

Landscape Governance Noord Brabant

Scored by name(s): Pieter Zwaan, Radboud University (pieter.zwaan@ru.nl)

Date: 01/12/2024

Cite as: Zwaan, P. (2024). Landscape Governance Noord Brabant (GOGREEN Case Report Series No. 35), Roskilde: Roskilde University. ISBN: 978-87-7349-353-3

Is the project a case of...:

- State-initiated co-creation
- Entrepreneur-driven co-creation
- Grassroots-based co-creation*

**For an elaboration of the typology, please consult the GOGREEN theoretical framework p. 25.*

Integrated case analysis

Before proceeding to the scoring of the GFs, please provide a 3–5 page case analysis in which you describe the background, history, and national, regional, and local contexts of the case, the problems, and goals addressed by the local collaboration, the participating actors and their relationships, the unfolding of the co-creation process, the most important governance factors (this may include factors other than those in focus in this project), and the generated outputs and outcomes. The conclusion may specify a few lessons learned from the case study.

1) Background, history, and national, regional, and local contexts of the case

The researched case is one of 14 landscape (collaborative) governance process that are set up around so-called “nitrogen sensitive Natura 2000 nature areas” in order to deal with the so-called “nitrogen crisis” (see below in italics) in the province Noord Brabant in the (southern part of) Netherlands (bordering Belgium).

The province is the second largest province in the Netherlands in terms of size (5.082,06 km²) and the third largest in terms of population (2,5 million). About 1 million people live in the five largest cities. About 500.000 people live in ten middle-size cities that are spread over the province. The province has the third largest economy in the Netherlands, after the provinces North and South Holland. The agriculture and horticulture sector is traditionally strong, as is forestry. Noord Brabant also has the highest amounts of pigs and poultry.

In 2019, it became clear that a national program to reduce nitrogen emissions did not provide sufficient legal guarantees that Natura 2000 areas would be restored and conserved. In fact, the nitrogen deposition from agriculture and other economic developments on already vulnerable Natura 2000 areas had only increased since the introduction of the national program. The program was heavily criticized by environmental groups, who sued the Dutch government in 2016, demanding that it would deny construction permits for developments near Natura 2000 sites. The case ended up before the Court of Justice of the European Union who gave a so-called preliminary ruling that stated that the granting of

permits for new developments before actual nature restoration measures had been implemented conflicted with the Habitat Directive.

The Dutch High Court implemented the ruling in May 2019, halting all permit applications under the national program. The freeze not only led to the immediate stalling of the expansion of farms, but also to a halting of plans for new homes, roads, and airport runways, creating the so-called Nitrogen crisis (2019 – now). As long as nitrogen emissions are not sufficiently reduced, economic developments that will lead to additional nitrogen emission cannot be allowed.

The landscape governance processes (known as a Gebieds-Gerichte Aanpak (GGA) or area-based approach) are convened on behalf of the province North Brabant with the explicit agreement of several stakeholders / organisations (including nature organisations and farmer representative) and took off in May 2021. The processes do not have a legal or governmental status (Salverda and Pleijte, 2022).

Similar processes have been established or about to be established in other provinces in the Netherlands as well. Where the Province of Noord Brabant decided to organize the process around Natura 2000 areas, some other provinces decided to organize these process at both a smaller and a larger geographical scale. Hundreds of processes are expected - at the time of writing this report - to be established in the coming years.

Parties participating in the process were expected to work “bottom-up” on the **double goal** of nature restoration and offering a perspective to (continue) agricultural practices, but also take into account other developments and challenges in the area, e.g. climate change, recreation, water quality and quantity. The main idea is that by adopting an **integrative perspective** for the area, in particular in the zones surrounding the nature areas, several challenges can be addresses at the same time and would lead to innovative solutions and synergies. Beside a focus on regional landscape governance processes, the province also adopted a more generic approach (the latter is used for reducing nitrogen emissions in particular) (Provincie Noord Brabant, 2020).

The “bottom-up” approach, however, has been somewhat challenged over time. Increasingly, new national and provincial ambitions and goals are set (often at a high level of abstraction), that have to be translated and accommodated at the provincial and regional level.

At the national level funding (5 billion euros) was made available in April 2020 that could be partly used by the provinces (12 in total) to deal with nitrogen emissions and depositions and nature restoration, as part of a structural approach. This approach also required provinces to draw up provincial plans for nature and nitrogen (Boezeman et al. 2023 , p. 126). The regional plans that would be developed in the landscape governance processes could, as was envisaged at that time, provide input to the provincial plan, and eventually make use of the funding made available by the national government.

At the national level, in the meantime, there was also a wish to broaden the structural approach and provide large investments for the transition of the rural area. On top of the 5 billion euros, 24 billion euros were planned to be made available for that purpose via a transition fund, to be spend before 2035. A draft

National Program for the Rural Areas (June 2022) set out general goals and ambitions. However, specific tools and instruments were not (yet) included.

A map of the Netherlands, included in the Program, that indicated where certain farming practice could and could probably no longer take place according to the national government, sparked broad protests nationally among farmers (Boezeman, et al. (2023), pp. 126-127).

The provinces were required to develop their own *Provincial Program for the Rural Area*. In this program, the provincial plan for nature and nitrogen had to be integrated / included. On the basis of the provincial program, that had to be finalized by June 2023, finances would be made available by national government for the different provinces (but see below).

As part of the provincial plan / program an analysis of the status of Natura 2000 areas was conducted in 2023: the so-called Nature Goal Analysis (NDA). The analysis showed that the situation in all nature areas was even worse than expected. This led to an even stricter restriction on the granting of permits by the Province of Noord Brabant. A possibility to exchange nitrogen emitting rights (so-called “external balancing of emission rights”), which was created to grant some room for developments, was put on hold by the province (see e.g. NOS 2 March 2023). This decision, just taken before the provincial elections in 2023, caused different municipalities to also join the landscape governance processes.

As a result of the collapse of the national government, new elections and the formation of a new government, there is no clarity at the moment [February 2024] about whether the 24 billion euros will be made available to the provinces. [UPDATE June 2024: the new coalition government has decided to terminate the transition fund].

