
INNO-Learning Platform
**“A targeted action to support trans-national policy
learning and policy cooperation”**

2nd Steering Group Meeting

MINUTES

Thursday May 10th 2007

Brussels, Belgium

1. Participants

Members

- Schulze **Klaus**, Brandenburg Economic Development Board GmbH
- Catherine **Larrieu**, OSEO Anvar
- Jorge **Liz**, ADI - Portuguese Innovation Agency
- Martin **Lyes**, Enterprise Ireland
- Mauro **Mallone**, IPI – Institute for Industrial Promotion
- Irma **Peçiak**, Polish Development Agency
- Jef **Pleumeekers**, SenterNovem
- Markus **Koskenlinna**, TEKES – Finish funding agency for technology and innovation.
- David **Robson**, Scottish Enterprise
- Knut **Senneseth**, Innovation Norway
- Ugor **Yüce**, Technology Development foundation of Turkey

Associate Members

- Jean Luc **Gal**, European Patent Office
- Rolf **Reiner**, i.con innovation

European Commission

- Françoise **Le Bail** Deputy Director General DG Enterprise and Industry
- Reinhard **Büscher**, European Commission
- Christophe **Guichard**, European Commission

INNO Learning Platform

- Aleardo **Furlani**, INNOVA Europe
- Paula **Galvão**, INNOVA Europe
- Babis **Ipektsidis**, Intrasoft International

- Thomas **Lilejmark**, Inno Scandinavia
- Rebeca **Lucas**, INNOVA Europe
- Eurico **Neves**, INNOVA Europe
- Marc **Pattinson**, Inno TSD

2. Introduction

Morning session

The morning session opened with a presentation made by Mr Reinhard Büscher on the main objective of the meeting, namely the identification of those areas in the field of trans-national policy cooperation in innovation which are worth pursuing and further developing at European level. Mr Büscher highlighted the importance to have a clear understanding of the main priorities to be promoted and the decisive role of the members of the ILSG as an advisory team in this field. He also praised the quality, richness and originality of the Exploratory Reports that were developed by the exploratory team members on the six innovation policy themes.

The session continued with the intervention of Mr Christophe Guichard who presented the future of Europe Innova and PRO INNO Europe initiatives. He explained in detail these two programmes, emphasizing that PRO INNO Europe's goal is to facilitate trans-national cooperation at policy level. It is mainly based on the "Open Method of Coordination" and focuses on policy analysis, learning and coordination. Europe Innova on the other hand, addresses innovation practitioners and professionals encouraging the formation of private-public partnerships. The INNO Learning Platform acts as a pre-incubator and its role in this framework is therefore crucial to identify the topics for further analysis.

Some questions from the ILSG members followed and Mr Büscher remarked the objectives of the meeting, namely (i) the identification of top class INNO-Net priorities promoting trans-national cooperation at programme level in areas related to society driven innovation; (ii) the identification of options for mini-INNO Nets developing a toolbox in areas where policy making can be improved by providing guidelines, new instruments/methodologies, practices and (iii) the proposal of ideas that could fit into the private-public partnership scheme. This third last scheme is related with initiatives to be developed under Europe Innova.

The representatives of the EC also mentioned the planning for future calls: the call for future INNO-nets under PRO INNO Europe is expected to be launched by end-2008. The call for public private initiatives under Europe Innova is expected to be launched by mid-2008.

After the presentations given by the EC representatives, Mr Büscher and Mr Guichard, the floor was passed to Mr Furlani who briefly reviewed the work that the ILP had done so far and the current state-of-the-art of the project, moving from six reports to specific actions and initiatives. Mr Furlani recalled the ILP 's objective of promoting trans-national policy cooperation following a consensus-based, bottom-up approach. He also recalled the role of the ILSG and the expected outcome of the meeting.

The presentations of the six exploratory reports followed. The six presentations followed a common structure: presentation of slides by a member of the exploratory team (or "Driver"); questions for discussion launched by Mr Büscher; open discussion (Q&A) among participants.

