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Presentation overview

- Regional growth... and well-being
- Regions and innovation policy
- “Functional” areas
- Connectivity
Regional growth: some general trends

- A few big regional hubs contribute a lot to aggregate growth
- But most growth occurs outside the hubs
- Several big cities are making little or no growth contribution
- The notion of an “average region” is meaningless

Regional growth: innovation-related variables

- **Innovation**: Technology-based measures of innovation become increasingly important for regional growth the closer the region is to the technology frontier.
- **Skills**: The low-skilled population is a bigger drag on regional growth than the lack of high-skilled workers, in part because the low-skilled are less mobile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth drivers/bottlenecks</th>
<th>Relative level of development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lagging (&gt;75% of national average per capita GDP)</td>
<td>Intermediate (75-100% of national average per capita GDP)</td>
<td>Leading (&gt;100% of national average per capita GDP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human capital/skills</strong>: presence of very low skilled</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human capital/skills</strong>: presence of highly skilled</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour-force mobilisation</strong>: participation/employment rates</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation activity</strong>: patents, R&amp;D spending, employment in knowledge-intensive sectors</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√√√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agglomeration effects</strong>: density of population, density of GDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of government</strong></td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: √ = somewhat important √√ = very important; √√√ = critical factor.

Source: Based on OECD (2012), *Promoting Growth in All Regions* and other OECD research.
Some implications for the design of RIS3 in low-density regions

- Focus on *different metrics*: it may not be relevant to measure rural innovation potential by metropolitan criteria.
- Lower population density implies that *physical geography* counts for more and rural economies are more idiosyncratic: look at specific assets.
- *Small is not necessarily the problem*: isolated is. Promote networks and ownership. Production chains matter and innovation is an interactive process. Links downstream may matter most: demand-driven innovation.
- *Social capital* is a specific asset of communities – but use of social capital depends on whether the members of the group feel authorised to innovate.
- *Process innovations* in service delivery may be particularly promising in the current context.
Fitting policies to places: complementarities among policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Environmental Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic policies</strong></td>
<td>Sustained growth</td>
<td>Economic reforms may increase equity</td>
<td>Green growth may improve sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social policies</strong></td>
<td>Social policies may increase efficiency (knowledge, trust, security)</td>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>Environmentally sustainable social policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental policies</strong></td>
<td>Green economy may boost innovation</td>
<td>Social policies can enhance inclusiveness; poor people are the most hurt by environmental degradation</td>
<td>Sustainable environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well-being...

1. goes beyond income inequalities;

2. should be measured where it matters; and

3. is strongly influenced by governance.

- Measure outcomes to support policy-making
- Learning from national, regional, and local experiences
- Case studies from the following countries: Denmark, France, Italy, Mexico, United Kingdom, United States
- Final report with key facts and policy recommendations on making use of outcome indicators for policy making (July 2014)
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Categorisation of regions using innovation-related variables

Knowledge Hubs
- Knowledge-intensive city/capital districts
- Knowledge and technology hubs

Industrial Production Zones
- US states with average S&T performance
- Service and natural resource regions in knowledge-intensive countries
- Medium-tech manufacturing and service providers
- Traditional manufacturing regions

Non-S&T driven regions
- Structural inertia or de-industrialising regions
- Primary-sector-intensive regions

Notes: This map is for illustrative purposes and is without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory covered by this map. Maps may be cropped for ease of display. Eight different types of regional profiles, based on an analysis of 12 indicators in OECD regions with available data, were grouped into these three categories.
Some considerations for framing regional action for innovation support

Knowledge Hubs
- Knowledge-intensive city/capital districts
- Knowledge and technology hubs

Industrial Production Zones
- US states with average S&T performance
- Service and natural resource regions in knowledge-intensive countries
- Medium-tech manufacturing and service providers
- Traditional manufacturing regions

Institutional context
- Significant control of STI powers and or resources
- Some decentralisation of STI powers and/or resources
- No decentralisation but regional innovation strategies
- No decentralisation and innovation projects only

Type of region
- Non-S&T driven regions
  - Structural inertia or de-industrialising regions
  - Primary-sector-intensive regions

Regional strategy
- Building on current advantages (science push / technology led or a mix)
- Supporting socio-economic transformation (reconversion or identification of a new frontier)
- Catching up: towards the creation of knowledge-based capabilities
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Redefining Urban: functional urban areas

264 functional urban areas of 500,000+ in OECD Metro database

Mismatch of administrative borders

Source: OECD (2012) Redefining Urban: A New Way to Measure Metropolitan Areas and OECD Metropolitan Database
www.oecd.org/gov/regional/measuringurban

Note: Percentage of population and GDP in metro areas (2008).
Redefining Urban: functional urban areas

Higher population growth outside of urban core

GDP per capita premium for metropolitan areas varies by country

Cross-border areas for regional innovation: What is the right scale?

