

Minutes of the OECD FG Meeting Innovative Firms and Networks

Rome, 1-3 October 2000

1.) The meeting was attended by the following participants:

	<i>country</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>address</i>
Wolfgang Polt	AT	Joanneum Research	wolfgang.polt@joanneum.ac.at
Andreas Schibany	AT	Joanneum Research	andreas.schibany@joanneum.ac.at
Anker Lund Vinding	DEN	Aalborg	alv@business.auc.dk
Jesper L. Christensen	DEN	Aalborg	jlc@business.auc.dk
Dirk Meissner	ADL	ADL	meissner.dirk@adlittle.com
Heinz Hollenstein	SUI	Swiss Federal Institute of Technology	hollenstein@kof.gess.ethz.ch
Bianca Poti	ITA	CNR	poti@www.isrds.rm.cnr.it
Vincent Wu	TAI	Chengchi University	fswu@nccu.edu.tw
Aggelos Tsakanikas	GRE	University of Athens	Atsaka@chemeng.ntua.gr
Michel Dumont	BEL	University of Antwerp	mdumont@ruca.ua.ac.be
Terttu Luukkonen	FIN	VTT	terttu.luukkonen@vtt.fi
Timo Hämäläinen	FIN	SITRA	timo.hamalainen@sitra.fi
Gerd Schienstock	FIN	University of Tampere	ytgesc@uta.fi
Tuomo Pentikäinen	FIN	VTT	tuomo.pentikainen@vtt.fi
Attila Havas	HUN	Dept of R&D / Hungarian Min. of Education	attila.havas@om.gov.hu
Svend Remoe	OECD	OECD	svend.remoe@oecd.org

2.) The meeting had the following agenda:

On **Sunday, 1 October** we had a meeting which was dedicated to Module 1 (completion and further exploitation of the second phase).

Participants: Jesper Christensen (DEN), Anker Lund Vinding (DEN), Andreas Schibany (AUT), Svend Remoe (OECD)

The following topics were discussed:

- A draft version of the paper related to the university-industry linkages. We discussed the contribution of the authors and that the work should be mainly done in October.
- Jesper will invite Ester (AUS) to join the group.
- We discussed two options of responsibilities for the papers. Jesper and Andreas will inform Luis and Finn about the outcome of our meeting.

Monday, 2 October:

FG were invited to present their current research findings in relation to the work of the FG. A brief summary of the discussion is given below (in order of sequence). The papers and presentations will be made available on the FG page of the NIS web-site: http://www.oecd.org/dsti/sti/s_t/index.htm → Activities → national innovation system (NIS) → ...

- **Svend Remoe (OECD):** NIS Project related issues.

Svend presented the main results of the last TIP meeting and gave an overview of the time schedule of the project. We further discussed the outline of the OECD synthesis report. The main results are as follows:

Results of the last TIP meeting:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Too much research driven- Synthesis need to include the NIS project as such, especially the link to the David/Foray paper and the previous phase and findings.- Focus on policy co-ordination, learning and institutional change/adaption.
Time schedule:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- TIP meeting 12-13 December- Synthesis draft report should be completed by 17.11.- Draft FG report to be made electr. available by 1.12.- Finalisation 1st quarter 2001.- Presentation CSTP march 2001- Presentation final TIP June 2001
Outline of the OECD synthesis report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Links to previous work- Knowledge markets- Human resources and labour markets- Knowledge management in firms, networks and clusters: competence development- Lessons for policy impact and formulation- Co-ordination, policy learning, regions
TIP meeting Dec.:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Presentation of the synthesis report- FG leaders present FG work

- **Dirk Meissner (ADL):** The innovative company. Using policy to guide the development of capacities for innovation.

