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ISRN’s Secrets for Success

- **H1: Interactive learning and knowledge circulation**
  - Long-term research partnership – collective learning quality
  - Mutual trust – leadership & vision
  - Local “buzz” and global linkages

- **H2: Attractiveness for, and retention of talents**
  - Lasting involvement of students – diversity (?)
  - Knowledge flow research-policy (brain circulation)

- **H3: Quality of associative governance**
  - Long-term partnership with policy-makers
  - “Hibernating” AND fashionable policy concerns
  - Evidence base for policy (not policy-based evidence!)
ISRN’s Key New Policy Messages

• Economic and Societal goals can be self-reinforcing

• Multi-dimensional recipe for success calls for holistic policy mixes (cfr. Tech transfer view)

• Different pathways to success are possible

• Resilience as success criterion – Creativity as ingredient
Ways Forward

• **P1: Internationalisation of findings**
  What can other countries learn from Canada and vice-versa?
  Idiosyncratic versus general findings – More robust evidence

• **P2: Impact evaluation in multi-dimensional context**
  How can we measure policy **mixes** success?
  3E: Efficiency, Equity, Environment
  Resilience as success criterion

• **P3: Policies for functional regions**
  Cross-border (domestic, international)
  Vertical AND horizontal synergies
Questions from OECD governments

- How can we demonstrate the importance of innovation policy for growth, economic restructuring and/or job creation at the regional level?
- Spillovers, networks, open innovation, global value-chains: how regional is regional innovation?
- Which instruments seem to work and which don’t?
- How is regional innovation policy integrated into national frameworks?
- Who does what? Who should do what? Where does the funding come from and where does it go?
- How do governments measure success?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tacit knowledge</th>
<th>Intra-organisation learning in policy-making/impl. institution</th>
<th>Intra-system learning, with users/partners in innovation system</th>
<th>Inter-system Learning international comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Experience, learning-by-doing, learning-curve, intra-organisational</td>
<td>3 Inter-organisational learning, people mobility, sharing visions</td>
<td>5 International discussions, peer reviews, mobility, exchanging experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Internal monitoring; budgetary, administrative, targets</td>
<td>4 Evaluations, National Monitor and evaluation system</td>
<td>6 International benchmarks, using (policy) scoreboards, databases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nauwelaers and Wintjes (2009)
Urbanisation levels may correspond to an increase in CO₂ emissions but emissions go down as density increases.

Urbanisation, Density and Carbon Emissions

Cities/Metro-regions matter to environmental objectives
Does concentration = growth?

In practice, many other patterns emerge
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**Economic Density**

GDP per square kilometre

**Labour Productivity**

GDP per worker

**Germany**

---

**Economic Growth**

Real GDP per capita growth

---

Policies versus policy mix

RIS Characteristics

Broad Policy Objectives

Governance

Policy impacts

Source: www.policymix.eu
Seeking policy complementarities

Climate change policy packages

The new role of regional agencies: the need to measure additionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Paradigm</th>
<th>New Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of agency</td>
<td>Outside of the system</td>
<td>Actor in the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Top-down resource provider</td>
<td>Facilitator, node in the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for</td>
<td>Market failures</td>
<td>Systems failures, learning failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Redistributing funds</td>
<td>Identifying and reinforcing strengths in the system: a change agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Policy mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and</td>
<td>Administrative and financial</td>
<td>Strategic, goal-oriented, additionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Restricted to execution</td>
<td>Expanded to strategic decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation still highly under-developed, but key to solve “prioritisation” dilemmas

- Traditional **performance** indicator benchmarking
  – Regional Innovation Scoreboard type indicators
- Lack of **policy indicators** (intensity, direction)
- Evaluations of individual programmes helpful...
- ... but the evaluation of the **policy mix** is rarely performed
- Evaluations of the actors promoting innovation
  – Innovation agencies, intermediaries and others
- Need for more **Strategic policy intelligence** (in-house, outside)