



# 1<sup>st</sup> Interregional Workshop & 3<sup>rd</sup> Management Board meeting

Thessaloniki – 11&12<sup>th</sup> December 2006

## Minutes of the meeting

	Participant	Acronym	Organisation
1	Pierre BOURGOGNE	PB	Regional Council of Lorraine
2	Georges MASSOURAS	GM	Regional Council of Lorraine
3	Adrian RAULEA	AR	Cluj County Council & EWE
4	Xavier LEAL	XL	Funditec
5	Dorel TAMM	DT	Institute of Baltic Studies
6	Adolf FILACEK	AF	STSSCZ
7	Jiri LOUDIN	JL	STSSCZ
8	Necdet GEREN	NGE	Tubitak Adana University
9	Arzu ISLER	AI	Tubitak Adana University
10	Cigdem SEZER	CS	Tubitak Adana University
11	Sirin ELCI	SE	Technopolis
12	Michal MIEDZINSKI	MM	Technopolis
13	Isidoros PASSAS	IP	URENIO
14	Nikolas GOUNTARAS	NG	URENIO
15	Nicos KOMNINOS	NK	URENIO
16	Sotiris ZIGIARIS	SZ	Regio Dynamics
17			
18			



## *The Agenda*

**Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> of December**

---

**09.15 Pick-up from Porto Hotel**

**10.00 Welcome address from URENIO team**

*by Isidoros Passas*

**10.15 Welcome address from the project director of the Management Board (introduction of Mr. Georges Massouras as new director)**

*by Pierre Bourgogne & Georges Massouras*

**10.30 Inputs from all partners regarding their progress since last meeting (1<sup>st</sup> session)**

*by all partners (max 15 min per partner)*

**11.15 Coffee Break**

**11.30 Inputs from all partners regarding their progress since last meeting (2<sup>nd</sup> session)**

*by all partners (max 15 min per partner)*

**12.15 Presentation: Mapping S&T regional networks using graph & matrix theory**

*by Sotiris Zygiaris*

**13.00 Mapping S&T networks (WP2) - Presentation from Technopolis**

*by Sirin Elci & Michal Miedzinski*

**14.00 Lunch at URENIO**

**15:00 General discussion regarding WP2 & WP4**

*by all partners moderated by lead partner*

**16:00 Departure to Porto Hotel**

**20.30 Dinner at the city centre**

**Tuesday, 12<sup>th</sup> of December**

---

**09.00 Pick-up from Porto Hotel**

**09.45 Dissemination Issues (WP5):**

**Website - Brochure – Advertisements – other suggestions**

*URENIO team presentation as WP manager*

**10.15 Discussion on the identification of thematic for the peer reviews and study visits (WP3) (Final arrangements and feedback by partners)**

*FUNDITEC presentation as WP manager*

**11.00 Coffee Break**

- 11.15 Management and Financial Issues (WP6):**  
**Adaptation of the work plan - Next MB call meeting - EC annual report (March 2007)**  
*All partners, lead by Pierre Bourgogne*
- 12.00 Conclusions from the 3<sup>rd</sup> MB meeting – Other issues**  
*by Pierre Bourgogne- Georges Massouras*
- 13.00 Visit tour to Thessaloniki Science Centre and Technology Museum**
- 14.00 Lunch at the museum**
- 15.30 Departure to Porto Hotel**

- 10.00** Welcome address by Isidoros Passas (URENIO team), Pierre Bourgogne & Georges Massouras (RCL).
- 10.30** Presentation of **URENIO** (Isidoros Passas): Questionnaires experience and problems arise, 1<sup>st</sup> business panel meeting concluded, results of the meeting, some comments regarding the mapping procedure that was proposed from Technopolis and the general objective of the project, financial issues related to absorbedness until February 2007
- 10.45** Presentation of **Cluj County & EWE** (Adi Raulea): Regional Intermediaries analysis, so far not having the results expected, 20% of SMEs can be characterised as innovative, problems with the questionnaires of SMEs because “research” is quite limited in most cases. SMEs have low access to R&D funding. The concept - tool of licensing does not exist at all, is considered as the more complex than the other ones.
- 11.00** Presentation of **Funditec** (Xavier Leal): Business Panel overview, basic results of S&T intermediaries & questionnaires, conclusions, SMEs comments and opinions, competition between Intermediaries. It was very difficult to get SMEs involved in the whole process. Xavier proposed to incorporate in CIDEM network and dissemination activities the SUPER-SME project. CIDEM activities are monthly and there are 70-100 participants on average per event. The technoparks that are place, although were established as sector focused now are more horizontal. For the S&T intermediaries it was very difficult to find one that did know all 7 themes.
- 11.25** Coffee Break
- 11.40** Presentation of **IBS** (Dorel Tamm): Preliminary results of the D3. Overview of SMEs and intermediaries interviewed. An interesting fact is that R&D intensive enterprises do not feel the necessity for public sector support in the area of finding R&D personnel. At the same time they need support in finding the management personnel.
- 11.50** Presentation of **Tubitak Adana** (Necdet Geren): Adana intermediation system can be mainly described by 4 main S&T intermediaries, one incubator and the Anatolia Technology transfer unit. Necdet presented the S&T intermediaries studies and the questionnaire results. The S&T network system, strong & weak points of the regional S&T intermediation system, intensity of contacts with intermediaries, business panel meeting incorporated 4 brainstorming sessions. There are no sufficient S&T intermediaries. Most of them are concentrated to metal manufacturing. Most the SMEs have personnel to ‘part time’ research activities.

