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Item 1. Election of officers

1. The Committee elected the following members of the Bureau for 2009: Chair: Ken Warwick (United Kingdom); Members: Agnès Arcier (France); Jane Corwin (United States); Finn Lauritzen (Denmark) and Yasuhsa Nakao (Japan). The term of office for the members of the bureau will begin on 1 January 2009.

Item 2. Adoption of the Agenda

2. The 113th session was chaired by Ken Warwick. The Committee adopted the draft agenda.

3. The Chair welcomed delegates from Brazil, Egypt, Estonia, Slovenia and South Africa who were participating as ad hoc observers at the meeting.

Item 3. Approval of the summary record of the 112th session

4. The Committee approved the summary record of its 112th Session.

Item 4. Statement by the Secretariat

Progress of the Programme of work and budget

5. Marcos Bonturi, from the Secretariat, provided an update on the main projects implemented under the 2007-2008 Programme of Work and Budget (PWB). The Committee had been active in implementing its POW and all papers had been produced. A number of projects had been undertaken in the white area (Part I) and others were undertaken on the basis of voluntary contributions. The priorities for the 2009-2010 POW had been sent to the Budget Committee and to Council who were discussing the overall budget of the organisation. It was expected that the Committee would, at the very least, maintain the same level of resources as the 2007-2008 biennium, with the possibility of some CPF funds for the Committee’s work on the Innovation Strategy. The Innovation Strategy (IS) had been instrumental in shaping the 2009-2010 POW, with most of the items considered priority by the Committee feeding directly into the work on the IS.

6. Concerning staffing, two members of staff had been transferred to other Directorates and the process had begun to hire new staff: a senior economist funded by voluntary contributions is to be hired before the end of the year to help move forward on a number of projects including software and non-technological innovation; and another senior economist post, under the Part I budget, foreseen for the beginning of 2009. The holder of that post would work on a number of projects including entrepreneurship and sustainable manufacturing and eco-innovation. Delegates were invited, once the post was open, to identify potential candidates in capitals and encourage them to apply.
CIIE and its Working Parties

7. Ken Warwick, the Chair gave a brief overview of the October meeting of the WPSMEE that he had attended for the first time. He noted that the Working Party had an ambitious agenda and had identified some real opportunities for the Committee and the Working Party to work more closely together to build synergies.

8. He also reported on the first joint meeting of the bureaus of CIIE/WPSMEE/WPIA. There had been a good discussion across a number of joint projects that could be undertaken, with some of them contributing to the Innovation Strategy and some of them longer term opportunities for cooperation, particularly in the area of entrepreneurship and micro-data studies which is where the work of the three bodies intersect. It was agreed to create a joint steering group arrangement for projects that straddle the areas of the different bodies. This will be a light arrangement and probably meet “virtually”. Two other items were discussed: i) OECD Secretary-General’s request to all Committee Chairs and Directors for suggestions for ways to contribute to respond to the global financial and economic crisis and ii) the Bologna + 10 process. The WPSMEE wants to mark the 10th anniversary of the Bologna Ministerial meeting of 2000 with a high level meeting of the group and they are keen for CIIE to be involved as a co-organiser.

Making Reform Happen

9. Deputy Secretary General (DSG) Mr. Aart de Geus, responsible for oversight of the planning and implementation of the OECD “Making Reform Happen”, informed the Committee of the preparations underway for this horizontal project.

10. The political economy of reform was an area of utmost importance since economies have to evolve to cope with changing environments. The OECD was well placed to undertake the political economy of reform project as it provides a forum for governments to compare and exchange policy experiences and to identify good and not so good practices. It can provide good data and evidence based analysis. This is done through specialised Committees and Directorates working in different fields of public policy, and EDRC work on country studies. In looking to the whole of society, there are many key stakeholders in reform at the OECD, including representatives of BIAC and TUAC. There are also governments that although not formal members, have observer or other status and can also contribute to this work.

11. In the context of reform, Mr. de Geus referred to the current financial and economic crisis, and highlighted two areas that required immediate attention and where the OECD might be able to contribute: i) the financial architecture, including the regulatory framework of the market and risk management, and ii) the looming recession. However, in responding to the crisis it was also important to keep sight of long term objectives such as sustainable growth, innovation, and environmental issues.

12. The project “making reform happen” has been underway for two years and looks to explore factors that contribute to success and failure in different reform areas by looking at the existence of appropriate institutions to support reform from decision to implementation. This includes formal and informal rules and institutions, the quality of institutions and leadership and the mechanisms for dialogue with stakeholders. This is because the political decision making process in countries can vary, not only in terms of parliamentary structure but also in terms of bodies that have the authority and credibility to speak about reforms. Proposals for reform need to be evidence-based. The capacity of the government administration to implement reform quickly without making mistakes is important. The project also considers the impact and reactions of those affected by the reform. There are winners and losers with uneven distribution of costs and benefits. It also looks at short term versus long term impacts as sometimes
as there can be a gap between the time efforts to reform are made and the time you see results, therefore strategies are important.

13. There are two strands to the project: the first, an analytical strand which is to provide analysis on approaches for achieving policy reform and strengthening the OECD’s analytical capacity. This includes looking into structural reforms in various areas and identifying key factors that made them a success or a failure. A synthesis of these results will be reproduced in a report on “effective ways to realise policy reforms” which is expected to be published early 2010. The second strand of the project is the “action” strand that provides direct support to member countries in their domestic reform efforts. This involves not only recommending the necessary reforms but also entails a hands on approach to assist through various channels including publications, country visits by a high level representative of the OECD, seminars with key stakeholders, or direct engagement with countries to provide policy advice. In this regard the Organisation had participated in work with France, Hungary and Mexico. Work was based on voluntary contributions so that other countries did not pay for country specific services. As part of the action strand, an internal process will be put in place to share existing OECD knowledge in its different areas of specialisation. One important element of this project is sharing the lessons learnt from governments’ successes and failures and experience in communication with stakeholders and the public. Another element is learning about timing as successful reform starts early on in the term of a new government.

14. In terms of what the project could bring to the CIIE, it would help to focus on the relevance of the Committee’s work, by going beyond proposing the content of a reform to also providing support to make reforms happen in a given area. Also it was of benefit to exchange lessons and experiences so that all involved could learn from each other.

15. Brazil agreed that timing was something that governments needed to take into account in moving ahead with reform. Brazil had had an interesting experience during the transition phase between incoming and outgoing governments that had initially posed the threat of a financial crisis. However the outcome had been contrary to expectations as the incoming government set up a team at an early stage in the handover process to coordinate with the outgoing government and measures were taken to promote the changes they wanted to implement and this was done rapidly.

16. Egypt thanked the OECD for enabling them to attend the CIIE for the first time and looked forward to actively participating in the work of the Committee. Egypt had since 2004 embarked on major programmes of reform. These were highly inspired by OECD best practices, projects and reports. The results of these reforms were very positive, for example industry growth rates had jumped from 3% in 2004 to 8%, and foreign direct investment had nearly tripled. In carrying out these reforms however they were faced with many challenges as some people gained and others lost out.

17. DSG De Geus welcomed the interventions by both Brazil and Egypt. There were lessons to be learnt in terms of maintaining continuity in long term reform agendas and the importance of strong leadership to lead to successful reform. An important element was identifying winners and losers based on facts, and compensating losers. An example was Mexico that, in preparing a major pension reform, did not get the necessary support of the parliament and of the unions. The government then introduced a package in which the elements of the reform were maintained in their entirety but which also included emergency help for health care for elderly people. This was an example of where compensation in one area can help push through reform at a relatively low cost. Finally, he would stay in touch with the Chair to keep abreast of developments in the Committee.

18. The Chair thanked DSG de Geus for his intervention and delegates for their input. The subject of political reform was very relevant to the work of the CIIE and Committees across the Organisation could learn from each other. He agreed that there was a risk that the crisis would distract governments from
some of the longer term reforms that need to continue. In terms of the projects on sustainable manufacturing and counterfeiting and piracy where the Committee needed to think about winners and losers this was perhaps an area where the PER project could provide guidance and experience. The Chair concluded that the PER Item would be included on the agenda for the next CIIE meeting, and selected countries would be requested to prepare some thinking in the area of policies, examples of reform experiences, for which the Committee was responsible which could be helpful to both the PER project and the CIIE in terms of comparing experience, establishing best practices.

