

Polycentric Puzzles: Emerging Mega-City Regions Seen through the Lens of Advanced Producer Services

Hoyler, Michael; Kloosterman, Robert Christian; Sokol, Martin

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Hoyler, M., Kloosterman, R. C., & Sokol, M. (2008). Polycentric Puzzles: Emerging Mega-City Regions Seen through the Lens of Advanced Producer Services. *Regional Studies*, 42(8), 1055-1064. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400802389377>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Polycentric Puzzles: Emerging Mega-City Regions Seen through the Lens of Advanced Producer Services

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2008-0128.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	L84 - Personal and Professional Services < L8 - Industry Studies: Services < L - Industrial Organization, R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Globalization, City-Region, Polycentricity, Advanced Producer Services



1
2
3 **Polycentric Puzzles: Emerging Mega-City Regions Seen**
4
5
6 **through the Lens of Advanced Producer Services**
7

8
9 **Michael Hoyler, Robert Kloosterman and Martin Sokol**
10

11
12
13
14
15 **MH:** Department of Geography
16 Loughborough University
17 Loughborough
18 LE11 3TU
19 United Kingdom
20 Phone: 01509 222740
21 Fax: 01509 223930
22

23
24 M.Hoyler@lboro.ac.uk
25
26
27
28
29

30 **RK:** AMIDSt
31 Universiteit van Amsterdam
32 Nw. Prinsengracht 130
33 Amsterdam
34 1018 VZ
35 Netherlands
36 Phone: +31 (0) 20 525 4017
37

38 r.c.kloosterman@uva.nl
39

40 **MS:** Geography
41 Queen Mary, University of London
42 Mile End Road
43 London
44 E1 4NS
45 United Kingdom
46 Phone: +44(0) 20 7882 5400
47 Fax: +44(0) 20 8981 6276
48

49 m.sokol@qmul.ac.uk
50
51

52 **INTRODUCTION**
53
54
55
56

57 More than half of the world's population lives in cities at the beginning of the
58 twenty-first century (UNFPA, 2007). At the same time, a new type of urban
59
60

1
2
3 form, first anticipated by GOTTMANN (1961), seems to be emerging across
4 the globe (SIMMONDS and HACK, 2000). This urban form is spread out over
5 a large area, contains a number of cities more or less within commuting
6 distance, and one or more international airports that link the region with other
7 parts of the world. Instead of one dominant central business district, there
8 appear to be multiple centres, many with a strong presence of producer
9 services housed in their telltale concentrations of high-rise buildings. Due to
10 their polycentric structure, these regions tend to display criss-cross
11 commuting patterns, which often result in severe traffic congestion. The
12 emergence of such urban regions in the closing decades of the twentieth
13 century, with an intricate spatial division of labour that clearly comprises more
14 than one central city and its direct hinterland, has, inevitably, caught the
15 attention of both academics and policy-makers. Within Europe, the
16 development of large polycentric urban regions has serious implications for
17 the key EU policy issues of competitiveness, social cohesion, and
18 sustainability.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Different attempts have been made to analytically handle these extended
45 urban regions, and a number of labels have been used to denote the
46 identified new metropolitan forms (see also TAYLOR and LANG, 2004); for
47 instance, *multi-core metropolis* (HALL, 1999), *polycentric urban regions*
48 (KLOOSTERMAN and MUSTERD, 2001), *global city-regions* (SCOTT,
49 2001a), *Zwischenstadt* (SIEVERTS, 2003), *megapolitan areas* (LANG and
50 DHAVALA, 2005), *megaregions* (REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION, 2006),
51 and, as in this issue, *mega-city regions* (HALL and PAIN, 2006). These

1
2
3 different conceptualizations share the above-mentioned core characteristic of
4 *polycentricity* at the level of an urban region (a term that itself requires further
5 definition), but tend to diverge in their specific meaning and regional scope.
6
7
8
9
10 We will briefly touch upon some of these approaches in the next section.
11

12
13
14
15 In this special issue of *Regional Studies*, we bring together key results of
16 *POLYNET – Sustainable Management of European Polycentric Mega-City*
17 *Regions*, a €2.4 million research project funded by the European Regional
18 Development Fund under the INTERREG IIIB North West Europe
19 programme.¹ Over a period of three years, this study investigated the
20 anatomy and dynamics of eight North West European ‘mega-city regions’²:
21 South East England, the Paris Region, Central Belgium, the Randstad, Rhine-
22 Main, RhineRuhr, Northern Switzerland and Greater Dublin. The principal
23 project outcomes, including a full description of research methods and
24 analyses of population, employment and commuting patterns in all study
25 regions, are reported in HALL and PAIN (2006), while the contributions in
26 HALBERT *et al.* (2006) discuss the policy implications of the research findings
27 in greater depth.³ This special issue focuses in detail on the thematic core of
28 the project: the analysis of economic connections and information flows
29 generated by *advanced producer services* in eight major urban regions in
30 North West Europe. The study started from the premise that business service
31 firms offer a strategic lens to examine inter-city relations *within* larger urban
32 regions and *beyond* defined city-regional boundaries, nationally and
33 transnationally, building theoretically on SASSEN’s (1991) identification of
34 advanced producer services as crucial actors and outcomes of globalization
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and localization processes, CASTELLS' (1996) notion of a 'space of flows',
4
5 and TAYLOR's (2004) concept of a 'world city network'. However, the focus
6
7 here is on the geographies of concentration and dispersion of advanced
8
9 producer services beyond the core cities that are at the centre of much of the
10
11 world and global cities literature.
12
13
14

15
16
17 Specifically, POLYNET aimed to test the hypothesis that 'APS [advanced
18
19 producer services] knowledge flows extend beyond the global city network to
20
21 create interlinkages between other cities and towns in North West Europe at a
22
23 city regional scale, leading to a new phenomenon: the global "mega-city
24
25 region"' (HALL and PAIN, 2006, p. 14). To study the advanced producer
26
27 services / inter-city relations nexus, a multi-layered methodology was used.
28
29 This involved a range of quantitative analyses, including the study of intra-firm
30
31 office networks, to map the geographies of connectivity and flow that bind
32
33 cities together. These were complemented with qualitative methods; in
34
35 particular interviews with decision makers in advanced producer service firms,
36
37 who through their locational strategies exert considerable influence on the
38
39 spatial structure of urban regions and their integration into wider economic
40
41 networks. As a study into the relational and scalar geographies of polycentric
42
43 city-regions, the POLYNET project was a first attempt to make the often
44
45 invisible contours of mega-city regions in North West Europe visible (see also
46
47 THIERSTEIN and FÖRSTER, 2008). The research reported here therefore
48
49 aims to contribute to what SCOTT (2001a, p. xiv) called 'a deeply contentious
50
51 and urgent debate' about emerging 'global city-regions' (see also SCOTT,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 2001b) and the challenges they pose for policy-makers around the world, a