Participating areas

• Ireland-Northern Ireland (UK)
• Bothnian Arc (Finland-Sweden)
• TTR-ELAT (Netherlands, Belgium, Germany)
• Helsinki-Tallinn (Finland, Estonia)
• Hedmark-Dalarna (Norway, Sweden)
• Oresund (Sweden, Denmark)

• When does it make sense to cooperate with your neighbour (or instead another place)?

• What is the geography of the innovation relationships in the cross-border area? (one main hub, several nodes, along the border)

• How do sector-specific considerations change the policy approach?
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Connectivity: global trade *in value added*

New OECD-WTO database released this month

Connectivity: profiling regions by internal and external linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centralised RIS</th>
<th>Decentralised Dense RIS</th>
<th>Decentralised Sparse RIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No hinges</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single hinge</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse hinges</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connectivity: the example of patents


• Analysis using:
  – PCT patent applications from 77-79 to 2005-2007 (OECD REGPAT database)
  – Variety of forms of collaboration and network indicators: degree,centrality, clustering
  – Evolution of co-inventorship networks over time in 3 technologies (biotech, telecom & renewable energies)
Persistence of some leaders but also new entrants in Biotech patents

**Top 20 patenting regions in Biotech % in world PCT applications -1977-1979**

- Massachusetts - USA
- New York - USA
- Southern-Kanto - JPN
- Maryland - USA
- South Sweden - SWE
- Minnesota - USA
- Illinois - USA
- Florida - USA
- Toukai - JPN
- California - USA
- New Jersey - USA
- West Sweden - SWE
- Lake Geneva Region - CHE
- Capital Region - DNK
- Pennsylvania - USA
- Midi-Pyrénées - FRA
- Queensland - AUS
- Northwestern Switzerland - CHE
- New South Wales - AUS
- Ile de France - FRA

**Top 5 patenting countries in BIOTECH Share on world total PCT applications 1977-1979**

- United States
- Japan
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Germany

**Top 20 patenting regions in Biotech % in world PCT applications 2005-2007**

- California - USA
- Southern-Kanto - JPN
- Massachusetts - USA
- Maryland - USA
- Toukai - JPN
- New York - USA
- Pennsylvania - USA
- New Jersey - USA
- Bavaria - DEU
- Texas - USA
- Capital Region - KOR
- North Carolina - USA
- Washington - USA
- Capital Region - DNK
- Ile de France - FRA
- Western Netherlands - NLD
- Illinois - USA
- North Rhine-Westphalia - DEU
- Ontario - CAN
- Baden-Württemberg - DEU

**Top 5 patenting countries in BIOTECH Share on world total PCT applications 2005-2007**

- United States
- Japan
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Germany

**Share of top 20 patenting regions on total patent applications 76% = > 52%**

Variety in collaboration models
Telecom 2005-2007

Intensiveness
Share of co-patents on total patent applications

Extensiveness
Territorial network degree (variety in number of extra-regional partners)

### Variety of co-inventorship networks for top patenting regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network topology</th>
<th>REGIONAL OPENNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR + SATELLITE</td>
<td>Ile-de-France &amp; Rhône Alpes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUBLE- HUB</td>
<td>Korea Capital Region &amp; Chungcheong Southern Kanto &amp; Toukai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biotech**

**Telecom**

**Renewable energies**

Network indicators in copatenting: centrality, clustering, degree

- Regions can exhibit different positions and roles in the network structure over time and across technological fields:
  - **North Rhine-Westphalia**: top clustering, centrality and degree in all technologies: biotech, telecom, renewables (2005-2007)
  - **Flanders**: top degree in telecom (2005-2007)
  - **Southern Finland**: top degree in telecom, top centrality in biotech (2005-07)

- **Other examples**:
  - top centrality in biotech Swedish Regions (East Middle, South Sweden and Stockholm) in the 80s, Lombardy and Copenhagen in the 90s and Oslo and Helsinki in 2005-07
  - top centrality in telecom Lombardy in the 80s, Olso and Western Netherlands in the 90s and Lombardy, Stockholm and Beijing in 2005-07
Connectivity trends using patents reveals...

- A **growing rate of co-applications for patents** are filed by co-inventors located in different regions, with variations by technology.

- Patenting intensive regions exhibit very **different collaborative behaviours and roles in the global network** structure, according to sector, stage of development, market structure, critical mass and institutional settings.

- Co-inventorship networks evolve over time and tend to become denser, showing **different patterns depending on the technology**.

- Early leaders tend to **maintain their leadership** role over time but there are **windows of opportunity** for new players.

- Even for top patenting regions beyond the more “closed models” found in Asia, **national borders still play an important role**.
Lessons from this research

- Technology-based advantages are created over time, so **smart specialisation/trasformation strategies matter**.

- There is **no optimal collaboration strategy**: local and global collaboration may both positively influence innovation processes, depending on the specificities of different innovation systems.

- Helpful to measure the **relative positioning of regions in global networks** to reveal connectivity-related behaviours (measured per patents, publications, research projects, trade patterns, etc.)