Item 5. The OECD Innovation Strategy


19. Ms. Susanne Huttner, Director of the DSTI, introduced the new draft of the scoping document and set out the time lines of the project. She highlighted the extraordinary nature of the project and the close collaboration that is being established throughout the organisation. She also clarified that the scoping document should be considered as a document setting out the issues, rather than as a roadmap for implementation of the project. The project is built around five pillars, three of which are thematic (markets and governance, human capital and global dimensions) and two are cross-cutting (the changing nature of innovation and measurement issues). Phase I, consisting of the scoping exercise and the definition of the products, is being finalised and the second Phase is now under way. This consists of drafting the roadmaps for the individual Committees and Working Parties to support priority setting and help articulate the work contributing to the Innovation Strategy in the PWB (see [DSTI/IND/RD(2008)1]). Work is currently under way on the 2009 progress report as well as on the outline for the final report for 2010. Ms. Huttner went on to underscore the importance of the role of the CIIE, in particular as it directly considers business aspects, including for SMEs, and works towards bridging the gap between macro and micro work.

20. Ms. Huttner also argued that the context of the current crisis further emphasizes the importance of the work on the innovation strategy as innovation is crucial for continued long term and sustainable growth. Therefore, it is important to identify potential threats to innovation performance and manage them. These threats include a tightening of investment in and by companies, especially in a culture of risk aversion, but also in infrastructure, human capital and R&D, each vital for maintaining longer term prospects.

21. Ms. Huttner also presented some other related developments, including the organisation of an OECD stock taking workshop and the ICCP Ministerial on the Future of the Internet in June 2008, briefing meetings for delegations, a submitted bid for CPF funding, the dialogue between Directors and the Secretary General, the formation of a private sector advisory group, and the establishment of the Innovation Strategy web site (www.oecd.org/innovation).

22. In addition to refining the final report outline and drafting the interim report, efforts to engage in capitals and with other stakeholders will continue. Furthermore, a joint meeting (to be chaired by DSG Padoan) of the Chairs and Bureaus of all the Committees involved was being planned for early December 2008. Finally, Ms. Huttner explained that external bodies currently involved in the Innovation Strategy include the World Bank, UNESCO, the Kauffman Foundation, NESTA and ICE.

23. The Chair welcomed the new documents and stressed that the interim report would also constitute a good opportunity to respond to the current crisis. Re-iterating the focus on new micro work he then opened the floor for interventions from Delegations.
24. A lively discussion followed with the intervention of fourteen Delegations (Denmark, France, Sweden, Canada, USA, Belgium, Spain, Japan, Norway, UK, Germany, New Zealand, the Netherlands and Italy).

25. Denmark thanked the secretariat for the road map and the scoping document which gave a good overview of the areas of work. Criticism was expressed over some of the work that had been done and there was concern over problems that the Committee was facing. Although Denmark endorsed the efforts being made to co-operate horizontally across relevant Committees, Directorates and bodies outside of the OECD, and considered that a relevant and good strategy, they had concerns as to whether the secretariat could produce something essential that could be sold to capitals, given that the strategy had to be published and transmitted to Ministers within one year. The problem was that there had been no discussion on the essentials of the Innovation Strategy. These were, for example, current practices and the impact of those practices, and identifying policy advice that the Committee and the Organisation could give to member countries. It was time to start discussing content and policy and not just process and budget. In that context Denmark had identified the changing nature of innovation, it had become more global, more based on co-operation between public and private partners. The delegation would welcome a discussion in this area to draw out some policy guidelines. It was up to the OECD to take the lead and discuss best practices, policies and their impact. With the present financial crisis, there was a risk that governments would take measures that would impede long term growth and innovation by introducing barriers to trade investment and competition. This made the innovation strategy even more important. It was important to proceed with the work at a more rapid pace than had been the case to date.

26. France welcomed the developments in what was a very ambitious project. The documents showed progress had been made and that the governance arrangements had been fleshed out. There was an opportunity for the Committee to make some very valuable recommendations in a number of areas, including public policy and indicators. There were however still some aspects that were not clear including financing; whether some areas of the work still required voluntary contributions. As Denmark pointed out, it was important to get an idea as soon as possible of the major outputs that the Organisation wanted out of the work.

27. Sweden supported the objectives and the chosen pillars in the strategy and scoping document, and noted that the approach was very broad covering a wide range of policy making areas. It was hoped that the work undertaken in the different OECD sectors could be used efficiently and that it would result in some concrete policy recommendations which could be used by governments and other stakeholders. The Innovation Strategy was a way of strengthening the core work of the Organisation, and the OECD resources should be used in an efficient way. The Innovation Strategy would contribute to a better understanding of efficient policies in different areas to increase sustainable growth. Two guidelines for the work are essential. Focus on what is possible to do in an efficient way in the given time period and be pragmatic.

28. Canada thanked the Chair and Ms. Huttner for their presentations and for the background papers more generally, and acknowledged and appreciated the amount of work that had gone into the material. It provided a relevant summary of the range of policy issues the Organisation confronted in advancing innovation. The challenge remained how to put this into effect. There was a need to understand exactly what of the list of issues were going to be included in the final strategy, because it was clear that they could not all be done. Canada’s concern was highlighted even further when comparing the issues in the scoping paper with those in the annex and road map. There was obviously some clear concordance between them, but other areas where issues were in the scoping paper, but not in the Programme of Work and Budget. The question was how to proceed on many of the issues raised in the scoping paper and the road map. The committee should not try to do all of it; there was a need to start prioritising the issues and decide which ones were taken through to the final project and which ones were either dropped or simply completed as
part of the Programme of Work and Budget. The scoping paper was not the appropriate vehicle to have that discussion about priorities; it should be used as a resource document. In proceeding to the next steps, the Final Report to Ministers and the Interim Report for 2009, appeared to be the appropriate vehicle to narrow the scope for many issues including funding decisions. Canada looked forward to receiving drafts of the report and working with the secretariat to focus it; they were prepared to respond to the call to prioritise and were ready to engage in the discussion to take this forward.

29. The United States thanked the Secretariat for providing the scoping paper; they firmly believed that innovation performance was a key driver in the economy and therefore supported the work of the OECD. They also welcomed the annex and the roadmap which was a valuable tool in identifying the key committees responsible for many elements of the innovation strategy. However, for a project that had been identified as a high priority by OECD ministers and whose scope and reach affect many areas of the OECD, the government had concerns with both the process and to some degree the content of the Innovation Strategy. First, they were concerned that member governments had not had an opportunity to comment on the scoping paper. There were a number of questions that would have been appropriate to raise beforehand. The Delegation had been informed that the scoping document could not be revised or reopened because there was very little time remaining before the 2009 Ministerial meeting. While they understood the time constraints, there were many elements of the study that affected multiple committees and required extensive consultations with colleagues in capitals. The innovation strategy based on both the scoping paper and the programme of work and budget mapping was a tremendous undertaking involving numerous directorates, committees and working parties. The United States, as other countries, were concerned that the Innovation Strategy was trying to do too much rather than focusing on the critical elements such as key drivers to innovation, framework conditions, intellectual property, and measurement. The Delegation welcomed the fact that the secretariat was establishing priorities and requested the secretariat to elaborate upon it. There was concern expressed that all the work that had been identified as contributions to the innovation strategy would not be ready in time for incorporation into the strategy. Some projects would probably have to be delivered in the long term and members should have an opportunity to comment on this.

30. The Delegation emphasised the need to be realistic and pragmatic regarding the management of the innovation strategy work and ensure that the product delivered was of high quality. Governments that gave the mandate to the OECD to conduct the high priority project must have the opportunity to work together with the Secretariat to ensure that all projects within the innovation strategy produce a consistent and non-contradictory message. An example, much of the work being conducted in various committees would have an IPR element. It was important that the OECD present a consistent message which reinforces existing multilateral agreements, notably WIPO and the WTO. In addition, with regard to whole of government approach, the work would not be best served through Ambassador meetings or correspondence. Members needed to think constructively about an appropriate mechanism that ensured that horizontal elements of the study were addressed effectively, and Ambassador meetings would not occur frequently enough to accomplish this. Time needed to be provided for full consultation with capitals.

31. The United States would like to move forward with the work and in order to avoid miscommunication in the future requested that: i) all future documents related to the innovation strategy as identified in both the scoping document and annex be presented to committees no later than three weeks prior to discussion, to enable member countries to review and comment; ii) any report that was to be used at the ministerial, including the interim report, be distributed for comment by Members 30 days prior to the Ministerial, otherwise there was a risk of not being able to endorse the report by the MCM due to lack of time for review. Finally, the Delegation looked forward to working with the secretariat; it was a high priority area and they had begun internally to reorganise the way they looked at the strategy and looked forward to its mission accomplished and goals fulfilled.
32. Belgium thanked the secretariat for the overview received and raised three issues. Firstly, the documents were more of a theoretical framework and the interconnection between the different areas looked more like initiatives rather than a coherent framework. Secondly, as Denmark and France had stated there was a need to have a more concrete document as soon as possible. Thirdly, it was extremely important to take the financial crisis on board. Concerning priorities, the focus should be on the link between innovation and long term economic growth; with the financial crisis it was easier to defend this. Finally concerning governance issues they welcomed clarification that there would be an important role played by the different Chairs of the various Committees.