- 12.15** Presentation of **STSSCZ** (Adolf Filacek): SMEs were surprised that a science institute is running such a project, Prague is not a typical EU region and this caused some difficulties, Prague intermediary system, European structural funds as intermediary, Demand-Supply of the intermediation system, technology transfer centres, overview of SMEs. There is no Regional Development agency in the region. 2 ministries govern the structural funds.
- 12.40** Presentation of **Lorraine** (Pierre Bourgogne): divided in two sections, categories of S&T intermediaries, sectors and areas covered by intermediaries, services received and needed by SMEs, main services should be better developed, strong & weak points of the regional system by SMEs, test and comments on the methodological issues to map the cooperation within regional S&T intermediation system, difficulties that have been appeared.
- 13.10** Presentation by Mr. Zigiari Sotiris: "Mapping S&T regional networks using graph & matrix theory". He presented an alternative way to the map the system, using performance indices. Statistical data for the regional S&T mapping exercise. Pierre Bourgogne made comments on the presentation regarding the profile of the proposed expert panel, the different level of each partner, and the parametric sensitivity of the proposed approach. Pierre mentioned that the system is not working because there is a feeling that it does not work; it might not be though the case. Nicos Komninos proposed to increase the number of experts to solve any issues regarding any issues that might arise for the expert panel. Prof. Komninos stated that the methodology is the most important issue regardless the tool for mapping. Michal Miedzinski from Technopolis said that SUPER-SME project is not intended to be an Academic study. The tool that was presented by Technopolis is not to give the actual dimensions of the map, but to understand the external impact of the service. Prof. Komninos asked about the main structural links of the S&T intermediation system. Michal Miedzinski stated that even if the analysis will focus on existing and lacking functions of the regional S&T intermediation systems SUPER-SME could be considered successful. The methodology developed for the project allows for such "functional mapping". Mr George Massouras mentioned that policies are aiming to enhance the links between actors of the S&T intermediation. Mr Massouras argued that is very difficult to precise measure the results of each policy because there are many parallel sub results that can not be traced and related to the policy. Prof. Komninos stated that the important issues are to identify the elements, linkages and the governance – policies regarding the S&T intermediation system
- 15.15** Mapping S&T networks (WP2): Mr. Miedzinski underlined that the project should not aspire to map in detail all flows and relations of the whole regional S&T intermediation system. In the scope of SUPER-SME the analytical focus should be on selected system areas or functions of particular interest to the partners e.g. clusters and business networks, support for IPR issues etc.

Nevertheless, a general description of the innovation and S&T intermediation system is needed. Therefore, the template for the categorisation of service areas relevant for the S&T intermediation system was developed while the report on regional S&T system includes sections describing innovation system and S&T intermediation context.

The description and analysis of selected S&T system areas should present its implications for the whole system. This could include analysis of the flows determining performance of the area. This could be done by the expert panel organised during peer-to-peer and study visits. Whenever possible existing performance indicators describing the input and outputs should be taken into account in analysis. These indicators could be defined with the help of mentor regions who have more experience in policy analysis. Above all, however, the exercise should focus on **gaining practical insights into ways to improve performance in the selected area** (mentor-mentee exchange) **with a view of an enhanced systemic performance.**

The level of analytical sophistication should be decided in cooperation between the partners and with a view of needs of a particular case. It should be noted, however, that the finalised template for the study visit report will set a minimum level analysis for all partners.

- 15.45 **Discussion on Methodology and mapping procedure:** Prof. Komninos claimed that simpler forms, like “stars” (one or two clusters) might be better for the project instead of the complicated “spaghetti” model. And after all what is the main objective for the regions in order to keep or change their policies. Prof. Komninos claimed at this point the use of indicators and cause and results effects.