Dirk presented the progress report of the work of the sub-group innovative firms. The main results of the discussion were:

- Due to the confidentiality problems and different starting date of the two groups there has not been an information flow between the two groups so far. Although policy related issues concerning networks will also be mentioned within the innovative-firm-FG it is (as of yet) not foreseen to input this work into the work of the Network FG as well. This caused concern among the FG members with regard to (a) the potential duplication of work, (b) the likely loss of information. ***The coordinator of the FG was asked to contact the OECD, AUS and AUT as the lead countries of the respective FGs to ask for a solution which could be the disclosure of empirical material also to the Network FG.***

- **Jesper Christensen (DEN):** Module 1 → see above

- **Heinz Hollenstein** (SUI): Innovation Modes in the Swiss Service Sector. A cluster analysis based on Firm-level Data
- **Bianca Poti** (ITA): Firm organisation and innovative performance. Results from empirical investigations in Italy
- **Terttu Luukkonen** (FIN): Market orientation and economic utilisation of research findings in collaborative R&D: the case of EU Framework Programmes
- **Michel Dumont** (BEL): Knowledge spillovers through R&D co-operation
- **Aggelos Tsakanikas** (GRE): RJVs in Europe: Trends and characteristics

Tuesday, 3 October:

- **Timo Hämäläinen/Gerd Schienstock** (FIN) Discussion of the work on Conceptual Framework produced so far by Timo, Gerd, Andreas. Basis for the discussion was the OECD paper OECD/DTSI/STP/TIP(2000)5 on Innovative networks.
- **Vincent Wu** (TAI): Conceptual Framework and Policies of Networks – the case of university-industry research cooperations
- **Wolfgang Polt**: (AUT) Outline of the Policy case studies
- **Andreas Schibany** (AUT): Outline of the Focus Group reports
- Time Schedule and Next meetings

3.) Format for the Policy Case Studies:

A format for the Policy case studies to be carried out by the participating countries was presented by Wolfgang Polt. Countries were asked to

- (a) collect examples of policies / programmes that target CCN
- most visible/important 3-5 policies/programmes in the country
 - good examples of success / failure
 - programmes with innovative approaches

Not only programmes that are explicitly targeting CCN, but also programmes with other primary goals, but having major effects on CCN could be included (e.g. Foresight). The choice is up to the country experts.

- (b) provide information about this programmes

Both in the form of

- policy documents related to the programmes,
- descriptions of the programmes,
- progress reports,
- available assessments and evaluations.

- (c) write up a 10-12 page synthesis report about these case studies

The Synthesis should give an overview of the programmes and describe their role and place in the overall technology and innovation policy of the country.

i) Suggested scheme for classification for the programmes to be used in the case studies:

Wolfgang suggested to use the scheme given in DSTI/STP/TIP(2000)5, page 11, par 31 for classifying the different angles of the programmes, e.g.:

<i>Types of programmes</i>	e.g. Programmes targeting Science-Industry linkages			e.g. Programmes fostering SME cooperation	e.g. Programmes oriented towards regional networks / clusters
Angle of intervention	Prog. 1	Prog. 2	Prog. 3	Prog. 4	Prog. ...x
Awareness of the network possibility	X	X		X	X
Search for partners		X			
Building trust and a shared knowledge base	X	X			
Organising the network	X			X	
Ensuring providing complementary resources			X		
Active cooperation			X	X	

A programme might have more than one angle of intervention. Presenting the programmes this way would give a good comparison between the different profiles of the programmes.

ii) Suggested scheme for analysis and interpretation of the programmes to be used in the case studies as a template / check-list:

- Characteristics of Networks (see DSTI/STP/TIP(2000)5, page 4 for a full list)
- Market / systemic failure they want to address; rationale and motivation for the programme
- Perceived and/or actual benefits (see DSTI/STP/TIP(2000)5, page 5 for a full list)
- Problems already identified / likely future (or built-in) failures of the programmes

These lists should be seen as a helping device and not as 'obligatory'. Nevertheless, the more we stick to it, the more comparable the analysis will read.