1
2
3 debate that is now in full swing (e.g. OECD, 2006; SEGBERS, 2007; DEWAR
4 and EPSTEIN, 2007; GOLDFELD, 2007; MEIJERS, 2007; LANG and KNOX,
5
6 2008).
7
8
9

10
11
12 In this introduction, we first briefly discuss key elements of the debates that
13 informed the research project and point out some unresolved gaps in our
14 understanding of polycentric city-regions. We then summarize the main
15 findings of the contributions of this issue and conclude by presenting a
16 possible agenda for future research on emerging mega-city regions.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **GLOBALIZATION, CITY-REGIONS AND POLYCENTRICITY**

30
31
32
33

34 In recent years, major developments have taken place in both theory and
35 policy debates on globalization, city-regions and polycentricity. Above all,
36 there has been a spectacular surge of interest in cities and regions and their
37 role in the global knowledge economy. This has been accompanied by
38 suggestions that the simultaneous processes of globalization and knowledge-
39 intensification of economies have produced a 'new spatial logic' (CASTELLS,
40 1989). However, key theorists have argued that within this 'new spatial logic'
41 the significance of agglomeration has *not* melted away. Quite the opposite –
42 cities and city-regions have gained new prominence.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 Thus, for CASTELLS (1989) the 'informational city' represents the emerging
59 'new spatial logic' born out of a tension between the 'space of flows' and the
60

1
2
3
4 'space of places' in the 'informational economy' or 'network society'
5
6 (CASTELLS, 1996). SASSEN (1991, p. 4) argues that 'a new type of city has
7
8 appeared' in the form of the 'global city'. Amid complex changes of the global
9
10 economy, major cities have acquired, in her view, a 'new strategic role' in
11
12 particular with regard to knowledge-intensive, advanced business services. In
13
14 turn, TAYLOR (2004) proposes that the interconnectedness of these
15
16 advanced producer services has created a 'world city network' in which cities
17
18 operate as global service centres. Both SASSEN (1991) and TAYLOR (2004)
19
20 initially focused their attention on the functional centrality of cities rather than
21
22 their wider city-regional context.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Elsewhere, however, the broader context of the region was taken into
31
32 account. CASTELLS (1989, p. 167), for instance, argues that the new spatial
33
34 logic is marked by the creation of 'multifunctional, multinuclear spatial
35
36 structures'. SCOTT (2001a, p. 1) develops a broader regional view and sees
37
38 'global city-regions' as new 'regional social formations'. These city-regions are
39
40 undergoing a major transformation due to the impact of globalization; they
41
42 perform a 'deepening role as points at which globalization processes
43
44 crystallize out on the geographical landscape' (SCOTT, 2001a, p. 7).
45
46 Furthermore, city-regions are 'active agents in shaping globalization itself'
47
48 (SCOTT, 2001a, p. 7) and can be labelled as 'basic motors' (SCOTT, 2001a,
49
50 p. 4) or 'essential spatial nodes of the global economy' (SCOTT *et al.*, 2001,
51
52 p. 11). Scott and his colleagues state that:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'most metropolitan regions in the past were focused mainly on one or
4
5 perhaps two clearly defined central cities, the city-regions of today are
6
7 becoming *increasingly polycentric* or multiclustered agglomerations'
8
9 (SCOTT *et al.*, 2001, p. 18; emphasis added).
10
11
12
13
14

15 In a similar vein, Peter Hall points to the emergence of a 'multi-core
16
17 metropolis' (HALL, 1999, p. 19). Elsewhere, he argues that contemporary
18
19 global city-regions are characterized by an extremely complex and
20
21 sophisticated internal geography that is 'quintessentially polycentric' (HALL,
22
23 2001, p. 73).
24
25
26
27
28

29 SASSEN (2001, p. 85) contends that city centres can extend into a
30
31 metropolitan area in the form of a 'grid of nodes' of intense business activity.
32
33 For her, the regional grid of nodes represents a 'reconstitution of the concept
34
35 of region' amid emerging 'new geographies of centrality (and marginality)',
36
37 although this 'grid of nodes' is clearly smaller than the wider mega-city region
38
39 (DERUDDER, 2006). More recently, SASSEN (2007, p. 60) has argued that
40
41 'the specific advantages of the megaregional scale consist of and arise from
42
43 the coexistence within one regional space of multiple types of agglomeration
44
45 economies'. According to this argument, the underlying spatial logic is not just
46
47 based on urbanization economies (advantages of scale and spatial
48
49 concentration) but also on localization economies.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 These mega-city regions then encompass two different logics of economic
59
60 organization and of global linkages (KLOOSTERMAN and LAMBREGTS,

2007). On the one hand, we find the globally linked advanced producer services highly concentrated in one city, as analysed by SASSEN and TAYLOR. The specific requirements for these 'commanding heights of capitalism' generate strong *urbanization economies* (JACOBS, 1969) and benefit, in particular, large cities. These cities constitute the higher echelons of a global network of cities, based on headquarters and other offices of transnational firms and producer services, on (international) accessibility (both physical and virtual), and on perceived quality of life. On the other hand, we find a different type of economic organization that is also very much part of the global economy. Many highly specialized, high-skilled economic activities are spatially clustered, too, but not necessarily in the primate city that houses the advanced producer services. These clusters are first and foremost dependent on more specific or *localization economies* and can, in principle, be located anywhere within a mega-city region. We find, for instance, high-quality knitwear in the Italian province of Modena, advanced automotive engineering (Porsche and Mercedes-Benz) in the German city-region of Stuttgart (COOKE and MORGAN, 1998), or world-class architectural design in Rotterdam (KLOOSTERMAN, 2008). The firms in these clusters thrive on the combination of local embeddedness (STORPER, 1997) and global pipelines (BATHELT *et al.*, 2004; CUMBERS and MACKINNON, 2004). As these clusters are to some extent dependent on the same infrastructure as advanced producer services (e.g. proximity to an international airport, ICT infrastructure) and the presence of a highly skilled labour force, and as they are, moreover, directly dependent on advanced producer services to link up with the global economy, these clusters are more likely to be found within

