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Abstract Berlin can be seen as an unusual case of metropolitan rescaling, as competing and overlapping governance practices as well as policy discourses constitute a multitude of metropolitan scales. In this paper we question how these different metropolitan scales are constructed explicitly or implicitly by metropolitan projects promoted especially by public actors. In a first step, we question the institutional set-up and policy competences at different governmental levels, which are involved in the construction of as well as strategic policy discourses at a metropolitan scale. Secondly, we analyse different governance practices and policies in order to answer the question of how the metropolitan scale is represented in spatial development strategies and whether we can observe consistency among definitions of metropolitan space. This paper follows a qualitative empirical approach comparing programs, policies or strategies in the field of spatial planning and economic development. We argue that there does not exist one metropolitan scale but a heteronomy of metropolitan (strategic) discourses and different metropolitan projects building on different delimitations of a metropolitan space in an ontological sense as well as overlapping and diverging discursive arenas. Furthermore, we point out the institutional and economic dominance of the core, the city state Berlin.

0. Introduction

This paper is part of an international comparative research programme on the construction of metropolitan space, with a specific focus on the role of economic development actors, interests and practices in affecting the construction of metropolitan scale.

The research pursues a comparative perspective on questions summarized as follows:

a. what is the role of economic interests and the national state in the production and governance of metropolitan development?

important sub-questions are:

- what is the role of the state – at different levels – in defining metropolitan scale and in the production and governance of metropolitan development?

- what is the relationship between the private and public in defining metropolitan scale and in the production and governance of metropolitan development?

- in which forms, arenas and public policy does this relationship come to play, and how does it affect the construction of metropolitan scale?
b. what elements of convergence or divergence can be detected among our selected case studies, and depending on what factors?

This first paper on the case-study of Berlin is conceived – in line with this approach – as a first stage of analysis in a three-stage approach which will articulate our case study along three distinctive analytical dimensions:

1. the construction of metropolitan scale in strategic policy discourses;
2. the construction of metropolitan scale in economic development policies;
3. the role of key economic actors in the metropolitan development arena.

The paper is structured as follows. At the beginning, we present some key theoretical assumptions and heuristic choices that serve, in the first place, to frame the overall research approach (section 1) and, in the second place, to structure the first stage of analysis of the case study (section 2). Key issues are our understanding of meaning of metropolitan development and metropolitan space, as well as a discussion of the heuristic meaning of reference to the metropolitan scope and scale of spatial and economic development policies. In section 3, we introduce the case study on metropolitan scales in Berlin and describe our envisaged approach. Section 4 then analyses the construction of metropolitan scales in Berlin in three steps. In section 4.1 we describe the multi-level governmental structure of the institutional context. Section 4.2 outlines some of the practices constituting metropolitan scales such as attempts of territorial reform and institutional cooperation. Section 4.3 compares selected policy documents regarding their territorial definition of a metropolitan space as a scale of policy. Section 5 then summarizes the findings and draws some preliminary conclusions.

1. Metropolitan space as a political construct

Our research is based on a political-geographic perspective on the construction of metropolitan space. We understand metropolitan space as a contingent outcome of (re-)scaling processes, that is, as being constituted though policy discourses, practices, representations that concur to producing concrete outcomes in terms of scalar relations, with particular reference to actors and arenas of spatial and economic development policy.

We understand ‘metropolitan development’ as a transformation (or a set of transformations) affecting an urbanized environment, of which the shaping of metropolitan space and, potentially, the constitution of a metropolitan scale are important outcomes. By metropolitan scale we understand a specific (but not necessarily singular or uni-dimensional) form of scalar consolidation of spatial policy representations, discourses and practices.

‘Scale’ thus understood is not a reified bounded-territorial space, but an emergent relational construct, contingently defined by the interplay of a variety of discourses, practices, representations along possibly coexisting (‘compossible’: Jessop and Jones 2010) but possibly mutually contradictory (‘incompossible’) dimensions. In other terms, we argue that metropolitan scale is a constructed reality and, as such, is constituted as a contingent outcome of specific spatial representations, discourses and practices involved in spatial development. However, we also see metropolitan space as a field of tensions between different spatial policy representations, discourses and practices, embodied by different rationales of agency and with potentially different scalar effects. Accordingly, we understand the concept of scale as an expression of a constitutively multiple ontology of geographical space, in which social relations of power and hegemony come to play.

To clarify this point, we can say that, in principle, scale can be conceived as a singular ontological object only as a result of a strategic-relational selectivity and, a fortiori, as a hegemonic construct. In reality, we assume metropolitan space as a terrain of hegemonic struggles in which different spatial
policy representations, discourses and practices are at play in defining understandings of scale, and where a hegemonic view of scale may contingently prevail. To exemplify this, we can identify some of these different representations, discourses and practices – and their respective definition of ‘scale’ – as follows:

- ‘metropolitan scale’ as the spatial (jurisdictional) domain of territorial institutions;
- ‘metropolitan scale’ as a socio-spatial outcome of social and economic dynamics;
- ‘metropolitan scale’ as a stake of strategic-relational interplays between private and public actors (i.e. strategically selective representation of private economic interests in the public policy domain);
- ‘metropolitan scale’ as (a set of) spatially consolidated ‘state effects’ (e.g. Painter 2010).

In relation to these assumptions, a caveat is in place. In line with our understanding of scale and of ‘rescaling’ as non-representational, relational geographic concepts, we are aware that the possible meaning of metropolitan ‘scale’ is dependent on the specific heuristics and epistemology of research. In referring to processes of ‘rescaling’ in relation to spatial development policy, we understand their outcomes as the construction of ‘policy spaces’ (Brenner 2004) relevant for the politics of metropolitan development. If this understanding may be referred to as ‘political rescaling’, it is therefore so not in the reductionist sense of being the expression only or primarily of political-institutional agency – or instance, in the form of practices of jurisdictional reform or of institutional representations of territory – but in the sense of a broader understanding of ‘public action’ (Lascoumes and Le Galés 2012), involving the agency of non-state actors and non-authoritative forms of agency, the interaction and intersection of institutional and non-institutional networks and arenas, and the mediation of different interests and rationales in producing governance and regulation outcomes (Jessop 2002).

The overarching research question in this perspective is to unravel the nature of public action, i.e. the specific interplay between actors, institutions, representations, processes and outcomes (Lascoumes and Le Galés 2012: 14-16) in a specific context of territorial politics, in relation to the production of ‘metropolitan scale’ as the contingent spatio-temporal fix of public action (Harvey 1985; Jessop 2002).