33. Spain agreed with other Delegations on the need to produce results in the interim report. It was important to try to tackle some of the most urgent issues that could help the financial crisis. In doing so, investment in innovation should not be slowed because that would be very negative for economies. The scoping document provided a good overview of the whole problem. The Delegation suggested there was a need to look at certain specific issues i) entrepreneurship, and recalled the workshop in Denmark that highlighted the important relation between entrepreneurship and innovation; ii) the regional dimension including the role of clusters and poles of competitiveness; iii) important links between eco innovation and non technological innovation. It was important to maintain long term investment in innovation in responding to the financial crisis.

34. Japan thanked the secretariat for the documents and fully supported the idea of reaching out to other committees or directorates and collaborating with other relevant players within and outside the OECD. The Delegation supported the meeting of committee chairs and the bureaus in a timely manner for co-operation to be carried out smoothly. Co-ordination between the CIIE and CSTP was still needed as many projects had common threads. The Delegation reported that they were aware of an advisory expert meeting chaired by DSG Padoan; they understood there had been a very useful discussion and expressed regret that they had not had any feedback on that. Feedback should be provided in a timely manner and should be a way of enhancing collaboration among the different parties within the Organisation. As other delegations had pointed out, prioritisation of the issues and tasks was of utmost importance due to the severe time constraints. There was a need to focus on ongoing work to produce tangible results to sell to Ministers in 2009 rather than starting something new and running out of time. There were a lot of good projects being carried out in the CIIE and CSTP which could provide a list of very attractive items under the Innovation Strategy.

35. Norway welcomed the documents and progress made; there were many promising deliverables that could be used in national policy developments. The Delegation shared the view for the need for long term perspectives and maintaining the focus on innovation. In view of the number of activities proposed, there was a need to prioritise and decide what not to do. A possibility would be to establish demarcation lines, for example, what should remain in the domain of firms. An important area to address was the need to integrate R & D and innovation policies into the overall framework and how that could best be achieved. It was impossible to have “one size fits all” but to have policy recommendations, best practices in this field would be very helpful and quite tangible for the ministries. Finally, Norway agreed that the interim report and the final report were suitable vehicles for making these priorities.

36. United Kingdom thanked the chair and the secretariat for producing the scoping document and the road map that had been put together at very short notice. The road map was unusual in that it did not contain any timings and it was important that it did. Timing was at the heart of the issue regarding the Innovation Strategy. It had been going for a while and, as a number of delegations indicated, the secretariat was at a point where it needed to start producing an interim report. There was a danger in terms of the final report that there would be some very broad conclusions that did not really take the debate forward. The Committee should reflect on DSG de Geus point about the importance of evidence in driving policy. There was a need to ensure that the final report was rich, deep in evidence and was attractive.
analytical work needed to be progressed and it was hoped that priorities would drop out of the work the Committee was discussing at the meeting. Activities to be chosen should provide interesting results that would enrich the strategy. Finally, priority should be given to putting the emphasis on analytical work and less on the procedural issues.

37. Germany expressed its appreciation over the first attempt to provide an overview of the innovation process. The Delegation agreed with others that the focus was too broad and there was a risk of getting lost in details. There was an urgent need to focus the project.

38. New Zealand agreed with other Delegations comments concerning the call for focus, the analytical framework and for action. Another element that was missing was an agreement on the way to take that forward. Ms Huttner had asked the Committee to consider how it could draw the strings of the work together to provide the analytical framework to be applied to all of the areas in the road map. The Committee needed to consider an appropriate response, whether it was some kind of electronic discussion group in which all members engaged or whether some members were asked to form a group to drive the work forward.

39. Netherlands supported the work and recognised the progress made. Focus should be made on how innovation was driving productivity and the role of innovation in solving problems in society such as energy and environment change. The link between entrepreneurship as a driver of innovation productivity growth should also be highlighted. These two areas should be stressed in the draft report.

40. Italy praised the secretariat for the amount and quality of work that had been put into the documents. The Delegation agreed that there was a need to agree on priorities. In relation to the informal advisory group meeting, he reminded the Committee of a point that was raised by the Italian delegate. That was in wanting a whole of government approach to innovation it was critical to look at barriers to innovation; in other words to look at the “don’ts” not only the “do’s”. An example was in the area of SMEs where measures were very pragmatic in terms of removing barriers, such as allowing entrepreneurs a second chance after failure. This should be a chapter in the work undertaken.

41. Ms. Huttner thanked the delegations for their interventions, comments and suggestions and acknowledged the need for increased focus and priority setting, but with the help of the delegations. She also stressed the need for more funding and the importance of raising more additional funding as the basis for carrying out and creating more new work, not only in the context of the current Innovation Strategy project but also going forward beyond 2010. Ms. Huttner also recognised that the current version of the roadmap is without timelines, but she argued that it will be more useful to add deadlines once the priorities have been set.

42. The Chair then summed up, welcoming the documents presented by Ms. Huttner, and reiterating the need for increased focus, priority setting, and being pragmatic. The Chair also re-emphasized the need for documents to be made available well in advance of meetings, and in particular also for the upcoming joint Chair & Bureaus meeting in order to share the documents with the CIIE delegates in advance so as to fully represent the CIIE at the meeting. The Chair also stressed the need to move on from the discussion about “what to do” and suggested to accept the current document as it is and start the work as soon as possible, while being careful to also identify current gaps, including in funding, that would prevent the goals of the Innovation Strategy from being achieved. The Chair also reiterated some of the points highlighted by the delegations, including best practice, drivers, IP, measurement, the link between innovation and long term growth and productivity and the links with global challenges and eco innovation. The Chair invited the Delegations to comment on the setting of priorities by the end of the week following the meeting (i.e. by the 7th of November) and the Secretariat to then indicate what decision will be made on priorities. This information should then also be included in the document that will be prepared in
advance of the joint Chairs & Bureaus meeting. He summed up by stressing the importance of producing high quality analytical work over the next six months.

b) The changing nature of innovation (NESTA, UK, and FORA, DNK) DSTI/IND(2008)19

43. Jorgen Rosted (Denmark) presented this document. He started by outlining the history behind the idea for this work, including the organisation of the three workshops on non-technological innovation (London, December 2007; Trento, January 2008; and Copenhagen, May 2008). At the Copenhagen workshop the idea and need to look at “next practice” rather than just at “best practice” emerged and inspired the development of a set of “principles”, a mixture of new emerging elements and declining “old” elements: i) knowledge is sourced globally; ii) value creation is the result of companies’ and customers’ joint efforts to find solutions for complex needs; iii) new knowledge on user behaviour will be critical to the creation of new solutions; iv) companies participate in partnership innovation and create close business networks and operate seldom on their own; v) new technology is an input to the innovation process more than an innovation in itself; vi) innovations by businesses, government and the third sector come in response to the requirement for greater environmental sustainability; vii) unsolved needs in Developing Countries and Emerging Markets are important sources of innovation, driving and shaping the demand; and viii) public services harness more radical forms of social innovation drawing on wider sources including the private sector and third sector to respond to major social challenges.

44. Mr. Rosted presented these principles to the CIIE for discussion by delegates, asking them to keep in mind specifically questions such as: where do we need more and/or new knowledge, what are the policy implications of the principles, and do current innovation policies need to be changed? He also suggested a need for further examination and evaluation of innovation policies in selected “best practice” countries, and continued discussion about the policy implications, not only with policy makers, but also with business leaders and academics.

c) Linking innovation and entrepreneurship (ICE) DSTI/IND(2008)20

45. The Netherlands presented this document as a representative and member of ICE – the International Consortium on Entrepreneurship, welcoming comments and suggestions on the paper. The main idea behind this work is that entrepreneurship is seen as a key driver of productivity and innovation. The OECD’s Entrepreneurship Indicators Programme (EIP) is very relevant for this work. The three main areas of analysis are: i) entrepreneurship and economic growth; ii) the drivers of entrepreneurship, and iii) next practices.

d) Possible workshop on New Practices in Entrepreneurship and Innovation

46. The Kauffman Foundation also took the floor to announce a follow-up workshop, which will look into these three areas in more detail, in Kansas (USA) on the 22 and 23 June 2009. This event will be organised in collaboration with the WPIA.

