

2.0 REGIONAL INNOVATION POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

2.1 Degree of autonomy of the Regional Government in RDTI explain RDTI matters (institutional and administrative autonomy – degree of empowerment of regional authorities from central government)

Definition: Overall autonomy in RDTI matters taking into consideration political, financial and legislative issues

Source: Regional analysis

Measurement: Qualitative indicator –

Metric: 0= no autonomy

Category C: centralised countries, either with regions playing a very limited role in RDTI matters, or with no regions at all. Many Member States, and all the New Member States, fall into this category. Apart from the obvious cases of very small countries where no sub-national division of the territory exists in these matters, this group also includes larger countries, where regions are defined but still do play a minor role in policy development, because they lack constitutional, legislative, and budgetary powers in RDTI matters. In a number of cases, regions have been defined for the purpose of handling Structural Funds, but the possibilities for their regions to define and implement their own policies is not (yet) present. Another set of countries under Category C includes regions which are rather active in implementing national development programmes with a regional development focus, and including innovation- (and sometimes research-) related measures, such as, e.g. in Ireland. It is to be expected that in a number of countries, regions will progressively acquire more powers in these areas, which might induce some shifts towards Category B.

5= some autonomy

Category B: centralised countries, where a dominant role is played by the national level, with however a significant possibility for regions to develop own initiatives in RDTI policy, in partnership with the national state. France presents a typical case of this category: French Regions have the possibility to develop their own policy orientations with regard to RDTI, but the RDTI landscape, funding sources, institutions, are mostly determined at national level, so that actions need to be developed in partnership with the State. Such Regions have co-funding possibilities, which allow them to orient their actions according to regional priorities. In countries of this category, there is usually a large difference between regions, in terms of their involvement in RDTI policy design and implementation, with some regions limiting themselves merely to implementing national instruments, while others developing specific

programmes and institutions, and policy lines. Finland and Sweden represent two cases where the responsibility of regions in RDTI matters is growing significantly, starting from a situation where until recently, these matters were still under exclusive responsibility of the national government. The Netherlands is following an opposite trend, with recentralisation moves occur after a period of larger initiative left to the Provinces.

10= full autonomy

Category A: decentralised countries, including regions with legislative and executive autonomy, able to design and implement RDTI policies on their own. The federal states of Austria, Belgium and Germany belong to this category, as their regions have constitutional powers allowing them to define their own policies. Belgium provides an extreme case where RDTI policies at regional and community level are run in complete independency from the federal state, which also possesses some autonomous competences in the science field. In Austria and Germany, most of the policies are implemented jointly between federal and regional level. The autonomous regions of Spain and Italy, and the devolved British regions enjoy different types of rights: some have been granted a larger degree of autonomy than others. So in the UK, Wales and Scotland could belong to the first category, while the other English regions belong to the second category, and the "historical autonomous communities" in Spain, as well as autonomous provinces in Italy have more autonomy than the other regions in their countries.

2.2 Total amount of Regional budget for innovation per capita (according to IMPACTSCAN definition: innovation budget under Regional government's responsibility)

Definition: The total amount of public money spent by the Regional government for regional innovation support according to the "regional budget" definition agreed upon in IMPACTSCAN: "The Regional Innovation Budget is defined as the latest available annual budget under regional responsibility, including funds received from national and EU budgets (e.g. structural funds). The Regional Innovation Budget is limited to public budget; private receipts are not to be considered. The Regional Innovation Budget is given in absolute amount.". It must correspond to M1 or M2 budget. It encompasses expenditures for R&D and innovation funding schemes as well as for setting up and running costs of the innovation supporting infrastructure (finance + infrastructure + person-related budget)

Source: M1-M2 budget - regional and national statistics

Measurement: Quantitative indicator

Metric: 0= 1.64 (Dolnoslaskie)
5= 7 region mean
10= 34.8 (Slovenia)

2.3 Share of this regional budget for innovation under regional authority's responsibility into the overall regional authority budget

Definition: Same definition as above for "regional budget for innovation"

Source: M1 budget / Total budget of the regional authority

Measurement: Quantitative indicator

Metric: 0= 0.35% (Madrid)
5= 7 region mean
10= 6.6% (Brittany)

2.4 Share of the regional budget for innovation on GDP

Definition: Same definition as above for "regional budget for innovation" – in relation to GDP

Source: Regional statistics – M1 budget

Measurement: Quantitative indicator

Metric: 0= 0.03% (Dolnoslaskie – Madrid)

5= 7 region mean
10= 0.41% (Slovenia)