In inquiring into the politics of metropolitan space formation as the outcome of interactions between institutional and economic actors and their spatial practices, interests, and representations, we therefore do not adopt any ontological pre-assumptions about ‘scale’ as an institutionally defined territorial unit, or even spatial representation, as it may be expressed and embodied by the jurisdictional framework of territorial politics. Rather, we understand the ‘political’ dimension of scale and ‘rescaling’ in terms of their emerging policy relevance, that is, in terms of the emergence of spatial relations that are relevant in affecting spatial development policy. The related practices and outcomes, and their scalar definition, can be seen as contingently emerging as a result not only of formal-institutional decision-making, but also of forms of agency developed in multi-actor governance arenas at variable degrees and forms of institutionalization.

For our research, these assumptions have several important ‘framing’ consequences. First, we understand metropolitan space as neither given nor fixed. This does not descend only from the well-known variety and definitional contingency of its possible understandings, as an analytic or as a policy concept. It refers to the fact that, as a relational reality, metropolitan space can be seen as a palimpsest, that is: as a reality made of diverse layers or aspects that emerge through the surface – like the appearance conveyed, for instance, by its formal definition or institutionalized representation – and that realize a complex interplay of representations, discourses and practices that may involve diverse spatialities and temporalities. It is a reality overwritten by old and new representations, discourses and practices that – implicitly or explicitly – stand in a competition among each other for producing and imposing frames for interpretation and for action.
Second, viewed from this latter perspective, metropolitan space is a field of forces in which hegemonic struggles over the meaning of space and its relevance for development policy take place.

In addressing rescaling processes in terms of a non-representational geography (Thrift 2008), this has two combined consequences. On the one hand, it requires addressing practices which reach beyond institutionalized ‘representations of space’ as the images, visions, epistemic constructs and cultural models of “planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers” (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: 38) involved in the formal-institutional arenas of spatial policy-making. On the other hand, it points to the fact that the production of ‘representations of space’, as conceived or conceptualized space and their impact on ‘representational spaces’, as lived spaces of social experience, must be conceived as a hegemonic struggle, involving a variety of spatial practices developed and enacted over multiple, diverse, and variably interacting arenas.

In this respect, at the same time as the representations of space conveyed by institutional practices of territorial policy and planning are relativized in their capacity to address and regulate metropolitan development, metropolitan space potentially becomes an ‘implicit project’ (Dematteis 1995), in which other hegemonic practices are at play in defining the orientation of policy action and concrete policy outcomes.

Third, this opens up possible critical perspectives of inquiry into the meaning of metropolitan space and of its making against the background of change in state agency and in the meaning of state policy instruments in territorial governance and regulation. As has been noted (Brenner 2001, 2003), metropolitan space becomes the epitomic terrain for a ‘glocalist’ struggle over the aims and rationales of spatial development, in which (in the sense of: Harvey 1989) traditional ‘territorial’ rationales of state politics give way to joint ‘entrepreneurial’ policy approaches to locational development, and post-political arguments of neo-liberal developmental nature by and large come to dominate policy frames.

Such developments not only imply significant changes in the setting of nested multi-level relationships that defines territorial politics, highlighting the emergence of new trans-scalar relationships, networks and assemblages in shaping spatial development in local contexts, but also direct attention to the ‘political’ meaning born by the relative power of actors to shape policy directions and to exert hegemonic influence over expected spatial outcomes (Cox 2013). Far from providing a viable interpretive blueprint, however, such developments – particularly in a comparative perspective – pose specific empirical and theoretical research challenges. These reside, in the first place, in the need to analyse the representations, discourses and practices concerning the development of metropolitan space that are expressed by a variety of actors in multiple, diverse, and variably interacting governance arenas and, subsequently, to critically assess the differential and variable hegemonic capacity they exert on defining explicit or implicit ‘metropolitan projects’ by pursuing visions and directions of metropolitan spatial development and/or by affecting its outcomes.

Two specific challenges emerge in this respect. The first – a key issue for any critical governance research approach – concerns the changing institutional capacity of public policy-making to guide and influence strategic conceptions of metropolitan development. This poses the question of the effectiveness of democratic legitimated public decision-making and steering in issues of spatial development, and requires – among other things – to inquire into how development trends and governance practices put under strain the consistency of the jurisdictional framework of territorial politics and of its strategic, representational and instrumental apparatus. In other terms, it poses the question of how far, under the specific socio-political circumstances of a specific context, but under growing conditions of trans-scalar interdependencies, an explicit ‘metropolitan project’ as an expression of a public intentionality is possible, effective, or consistent.

The second concerns the capacity of private and in particular economic actors to influence metropolitan development. The challenge here resides in particular in the need to inquire not only into the way in which, through a multifarious range of activities and arenas of institutional and para-institutional interest representation, joint or delegated governance, self-regulation, and partnership-
based or publicly supported entrepreneurship, economic interests and actors express a capacity not only to contribute to defining an explicit ‘metropolitan project’ but, even more importantly, to pursue their own implicit projects and to exert by this a defining or even hegemonic role in constructing metropolitan space.

2. On inquiring into ‘metropolitan space’ as an explicit or implicit project: outline of research

In order to address the construction of metropolitan space and its possible emergent scalar features, in this first stage of research we apply to our Berlin case study an analysis of the understanding of metropolitan space expressed by institutional practices and spatial development policy approaches. By investigating on representations, discourses and practice, we analyse the existence of explicit or implicit definitions of scale and the way they contribute to an explicit or implicit ‘metropolitan project’.

For this purpose, we combine an analysis of in different contexts and arenas of policy-making with a distinction between metropolitan scope and metropolitan scale of policies. The notions of scope and scale have been variously introduced in order to address different spatial dimension of policies – in particular in the study of regionalization processes (e.g. Harvey 1985; Gualmini 2004; Blatter 2006). For our purposes, metropolitan scope refers to the spatial frame of reference for policies which express a specific purposive intentionality, but not necessarily a spatial intentionality. Interests and actions defined by a metropolitan scope can bring about metropolitan scale effects: for instance, this can be the case of actions by public and/or private actors which are metropolitan in scope – for instance, the scope of outputs produced by specific planning activities or development policies – even though they do not necessarily contribute to the construction of a metropolitan scale of policy or governance. To adopt a perspective of the multiple ontology of scale, for instance, metropolitan scale effects may emerge from the practices of actors that have different scopes of action and interests, and can therefore either converge or diverge in terms of producing scale effects.

A politics of metropolitan scale emerges when public action addresses – through specific spatial representations, discourses and practices – a mediation between forms of agency with different spatial scopes, and their possible different scalar effects, and, in doing so, develops and brings to expression a specific scale intentionality. By doing so, public action engages in discursively constructing ‘metropolitan scale’ as an intentional frame of reference for interpretation and action.