1
2
3 mega-city regions than outside. They may thus contribute to a specific
4 polycentric pattern, whereby different highly specialized clusters are scattered
5 within one mega-city region, with one primate city specializing in advanced
6 producer services and serving as a global gateway and node. The POLYNET
7 project, however, did not investigate these different sets of agglomeration
8 forces, nor did it focus on potential synergies in polycentric urban regions
9 (MEIJERS, 2007). We will come back to these issues below when we propose
10 a renewed research agenda.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 The view that mega-city regions are taking on a specific spatial form is gaining
25 ground. Many urbanists now seem to agree that these regions are becoming
26 increasingly multinuclear or polycentric. However, the key question is what
27 implications this may have for competitiveness and balanced spatial
28 development. Two contrasting positions can be identified. On the one hand, it
29 is hypothesized that polycentric urban regions have *potential* competitive
30 advantages over monocentric regions and that they derive considerable
31 economic strength from their polycentric structure (HALL, 1997; LAMBOOY,
32 1998; BAILEY and TUROK, 2001). On the other hand, it has been argued that
33 the 'culturally heterogeneous, polycentric, socially and spatially segmented
34 global city-region is ... a highly fragmented chess-board of uneven
35 development sprawling ever outward' (SCOTT *et al.*, 2001, p. 20), thus
36 representing a major challenge in terms of social and spatial cohesion and,
37 increasingly, also in terms of sustainability (WHEELER, 2008).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 These are precisely the issues that policy-makers are facing around the world.
4
5 Indeed, rising competitive pressures, said to emanate from combined
6
7 processes of globalization and increasing knowledge-intensity of economic
8
9 activities, accompanied by growing social and spatial inequalities, create new
10
11 policy imperatives. Policy-makers at all spatial levels are preoccupied with the
12
13 question of how to guarantee competitiveness and, at the same time, to
14
15 safeguard cohesion. This policy dilemma is perhaps most apparent in Europe,
16
17 striving to be the most competitive *and* socially inclusive knowledge economy
18
19 in the world (EUROPEAN UNION, 2000). However, amid difficulties of
20
21 achieving the above self-imposed target there is a growing realization that
22
23 city-regions may be central arenas with regard to both objectives. The
24
25 European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) is perhaps the best
26
27 example of this. The document has introduced the concept of 'balanced
28
29 competitiveness' and argued that *polycentricity* is the best tool for achieving it
30
31 at both European and city-regional levels (EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 1999).
32
33 In an interesting circle then, policy agendas and theory developments seem to
34
35 come happily together: the tendencies identified by academics are at the
36
37 same time promoted by policy-makers. However, there are several key
38
39 problematic issues with regard to 'polycentric city-regions' to which we now
40
41 turn.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 While the above theory and policy developments constitute a major shift in our
53
54 approach to spatial urban forms at the beginning of the twenty-first century,
55
56 many questions remain unanswered. Crucially, despite the proclaimed
57
58 importance of polycentric global city-regions, there are serious gaps in our
59
60

1
2
3 understanding of this phenomenon. Indeed, several interrelated challenges
4
5 need to be addressed.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 *Lack of conceptual clarity* 13 14

15
16
17 Some basic conceptual building blocks still await a thorough definition,
18 including the key terms of 'city-region' and 'polycentricity'. These are currently
19 used very loosely, indeed can be characterized as 'fuzzy concepts'
20 (MARKUSEN, 1999) that render the conceptualization of a polycentric 'global
21 city-region' rather problematic. Current definitions of polycentricity usually
22 combine morphological characteristics and functional relations, and this
23 contributes to a conflation of two analytically distinct dimensions of
24 polycentricity. The various approaches, in addition, cover a whole array of
25 causes and drivers. They can be *economic* (e.g. disintegration of value chains
26 in combination with spatial concentration of co-ordination tasks; globalization
27 versus localization); *technological* (e.g. ICT developments); *infrastructural*
28 (e.g. mass-commuting by car or public transport in combination with
29 centralized international airport or high speed train hubs); or simply
30 *demographic* (population growth and urban sprawl). In addition, analytical and
31 prescriptive or normative approaches co-exist, sometimes without a clear
32 demarcation line. There is no doubt that further conceptual work is needed to
33 clarify the meaning of 'polycentricity' in specific urban and regional contexts
34 (e.g. KLOOSTERMAN and LAMBREGTS, 2001; DAVOUDI, 2003; CATTAN,
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2005; PARR, 2004, 2005; TUROK and BAILEY, 2004; LAMBREGTS, 2006;
4
5
6 MEIJERS, 2007).

7
8
9
10
11
12
13 *Lack of detailed empirical evidence*

14
15
16
17 The absence of a clear conceptualization makes the empirical investigation
18 into polycentric city-regions a challenging task. As the different approaches
19 focus on a variety of aspects of polycentricity and their underlying causes, the
20 existing empirical evidence is at best fragmented and disjointed, as can be
21 gleaned from previous special issues of *Urban Studies* (38.4, 2001) and
22 *European Planning Studies* (6.4, 1998, 12.3, 2004). We can also observe an
23 array of methods and indicators to capture the polycentric character of
24 specific city-regions (e.g. city size rankings; commuter data; firm dynamics;
25 changes in economic profiles; telecommunication flows). There is therefore a
26 lack of *systematic* evidence on the changing internal geographies of mega-
27 city regions and the potentially synergetic effects of polycentricity (PARR,
28 2004; CHESHIRE, 2006). Equally, there is a need for a more detailed
29 understanding of functional integration of various economic activities within
30 city-regions and their interconnectedness with the global economy.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 *Problematic policy agenda*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The lack of a sound conceptual framework and the weak empirical evidence
4 make policies that promote 'polycentricity' rather problematic (KRÄTKE, 2001;
5 DAVOUDI, 2003). In particular, the implications for competitiveness and
6 cohesion remain uncertain. An example of this is a situation where the
7 promotion of polycentricity at one scale (e.g. Europe-wide) may lead to
8 increased monocentricity at another scale (e.g. nationally). Furthermore,
9 centrifugal forces that lie behind increasing polycentricity do not necessarily
10 support the kind of balanced and sustainable development that policy-makers
11 would like to see. Instead, spatially fragmented and unevenly developed
12 agglomerations may emerge (SCOTT *et al.*, 2001). Such city-regions present
13 major socio-economic, transport-related and environmental challenges.
14 Addressing these successfully may additionally be hampered by politico-
15 administrative fragmentation and a concomitant lack of strategic planning
16 capacities (HERRSCHEL and NEWMAN, 2002; HOYLER *et al.*, 2006).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **ADVANCED PRODUCER SERVICES IN NORTH WEST EUROPEAN** 42 **MEGA-CITY REGIONS** 43 44