A lot more details can be provided about these provincial plans. A good overview can be found here: <https://www.iddri.org/en/publications-and-events/blog-post/no-deal-farming-lessons-netherlands>.

In the context of the CG process that is described below there has, however, been a loose coupling with these policies and much discussion about their meaning for the landscape governance process.

2) The aims of the project and the sustainability problems that it seeks to address

Defining and specifying the aims is still part of the collaborative process. In general, the CG process seeks to restore nature areas and to look for integrative solutions that will also allow for achieving other goals in doing so. The aims of the process are still formulated at a high level of abstraction, referring in particular to several legal (EU) requirements, including those related to the conservation of Natura 2000 areas (based on the EU Habitat and Birds Directives) and the Water Framework Directive, as well as several national and provincial programs (e.g. on forestry, recreation) that have to be translated to the regional level. Specific targets or norms (related to specific years) are not (yet) formulated at level of the region (“Vision for the Area”, 2024).

3) The participants and their interaction and communication in and between meetings

The collaboration takes place foremost at the level of the Steering Group. The group includes civil servants and professionals of several organisations. Many of them have a generalist background in “public affairs”, “stakeholder management” or “representation”. At times, experts are more closely involved.

The main activities they are involved in are, thus far, knowledge sharing and strategy development.

The actors involved represent:

- a) The Province Noord Brabant
- b) Municipalities (4)
- c) Waterboards (2)
- d) Drinking water company (1)
- e) Local land owners (2)
- f) Farmer representatives (2; one general; one agri-environmental organisation)
- g) Nature / Landscape management (3)
- h) National level (1)

Over time the group of parties has expanded, with more municipalities joining in particular.

The Steering Group is formally overseen by a group of “governors” from these different organisations. Typically the organisations involved have boards, that are accountable to the organisations constituents. Members of these boards take place in this Governing Group. This group meet at least twice a year, but have not played a very active role yet. Their main role is to set the direction of the CG process and to take formal decisions, if needed.

4) How often do they meet, and do they communicate between meetings?

The Steering Group meetings bring all the participating actors together about every two or three months. The meetings are attended by most parties. It hosts formal, but relatively open discussions where knowledge is shared and problems and issues are brought up, although these are not always fully discussed in detail.

The board of governors comes together about two or three times a year.

Different parties also have contact outside of the GGA, where they work on specific projects that contribute to the goals of the GGA, but are not formally part of it. The GGA has been described by several respondents as a platform where they meet and can establish “short lines”.

Besides meeting together, there are also individual contacts between the process facilitator and individual parties. This leads to the collection of lots of info, and trust of parties in the process. Yet this information is not always shared in a transparent way with others.

The process facilitators are independent external parties. So far, two different consultancy agencies have provided these process facilitators.

Process facilitators of a new (third) agency will take over the process from now on. The main job of the facilitators is to guide the parties through the different stages of the process. Based on an open

competition, consultancy offices are invited to set out their plans. A small group of parties that take part in the GGA is responsible for selecting the agency.

Besides a process facilitator, there is also a process manager that oversees the process on behalf of the province.

5) The role and forms of knowledge sharing, coordination and joint problem-solving

The GGA follows a (spatial) planning approach that has been used in the past for transitions in the rural area. It distinguishes between different stages: Exploration, Vision, Plans, Execution. So far, the activities have largely focused on policy-related activities of the Exploration and Vision stage, for which knowledge sharing and joint fact finding are the most important activities.

The process has mainly focused on bringing together the information that different parties have to overcome uncertainties, in particular with regards to the hydrological functioning of the area, which is very complex and the impact and sources of nitrogen depositions (which is more uncertain and contested). Much of this information is shared initially with the process facilitators who then bring this in the process, via presentations or documents. Joint fact finding takes place mainly through the involvement of third parties / experts, which are hired by the province.

Parties in the GGA can make use of these experts to get more information based on specific questions. Knowledge questions tend to focus on the existing situation. Answers to the questions, however, often also include ideas about how to improve the existing situation. These solutions are more contested and seen as technocratic by several of the involved parties.

6) The relation between consensus and conflict and the handling of the latter

There is no real consensus yet about any common goals, except for very general ones.

At the same time, conflict is also somewhat avoided at this stage by keeping discussions often rather abstract. As a result, the goals that have been formulated so far, are hard to object to, or consist of objectives that already have to be met. More info about this described below.

7) The role and form of leadership: lead actor, steering group and/or collective leadership

Leadership is largely lacking in the process, so far. The process manager of the province, which could be seen as a sponsor of the project, struggles with setting specific ambitions for the process, and also the Governing Group has not been able to set specific goals, so far. As the process facilitators adopt an independent role, they are also not in a position to do this. While some actors in the Working Group call for ambitious goals, they are not in position to truly guide the group.

These different actors and fora look at each other to adopt this role. There is this idea that there should, ideally, be a collective leadership by the Governing Group, but there is not enough trust (and too diverse interests) between parties to establish this.

8) The temporal unfolding of the co-creation process: major shifts and ups and downs

The process was originally facilitated by an agency that had strong (own) ideas about the (content of the) exploration and the vision that had to be established. In developing this, they largely followed their own ideas and priorities, in the hope to also inspire and bring in other parties. Weak process management (e.g. no clear agenda's or feedback), amongst others, led to a situation in which many parties lost commitment (to provide input and resources) to the process (in as far as this had been the case). This, in turn, led to a situation in which the process facilitators could even take greater initiative to formulate the contents of the exploration. When the Exploration had to be sent to the group of governors for approval, it became clear that most parties in the steering group did not support the exploration document that had been made.

Also the group of governors did not give its approval and decided that a new exploration had to be developed under the facilitation of another party.

The process that led up to a new exploration, led by another independent process facilitator, was well managed and actively involved all parties by allowing them to give their input. Within a short timeframe a new exploration document was established. While most parties supported (or, at least, not objected) the exploration, there were critical remarks on the level of detail in the exploration and the many issue that had to be further researched and discussed. While a “go” was given by the Governing Group to continue to the Vision stage, it was also stressed that first a number of things had to be further specified and clarified.

