The report ends by setting out a comprehensive timetable of activities and outputs and describes how they fit with the planned meetings of the research group and the stakeholder consortium and relate to the dissemination of emerging and final findings from the study.

## **2. The research context**

In the 1970s and ‘80s, when the impact of the major advances in information technology that have reshaped the way we live and transact business were just beginning to be felt, it was often argued that one of the long-term implications of the shift to a knowledge-driven economy would be the ‘death’ of cities as we have known them. Once we no longer ‘needed’ to live, work or locate our businesses in cities, so the story went, we would happily desert them in ever-larger numbers and use the possibilities opened up by new technologies to work flexibly and remotely, out of locations of our own choosing, thereby escaping the diseconomies of agglomeration that go with urban life – high housing costs, overcrowding, traffic congestion, environmental degradation, crime and so on. This prognosis fitted well with many of the pessimistic accounts of the performance and prospects of cities that had come to dominate much of the ‘urban’ literature, especially in the Anglo-American tradition (see Storper and Manville, 2006, for a review), with its talk of urban ‘decline’, ‘decay’ and ‘poverty’, of cities as ‘sick’, ‘dispossessed’ and ‘desolate’ and of cities that were ‘in trouble’, ‘at risk’ or ‘under siege’.

Within a relatively short space of time, however, a combination of the productive forces unleashed by technological change and the steady liberalisation of financial regulation that triggered an acceleration in globalising processes began to produce a radically different urban narrative in which cities were once again identified as key sources of economic dynamism. The pioneering work of Sassen (1991), in particular, pointed to the emergence of a small number of ‘global cities’ that acted as key command and control centres within an increasingly globalized economy. In some ways, the evidence of urban resurgence set out by the likes of Sassen were the polar opposite of those that saw technological change and globalization as leading inevitably to attenuated urban decline. On closer inspection, however, Sassen, too, was somewhat pessimistic about the trends she described.

On one hand, her initial analysis was silent about the huge numbers of urban areas, large and small, that were not connected to global flows of money, goods, people, information and ideas to the same extent as the Tokyos, New Yorks and Londons of the world. On the other, she saw the rise of global cities as leading to intense polarisation within the urban labour market in which the needs of a new, highly skilled and well-rewarded urban information elite would be serviced by an insecure and increasingly impoverished army of workers within consumer service industries. She also argued (rather than demonstrated) that global cities were increasingly more connected with others like themselves rather than with their immediate hinterlands and therefore that the agglomeration benefits that have traditionally been associated with urban economic growth were dwindling in the information age.

What was missing from both sets of accounts, in broad terms, was an appreciation of the importance of *city-regions*, rather than cities *per se*, and the need to think about patterns of urban decline or growth within a wider spatial context. Thus, traditional accounts of urban ‘decline’ tended to present the outflow of people (often in the form of suburbanisation) and firms (often through the decentralisation of economic activity to areas in the wider city-region) as destructive for administratively-defined ‘cities’ rather than productive for the city-regions of which the core city formed only a part.

Sassen, similarly, chose to emphasise polarisation within ‘cities’ rather than the positive impacts that growing urban productivity had in terms of the wealth of city-regions and their inhabitants and the expansion of aggregate city-regional economic activity that could be caused by the decentralisation of jobs in lower value activities from high cost urban cores.

Whilst Sassen’s later writings have begun to take the potential for positive economic interactions within ‘mega-regions’ much more seriously (see, e.g., Sassen, 2007), neither account did justice to the relationship between agglomeration economies and the development and welfare of city-regions. Indeed, it could be argued that had ‘urban’ academics analysed patterns of spatial economic change on the basis of the experiences of, and within, city-regional ‘units’ rather earlier than they did, we would have had a much more sophisticated and powerful understanding of the costs and benefits of urban economic change that could have been employed rather more quickly within policy debates and policy development processes.

Since the early 1990s, the gap in our knowledge about the costs and benefits of agglomeration economies for and within city-regions has begun to be filled in a number of partial ways. Empirically, it has been demonstrated that the growth in global economic capacity and trade that has occurred in the interim period has been associated with urban renaissance within the developed world as well as rapid urbanisation in the developing world. In general terms, the information economy has been found to be more ‘urban’ than its late industrial predecessor, not least because information-rich economic activity is less tied to particular places by the need to have ready access to raw materials, sources of energy, goods transportation networks, extensive supplies of land and so on (Harding, 2007).