As this makes clear, a politics of (re-)scaling – may then emerge as the outcome of a strategic intentionality as well as of strategic-relational mediation in the field of practices involved. The most important rationales or modes by which public policy defines a politics of metropolitan scale are:

- spatial visions, representations and definitions explicitly inspiring (and inspired by) state policies, at different levels: these may involve:
  -- territorial reforms,
  -- territorial governance arrangements, but also
  -- policies explicitly assuming some a territorial definition of metropolitan space as the scale of expected policy outputs and outcomes.

In these cases, despite a variety of possible policy contexts ranging from all-purpose governmental authorities to functional special-purpose governance agencies, the definition of metropolitan scale is rather the expression of an institutional project and is territorial and comprehensive in nature;

- policies directed to the production of purposive actions by public and private actors – often within a specific cooperation arenas – in relation to a spatial frame for reference.
In the case of such forms of public policy, the definition of metropolitan scale is relational in nature and directly dependent upon the way specific policies are defined: by definition, a consistent definition of metropolitan scale can emerge if a policy frame is provided that realizes an effective strategic-relational mediation between the spatial scope of actions and interests involved in different policies;

- policies directed to the production of purposive actions by public and private actors, according to a spatially relevant metropolitan scope, but without an explicitly metropolitan spatial frame of reference.

In these cases, the potential for a politics of metropolitan scale resides in the capacity of realizing a meta-policy mediation, for instance, in terms of symbolic framing; on the contrary, in the absence of such an effective meta-policy framing, the scale implications of policies are likely to remain implicit, and to possibly constitute a variety of implicit metropolitan projects in a relationship of potential competition with each other.

On the background of these observations, we formulate a general hypothesis concerning the scalar nature of metropolitan policy and governance which reflects our constructivist and multiple ontological understanding of scale, and we accordingly assume:

- that the rationales or modes by which public policy defines metropolitan scale are increasingly diverse;
- that different rationales or modes by which public policy defines a politics of metropolitan scale may coexist;
- that, however, their coexistence may be contradictory (i.e. they may be ‘non-compossible’) as regards both spatial rationales and policy rationales;
- that such contradictions may come to expression in terms of e.g. policy ineffectiveness and/or governance failures;
- that, moreover, such contradictions are played out in terms of a strategic-relational struggle among actors and interests with different spatial scopes;
- that, as a result of such strategic-relational struggles, an hegemonic understanding of metropolitan scale may possibly consolidate, as well as be contested and possibly fail to emerge.

3. Introduction to the Berlin case study

The selection of Berlin as a case for the construction of metropolitan scales may be surprising for a number of reasons. Compared to other ‘metropolitan regions’ in Germany, Berlin has been referred to as one of the unusual cases, which are “[…] in a particular situation since the ‘central city’ is a Land (a federal state) and ‘regional governance’ would require inter-state agreements.” (Fürst 2005). Here, this particular character of the metropolitan space in Berlin is not understood as an obstacle but as the starting point for our analysis. What draws our attention is the fact that there does not exist one explicit and dominant metropolitan scale, which is comparable to other metropolitan regions in Germany. Our specific interest in Berlin is rather based on the observation that the metropolitan space of Berlin is constructed implicitly by different understandings and multiple metropolitan scales. Studying Berlin as an exceptional case of metropolitan governance or even political rescaling aims at exploring the contested contradictory nature of rescaling processes and will serve as a background for addressing the influence of economic interests and actors in constructing metropolitan space.
The next paragraphs describe in what way the case study builds on existing academic debates on Berlin as metropolitan space. The following paragraphs then explain the chosen methodological approach for understanding the implicit construction of metropolitan space in Berlin.

The understanding of Berlin as a metropolitan space is related to policies and governance arrangements regarding city-regional cooperation, especially in regional planning. As noted above, Berlin has often been described as an exceptional case of metropolitan governance. Hauswirth and colleagues for example examined "the reasons why effective city-regional cooperation had failed to emerge by the end of the 1990s." (Hauswirth et al. 2003: 121). They also pointed out that city-regional cooperation in Berlin and Brandenburg is a case of "[…] weak arrangements for coordination, potential inefficiencies of multi-scalar governance" (Hauswirth et al. 2003: 119). A common perspective of studies of metropolitan governance and planning in Berlin is their understanding of metropolitan space as an institutionally defined territorially bounded space. These studies often suggest that the metropolitan space consists of the states Berlin and Brandenburg, and take into account only policies and planning documents that explicitly refer to Berlin-Brandenburg as a ‘metropolitan region’ (Häußermann 2003; Holtmann 2005; Krappweis 2001; Murray & Neill 2011). This stands in contrast to earlier studies in the field of planning, which refer to other territorial solutions of city-regional cooperation (Benz 1995; Sauberzweig & Schmidt-Eichstaedt 1992). Besides, there exist only few studies with an alternative approach to the metropolitan space Berlin. For instance, Ortelt (2011) attempts to capture the different perceptions of the metropolitan regions in the population. Other authors focus on urban policies in Berlin as a city state, for instance form a neo-liberal perspective see (Heeg 1998) or with a perspective of urban regime theory (Strom 1996). Further aspects that have been debated recently are city marketing and branding (Colomb 2012; Mahnken 2003).

Besides studies focused on political, institutional and territorial aspects, there exist alternative academic accounts of varying facets of Berlin as metropolis or metropolitan space. These aspects of Berlin only play a marginal role in the following analysis, yet have to be taken into consideration for interpretative explanations of the construction of metropolitan scales in Berlin. One important debate on Berlin focuses on the consequences of re-unification in the formerly divided city. After re-unification, Berlin became again the capital city of Germany with consequences for its role in the German city system as well as effects on urban development (cf. Häußermann & Strom 1994; Häußermann 1999; Campbell 1999; Marcuse 1998). The specific political context came along with a peculiar economic development of Berlin after re-unification. Häußermann for instance (Häußermann & Kapphan 2000) discusses this specific economic situation as well as the related socio-economic developments, whereas others draw the attention to the role of the creative industries and service sector for Berlin (Krätke & Borst 2000; Krätke 2004; Kujath 2005).

Berlin is furthermore seen as a functionally interdependent city-region. This functional perspective emphasises the interdependencies between city centre and surrounding areas, as well as at the centre-peripheral relations concerning commuting, transportation and infrastructure. One suggested concentric spatial model differentiates between the inner city (Innenbezirke) and outer boroughs (Außenbezirke) within the city state of Berlin (Häußermann & Kapphan 2000). Another distinction is made between the city state as the centre with fringe containment in the surrounding suburban areas in Brandenburg (Speckgürtel) as well as the peripheral Brandenburg area (Hinterland) (Saupe 2009). A terminology commonly used in political and planning practices distinguishes between the immediate sphere of influence (engerer Verflechtungsraum) and the further sphere of development (weiterer Entwicklungsraum, see among others Benz et al. 1998; Häußermann 2003).