45
46
47
48 This special issue aims to move forward the theoretical debate on large
49 polycentric urban regions on the basis of new empirical evidence from North
50 West Europe. The first two contributions provide a conceptual introduction to
51 the POLYNET study and an initial comparative quantitative analysis of
52 advanced producer service linkages that integrate the eight mega-city regions
53 into wider economic networks. This is followed by seven regional case studies
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that explore the 'mega-city region' hypothesis based on evidence gathered
4 during POLYNET and through other complementary work. Each regional case
5 study follows its own thematic and methodological perspective to develop a
6 context-specific argument for its city-region. The final paper takes a European
7 view and critically addresses the promotion of polycentricity in European
8 spatial planning.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 In the first contribution, Kathy Pain and Peter Hall outline the theoretical
21 framework of the POLYNET project. They introduce four central concepts –
22 the mega-city region, polycentricity, advanced producer services, and
23 information flows – and critically discuss the varied methodological
24 approaches undertaken to study mega-city regional processes in North West
25 Europe. Pain and Hall conclude with a brief overview of key conclusions of
26 POLYNET that set the scene for the following papers.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Peter Taylor, David Evans and Kathy Pain provide a comparative analysis of
40 functional polycentricity for the eight mega-city regions studied in POLYNET.
41 Taking their lead from the world city literature, the authors adapt TAYLOR's
42 (2001) interlocking network model, originally devised to study inter-city
43 relations at the global scale, to measure polycentricity within and beyond city-
44 regions. A key result of their study is the scale-dependency of functional
45 polycentricity. The authors identify a general decline in polycentricity with
46 increasing scale (with considerable variation between the eight mega-city
47 regions) and convincingly argue that polycentricity should not be viewed as a
48 simple singular property of a city-region.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 In the first regional case study, Michael Hoyler, Tim Freytag and Christoph
7 Mager further explore the multi-scalar polycentricities produced by business
8 services. They address the question how intra-firm linkages of advanced
9 producer service firms in Rhine-Main connect the region internally and
10 externally across multiple scales. Frankfurt's dominant position as 'first city' in
11 Rhine-Main is confirmed at all scales but is particularly pronounced at
12 national, European and global scales, where functional polycentricity is weak.
13 Despite Frankfurt's primacy at larger scales and its significant gateway role,
14 the paper identifies sector-specific complementary network patterns of
15 advanced producer services that connect the other cities of Rhine-Main to the
16 wider German economy.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Alain Thierstein, Stefan Lüthi, Christian Kruse, Simone Gabi and Lars
35 Glanzmann use evidence from both intra-firm and inter-firm networks of
36 advanced producer services to identify an emerging mega-city region in
37 Northern Switzerland, focused on the two main centres Zurich and Basel. In
38 their analysis of changing value chains in the Swiss knowledge economy, the
39 authors note an increasing concentration of highly advanced functions in a
40 few centres and a dispersion of associated functions into the wider mega-city
41 region. The authors conclude that the identified functional spaces of economic
42 interrelation that constitute the mega-city region Northern Switzerland have
43 yet to be taken seriously by policy-makers whose attention remains primarily
44 directed to the local scale.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In contrast to the Swiss case, Martin Sokol, Chris van Egeraat and Brendan Williams find little evidence for an emerging polycentric city-region Greater Dublin. Knowledge-intensive business services in Dublin remain concentrated in the metropolitan area and show no significant signs of outward diffusion into the wider city-region apart from some subordinate support functions. The authors analyse corporate strategies, labour market conditions, and the role of the state to account for the observed lack of functional polycentricity in Greater Dublin that sits uneasily with CASTELLS' (1989) concept of the 'informational city', and thus problematize the claim that a dramatically 'new spatial logic' is emerging.

Ludovic Halbert is similarly sceptical in his examination of the mega-city region hypothesis for the Paris city-region. Based on the analysis of population and employment figures and information flows measured by telephone calls between firms, he too finds little evidence for the dispersion of advanced producer services from the Ile-de-France to the wider region of the Bassin parisien. While a functional division of labour exists between Paris and the Paris city-region, the French global 'space of centrality' remains firmly located in the central metropolitan triangle marked by the western districts of Paris, La Défense, and Boulogne-Billancourt/Issy-les-Moulineaux. Halbert explains the limited regional polycentricity with reference to the strategies of real estate developers, advanced producer service firms, and the history of spatial planning policies for Paris and its wider region.

1
2
3 Examining Europe's dominant global city, London, and the South East
4 England region, Kathy Pain on the other hand uncovers a dense web of inter-
5 urban linkages that connect the 'first city' London with its extended hinterland.
6 Her analysis of interviews with senior managers in advanced producer
7 services in London and eight other urban centres in South East England
8 reveal 'intense virtual and physical flows', fuelled by London's role as global
9 hub for the creation of high value business knowledge. In contrast to other
10 regions studied in POLYNET, such as the Randstad, RheinRuhr or Rhine-
11 Main, Pain finds little evidence for sectoral specialization in the regional
12 centres outside London. The growth of advanced producer services in the
13 wider South East England region is seen as additional to growth in central
14 London rather than a result of net decentralization.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Bart Lambregts also uses evidence from corporate interviews, in the Dutch
35 Randstad, to explore in more detail the geographies of knowledge formation
36 in advanced producer services. He argues that the global players among the
37 region's business services are strongly constitutive of external knowledge
38 relations, which he sees as key to enhance regional competitiveness.
39 Lambregts explores which types of knowledge are typically acquired by
40 advanced producer service firms within the mega-city region and which types
41 may travel – notably through the firms' office networks – between city-regions
42 with relative ease. He finds that the need for operational market-related
43 knowledge ties such firms to a specific location and that some types of
44 product-related knowledge may be acquired over larger distances. The
45 polycentric layout of the Randstad and the consequent spatially dispersed
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 availability of sources from which to derive market-related information, may
4 explain why many firms service the region through several offices rather than
5 through one.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Wolfgang Knapp and Peter Schmitt examine the notion of a mega-city region
13 RhineRuhr within the new metropolitan policy discourse in Germany. They
14 observe a process of re-scaling that promotes a number of 'European
15 Metropolitan Regions' as engines of economic growth in Germany's
16 polycentric urban system. The cities in RhineRuhr, the POLYNET region with
17 the highest degree of functional polycentricity at all scales, are characterized
18 by a high degree of sectoral division of labour and functional specialization.
19 However, political cooperation in the region is hindered by a lack of a shared
20 regional vision and continued competitive localism.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 Christian Vandermotten, Ludovic Halbert, Marcel Roelandts and Pierre Cornut
37 conclude this special issue with a critical engagement with *polycentrism*, the
38 normative promotion of greater polycentricity in the European urban system
39 that aims to achieve both competitive growth and sustainable balanced spatial
40 development. The authors provide a theoretical and methodological critique of
41 the ESPON 1.1.1 study on polycentric development in Europe (ESPON, 2005)
42 and question the assumptions that underlie many EU policy documents that
43 explicitly advocate polycentricity (e.g. the ESDP).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57
58 The various contributions to this issue show that the mega-city region is not
59 merely a theoretical construct but, in some cases, can indeed be identified in
60