The first report to be presented was the one on “high-growth innovative enterprises”. Mr Furlani presented it. After the presentation, the ILSG made some comments regarding the definition problems, the status in relation to growth (whether we are dealing with firms that are already growing or with firms that have the potential to grow). At the end the ILSG expressed the opinion that gazelles is not a topic candidate for society-driven innovation but instead, there is indeed further scope for further assessing how to help gazelles (toolbox for better innovation policies)

The second presentation was “Skills and Talents” made by Mr David Robson (Scottish Enterprise who stressed the idea that effective innovation policy must start by investing in skills and human resources. Mr Robson presented a slide with an interesting diagram showing two axis (vertical: technical skills (up) and non-technical skills (down), horizontal: better skills (right) and new participants (left) (please see Mr Robson’s presentation for a better understanding of the picture). This diagram allowed the identification of areas which should be developed and areas which should be consolidated. Most of ILSG members agreed that the areas to invest are Innovation beyond R&D, the areas to invest should be on non-technological innovation and Social entrepreneurship networks and mechanisms.

The third report, presented by Mr Thomas Lilejmark (ILP) was on Eco-Innovation. This was an important topic for the audience since Europe can take the lead in this field (lead market initiatives will be under Europe Innova programme). The Sustainability agenda is to be enhanced and both DG Environment and DG Industry should be involved. Most policy actions regarding eco-innovation should fall under “society-driven innovation” and the potential action on foresight should be better placed under the “toolbox” category. The optimisation in the use of Structural Funds was an important issue raised by participants.

The “Knowledge Sharing through improved research-industry cooperation” report was presented by Mr Eurico Neves (ILP) and the initiatives proposed aimed a bridging the gap between research and industry “by filling it” through trans-national research organisations. It was noted that the push/pull approached adopted by several countries/regions have helped but have not yet solved the problem and therefore a new approach is needed. The main ideas that emerged were that: there is a need to have organisations that do research with a market/industrial view; centres of competences should be pull oriented, not push oriented; University performance should be evaluated; Knowledge transfer has to be improved in services. There was a general agreement that this area is over-populated/crowded in terms of activities and that most actions fall into Europe Innova. Moreover, they should be horizontal actions activated through PPPs. Under Pro-Inno Europe there is room for cluster cooperation initiatives and for IPR model contract under the Toolbox for better innovation policies. The discussion on this topic finalised with an observation made by Mr Büscher on a missing point, namely the representation of European Agencies outside Europe (China, India, US). A policy could be developed in this area.

The fifth presentation was on Public procurement and innovation which was presented by Mr Marc Pattinson (ILP). The idea that emerged was that a great variety of public procurement bodies is needed and the actions relate to: Public launching; Trans-national network and Trans-national cooperation in strategic lead markets. Mr Büscher invited the floor to think about three questions, namely: (i) should networks be established at horizontal level or should a thematic approach be followed?; (ii) Is there a need and value added to further develop or better validate the existing tools (e.g. handbook on green procurement, or the guidelines on public procurement for innovation)?; (iii) does it make sense to have Inno-net under society driven innovation on public procurement policy cooperation?

The last exploratory report was Innovation governance and it was presented by Mr Thomas Lilejmark (ILP). The main challenges identified refer to the design of more efficient innovation policies, innovation procurement as a driving force, and the better use of State-aid-rules. The discussions were then organised around the following three issues: (i) is there a scope for networks (role models) of national think-tanks to be developed under society driven innovation theme or instead consider them under the toolbox type of activities, or both? (ii) is there scope for an Inno-Net to bring innovation to citizens(e.g. schools)? (iii) what kind of financial incentives should be given to foster transnational cooperation? Should the EC financial contribution for future INNO-nets be limited (100% or less funding)? The main ILSG orientation was towards networks (role models) of national think-tanks since common shared governance approaches are necessary in this field across Europe.

Afternoon session

The first part of the afternoon session counted with the presence of Ms Françoise Le Bail, Deputy Director General of DG Enterprise and Industry.