Regarding the multiple facets of the state of the art, we argue that there does not exist one dominant perception or definition of the metropolitan space Berlin. Therefore, we suggest an analytical approach that compares different ontologies of the metropolitan space expressed in policy scales. Our analysis thus builds on a methodology, which attempts to go beyond a territorial-institutional perspective and to capture the construction of metropolitan scales in representations, discourses and practices, understood as different metropolitan projects, pursued by different actors. In this paper, we focus on
public actors and take into account the importance of institutional context for metropolitan rescaling by describing the multi-level governmental system in Berlin and Brandenburg. The core analysis then focuses on explicit and implicit metropolitan projects, in order to map how different understandings of the metropolitan space are constructed. We assume that these metropolitan projects are represented by attempts at territorial reform and governance arrangements (understood as different practices constructing different metropolitan scales) and policies with a territorial definition of metropolitan space (or scope) (understood as discourses constructing different metropolitan scales). For the case study Berlin we compare strategic policy documents in the field of spatial planning and urban economic development. Thereby, we aim at understanding the consistency and coexistence of different metropolitan discourses and multiple definitions of metropolitan scale.

The research question of this specific article is the following: how are different metropolitan scales constructed explicitly or implicitly by metropolitan projects promoted especially by public actors? This implies to describe the institutional set-up of the public actors as well as their metropolitan projects or policies. In a first step, this article questions the institutional set-up of state governments and policy competences at different levels, which are involved in the construction of as well as strategic policy discourses at a metropolitan scale. Secondly, the article analyses different governance practices and policies in order to answer the question of how the metropolitan scale is represented in spatial development strategies and whether we can observe consistency among definitions of metropolitan scale.

This paper follows a qualitative empirical approach, which describes the institutional context, governance arrangements and policies with a metropolitan dimension based on structured document analysis. Different programs, policies or strategies in the field of spatial planning and economic development were selected, which are assumed to be related to the construction of the metropolitan scale in Berlin. The document analysis focuses on the most recent developments (early 2000s until 2013), while the overall horizon of our study begins in 1990 since major changes have taken place since re-unification.

4. Case study Berlin: Institutional construction of metropolitan scales in practice

4.1 Institutional context

In this section we describe different governmental levels of which we assume having an influence on the metropolitan space. It focuses on territorially defined entities and the relationship between national, regional and local levels. These different levels of government form a hierarchical or nested federal system in political-administrative terms. Berlin as a city state is situated in the middle of the territorially spread out Brandenburg. At the same time, the two states (Länder) Berlin and Brandenburg differ in their political-administrative structure and dispose over very different historical-institutional, functional and economic features.

Berlin’s constitution states that it is a federal state and a city at the same time (Abgeordnetenhaus von Berlin 1995 Art. 1, S. 1). In legal terms, Berlin constitutes a common municipality (Einheitsgemeinde, cf. Hoffmann & Schwenkner 2010) over a territory corresponding to the outreach of the ‘Greater Berlin’ introduced in 1920. It consists of boroughs (Bezirke), which are administrative units and fulfil certain tasks of self-government on the local level. In 2001, the number of boroughs was territorially reformed from 23 to 12 in order to equalize their population size to around 300,000 inhabitants per borough (Hoffmann & Schwenkner 2010). Each borough holds a local parliament (Bezirksverordnetenversammlung) and an executive structure (Bezirksamt and Bezirksbürgermeister). The political structure on the state level consists of the House of Representatives (Abgeordnetenhaus) and an executive organ (Senat with Regierende Bürgermeister and Senatoren), which heads a
number of sectorial administrative units (cf. Land Berlin & Senatsverwaltung für Inneres und Sport 2013).

Brandenburg, in contrast, is administratively organised based on municipalities (Gemeinden) and rural districts (Landkreise). On the municipal level, the major and the representative organ (Gemeindevertretung or Rat) are directly elected and complement an administrative unit (Künzel 2010). The rural districts constitute a mediate level between the local and federal level with an executive (Landrat) and elected representatives (Kreistag). On the federal level, Brandenburg’s political system consists of an elected parliament (Landtag) and a government (Landesregierung) with a prime minister (Ministerpräsident) (Land Brandenburg & Landesregierung Brandenburg 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial level</th>
<th>Relevant bodies or sub-units</th>
<th>Important competences and tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal level:</strong> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, Bundesministeriums für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit (BMUB), Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik</td>
<td>Air transport and railways (Art. 73 GG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State level:</strong> Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt, Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Forschung</td>
<td>Urban development and urban renewal (Städtebauförderung)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State level:</strong> Ministerium für Infrastruktur und Landwirtschaft, Ministerium für Wirtschaft und Europaangelegenheiten</td>
<td>Spatial planning (Raumordnung)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local level:</strong> Bezirksamt (Wirtschaftsförderung, Bauwesen), Main administrations (Amt)</td>
<td>Common task (with state level) for improvement of regional economic structure (Gemeinsame Aufgabe Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur, Art. 91 GG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tab.1: Institutional set-up and multi-level structure of Berlin-Brandenburg in the fields of spatial and economic development.

The political system of Germany is often described as a cooperative federalism, in which competences are shared between different levels and the administrative implementation of a policy takes place on a hierarchically lower jurisdictions than the decision-making (cf. Fricke & Grasl 2014). Table 1 illustrates how specific policy fields are not always linked to one governmental level for the case of Berlin-Brandenburg. The table includes only selected bodies or units, which are estimated to be important for the constitution of a metropolitan scale, and describes their competences regarding spatial and economic development.
Cooperative federalism is also characterised by its multi-level interdependencies in fiscal terms. In Germany, there exists a complex system of fiscal equalization (Länderfinanzausgleich), by which financially weaker federal states receive funding from donor states. The fact that Berlin is one of the major recipients (in 2013 3.5 Mio €, cf. Bundesfinanzministerium 2014; Zawatka-Gerlach 2014) is currently contested by the donor countries.

4.2 Institutional governance practices in the metropolitan space

The institutional set-up in Berlin and Brandenburg described above builds the context for a number of practices arrangements referring to multiple metropolitan scales, such as territorial reforms or institutional arrangements for inter-state cooperation. Some of these metropolitan practices developed in a chronological manner and build on previous practices, while others exist synchronically. The following section describes different practices and thereby draws a picture of the different arenas in which the metropolitan policies take place.

4.2.1 Attempts of territorial reform of Berlin and Brandenburg

Attempts of territorial reform constitute one discursive perspective on Berlin-Brandenburg as a metropolitan space. Regarding discourse on institutional reform two distinct, yet related options have to be taken into consideration: First, it has to be questioned why there was no city-regional planning district introduced after Berlin-Brandenburg being designated a metropolitan region by the federal level. This, secondly, is related to the question why the merger of the two states failed in 1996 and has not been re-launched since. Instead, Berlin-Brandenburg chose a third option of creating cooperation between existing territorial units in a less intensive fashion, which is more flexible and less institutionalized.