This evidence led Scott and Storper (2003), for example, to argue that:

City-regions are locomotives of the national economies within which they are situated, in that they are the sites of dense masses of interrelated economic activities that also typically have

high levels of productivity by reason of their jointly-generated agglomeration economies and their innovative potentials

Veltz (2005), similarly, offered the view that:

Metropolitan spaces are becoming, more and more, the adequate ecosystems of advanced technology and economy.... [T]he decrease of communication costs does not by itself lead to a spreading and diffusion of wealth and power; on the contrary, it entails their polarization.

Urban experiences of positive economic change have nonetheless proven patchy, depending upon a variety of factors which have been argued to include the nature and diversity of historic economic specialisms, the density of urban labour markets and the advantages that rich labour pools offer to firms, workers and households, degrees of physical and virtual connectivity, environmental quality, cultural diversity, quality of life and urban 'buzz'. In the process, urban hierarchies have become 'stretched' and the gap in economic performance between cities/city-regions has grown.

The search for explanations for differential patterns of urban-regional development has advanced along two broad fronts. On one hand, a new generation of spatial economists have taken inspiration from the so-called 'new economic geography' (see, e.g., Krugman, 1991a & b; Fujita *et. al.*, 1999; Fujita and Thisse, 2002; Baldwin *et. al.*, 2003) and begun to develop econometric approaches to understanding (a) the geography of economic change and the agglomeration processes that underlie them, and (b) the factors that are associated with different levels of city-regional productivity. On the other, a number of more critical commentators, writing from a governance perspective, have pointed to the emergence of forms of city-regional governance as a way of managing the implications of uneven spatial development more effectively, from particular perspectives, either through the creation of city-regional institutions, the development of city-regional partnerships or changes in the incentive structures operated by higher levels of government (national, regional) in order to promote city-regional strategies (see, e.g. Brenner, 2004; Ward and Jonas, 2007; Harding, 2007b).



As yet, however, there have been few attempts to bring together understandings of the economics of city-regions and the politics and administration of city-regionalism. A series of papers by the urban economist Paul Cheshire (see, e.g., Cheshire, 1996; Cheshire and Magrini, 2002) have demonstrated some correlation between the existence of a unit of governance at the city-regional or metropolitan scale and some core indicators of superior economic performance but have revealed little about the way in which the powers, resources and activities of these units have contributed to spatial productivity. In order to uncover causal connections between city-regional/metropolitan governance and the management of agglomeration economies, it is necessary to go one step further and identify the ways in which these powers, resources and activities shape spatial economic activity. This is the principal challenge faced by the CAEE project.

### **3. The research programme**

Agglomeration processes are not, nor are they seen as, neutral. They produce, and are seen to produce, winner and losers, in relative if not also in absolute terms, both between and within city-regions. Hence the way in which public policies respond to the actual or perceived benefits and costs of agglomeration is dependent not just upon scientific observation but partly upon the geographical scale at which any cost-benefit analysis might be undertaken, and partly upon the way certain scales or particular types of cost and benefit become recognised, politically, as important. In other words, agglomeration processes and the spatial effects that flow from them, whilst they result from a myriad of choices taken by individual households and firms, are also shaped by public policy and spending decisions. The challenge, for the CAEE research programme, is to understand the geography of agglomeration processes better and to work back from this understanding in order to appreciate how public policy choices have influenced them and may do so in future. Consistent with the arguments set out above, the hypothesis that will guide the CAEE work is that the effective management of agglomeration processes for a variety of social, economic

and environmental ends will depend upon the degree of autonomy possessed by city-regional institutions and governance arrangements.

In using these terms, we do not assume any cross-national similarity in the institutional structures that provide, and in most cases have been specifically developed to provide, greater policy integration and coherence at the city-regional scale. Indeed, our existing knowledge of the case study areas, allied with an awareness of the national institutional and policy contexts in which they operate, is sufficient to suggest that patterns of institutional change and the restructuring of governance arrangements take very different forms, over time and between places.

