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2. Executive summary

This report outlines the preliminary findings of a four-year cross Canada research project investigating regional development in theory and practice as well as considerations for future potentials in advancing regional development in the province and across the country. This SSHRC funded project compared the policies and practices of four provinces: British Columbia, Newfoundland and Labrador, Ontario and Quebec, and in specific regions in each province. Due to the support from the Harris Centre Applied Research Fund, two regions have been investigated in Newfoundland and Labrador. This has allowed for the exploration of varying and similar approaches and circumstances within this province and, in particular, in the Kittiwake Economic Zone/Gander-New-Wes-Valley Rural Secretariat Region. The findings in this report contribute to a greater understanding on how “New Regionalism” have been and can be applied to the Kittiwake regional context and will facilitate more appropriate regional policies and future practice.

For this project the research team examined five key themes pertinent to regional development, and New Regionalism in particular. First, we wanted to see if policy makers and practitioners on the front line are now re-focusing on PLACE itself as a starting point for development. It was found in the Kittiwake region that geographical landscapes, histories and socio-cultural identities have influenced initiatives, plans and programs. This influence exists on a community scale, but there is little evidence of a broad, region-wide identity. The impacts of transient workers on place-based approaches were also raised in the research as a topic for further study, complementary with the new major research initiative – On the Move – at Memorial University. There was little evidence of formal place-based sustainability initiatives other than some watershed related initiatives.

Second, we were interested in the extent to which power and development decision-making is shared among different groups at all levels: a key ingredient of GOVERNANCE. Throughout the region it was clear that there was a lack of consistency in what governance really meant to different actors. Many multiple community collaborations were taking place, however there was a lack of a coherent region-wide strategy. Local actors have become increasingly aware of the need for governance, though it is still evident that when collaborations exist between multi-levels of government (federal, provincial, local) and non-government organizations, senior government still maintain the majority of decision making power.

We also explored the role that KNOWLEDGE AND INNOVATION played in the development process in the Kittiwake region. Not surprisingly, Memorial University and the Harris Centre were strong actors for the support of knowledge flows and innovation. Barriers to innovation included: limited access to capital, attraction and retention of human resources, aging rural populations and youth out migration. In the monitoring of current policies and the creation of new policies and programs most evaluations remain informal in nature, as are the knowledge claims made by interview respondents.
How RURAL-URBAN relationships are managed was another theme of this research. It was found in an initial analysis that rural and urban interactions in the region were usually either more informal associative interactions or solely based on market or bureaucratic agendas. The realization of the interdependencies of economic networks in the Kittiwake region has recently become more prevalent with branding exercises such as ‘Buy Local: Keep it in Kittiwake’.

Finally, we wanted to know the extent to which a wide variety of sectors and issues are INTEGRATED into regional development practices. Throughout the Kittiwake region there is the acknowledgement of complexities in planning. However, in regards to multi-objective perspectives, planning, regional development and policies are still strongly economic centric, especially at the federal and provincial level. To date, there is no evidence of an all encompassing Kittiwake/Gander-New-Wes-Valley regional plan.

Ultimately, the various components of regional development according to the explored framework of New Regionalism are present to various extents throughout the region, making it inappropriate to make an overall statement regarding the applicability of New Regionalism in Kittiwake regional development practice. The Department of Industry, Business and Rural Development (IBRD), the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) and the Kittiwake Economic Development Corporation (KEDC) were found to be strong region-wide actors. As the KEDC was found to be the leading organization pursuing an explicit regional agenda in economic development, the closure of the REDB is likely to threaten progress in regional economic development approaches. In concluding this report, the authors have provided a number of recommendations regarding future regional development policy and practice based on the five themes under investigation in the Kittiwake region. As a part of a larger project team, we recognize that further analysis is required and that maintaining continued relationships with our research partners and regional stakeholders will be critical in furthering knowledge and community mobilization around a regional development agenda.

3. Introduction

3.1 Project background and purpose

Regional development (RD) has been recognized in Canada and elsewhere as a strategy for addressing the needs of areas of the country that have not benefited from the same levels of socio-economic development as others. Yet after 50 years of RD efforts many communities and regions continue to have vulnerable economies, limited livelihood opportunities, and other disadvantages that leave them ill-equipped to cope with relatively rapid restructuring and structural challenges such as urbanization, resource depletion, technological advancement, demands for high quality services, and governance change (Markusen & Glasmeier, 2008; OECD, 2006). Despite periods of investment and persistent need, Canada’s RD history remains largely unevaluated (Desjardins et al., 2003). Savoie (2003, p. 172) suggests “regional development policy now has a serious credibility problem” while Kitson et al. (2004) contend
that regional development policy has jumped ahead of regional understanding and empirical analysis.

Since the mid-1990s, the region has re-emerged as subject of policy and practice, as well as academic debate. The region is described today as “a fundamental basis of economic and social life” (Storper, 1997, p. 3) and as “key economic units in the global economy” (Florida, 1995, p. 531) as a focus for knowledge creation, innovation, and decision-making (Tomblin, 2002; Welch, 2002; Harrison, 2006). This return to regions, but shift in focus and approach has been called “New Regionalism”. Douglas (1999), Vodden (2005, 2009) and others suggest that New Regionalism is increasingly being pursued by networks of rural communities as a means of recognizing shared interests, coping with common scarcity of resources, and fostering collaboration (Douglas, 1999; Vodden, 2005).

Through the investigation of the Kittiwake Economic Zone as a case study, in a national, 4-year project the purpose this research is: (i) to undertake a critical assessment of the application and relevance of New Regionalism in the Canadian context; (ii) to seek Canadian innovations in RD; and (iii) to understand how these innovations are evolving and if and how they are being shared across space in networks of RD practice. We have sought to address existing gaps in theory and practice by conducting an empirical assessment of Canadian RD, with a focus on four case study provinces including Newfoundland and Labrador (NL). The research will contribute to the advancement of knowledge and a growing, international body of literature on development governance, New Regionalism and learning and innovation in RD. It will enhance understanding of factors that contribute to successes and failures in Canadian RD and facilitate more appropriate policies and future practice. To accomplish these objectives the research has addressed the following research questions:

1) How has Canadian, and in this case NL, regional development (RD) policy and practice evolved since the creation of existing federal regional development agencies in the 1980s?

2) To what extent have Canadian RD systems incorporated the key themes of New Regionalism into their policy and practice?

3) What can we learn from the Canadian context about the merits or flaws of New Regionalism and associated theories and concepts?

4) What innovations have been developed in Canadian, and in this case NL and Kittiwake region RD that can contribute to the broader body of RD theory and practice provincially, nationally and internationally?

5) To what extent is RD in Canada, particularly in four Canadian provinces and in this case NL and the Kittiwake region, characterized by knowledge transfers and shared learning among policy and programme designers and practitioners; and

6) What factors enable or constrain knowledge flow and what current and potential mechanisms exist for facilitating learning, knowledge flow and collaboration within Canadian RD networks?
The national project, funded by SSHRC, allows for one case study region per province and due to the support from the Harris Centre Applied Research Fund, two regions have been investigated in Newfoundland and Labrador. This has allowed for the exploration of varying and similar approaches and circumstances within this province and, in particular, in Kittiwake Economic Zone/Gander-New-Wes-Valley Rural Secretariat Region.