47. The Chair gave a quick summary of the work done by Denmark and the Netherlands, and the Secretariat highlighted how this work fits closely with the PWB for 2009/10, especially regarding new actors and practices in innovation (PWB, Item 4.1). Work by the Secretariat in this area will be published in the fourth quarter of 2009 and will feed directly into the IS. The Secretariat also mentioned its engagement with work on entrepreneurship (PWB, Item 2), which received the second highest priority from delegates, and its linkages to innovation. This work will draw on case-study analyses of both firms and sectors. The report and case-studies are to be delivered early to mid 2010 and will also feed into the IS. Given continued priority, work in this area will continue beyond 2010.
48. The United States thanked NESTA and Fora for bringing focus to the changing nature of innovation and the importance of non-technological innovation which has not seen much attention compared to traditional R&D. Australia, Poland, the United Kingdom, and Spain thanked Denmark and the Netherlands for bringing depth and richness to the IS with their initiatives and the development of a conceptual foundation for further work. Poland mentioned that the issue of open-source and internal community building should be addressed more explicitly, including in the IS, and underscored their readiness to support Denmark’s work, including financially. Finland expressed full support of Denmark’s work. The United Kingdom mentioned their own work on high-growth firms and promised to pass this on to the OECD.

49. The Chair thanked the delegations of Denmark and the Netherlands, as well as the Kauffman Foundation and NESTA for their work. He noted the Committee’s strong support to the continuation of this work, including agreement to working with the Kauffmann Foundation to organise the June 2009 Workshop. He encouraged these delegations to continue to liaise closely with the OECD Secretariat in developing this work, and highlighted its great potential for contributing to the work of the Committee in the context of the IS, as well as the linkages with work done by other Committees. The Chair also welcomed Denmark’s suggestion to let the Bureau act as a “steering group” for distributing documents and to sound out CIIE interests in connection with work on the IS.

e) Measuring innovation with trademark data

50. The Secretariat highlighted that there is a lack of data for measuring non-technological innovation and presented ideas on how such indicators could be compiled using trademark data. Even if trademarks are mostly associated with product innovation they are often used when launching new goods and services, and they are linked with marketing innovation. Trademarks are also associated with market premiums and are among the few quantitative information sources that are available on non-technological innovation. Other promising characteristics of trademark data concern large quantities, relatively high data comparability, high representation of services, and the possibility of linking trademarks with firm-level data (a process that has been started).

51. Denmark, Canada, France, and the Netherlands commended the Secretariat for putting efforts into measuring non-technological innovation and expressed interest in the project. France also mentioned that it would provide financial support for the work. Denmark highlighted potential problems with trademark data and suggested that these be supplemented with CIS data.

(f) Innovation in business service functions: A Canadian Perspective

52. Canada presented its own work on non-technological innovation. The work highlighted the need for looking at services in a new way; i.e. as a “functional activity” as opposed to an industrial sector, and a need for better measurements. The project identified three areas of interest with direct relevance for policy: i) product design and development, ii) logistics and supply chain management, and iii) customer relationship management. The importance of being able to benchmark Canadian policy developments with the United States was also considered key for the work.

53. The Chair underscored that the work done by Canada is of high relevance to the CIIE and that the Secretariat welcomes working closely with Canada in this area. Denmark urged Canada to provide more specifics on the policy implications of its work and on what Canada will do.

g) Regional Innovation and Competitiveness (France)

54. France presented the results of a 2 year study on innovation and the role of regions. The report, which was published in September 2008, concluded that there is much debate over how to manage
innovation at the regional level. Several schools of thought hold that one should be cautious with territorial innovation policies but that such policies may be useful in as far as they can bring positive differentiations. Unified national actions generally tend to spread resources too thinly and regions do little to identify areas where innovation is most likely to occur. Implementation of regional innovation policies requires regional knowledge on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. France has implemented programs which developed a methodological guide in 2006 for diagnosing regions. This process, which started in 2008, is expected to bring conclusions in the second half of 2009, leading into the operational programs of the EU structural funds.

55. Spain noted that the strategy for innovation in Spain is very different from the one presented by France. Regional voluntarism was in particular highlighted as a reason that France’s strategy would not necessarily work in Spain. Brazil expressed interest in the French strategy but questioned how it could be replicated. Especially considering that Brazil’s own regional experiments in the past had not worked. Brazil also questioned how to develop region-based strategies which at the same time would be adaptable to national strategy. As a response, France mentioned the importance of managing the dialogue between regions and national authorities following a bottom-up approach and to create incentives for regions.

Item 6. Entrepreneurship policies

a) Review of entrepreneurship policies in Denmark

56. Koen de Backer and Fabienne Cerri from the Secretariat presented the review of entrepreneurship policies in Denmark. Fabienne Cerri presented main determinants and conditions for entrepreneurship as well as the multi-level governance system of entrepreneurship policy in Denmark. Koen de Backer provided insights into the objectives of the review, the analytical framework and outlined areas for policy improvement.

57. The Danish delegation thanked the Secretariat for an extremely useful review and recommended other delegations to undertake a similar exercise in order to enrich knowledge of entrepreneurship policies.

58. Finland noted the thoroughness of the report and asked whether the Nordic model could hinder support of entrepreneurial activity in Denmark. Finland also mentioned it had already worked on the integration of innovation and entrepreneurship policies and could therefore serve as a source of inspiration for Denmark in this policy field.

59. The Netherlands commented on the quality of the review. The Dutch delegation raised the fact that centers for entrepreneurship had been set up in Higher education institutions - following best practice from the United States – and that this is something Denmark could also envisage.

60. Other delegations intervened. Switzerland enquired about co-ordination with the work of WPSMEE as regards the review. Marcos Bonturi, from the Secretariat explained the difference between the country-specific exercises conducted by the WPSMEE and by the parent Committee. The Secretariat strived to build synergies between the two strands of work, which could be seen as complementary. Consultations between the different parts of the Secretariat had been a key to preparing this report, with Economics, Statistics, Public Governance and Territorial Development, among those Directorates that had been consulted. The Public Governance and Territorial Development had actually written a chapter of the report.

61. Sweden mentioned the importance of female entrepreneurship when more growth enterprises are needed. Brazil stressed the need to keep focusing policy on creating a favourable entrepreneurial culture despite foreseen budget cuts in the context of an economic downturn.
62. The Chair asked the Secretariat to incorporate minor comments and confirmed that the report is declassified.

**b) Evaluation of Entrepreneurship Education Programmes**

63. Marie-Florence Estimé from the Secretariat (CFE) introduced this item and presented Mr. Malcolm Maguire (external consultant) who prepared the draft synthesis report in collaboration with the Secretariat. The work is part of WPSMEE’s 2007-2008 POW and intends to provide a better understanding of how to promote entrepreneurship education. It completes work undertaken by the Working Party on the evaluation of policies and programmes aimed at strengthening an evaluation culture (cf. the 2008 publication “OECD Framework for the Evaluation of SME & Entrepreneurship Policies and Programmes”).

64. Mr. Maguire gave an overview of the study which includes two phases: i) Phase 1 which contains a literature review on methods and approaches taken to the evaluation of programmes, especially where a measurement of the impact of such programmes has been sought; ii) Phase 2 which aims at producing: a resource tool kit, a list of evaluation studies of education for entrepreneurship programmes which have been undertaken, a fully populated evaluation matrix and a set of recommendations for undertaking the evaluation of entrepreneurship education programmes. Mr. Maguire stressed in particular the importance of integrating evaluation as part of the programmes, at the conception phase.

65. New Zealand thanked the Secretariat for the significant contribution of the project: it was the first serious attempt to think about evaluation in this policy area. The United Kingdom wondered whether the project could better highlight best practices, pointing to successful programmes with robust evaluation techniques.

66. Mme Estimé invited CIIE delegates to send comments before 20 November in order to finalise the report by the end of the year. The Chair mentioned that information on best practices as regards entrepreneurship education programmes would be the most relevant part of the work as far as the CIIE was concerned.

**c) Entrepreneurship and innovation micro-data project**

67. Dominique Guellec from the Secretariat presented the business micro-data projects of the Working Party of Industry Analysis (WPIA). The projects aim to compile indicators and regressions, using micro-data, which are as comparable as possible across countries on entrepreneurship, innovation and the development of firms. Four projects would investigate: innovation dynamics of firms, financing of new firms, market incentives to innovate and links between skills, ICT and productivity. Initial results are planned for fall 2009, the final report would be available end of 2010. Mr. Guellec asked CIIE delegates to consult with WPIA delegates to confirm countries’ participation in the projects before 14 November.