Our approach to testing the relationship between agglomeration processes and city-regional autonomy is built upon the observation that it is possible to provide a review which builds upon previous ESPON and related work, puts the development of the case study areas into a wider perspective and assesses the extent to which policy choices have affected city-regional development patterns. In order to fully realise the ambitious objectives set out in the project specification, though, it is necessary to provide a firm conceptual and methodological platform that can enable the research team to test some of the key implicit assumptions that underlie the research brief. The advantage of this approach, we argue, is that it improves the project's chances of informing feasible strategic policy options for the future, so long as each stage of the research programme is developed with a high degree of co-operation and interaction between the research team and Steering Committee members.

Based upon these considerations, the CAEE team proposed a modified set of achievable objectives for the study which might therefore be summarised as follows:

- To clarify how agglomeration effects can be measured, in principle, using the data available to the research team and, if feasible, to apply a common measurement methodology across each of the case study areas,

- To derive some measures of city-regional autonomy with which to compare governance arrangements in and for the case study areas and to determine, from the application of these to the case study observations, the extent to which city-regional policy choices have affected and can feasibly affect the nature and pattern of agglomeration economies,
- Building on the above, to provide an understanding of the sources of agglomeration within the four nominated case study areas, and to assess whether there is a policy role for influencing agglomeration economies, and if so for whom
- To provide a comparative analysis of agglomeration, including both potential economies and diseconomies, across the case study areas, and
- To propose potential strategic policy options, to be developed iteratively with Steering Committee members, which might, for example, encourage ‘hot spot’/agglomeration growth to spill over to the wider regional economy, and
- Drawing as appropriate upon lessons from past policy initiatives, to assess the extent to which governance arrangements in and for the target areas have enabled (or constrained) city-regional development in the past and are likely to do so in the future.

In order to satisfy these objectives, we propose a set of interlinked and cumulative research activities. These are explained below, grouped into a number of work packages.

Work package 1: Review of European spatial economic change.

This work package focuses upon interrogating and extracting the key messages from existing ESPON applied research and other relevant cross-national and national

studies identified by research team members. It concentrates mainly upon putting the development of the case study areas into a broader spatial perspective by identifying the way in which key indicators of economic and related change have evolved over similar time periods. Care is needed, in completing the review, to ensure that the geographical units employed for the purposes of the analysis are consistent with the purposes of the study. The review will not assess agglomeration effects directly, given that the standard data sources which can be used for Europe-wide comparative analysis are relatively crude. It will, however, provide an indication of the extent to which spatial economic performance is related to population size and employment density and be useful in ‘benchmarking’ the case study areas against other comparators.

The review is the responsibility of an economist drawn from the Lead Partner for the project, advised by the leader of Partner 2 who has significant experience of working with ESPON. It will be carried out in close co-operation with the ESPON 2013 database project and the “Future Orientations of Cities” (FOCI) study.

Data issues: Because of the reliance upon NUTS classifications, the review will be based primarily upon data relating to demography, employment, income and GDP/GVA that are available at NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 scales.

#### Work Package 2: Conceptual/methodological review; agglomeration

This work package involves the production of a scoping paper on ‘measuring agglomeration’ which falls into two main parts. The first reviews the relevant conceptual literature on the development of the notion of agglomeration and its recent ‘rediscovery’, particularly by spatial economists. Its primary focus, however, is upon recent attempts, within the ‘new economic geography’, to estimate and map agglomeration benefits with a view to identifying the methodologies and data sources that can be applied to an analysis of the case study areas and other comparators. The primary purpose of the paper is to identify the methodological approach(es) that best

fit the purposes of the project and to outline the most feasible approach to measuring agglomeration effects within the four case study areas. Responsibility for the review rests with an economist from the Lead Partner team. Advice on the availability of data sources and the feasibility of methods will be sought from economists and other experts in quantitative economic analysis within the project partners and from members of the Steering Committee.