3.2 Theoretical approach

This research draws from and will contribute to a growing body of literature in several disciplines that recognizes development as taking place within a complex, changing world where many actors are dynamically interacting at multiple scales, forming “complex links within multi-scalar systems of governing” (Hudson, 2007, p. 1153). As a continual and spatially, sectorally, and institutionally layered process RD is compatible with this complex systems perspective and with network theory, a particularly appropriate lens through which we are examining this field. In turn, this research will allow us to reflect on the ways in which these perspectives can inform RD theory and practice. The interdisciplinary nature of our research team provides the breadth of scope and expertise required for a study of this nature and is consistent with a systems view that development and the study of development is necessarily interdisciplinary (Brett, 2001). The five key themes of New Regionalism, described further below, form the conceptual framework for this study.

The first key theme of New Regionalism that is being investigated is collaborative, multi-level governance. Until the 1990s Canadian RD interventions were largely focused on “equalizing” interprovincial inequities and negotiated federal-provincial arrangements (Hodge & Robinson, 2001; Ali et al., 2007). Today RD efforts involve an increasingly diverse set of actors, with overlapping and multi-level roles and policy and programme approaches (Galaway & Hudson, 1994; Douglas, 2006; Savoie, 2003; Vodden, 2009a). Increasing attention has been paid to the scale of the sub-provincial region and the emergence of a great variety of sub-provincial arrangements and structures such as economic development trusts, boards or authorities and inter-municipal collaborations (Coe, 2006; Brunnen, 2006; Markey et al., 2005; Greenwood, 2005; Douglas & Chadwick-Parkes, 2003; Vodden, 2005). It is argued these structures are more accessible and responsive to local communities than provincial and federal agencies, yet more affordable and effective at instigating change than single community efforts (Markey et al., 2005; RCEUN, 1986). New Regionalist proposals for institutional restructuring and multi-level governance networks that include regions as ‘new state spaces’ appear to have particular relevance for Canadian RD (Douglas & O’Keeffe, 2009; Vodden 2009a; Reimer & Markey, 2008; Albrechts, 2004).

Second, international experiences and RD literatures emphasize the need for integrated rather than single sector development approaches (OECD, 2006; Faludi, 2002; Goldenberg, 2008). The European Spatial Development Perspective, for example, promotes ‘territory’ and sustainable, balanced territorial development that better integrates sectoral policies and reconciles social, economic, ecological and cultural demands as a new dimension of European policy (ESDP, 1999;
Despite stated recognition that effective federal policy often requires horizontal collaboration (Beaumier, 1988; Canada, 2008) the extent to which this recognition has influenced Canadian RD is unclear.

Third, New Regionalist authors suggest that **knowledge flow and learning** are critical to economic outcomes, drawing on concepts such as innovation, social capital (‘relational assets’), and learning regions (Shearmur, 2008; Cooke & Morgan, 1998; Storper, 1997). New ideas and adaptations are required for survival and resilience in a changing world, they suggest, and regions are increasingly the level at which innovation is produced. Ideally, cultural norms and relationships within these ‘created spaces’ of linked actors, firms and institutions nurture creativity and innovation (Goldstein, 2005; Malmberg & Maskell, 1997; Coffey & Bailly, 1996). We have drawn from literatures on policy and organizational learning together with economic geography contributions on innovation systems to explore the nature and extent of the learning and innovation that is taking place within Kittiwake region and more broadly provincial and Canadian RD systems. The focus of innovation systems research has typically been at the level of the firm, industry cluster, or region. Cohendet & Llerena (2001) and others note the opportunities for broader learning through shared experiences as a community of practice but federal and provincial RD actors are criticized for lack of communication, coordination, coherent planning, and resistance to change while local actors often underestimate the need for investment in knowledge transfer or translation (Vodden, 2009a, c; Hughes, 2007; Savoie, 1992). A recent federal report (Canada, 2008, p.1) suggests there have been recent efforts “to understand local needs and circumstances in more comprehensive and holistic ways” without “opportunities or spaces for sharing and building upon this knowledge.” On the assumption that shared learnings in this diverse field are desirable, and without them there may be significant diseconomies and lost opportunities, this research will investigate whether learning is taking place across this diverse policy and organizational milieu and, if so, the nature of this learning (e.g. policy, institutional, management, technical dimensions, organizational innovation, collaborative processes, resourcing alternatives).

A fourth theme being explored is **place-based development**. The notion of place is linked to the geographer’s concept of genre de vie, or lifeworld, to relations between human societies and their environments, cultures, identities and ways of life (Buttimer, 2001; Rose, 1993, Reimer and Markey, 2008). While some authors suggest New Regionalist approaches are functional and relational rather than place-based, Storper (1997), Morgan (2007, p. 33) and others dismiss this “debilitating binary division,” pointing out that these interpretations need not be seen as mutually exclusive. In general, New Regionalist literature recognizes regional assets, identities, relationships, and governance structures and processes as place-based (Reimer & Markey, 2008; Markey et al., 2008), providing “soft economies” of learning and collaboration (Porter, 2000). Regions are perceived as an environment for competitiveness, entrepreneurialism, quality of life, relationships of complementarity and trust as well as planning and organizing (Kitson et al., 2004; Massey, 2004; Cattan et al., 2004). Douglas (2006) analyses re-emergent regionalism in the context of globalization. Authors such as Partridge and Rickman (2008), Andrew (2005) and Maxwell (2005) call for more place-based policy-making that is multi-sectoral, incorporates local values, aspirations and strengths and includes a commitment to
enhancing local capacity, infrastructure and informational systems as foundations of development.

Fifth, many New Regionalists focus on city-regions and high-profile urban metropoles as “engines of growth”. Savoie (2003) suggests Canada’s RD problem is now an urban-rural rather than a regional or provincial one. This research will build on a current body of Canadian, particularly Newfoundland and Labrador research focused on changing urban-rural relationships, interdependencies and shared governance arrangements, in which the applicants have played a leading role (Reimer, 2009a; Vodden 2009b, c). Examining these five themes of New Regionalism, their interconnections and relevance in a regional, provincial and national context offers the potential for significant advancement in the theory and practice of regional development and to contribute to this growing literature from a Canadian and, in this case, a Newfoundland and Labrador perspective.

3.3 Research methodology

The national research project has employed a comparative, embedded/multi-level, multi-case study research design to understand how theories and concepts associated with New Regionalism are applied within specific Canadian contexts, to determine their empirical and practical relevance and to draw lessons from their application for both practice and theory. Eisenhardt (1989), Gephart (1999) and others suggest case studies are an appropriate tool for this grounded theory building approach. Demetrion (2004) adds that the “thick” description of case study analysis is useful where we seek to understand, not just describe, the behaviour of agents and where causal attribution may be susceptible to multiple explanations. Given the complexity of RD and relative infancy of New Regionalism a case study approach has been adopted.

At the national level, to examine knowledge flows and innovations across provinces and provide a more comprehensive cross-Canada perspective, the research is also focusing on federal RD agencies and national associations that connect provincial RD organizations. Methods used at the national and provincial levels include an extensive review of published literature and related government and non-government reports, and interviews with key informants. Within each case study province, one region was selected to provide a local level perspective, ground truth findings at provincial and federal scales and their local relevance and to provide opportunities for local knowledge mobilization. In NL the Harris Centre’s Applied Research Fund support allowed for the inclusion of a second region in this study. The two selected regions were the St. Anthony - Port au Choix Rural Secretariat Region (with a focus on the multi-level governance theme) and Kittiwake Economic Zone/Zone 14 (with a focus on place-based development and rural-urban interactions). Both cases will also investigate the cross-cutting theme of innovation and knowledge flows. Within the Kittiwake region an independent but affiliated thesis project conducted by MA candidate Jennifer Daniels, and supported in part through the Harris Centre Applied Research Fund, provided in-depth insights into governance and place-based development within the Gander River watershed in particular.
A range of data sources are being used, including: literature, key informant interviews, participant observation at the sub-regional level, focus group sessions, and network mapping as a visual tool for analysis, dialogue, and dissemination. Interviews have been transcribed, organized by major themes (along with data from other sources) and analyzed for patterns by both the NL provincial team and by theme teams. The development of a unifying framework and close collaboration within the national research team, facilitated by regular team meetings and communication has provided consistency across cases, while also recognizing the need for flexibility to account for local circumstances and researcher approaches.