The possibility of rescaling was internally debated under the label of a functional planning district including the immediate sphere of influence order to institutionalise the planning between the boroughs of Berlin and the surrounding municipalities of Brandenburg in form of a ring or corona (for instance in a functional municipal union (Zweckverband Berlin-Brandenburg, cf. Krappweis 2001: 226). Another suggestion was to introduce a planning district between Berlin and the surrounding rural districts (Zweckverband Umland-Berlin, cf. Sauberzweig & Schmidt-Eichstaedt 1992, see for an overview of suggestions for city-regional planning Benz et al. 1995). As Brandenburg opposed to both models, it was able to enforce its own pie-slice model (Tortenstückmodell) of five regional planning districts (Regionale Planungsgemeinschaften, Benz et al. 1995).

While the option of cooperation on the municipal level was no longer debated, a political-administrative merger of the two states became even more important as a metropolitan practice. Regarding the attempt in the mid-1990s, it has to be questioned, why the merger of Berlin and Brandenburg failed and why a complete political-administrative union of the two independent states in near future is politically impossible.

The perception of Berlin-Brandenburg as two separate political entities builds on a series of events or practices that can be seen as a historical process oscillating between rapprochement and repulsion. The jurisdictions of Berlin and Brandenburg were introduced after re-unification and in the early 1990s the preparation of a merger started. The political debate concerned the question of how the relationship of the two political-administrative units could be managed. In 1992, the governments of the two states established a common governmental commission, with the task to prepare the territorial reform. An interstate treaty on the merger was adopted by both parliaments in 1995, yet the public opinion and political coalitions in Brandenburg were not strongly in favour. The population of Berlin
voted for the merger in a popular vote in 1996 while Brandenburg’s population opposed it. As a result, the popular support for the treaty was not sufficient and the territorial reform failed.

A number of arguments were brought forward for and against the merger (for an overview of the events regarding spatial planning see Krappweis 2001; for a legal perspective on the merger see Tripke 2009, for fiscal and economic explanations Hauswirth et al. 2003). The merger was expected to be advantageous regarding the fiscal situation of both jurisdictions because administrative structures were to be reformed. Furthermore, the governance of the areas surrounding Berlin was supposed to be more effective. In contrast, an argument that was used by opponents of the merger was that of the unclear situation regarding the system of fiscal equalisation (Länderfinanzausgleich). Other issues that hampered the merger in 1996 were said to be the urban-rural divergence, the fear of Brandenburg’s population to be ruled out by the Berlin majority, and historically-ideological resentments (Krappweis 2001: 217f).

At the beginning of the 2000s, there were political attempts to re-schedule a popular vote on the merger for 2009. In the mid-2000s, however, the interest of the political side to push forward the merger lessened and was more oriented towards inter-state cooperation (Industrie- und Handelskammer Berlin 2014; Stiftung Zukunft Berlin 2014). In the late 2000s, the support for the merger among both populations also diminished (Niedermayer & Stöss 2008). Economic actors still emphasized their interest in a territorial reform in the long term (Märkische Allgemeine 2010; Industrie- und Handelskammer Berlin 2014; Industrie- und Handelskammern 2010). Recently, a new discussion was launched by the association ‘Perspektive Berlin-Brandenburg’ (Perspektive Berlin-Brandenburg e.V. 2014), which succeeded to initiate a ‘secret meeting’ between the two heads of state, yet with the result that a merger is not possible currently and inter-state cooperation has to be enhanced (Metzner 2013).

While the merger failed in 1996 because of the negative vote of Brandenburg’s population, a number of joint institutions and initiatives were set up for cooperation between the two jurisdictions in the field of spatial planning, regarding strategic infrastructure projects and economic policies. These different forms of inter-state cooperation will be discussed in the next section.

4.2.2 Metropolitan governance practices as different initiatives of cooperation

While governance practices failed to introduce a metropolitan institution as well as to merge the two states territorially, a variety of forms of institutional cooperation emerges. These initiatives of cooperation developed between different territorial jurisdictions, for instance between the two federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg, and also between municipalities as well as other (mainly public) actors. In this short section, the current practices of metropolitan governance will be identified in order to describe in the following section how they constitute different metropolitan scales in their current policies.

Before and after the attempt of the merger in 1996, a ‘wave of merger’ (“Fusionswelle” cf. Industrie- und Handelskammer Berlin 2014) took place, initiating a number of institutional cooperation based on public contracts on the state level. Initially, these were supposed to prepare the overall territorial reform, but continued even after the failed popular vote. In retrospective, this institutional inter-state cooperation is seen as a ‘small merger’ (Krappweis 2001: 216), a ‘partial merger’ (Tripke 2009) or even as a cohabitation (“wilde Ehe”: cf. Arndt 2006).

Today, there exist a formalised system of inter-state as well as inter-municipal cooperation in the field of regional planning based on the German hierarchal planning system: On the state level, the joint spatial development department (Gemeinsame Landesplanungsabteilung) was introduced in 1996, which is complemented by a joint commission on planning as a ministerial institution (Benz et al. 1995; Häußermann 2003; Holtmann 2005). In 2006, the joint department published an informal common
development strategy (entitled “Leitbild” cf. Gemeinsame Landesplanungsabteilung der Länder Berlin und Brandenburg 2006), which built the ground for a formally binding program and plans for the spatial development of both states (“Landesentwicklungsprogramm” cf. Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung et al. 2008; “Landesentwicklungsplan” cf. Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung et al. 2009, for the analysis of the documents see below). The personal structure of the joint department is reflecting the equal influence of both states on the decision-making level. Nevertheless, representatives of economic interests (Industrie- und Handelskammer Berlin 2014) observe a more Brandenburg-friendly position of the joint department, due to its location in Potsdam and the fact that most employees are brought in by Brandenburg government.

In 1993, five regional planning districts between Brandenburg and Berlin were introduced. Territorially, they are organized according to the pie-slice model and members of these public bodies are rural districts or cities. All of the five regional districts established regional plans between 1998 and 2002, yet legal claims were raised concerning wind energy planning so that none of the plans is legally binding today (Gemeinsame Landesplanungsabteilung Berlin-Brandenburg 2014). Furthermore, an inter-municipal neighbourhood forum (Kommunales Nachbarschaftsforum) was established in order to coordinate the different planning districts in the surrounding areas of Berlin (Kommunales Nachbarschaftsforum (KNF) 2007; Segebarde & Elsing 2008).