Data issues: This review provides a framework which will be used to identify feasible, internationally comparable datasets for the purpose of bespoke econometric analysis, to be discussed and agreed by CAEE project team and Steering Group members. The critical issue that needs to be faced is the availability of data at various scales that can be aggregated or disaggregated to agreed city-regional geographies. In agreeing a common approach to city-regional geographies, the CAEE team will explore the possibility of going beyond a NUTS-based approach and the development of comparable units for comparative purpose, built upon travel-to-work or time-distance data.

### Work Package 3: Conceptual/methodological review; city-regional governance

This work package comprises a scoping paper which briefly reviews the evidence for arguing that there is a correlation between scales of governance and spatial economic performance. The main focus, however, is on assessing the notion of ‘urban-regional autonomy’ through a critical interrogation of the conceptual literatures on central-local government relations (‘autonomy from’) and urban coalition-formation (‘autonomy to’). The aim is to specify a small number of key quantitative and qualitative indicators of city-regional autonomy which can be incorporated into and help structure the case study work. These indicators will provide one way of assessing differences in the capacities of city-regions and the assemblages of institutions and policy regimes that comprise them to influence city-regional development patterns. The review is the responsibility of a political scientist drawn from the Lead Partner team who will take advice from the other project partners and

Steering Group members on the feasibility of using different indicators to measure city-regional autonomy in the other case study areas.

Data issues: The paper will explore ways in which city-regional autonomy can be compared across the case studies and is expected to include financial indicators (budgets, finance-raising powers, both generally and with respect to particular policy areas) and indicators of different degrees of city-regional institutionalisation.

#### Work Package 4: City-regional governance and economic change

This work package is the first component of the case study analyses that will be undertaken, to a common format, across the four chosen cities/city-regions. It comprises an ‘interpretive history’, designed to review the medium to long-term evolution of city-regional governance arrangements and the extent to which they have been associated with enhancements in capacity to influence city-regional development trajectories. The effective ‘start date’ for these accounts will depend upon the point at which a concern with ‘upscaling’ city governance appeared on the agenda in the various national contexts appertaining to the case studies. They will draw mainly upon primary and secondary published sources and additional ‘grey material’ to which Steering Committee members can grant the research team access. The ‘interpretive histories’ will also provide an overarching account of economic change, drawing upon similar sources. Care will be taken to ensure that both the economic and governance analyses take into account variations within a particular city-region.

Preparation of initial interpretative accounts of the evolution of the relationship between city-regional governance reforms and processes of economic change will proceed in parallel with the conceptual/methodological reviews and be adjusted and developed in order to take account of their findings. The second stage will comprise a series of interviews with leading city-regional stakeholders in selected policy areas

designed to assess the way in which the levels of autonomy they command have been used to shape the factors that influence agglomeration effects.

Responsibility for this element of the case study analysis will rest with the individual partners, the overarching quantitative analysis generally resting with economics or related specialists and the governance aspects with political scientists. In both cases, the support of Steering Group members will be sought.

Data issues: As noted above, the first stage of the case study work will draw primarily upon published sources and grey material which will be analysed by individual case study teams. The second stage will build upon the results of the conceptual reviews and will comprise a series of semi-structured interviews with key informants, undertaken to a common format. The model provided by the recent Manchester Independent Economic Review and the baseline study that accompanied it will form the basis for determining the identification and sourcing of comparative quantitative data.

#### Work Package 5: Econometric analysis of agglomeration effects

The second part of the case study analysis will need to await the outcome of the relevant conceptual/methodological review and the advice from partners about the availability of data within, and the compatibility of data across, case study areas. Its purpose is to examine the relationship between agglomeration measures and productivity and to estimate the spill-over effects to neighbouring areas that are associated with agglomeration effects at different points in time.

The specific methodology to be used to operationalise the notion of agglomeration, empirically, is that of applied econometrics, involving time series and cross-section (and, in the best case panel data) estimation. The focus of attention will be an appropriate measure of the productivity of a city-region (or the best statistical proxy for a city-region) and its relationship to a measure of agglomeration – the population or population density of the city-region (or the best available variant such as

employment or employment density). Recent advances in the estimation of agglomeration economies have elaborated the concept of “economic mass” or “effective density” whereby it is recognized that what counts for a given area to profit from agglomeration economies likely will include the ability to draw on employment resources from surrounding districts; if this is measured it can be, indeed, as a measure of agglomeration in the first place. However defined, the theory of agglomeration economies indicates that the bilateral relationship between productivity and agglomeration should be upward-sloping in productivity-agglomeration space, and theoretical considerations provide a number of reasons for expecting this positive relationship. Agglomeration economies take the form of externalities arising from the creation of thicker labour markets where better matches are possible, knowledge interactions, specialization, the presence of public goods and the sharing of inputs and outputs. These all are reflected in measurable levels of productivity.