Case studies at the sub-provincial scale have been selected in a manner that ensures diversity in: population, degree of rural-urban interaction, single industry dependency, RD experience, organizational frameworks and approaches. Regions have been selected that have a cross-section of overlapping RD initiatives and characterizations of region (e.g. regional economic development, land use and/or coastal planning, city regions, leading vs. lagging) and that have the ability to illuminate each of the five themes within the conceptual framework. Willingness of regional partners to participate in the project has also been critical (in this case Kittiwake Economic Development Corp., Rural Secretariat and the Central Region Community Development Community of Practice).

The project has involved three phases. **Phase 1 – Laying the groundwork, literature review and case study engagement (June 2010 to June 2011)** has included: meetings and an initial work planning session with co-investigators (Oct. 2010); student recruitment and training; case study region selection and securing agreement from case study organizations and partners. Literature review has been conducted to synthesize the current state of knowledge in the theory and practice of New Regionalism, particularly as it relates to the five themes outlined above and Canadian applications (questions 2 and 3). **Phase 2 – Field work/data collection (May 2011 to May 2013)** has involved document review, practitioner interviews, surveys, and observation at all three case study levels to map the actors involved in RD, the extent to which and ways they interact across scales. Case study data collection included MA student residencies (Jennifer Daniels, Lauren Edens), participation observation and 53 interviews with RD stakeholders in Kittiwake region and 174 across the country. A review of government and non-government reports and websites and 8-10 national and provincial level key informant interviews will also be used to describe RD actors and their evolving roles in each province and nationally, the policies, programs and initiatives adopted, commonalities, differences and changes in policy and practice. We will seek to identify seminal moments and major periods of change after the 1980s development of federal RD agencies, assess the extent to which regionalism has “re-emerged” and the transition between ‘old’ and ‘new’ regionalism if such a shift has occurred (questions 1-4). Note: **Harris Centre Applied Research Funding supported phase 2 of this research within the Kittiwake region.**

**Phase 3 – Analysis and dissemination (August 2012-May 2014)** will finalize the identification and mapping of the actors involved in case study RD networks, the ways they interact, including the extent to which learning about RD policy and practice is shared, resulting innovations and/or transformations in decisions or behaviours. Connections between transformations in RD
and learning processes will be investigated (question 5) using a four part adaptive, learning framework for regional governance developed by Vodden (2009a). Factors that enable or constrain knowledge flow within case study networks will be identified. The degree to which knowledge transfers are even possible when the spatial extent, approaches to and conceptualizations of "development" itself are potentially boundless will be considered and opportunities for further development of learning systems and scaling up learning networks identified (question 6). Finally, a critical analysis of New Regionalism will be conducted in light of research findings (question 3) together with continued knowledge mobilization.

4. Kittiwake project results to date

4.1 Regional description

Kittiwake/Gander – New-Wes-Valley region is located in the north eastern coast of insular Newfoundland and Labrador. This region is delineated by the Regional Economic Development Zone (Kittiwake) and the provincial Rural Secretariat region (Gander – New-Wes -Valley) (Figure 1), which have closely overlapping jurisdictions. There are 119 communities (six with a population over 2,000) and a population of approximately 46,000 spanning over about 14,000 square kilometres of land (KEDC, 2009). Overall, the zone includes 35 incorporated municipalities, with three municipalities accessible only by boat (St. Brendan’s, Town of Fogo Island and Change Islands), and two Mi’kmaw bands\(^1\) located in Gander Bay and Glenwood. Fishing, retail sales, clerks & cashiers, clerical occupations, management, and fish processing workers are the region’s most common occupations (Community Accounts, 2006 census).

Figure 1: Gander – New-Wes Valley (Map Credit: C. Conway 2008)

\(^1\) Currently, the majority of Aboriginal residents in Glenwood and Gander Bay are registered through the Miawpukek First Nation (in Conne River) or the Qalipu First Nation. During the period of this study many members of the Glenwood and Gander Bay have become members of the new Qalipu First Nation.
4.2 Regional development in Kittiwake

Rural and regional development in the Kittiwake region over the past century has proceeded similarly to the rest of the island. Prior to Confederation - and the era of Joseph Smallwood as Premier - targeted rural and regional development in the province Newfoundland and Labrador was limited. During the period before Confederation, government was centralized in St. John’s, while outport communities had little in the way of local government structures; formal organization of local governments did not exist beyond a priest, politician, merchant and teacher (Baker & Pitt, 1988). Since permanent settlement of insular Newfoundland, rural communities were almost exclusively structured around the fishery, although small-scale agriculture and then later, in the early 1900s, larger scale mining and hydro-electric developments did emerge regionally. The rural economy was also supported through subsistence activities including wood cutting, game hunting, berry collecting and the use of personal and family gardens. However, the fishery was the backbone of the economy- with the concentration of wealth and decision making power centralized with the merchant-class and government located in St. John’s.

During the Smallwood era, rural Newfoundland experienced many changes, as provincial development policy and practice was under massive transformation. According to Vodden (2006), “while many outport residents saw their communities abandoned or moved in the 1950s and 60s, those that remained, in part as a form of resistance to Premier Smallwood and his resettlement policy, began to develop a system of local governance that would form the foundation of “bottom-up” development in the province” (p.2). In the late 1950s, committees formed to address issues of basic infrastructure, which have been described has the foundation of the rural development movement in the province (Vodden, 2006). Over the next ten years, these committees evolved into what became known as Rural or Regional Development Associations (RDAs), and in some cases into an emerging municipal sector (Ibid.). Three of these RDAs are still active in the Kittiwake region: the Fogo Island Development Association, Cape Freels Development Association and the Twillingate – New-World Island Development Association. The RDAs were composed of individuals from rural communities, and were funded through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion (DREE), and later DRIE, and the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) up until the mid-1990s (Ibid.) During this period, the Regional Economic Development Boards (REDBs) were formed were established across the province after a 1992 recommendation in a strategic economic plan for the province and another recommendation in the 1995 report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Task Force on Community Economic Development (Ibid.).

By 1997, REDBs had been implemented in 20 regions in the province. REDBs operate with a mandate that includes five core functions: developing and coordinating the implementation of strategic economic plans (SEPs); coordinating business development support in each zone; supporting organizations and communities within the zone; coordinating social and economic initiatives relating to regional economic development; promoting public participation and community education related to regional economic development (Vodden, 2009). In the
Kittiwake region, the Kittiwake Economic Development Corporation (KEDC) in the REDB, and has served as a major economic development player over the last 17 years. The REDB operated at a larger regional scale compared to the RDAs, and received funding support through ACOA and the provincial government until 2012. ACOA has argued the reason for this withdrawal of support is to avoid duplication of regional development efforts, and while there are possible alternative approaches to regional economic development, the future of RD in the province is unchartered territory (Gibson, 2013).