1
2
3 social reality. There is, however, considerable variation between the different
4 regions, which defies easy generalization by researchers and policy-makers.
5
6
7
8 These differences can be attributed to several factors:
9

10
11
12 First, there is the effect of the morphology of a specific urban system or, in
13 other words, the sunk-costs of the built environment and its associated social
14 structures, which mould and shape the impact of globalization/localization and
15 concentration/deconcentration. The urban systems in, for instance, the Dutch
16 Randstad and German RhineRuhr, have a very different morphological make-
17 up compared to the ones of Paris and London. The historical legacy of
18 concentration and accumulation in national urban systems with its associated
19 particular population distribution, infrastructural networks, governance
20 structures and national planning arrangements impinge on the locational
21 decisions of advanced producers services and, hence, on the functional
22 relations within the mega-city region (KLOOSTERMAN and LAMBREGTS,
23 2007).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Second, the nature and extent of functional relationships within and between
mega-city regions is to some degree dependent on the characteristics of
advanced producer services in a particular region. The leverage of business
service firms is related to the size of their home market and, increasingly, to
their role in global markets. The leading position of London in global finance,
for example, is mirrored in the size and importance, in absolute and relative
terms, of its advanced producer service sector (BEAVERSTOCK *et al.*, 2001;
TAYLOR *et al.*, 2003). Further to this, it is important to note that, despite some

1
2
3 commonalities, the functional and spatial organization of advanced producer
4 service firms does not follow some kind of universal logic. Indeed, significant
5 differences can be found between and within individual advanced producer
6 service sectors. The financial services sector, for instance, operates through a
7 diversity of geographies (Sokol, 2007) with important bearings on the pattern
8 of internal and external relations of a given mega-city region.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Third, location decisions of advanced producer services are not taken in a
21 vacuum, but instead in a complex arena of context-specific rules and
22 regulations where public (e.g. urban planners) and private actors (e.g. real
23 estate developers) meet.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Another finding is that processes of concentration and deconcentration occur
33 simultaneously in mega-city regions. It seems that high-end advanced
34 producer services continue to concentrate within the leading city/cities,
35 whereas activities with lower value-added are moving out of the centres,
36 either to suburban locations or into the wider urban region. In other words:
37 advanced global functions tend to concentrate strongly in just one 'first city' as
38 this is where they can find a suitable environment with other globally
39 organized firms and related supporting producer services, prime office space,
40 and a cosmopolitan climate and associated amenities. This finding suggests a
41 process of *nested globalization* whereby the crucial global linkages within the
42 mega-city region appear to run through the first city (and within that city
43 through a special part of the city) and from there to the rest of the region and
44 beyond (see also SASSEN, 2001, 2007). This is in line with the observation
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that the mega-city region is still very much a differentiated space in terms of
4 density, infrastructural endowments, economic activities, mix of functions, and
5
6 social, cultural and ethnic composition of the population.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 **AN UPDATE OF THE RESEARCH AGENDA**

16
17
18
19
20 The mega-city region, in its various guises, is becoming a more general
21 phenomenon in advanced and, arguably, in emerging economies. Research
22 on urban issues should, at least partly, be refocused to take into account the
23 complex and dynamic picture of different sets of cities connected through first
24 city hubs that provide the environment for high end 'connectors' such as
25 advanced producer services. Some extensions of the POLYNET project are
26 already underway, both in terms of expanding the scale of analysis from
27 regional to national (TAYLOR *et al.*, 2007), and in terms of adding other
28 knowledge-intensive sectors to the analysis, such as high-tech firms (LÜTHI
29 *et al.*, 2008). Below we will suggest a research agenda beyond the immediate
30 parameters of POLYNET, following the triad of competitiveness, social
31 cohesion and sustainability that underpins viable cities and city-regions.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 *Competitiveness*

54
55
56
57
58 Advanced producer service firms are important in helping to boost and,
59
60 arguably, even create competitiveness (KAY, 2004). The POLYNET project

1
2
3
4 used these services as a lens to observe inter-city relations. We now seem to
5
6 be witnessing a redistribution of advanced producer services with a
7
8 deconcentration of lower-value added activities and a concentration of high-
9
10 value-added activities in the first city. As these latter activities function as an
11
12 interface – perhaps even gatekeeper – between firms elsewhere in the region
13
14 and the global markets, it is imperative to go beyond the POLYNET lens and
15
16 look at the relations of firms that actually (intend to) export to global markets.
17
18 How do they find suppliers/clients globally and where, if at all, do advanced
19
20 producer services come into play? Are there, in other words, also significant
21
22 lateral network-type relations that bypass the advanced producer services in
23
24 the first city? Is the global economy, thus, less hierarchical than it seems to
25
26 manifest itself in this project? What complementarities between the different
27
28 forms of spatial logic do arise within the mega-city regions?
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 A second issue considers not so much the relationship between the first city
37
38 and the rest, but the dynamics within these first cities themselves. The
39
40 combined process of concentration of high-end and deconcentration of low-
41
42 end services may accelerate further. This process of increasing returns in
43
44 combination with expanding financialization might crowd-out other economic
45
46 activities and erode the diversity of the economic base of the first cities.
47
48 Processes of innovation are dependent upon sheltered spaces where new,
49
50 unorthodox insights and knowledge can be generated. To rephrase this in the
51
52 form of a question: is the economic (and social) diversity within the central city
53
54 under threat due to the increasing role of high-end producer services and, if
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 so, does the mega-city region as a whole offer a palette of sufficiently different
4 milieus that include, for example, also incubator spaces for cultural industries?
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 *Social cohesion*

