

OSLO Meeting Minutes

OSLO Meeting Minutes	1
INTERREG III C - STRATINC.....	2
Participants:.....	2
Day 1 : May 24. (9 am to 18 pm) :.....	3
1. Sectoral presentation of clusters, and systems organising the clusters... ..	3
Oslo Teknopol :.....	3
Nord Rhein Westphalia :.....	3
Murcia :.....	3
Mancomunidad North Tenerife :.....	3
Region of Central Macedonia:	4
Lorraine:.....	4
2. Experience developed in the Oslo Region	4
4. Scientific Committee discussion	5
Day 2 : May 25, 9 a.m to 1 p.m.....	5
5. Cluster approach, short round table on : expectations of each partner regarding the clustering, challenges, vision , first results.....	5
Oslo Teknopol :.....	5
Nord Rhein Westphalia:	5
Murcia:	6
Tenerife :.....	6
Lorraine :.....	6
61. The web site must be improved and it is decided to :	6
62. Communication/dissemination activities :	7
63. For coordination improvement :.....	7
64. Next meeting in Thessaloniki :.....	7
7. Financial rules:	7
8. Scientific committee conclusions and inputs:	7
Annex : PSIP Map (source : Michael Laubenheimer)	9

INTERREG III C - STRATINC

COCOM Date: **May 24-25** Location: **Oslo**
 Scientific Committee Date: **May 24-25** Location: **Oslo**
MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Organisation: Oslo Teknopol
 Oslo Teknopol hosted and organised the meeting

Participants:

Each partner of STRATINC was represented by members of the Stratinc Steering Committee:

First name	NAME	ORGANISM
Michael	GUTH	ZENIT
Susanne	JAKOBS	ZENIT
Ann C.	KROGH	Oslo Teknopol
Martine Lien	ENGERUD	Oslo Teknopol
Knut	HALVORSEN	Oslo Teknopol
Joan	BAEZ	Mancomunidad North Tenerife
Juan Luis	ESTEVEZ HERNANDEZ	Mancomunidad North Tenerife
Esteban	PELAYO	Murcia Regional Development Agency
Juan	AROCA	Murcia Regional Development Agency
Isidoros	PASSAS	Region of Central Macedonia
Pierre	BOURGOGNE	Regional Council of Lorraine
Isabelle	LETELLIER	Regional Council of Lorraine
Mireille	LACAVE ALLEMAND	Lacave Allemand et associés
Michel	LACAVE	Lacave Allemand et associés
Maximiano	MARTINS	Expert Scientific Committee
Jaime	Del CASTILLO	Expert Scientific Committee
Michael	LAUBENHEIMER	Expert Scientific Committee

This memo follows the agenda (see annex) of the meeting, the different issues have been addressed and are followed by the conclusions of the discussions, and/ or by the decisions that have been taken.

Oslo Teknopol invited the Local Working Group members who presented the different initiatives they are in charge of (see Agenda of the meeting).

The first meeting of the Scientific Committee was held.

The Scientific Committee has been appointed at the end of December 2003, after a public call for tender won by Lacave Allemand & Associés (consultancy company).

Day 1 : May 24. (9 am to 18 pm) :

1. Sectoral presentation of clusters, and systems organising the clusters...

...within the partners' areas, discussion on the findings from the surveys and interviews done, first identification of business needs or practices in terms of strategic intelligence

Oslo Teknopol :

Rationale : pave the way for a life science cluster in the Oslo area where around 1,000 companies are working in the related sectors, and different organisations are managing or running initiatives with similar objectives and similar skills.

General context:

- a competition between different initiatives and institutions which did not know the initiatives taken by others : Research Council of Norway, collecting strategic information for strategic assessment and foresight exercise (Biotechnologies to 2020 for instance), MedCoast initiative (data base of companies)
- a fragmented cluster, in the capital city of the country

Needs expressed : market the cluster and the companies

Nord Rhein Westphalia :

Rationale : fragmented cluster in the New Materials sector with a high potential, but no awareness, no collaboration between enterprises themselves, nor between enterprises and R&D institutions.

General context :

Large number of companies in the sector, in particular in the Aachen area, and an organisation NeMa regrouping 75 of them.

Needs : not yet available

Murcia :

Rationale : small cluster organised around 13 companies leading the fruit juice market within the region.

General context :

Each of the company works by itself, the IFM is coordinating the technological centres, and provides mostly a top down approach of information than a bottom up, in a sector which is one fifth of the national Spanish market.

Needs : information on market and technological issues

Mancomunidad North Tenerife :

Rationale : the wine cluster in MNT, known as Winenet, is being set up for improving quality and marketing of wine, with exports to mainland Europe.