There are a host (albeit shrinking in number) of other community and regionally-based organizations in the Kittiwake area that range from “tourism and industry associations to development corporations, which play a role in economic development at the local level” (Vodden, 2006, p.17). Many of these associations were created to deal with issues of preservation and tourism. These include: the Banting Heritage Trust, the Cape Freels Heritage Trust, and the Twillingate Island Tourism Association. Each of the associations have at least an indirect tie to tourism, and many of them are oriented towards the promotion with promotion and protection of the way of life, traditions, and heritage associated with Newfoundland and Labrador. While this is certainly not an exhaustive list of community-based associations, in general these groups are critical in their inclusion of local participation in regional development and the integration of social and economic development initiatives (Ibid.).

4.3 Current regional policy directions in Newfoundland and Labrador

This project is continuing to examine regional policy and practice in Canadian Regional Development through five lenses: 1) collaborative, multi-level governance; 2) integrated development; 3) knowledge flow and innovation; 4) place-based development, and; 5) rural-urban interactions. At varying degrees, these themes intersect in regional development policy in this province, which in turn, influence development practice in the Kittiwake region. This section will briefly outline some of these policies.

Briefly, in a survey of provincial Throne Speeches from 2001 to 2012, the terms “collaborative, multi-level governance”, “integrated development” and “place-based development” are largely absent, while innovation and rural-urban interdependence (expressed as the need for regional approaches to service delivery and local development) are themes which are frequently mentioned. Collaborative governance was addressed once in the 2009 Throne Speech, with the launch of the new Regional Collaboration Pilot Project on the Northern Peninsula, where the provincial government sought to work with regional leaders “to explore collaborative forms of governance that advance regional sustainability (Gov. of NL, 2009)”. Place-based development was first mentioned as a broad policy direction in the Strategic Social Plan (1998), which was eventually replaced with the directive set by the Rural Secretariat upon their development in 2004. According to the 2004 Throne Speech, the Rural Secretariat was tasked with approaching regional development from an integrated perspective, that is, they would be responsible for “promoting the well-being of rural Newfoundland and Labrador through a comprehensive approach aimed at integrating economic, social and cultural aspects of rural and regional development (Gov. of NL, 2004)” . However, the specific mechanisms for these directives are not clear from this cursory review of the Throne Speeches.
A further review of provincial regional development policy according to the project’s five core themes is provided in Gibson and Vodden (forthcoming). For the purposes of this report policy directions related to the two dominant themes within the Throne Speeches are reviewed: innovation and regionalization and rural-urban interdependence.

Innovation

A review of federal and provincial innovation-related programs and interviews with senior government officials reveals a range of programs that have been put in place to support a policy direction from both levels of government to encourage and support innovation.

In the early 1970s, the Department of Rural Renewal was created. After several changes in name and mandate the Department of Industry, Trade and Rural Development (INTRD) emerged from the merger of the former Departments of Development and Rural Renewal (DDRR) and Industry, Trade and Technology (DITT) in 2002. In 2004, the name was once again changed to the Department of Innovation, Trade and Rural Development, recognizing innovation as playing a major role in rural and regional development. In 2011 most of the programs of the former Department of Businesses were transferred to the Department and it received its current name – the Department of Innovation, Business and Rural Development (IBRD) (Vodden et al. 2013).

The Province of NL launched its Innovation Strategy, *Innovation Newfoundland and Labrador: A Blueprint for Prosperity*, in 2006. With four key elements and an allocation of $20 million this initiative set out to: maintain an innovative culture, establish NL in the international market, planning educational development, and foster commercialization (Department of INTRD, 2006). Funding programs that have assisted in policy implementation since 2006 include: Commercialization Program and Innovation Enhancement Program (both introduced in August 2006), Technology Utilization Program (2011 – present), a pilot Innovate and Demonstrate Program, Youth Innovation Program (2009-2012) and Youth Entrepreneurs and Innovators Program. The innovation strategy also includes two sector-specific programs: the Fisheries Technology and New Opportunities Program, supported by Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, and Growing Forward: Agriculture Innovation Program, delivered through the Forestry and Agrifoods Agency of the Department of Natural Resources. Actors in these sectors receive support for projects such as marketing, innovative processes, greener business, introducing products, and research and development (Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, 2012). The Workplace Skills Enhancement Program launched in 2009 funds up to for 75% of skills upgrades for a firms’ existing employees. Also in 2009 the Province formed the Research & Development Corporation (RDC) as an arms-length corporation under the *Research and Development Council Act* in 2009. The Corporation’s mandate is to improve research and development (R&D) in NL and in particular moving from research into commercialization. Within the provincial government, one respondent suggests “there’s a sense that Newfoundlanders, you know, are very creative and innovative but that that’s not getting to commercialization.”
The federal government also supports innovation in the economy through investments in education, training, basic and applied research, and the translation of research findings to the private sector. The Government of Canada has made provisions to foster innovation in the province through programs such as ACOA’s Innovative Communities Program and The Atlantic Innovation Fund. The former is concerned with knowledge performance, skills, innovation environment, and strengthening communities. The latter program is meant to increase the innovative capacity of Atlantic Canada. The objectives are to increase research and development in Atlantic Canada by directing funds at universities, research institutions, and private sector businesses (ACOA, 2012). The federal ecoENERGY Innovation Initiative (NR Can, 2011-2016) supports renewable energy and clean energy technologies, while the Canada Foundation for Innovation, a not-for-profit corporation, invests in the modernization of Canada’s research infrastructure.

In 2011 an Expert Panel on innovation submitted its report to the Government of Canada, *Innovation Canada: A Call to Action*. The Panel found that Canada depends too highly on a complex and unpredictable tax incentive program rather than direct expenditures that support innovative firms and research collaborations, that support program are difficult for firms to navigate, that more could be done to leverage government purchasing power to promote private sector innovation, enhance risk financing and develop a “whole-of-government” approach to innovation. In response the Government promised a new approach to promote business innovation “through improved support for high-growth companies, research collaborations, procurement opportunities, applied research and risk financing” (Government of Canada, 2011b). The subsequent 2012 budget included support for federal initiatives private sector needs and innovation, including: the Canadian Innovation Commercialization Program initiative to help companies bridge the pre-commercialization gap for their innovative goods and services through contracts, feedback, regional events and trade shows (Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC), Office of Small and Medium Enterprises (OSME)), the National Research Council and Industrial Research Assistance Program, Scientific Research and Experimental Development tax incentive program, Business-Led Networks of Centres of Excellence program, Business Development Bank of Canada venture capital activities, and a forestry innovation and market development initiative (Government of Canada, 2012).

**Regionalization and Rural-Urban Interdependencies**

As Freshwater at al. (2011) point out, rural communities in Newfoundland and Labrador often place a high value on their independence. With primarily water-based transportation in many areas until the 1960s and 70s (some towns remain water access only) they had not traditionally relied on neighboring communities for their livelihoods. With declines in fishing employment, increases in commuting and centralization of service communities have struggled to adapt to new realities. These efforts have been aided by both locally and provincially and federal driven initiatives to encourage regional (multi-community) collaboration. Vodden et al. (2013) identify over 1,000 multi-community arrangements for service delivery or collaboration in development activities in the province. In many cases, particularly with recent government-driven initiatives these collaborations have included a mix of rural and urban settlements.
Examples include regional economic development boards (REDBs), community business development centres, destination marketing organizations, chambers of commerce, regional health authorities, and school districts.