2.5 Influence of regional government on regional innovation policy = share of the regional budget for innovation on the overall public money for innovation for the Region

Definition: Identification of the Influence of regional government on the regional innovation policy and budget understood as the estimated share of the regional budget (decision power located by the Region – same definition as above for “regional budget for innovation”) in relation to the overall budget for innovation support available in the Region (State, European, sub-local innovation budget outside Regional government’s responsibility)

Source: Regional and national statistics or estimation

Measurement: Quantitative indicator – estimation

Metric:

- 0= 0% of the overall budget for regional innovation support activities comes from the regional government
- 5= 50% of the overall budget for regional innovation support activities comes from the regional government
- 10= 100% of the overall budget for regional innovation support activities comes from the regional government

2.6 Existence of “management infrastructure”/ “coordination platform” for regional innovation policy (steering committee, executive unit)

Definition: In order to fine-tune the effectiveness of single regional activities and to coordinate individual activities as efficient as possible an “increasing order” of coordination activities (coordination platform of the regional actors), with a strategic committee on the top (regional steering committee) is necessary.
Clear rules have to be defined and a “Code of Conduct” is necessary in order to ensure the follow-up of the decisions.

Source: Expert assessments, preferably of several persons

Measurement: Qualitative indicator

Metric:

- 0= no specific management bodies, no strategic committee exists at all – no governance system
- 5= some actors meet regularly but no formal coordinating process and organisation

10= very well structured governance system for the regional innovation system - One "steering" committee / management body/ coordinating body empowered and legitimate. it is mandated to supervise the implementation of the regional innovation policy and fine tune the support activities. This "entity" can also take the shape of regular meetings of all actors (e.g. every four months) with open discussions if it has the political backing and the power to have decisions implemented.

2.7 Existence of holistic regional innovation strategy (vision, turning into action, adoption and further development)

Definition: In close connection to or as a result of the regional steering committee and the political decision process a holistic regional innovation strategy – including vision, turning into action, adoption and further development – is necessary for a target oriented innovation policy. This strategy must take the current situation of the needs of the regional firms and the existing competencies into consideration (transparency of regional know-how and competencies (innovation potential), transparency of firms' needs in innovation support). This strategy ideally is documented in a specific strategy policy paper (stipulating objectives, instruments, intermediary, type of intermediaries and their mission, type of infrastructure and activities)

Source:	Expert assessments, preferably of several persons
Measurement:	Qualitative indicator
Metric:	<p>0= no regional innovation strategy exists at all, no regional innovation-related policy paper(s)</p> <p>5= a regional innovation strategy exists, some of the pillars are implemented with the necessary backing. Some policy papers are partially related to the regional innovation infrastructure but as such do not stand for a comprehensive action plan or policy paper.</p> <p>10=existence of a regional innovation strategy with political backing, based on the consensus building of the actors of the regional steering committee. Exact defined objectives and milestones, demonstrating the actual progress of the defined measures for every corner pillar. One or several specific strategic policy documents precisely frame the regional innovation support in the Region; specifying medium and long terms objectives, instruments, intermediaries' mission, activities, as well as planning and financing methods (money allocated).</p>

2.8 Strength of monitoring and evaluation efforts for innovation policy

Definition:	<p>Monitoring is necessary in order to assess the impact of the measures on the Regional Innovation Profile and for further adjustments of the current innovation policy and the adjustment of single activities.</p> <p>The monitoring activities have to be dedicated to responsible, professional institutions and persons, the monitoring methodology has to be defined clearly and has to be traceable for all involved persons.</p>
Source:	Regional sources
Measurement:	Qualitative indicator
Metric:	<p>0= no monitoring activities</p> <p>5= some monitoring activities, use of some reporting and assessment tools, with clear responsibilities</p> <p>10= clearly defined and highly professional monitoring and assessment system (outputs and impact of services and funding schemes, firms' needs...). Indicator set, data collection and proceeding methods (reports, survey, questionnaires, ICT tools...) are used by dedicated body. This body collects, codifies and transfers this knowledge to policy-makers. Follow up of the results: data are used in the policy governance to adjust the system.</p>

2.9 Perspectives and plans for reinforcement of innovation policy

Definition:	The development of a monitoring and governance system aims at fine-tuning and updating the regional innovation policy.
Source:	Regional sources
Measurement:	Qualitative indicator
Metric:	0= no new plan, no concrete perspectives under construction for the moment 5= some changes are planned in the innovation policy but no deep modifications foreseen 10= new plans and perspectives have been launched or are planned to be launched to reinforce regional innovation policy.