Besides, a variety of inter-state institutions exist, for instance in the field of broadcasting or for the support of economic networks. In contrast, concurrent practices of promotion of economic development developed in the field of economic development (Wirtschaftsförderung, Industrie- und Handelskammer Berlin 2014). In 2008, an attempt to merge the agencies for economic development (Wirtschaftsfördergesellschaften, Berlin Partner and Zukunfts Agentur Brandenburg) failed.

4.2.3 Berlin-Brandenburg as a ‘European Metropolitan Region’

One distinctive discursive practice which directly refers to Berlin-Brandenburg as a metropolitan space is the German debate on ‘European Metropolitan Regions’. In Germany, metropolitan regions were introduced as a new spatial category and as a concept of federal spatial planning in the mid-1990s by the ministerial conference of planning (Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung). In 1995, the federal action framework on spatial policy designated a first group of six metropolitan regions: Berlin-Brandenburg, Hamburg, München, Frankfurt/Rhein-Main, Rhein-Ruhr, and Stuttgart (Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung, Geschäftsstelle im Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) 2006). In 2006, a second group of metropolitan regions was designated: Halle/Leipzig-Sachsenreick, Hannover-Braunschweig-Göttingen, Nürnberg, Rhein-Neckar, Bremen-Oldenburg (cf. Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung, Geschäftsstelle im Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) 2006). In total, 11 metropolitan regions were identified by the federal level (see for a description of context and institutional set-up Ludwig 2008). The exact definition of their spatial extension as well as their institutional structure were left open and to be defined by the metropolitan regions themselves in order to enhance a “competition of successful models of city-regional self-organization” (Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung, Geschäftsstelle im Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) 2006, translation by the authors). This also accounted for the fact that in some of the regions, different organisations for regional planning already existed (Benz 1995). Since the introduction of the political concept, very different organisational forms for metropolitan governance developed and rescaling as well as metropolitan reform took place (Benz et al. 1998; Blatter 2006; Fürst 2005; Heinelt & Zimmermann 2011).

Although the concept of ‘European Metropolitan Regions’ was introduced on the German federal level, its name (Europäische Metropolregionen) explicitly refers to a European context. This is based on the idea that the identified metropolitan regions in Germany play an important role in the European and international urban hierarchy and fulfill specific metropolitan functions (Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR) within the Federal Office for Building and
Regional Planning (BBR), Bonn 2011). This corresponds with a qualitative as well as evidence-based approach that these metropolitan functions are measurable in empirical terms (for a monitoring of metropolitan regions in Germany, see: Initiativekreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland (IKM) & Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung (BBSR) 2010; for a more critical perspective: Blotevogel & Schulze 2009).

Here, the introduction of metropolitan regions as a spatial planning concept is interpreted as an interrelated discursive practice for possible practices of metropolitan political rescaling in Berlin-Brandenburg. Since 1995, Berlin-Brandenburg is designated a ‘metropolitan region’ (Metropolregion) with its own entitlement as the ‘capital region’ (Hauptstadtregion) in various planning concepts on the federal and state level. The actors in the metropolitan space could have used this renewal of federal spatial planning for institutional reform and the creation of an independent, explicit metropolitan scale, for instance for introducing a regional planning district or territorial reform (see above). For the case of Berlin-Brandenburg, it remains thus debateable, why the introduction of metropolitan regions in Germany was not used as a window of opportunity for metropolitan rescaling or territorial reform.

4.3 The metropolitan scope of current spatial and economic policies: What is meant by “metropolitan” Berlin?

This section compares the construction of a metropolitan dimension in different spatial and economic development plans and policies. In relation to these different domains of policy-making, it addresses the question, first, of how a metropolitan scope of spatial development policies is defined and, second, of whether and what kind of metropolitan scale is implied. For this purpose, we analyse plans, programs, strategies based on their verbal formulation and visual representations. The selected policies are related to the different practices of metropolitan governance and are (explicitly or implicitly) referring to the ‘space’ or spatial ‘image’ of Berlin. In contrast, we do not consider policies that refer only to local levels or Brandenburg.

We argue that the documents analysed in the policy domains of spatial planning and economic development follow different spatial logics. In regional planning documents, space is explicitly referred to as a bounded territory and as an object to steer or to govern. Planning documents are embedded in the hierarchical planning system and therefore strongly linked to governmental levels, competences and jurisdictions. We expect this to be the case in more formal spatial plans as well as in informal, integrated planning strategies. Economic development policies are also taking place in a federal system but, in contrast, more often cut across governmental levels as well as being probably more directly influenced by private actors’ perceptions of space. Here we analyse formal and informal concepts as well as public-private initiatives for economic development.

The comparison of policies and plans focuses on the question of how a metropolitan scale is implicitly constructed or even explicitly defined in political and planning discourse. More specifically, it looks at how policies formulate spatial scales, as either an (implicit) scalar effect of the scope of policies, or as an (explicit) spatial reference for policies. It aims at a comparison of the varying metropolitan foci of policy-making and questions to what possibly new metropolitan scale(s) they are referring to. Thereby, we then draw conclusions on how visions and spatial definitions contribute to the establishment of a metropolitan scale as either the result of an implicit or explicit project.

In order to answer these questions, we examine the selected documents in three analytical steps. First, we compare the verbal formulations in a qualitative document analysis. We start with an inductive coding of the participating actors, themes or functions, options of cooperation, and explicit references to a specific scale, which findings are summarized in table 2. Secondly, we refine the coding according to the spatial orientation of documents. Here we investigate on how the documents re-formulate the spatial orientation of documents. Here we investigate on how the documents re-formulate the metropolitan scale, in terms of visions or paradigms of metropolitan development (see table 3 in the appendix). In a third step, we then compare differences and similarities of spatial or
Comparing the different policy documents, strategies and plans, the following overall patterns (or discursive strings) can be observed. A more general distinction can be made between documents focused on spatial planning and strategies promoting economic development. In planning documents, mostly public actors are involved and – as in the here selected documents – public actors stemming only from one governmental level. In contrast, informal strategies aiming at the promotion of economic development, such as the Wachstumsinitiative or the Masterplan Industriestadt, also involve private actors such as branch associations and the chamber of commerce. With regard to their area of reference, both informal strategies promoting economic development, focus on the city state Berlin, but also emphasise the need for cooperation and action beyond state borders. For example, the master plan industrial city (Masterplan Industriestadt) states that “coordination and cooperation with the state of Brandenburg” (Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Frauen & Netzwerk Industriepolitik 2010) is needed for more economic growth and an integrated locational policy.

There exists furthermore a difference between spatial and economic documents when it comes to the possibilities of cooperation. The economic policies emphasize cooperation between public and private
actors, such as economy and science, while planning documents draw attention to cooperation between different jurisdictions and especially between the states of Berlin and Brandenburg.