Mr. Pierre Bourgoigne mentioned that mapping is needed for other work packages to be based on it and also that we have to clear define who will look at the map; there are different perspectives from different actors. Mapping is a decision support tool for the system. It has to be identified how to “sell” the tool to regional authorities. Mr Xavier Leal preferred to use simpler forms and models, as the system in Catalonia is already quite complicated and is used more for political reasons.

Prof. Adolf Filacek argued that more colours are required in the “spaghetti” model in order to be more comprehensible, particularly for other actors not familiar with SUPER-SME.

Ms Dorel Tamm claimed that partners may not be able to redesign the policies of the countries. This target is too optimistic.

Mr. Adrian Raulea, from Cluj County, pointed out that in the SUPER-SME project they represent policy makers, so they have a role conflict. How they can propose a new alternative S&T intermediation policy – system, is like not approving what they are implementing up to now. He claimed as well that for all of us maybe it's better a more complicated form, as it appears to be more sophisticated.

Mr Nikolas Gountaras raised again the issue of to whom the mapping refers to SMEs, policy makers or S&T intermediaries, as it appears to be vague? Mr Isidoros Passas pointed out that is critical time to come with a simpler form of mapping to go on with work needed for other packages. Mr. Pierre Bourgogne claimed that there is no need to come up with reproduction of structural forms that are already well known. Prof. Komninos proposed a supply chain look alike, mapping. He argued that we can show different ways to do things but we can say about improvement. Mr. Michal Miedzinski proposed to perform a functional mapping and further elaborate on it, while Prof. Komninos proposed to use of map metaphorically and elaborate on each issue. Mrs. Tamm pointed out the issues and potential problems that arise for the different level of each partner. Mrs Sirin Elci argued that truly the redesign is too ambitious though it has been presented to the Commission.

**Concluding the Discussion on Methodology and mapping procedure Prof Komninos proposed a mapping of the S&T Intermediation system with the following components:**

- 1) Institutional mapping (a list of the institutions in each region; flowchart enclosed in the summary report template “S&T intermediation in the wider regional innovation system”)
- 2) The graphical mapping of the network by selecting a specific field (or functions) of S&T intermediation system that are of particular interest for each partner;
- 3) The performance (indicators 4-6 indicators out of the 26 of Scoreboard): if possible (depending an available data or regional innovation indicators), to use performance indicators to describe the functioning of intermediation system;
- 4) An elaboration on the key processes – functions of the system in each partners' region (Spin-offs, licensing, human mobility). The elaboration could be the presentation of best practises from each region. Description of good practices should include reference to the role of it plays in the wider regional innovation system. Mr Zygiaris proposed that if it is not possible to find performance indicators, than the opinion of an expert panel group would be most appropriate.

***Tuesday, 12<sup>th</sup> of December***

---

**09.45 Dissemination Issues (WP5):** Mr Isidoros Passas presented the latest web analytics of the projects' web site. Key findings of the presented analysis are that the new visitors are 70% of the total number. There are visitors from nearly all around the world. Appears that the people who are



interesting for the SUPER-SME project are interested for the library, and they are looking for more information. Unfortunately though the library section of the web site is empty. If it will continue to be empty then probably we can delete that section completely. URENIO participated in the workshop organized under the implementation of project "Managing and Infusing Research Investment (MIRIAD)", FP6 Regions of Knowledge 2. Isidoros wrote Six (6) posts in the SUPER-SME blog regarding the S&T intermediation. URENIO has disseminated seven hundred copies of the printed brochure

#### 10:15 Discussion on the identification of thematic for the peer reviews and study visits (WP3):

At this point Mr. Xavier presented material that helped the discussion on the identification of thematic for the peer reviews and study visits (WP3). FUNDITEC is the WP leader.

SUPER-SME partners ranked service areas relevant for S&T intermediation system according to the needs of their respective regions. Mentees indicated five areas of the highest relevance, that is where mentoring was demanded (1 stands for the most relevant area; 5 - least relevant), whereas mentors indicated fields in which they could provide expertise and possibly host a study visit. The