This feeling was shared at the level of the steering group.

An explicit “specification” of the general goals that the process should focus on, however, was never made, but became part of the “Vision stage”. Much of the input that was collected and processed during this stage had been on the basis of one-on-one talks between involved stakeholders and the process facilitators.

Based on that, the process facilitators had prepared several maps for the area to be discussed, yet, time to do so was very limited. As a result, most feedback on the Vision was send via paper by the different parties. Over 800(!) comments were sent to a first draft; over 230 comments to a second draft. A final Vision has been sent to the Steering Group and the Governing Group in March 2024.

In terms of content, the Vision mainly summarizes the national and provincial laws and programs and provide a broad and general (i.e. no-place specific) translation of these frameworks for the area. During the closing session of the Vision at the steering group level, it also became clear that there were still ambiguities and uncertainties in the Vision, which would make it hard for some of the parties to officially approve the document. The outcome of the discussion was that the governors would be asked to agree to use the Vision as a basis for continuing the process and to move the process to the next stage: making more specific plans. The Governing Group agreed with this.

9) The most important governance factors (may include factors other than those in focus in this project)

Many factors play a role in this case and tend to amplify each other. The process, first of all, shows that it takes much time to build trust between parties. Things move forward, but very slowly, as a result.

Lack of clear leadership (GF 16) and/or specific frameworks further hampers the process. Parties differ too much on the problem at hand and possible solutions to guide the process themselves. Where this leadership should come from, however, is also heavily debated. Different governmental parties, which could be seen as the most likely candidates for doing so, at the same time, also seem unlikely to take clear (and hard) decisions which could lead to political upheaval, in particular by farmers that will be most affected by the process. Discussions as a result stay very general, which is exacerbated by the large size of the area.

The main focus for many parties (and especially the province), therefore, is to keep talking with each other. The process itself, at times, appears to be the goal rather than an end. It is increasingly recognized, however, that difficult decisions have to be made, if we want to move forward.

The high political stakes also lead to a politicization of facts. Before taking decisions, uncertainties have to be removed. This leads to a continuous fact-finding in the hope to reach certainty. Dealing with disputed facts and engaging in joint-fact finding is difficult also due to limited expertise that is and can be made available by many organisations. The latter also has the effect that much of the discussions that takes place in the Steering Group do not directly involve the people with the most expertise of the area. This contributes to the heavy reliance on communicating via paper instead of via face-to-face dialogues.

10) The generated outputs and outcomes

So far, there have not been specific outputs or outcomes yet, except for a general Exploration and Vision for the area. The discussion has been too general to create tangible innovative solutions. It is noteworthy, however, that several parties collaborate outside of the landscape governance process where they work on specific projects in an integrative manner, e.g. on water management and other farming practices.

11) Lessons learned about the conditions for co-creating green solutions

See point 9.

Scoring and analysis of governance factors

1. Perceived importance of biosphere conditions

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Almost all informants refer to the degradation of biodiversity as a reason for participating in the collaborative process. This is framed in different ways, however. For nature (management) organizations this has a great sense of urgency and is the main motivation to participate in the process. This common goal is in line with their own goals / interests.

For others, halting this degradation process is seen as a legal obligation, that follows from (the implementation of) EU obligations. The legal goals must be followed. In doing so, these parties aim to look for innovative solutions and ways to integrate this ambition with other regional ambitions.

For another group of actors, meeting these obligations is (also) directly linked to the limits that the current state of nature imposes on other (economic and building) developments. This sense of urgency increased after the stop on the granting permits for new developments in 2023. From that moment, municipalities in particular became more active in the process, realizing that these formal goals must be met if they want to be able to build houses for their inhabitants.

For a long time, environmental problems were framed in general terms, as precise data was lacking on the state of nature in the area. In the pre-exploration and exploration stage, the state of nature was described on a very general level. This has changed after the publication of the NDA, which made clear that the state of nature is even worse than expected. The NDA outcomes seem to be taken more as a basis for the discussion, although there have been some critical remarks on its validity and the exact status of the analysis. There remains thus some discussion about the exact state of nature/biodiversity (although all agree it is not that good), but especially about the causes and what is needed to address these causes.

The impact of nitrogen dispositions by farmers in particular, remains disputed by farmer organisations. So far, this did not play a big role in the discussion in the GGA as it was decided to deal with nitrogen emissions at the provincial and not the regional level. After the publication of the NDA this has changed.

While there is some agreement on the bad state of nature, it is also realized that stopping degradation or restoration of the area will be very hard and will have severe consequence for existing (farming) practices. Related to stopping the degradation of biodiversity and its restoration, there is much attention for the importance of a sustainable usage and management of water in the area. This can contribute to stopping biodiversity degradation, but is also seen by farmers as necessary for the continuation of farming. On this theme there is a clear sense of urgency and realization that parties are dependent on each other.

Another main reason for parties to participate in the process is that they simply cannot stay out of it. The process is expected to play an important role in the funding (!) and regulation of the transition of the rural area in the coming years / decade. By participating, parties can keep track of these developments, anticipate them, and play a role in shaping these developments.

Building a “perspective of farmers” was an original goal of the process and played a role in the (pre-) exploration. So far, this has not been part of an explicit discussion. What the (negative) impact of different “nature measures” will be on the perspective of farming practices is not much or openly discussed so far.

In part this has to do with the general level of the discussions that takes place: what the impact will be on individual farmers is hard to tell. There is also strong hesitation to talk about this, however. In an earlier draft national program for the rural area, different zones were drawn on a map indicating where (different type of) farming would remain possible if we want to meet EU obligations. This map sparked large protests by farmers and also put pressure on the GGA (with farming representatives making clear during one meeting shortly after the publication of “map” that they were not sure if they could or would continue to participate in the process; an explicit decision on this was never taken).

Another complicating factor is that negotiations on a “farming agreement” at the national level collapsed. This agreement had, in part, offer a perspective to farmers. Among farmer organisation it is felt that especially on this level a perspective for farmers has to be established.