Mr Büscher opened the afternoon session, welcoming Ms Le Bail and briefly introducing the scope of the meeting. The floor was then passed to Mr Furlani, who made a presentation on the Framework for the identification of the themes to be further explored by the INNO-Learning Platform and the wrap-up of the morning session. He presented the different options identified in the morning discussion for trans-national cooperation in society-driven innovation and for a toolbox aimed at promoting better innovation policy initiatives, i.e:

Options for society-driven innovation initiatives:

- o Skills and Talents: Networks for social entrepreneurship and Innovation managers (Services and Organisational innovation boost)
- o Eco-Innovation: Innovation agencies and Environmental agencies Network to enhance Sustainability agenda and trans-national policy cross-fertilization between them
- o Public procurement: an horizontal public procurement and innovation policy cooperation network involving Ministries and procurement bodies(innovative ways to procure)
- o Innovation Governance/1: networks and original role models) of national think-tanks on innovation policies/State-aids
- o Innovation Governance/2 : awareness raising (road-shows, educational programmes, press campaigns) of innovation for citizens and communities

Options for innovation policy toolbox initiatives:

- o Gazelles: (i) identification and selection,(ii) service package, (iii)fast track.
- o Skills and Talents: (i) training innovation on non-technical aspects, (ii)development of new metrics for innovation skills and talents
- o Eco-Innovation: (i) technology and normative foresight
- o Knowledge sharing through improved research-industry cooperation: (i)IPR model contracts ,(ii) University performance assessment through new metrics, (iii) a policy for representation of European Agencies outside Europe
- o Public procurement: validation, consolidation and selection of available tools/instruments in lead markets (Public Health)

- o Innovation Governance: tailor-made policy advising on relevant issues with a clear mandate (i.e. State-aid)

Then, the ILSG members were invited to express their views on the potential actions/projects to be selected studied during the validation phase and to express their interest on taking part or not in the identified projects.

After this, Ms Le Bail's emphasized the fact that innovation is a key priority area high in the EU political agenda and that the EC is launching a new way of carrying out projects. She insisted on the need to go beyond studies and to do practical things jointly. She acknowledged key priority themes at the EU level, namely climate change and energy efficiency and agreed with the results of the ILSG discussions identifying eco-innovation as an important area to consider. She also supported the idea that public procurement, lead markets, skills and the outside representation of agencies are important themes to be further developed.

Moreover, she mentioned the multiplicity of existing initiatives at all levels and the need to streamline them with a view to create more coherence. There is a real need to simplify what it is being done in this field and to make it more practical and understood by politicians.

Mr Büscher supported Ms Le Bail's views on how to improve the efficiency of the innovation instruments by stressing the fact that the need for coherence and simplification should also be supported by a commitment to do things better.

After Ms Le Bail left the meeting the discussions continued with the ILSG members, chaired by Mr Büscher. The discussion focused on the list of themes to be selected for a deep review in the validation phase. The ILSG notably advised to drop at this stage the theme on awareness raising of innovation for citizens. The validation phase shall aim at identifying the most promising options for future INNO-Nets, the partners that might be involved, the potential impact and possible outcomes. A policy dialogue should be established during the validation phase to verify the potential and the impact assessment through notably peer reviews. To conduct this validation phase, two task force teams will be then created (one for "society-driven innovation" and the other for "toolbox for better innovation policies"). The task-force teams will be made up of minimum 5 experts: at least 1 from the ILSG, 1 from the ILP and 3 external experts. Some members of the ILSG have already expressed their interest to participate to take part in these task-force teams: , Scottish Enterprise, OSEO-Anvar, Innovation Norway and Senter Novem to work on the options falling under "society driven innovation" and have Tekes, Senter Novem, Agencia Inovação Portugal and Enterprise Ireland To work on the option for a toolbox for better innovation policies.).

Mr Eurico Neves from the ILP wrapped-up the session and concluded.

3. Next Steps

- Re-define (better define) the different options under the two thematic umbrellas (i.e. society-driven innovation and toolbox for better innovation policies)
- Create the two task forces
- Select external experts
- Appoint the ILSG members for the two task-forces to be created

- Appoint the ILP members for the two task-forces to be created

4. Next INNO-Learning Steering Group meeting

The next meeting will be held around November 15th 2007 in Brussels, Belgium.

Enclosures:

- Presentations delivered by Christophe Guichard and Aleardo Furlani
- Presentations of the 6 Exploratory Reports
- Agenda of the meeting