**d) Entrepreneurship indicators**

68. Koen de Backer from the Secretariat provided an update on the OECD-Eurostat Entrepreneurship Indicator programme. The programme started in 2006 and has benefitted from funding by the Kauffman Foundation and by the Danish led ‘International Consortium on Entrepreneurship’ (ICE). A digest of indicators with preliminary results measuring entrepreneurship will be released in November 2008. The Entrepreneurship Manual is planned to be available in the first half of 2009, while the Entrepreneurship Compendium is to be finalized end of 2009.

69. The Kauffman Foundation thanked the OECD for its collaboration and stressed that it is the first time such indicators on entrepreneurship would be available.
70. The Chair summed up the item inviting delegations who expressed possible interest in the micro-data projects to consult with capitals in order to widen participation.

**Item 7. Counterfeiting and Piracy**

**a) Phase II: Piracy of digital content**

71. Marcos Bonturi from the Secretariat briefed the CIIE on the current status of the OECD Project on Counterfeiting and Piracy. He informed the Committee that the results of Phase I of this project had been published and had been very well received, whereas Phase III, which will cover other IP infringements, is yet to be scoped.

72. Piotr Stryszowski from the Secretariat summarized the findings of Phase II of the study that focuses on piracy of digital content and covers the following research areas: 1) technical and economic perspective of markets for pirated digital products, 2) factors that drive supply and demand of pirated digital content, and 3) institutional regulations and industry initiatives to counter digital piracy. The floor was then taken by Danny Scorpecci from the Secretariat, who presented the case study of digital piracy in the sports rights owners sector.

73. Finally, with respect to digital piracy generally, Mr. Scorpecci outlined the key issues for consideration by policymakers including: 1) the complexity of markets where many pirated digital products are exchanged at virtually zero price, with the resulting need for innovative business models as well as adequate regulations; 2) the need for legal means of dealing with infringements to be rapid, targeted and flexible, without unreasonably affecting Internet as a communication, commercial and educational tool; 3) the importance of changing public attitudes towards digital piracy through targeted public awareness campaigns that should be coupled with enforcement efforts.

74. The delegations of the United States and BIAC expressed their appreciation to the Secretariat for preparing the draft report and gave broad endorsement to its contents. However, they also indicated a need for some minor adjustment of the text that would be submitted to the Secretariat in writing.

75. The US Delegate asked the Secretariat about the role of the Committee for Information, Computer and Communications Policy (ICCP) in declassifying the document. Marcos Bonturi replied that the document would be sent to ICCP for comment, and noted that the CIIE was the body responsible for declassifying the final document. He also asked the delegates to provide their comments to the Secretariat on Phase II by 14 November. Once these comments and any eventual comment from ICCP delegates were incorporated, the report would be submitted to the CIIE for declassification under the written procedure (probably in January 2009).

**b) Regional fora and other events (Germany and Spain)**

76. Danny Scorpecci from the Secretariat recalled the idea of global fora to disseminate the findings of Phase I and possibly of Phase II of the study. There are currently two events in the pipeline. The first one will be an activity in cooperation with the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office, to be held in February 2009 in Madrid. The second one will be a session on counterfeiting and piracy in a conference on IPRs organized by Association of German Industries (BDI) to be held in Berlin on 24 April 2009. Mr. Scorpecci noted that the findings of Phase I are also disseminated by Secretariat members, who have been making presentations at numerous conferences and other events.

77. The Spanish delegate intervened to confirm the engagement of the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office in co-organising the event in Madrid.
Iain Gillespie from the Secretariat presented the draft OECD Recommendation on Counterfeiting and Piracy that is based on the finding of Phase I of the study. He noted that the current draft is a result of a collaborative approach of delegates and the Secretariat, including through consultations with a number of OECD Committees with an interest in Intellectual Property Rights. In particular, Mr. Gillespie pointed out that a major, unanswered policy question was whether the instrument should be tightly focussed on counterfeiting and piracy (as the draft in document DSTI/IND(2008)15/REV2 currently is) or broadened to cover IPRs generally. Mr. Gillespie suggested that this fundamental policy issue could not be dealt with through simple drafting and would have to be resolved by Delegates.

The European Commission delegate expressed the view that the Recommendation should cover the infringement of all types of intellectual property rights, as these are all of equal importance. The EC delegate also recalled that the TRIPS Agreement also covers a broad spectrum of IPRs, and that the OECD study mandate is firmly based on that Agreement. The intervention of the EC Delegate and the demand for a broad scope of the instrument were subsequently supported by a number of other countries including: Spain, France, Italy, Portugal, Germany, Hungary, Austria and Greece. Sweden also expressed their general support for the EC proposal but asked for some additional time for analysis of its details. In addition the UK delegate noted that the disagreement concerns mostly timing and bureaucracy, and called for pragmatism. This intervention was echoed by the Danish delegate. Switzerland supported the EC position and agreed with the UK.

Other delegations including Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States noted that while they agreed that an instrument with broad coverage would be desirable, there was insufficient time to finalise this before the end of 2008, by which time it had been hoped, the Recommendation would have been adopted by Council. It was highlighted that the current version was the result of a long process of negotiations, and that a broadening of the scope would require additional consultations, including with new stakeholders. These delegations pointed out that the current draft instrument mirrors the completed Phase I of the OECD study on Counterfeiting and Piracy. Once other Phases of the report were completed, the Recommendation could be expanded to include other types of IP infringements.

In summing up the debate, the Committee Chair noted that in principle all delegates agree with respect to the importance of all types of intellectual property rights being covered by the Recommendation, and the only remaining issue concerns the timing of adoption. He then called on the CIIE Delegations to consult on the draft Recommendation on Counterfeiting and Piracy to try to find a compromise solution, with all inputs to reach Secretariat by 12 November. In the interest of transparency the Secretariat will act as co-ordination point for any material generated by the Delegations that they wanted to transmit to CIIE Delegates.

Further action will depend on whether Delegations are able to find a policy compromise on the issue of the scope of the coverage of the Recommendation by mid-November. If a policy compromise is reached by then, the Secretariat will circulate the revised text to CIIE for approval under the written procedure. In the event that such a compromise is reached and agreed to by the CIIE, the Secretariat has already consulted with the Executive Committee and Council Secretariats to include the item on the agenda for the Executive Committee on 3 December and the Council on 17 December.

If a compromise is not reached by mid-November, the Committee will be asked to look again at this issue in 2009, either by written procedure or in plenary.
84. The Chair reiterated previous comments made by delegates about the importance of innovation to long term economic growth and opened the floor for a “Tour de Table” about the role of CIIE in the OECD’s response to the current crisis. Fifteen delegations, including three of the CIIE observers, took the floor (Denmark, Hungary, Canada, Brazil, Turkey, Switzerland, Portugal, Israel, the UK, Egypt, BIAC, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain and Mexico). Most delegations highlighted the potential threat the crisis may pose to long term growth and productivity if short-term problems and solutions lead governments to impose measures that lose sight of long term implications, for example measures that could suppress investment, in particular in innovation, and if countries react with protectionist measures. Several countries set out the measures they have already taken in response to the crises, such as Hungary, Portugal and the UK, as well as Turkey in the context of SMEs specifically. Most delegations also highlighted the role of the CIIE and the importance of the contribution the Innovation Strategy could potentially make by stressing and illustrating the importance of investment in innovation, including through support to businesses and small businesses in particular, access to finance, and measures that maintain a competitive business climate. It was suggested by several delegations it could be useful to take stock of the various measures taken by countries in response to the crisis. The CIIE should highlight the continued importance of innovation and long term investment, especially in R&D, and support continued efforts to liberalise trade and investment flows by taking a stance against protectionism.

85. It was suggested that the Innovation Strategy interim report should take the opportunity to highlight some of risks, such as: i) a protectionist response, ii) a diversion of resources away from long term objectives and innovation, and iii) spending on innovation related programmes may come under pressure in the context of changing short term priorities.

86. Some Delegations stressed that it was important for the CIIE to bring together best practices in the context of the crisis and the Innovation Strategy, but that additional work can only be done with the support of additional voluntary contributions. New work could include, for example, a questionnaire, a study of whether more innovative firms cope better with the crisis, and a study of the differences between short term changes and long term structural changes – is the current crisis a short term problem or a structural problem?