2. Legislation, programs, and formal goals

QCA score:

- 0
 0.33
 0.66
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
 Medium confidence
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
 Documents
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

There has been a loose coupling with formal rules and obligations by the process managers and facilitators. In part this is because these formal goals are broadly defined [e.g. bringing the nature area in a favorable condition], are still being developed, and are not (yet) translated by the province to the regional level.

This also results from the explicit bottom-up approach that was taken, in which regional parties were invited to set priorities and look for integrative solutions for the region that would go beyond a more sectoral approach. These ideas would have to provide input for provincial plans and programmes (see also point 5). In this respect there is a complex relation between bottom-up and top-down dynamics.

In the Exploration, references were made to these general rules, programmes and goals. In the Vision these references have become more explicit. The PPLG (Provincial program for the rural area) is also increasingly referred to. The latter program, which must be aligned with a National program for the rural area and gain approval*, however, also only set broad goals for the different natura 2000 areas. In doing so, it also lists different measures and instruments that could be used to meet these, and for which – likely – funding will be made available via the provinces to the regions. There is no clear direction, however, - or at least this is not felt - for how these have to be translated and implemented at the regional level. This seems to be up to the region / area.

Observations of the meeting reveal that many parties struggle to keep track of different policy developments and what they mean exactly for the GGA. A lot of time, as a result, is spend on discussing these during the meetings of the Steering Group. Also for the program manager of the province it is hard to tell what programs and goals have to be met, as these plans are still being developed and change.

Besides meeting formal EU obligations, offering a “perspective to farming practices” has also been an objective of the GGA. While this objective plays a role in the back of minds of many participants, this is not explicitly acknowledged or discussed as such. During the latest round of interviews, many respondents, in fact, only referred to the restoration of nature as the goal behind the GGA and did not refer to the other goal.

Overall this discussion is complicated by the high level of abstraction, but also by the wish among individual farmers to be granted as many leeway (“entrepreneurship”) as possible to choose the instruments themselves to meet certain goals. “Prescribing” what kind of farming activities are possible in certain areas is a sensitive issue.

**Based on the provincial program, financing would be made available by the national government to the province. If this remains the case, it is not clear yet. The so-called transition fund that would be used for this was put on hold after the national elections.*

3. Relative openness of public governance paradigms

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The process is relatively open and builds on a longer tradition of multi-stakeholder collaboration in the rural area (and a very corporatist / consensual tradition of policy making in general). Typically, this involves organized parties that play an important role in the implementation of policies, such as organized private landowners, (public and private) nature management agencies and representatives of the agricultural sector.

Through subsidies of, and contracts with the provincial government these parties contribute to nature management, restoration and development. Especially when it comes to nature development or restoration, several parties are involved in these processes. Collaboration (and negotiation) between parties plays an important role here, as the provincial government is reluctant to impose new measures top-down.

So far, the involved parties in the steering group are organized interest groups and governmental actors that have a direct stake in the process. Private landowners also play a role in the process.

Several parties have already collaborated on more sectoral policies in parts of the area. The GGA, however, is the first process that tries to bring together all relevant parties. Over time, several new parties have joined the GGA. All these (new) parties are welcomed.

It is hard to tell to what extent this has supported the collaborative process as parties have different views about what should happen in the area. Several respondents have argued that working with a group of more like-minded parties would probably have sped up the process. While I believe this is true for the current stage of the project (i.e. vision stage), the informants also anticipate that involving all parties will be beneficial for the implementation stage.

4. Formalized institutional channels for citizen participation and community mobilization

QCA score:

- 0
 0.33
 0.66
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
 Medium confidence
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
 Documents
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

There have been recurring discussions about the involvement of citizens (groups) and especially the farming community in the process.

Individual farmers have been loosely involved in the process by organizing one-on-one (kitchen table) talks to find out more about their perspectives and plans. On that basis, some general input has been provided to the GGA process.

Given the general and abstract level of the discussions taking place (and based on experiences in other GGA processes in the province) it has been decided to not already involve citizens and individual farmers directly in the process. Among the farmers community this has led to some uncertainty and complaints about the transparency of the process.

More recently, a participation and communication sub-group has been established that deals with this issue. When it comes to the involvement of citizens, the focus lies on involving and informing the local (elected) parliaments of the municipalities that are part of the GGA.

It seems that the vision / plan for the area must be translated into a more official vision/plan of the municipalities later. At that moment citizens will also have a formal moment to react and provide their input for the municipal plan. Since the beginning of this year a new spatial planning regulation has been in place which requires the government to engage in a dialogue over spatial developments in an early stage. So far, citizens have not been directly involved.

5. Mechanism for ensuring top-down government and bottom-up social accountability

QCA score:

- 0
 0.33
 0.66
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
 Medium confidence
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
 Documents
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The work of the Steering Group is overseen by a group of governors which is presided by a governor of one of the governmental parties involved in the process. The Governing Group formalizes the different steps that are undertaken: it plays a role in deciding whether the process can continue towards a next step. It is informed on a regular basis (i.e. 2/3 times a year). This group is not a formal body. The involved governors are all accountable (more or less directly) to their own constituents / members.

So far, the Governing Group has postponed several steps that need to be taken (see point 8). A recurrent call by the governors has been to make things more specific. Up till now the process remained too general for that. This also led to a situation that no explicit support or decision is given for the deliverable that provide clear closure to the different steps. The different deliverables are rather "taking notice off".

Due to the high level of abstraction, it also remains hard to give further guidance or direction to the activities of the Steering Group. This in turn makes it hard for the Steering Group to take more specific steps, which result in a continuation of a rather general discussion, on which basis the Governing Group cannot provide direction, etc.... It remains difficult to break through this cycle.

The different parties in the Steering Group also report directly to their own organisations. The GGA takes up time, and availability of staff is a big issue. This has led to discussion among some parties about their involvement and the progress that is made, but has not really led to undermining of the legitimacy of the process so far.