General context : two categories of actors are concerned, the cellars (around 30) from one side, the farmers (more than 2000) on the other side, the first have developed an innovation strategy improving their process and quality control, the second are more reluctant to organise.

Need : demand for information on technological development, sectoral information, and research and development

Region of Central Macedonia:

Rationale : the ICT sector in the region is composed by very small companies having a day-to-day vision, following the market, not aware of market conditions and competitors.

General Context : small companies rather than medium companies (system integrators, software development, etc.), having done an effort with an ISO 9000 certification for quality. Close to their market, but very short-term oriented.

Need : no strategic vision, but need for information on quality, market and products of competitors, regulation and recruitment.

Lorraine:

Rationale : the wood sector is supported by a CRITT, or technical centre which has developed a web platform mostly dedicated to satisfy technological needs, more than to strategic information (Epinette), this system has been operating for one year.

General Context : the companies have some links between them and share interest and supply, using regularly the CRITT resources and skills (through the web platform).

Need : no strategic vision, but need for information on markets (customers, suppliers, competitors), technological issues (new products), regulation and management, recruitment. (complete report before end of July)

2. Experience developed in the Oslo Region

Three interventions have presented the state of the art of projects tending to develop a life science cluster within the Oslo area with a nationwide impact. All of them offer databases, and one of them is foresight-oriented, due to the big and strong international competition in the sector (very broad definition) which required thinking “a bit larger” than currently accepted.

Oslo Teknopol through Stratinc is facing the implementation of a strategic platform within a rather large cluster composed by mainly small units (compared to international competitors), with an objective: be visible on the global scene.

3. First results of a benchmarking survey of support software for strategic intelligence...

...discussion on the results :

- 32 software out of 300 have been selected (by the consultancy company of Lorraine – Ceis)
- It is asked to the partners to check this “benchmarking” to choose their own solution, and prepare a short description of their technical equipment together with a synthesis of the needs identified (from the surveys).
- By the end of June, the 32 software technical descriptions will be sent, and by September the partners will have completed the evaluation of their requirements.
- The objective : have the capability to decide which “instrument(s)” must be selected at the next meeting, and decide which is or are the best in such conditions.
- The software prices vary from 1000 to 30 000 €

4. Scientific Committee discussion

Comments from the experts are :

J. del Castillo :

The Stratinc project involves very different clustering levels and cultural contexts; nevertheless, and if the project has to be successful, it will be of strong interest for policy-shaping and policy-making. An aspect of the project is the coherence of its conclusions and the identification of what is commonly shared, compared to what is specific in each of the areas. After that, it will be possible to shape an action that could change the “pattern of the companies”.

M. Martins : the final output of the project will be “innovation in different regions” and cultural environment changes through the PSIP methodology which addresses both complexity and competitiveness. This process is much more complex than the mere methodology as it supposes the sharing of practices on a trans-national basis.

M. Laubenheimer : The project currently follows a top down approach with a preliminary evaluation and selection of appropriated tools following a series of criteria. The delivery of a detailed description of a final set of 32 tools will certainly help the regional partners to make their choice between one of these tools or the development of an own tool. For that the regional partners have to define their own criteria of decision. In order to avoid any influence in the set-up of regional criteria through the description of 32 tools, it might be useful and helpful if each region starts already to define their cluster and SME requirements, this is to say implement a bottom-up approach. In case a region would have problems to engage this action, a template could be prepared by the lead partner Lorraine. The template should mention all the issues which need to be addressed while defining regional /cluster/SME requirements.

Day 2 : May 25, 9 a.m to 1 p.m

5. Cluster approach, short round table on : expectations of each partner regarding the clustering, challenges, vision , first results

Challenges and added value of Stratinc

Oslo Teknopol :

Challenge : the life science cluster in Oslo is fragmented, and several institutions are in the game, with various initiatives; Stratinc strongly contributes to solve a “governance” problem concerning these initiatives through bringing together their promoters, linking the individual projects, and creating synergies. There is a need to achieve a high level of visibility through an inter-related information system, which should be the Stratinc platform.

Added value: governance, synergies, foresight.

Nord Rhein Westphalia:

Challenge: The sector of new materials is one of the most complex as it is divided into branches, having sub-clusters in various geographical areas; in consequence the cluster is fragmented in “meso-institutions” but with high potential for merging data. The PSIP (as a tool, even if a tool does not produce “trust”) could help.

Added value: structuring the cluster, bring companies into collaborative approaches.

Murcia:

Challenge : the Stratinc project offers an opportunity to develop the awareness of the cluster, which is not composed only by fruit juice producers, but belongs to the “can food industry” and has to involve all the “filière” (packaging, machinery and equipments,...).