87. The Chair summed up the discussion, noting that CIIE policy areas are generally longer term in impact, so not necessarily well suited to responding to the short-term impact of the crisis. It was more important to prepare economies to take advantage of the recovery. It was also important for countries not to turn inward, nor to divert attention or spending from policies in support of entrepreneurship and innovation.

88. At the next meeting of the CIIE we should have a tour de table on responses to the crisis. This would include any perceived impact on enterprise, innovation and entrepreneurship and any evidence of adverse developments in spending on programmes in support of these areas. The interim report on the Innovation Strategy would be an opportunity to set out the importance of sticking to the long-term agenda on micro policies and structural reform, although it should also be an opportunity to present interim findings and long-term policy orientations.

89. Delegations considered it useful for DSTI to revisit its work on long-term structural change in the OECD to consider whether it is affected by recent developments in, for example, the financial sector. They supported the proposal of the WPSMEE to convene a round table on SME financing issues. WPGI could also make a contribution by tracking the impact of recent developments on globalisation trends. Finally, subject to voluntary contributions being made available, the Secretariat should consider the scope to undertake new projects related to the economic crisis.
90. The Chair will report back to the Secretary General about the CIIE’s response to the current crisis, and a corresponding item will be included on the agenda of the next meeting of the CIIE in April 2009.

9. Innovation in the software sector

a) Progress report on the project

b) Outcome of the Software Conference in Tokyo and the AEG (6-7 October 2008)

91. Douglas Lippoldt from the Secretariat summarised the current state of the project and its achievements, in particular developments since the last Committee meeting:

- The advisory expert group (AEG) met on 2-3 June 2008 in Jerusalem, hosted by the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Labour, where the directions for further research were indicated.
- Three draft chapters of the final report were then prepared by the Secretariat and submitted to the Committee for discussion.
- These chapters were also discussed during a Technical Workshop under the auspices of the AEG, which was held in Tokyo (October 7, 2008), back to back with a joint OECD-METI-RIETI conference on Innovation in the Software Sector (October 6, 2008).

92. The chapters will be revised taking into account feedback and suggestions received via the Tokyo events and the CIIE. Mr. Lippoldt also acknowledged the outstanding support received from METI and RIETI in organising the Tokyo events.

93. Piotr Stryszowski from the Secretariat summarized chapter one of the draft study, which covers the economics of innovation in the sector. The results of the first chapter underscore the knowledge intensity of software, as well as the great dynamism of the software industry and its innovation processes. Douglas Lippoldt from the Secretariat presented findings from chapters two and three of the study. Chapter two focuses on R&D and the market environment in the software sector and underscores the importance of human capital; knowledge, skills, aptitudes of participants and the network collaboration are critical inputs to the engine of software R&D. Although the private sector is a lead player, government policy influences the environment in terms of fostering basic research, intellectual regime, and human capital development. Chapter three presents user perspective on software innovation, focusing on five selected software functionalities including security and privacy, mobility, interoperability, accessibility and reliability.

94. The Japanese delegate provided an oral report on the Tokyo Conference and Technical Workshop on Software Innovation held in Tokyo, 6-7 October 2008. He underscored the success of these events that attracted more than 300 expert delegates from academia, government and industry and noted that Mario Amano, the Deputy Secretary General of the OECD was a keynote speaker at the Conference. The Japanese delegate concluded by observing that the conference provided substantial inputs for use in the finalisation of the project.

95. The floor was opened for debate. The delegate from Spain recalled the successful conference on Software Innovation in Caceres, held November 2007 and thanked the secretariat and the delegates for involvement in the work on the project. The Israeli delegate recalled the recent experts group meeting in
Jerusalem, thanked all participants for attendance and noted the fruitful debate that fuelled further work on the project.

96. Other delegates responded with questions and suggestions for further amendments including consideration of: 1) the economic and business dimensions in the analysis, 2) detailed policy conclusions, 3) benchmarking in the software sector, and 4) software innovation in relation to SMEs in the sector and in other sectors. In addition the European Commission delegate asked about the problem of statistics on Open-Source Software (OSS).

97. In responding to these interventions, Mr. Lippoldt highlighted the general problem with software statistics that is reflected in the difficulties in capturing certain dimensions of software innovation including with respect to some OSS. He recalled that some of the suggestions for development of statistical measures go beyond the original scoping document and could possibly be addressed through a follow up study. Mr. Lippoldt noted that the project documentation has been posted on the AEG website.

98. Marcos Bonturi, from the Secretariat, encouraged the delegates to submit their written comments on the draft report by 14 November. The Secretariat in co-operation with the Advisory Expert Group will then revise the body of the report and add an executive summary, policy recommendations and proposals for further work. This will be submitted to the CIIE in February 2009 for written comments. A revised version incorporating those comments will be sent to the CIIE two weeks prior to the CIIE meeting. The final draft would be presented for declassification during the 114th CIIE meeting. A synthesis report would then be sent to the Ministerial Council Meeting.

Item 10. Sustainable manufacturing and eco-innovation

99. Marcos Bonturi of the OECD Secretariat started by introducing this item, outlining the origin and history of this project and the reports presented under this agenda item.

a) Progress report on the project DSTI/IND(2008)16/REV1
b) OECD questionnaire on eco-innovation policies DSTI/IND(2008)18/REV1

100. Tomoo Machiba of the Secretariat started by presenting the progress report, outlining the work carried out since April 2008, as well as the next steps to be taken until April 2009. Main deliverables of this project will be a review and framework paper which comprises five parts: i) a common analytical framework, ii) examples of eco-innovation, iii) review of indicator sets, (iv) review of governmental policies, and v) measuring eco-innovation. Two parts of the paper have now been completed (i and iii) and are presented in documents [DSTI/IND(2008)16/REV1] and [DSTI/IND(2008)17/REV1], respectively.

101. In September 2008, an international conference was organised in Rochester, NY (United States) during which focus group meetings and the second meetings of the Advisory Expert Group (AEG) were also organised. In addition, a web-forum for AEG members has been set up, and two questionnaire surveys have been prepared: one for business, and one for government [DSTI/IND(2008)18/REV1]. Mr. Machiba also presented a review of indicators for sustainable manufacturing [DSTI/IND(2008)17/REV1]. Lastly, he solicited the CIIE delegates with three requests for participation: i) to join the AEG web-forum, ii) to provide a co-ordinated response to the questionnaires, and iii) to recommend participants for the focus groups that would be held in Brussels in 12-13 November. Karsten Olsen, from the Secretariat, presented first ideas to build a common analytical framework for sustainable manufacturing and eco-innovation [DSTI/IND(2008)16/REV1].
c) Outcomes of the Rochester Conference and the 2nd AEG meeting, 23-25 September 2008

102. The US delegation presented some of the highlights of this three-day event which included a tour of companies on the first day, the conference on the second day, and the second AEG meeting on the third day. The US delegation also recounted some of the highlights of the conference and the original way in which it was organised, for example with “the writing on the wall” where the discussions at focus groups were literally presented on flip charts.

103. The Chair concluded that it was clear the CIIE has a role to play in this area and then opened the floor for interventions from delegations.

104. Many delegations welcomed the work as well as the steps taken towards building a common analytical framework and trying to link eco-innovation with sustainable manufacturing. They also congratulated the United States and the OECD on the organisation of the Rochester Conference. Sweden added that it would be valuable to look at the links between large and small firms, and at the usefulness of the indicators for small firms. Japan emphasised that these projects should collaborate and be run in parallel, but without being merged, although they acknowledged many common elements existing between the eco-innovation project and the sustainable manufacturing project. They invited all countries to respond to the questionnaire [DSTI/IND(2008)18/REV1]. Denmark suggested that it was important to see sustainable production as a benefit rather than as a cost. They also suggested that it could be interesting to obtain some information and measurement on the role of eco-innovation in innovation and the economy in general, as in Denmark eco-innovation now constitutes the fastest growing part of the economy. They added that if resources allow, work should also be conducted on policy recommendations, on the role of regulation as a driver of innovation, and on partnerships between firms, authorities and users. France indicated that future work could include more sectors and look at the role of supply chains upstream and downstream including emerging economies.

105. BIAC highlighted the importance of this work for the Innovation Strategy. This was echoed by the Chair who requested the Secretariat to make the connections between different strands of work as explicit as possible, in particular making the work on eco-innovation one of the priorities of the Innovation Strategy.

106. Marcos Bonturi from the Secretariat told the CIIE that the agenda of the next CIIE in April 2009 would include an item to discuss how to move the two projects forward. Mr. Bonturi acknowledged the need for continued thinking about integrating this work in the Innovation Strategy. With regard to the engagement of non-member economies, he informed the Committee that talks were already under way with India, with the possible organisation of a conference in New Delhi in co-operation with the Confederation of Indian Industries. This would be a good opportunity to engage the CIIE observers who could potentially work on this project.

