

<p>Interview Questions: These questions should be read in conjunction with the Theoretical Position note previously circulated. The number of questions has been cut significantly. This is to make sure we focus on questions that are key to the objectives of the project within a limited interview time. The questions are intentionally broad so as to not lead the interviewee into particular answers or pre-empt what we think may be important. Of course, questions can be tweaked/made more specific to fit each case study. However, it is essential that the focus remains squarely on the impact of the Smart Cities Mission reforms.</p>		
Question	Why are we asking this?	Potential Follow-up Questions or Prompts
<p>Theme: Opening questions – Important in making the interviewee feel comfortable and might provide useful information to pick up on again later</p>		
1. What is your role within your organisation?	Warm-up/background	
2. What is your relationship/involvement with the smart cities mission?	Warm-up/background	
<p>Theme: Smart Cities Mission Competition – Important because this helps us think about the impact of competitive federalism on urban transport governance reform</p>		
1. Why do you think this city bid for SC status?	Get a better idea of the motivations behind applying for competitive funding under the SC mission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think this reason is the same as for other cities? • Why do you think other cities may not have bid?
2. What were the benefits and challenges of the competitive bid approach taken by the SCM?	Gain an understanding of the potential impact the competitive process had on application processes and what was funded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What impact did the timescale for applications have on the application process?
3. How were the projects in the City's SCM proposal chosen?	Gain an understanding of what/who was influencing the proposal content and whether this was potentially influenced by a sense of needing to game the system. i.e was there a focus on success measures and working back from there, or was it seen as an opportunity to try and get things funded that cities had wanted to do for a long time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who drove the choice of projects? • Was there any consultation with national stakeholders during the process?
4. To what extent do you think the use of external consultants was	The SCM processes strongly encouraged the use of consultants. It would be useful to know what different	

necessary in the development of the SCM bid?	actors think of their role in the process. Helps us identify where power was in the process of application and the influence different actors had.	
5. Was it clear to you on what criteria SC status would be awarded?	This helps us to better understand what the expectations were going into the SC bidding process, and potential motivations for deciding proposal content.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it was not clear – how did you manage this uncertainty in the bidding process?
6. From your understanding of successful bids, what are the key things that the Indian Government is looking for?	This helps us get a better sense of the rationale for the SCM in and of itself and understand the characteristics of winning bids (helping us to get behind the rhetoric of a competitive bid process).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the cities that won SC status the ones you would expect to win?
Theme: Relationships between Stakeholders – Important because helps us identify the nature of ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ relationships in MLG context		
1. Which organisations do you think are the most important for deciding urban transport policy and what projects are funded, and why?	This is an intentionally open question. Responses will help us understand the perception of actors (depending on where they sit in the policy network) and therefore help us to determine who has influence in practice rather than on paper. While not being about the SCM specifically, the answers will help us to identify the status quo (and how this is, or could, change with the SCM) and identify gaps in our stakeholder maps and the vertical and horizontal interactions between actors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much influence do you think national actors have? • How much influence do you think state actors have?
2. What influence does the private sector have on determining urban transport decisions?	Helps us understand the influence of a potentially important group of stakeholders, given the importance of land-value capture discussions in the national workshop (and importantly whether this is part of the status quo or will be any different with the SCM). Also helps us determine the extent to which private sector are influential within Type II organisations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you see the private sector as playing more of a role with the introduction of SC status?
3. At present, what relationship do you (or your organisation) have with the SC SPV?	This is about understanding the relationship between organisations and specifically relationships between Type I and Type II organisations in various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have regular interactions with the SC SPV?

	combinations.	
4. To what extent has the creation of a SC SPV changed relationships between city, state and national agencies?	This question is trying to determine how vertical and horizontal relationships have changed with the onset of the SPV.	<p>If the SPV is in its early stages, you can ask people to try and predict how these relationships might change. Or you can ask them to draw on current examples of existing SPVs (if there are any) to draw comparisons).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a more direct relationship between national and city level now? • Do you feel like who you are held accountable to has now changed?
5. Does the SCM offer more or less opportunities for the public to participate in urban transport decisions?	Trying to get at whether avenues for participation have shifted with the SCM. If more responsibility moves to a Type II organisation you may expect public accountability and opportunities to participate to be reduced. However alternatively, projects may become more high profile and therefore more open to scrutiny.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there more or less opportunities to challenge funding decisions with the creation of the SC SPV?
Theme: Smart City Special Purpose Vehicle – Important because it helps us identify the impact of a ‘Type II’ organisation on urban transport governance and its interactions with ‘Type I’ governmental institutions		
1. What is the composition of the SC SPV Executive?	Primarily background information, but helpful to open up the conversation about who has influence on (and within) the SPV.	If the SPV is not yet in existence, then the discussion could be about what the makeup of the SPV <i>will</i> be.
2. What powers does the SC SPV have?	To understand the role of the SPV (Type II organisation) in practice and how the SPV may affect decision making processes and relationships with others.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do these powers affect the powers of other organisations?

<p>3. How does the SCM SPV as a mode of decision making differ to previous modes of decision making relating to transport policies in the city?</p>	<p>This question helps us to identify the extent to which the SPV model is new to the city or more of the same. In turn, it helps us to identify an interesting potential comparator between cities – whether governance arrangements prior to the SC SPV affect SC SPV implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the SC SPV duplicate responsibilities that already exist in other organisations?
<p>4. To what extent do you think the existence of a SC SPV will change policy priorities or projects implemented in the city?</p>	<p>This question again tries to get at the potential power of the SPV and whether its makeup (or the new relationships it fosters) will change power relationships and in turn whether policy will change as a result (or reinforce existing priorities but just through a different delivery mechanism).</p>	
<p>5. What do you think the benefits of a SC SPV are for project delivery?</p>	<p>The answers will help us further understand the relationships between actors and where the SPV can potentially bypass existing decision-making processes. For example, if the SPV may speed up decision making – understanding what aspect of the SPV’s role is enabling this</p>	
<p>6. How do you think the fixed life-span of the SC SPV will affect decision making and the implementation of projects?</p>	<p>Type II organisations can be more or less temporary, and it may be that even if they are only officially in existence for five years, they may become more or less embedded depending on how the rest of the policy network responds to it</p>	
<p>7. Who is the SC SPV accountable to?</p>	<p>Who the SPV is accountable to will help determine who has influence over it, and help speak to broader debates in the literature about whether Type II organisations have a democratic deficit.</p>	
<p>1. Who else would it be worth us talking to? – this question is important for snowball sampling and making sure we don’t miss important people to speak to</p>		