In order to measure the agglomeration-productivity relationship accurately it will in general be necessary to account for other factors which separately influence productivity, which can be thought of as “controls”. One of the problems to be solved along the way is how to separate these controls from the effects of agglomeration per se. For example, a candidate control might be the quality of the workforce perhaps measured in terms of educational qualifications: yet one of the effects of agglomeration and a factor in the measure of agglomeration economies is precisely that an agglomeration acts as a magnet for talent, and in this case the control is not wholly exogenous to the measure of agglomeration economies.

More generally, it will be important to review carefully the channels through which agglomeration economies are supposed to be realized; these may not be the same in every case and it is critical to be able to identify these channels if the results of the investigation are to be used to enlighten policymakers as to the key features of agglomeration economies in their regions. It is already established that



agglomeration economies vary according to the type of industrial sector under consideration; given appropriate data it may be important to explore this issue.

Responsibility for this element of work will rest with economists drawn from the Lead Partner team, supported by their counterparts amongst project partners.

Data issues: The data requirements (and availability) for an approach of the type outlined are for time series and cross-section information about city-regional productivity levels, agglomeration measures and measures of other factors which might be candidates for “control variables”. The choice of which data to use as indicators for each of these categories will be determined following our initial review of data availability and advice from the project partners.

In addition to the work packages that make up the activities phase of the programme, the CAEE project also has write-up and dissemination responsibilities which comprise three sets of inter-linked tasks: synthesis, development of policy implications, and dissemination of findings. The first two of these are described below. The third is described in the final section.

## Synthesis

Synthesis of the scientific findings of the project falls into two main parts. First, there is the synthesis of the two elements of the case studies whose main purpose is to relate the findings on agglomeration economies to those on the capacity of city-regional governance arrangements to influence the factors that are found to be most closely associated with them. Responsibility for interpreting this relationship for individual case study areas will lie primarily with the individual partners although it is accepted that the additional value of these interpretations will arise from the comparison of cases. Responsibility for the latter, and for producing the key, overarching products of the study, rests with the Lead Partner. The level of collaboration between partners that is built into the research programme will mean,

however, that all of the outputs of the project, with the exception of case study reports, will be collective pieces of work.

Data issues: the major building blocks for the synthesis will be written material produced through Work Packages 1-5, above.

#### Development of policy implications

The research team recognise that the development of policy implications is a central objective of the part of the ESPON programme within which the CAEE project falls. In recognition of the importance attached to practical benefit for users, the team will ensure that activities devoted to development of policy implications will build upon a high level of collaboration between the research team and the policy partners, as represented by Steering Committee members. The research team is confident that the scheduled meetings of the research group with the Steering Committee and the interactions between their members that will take place around the organisation and delivery of case studies will promote a high degree of interaction between researchers and practitioners but the study will also enable further formal and informal opportunities for dialogue between the research team and Steering Group members, collectively and on an individual case study basis, through sharing of work in progress, at each point in the evolution of the programme. Responsibility for this will lie principally with the co-ordinator of the Lead Partner and the individual leads for the other Project Partners. It will be especially important to ensure a high level of input from Steering Group members at the points at which the research team moves from the draft to the final report stage.

Data issues: Reporting of study findings will be written up in a simple, accessible form to ensure maximum legibility to Steering Group partners.

#### **4. Timetable, outputs and dissemination**

The project will produce a variety of written outputs, some of which are likely to be produced in a high quality format – the final report being the obvious example – and some as internal working papers which could be put into the public realm with the agreement of the Steering Committee. A number of presentations, in powerpoint form, will also be produced during the course of the project, either during the dissemination phase, when four presentations to external audiences are planned, and, during the activities phase, both for internal, progress reporting purposes and for use at meetings of the broader ESPON 2013 programme. These, too, could be made available to a wider audience with the agreement of the Steering Committee.