107. Myriam Linster from the OECD Environment Directorate then presented some of the work related to sustainable manufacturing and eco-innovation under way in that directorate, including the project on resource efficiency and sustainable material management.

108. Egypt indicated that they would be pleased to participate in the activities of the sustainable manufacturing and eco-innovation project. They mentioned a meeting of African industry in Nice in the week following the CIIE meeting, where a sustainable manufacturing strategy for Africa would be discussed.
109. The Chair closed this item, highlighting the importance of engaging observers and other non-member economies in these projects, and stressing the importance of responding to the questionnaire and participating in the AEG web-forum.

**Item 11. Globalisation and policy effectiveness**

a) **The location of multinational firms’ investments related to innovation**

110. Mr. Thomas Hatzichronoglou from the Secretariat presented some new aspects of this project. After the main results concerning the geographical location of the activities of multinationals related to innovation presented at the April meeting of the committee, he emphasized the most important determinants concerning the location of these investments as they were identified by many empirical studies. These studies conclude that the international location of R&D investments by multinationals depended mainly on the market size of the host country, its scientific infrastructure, the agglomeration effects (clusters), and the protection of intellectual property rights. In order to analyse policy incentives to these investments a questionnaire will be distributed soon, but the Secretariat in co-operation with other Directorates is exploring the potential availability inside the OECD for some of the requested information. Mr. Hatzichronoglou underlined in his conclusion that the resources attributed to this ambitious project are insufficient, and invited delegations to make voluntary contributions.

b) **Emerging global markets for technology: Issues paper**

111. Mr. Koen de Backer from the Secretariat introduced the proposal for the new project concerning the emerging global markets for technology. He emphasized the fact that knowledge markets have become increasingly global in character as the accelerating pole of globalisation has facilitated and at the same time spurred the increase in inter and intra company exchange across borders. Mr. de Backer described briefly some results from patent licensing surveys, in particularly a Japanese survey. Innovative firms are increasingly dependent on external sources of knowledge rather than conducting in-house research. He also emphasized the importance of improving indicators concerning technological balance of payments which measures the international transfer of technology. The development of this project will be conducted if additional voluntary funding is available in the 2009-2010.

112. The UK delegate expressed his interest in the project concerning location factors in the activities related to innovation of multinationals and invited the Secretariat to explore the role and the nature of R&D investment in the non OECD area. Brazil agreed with the UK delegate and asked the Secretariat to analyse the incidence of R&D investments in China. Japan also insisted on the importance of the Secretariat project on the innovation strategy and particularly taking into account the role of new emerging countries.

**Item 12. WPSMEE Programme of Work 2009-10**

113. Marie-Florence Estimé from the Secretariat (CFE) reported on the activities of the Working Party on SMEs & Entrepreneurship (WPSMEE), on behalf of the Chair, Jacques Augustin (France). The 34th Session of the WPSMEE had taken place on 27-29 October with a special session on SME and entrepreneurship related statistics, on 28 October, to launch the 2009-2010 activity on Globalisation, Entrepreneurship and SMEs.

114. The Working Party had a preliminary exchange of views (Tour de table) on the impact of the global financial crisis on SME and entrepreneurship financing, and discussed the strategies adopted by governments so far in dealing with the problem and what should be done next. Among the questions discussed were the following: *Do Basel 2 rules, as well as international accounting standards for firms’...*
balance sheets, need to be rethought, or revised? Is there room for a coordinated international initiative to tackle the structural dimensions of the current tightening of credit conditions for SMEs

115. As it was deemed early to observe the overall impact of the crisis on SMEs, except in some specific countries, and as a response to the second question, the WPSMEE decided to organise a High-Level Roundtable on Financing SMEs which will bring together key decision makers (from governments, financial institutions and international organisations and SME representatives) to review evidence and propose short and medium-term solutions. The Roundtable could take place early April 2009.

116. To prepare the Roundtable the Working Party is reinstating the informal steering group which guided the Secretariat and monitored the preparation of the study on the SME Financing Gap: Theory and Evidence, carried out in 2005-2006 for the 2006 Brasilia conference. The steering group is chaired by Professor Salvatore Zecchini, [President of the Italian Agency for Industrial Promotion (IPI), former Executive Director of the IMF and former Deputy Secretary General of the OECD] who attended the meeting of the Working Party. The steering group will gather experts from financial institutions, the banking community and also policy makers of selected countries. In this connection delegates were invited to provide the names of their experts in SME financing and delegates that wished to participate. The steering group will prepare an issues paper which will be the basis for the High Level Roundtable discussions and recommendations.

117. The Secretariat recalled that the WPSMEE carried out an extensive study in 2007-2008 on High Growth SMEs, Innovation, Intellectual Assets and Value Creation. The final draft will be ready by the end of 2008 and circulated to the CIIE for comment. The report will be published in the first half of 2009.

118. The Secretariat reported on the 28 October special session on SME related statistics dedicated to the measurement issues related to the impact of globalisation on entrepreneurship and SME competitiveness. The morning panel was chaired by Mr. Bob Litan, Vice President of the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. There were a number of interesting speakers who provided insight into how to go about analysing and collecting the relevant data to be able to undertake an international comparative analysis. The afternoon panel, chaired by Roger Wigglesworth, former Chair and delegate to the Working Party, was devoted to the impact of globalisation on SME competitiveness and performance. Agreement was reached on the methodology and type of indicators required to undertake an analysis which will be ready in 2010.

119. The Secretariat also reported briefly on the two core activities that the WPSMEE agreed to undertake in the framework of its 2009-2010 Programme of Work with Part I resources:

- **Globalisation, Entrepreneurship and SMEs.** As mentioned above, this new WPSMEE study will aim to improve the factual and analytical base for policy design related to the impact of globalisation on entrepreneurship and SME competitiveness. This activity will also include an important module on SME and entrepreneurship financing in relation to the work carried out for the High Level Roundtable in 2009 which should result on concrete proposals for facilitating and monitoring SME Access to financing.

- **Innovation and Management of Intellectual Assets in Creative and Selected Service and Manufacturing Industries.** This new study will consider what kinds of intellectual management methods are most frequently used by SMEs in creative industries (such as visual arts; cinema and audiovisual media; literature, books and publishing, etc.) and selected service and manufacturing industries where the issue of IP is especially relevant. It will also analyse how different intellectual property settings (e.g. regulations) may better serve the objectives of creating globally competitive firms. This work will also contribute to the OECD Innovation Strategy.
120. The WPSMEE has also agreed to carry out two other activities only if they are entirely funded by voluntary contributions:

- **Country reviews on SMEs and Entrepreneurship Issues and Policies at national and local levels.** At the request and with the financial support of the Polish Authorities, a review of Poland will be carried out in 2009. Preliminary results will be discussed by the Working Party at its 35th Session to be held in Warsaw on 4-5 June 2009 at the invitation of the Polish Authorities. The peer review will take place at the 36th Session of the WPSMEE in October 2009 in Paris.

- **Women’s Entrepreneurship and Innovation.** This activity is dependent upon external funding which has not been secured.

121. The WPSMEE has also decided to hold a high-level meeting in October 2010, which will include accession and enhanced engagement countries and selected non-members, to take stock of 10 years of analytical work and policy design on SMEs and entrepreneurship since the first OECD SME Ministerial in 2000 (Bologna, Italy). The objectives of this “Bologna+10” meeting are to revisit the impact of globalisation on SMEs and entrepreneurship, assess successes and failures of policies and programmes over the decade, and bring new political impetus to promote entrepreneurship and SME globalisation in the context of innovation-led growth strategies and in the aftermath of the global economic crisis.

122. The Secretariat stressed that it was important that the CIIE, as the parent Committee, contribute actively to the “Bologna+10” Meeting, for instance through its work on sustainable manufacturing. The in-progress CIIE work in this area could be presented at the next June 2009 WPSMEE meeting in Warsaw. The Secretariat also emphasized that the results of the Innovation Strategy would have been discussed at the OECD 2010 Ministerial Meeting and it would be timely for the CIIE to present these at the “Bologna+10” high level meeting in October 2010.

123. The delegation for Austria expressed its appreciation for the work carried out by the WPSMEE in general and in particular its support to the “Bologna + 10” meeting. The delegate acknowledged that the Working Party contributed to the understanding of some very complex issues affecting SMEs and entrepreneurship including globalisation and access to appropriate financing. The high level meeting would provide an opportunity to increase the visibility of the Working Party’s work.