Added value: structuring the cluster, involving all stakeholders, sub-contractors, suppliers,...

Tenerife :

Challenge : as the cluster is related to two categories of actors (cellars and producers), the clustering process is at different levels, the challenge is to offer a wide range of services, basically a significant and important flow of information, both with a technology-oriented platform.

Added value: strengthening the “cellar cluster”, developing a specific clustering process within the farmers community (“social glue”).

Lorraine :

Challenge : establish a trust relationship with the entrepreneurs, offering them a better access to markets and better conditions for their business, complementing the supply they are already benefiting (Epinette, technological support), through flexible consortia for “bids” (give them opportunities to prepare bids for furniture for hotels for instance).

Added value: enhance the already existing clustering process.

Pierre Bourgogne concludes and summarizes the overview of the added value and challenges of Stratinc, addressing four questions to put on the agenda of the next meeting :

- i. How Strategic Intelligence is useful for identifying clusters and needs of related companies
- ii. How to introduce a foresight aspect (link between foresight and Strategic Intelligence)
- iii. Decide upon which profile for PSIP
- iv. Prepare the first papers targeted to the realisation of the Methodological Guidebook

6. Co-ordination activities

Activities achieved, in progress, to be done until next meeting, improvement of co-ordination, communication and dissemination on the agenda; next meeting.

The co-ordinator presents which activities have been achieved, administrative activities as well as activities such as questionnaires and surveys, for which the Oslo meeting constitutes the first milestone with outputs and deliverables (see CD-Rom).

6.1. The web site must be improved and it is decided to :

- i. Feed it with the outputs and deliverables from the Oslo meeting : Lorraine transfers to Web master – mid-June
- ii. Update the “database” of contacts
- iii. Update the web in a continuous process taking into account the necessity of controlling the information : each input must be communicated to the leader (Lorraine)
- iv. Feed the boxes, such as “library” with articles (URL Address) and books

62. Communication/dissemination activities :

- i. Follow the track taken by Oslo which provided a list of newsletters, newspapers, and projected promotional material
- ii. Each partner is required to prepare the same list, send it to Lorraine which transfers it to the web master – mid-June
- iii. Lorraine is asked to write down a list of European Business organisations related to the sectors concerned.

63. For coordination improvement :

- i. The partners agree on the means used (as reminders, notes,...). It is decided to continue.
- ii. Progress report 2 (September 1st). It is required for mid-July :
 - a. A detailed description of which computer and web equipments are available in the cluster organisation
 - b. Final synthesis of the surveys focused on SMEs needs as it appears from the surveys
 - c. Which software tool is or is expected to be selected by each partner (after the mailing of the benchmarked list)
- iii. The coordinator will provide) for mid-June : a reminder 4, a list of deliverables for Progress Report 2, and a Work programme covering the period until the next meeting (October 7-8)

64. Next meeting in Thessaloniki :

- iv. The partners write down a short paper outlining: their expectations from the Stratinc project and expectations from the Platform, the challenges and threats they are facing, for mid-June (to prepare the meeting)
- v. The date proposed is October 7-8
- vi. Provisional agenda: sessions
 - a. How is Strategic Intelligence useful for identifying clusters and needs of related companies
 - b. How to introduce a foresight aspect (link between foresight and Strategic Intelligence)
 - c. Decide upon which profile for PSIP
 - d. Prepare the first papers targeted to the realisation of the Methodological Guidebook (draft 1)

7. Financial rules:

Reminder of the rules already explained by D. Lorette from the Lorraine Regional Council.

8. Scientific committee conclusions and inputs:

Michaël Laubenheimer has designed a scheme of the tasks to implement for the PSIP conception and development (see annex).

M. Martins : his interpretation of the project is articulated on three issues

- Macro vision : Stratinc as strategic exercise is a project generating SI through knowledge
- Micro vision : providing services to clients
- Meso approach : shared vision of the different actors, importance of looking forward at meso-level governance

Michaël Guth agrees with these three levels of interpretation for the readiness of the methodological guidebook to be. Very valuable. He proposes to add a “meta-level” regarding trust, social capital and foresight.

J. del Castillo, recommends to be clearer clarifying the possible confusions between cluster-oriented policies and tools for strategic intelligence, concentrating on tools which constitute a concrete target. The partners must be realistic using limited resources and targeting more the questions. The experts must be in charge of very focused parts on the project in order to be useful.

At 1 pm, the final address is delivered by Knut Halvorsen.

Annex : PSIP Map (source : Michael Laubenheimer)