The principle point of external access to the available outputs of the study will be via a project website that will be developed as a self-contained sub-set of the Lead Partner's web-pages. An intranet site will also be developed to link the project partners together in 'real time' and to provide a repository for materials used by or generated through the research programme. This will be password-protected, enabling selected access to be offered to other people and organisations, as required.

The schedule of outputs for the project is as follows:

16 July, 2009. Steering Committee Meeting (Dublin)

1<sup>st</sup> drafts of scoping papers for Work Programmes 2 & 3

Initial summaries of 'interpretive histories' (Work Programme 4)

Mid-term Report: 7 December 2009

To be prepared from final draft of scoping papers plus results of overview of spatial economic change in Europe (Work Programme 1) plus plan for qualitative fieldwork

4 February 2010. Steering Committee Meeting (Barcelona)

1<sup>st</sup> draft of econometric analysis (Work Programme 5)

1<sup>st</sup> drafts of final case study reports

Plan for synthesis

Draft Final Report: 5 April 2010

6 May 2010. Steering Committee Meeting (Lyon)

Final case study reports and econometric analysis

Consideration of Steering Group feedback on draft final report

Final Report: 7 June 2010

It should be noted that this list does not include any academic outputs that might draw upon the research, for example in the form of journal articles, book chapters or papers delivered at conferences and seminars. The Lead Partner will encourage the production of academic outputs, particularly of a cross-national, collaborative nature, not least because this will deepen the level of collaboration between partner institutions and individuals and improve the quality of the analysis that can be provided to the client. Drafts of any academic outputs will be shared, pre-publication, with the Steering Committee and its members' comments reflected in final drafts. All academic outputs will acknowledge ESPON as the source of support for the research.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin, R.E., Forslid, R., Martin, P., Ottaviano, G. and Robert-Nicoud, F. (2003) *Economic Geography and Public Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Brenner, N. (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban governance and the rescaling of statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Cheshire, P. (1996) Urban economic growth in Europe: testing theory and policy prescription, *Urban Studies* 33 (6), 1111-1126
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Magrini, S. (2002) The distinctive determinants of European urban growth: does one size fit all? *LSE Papers in Environmental and Spatial Analysis* 73 (London: London School of Economics)
- Fujita, M., Krugman, P. and Venables, A. (1999) *The Spatial Economy: Cities, regions and international trade* (Cambridge, MAS: MIT Press)
- Fujita, M. and Thisse, J. (2002) *The Economics of Agglomeration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Harding, A. (2007) Globalization, spatial economic change and urban policy, in OECD *What Policies for Globalizing Cities? Rethinking the future of urban policy* (Paris: OECD), 44-74
- Krugman, P.R. (1991a) Increasing returns and economic geography, *Journal of Political Economy* 99 (3), 483-99
- Krugman, P.R. (1991b) *Geography and Trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- 
- Le Galès, P. (2002) *European Cities: Social conflicts and governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Marcuse, P. and van Kempen, R. (eds.) (2000) *Globalizing Cities: A new spatial order?* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Sassen, S. (1991) *The Global City: London, New York, Tokyo* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)

- Sassen, S. (2007) The repositioning of cities and regions in a global economy: pushing policy and governance options, in OECD *What Policies for Globalizing Cities: Rethinking the future of urban policy* (Paris: OECD), 94-125
- Scott, A.J. and Storper, M. (2003) Regions, globalization, development, *Regional Studies* 37 (6/7), 579-593
- Storper, M. and Manville, M. (2006) Behaviour, preferences and cities: urban theory and urban resurgence, *Urban Studies* 43 (8), 1247-1274
- Storper, M. and Venables, A. (2004) Buzz: face-to-face contact and the urban economy. *Paper to the Leverhulme International Symposium on the Resurgent City*, London School of Economics, April 19-21
- Veltz, P. (2004) The rationale for a resurgence in the major cities of advanced economies. *Paper to the Leverhulme International Symposium on the Resurgent City*, London School of Economics, April 19-21