The metropolitan scale or city-regional relations are discussed in almost all documents, but are seldom the main focus or even explicitly addressed. The documents aimed at economic development such as the Wachstumsinitiative, Masterplan Industriestadt, SteP Industrie & Gewerbe, all focus on Berlin itself. While they construct Berlin as a city state, they also discuss its relationship with the surrounding areas. The documents also refer to city-regional relationships are referred to when, for instance, they state that “Berlin has to be seen as a metropolitan area” (Vereinigung der Unternehmensverbände in Berlin und Brandenburg e.V. et al. 2004).

The documents produced by the joint department for regional planning officially focus on Berlin-Brandenburg entitled “capital region”, especially in the spatial development program (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung et al. 2008). At the same time, they differentiate between Berlin, its direct surroundings and the remaining regions of Brandenburg. They describe the metropolitan scale of Berlin as “area close to Berlin” (Gemeinsame Landesplanungsabteilung der Länder Berlin und Brandenburg 2006) or the “city-regional relationship around Berlin and Potsdam” (Gemeinsame Landesplanungsabteilung 2009). Here, the metropolitan region of Berlin is represented as a scale, which does not match jurisdictional borders.

More recent documents introduce the idea of a variable geometry of cooperation. For instance, the most recent urban development concept for Berlin suggests that spatial delimitations of the relationship between Berlin and Brandenburg are „dynamic arrangements“ (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt 2013b) depending on functional requirements. Similar to that is the spatial logic of the report on larger scale cooperation in the field of regional planning between Berlin, Brandenburg and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, which reflects different actions spaces of participating actors (Land Mecklenburg-Vorpommern et al. 2008).

Another pattern can be studies by comparing the documents over time. Comparing documents form the early 2000s to recent ones we observe significant changes in the visual and linguistic representations and reference to the metropolitan space. At the beginning of the 2000s, documents name the merger of Berlin-Brandenburg as the main political goal of inter-state cooperation (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung 2004; Vereinigung der Unternehmensverbände in Berlin und Brandenburg e.V. et al. 2004). Today, the importance of Berlin itself is more emphasised, which is underlined by the title “Berlin as metropolis” of the current urban development strategy (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt 2013b, see also master plan industrial city Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Frauen & Netzwerk Industriepolitik 2010). Additionally, the more recent strategies focus on selected areas inside the city state, for instance called “transformation areas” (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt 2013a) or recommend measures for specific boroughs (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung & Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Frauen 2011).

Another significant concurrent, but potentially competitive discourse delineates an understanding of the metropolitan region as defined by the dominance of the core (Kernstadt or Metropole Berlin). It stems from policies that express not only an autonomous agency by the Land Berlin, but also an autonomous positioning of Berlin – its core agglomeration being almost coextensive with the territorial extension of the Land – as a metropolis in itself. This perspective leads to the question of how Berlin, in terms of spatial and economic development policies, can succeed in constituting itself as a metropolitan scale independently from of its surroundings. The discursive practice regarding the spatial pattern of the metropolitan region often refers to the city of Berlin as the core (Kernstadt) of a larger functionally related space (Verflechtungsraum). This perspective often refers on arguments that emphasize a strong centralization not only in physical-spatial terms, but also regarding the focus of strategic development branches and initiatives within the metropolitan core.
5. Conclusions

On the background of the pitfalls of institutional attempts at metropolitan reform and of a shifting understanding of metropolitan space (discussed in section 4.2), this paper addresses the question of how the visions and spatial definitions expressed by different domains of spatial and economic development policy contribute to the establishment of a metropolitan scale (discussed in section 4.3).

The policies selected for this purpose relate to different practices of metropolitan governance and, – not surprisingly, given the absence of a strong ‘explicit’ project metropolitan – also feature different spatial references. The first stage of analysis we have conducted on the basis of the verbal formulation and visual representations in plans, programs and strategies, in addition, highlights the co-presence of a variety of different spatial logics across different policy fields.

Among the provisional findings we can draw is that there is a significant difference in spatial reference between spatial and economic documents, particularly as the definition of spatial arenas for cooperation is concerned. At the same time, while there is a constant – and possibly often rhetoric – reference to a metropolitan scale or to city-regional relations, the focus and definition involved are variable and also involve varying relationships with jurisdictional entities or borders. This is in line with the increasing explicit understanding of a variable geometry of governance, seen as dependent on the specific functional and spatial scope of cooperation, intended as ‘dynamic arrangements’ and reflecting their different actions spaces. Next to a significant co-presence of different spatial rationales, we however also recognize significant changes in the visual and linguistic representations and reference to the metropolitan space – of which possibly the most significant is a discourse identifying the metropolitan space with Berlin’s urban core.

The findings seem to confirm – from the viewpoint of an analysis of spatial representations – the image of Berlin as a laggard in metropolitan governance and in the establishment of a metropolitan scale in the German context. It also seems to support, moreover, the hypothesis that metropolitan space, far from being a consolidated policy object, is at stake in a variety of potentially competing policy practices. The provisional interpretation we draw from this serves as a background for addressing this in further stages of analysis.

Berlin’s metropolitan space presents a situation characterized by multiple arenas of cooperation in spatial development policy, and which is the historically and institutionally determined expression of a weak metropolitan governance capacity. While the reasons for this are complex, they can traced back, on the one hand, to a distinctively monocentric pattern of socio-spatial and functional relationships in the metropolitan region with a high centrality of the capital city-state and, on the other hand, to the resilience of the federal political-institutional setup of territorial government that has led to failure of designs of territorial reform – and in particular, so far, the merger of Berlin and Brandenburg.

Against the background of the re-positioning of the urban region in terms of both functional dynamics and geopolitical after German re-unification, institutional reforms designs involving the creation of new territorial jurisdictions failed to gain political-institutional support, highlighting significant divides in the joint definition of metropolitan interests and tasks. Meanwhile, the emergence of new frames of reference for territorial politics and governance based on functional-strategic definitions of scope rather than on institutional ‘scale’ reform – in particular, the federal policy of promoting ‘European Metropolitan Regions’ – has offered a rationale for a range of flexible and ad-hoc modes of inter-institutional cooperation, without however supplying a distinctive spatial concept in terms of a ‘rescaling’ project.

As a response to constraints to achieving a comprehensive renewal of the jurisdictional setup of the state, an ‘experimental’ but highly tentative and fragmented policy environment has thus emerged, in which multiple actors constellations and multiple development coalitions define flexible, often overlapping governance arrangements, the spatial reference of which is often defined in relative autonomy according to their definition of scope – and even in relative autonomy from their institutional
and functional nesting within territorial jurisdictions. The result is that unitary and consistent representations of metropolitan space are barely recognizable, but also that metropolitan scale is rarely represented in terms of an explicit project. The more apparent becomes therefore the fact that different areas of spatial development policy and governance contribute to defining policy-driven understandings of metropolitan space and to realizing scale effects. As such, they represent potentially competing, if not conflicting, representations of metropolitan space that strive for hegemony in defining orientations of public action as ‘implicit’ scalar projects.