The GGA remains to have an unclear status. It is not fully clear yet (or at least not clearly communicated) how the process and plans that result from the process will translate into plans or regulations that will have a more formal status. Likely, part of the plans have to be translated into / aligned with local planning visions, which will then be translated into more binding plans that need approval by municipal parliaments. Other parts have to be included in the so-called Natura 2000 management plans that are established by other government actors.

The status of the process and its outcomes also leave in limbo if all parties need to agree, eventually on the plans that are being made within the GGA.

At the start of the GGA the idea was that the development of the regional plans would be a bottom-up process. Later it was decided that they also provide input (bottom-up) for the provincial plan that had to be prepared for nature and nitrogen, and later, for the provincial program on the rural area. These provincial plans would then also have to be aligned with a national plan.

During the process one specific meeting was organized for this, but it became clear that it was hard to provide input for the provincial plan based on the progress that was made so far. No consequences were attached to the fact that no input was provided.

This is also the case for reports about the progress in the GGA towards the provincial legislature. There is an obligation to report on the progress, but this is not seen or felt as an impetus to work harder on the deliverables. What would happen if the GGA process collapses is also not clear.

6. Strategic agenda-setting by means of translation

QCA score:

- 0
 0.33
 0.66
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
 Medium confidence
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
 Documents
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

In the GGA, parties do not explicitly refer to the SDGs. They do refer to the EU, national and provincial goals that relate to these. Translating these and aligning these with local problems and issues has been the main focus (and difficulty!) of the GGA so far. As a result these goals remain very general.

In part, this results from continuing changes in the national programs and goals, and uncertainties about how these should be taken into account (see also point 2). This makes it hard to translate these. Also the province does not take the lead in this (see point 16).

More strategic (political) reasons can be found for failing to do so. Meeting the goals will have major consequences for farming practices. In a way, certain parties can also use the uncertainty of the plans to refrain from action.

Yet, also several more benign factors are provided by respondents and have come to the fore in discussions in the steering groups:

The large size of the area is a first factor that is being mentioned. As a result, discussions stay very general. The decision has therefore been taken to translate the goals in separate visions for sub-areas in a next stages, prior to the planning stage.

The people involved in the steering group tend to have only general knowledge of the area. For more specific discussion, parties need to bring in experts, but it remains difficult to bring them to the meetings. Therefore parties do not have enough capacity.

More in general, data and facts are still missing to make this translation. Given the great consequences that future measures will have, several parties stress the need to have accurate data, before we can further discuss what must be done in the area.

Translating the different goals is also complicated by the integrative nature of the process. While parties support the ambition of looking for integrative solutions, this is also somewhat overwhelming, especially as no explicit priorities have been given to the different goals that need to be integrated. All goals matter in an equal way. According to some it could help to priorities some of the goals (observations). It appears that this idea sinks in slowly. It becomes increasingly clear that “not everything is possible”. The legal goals that have to be met are more explicitly mentioned as priority, but not all parties seem fully committed to meeting these. Neither is it clear how priorities should be weighed.

7. Construction of narratives about successful multi-actor collaboration

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Most parties agree that collaboration is necessary for success and believe that it is needed to move beyond sectoral ways of working and look for integrative solutions. This is strongly shared among participants and a main motivation to participate. Besides looking for integrative solutions, parties also expect to learn from each other (Document A).

There were already several collaborations in the area, but often with a selection of parties, in which actors talked about, but not with each other. The GGA brings them together and provide a platform for *all* parties to meet and to move towards more integrative and innovative solutions. Amongst some, there was a hope that the GGA would in part replace existing sectoral collaborations taking place. This, however, did not happen.

Besides the GGA, different processes continue to take place. Within these processes there is a somewhat different approach visible, in which the “GGA way of working” (i.e. looking for integrative solutions, together) plays an important role. Also several new collaborative projects (see below) are started in which this way of working plays a role. In this respect the GGA can be considered a success. It is felt that also these projects could be flagged out a bit more as a result of the GGA. The GGA in this case is thus seen as a success that is referred to in other processes.

In the different deliverables, process facilitators also pay explicit attention to the need to collaborate. In the Exploration this narrative is provided and endorsed (Exploration for the Area, 2022). This narrative has also been brought to the fore by some of the participants in meetings where participants of other GGAs meet each other. Clear successes have not been accomplished, however, that have fed back in the process itself.

At the same time, many parties are also worried about the risk of talking too much and ending up with plans that have very general goals that nobody can object to. Some parties have referred to this risk based

on their experiences with similar processes. Some parties, as a result, are a bit skeptical, especially about the “explorations and vision stages” of the process. Too much talking is felt by some as a “waste of time”: action is needed. It is in part because of this that more concrete projects are started outside the GGA.

At the same time, it is also realized that these early (yet slow) stages are needed to build up trust in the process, and especially each other. It is realized that this will be necessary in order to take more difficult decision in a later (planning and implementation) stages.

8. Building or harnessing institutional platforms and arenas

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The GGA has been set up by the province as a platform for collaboration. It also has a fixed procedure for defining the different steps of the process, that is based on previous approaches adopted for landscape governance processes and consist of different steps: exploration => vision => plans => execution.

There has been much discussion about what should be the outcome of these steps: “when are we satisfied?” Different parties have different ideas about this, and now and then this pops up in discussions, especially as deadlines for delivering products are approaching.

Besides plenary meetings, there are also subgroups that focus in particular on joint-fact finding. A separate subgroup focusses on participation and communication. Others turn to water, nitrogen emissions / depositions and land (acquisition) policy. Parties taking place in these subgroups do so as experts rather than as interest representatives.

At the start of the process, digital meetings platforms were used during the COVID-19 pandemic, but now most plenary meetings have returned to in-person meeting that are preferred by the participants. Some of the sub-meetings take place online. Besides plenary meeting, several outings have been organized, to allow for more informal contact. The in-person meetings have contributed to more interaction between parties and also allowed for more informal connections. The in-person meetings have been accompanied by a walk-in of about 30 minutes before the meeting and a lunch afterwards to contribute to these contacts. This has been beneficial for the process. These informal get-togethers also led to several other smaller projects that have been set up.