Despite resistance to regionalization policies in the province connected to political backlash from earlier amalgamation attempts and resettlement programs of the 1950s and 1960s, municipalities have increasingly looked to shared service and multi-community collaboration as a sustainability strategy. This shift has been encouraged by provincial policies and incentives, coupled by financial and demographics pressures. A 2011 Census of Municipal Government indicated that 76% of municipalities were sharing services with at least one other neighbouring community and/or other partners (MNL, 2011). The most commonly shared services are economic development, through municipal involvement in REDBs and Development Associations, waste disposal and collection, and fire protection. According to MNL regional approaches are “growing faster than any other element of municipal government, whether it be through cooperation or regional government” (MNL, 2005). In 2010, MNL launched its Regional Government Initiative to look beyond municipal service sharing and explore the potential for regional government in the province (MNL, 2011b).

4.4 Thematic analysis

Collaborative, multi-level governance

The definition of multi-level governance used in the interview guide is the “process built on the foundations of collaboration and multiple partnerships among community/region-based organizations, statutory/government agencies, and the private sector facilitating empowerment within regions through sharing of power and collective decision-making”. Given this definition, we asked interview participants questions regarding the roles of these multi-scale, cross-sector institutions in local and regional development processes. Also important here was the degree to which individuals felt such governance processes were taking place within their region. Within the Kittiwake region, it is evident that multiple governance initiatives are taking place in each community; however, varying language was used to describe these initiatives, indicating a lack of consistency regarding the terms used to describe and explain governance. Additionally, there were consistently different roles and responsibilities for various groups (e.g. from community associations, municipal government, non-governmental groups and more senior governments-i.e. provincial and federal) amongst governance initiatives. For example, relationships with ACOA and IBRD vary from municipality to municipality and sector to sector. Overall, there appears to be a lack of coherent strategy for governance initiatives, though most initiatives are reactive or project focused, as opposed to undertaking extensive vision plans for community/regional futures. Many municipalities noted an absence of a strategic effort for collaborations and collaboration happening more incidentally or only due to funding or resource issues.

In terms of the role of individual organizations, senior levels of government are often involved, in particular ACOA (federal) and IBRD (provincial), with the provincial government playing a
more dominant role. In the case of senior government, they are often funders of projects, but in some cases, are involved in some level of collaboration, such as playing a consulting role in project planning, and networking. In Kittiwake especially, there are instances where multiple departments in the provincial government are involved in co-funding projects. It is evident that local actors are becoming increasingly aware of the need for, and in some cases participating in collaborative approaches to regional development. Local responsibilities are increasing, though despite this, power remains external in most instances. Senior governments engage in consultation, but maintain power both in terms of regulatory as well as technical capacity. Unfortunately, local groups are frequently constrained by a lack of human and financial resources. This was evident with a reoccurring issue of “volunteer burn out” or lack of volunteers from most communities and organizations.

There was a strong role for the KEDC, the Regional Economic Development Board in the region, as they collaborated with various other organizations, including: municipal governments, the provincial Rural Secretariat and IBRD. The KEDC was noted for being an appropriate structure to properly address planning issues. With the recent loss of their core funding in 2012, the most of the REDBs will no longer continue, including KEDC. In addition to KEDC, non-government organizations, such as the Chamber of Commerce, are connectors of multiple private and public actors. These kinds of “connectors” were noted as being very important to improve capacity for regional collaborations. Limited capacity for regional collaboration in the area was noted by many informants as being a barrier to regional action.

In this analysis, it is important to note the historical trajectory in which Kittiwake communities have experienced development, and the influence of this on the current development scene. Across the region, it appears there is a willingness of local groups to participate in collaborative practices with surrounding communities, but there is also a feeling of isolation between communities. There is a sentiment among many communities which presents as a fear of amalgamation with others and subsequent loss of identity. As result, messages of encouraged collaboration with other communities, especially if they come from outside the community itself, can often be perceived as a threat to identity. Incidences where there seems to be a positive experience with regional collaborations were generally related to good local leadership or personal relationships with collaborators. Inter-municipal collaboration in tourism development was most evident in the interview results.

**Integrated development**

The concept of integrated refers to an approach to development policy and planning that seeks to address the complexities of regional planning and relates to contextual conditions (e.g. regional economy, local government system), to normative designs (e.g. community recreation outcomes, environmental remediation targets), or to issues of process and practice (e.g. planning procedures, public communications). Integrated perspectives in development policies, programmes and planning incorporate such dimensions of reality as systems and sub-systems, linkages, networks, uncertainty, feedback, interconnected levels, and holism, and are associated with interdisciplinary approaches to analysis, plans and programs and largely entails...
the breaking out of sector ‘silos’ (Douglas, 2013). The following “perspectives” of integration were explored in this project as dimensions of the theme in regional planning: Alternatives to Economics; Comprehensiveness; Efficiency and Effectiveness; Growth and Equity; Holistic Approaches; Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives; Operational; Participatory Process; Political-Territorial; Systems Theories; Transborder Interconnectedness; Complexity; Multi-Levels of Government; Anti-Silo; and Community Development (Douglas, 2013).

In the Kittiwake region it has been found through the interviews conducted in the region and subsequent coding and initial analysis (these findings are preliminary) that integration varies throughout the region. There were some strong indications of an integrated approach to regional development, especially concerning research done and the acknowledgement of complexities within the region and the ability to understand linkages between problems within the region. There is the realization of the interdependencies between various sectors such as recreation, tourism, culture and the environment, however usually the connection is typically still dictated by economic drivers. Community development approaches were also evident, but are still heavily rooted in economic development.

Sustainability of the region is an important facet of planning in the Kittiwake region, especially for higher levels of government such as ACOA and the Rural Secretariat, however, it is evident that economic sustainability is the dominant focus among these organizations. A multi-disciplinary and multi-objective approach was evident in the Kittiwake results, with a particular focus on social dimensions. Again results vary by community and sub-region but the recent completion of Integrated Community Sustainability Plans (ICSPs) has left the multiple pillars approach to development top of mind for some municipal leaders.

Some alternatives to economic planning approaches are prevalent such as considerations of healthy communities and quality of life issues. However, compared to the other regions in Canada explored in this research the Kittiwake region lagged behind considering alternative economic sectors in areas such as green enterprises. See place-based below for further discussion on subsistence activities, however, as a component of Kittiwake economies.

Generally, efficiency and effectiveness was very prominent in municipal level government and organizational planning, often being a catalyst for collaborations and the pooling of resources on issues such as shared services and infrastructure projects. However, there was still few examples of strategic planning in the region, including operational tools such as benchmarking, the linking of inputs to outputs, program evaluation and review techniques and plan management. Most planning processes and evaluations were still comparatively informal and lacked a comprehensive approach (e.g. building upon studies, analysis, evaluations and planning reports when planning). The creation of the ICSP’s is an exception to this. A regional plan for the area seems at this point non-existent and not on the agenda of any level of government.
Knowledge flows and innovation

The theme of knowledge flows and innovation was investigated in multiple ways through the interview process, including multiple indicators of innovation and innovation potential identified through a review of innovation literature. Here, the research team has investigated the state of knowledge infrastructure existing in the Kittiwake region, the sources of knowledge which interviewees regularly adopted and/or used to verify their responses, the degree to which local organizations are open to trying new things and general willingness to innovate, modes of sharing knowledge and internal learning, and perceived barriers to innovation.