13
14
15
16
17 So far, little research has been directed towards the issue of social cohesion
18 at the scale of polycentric regions, and the contributions in this special issue
19 are no exception. Inequality and social cohesion within the context of these
20 evolving mega-city regions, however, without any doubt appear on the
21 agenda of policy-makers, and both drivers and consequences should be
22 addressed in future research. According to SASSEN (2001) the first or global
23 cities within global city-regions are both richer and poorer than the other cities.
24 What are the implications of this for the social cohesion within these cities
25 and, on a higher level of scale, on that of the mega-city region itself? Are
26 these city-regions becoming more polarized? To what extent can polarization
27 be attributed to the first city functioning as a social escalator, whereby (young)
28 people from elsewhere move to the first city to climb the steps of the social
29 ladder and then move out again? More generally, how are spatial aspects of
30 the life cycle of different groups related to the emergence of mega-city
31 regions? Which groups are stuck in the basement (sometimes even literally)
32 of the first cities?
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 55 56 57 58 59 60 *Sustainability*

1
2
3
4
5
6 It seems highly likely that costs of spatial mobility will rise further in the near
7
8 future, as energy prices will increase even more and (national and local)
9
10 governments will impose (higher) taxes and other measures to curb the
11
12 emission of greenhouse gases. How will this affect the internal relations,
13
14 partly based on mass-commuting, within mega-city regions? Will we see a
15
16 rise of multiple location households (second homes) to straddle the demands
17
18 of being present in high-density, frequent contact 'first cities', and the desire
19
20 for space (and what does this mean for mobility not just on a daily, but also on
21
22 a weekly and even monthly basis)? Other sustainability issues that pose
23
24 particular challenges at the megaregional scale include the management of
25
26 resources such as water and agricultural land, increasing intra and
27
28 interregional disparities and resulting equity issues, as well as questions of
29
30 community-building and identity formation in mega-city regions (WHEELER,
31
32 2008).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 The above-mentioned issues are just some of the more pressing research
45
46 lines that could be pursued building on the findings of the work reported here
47
48 and other projects in the field. This new research agenda, however, may also
49
50 require new methodological approaches. As documented in this special issue,
51
52 the POLYNET study explored a range of methods that go well beyond a
53
54 simple measurement of commuter flows in polycentric urban regions. In
55
56 particular, the combination of quantitative and qualitative research has been
57
58 fruitful. But more can be done. For instance, new possibilities are now
59
60

1
2
3 opening up as combinations of qualitative research and GIS techniques
4 enable researchers to map the movements in the ostensibly *panta rhei* of
5 mega-city regions in a way that was hitherto impossible (KWAN and KNIGGE,
6 2006). Importantly, polycentricity appears to be a multi-layered phenomenon
7 with each layer displaying a distinctive spatial pattern. Investigating the
8 underlying processes thus requires a variety of methods, from those
9 measuring commuting to those capturing knowledge spillovers among
10 advanced producer services. Future research should aim to combine different
11 aspects of polycentricity in a systematic way, for example by creatively
12 engaging GIS techniques that may allow a more comprehensive analysis of
13 how these are interrelated.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Finally, it remains to be seen in what way the insights gained from studying
33 eight North West European mega-city regions compare with evidence from
34 emerging megaregional urban forms and experiences outside of Europe.
35 Such a truly global perspective would also help to further elucidate the extent
36 to which the formation of mega-city regions represents a gradual reworking of
37 inherited urban structures or a genuinely new and qualitatively different spatial
38 logic.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Acknowledgements**

54
55
56
57
58

59 **REFERENCES**

60

1
2
3
4
5
6 AUJEAN L., CASTIAU E., ROELANDTS M. and VANDERMOTTEN C. (2007)

7
8 Le positionnement des villes belges dans le réseau global des services
9
10 avancés, *Belgeo* 2007/1, 15-30.
11

12
13
14
15 BAILEY N. and TUROK I. (2001) Central Scotland as a polycentric urban
16
17 region: useful planning concept or chimera? *Urban Studies* **38**, 697-715.
18

19
20
21
22 BATHELT H., MALMBERG A. and MASKELL P. (2004) Clusters and
23
24 knowledge: local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge
25
26 creation, *Progress in Human Geography* **28**, 31-56.
27

28
29
30
31 BEAVERSTOCK J.V., HOYLER M., PAIN K. and TAYLOR P.J. (2001)
32
33 *Comparing London and Frankfurt as World Cities: A Relational Study of*
34
35 *Contemporary Urban Change*. Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of
36
37 Industrial Society, London.
38
39

40
41
42
43 CASTELLS M. (1989) *The Informational City: Information Technology,*
44
45 *Economic Restructuring and the Urban-Regional Process*. Blackwell, Oxford.
46
47

48
49
50
51 CASTELLS M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Blackwell, Oxford.
52

53
54
55 CATTAN N. (Coordination) (2005) Critical Dictionary of Polycentrism. Annex
56
57 Report A, *ESPON 1.1.1: Potentials for Polycentric Development in Europe*.
58
59 (available at: <http://www.espon.eu>) (accessed on 19 May 2008).
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 CHESHIRE P.C. (2006) Resurgent cities, urban myths and policy hubris: what
7 we need to know, *Urban Studies* **43**, 1231-1246.
8
9

10
11
12 COOKE P. and MORGAN K. (1998) *The Associational Economy: Firms,*
13 *Regions, and Innovation.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
14
15
16

17
18
19 CUMBERS A. and MACKINNON D (2004) Introduction: clusters in urban and
20 regional development, *Urban Studies* **41**, 959-969.
21
22
23

24
25
26 DAVOUDI S. (2003) Polycentricity in European spatial planning: From an
27 analytical tool to a normative agenda, *European Planning Studies* **11**, 979-
28 999.
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 DERUDDER B. (2006) On conceptual confusion in empirical analyses of a
36 transnational urban network, *Urban Studies* **43**, 2027-2046.
37
38
39
40

41
42
43 DEWAR M. and EPSTEIN D. (2007) Planning for “megaregions” in the United
44 States, *Journal of Planning Literature* **22**, 108-124.
45
46
47
48

49
50
51 ESPON (EUROPEAN SPATIAL PLANNING OBSERVATION NETWORK)
52 (2005) *ESPON 1.1.1: Potentials for Polycentric Development in Europe.*
53 *Project Report.* (available at: <http://www.espon.eu>) (accessed on 19 May
54 2008).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 EUROPEAN COMMISSION (1999) *ESDP European Spatial Development*
4
5
6 *Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory*
7
8 *of the European Union*. Office for Official Publications of the European
9
10 Communities, Luxembourg.