Meetings did not take place that often during the vision stage. Much of the input was collected and provide via direct input of parties (often on paper), on which basis the process facilitator has produced a draft vision.

9. Provision of access to blended financing

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The GGA process is funded and financed by the province (see also point 10). Concerns about funding for projects that come out of the process has not been a main issue so far. At the start of the process no financial guarantees were given, although many actors realized that provincial funding (via subsidies) that would be made available (for nature restoration) would be provided via the GGA.

Even without direct access to funding, parties, however, believe it is important to work on projects and “put them on the shelves”, so they can be brought in quickly when financing becomes available.

It appears that uncertainties about financing (due to political uncertainties about the transition fund) has not stopped participants from participating and working on ideas. Several parties do place their bets also on other programs and funding that may come available (which is an indication of their trust in the process).

The lack of certainty about financing possibilities has been an issue in particular for the province, as it cannot guarantee that projects that are developed in the setting of the GGA can be realized. As the process is still in the stage of developing a common Vision, this plays a role on the background. One respondent, however, remarked that this might be reason for a lack of leadership by the province.

10. The capacity to leverage support from authorities to enable local collaboration

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The process facilitation, and locations are financed by the province.

In addition, parties could apply for a subsidy/financing of their involvement. This has been helpful for some parties. A main issue / concern for most parties is capacity at the moment. All parties struggle with having enough people with expertise.

When it comes to (joint) fact finding the province also plays an important role by providing its own expertise and contracting several experts to provide data on the area. In part, these experts provide

answers to more general questions (asked by the provinces) about the impact of different developments. It is also possible, however, to ask more specific to these experts. In relation to water and nitrogen emissions these questions are prepared in a sub-group of the Steering Group. This has been helpful to overcome uncertainties in the process, although many uncertainties also remain in place.

11. Inclusion and empowerment of relevant and affected actors

QCA score:

- 0
 0.33
 0.66
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
 Medium confidence
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
 Documents
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

During different meetings it was discussed if all relevant actors are included. Specific attention is paid to individual farmers in the process via individual talks. This group will likely be most affected by the process*. For some the process will mean stopping, moving or turn extensive farming.

There has been efforts by local land owners to empower and organise themselves to play a role in the GGA. This group was originally not involved in the process, but became involved when it became clear that they play an important role in the area. The process facilitators actively involved them.

The support of the provinces (see point 10) has been helpful for this group to organize themselves and to participate in the process. Their participation has been beneficial as they bring in specific and local knowledge in the discussions. At times, however, this local knowledge also conflicts with the knowledge of others.

** At the institutional level this is group that has good access to decision makers, and whose interest are well considered by politicians. This makes it hard to speak of empowerment.*

12. Clarification of interdependence vis-à-vis common problem and joint vision

QCA score:

- 0
 0.33
 0.66
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
 Medium confidence
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
 Documents
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

As the plans that are being developed are still very general, there is also a general understanding that parties need each other. In general, most parties (but not all) seem to recognize that they will need each other to achieve their own (and more common) goals. Parties seem to be aware of other's skills and

resources (land and land-use!) and recognize that they depend on the actions of other to achieve their own goals.

Increasingly it is being realized that not everything is possible, and a combination of functions will be needed.

There is also a clear understanding that parties will be largely dependent on farmers changing their practices.

13. Trust-building and conflict mediation

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Respondents differ in opinion on the level of **trust** among parties. Based on observations, it seems that parties are open and respect the position others are adopting. Many of the parties adopt a professional role. They accept that people adopt certain positions on behalf of others. This contributes to acceptance of each other’s position and role in the process.

Some parties are less trusted as they are seen to be not fully transparent about their objectives in the process. As the GGA is not the only platform through which different actors seek to accomplish their goals, there is also a feeling that not all information is shared among parties. Several parties, at the same time, do actively share information about what they are doing.

All respondents agree that there has been a (very) slow growing of trust. People have more understanding for each other’s positions and know how to “find” each other more easily. The process facilitator invests much in this through informal get-togethers, and much time is reserved for informal “afters”. This has led some actors finding each other in new ways and working together on specific projects outside the GGA.

Different parties also realize that they need to get over things that happened in the past and need to look forward, although this can be difficult when “older discussions” that have not been fully settled in the past, pop up again in the discussion.

Conflict is avoided rather than mediated by parties. There is a fear that this will break up the process. The main interest for province and process facilitator is to keep parties (working) together. When things pop-up between actors, smaller meetings are suggested to discuss things among each other.

Most parties involved also realize that more difficult stages will follow, for which trust is essential. It is considered too risky to jeopardize the trust building process.

On the one hand this makes sense, but as a result this also makes the discussion abstract and general. The high level of abstraction also makes that conflicts are not made very explicit. At times, differences in views and conflict pop up when specific examples are being discussed. So far, these discussions, however, have remained somewhat theoretical and have not had any clear consequences.

Parties in the steering group also struggle with this. In their view they are there to provide expertise and different points of view, but do not feel that it is their role to take decisions when there are conflict with other parties. Conflicts have to be settled at the level of the Governing Group.

As a result, the meetings often take the form of presenting a wish lists, that are translated by the process facilitators in a document, which parties then react to, etc. Based on this, tensions become clear, but so far there has not been many face-to-face discussions or dialogue about these tensions and how to resolve theme. There is also not much explicit facilitation of this process so far (see point 16): parties are typically invited to discuss matters amongst each other with specific facilitation of the interaction process.

14. Use of experimental tools for innovation

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

This is not an issue yet as parties are still working on a vision. In thinking about possible solutions, several examples of specific projects have been visited, e.g. a food forest.

Based on observations, it can be said that thinking in terms of innovative solutions and especially integration of several activities has had a somewhat paralyzing effect on parties.

15. Ongoing critical self-reflection and learning (i.e., process and/or developmental evaluation):

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

There have been several meetings where parties stop and look back to analyze the process and then decide what is the most appropriate way to address problems and challenges. This is most clear when parties move to a different stage / step in the process. Yet, also during other meetings of the steering groups it often comes up that things might need to be done in a different way.