In terms of knowledge infrastructure, university and other research institutes, Memorial University and the Harris Centre are often referred to in reference to partnerships, while government agencies are also mentioned, but not necessarily as genuine partners. Success rates in obtaining innovation funding have been low. For example, program spending data provided to the research team by the provincial Department of Innovation, Business and Rural Development indicate that of 26 provincial applications submitted to innovation programs since 2006 and only three for the region have been approved totalling $329,000 of a total provincial investment of $16.5 million. Patents in the region are also rare (OECD, 2013). College of the North Atlantic, Keyin College, and Gander Flight Training campuses in Gander represent knowledge infrastructure and opportunities in the region but are not highlighted by most regional development actors.

New technologies, such as Skype and other forms of video technologies are highly utilized among Kittiwake communities; interviewees suggest these forms of communication cannot replace face-to-face meetings, but facilitate meetings in a way that email and teleconferencing cannot. The internet is also an important source of new-to-region ideas. There is evidence that communication technologies are present, but that some individuals cannot use it, in particular there is a generational gap with user comfort of these technologies. Likewise, there are ongoing improvements -from cellular networks to roads and libraries, and while access to technology (e.g. tablets, GIS software, interactive website development tools, Skype, video conferencing) these often require a reliable connect to high-speed internet, which has been stated by interviewees as lacking in some areas. Some state that lack of cellular coverage is a major barrier to facilitating communication, but internet coverage is a greater issue- having negative social and economic effects. There is also a feeling among regional participants that island and remote communities, such as Fogo Island, face additional isolation because of this underdeveloped communication infrastructure.

Knowledge sharing is largely an internal mechanism, meaning that it tends be strongest, or at least more apparent, when it occurs within an organization, community or at the sub-regional level. There are few formal mechanisms for both sharing knowledge and internal evaluation noted. Seeking lessons around regional development from outside, that is, provincial, national, and international contexts, is occurring- often in the form of background research through document and website review. Attending conferences, as well as developing/hosting collaborating with other organizations, are also cited as another way for organizations to
acquire lessons from external regions and incorporate them into their practices. The latter is the case for the Gander Chamber of Commerce, who regularly attend national conferences as means of engaging in research and learning.

Regarding knowledge sources and claims, compared to other provinces, Newfoundland administrators are more likely to make descriptive claims backed up with specific personal evidence, such as the retelling of some personal vignette. The most prevalent source of knowledge across the Kittiwake interviews are those claims based on personal experience, likewise interviewees tend not to cite their sources in conversation. One possible explanation for why this is the case is that there may be a higher number of face-to-face encounters (vs. strictly email and telephone communication) in daily operations, and as such, “informal” language is more common than in other provincial regions.

Generally there appears to be a paradox with respect to the openness of organizations in that interviewees state that members of their organization claim to be open to creativity and change, where in actuality, there is little evidence to support this apparent “openness”. Perhaps this, in part, stems from the ambiguity revolving around the term “open”, and as a result, a lack of objective/predictive measurement. Despite this, there appears to be a readiness and willingness to innovate, although this is dependent on the degree of investment required and the feasibility of successfully implementing a particular project within a given region.

As for examples of innovation in the region, Shorefast was cited along with other Fogo Island entrepreneurs such as a new business that grinds its own coffee. Organizations such as KEDC, Gander Chamber of Commerce, and Rural Secretariat were also noted. Respondents often viewed their own organization as being innovative, whether it is a municipality or development organization. Respondents indicated that they were innovative largely because they were willing to “look outside the box”, and to seek lessons from other organizations and incorporate that into their strategies. They also expressed an eagerness to collaborate despite the greater region fearing collaboration as a synonym for amalgamation. The Gander Airport Authority’s marketing was noted as innovative. The Authority has also pursued the development of a retail business park and forestry operation on its lands.

Barriers to innovation are frequently cited within the interviews. Those that are most regularly mentioned as constraints in the Kittiwake region include: limited access to capital, difficulty in attraction and retention of human resources as well as increasingly aging rural population and youth out-migration, and the subsequent difficulty these demographic factors create for organizational and community succession planning. Another barrier to innovation mentioned by one interviewee affecting the Kittiwake region is the attempt, on the part of economic development officers, planners and municipal leaders, to maintain secrecy when developing plans and pursuing development. This strategy effectively works to reduce potentially lucrative knowledge exchanges, and arguably development success, because it furthers isolation in small-town and rural communities.
Some areas (Twillingate- New World Island for example), have shown innovation and entrepreneurial spirit, which aided in diversification, particularly in terms of developing locally-based tourism operations. This in turn is aided through the support of an active local tourism association. as stated previously, other areas showed resistance or resignation when it came to change. This was evident by low levels of innovation and resistance to trying out new projects/initiatives and/or collaborating with regional partners. It is clear that key individuals play an important role, either positive or negative in economic diversification. Barriers to economic diversification noted include limitations in transportation and resources (from physical infrastructure, to financial and human resources), and a fear of risk.

With regard to access to financing, respondents suggest that funds are available but can be difficult to access and the sources are often external to the region: “It’s there but your application must be strong and you must have the knowledge”, “There are good programs, but they’re hard to get”. Cutbacks have made accessing government funds harder. Others suggest it is difficult to obtain bank financing for business and there are few dollars available for small communities.

**Place-based development**

Within development theory and practice, place plays a key role by illustrating the effects of factors such as culture, resources, human capacity, identity rooted in place, relationships, and others that combine to create a unique environment, which, in turn, influences how development proceeds. Place-based development is a holistic and targeted intervention that seeks to reveal, utilize and enhance the unique natural, physical, and/or human capacity endowments present within a particular location for the development of the in-situ community and/or its biophysical environment (Markey, 2010). Place-based approaches have been widely discussed within the geographic and planning literature and are gaining prominence in federal policy discussions (Gov. of Canada-Policy Horizons Canada, 2011).

Within the interviews, place conditions or those contextual factors related to particular geographies, histories and socio-cultural identities had multiple influences on development. These influences shape and both help and hinder development activities and processes. Identity was an obvious key element in the Kittiwake interviews, although not necessarily an identity that corresponded with the entire region. The influence of identity featured prominently in initiatives, plans, programs, etc. across the board. These contextual trajectories can help us discuss the ways in which identity within a community or sub-region can be strong, and play a key role in day to day decision making, but cannot be scaled up to the level of the entire Kittiwake region. There is a high rate of volunteerism and sense of community in the region, but the idea of multi-community and regional collaboration, especially when it is posed from outside, can often stand as a threat to community identity. It has been suggested by some interview participants that, within the context of the Kittiwake region, this (perceived) threat stems from the association of region with the negative historical experiences with amalgamation. Here, amalgamation, and by extension regional collaboration, conjures sentiments of something being taken away, in this case it is not necessarily material in form,
but rather something tied to cultural memory and personal identity. However, at the same time, there are other cultural memories and identities such as the resilience of rural Newfoundlanders which can fuel new and different ways of operating in places, as well as widening worldviews with a shift in generations. In turn, these factors create new regional identities and histories.

In terms of economic place-based elements, diversification (or lack thereof), branding, buy-local campaigns and a transient workforce are the most relevant to discussion in the Kittiwake region. The fishing industry and tourism were widely discussed and in some communities there is diversification from fishing to include tourism, for example. There is some recognition of the need for greater diversification and overall, the economy was seen as not being diverse enough, as evidenced by the number of seasonal workers and transient workforce.