11
12
13
14
15 EUROPEAN UNION (2000) *Lisbon Extraordinary European Council, 23-24*
16
17 *March 2000: Presidency Conclusions*. European Council / European Union,
18
19
20 Brussels.

21
22
23
24
25 GOLDFELD K.S. (Ed) (2007) *The Economic Geography of Megaregions*. The
26
27 Policy Research Institute for the Region, Princeton, NJ.

28
29
30
31
32 GOTTMANN J. (1961) *Megalopolis: The Urbanized Northeastern Seaboard of*
33
34 *the United States*. The Twentieth Century Fund, New York.

35
36
37
38
39 GREEN N. (2007) Functional polycentricity: A formal definition in terms of
40
41 social network analysis, *Urban Studies* **44**, 2077-2103.

42
43
44
45
46 HALBERT L., CONVERY F. and THIERSTEIN A. (Eds) (2006) *Reflections on*
47
48 *the Polycentric Metropolis*. *Built Environment* **32**(2).

49
50
51
52
53 HALL P. (1997) The future of the metropolis and its form, *Regional Studies*
54
55 **31**, 211-220.

56
57
58
59
60 HALL P. (1999) Planning for the mega-city: A new Eastern Asian urban form?

1
2
3 in BROTCHE J., NEWTON P., HALL P. and DICKEY J. (Eds) *East West*
4
5
6 *Perspectives on 21st Century Urban Development: Sustainable Eastern and*
7
8 *Western Cities in the New Millennium*, pp. 3-36. Ashgate, Aldershot.

9
10
11
12
13 HALL P. (2001) Global city-regions in the twenty-first century, in SCOTT A.J.
14
15 (Ed) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 59-77. Oxford
16
17 University Press, Oxford.

18
19
20
21
22 HALL P. and PAIN K. (Eds) (2006) *The Polycentric Metropolis: Learning From*
23
24 *Mega-City Regions in Europe*. Earthscan, London.

25
26
27
28
29 HERRSCHEL T. and NEWMAN P. (2002) *Governance of Europe's City*
30
31 *Regions: Planning, Policy and Politics*. Routledge, London.

32
33
34
35
36 HOYLER M., FREYTAG T. and MAGER C. (2006) Advantageous
37
38 fragmentation? Reimagining metropolitan governance and spatial planning in
39
40 Rhine-Main, *Built Environment* **32**, 124-136.

41
42
43
44
45 JACOBS J. (1969) *The Economy of Cities*. Random House, New York.

46
47
48
49
50 KAY J. (2004) *The Truth About Markets: Why Some Nations Are Rich But*
51
52 *Most Remain Poor*. Penguin, London.

1
2
3 KLOOSTERMAN R.C. (2008) Walls and bridges: knowledge spillover
4 between 'superdutch' architectural firms, *Journal of Economic Geography* **8**,
5 545-563.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 KLOOSTERMAN R.C. and LAMBREGTS B. (2001) Clustering of economic
13 activities in polycentric urban regions: the case of the Randstad, *Urban*
14 *Studies* **38**, 717-732.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 KLOOSTERMAN R.C. and LAMBREGTS B. (2007) Between accumulation
23 and concentration of capital: Comparing the long-term trajectories of the
24 Dutch Randstad and London urban systems, *Urban Geography* **28**, 54-73.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 KLOOSTERMAN R.C. and MUSTERD S. (2001) The polycentric urban
33 region: towards a research agenda, *Urban Studies* **38**, 623-633.
34
35
36
37

38
39 KRÄTKE S. (2001) Strengthening the polycentric urban system in Europe:
40 conclusions from the ESDP, *European Planning Studies* **9**, 105-116.
41
42
43
44

45
46 KWAN M.P. and KNIGGE L. (2006) Doing qualitative research using GIS: an
47 oxymoronic endeavor? *Environment and Planning A* **38**, 1999-2002.
48
49
50
51

52
53 LAMBOOY J.G. (1998) Polynucleation and economic development: The
54 Randstad, *European Planning Studies* **6**, 457-466.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 LAMBREGTS B. (2006) Polycentrism: boon or barrier to metropolitan
4 competitiveness? The case of the Randstad Holland, *Built Environment* **32**,
5
6 114-123.
7
8
9

10
11
12 LANG R. and DHAVALA D. (2005) America's megapolitan areas, *Land Lines*
13 **17** (available at: <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/PubDetail.aspx?pubid=1039>)
14
15 (accessed on 19 May 2008).
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 LANG R. and KNOX P.L. (2008) The new metropolis: rethinking megalopolis,
23
24 *Regional Studies*, doi:10.1080/00343400701654251.
25
26
27

28
29 LÜTHI S., THIERSTEIN A. and GOEBEL V. (2008) Intra-firm and extra-firm
30 linkages of the knowledge economy – the case of the mega-city region of
31 Munich, *GaWC Research Bulletin* 269 (available at:
32
33 <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/rb/rb269.html>) (accessed on 19 May 2008).
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 MARKUSEN A. (1999) Fuzzy concepts, scanty evidence, policy distance: the
42 case for rigour and policy relevance in critical regional studies, *Regional*
43
44 *Studies* **33**, 869-884.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 MEIJERS E. (2007) *Synergy in Polycentric Urban Regions: Complementarity,*
52
53 *Organising Capacity and Critical Mass*. Delft University Press, Delft.
54
55
56

57
58 OECD (2006) *Competitive Cities in the Global Economy* (OECD Territorial
59
60 Reviews). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.