At the same time it has been hard to decide how to change the way of working. It is not clear who should take the lead in this (the steering groups, governors, province or process facilitator) and parties also differ about this (see point 16 below).

16. Exercise of facilitative leadership:

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The process is overseen by a process manager by the province. Besides overseeing the process, the manager is also a partner in the process and has to bring in provincial goals. This can be difficult. A solution to this is to bring in other provincial experts to the meetings. Overtime, different people have taken this role of process manager.

For the direct facilitation of the different steps / stages an external (independent) process facilitator (PF) is hired, that works on the basis of a contract and specific deliverable. For different reasons it has been difficult at times to adjust the approach adopted by the process facilitator to developments taking place. The fixed deadlines for deliverables also lead to a situation in which the process is moved to a different stage, without having truly closed a previous stage.

The current process facilitator plays a constructive role in convening meeting and bringing parties together. The project is well managed in term of planning, sending around of agenda's, background info etc. Parties also have the feeling that they are well involved in the process (this had been an issue at an early start of the process, where process facilitators moved ahead without involving parties in the steering group).

At the same time, not many plenary discussions take place that are truly facilitated. Time is often lacking to do this in a structured manner and participants have a habit of messaging and listening, but not really discussing.

To the extent this happens, discussions take place in smaller groups (while looking over maps of the area) that are "self-facilitated". The outcomes of these smaller sessions are not "brought back" to the plenary, but find their way in the reports of the process facilitators.

The main role of the process facilitator is to collect all information that parties provide. This is done during the meetings, but also much through individual appointments. This input is then integrated into draft documents or presented on maps that are sent around, often when a deadline is approaching. These documents are then discussed, and often trigger a lot of additional comments and amendments. Some of

these comments are discussed in the plenary, but not all input is shared. This has changed more lately, however.

In the end, the process facilitator draws up the documents that need to be sent to the governors (after getting approval by the steering group) to be “formalized.”

As the process facilitator adopts an independent position, and clear objectives and goals are lacking that could be used as a benchmark for including or excluding information or wishes of the different parties, the deliverables tend to add up all ideas and wishes of the involved parties, but does not really make clear choices or attempts to integrate these.

The process facilitator (but also the provincial program manager) struggles to facilitate this part of the process (i.e. setting priorities, making choices) and to find enough time to organize this. There is also a shared feeling among parties of the steering group that this cannot be “solved” in the steering group but should be addressed by the governing group.

The smaller discussions do aim to contribute to creative problem-solving. In that case the discussion often moves to more specific areas or functions, and different frictions come much more to the fore that call for innovative and integrative ideas.

It is not always clear, however, what the smaller discussions will contribute to exactly. These sessions tend to have the feel of an “exercise”: to the extent that parties look for innovative solutions, this remains somewhat hypothetical, also, in part, as not all directly affected parties (i.e. individual farmers, landowners) participate in these discussions. While these sessions bring much more to the fore what is at stake, it is not clear how this feeds back in the deliverables that have to be developed.

Outcome variable: Successfully co-created green transitions

The outcome variable ‘co-created green transitions’ will be scored in two parts. First, ‘co-creation’ will be scored based on an assessment of whether the participants in the initiative, project or process engaged in collaborative problem-solving that fostered creative ideas and innovative solutions (data will consist of survey data combined with interviews and documents). Next, ‘green transitions’ will be scored based on an assessment of whether the initiative, project or process has fulfilled or is expected to fulfill its green goals, ambitions and aspirations (data will consist of survey data combined with interviews and internal and/or external evaluation reports, including scientific publications).

The scoring of this variable is done in two parts:

- 1. Is the developed solution based on collaborative problem-solving spurring creativity and innovative solutions?*
- 2. Does the developed solution engender a green transition?*

This scoring should be conducted based on both the survey and complementary green outcome evaluations. Please consult Sections 4.4 and 6.10 in the Research Protocol for more details.

1. Is the developed solution co-created?

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Survey
- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this part of the governance factor, including the data sources used for the scoring.

A series of survey questions focus on the presence of collaborative problem-solving (1), the fostering of creative and innovative solutions (2-6), the support for process, outcomes and the level of engagement (7-12), and the attainment of goals that are robust and serve to enhance sustainability (13-15).

The distribution of answers to the **first questions** indicates that there is no agreement that different ideas, resources and forms of knowledge have been mobilized in the search for new perspectives. The GGA in this respect is not (yet) a case of collaborative problem-solving. This is in line with the interviews, although there is a hope among many that this will happen when things get more specific.

The responses to **questions 7-10** show that there is also mixed support for the process and outcomes of the Vision. There is much variation in how parties value the content of the Vision, although most agree that the collaborative processes has contributed to the quality of the Vision [I slightly reframed this question; note also that I reframed question 10 as the term “community” is not applicable to the context of the process].

As for **questions 11-15**, there is again much diversity in the answers that are provided. [I excluded question 14 in my survey, as this question is not applicable to the process].

It is worth noting that many parties indicated (I included a column for remarks in the survey) that it is still too early in the process to answer the questions.

If possible, please insert your survey responses in the table below (in % for each response), including the mean/average % for each survey item.

n = 11	Strong. dis.	Dis.	Slight. dis.	Neither agr/dis	Slight. agree	Agree	Strong. agree	Don't know	Mean score
1. Problem-solving mobilized different experiences, and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge to develop new perspectives		27%	7%	13%	27%	20%	7%		0,27
2. Through the collaborative problem-solving process, different experiences and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge have been mobilized to search for unconventional solutions		33%	27%		33%			7%	-0,6
3. The collaborative problem-solving process mobilized different experiences, and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge to search for solutions that go beyond standard/text-book solutions		27%	27%	20%	7%		7%	13%	-0,53
4. The co-created solution [Vison] breaks with established practices	7%	47%	13%	7%	14%	7%		7%	-1
5. The co-created solution [Vision] disrupts conventional wisdom	9%	27%	18%	9%	18%	7%		7%	-0,67
6. The co-created solution [Vision] offers new ideas to address the green transition problem	7%	33%	20%	13%	7%	7%	7%	7%	-0,65
7. I'm supportive of the co-created solution [VISION]		7%	13%	40%	13%	20%	7%		0,47
8. I'm content with the overall collaborative process of the project		7%	33%	20%	7%	20%	13%		0,39
9. I feel the multi-actor collaboration process was a prerequisite for the success of the project [Vision]			13%	20%	33%	27%	7%		0,95