For the following countries a country report till November 1st seemed feasible: **AUT, FIN, DEN, TAI, ITA**. In the case of **SUI** Patrick Vock will be contacted. **GRE**: Aggelos will inform us till the 6th of October if it is possible for him to contribute with a country report.

→ A summary of the contributions (2-3 pages) will be included in the Summary Report of the FG.

4.) The outline of the **deliverables** of the FG:

First, it was the common opinion of the FG that there should be two different reports of the FGs on innovative firms and innovative firm networks respectively.

Second, we agreed on the structure and timing of the following deliverables:

4.1) A Draft Summary Report of the FG to be delivered till 17.11. as a draft for the TIP meeting in December 2000 and as a Final Report in the course of the spring:

This Summary Report will contain:

- (i) a 5 page summary of (a) the main findings of the FG regarding development of networks, (b) tentative policy conclusions. (a) will be based on the existing papers and studies, (b) will be based on the country case studies and on further elaborations on the existing papers by Timo, Gerd, Andreas and Wolfgang.
- (ii) A compilation of the draft of the existing papers produced so far.

4.2) The Final publication of the FG containing the contribution of the participants:

Part 1: Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Link to the OECD-NIS Project (<i>Svend Remoe</i>) - Profile of the FG, working plan (<i>Wolfgang Polt/Andreas Schibany</i>)
Part 2: Theoretical and conceptual issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Innovation networks and determinants of network creation (<i>Timo Härmäläinen/Gerd Schienstock</i>)
Part 3: Empirical investigations on Networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaboration between manufacturing firms and knowledge institutions on product development (<i>J. Christensen, A. Schibany, A. Vinding</i>) - Contribution of the service sector to product development (<i>L. Sanz</i>) - Foreign and domestic partners in product development (<i>F. Orstavik</i>) - Innovative Activity and Knowledge Networks (<i>H. Hollenstein</i> – 3 papers) - Firm organisation and innovative performance – the case of Italy (<i>B. Poti</i>) - Econometric analysis of clusters and networks (<i>T. Pentikäinen</i>) - Knowledge spillovers and R&D co-operation. The case of EU-FP (<i>M. Dumont, A. Tsakanikas</i>) - Patterns of collaboration within the EU-FP (<i>T. Luukkonen</i>) - Types of c/c/n between the science system and industry (<i>A. Schibany</i>) - University-industry research co-operations: the case of Taiwan (<i>V. Wu</i>)
Part 4: Network facilitating policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rationale and scope for policy in promoting c/c/n (<i>W. Polt, T. Härmäläinen</i>) - Policy case studies (<i>all participants</i>)
Part 5: Summary and conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy synthesis (<i>P. Vock, t. Härmäläinen, G. Schienstock, W. Polt</i>)

- 5.) It was agreed to hold next meeting **8-9 March 2001** in Vienna. The main tasks of this meeting would be to discuss the Final version of the FG Report. To this end, The (almost final versions) of the papers should be sent around and will be discussed each by invited 1-2 discussants at the meeting. One option would be to 'cross-peer-review' among ourselves, the other would be to invite some Austrian colleagues who are knowledgeable in the field. Please let us know your opinion about that.

We agreed that the meeting should really be two full days, as we would have to discuss a lot of stuff. Therefore it is recommended that you book also the 10th. Also, the suggestion was made to have a joint trip over the weekend to Semmering, the closest Ski resort to Vienna. We will come back to you with respective suggestions in due time.

- 6.) At the meeting, an interesting and lively discussion about policy aspects emerged. Due to time restrictions, we could not complete this discussion, but Timo, Gerd, Andreas and Wolfgang will try to incorporate as much as possible in the revision of their respective chapters. Subsequently, Jesper has made the suggestion to discuss these issues electronically. We think this is a good idea which might help the revision of the chapters. We will come forward with a 'policy brief', in which we will give a list of the main policy messages which could be distilled from the work of the FG and send it around.