The interpretive framework thus defined constitutes a starting point for inquiring – in the following stages of research – into the role played by economic actors in the construction of metropolitan space. The focus will be in particular on the way their interest-based policy practices – either through channels of representation and consultation, direct involvement in cooperative decision-making and governance arenas, or lobbying and bargaining – influence representations, discourses and practices of metropolitan space in spatial development policy.

Note

1 The authors would like to thank Johanna Franke and Martin Rhode for their support in data and literature research.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Spatial orientation of thematic focus</th>
<th>Spatial orientation of cooperation</th>
<th>Reference areas</th>
<th>Explicit metropolitan scale?</th>
<th>Descriptions of a metropolitan or city-regional space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stadtentwicklungs-konzept 2020</td>
<td>Berlin metropolis, and city-regional-relations</td>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg</td>
<td>sub-districts, inner sphere of interrelations Verflechtungsraum, wider sphere of development (äußerer Entwicklungsraum, p. 34)</td>
<td>&quot;metropolis in the region&quot; (p. 5); &quot;metropolitan region (inner sphere of influence)&quot; (p. 24)</td>
<td>&quot;Innerhalb des Gemeinsamen Planungsraumes Berlin-Brandenburg bilden Berlin und der engere Verflechtungsraum die Metropolregion Berlin (metropolitan area).&quot; (p. 29); &quot;Auf Grund der verschiedenen funktionalen Beziehungen von Metropole, engem Verflechtungsraum und äußerem Entwicklungsraum bedarf es unterschiedlicher Strategien für den Gemeinsamen Planungsraum beider Länder, für den Stadt-Umland-Raum sowie für die Lösung der spezifischen Strukturprobleme des äußeren Entwicklungsraumes.&quot; (S. 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtentwicklungs-konzept 2030</td>
<td>Berlin metropolis, and city-region, &quot;capital region&quot;</td>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg and beyond</td>
<td>State Berlin and selected strategic areas (p. 7)</td>
<td>&quot;Berlin as metropolis&quot; (p. 14),</td>
<td>„Die Beziehungen zwischen Berlin und Brandenburg sind, wie in jeder Metropolregion, dynamische Arrangements, für die sich je nach Thema andere Funktionsbeziehungen mit jeweiligen räumlichen Zuschnitten ergeben.“ (S. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wachstumssinitiative</td>
<td>Berlin's positioning and competitiveness</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>State Berlin and Berlin-Brandenburg</td>
<td>&quot;metropolitan region&quot; (p. 6 and 13)</td>
<td>&quot;Berlin muss als Metropolenraum betrachtet werden und als solcher in Deutschland und der Welt auftreten. Als wichtigster Schritt ist die Fusion der Bundesländer Berlin und Brandenburg voranzutreiben. Doch bereits schon jetzt ist eine Verbesserung und Intensivierung der länderübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit der Länder, insbesondere im Bereich der Wirtschaftsförderung, anzustreben.&quot; (S. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterplan Industriestadt</td>
<td>Berlin's industrial policy and specific locations</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>State Berlin (and Berlin-Brandenburg)</td>
<td>&quot;metropolis Berlin&quot; (p. 4)</td>
<td>&quot;Überdurchschnittliches Wachstum in der Berliner Industrie wird durch eine integrierte Standortpolitik gestützt. […] Das umfasst auch die noch engere Koordination und Kooperation mit dem Land Brandenburg, um Synergien zu nutzen und Mehrfachstrukturen zu vermeiden.&quot; (p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SteP Industrie &amp; Gewerbe</td>
<td>Berlin's economy; industrial locations and specific quarters</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>State Berlin and selected strategic projects or areas</td>
<td>&quot;capital region&quot;</td>
<td>„Wirtschaft entwickelt sich stets auch in einem regionalen Kontext, enge regionale Verflechtungen sind eine wesentliche Voraussetzung für eine stabile wirtschaftliche Basis. […] wobei die ökonomische Verflechtung ihren räumlichen Niederschlag v.a. entlang der wesentlichen Achsen findet, die die wirtschaftlichen Zentren der Stadt und des Umlands verbinden.&quot; (p. 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leitbild Hauptstadt-region</td>
<td>metropolitan region and German capital</td>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg</td>
<td>States Berlin and Brandenburg</td>
<td>&quot;capital region&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Berlin – das zeigt die historische Erfahrung – kann ohne Region keine Metropole sein.&quot; (p. 3); &quot;Wir nennen uns Hauptstadtregion 'Berlin-Brandenburg', weil wir davon überzeugt sind, dass die Bundeshauptstadt in unserer Mitte der gesamten Region besondere Chancen eröffnet.&quot; (p. 5); &quot;Entwicklung Berlins und des berlinnahen Raumes als Wachstumsmotor der Region&quot; (S. 6);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landesentwicklungsprogramm</td>
<td>Berlin and Brandenburg as entire region and</td>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg</td>
<td>States Berlin and Brandenburg</td>
<td>&quot;capital region&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Die Hauptstadtregion Berlin-Brandenburg (Hauptstadtregion) ist eine europäische Metropolregion und umfasst das Gesamtgebiet der Länder Berlin und Brandenburg.&quot; (p. 5);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Spatial orientation of thematic focus</th>
<th>Spatial orientation of cooperation</th>
<th>Reference areas</th>
<th>Explicit metropolitan scale?</th>
<th>Descriptions of a metropolitan or city-regional space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landes-entwicklungs-plan</td>
<td>Berlin and Brandenburg as entire region and capital region</td>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg</td>
<td>States Berlin and Brandenburg</td>
<td>“metropolis Berlin” and “capital region” (p. 15)</td>
<td>“Gesamtgebiet der Länder Berlin-Brandenburg (gemeinsamer Planungsraum)” (p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORO BB-MV</td>
<td>North-East</td>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg and beyond</td>
<td>States Berlin, Brandenburg, and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern</td>
<td>“metropolis Berlin” (p. 5)</td>
<td>“Metropole Berlin mit ihrem Stadt-Umland-Raum als wirtschaftliches, wissenschaftliches, politisches und kulturelles Zentrum des Raumes” (p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovations-strategie</td>
<td>cross-state cooperation Berlin and Brandenburg</td>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg</td>
<td>States Berlin and Brandenburg</td>
<td>“capital region” (title)</td>
<td>(inter-state cooperation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab.3: Metropolitan scale and scope of analysed policy documents.