1
2
3
4
5
6 PARR J.B. (2004) The polycentric urban region: a closer inspection, *Regional*
7
8 *Studies* **38**, 231-240.
9

10
11
12 PARR J.B. (2005) Perspectives on the city-region, *Regional Studies* **39**, 555-
13
14 566.
15

16
17
18 REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION (2006) *America 2050: A Prospectus*.
19
20 Regional Plan Association, New York.
21
22

23
24
25
26
27 SASSEN S. (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton
28
29 University Press, Princeton, NJ.
30

31
32
33
34 SASSEN S. (2001) Global cities and global city-regions: a comparison, in
35
36 SCOTT A.J. (Ed) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 78-95.
37
38 Oxford University Press, Oxford.
39
40

41
42
43 SASSEN S. (2007) Megaregions: benefits beyond sharing trains and parking
44
45 lots? in GOLDFELD K.S. (Ed) *The Economic Geography of Megaregions*, pp.
46
47 59-83. The Policy Research Institute for the Region, Princeton, NJ.
48
49

50
51
52
53 SCHMITT P. and KNAPP W. (2006) RheinRuhr als polyzentrischer „Raum der
54
55 Orte“ im „Raum der Ströme“, *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie* **50**, 217-
56
57 231.
58
59
60

1
2
3 SCOTT A.J. (Ed) (2001a) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*. Oxford
4
5 University Press, Oxford.
6
7

8
9
10 SCOTT A.J. (2001b) Globalization and the rise of city-regions, *European*
11
12 *Planning Studies* **9**, 813-826.
13
14

15
16
17 SCOTT A.J., AGNEW J., SOJA E. and STORPER M. (2001) Global city-
18
19 regions, in: SCOTT A.J. (Ed), *Global City-Regions; Trends, Theory, Policy*,
20
21 pp. 11-30. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
22
23
24

25
26
27 SEGBERS K. (Ed) (2007) *The Making of Global City Regions: Johannesburg,*
28
29 *Mumbai/Bombay, São Paulo, and Shanghai*. Johns Hopkins University Press,
30
31 Baltimore, MD.
32
33

34
35
36 SIEVERTS T. (2003) *Cities Without Cities: An Interpretation of the*
37
38 *Zwischenstadt*. Spon Press, London.
39
40

41
42
43 SIMMONDS R. and HACK G. (Eds) (2000) *Global City Regions: Their*
44
45 *Emerging Forms*. Spon, London.
46
47
48

49
50
51 SOKOL M. (2007) Space of flows, uneven regional development, and the
52
53 geography of financial services in Ireland, *Growth and Change* **38**, 224-259.
54
55

56
57
58 STORPER M. (1997) *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global*
59
60 *Economy*. Guilford Press, New York.

1
2
3
4
5
6 TAYLOR P.J. (1999) Worlds of large cities: pondering Castells' space of
7 flows, *Third World Planning Review* **21**, iii-x.
8
9

10
11
12 TAYLOR P.J. (2001) Specification of the world city network, *Geographical*
13 *Analysis* **33**, 181-194.
14
15

16
17
18 TAYLOR P.J. (2004) *World City Network: A Global Urban Analysis*.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Routledge, London.

TAYLOR P.J. and LANG R.E. (2004) The shock of the new: 100 concepts
describing recent urban change, *Environment and Planning A* **36**, 951-958.

TAYLOR P.J., BEAVERSTOCK J.V., COOK G., PANDIT N., PAIN K. and
GREENWOOD H. (2003) *Financial Services Clustering and its Significance*
for London. Corporation of London, London.

TAYLOR P.J., EVANS D.M., HOYLER M., DERUDDER B. and PAIN K.
(2007) The UK space economy as practised by advanced producer service
firms: identifying two distinctive polycentric city-regional processes in
contemporary Britain, *GaWC Research Bulletin* 227 (available at:
<http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/rb/rb227.html>) (accessed on 19 May 2008).

THIERSTEIN A. and FÖRSTER A. (Eds) (2008) *The Image and the Region:
Making Mega-City Regions Visible!* Lars Müller Publishers, Baden.

1
2
3
4
5
6 THIERSTEIN A., KRUSE C., GLANZMANN L., GABI S. and GRILLON N.
7
8 (2006) *Raumentwicklung im Verborgenen. Die Entwicklung der*
9
10 *Metropolregion Nordschweiz*. Verlag Neue Zürcher Zeitung, Zürich.

11
12
13
14
15 TUROK I. and BAILEY N. (2004) The theory of polynuclear urban regions and
16
17 its application to Central Scotland, *European Planning Studies* **12**, 371-389.

18
19
20
21
22 UNFPA (UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND) (2007) *State of World*
23
24 *Population 2007: Unleashing the Potential of Urban Growth*. UNFPA, New
25
26 York.

27
28
29
30
31
32 WHEELER S. (2008) Regions, megaregions, and sustainability, *Regional*
33
34 *Studies*, doi: 10.1080/00343400701861344.

35
36
37
38
39 YARWOOD J. (Ed) (2006) *The Dublin-Belfast Development Corridor: Ireland's*
40
41 *Mega-City Region?* Ashgate, Aldershot.

42
43
44
45
46
47 ¹ The international consortium was co-ordinated by Peter Hall and Kathy Pain at the Young
48
49 Foundation (formerly Institute of Community Studies) in London from 2003 to 2006 and
50
51 included a further eight European research institutions: Universiteit van Amsterdam;
52
53 Université Libre de Bruxelles; University College Dublin; Institut für Landes- und
54
55 Stadtentwicklungsforschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Dortmund; Universität
56
57 Heidelberg; Loughborough University; Université Paris 1; and Eidgenössische Technische
58
59 Hochschule Zürich.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

² We have adopted the terminology used in POLYNET in this introductory paper. HALL and PAIN (2006, p. 3) define the 'mega-city region' as 'a series of anything between 10 and 50 cities and towns, physically separate but functionally networked, clustered around one or more larger central cities, and drawing enormous economic strength from a new functional division of labour'. This is similar in concept to SCOTT's (2001a) 'global city-region', an exemplar acknowledged by HALL and PAIN (2006, p. 12; see also HALL, 2001). We use both terms synonymously here but would argue that 'global city-region' captures the focus on economic-functional linkages better than 'mega-city region' with its demographic connotation of rapid urban growth (note the different use of hyphen), especially in a European context (see TAYLOR (1999) for a discussion of the dangers of conflating the concepts of global city and mega-city; a point that equally applies to the city-regional dimension discussed here). Both terms share their focus on large (however defined) polycentric city-regions with the term 'megaregion' used in the US planning context (e.g. DEWAR and EPSTEIN, 2007; GOLDFELD, 2007).

³ In addition, individual research teams have published regionally focused monographs (THIERSTEIN *et al.*, 2006; YARWOOD, 2006) or specialist papers dealing with specific analytical or methodological aspects of the POLYNET project (e.g. AUJEAN *et al.*, 2007; GREEN, 2007; SCHMITT and KNAPP, 2006).