Place branding was also recognized as important; the provincial brand was brought up as both a successful example, but also an issue in terms of satisfying tourists’ expectations and varying degrees of readiness, on the part of communities to fulfill these. There is also a case of regional branding directly linked to tourism through the destination marketing organization in which many community and sub-regional organizations and operators, in both rural and urban (Gander) settings, are actively engaged. Although, this is by no means to argue there is a cohesive regional brand. Though, it must be stated that culture and (rural) identity, along with environmental assets, are a key component of tourism in the Kittiwake region. There is one formal, regional buy-local campaign, “Keep it in Kittiwake” which was launched by KEDC. Interview participants discussed informal buy-local initiatives, though, where these do exist, they are more community-based as opposed to regional in nature.

Another key element affecting place-based development in Kittiwake is the highly mobile or transient workforce. Here, the definition of transient workforce describes the degree to which individuals travel to work, often working away for extended periods of time, but still maintain periodic residence “at home”. Across all provinces, this criterion was highest in Newfoundland and Labrador, Kittiwake in particular. In Kittiwake, this workforce includes: seasonal workers, fly in-fly out, those who work in Alberta, Labrador and offshore as well as those who work in urbanized areas and return to their “bedroom communities”. These trends are linked to demographic change, out migration, an influx of money to the region, and a stream of people returning to the region, either coming home for work or retiring. While this indicator was initially considered a sign of placelessness (or a negative indicator of a place-based approach) the research suggests that mobility – and the choice to be mobile rather than to move elsewhere - can also be considered an indication of commitment to place and, perhaps, a strategy for place-based development.

Further, a number of the place-based development initiatives undertaken in Kittiwake have demonstrated links through three distinct, yet interconnected arenas: economic development (ED), recreation, and watershed management. Watershed management initiatives within the region are illustrative of the cross-cutting nature of place-based development, as these initiatives have ties to both recreation and economic development. The local governance of the
Gander River watershed has involved many different actors, from community associations, First Nation Bands as well as provincial and federal players and is illustrative of community-based management strategies, improvements to environmental and physical infrastructure (namely the reed-effluent treatment systems and an increase in river water quality), place-based branding through river associated recreation, and a strong sense of territory and belonging among local river users. The Indian Bay Ecosystem Corporation (IBEC), a community-based watershed management organization, provides strong links with ecosystem and activities throughout watershed. IBEC also promotes local participation and community-led social enterprise, economic diversity and infrastructure through the knowledge-based economy and protection of informal economy and environmental-oriented development through local involvement for sustainable, integrated, and ecosystem-based planning.

Compared to other provinces, there are fewer formal sustainability initiatives, and less of an explicit environmental focus within projects/programs. Despite this, there is a high presence of informal economic activities within Kittiwake, such as food and firewood self-provisioning and other subsistence activities which contribute greatly to the rural economy of this region. Further, these activities, while economic in nature, are also inherently environmental and are indicative of the intimate relationships rural residents have with the environment. It is out of a deep concern for their livelihoods, way of life and the environment itself that many rural inhabitants practice sustainable harvesting practices, for example, through selective tree thinning while wood cutting in the Gander River watershed. These activities are an important aspect of environmental sustainability in the Kittiwake region.

**Rural-urban interdependence**

Rural-urban interactions and interdependencies, as well as the governance arrangements there in, can be well framed through four normative systems of interaction (Reimer, 2006). These include: 1) *Market-based*, characterised by contractual, short-term, supply and demand processes, e.g. commerce, labour, housing and trade; 2) *Bureaucratic-based*, featuring rationalized roles and principles, e.g. government, law, corporations; 3) *Associative-based* involving relations out of shared interest, e.g. recreation, charity, religious groups, and; 4) *Communal-based* characterised by generalized reciprocity, identity and low choice relations, e.g. families, cultural groups, gangs. These set of systems assist in understanding rural-urban relationships in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The analysis of rural-urban interdependence is still underway in the Kittiwake region. From preliminary analysis, the dominant normative system tend to be more informal, associative relationships overall, but there is existence of extensive market and bureaucratic-based rural-urban relationships. One participant suggests there is a great deal of interdependence between the rural and the urban, particular the interdependence of economic networks in the region. This interdependence is also apparent in Destination Gander’s branding strategy- “one stop, three vacations”, playing on the fact that Gander is relatively accessible due to the airport and has more tourist amenities than the outlining areas, yet it is these rural communities that offer a great appeal to tourists- from the Icebergs in Twillingate, the Kittiwake Coast and the Road to
the Beaches (Eastport). Thus, the Town of Gander, through Destination Gander in this instance, recognize the importance of collaboration with rural communities for the regional economy.

Gander, and to a lesser extent Lewisporte, serve as regional service centres – providing government services and shopping opportunities for residents. However, there is also a sense that there is no urban centre in the Kittiwake region, particularly in terms of federal granting agencies and the relative isolation of operating business in central Newfoundland. Despite serving as a unique regional service centre of the Kittiwake region- the rural/urban distinction certainly requires more nuanced gradients of analysis.

4.5 Cross-thematic review

Cross-thematic review will follow in future reports on the project.

5. Conclusions and Future Directions

5.1 Applications to policy, practice and theory

Canadian regional development (RD) today involves multiple actors operating within nested scales from local to national and even international levels. Policies, programmes, institutional structures, practices, and organizational arrangements are also increasingly diverse. Recent approaches to making sense of this emergent complexity draw on concepts such as multi-level governance, relational assets, integration and learning regions. Yet there has been little critical analysis of Canadian RD policies and programmes or the New Regionalist theories and concepts upon which many contemporary RD strategies are based. Given what Savoie (1992) and others suggest is a poor federal and provincial government track record in this field, empirical and theoretical analysis of changes in Canadian RD and the potentials of new approaches for improving the lives and well-being of communities and regions is urgently needed. RD theorists are criticized for lack of adequate testing and evaluation in differing contexts, lack of attention to power dynamics, inequity and the role of the state, and their inability to explain the realities of contemporary RD (Christopherson & Clark, 2007; MacLeod, 2001; Lovering, 1999). This research responds to calls for relevant, rigorous New Regionalist research and therefore has important applied (policy and practice) and theoretical dimensions. In NL this research has relevance for increasing number of regional organizations involved in planning and implementing regional development projects and programs and for federal and provincial agencies that support for regional development efforts. The goal of engagement with research partners throughout the project will be to ensure local and provincial learning and benefits for policy and practice are maximized.

Collaborative, multilevel governance

It is important for policy makers, practitioners as well as local actors to recognize the inherent ambiguity which exists in governance “practice”. Given this ambiguity, including lack of clarity regarding the various roles of individuals and groups (from community residents to senior level governments) could and should be playing in collaborative, multi-level governance, regional
governance strategies need to be developed across the province and will not look the same for every region. These strategies will help communities and regions to clarify their priorities and roles in governance. The development of such initiatives require development from the ‘ground-up’ with technical consultation from senior level governments, as well as financial and political support. Post-secondary institutions can also play a role in researching alternative models, for example, and facilitating dialogue on governance alternatives. Regional governance strategies need to recognize the importance of regional ‘ connectors ’ to regional development more generally, and senior-level governments should be looking to help build the capacity, including networking ability, in supporting individuals and groups playing these connector roles. Finally, as established in the place-based development theme, the role of regional and community identity is fundamental to the success of regional collaboration. By recognizing (and developing upon) informal, and place-based governance networks, practitioners and policy makers may come to a closer understanding of collaboration success in RD.