124. The delegation for Brazil saw the “Bologna+10” meeting as a good opportunity to undertake a stocking taking exercise of policies that had succeeded or failed. High level participation from OECD members and non members could bring visibility to the OECD work.

125. In relation to the “Bologna+ 10” meeting, the delegate of Switzerland expressed its support and stressed the importance of the CIIE being fully engaged in shaping the programme of such a high level meeting.

126. The delegate for the United States expressed his appreciation for the work that was being undertaken by the WPSMEE and identified synergies with areas of the Committee’s work, including on sustainable manufacturing. He stressed that there were areas which contributed to the Innovation Strategy. He thought it was important that the Working Party remain focused on their POW and concentrate resources to ensure the work came to fruition and would work closely with the Working Party to that end.

127. Marie-Florence Estimé, in response to a question by the Chair concerning the Working Party’s resources and co-ordination with the CIIE, explained that the High Level “Bologna+ 10” agenda would be based on the Working Party’s activity on Globalisation, Entrepreneurship and SMEs that was part of its 2009-2010 POW. The results of the work would be contained in a policy report and recommendations.
The Working Party will circulate progress reports and invite feedback from the CIIE. In this regard the parent committee should also feel ownership of the “Bologna+10” meeting. There could be specific joint Bureau coordination either virtually or in person to discuss “Bologna + 10” agenda and CIIE’s specific contribution in selected areas.

128. The Chair thanked Mme Estimé for the clarification and highlighted the importance of cooperation between the CIIE and the Working Party in undertaking the work foreseen in the programme of work. He welcomed the joint CIIE-WPSMEE organisation of the “Bologna+10” high level meeting and identified ways in which the CIIE and the Working Party should cooperate: i) the Committee was to receive all interim reports and ii) the joint steering of projects agreed at the joint Bureaus meeting. Finally, he also encouraged WPSMEE to co-ordinate its work with the other CIIE working parties, WPGI and WPIA.

**Item 13. Renewal of the mandate of the WPGI**

129. The Chair reminded the committee that the WPGI’s current mandate expires at the end of 2008, and invited the Committee to approve and renew this mandate for a further three years, in order to coincide with those of the parent committee and its other working parties (WPIA, WPSMEE). He also invited the Committee to propose a new chair for this Working Party and encourage attendance by economists and other policy officials.

130. Delegates from Japan and the United States indicated that they supported the extended mandate of WPGI and both suggested organizing the next meeting back to back with the CIIE committee.

131. The Chair concluded that the Committee had approved the extension of the mandate for WPGI until 31 December 2011.

**Item 14. Other business**

a) **Relations with non members**

132. It was agreed that decision on the participation of selected non member economies as ad hoc observers at the next CIIE meeting would be taken under the written procedure.

b) **Dates of next CIIE meetings**

133. It was agreed that the next meeting of the CIIE will be 2-3 April 2009.
ANNEX I

ITEMS DEALT WITH BY WRITTEN PROCEDURE
BETWEEN 112TH AND 113TH SESSIONS OF THE CIIE

Finalisation of the Programme of work and Budget 2009-2010

1. The Committee APPROVED the revised version. (DSTI/IND(2008)12/REV1)

Proposed workshop on sustainable manufacturing, New Delhi, India

2. The Committee AGREED to holding a two day workshop on Sustainable Manufacturing in New Delhi to be hosted by the Confederation of Indian Industries (CII). The workshop which was originally scheduled for November 2008, was postponed to Spring 2009.

Observerships

3. The Committee APPROVED Slovenia’s request for observership to the CIIE and APPROVED Ukraine and the Russian Federation’s request for observer status to the Working party on SMEs and Entrepreneurship (WPSMEE). Both decisions were transmitted to the OECD External Relations Committee.

Participation of non members in the meeting of the CIIE November 2008

4. The Committee AGREED to invite the following non-members as ad hoc observers: Brazil, Chile, China, Egypt, Estonia, Russia, Slovenia and South Africa.
ANNEX II. ACTION ITEMS CHECKLIST - 113TH SESSION

Note: This action list was sent to CIIE Delegates on 7 November 2008.

1. Election of officers (for decision) No action needed
2. Adoption of the agenda (for decision) No action needed
3. Approval of the Summary Record of the 112th session held on 3-4 April 2008 (for decision) Secretariat is to prepare the summary record by the end of November and send it to the CIIE for approval by written procedure.
4. Statement by the Secretariat (for information) PER Item to be included on agenda for the next CIIE meeting.

Including an update on the Political Economy of Reform project, progress made on the programme of work 2007-2008 and preparations for the programme of work 2009-2010.

5. The OECD Innovation Strategy
   a) Scoping of the OECD Innovation Strategy
   b) The changing nature of innovation
      NESTA (UK) and FORA (Denmark)
   c) Linking innovation and entrepreneurship
      International Consortium on Entrepreneurship (ICE)
   d) Possible workshop on New Practices in Entrepreneurship and Innovation

a) Meeting of OECD Committee chairs in December 2008. Secretariat to provide CIIE Chair with relevant documents sufficiently in advance to allow consultation with the Committee.

b) & c) Delegates are invited to provide suggestions and participate in the work so it reflects the views and priorities of all CIIE members. CIIE bureau to act as steering group in leading the work.

d) The Committee approved the workshop. Secretariat to work with Kauffman to define the scope.
e) Measuring innovation with trademark data

e) No action needed

5. The OECD Innovation Strategy (continued)

f) Innovation in business service functions: A Canadian Perspective

f) No action needed

g) Regional innovation and competitiveness (France)

g) No action needed

6. Entrepreneurship policies (for discussion)

a) Review of entrepreneurship policies in Denmark (for discussion)

a) Secretariat to incorporate minor comments by 15 November. Report declassified.

b) Evaluation of Entrepreneurship Education Programmes: draft synthesis report

b) CIIE delegates are invited to provide written comments by 20 November 2008.

c) Entrepreneurship and innovation micro-data project

c) Delegates who expressed possible interest in participating in the WPIA micro-data projects are invited to get in touch with their WPIA delegates by 14 November 2008.

d) Entrepreneurship indicators

d) Secretariat to circulate report and presentation when available (checking date with Koen).

7. Counterfeiting and piracy

a) Phase II: Piracy of digital content (for discussion)

a) CIIE delegates to provide comments to secretariat on Phase II by 14 November. Secretariat to revise document by 21 November. Document to be submitted to ICCP for comment. Report to be declassified by CIIE under the written procedure in December or January 2009.

b) Regional fora and other events (Germany and Spain)

b) Secretariat to be in contact with Spanish and German authorities to prepare workshops.

c) Draft OECD Recommendation on Counterfeiting and Piracy (for decision)

c) Delegates to consult on the draft OECD Recommendation on Counterfeiting and Piracy to try to find a compromise solution, with all inputs to reach the Secretariat by 12 November 2008. Secretariat to act
as co-ordination point. Further action will depend on whether Delegations are able to find a policy compromise on the issue of scope of coverage of the Recommendation. If a policy comprise is reached, the Secretariat will circulate revised text to CIIE for approval under the written procedure. The Secretariat has already consulted with the Executive Committee and Council Secretariats to possibly include the item on the agenda for the Executive Committee on 3 December and the Council on 17 December.

8. OECD’s role in fighting the current financial and economic crisis

Tour de table on CIIE involvement

9. Innovation in the software sector

a) Progress report on the project

b) Outcome of the Software Conference in Tokyo and the AEG (6-7 October 2008)

10. Sustainable manufacturing and eco-innovation

a) Progress report on the project

b) OECD questionnaire on eco-
innovation policies

11. Globalisation and policy effectiveness (for discussion)
a) The location of multinational firms’ investments related to innovation
b) Emerging global markets for technology: Issues paper

a) & b) Voluntary contributions are required for both projects. Delegates are requested to consider financial participation, whilst noting that the most urgent need for resourcing concerns b).

12. WPSMEE Programme of Work 2009-10
(for discussion)

CFE Secretariat to circulate interim reports to CIIE delegates and actively seek their advice on the implementation of the programme of work and budget.

13. Renewal of the mandate of the WPGI (for decision)

New mandate approved. Secretariat to organise a back to back meeting between CIIE and WPGI in 2009. Delegates are encouraged to nominate a new Chair for the WPGI.

14. Other business
a) Invitation to selected economies to participate as an *ad hoc* observer at the next CIIE meeting (for decision)

a) Item to be undertaken under the written procedure

b) Dates of next meetings (for decision)

b) Next meeting of the CIIE will be 2-3 April 2009.

c) Other
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