	study visits						
	offer			demand			
	Lorraine	Catalonia	Central Macedonia	Estonia	Adana	Cluj	
<b>Collective actions</b>							
awareness raising activities for enterprises (e.g. study visits, presentations and conferences)		x					
awareness raising activities for the scientific community on research commercialisation and IPR		x					
technology watch - analysis of evolution of the technological needs of the region	x	x					
collecting and disseminating information on relevant existing technologies	x	x					
coordinating and disseminating information on available S&T services for companies	x	x					
<b>Support for technological and scientific cooperation</b>							
Technological audit - analysis and identification of needs of enterprises		x					
Search for regional and national scientific partners for R&D projects		x					
Search for international scientific partners for R&D projects		x					
Search for regional and national industrial partners for R&D projects, and S&T support		x					
Search for international industrial partners for R&D projects, and S&T support		x					
Technical and legal support for preparing projects and agreements related to S&T collaboration		x					
<b>Support for new product and service development</b>							
Technical assistance for preparing a feasibility study of the product/service	x	x	x	5			
Assistance for developing a business plan for the new product/service	x	x	x				
Assistance for prototype development (e.g. fast prototyping etc.)	x	x	x				
Assistance for prototype testing	x	x		1			
Support in product launch or service implementation							
<b>IPR and commercialisation</b>							
Initial IPR check for products and services before their development			x	2			
Assistance in commercialisation of industrial research projects, identification of results requiring IPR protection		x	x				
Assistance in depositing patents and management of patent portfolio							
<b>Licensing</b>							
Industrial partner search for licensing							
Preparing and negotiating conventions (licence agreements)							
<b>Support to innovative start-ups and spin-offs</b>							
Legal support in creating a start-up		x	x	3			1
Legal support in creating a spin-off		x					2
Search for private financial partners for start-up/spin-off creation		x	x			1	
Preparing business plan and budget for spin-off creation		x	x				
Monitoring and promotion of start-up/spin-off		x	x			4	
<b>Human capital mobility</b>							
Placement schemes between research and industry	x					5	
Search for highly specialised R&D personnel	x						
Search for highly specialised management personnel (e.g. innovation management, knowledge management)	x						8
<b>Networking and clustering</b>							
Supporting and creating business networks (B2B)	x		x			2	
Supporting and creating networks of SMEs and research base (University, research centres)	x	x	x	4		3	3
Supporting and creating clusters, and promotion of SMEs and research base participation	x		x				4
<b>Assistance in accessing public funding for RTDI activities</b>							
Search for public funding and monitoring of public tenders		x					
Assistance in accessing funds from EU Framework Programmes		x					
Assistance in accessing funds from EU Structural Funds		x					5

exercise was based on the categorisation of S&T intermediation services areas used in the project questionnaires and reports (see table below for detailed results).

The exercise allowed for matching demand from mentees with expertise available among mentors. As a result a number of possible topics for study visits was highlighted. Regions-mentees most often indicated area of **networking and clustering** (e.g. supporting and creating business-to-business networks and networks of SMEs and research base) and **support to innovative start-ups and spin-offs** (e.g. legal support in creating start-up and spin-offs, search for private financial partners for start-up/spin-offs).

Other fields indicated included support for new product service development, IPR and commercialisation and to a lesser extend human capital mobility and assistance in accessing public funding for RTDI activities.

The issue of choosing attractive topic for SMEs taking part in the visit was raised by some partners.

## **11:15 Management and Financial Issues (WP6): Adaptation of the work plan - Next MB call meeting - EC annual report (March 2007)**

### **Proposed Action Plan**

The main tasks to be accomplished in the following months are the peer review meeting and the study group visits.

#### For the implementation of the **peer reviews**:

- 1) by the 12<sup>th</sup> of January a proposal by FUNDITEC will be distributed to all the partners on the peer reviews, mentor – mentee, and study visits. The proposal will try to answer the questions Where? Who? How? What?
- 2) The next step will be the approval or collective discussion via a call conference by the 16th of January.
- 3) The formal action plan will have to revised and proposed by the lead partner before the end of January Design + Action plan (End of Decision process)
- 4) During Feb 2007 to March 2007 the visits have to be implemented.

#### **Reports:**

- 1) End of March (Agenda – Framework for the mentor- mentee)
- 2) Design the Mentor – Mentee visit

Where Who How What

**Mentor – mentee visits:** They have to be implemented between April to May 2007. The latest by the end of March they have to start.

Discussion on S&T intermediation system

+ Framework from the study visit

**Study Visits:** They have to be implemented between June to July 2007 (4 study visits in total)

Both the reports, the mentor – mentee and the study visits have to be organized by answering the following crucial questions: What Where How Who.

### **Regional Business Panels**

The second (March - May) goes with the mentor – mentee.

The third goes (June – July) with the study visit.

### **Dissemination issues:**

Each partner has to report to the lead partner of WP5 (URENIO) for all the dissemination activities regarding the SUPER-SME Project. The dissemination is a continuous occurring task therefore the reporting has to be continuous as well.

### **Financial issues:**

The intermediary financial reports do they have to be audited by external auditor?

The EC do not request for the intermediary/periodic financial reports an audit certificate. But an audit certificate will be submitted to the EC at the end of the project for the final financial reports.