10. I'm satisfied by the results of the co-creation effort in terms of expected impact on the welfare of the community The Vision for the area take into account the interest of different parties.	13%		7%	27%	7%	27%	20%		0,75
11. The collaborative interaction in the project has led to an innovative solution		47%	20%	20%	7%	7%			-0,93
12. The actors involved in the project are engaged in collaborative interaction that stimulated creative problem-solving		20%	13%	20%	27%	20%			0,14
13. The co-created solution meets the proposed goals of the project		7%	20%	20%	33%	13%	7%		0,46
14. The co-created solution will be durable and robust in the long run									
15. The co-created solution is expected to significantly improve sustainability for the whole community		7%	20%	7%	33%	7%	13%	13%	0,52

2. Does the developed solution engender a green transition¹?

QCA score:

- 0
 0.33
 0.66
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
 Medium confidence
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Survey
 Interviews
 Documents
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this part of the governance factor, including the data sources used for the scoring:

A series of **survey questions** focus on whether the project has produced or is expected to produce a green transition aiming to avoid a worsening of the status quo, maintain the status quo or improve the status quo.

¹ By "green transitions", we mean objectives and aspirations that correspond to at least one of the Green SDGs (SDG 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). The project does not have to refer explicitly to the green SDGs, but the project's green objectives

Several parties remarked (I allowed for additional comments) that their judgement is as much based on a hope than on an expectation. Again, it is a bit too early for most actors in the process to score this.

Note that I added an additional question on the perspective for farmers. This is a main issue in debates on the future of agriculture and nature in the Netherlands and Europe. It is worth noting that parties closer to farmers were more likely to answer No or Don't know to this question than other parties.

If possible, please insert your survey responses in the table below (in % for each response).

1. The project:	Yes	No	Don't know
...did not produce any green transition solution	13%	87%	
...has produced or is expected to produce a green transition solution aiming to avoid a worsening in the status quo	73%	28%	
...has produced or is expected to produce a green transition solution aiming to maintain the status quo	40%	60%	
...has produced or is expected to produce a green transition solution aiming to improve the status quo	73%	27%	
Offers a perspective for (continuation) of farming practices [ADDED]	60%	27%	13%

n = 15

Please list all the informants you have interviewed for the case study (list project role + interview date):

I interviewed 15 people in connection with the study. Half of the interviews were in person, others took place online. Interviews lasted between 1 and 1,5 hours. Besides interviews, many informal talks were held with parties about the process. With process managers (of the province) and facilitators (independent) several (informal / background) talks were held, reflecting on the process and possible steps to be taken.

Part of the interviews (seven) were held after the publication of the Exploration. These interviews had a rather open structure (guided by literature on CG) and were partly used to reflect on my own observations of the process (i.e. (dis)confirmatory interviews). The questions / topics that were discussed were much in line with the interview guide. These interviews were held in November and December 2022.

Interviews (eight) on the Vision were held in December 2023 and January 2024. The GoGreen interview guide was used in these cases. Not all topics, however, seemed relevant (yet) to the participants.

List of informants:

- Three representatives of the province
- Three representatives of farmer organisations
- One representative of private land owners
- Three representatives of nature management organisations

One representative of waterboard (2 times)
Two representatives of municipalities
One representative of National government

The informants are displayed anonymously, but I have a full list of names.

Please list all the observations you have made (type of meeting/workshop/etc. + observation date):

I attended all plenary meetings (about 20 meetings) of the steering group over the last three years, and several meetings of a sub-group. Note-taking focused on sensemaking and the translation of national and provincial plans, in particular, as well as leadership, as this became a recurring issue. In addition, specific attention was paid to processes of trust, dialogue and conflict mediation.

As indicated, several of these sessions also involved reflections and “collective sensemaking” on the process. These sessions have been very informative for understanding participants’ collective experience and evaluation of the process.

In addition, several surveys were sent out during the process to inform the CG process, that were also used for this study (e.g. on actors goals / ambitions; assessment of the process) (Document A, B).

The meeting of the Governing Group were not attended. Minutes of these meetings and feedback on these meetings have been shared.

Please list all the documents you have analyzed (document name + source + year):

Document A: Inventory of participants’ goals and ambitions (April 2022). Consult author

Document B: Inventory of participant’s evaluation of the process (December 2023). Consult author

Boezeman et al. (2023) Stikstof- en natuuraanpak in Nederland: feiten, cijfers en consequenties voor de uitvoering van beleid. PBL. <https://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/downloads/boezeman-et-al-2023-stikstof-en-natuuraanpak-in-nederland-5236.pdf>

Provincie Noord-Brabant (2020). Brabantse Ontwikkelaanpak Stikstof 1.0 . Uitvoeringsagenda 2020-2023, 's Hertogenbosch, 15 december 2020.

Salverda I. and M. Pleijte (2022) Verkenning van het provinciale beleid voor overgangszones die grenzen aan natuur: Leren over governance-uitdagingen voor een integrale gebiedsaanpak. <https://www.wur.nl/nl/publicatie-details.htm?publicationId=3f6b5c27-61fa-4115-9b94-3f1f13dd839a>

NOS (2 March 2023) <https://nos.nl/artikel/2465768-brabant-verleent-voorlopig-geen-vergunningen-vanwege-verslechterde-natuur>

Vision for the area (2024). Consult author

Exploration for the Area (2022). Consult author

Please note the response rate for the survey/measurement of outcome variable:

The list was sent to (in total 32) representatives of about 20 organisations. Representatives from nature organisations (3), farmer organisations (2), municipalities (3), process facilitators (2) the province (2) and private landowners (2), national government (1) filled in the form, leading to a response rate of 48%.