**Integrated development**

In regards to the theme of integration it is suggested in policy and practice, greater effort in the KIttiwake region should be devoted to more strategically addressing integration process in regional planning and programs. An effort to go beyond solely recognizing the interdependencies between planning sectors (health, economic, cultural, environmental, etc) to purposefully creating policies and programs that have representation and equal input from various sectors and multi levels of government is needed. This could include the creation of regional planning committees and advisory boards that contain public and private sector members from a variety of governmental departments and disciplines. With regarding to planning that recognizes multiple sectors and objectives, the Integrated Community Sustainability Planning (ICSP) process introduced many communities in the region to this planning approach. To fully capitalize on this opportunity to enhance capacity and integration municipalities and agencies such as ACOA and Municipal Affairs should look to supporting (and requiring) implementation of the these plans and planning efforts that build from the ICSPs as a starting point.

**Knowledge flows and innovation**

Barriers to innovation identified in this research suggest several directions for moving forward and enhancing innovation in the future. First, strengthened linkages between local business and regional development actors with post-secondary institutions in the region should be explored. While Memorial University was identified as a playing an innovation support role, this role could be expanded upon. Further, local colleges were seldom mentioned as facilitating workforce enhancement or for their role in regional development more generally.

In terms of government policies and programs in support of innovation, there is again apparent room for improvement in this aspect of the regional innovation system. Further investigation is needed to determine reasons for low success rates in innovation program applications from the region. There may be a need for improved support for applications to innovation programming.
Addressing remaining gaps in access to broadband and cellular telephone service across region should remain a priority. The provincial Rural Broadband Initiative offers an opportunity to pursue additional support for this critical infrastructure, following on a 2006 Broadband initiative that brought high speed internet to 13 communities in the region.

In terms of sharing lessons, picking up new ideas and creating networks, provincial and national conferences are key events for development actors. Support for travel to such events has been difficult in recent years for some organizations and agencies in the region, but this research suggests that such events play an important function and warrant support where possible. Ways of expanding the use of internet technology for sharing information in rural regions also require further exploration. Finally, there is a need to formally recognize the importance of learning, including learning from one’s own experience as well as those of others in regional development. Evaluation processes are spotty and often informal; efforts to share lessons learned also sporadic. A more deliberate approach to learning can foster incremental innovations and improvements in regional development practice.

**Place-based development**

As stated above in collaborative, multilevel governance, greater recognition is needed on the part of senior government and practitioners of the importance of community-based identity. That is, identity is deeply rooted in place-specific contexts and histories, but is also open to change, and in rural Newfoundland, such identities are critical to community and personal wellbeing. This is significant because identity influences regional development processes (both positively and negatively), and as such, it is fundamental for policy makers to recognize that identity-construction- for example, through creating regional boundaries- must be a process supported by communities and individuals. In general, senior governments could play a critical role in place-based development initiatives by further developing capacity building initiatives through supporting economic diversification by promoting a culture of entrepreneurialism and preparing rural residents for tourism through education related to tourists’ expectations. In addition, the senior governments need to provide greater support to formalized environmental initiatives that are taken up by locally-based groups as well as recognize (and support where feasible) the value of informal economic activities, such as subsistence activities, to both the environment and the rural economy in Newfoundland and Labrador more generally.

**Rural-urban interdependence**

There is a clear need in the region to continue building urban-rural relationships and exploring opportunities for collaboration. There is a sentiment from some representatives of rural communities that while people and dollars flow into urban centres, urban residents seldom visit or support rural communities. Tourism is one area where the regional service hubs do see a strong connection to rural attractions and communities where they are located. One way to build rural-urban relationships would be familiarization tours that bring urban-based businesses and organizations to visit rural attractions, thus improving their ability to market rural
attractions but also increasing their familiarization and connection with rural communities and building rural-urban connections.

There is also a need to increase awareness regarding rural-urban interdependence. One valuable approach would be to visit Kittiwake sub-regions to present and discuss the most up-to-date functional regions research. This could be used as an opportunity to generate dialogue about potential for rural-urban collaboration.

5.2 Knowledge mobilization

Communication of results within the academic, policy and practitioners communities have occurred through a number of venues, and, in conjunction with local partners, we will continue to explore avenues for dissemination. Critical partners for this have included the local Regional Economic Development Board (KEDC); a regional Community Development Community of Practice (CoP) and the Rural Secretariat. Regional knowledge sharing and dissemination activities have included: meeting with KEDC staff about the research on several occasions; development of a series of toolkits on community development topics as a service learning project with Geography 3350 class at Memorial University, Rural Secretariat (RS) and the CoP in fall 2011; a presentation in spring 2012 in Gander (webcast to three other locations in Central region), which included lessons from study such as an evaluation case study; a presentation to RS Council in May 2012, and; presentation and display of a poster at National Aboriginal Day in June 2012 at the Glenwood Mi’kmaq First Nation band office in Glenwood.

Other knowledge mobilization tools will include a project website (http://cdnregdev.ruralresilience.ca/) and series of working papers, presentations at national and international conferences. These have included: working papers on all five themes and Canadian regional watershed management, regional profile reports and vignettes, three chapter contributions to the Place Peripheral edited volume (forthcoming), three international presentations and multiple paper and poster presentations at national conferences since 2010.

In the future, the project team will produce a minimum of three articles in refereed journals and an edited volume, with contributions invited from both academic research team members and community partners. Working papers and interim findings have be presented in conjunction with focus groups sessions at provincial and regional RD workshops, such as a series of innovation workshops to be held in May/June 2013, including one in Kittiwake to disseminate and hold a dialogue on the innovation theme, and special sessions of professional, policy and academic conferences and workshops (e.g. Canadian Rural Revitalization Foundation, Community Futures Network,) to ensure that researchers as well as practitioners and policy makers are informed of and have opportunities to contribute to the research.

2 toolkits to be used in a series of webinars to be held through 2013-2014
Final results will be presented in Phase 3 in each case study region, at a minimum of two national and one international conference, in a series of policy briefs targeted to provincial and federal decision-makers, peer-reviewed journal articles and, finally, in an edited volume. This senior undergraduate level text will meet a need identified by the co-investigators as professors teaching related courses at four Canadian universities. The text will fill a significant gap in existing works by providing a contemporary perspective on Canadian RD that incorporates key themes of New Regionalism. Additional knowledge mobilization techniques will be identified and developed in conjunction with the Harris Centre and participating regional partners. These may include but are not limited to articles in local media, displays or presentations at local events.
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The project is conducting an empirical assessment of Canadian regional development using a multi-level, mixed methods case study approach in four provinces: British Columbia, Newfoundland and Labrador, Ontario, and Québec. The assessment of regional development across the case studies is based on the five key themes of New Regionalism: i) collaborative, multi-level governance; ii) integrated versus sectoral and single objective approaches; iii) fostering knowledge flow, learning and innovation; iv) place-based development; and v) rural-urban interaction and interdependence.

Kelly Vodden (Environmental Policy Institute, Grenfell Campus and Department of Geography, Memorial University) is leading the project, together with co-investigators David Douglas (School of Environment Design and Rural Development, University of Guelph), Sean Markey (Geography, Simon Fraser University), and Bill Reimer (Sociology and Anthropology, Concordia University). In addition, graduate students at all four universities are engaged on the project.

Further information on the project can be obtained at http://cdnregdev.ruralresilience.ca. The project has been financially supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Leslie Harris Centre for Regional Policy and Development.