



Results of an inquiry to science parks and innovative centres including technology networks in the Euroregion Baltic

The questionnaire has been sent to six centres on the Swedish side, one to Bornholm and 13 to various parks or potential parks in Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Russia (Kaliningrad). The questionnaire can be found in the appendix.

Before going into the results something must be said about definitions. In this study the emphasis is on centres with a system where new companies are created in a university close relation. A lot of (or not to say most) companies develop out of ideas coming from inventors, people employed in existing companies and ordinary newstarters in for instance retailing. These are not subjects of this study.

The definition on parks below follows the standard set up by the union of Science Parks in UK, UKSPA.

1. Different parks according to their mix of research and manufacturing

RDD = research, development, design.

Name of park	Location	Mix of RDD and Manufacturing
Research Park	urban/suburban campus	RDD
Science Park	urban/suburban campus	RDD + some manufacturing
Technology Park	urban/suburban campus	RDD + more manufacturing
High Tech Park	Suburban	(RDD) + manufacturing
High Tech networks	no specific place	RDD + manufacturing
Technopoles	allocation of city or zone of to support wealth creating through invest. in Sci/Tech	support education, science, tech and advanced engineering
Incubator centre	urban building/part of campus	can be found in various parks

It will be seen from the material that the most common ones in the study are science parks, technology parks and high tech parks. In many cases there are also high tech networks like Telecom City in Karlskrona, Internet City in Växjö and Kalmar Bioscience. These are today working as networks but the tendency is clear, they are more and more getting linked to an existing or developing park.

There is at the moment no real research park in the area even if there are some specialized fields developing. These will be examined in the second report.

On the east side of the Baltic Sea there are established science parks in Kaunas and discussions are going on to develop parks in Kaliningrad, Elblag, Klaipeda and Liepaja. The situation in Ventspils is still somewhat unclear.

In many cities on the east side of the Baltic Sea there are also a specific form of developing areas called “Free economic zones” (FEZ). They would normally be referred to as industrial parks and should as such not been part of this study but in this case I think that some of them might represent an intermediate form that later can be transformed into a technology park.

On the Swedish side it is also absolutely clear that the concept of the Triple Helix model is there to stay. The Triple Helix innovation system model, described by Henry Etzkowitz and others, simply says that if a science park wants to be successful it has to contain the elements from three sectors, the public sector, the university sector and the company sector. The three helixes will, if properly managed, help to grow the centre at a much faster pace than otherwise. In this study it is also clear that the cities are taking a great responsibility for the sustainability of the parks.

This is, however, also confirmed in international studies where for instance M Castells in a deeploading study of North American, European and East Asian science parks have found that the most interesting ones are those where public money is present.

Another remark is that in the former central planned economies there is still an unclear responsibility between the state and the cities. The cities still seem to wait for state initiatives which in turn partly reflects the lack of local resources.

Innovation centre – a brief definition

Why have all the major countries shown such an interest in innovation systems in the last two decades? I will try to outline some of these questions.

“We know that the source of wealth is something specifically human: knowledge. If we apply knowledge to tasks we already know how to do, we call it ‘productivity’. If we apply knowledge to tasks that are new and different, we call it innovation. Only knowledge allows us to achieve these two goals”.
Drucker P, Managing for the future, the 1990:s and beyond. 1992 p 26

More than 84 % of senior managers in the biggest 700 American companies recognize innovation as a significant issue for their business.

Why is that so? The new economies of information and knowledge and the fact that more than half of an age-group will continue to higher education means that the knowledge created at universities will be ever more important to a city’s, region’s and nation’s wealth.

As a consequence there is a strong tendency all over the world to support innovation through public money. This movement started in the US but has spread to all countries but the poorest. For instance in the 80:s, Science and Technology

Centers were established all over US where the emphasis was on co-operation between companies, public sector and schools. In Japan the MITI department 1979 put up a strategy for building technopoles all over the nation. In Europe most of these efforts have been national but in 1999 EU took a step within the 5th Framework program where a special program (PAXIS) was devoted to 'Innovative Regions' to make clear the ambition from EU to compete with US and Japan and to do that by showing the importance of innovation systems.

South Sweden is one of 22 regions selected by the Commission together with Berlin, Copenhagen, Hamburg, Helsinki and Stockholm in Northern Europe.

Why is it so that US, Japan and EU are so interested? Micro-economic research has found that there is a tendency to underinvest in RD in relation to the public values that come from private RD investment. Economists like Ed Mansfield have shown that the public return from private investment in R&D is somewhere between 20–40 % and the public return from public R&D is even higher.

The second reason is, maybe more important, the failures in social capital. That is how to get a whole set of issues to make research accessible, to spread knowledge throughout the society, to make institutions and individuals to adopt or absorb new ideas and derive the benefits from it.

From international research on innovation there is also an increasing amount of empirical evidence supporting the phenomenon that the rate of introduction of innovations by firms seems to be increasingly dependent on their ability and capacity to cooperate with other firms.

The emphasis in this project is on innovation centres and their networking. To better describe the various steps in such a centre I will follow a model developed for the Otaniemi Science Park in Helsinki.

Firm birth	Firm stabilisation	Firm expansion	Commercial success
Research Institutes			
	Incubators	Business generators	Business accelerators
University teachers and students			

This model will be evaluated further in the second part of my project and will be one of the themes for discussions at the seminars. To illustrate it briefly I will here give the example from Kalmar:

Ideas	Birth	Stabilisation	Expansion and success
High school	Young Entrepreneurs	Entrepreneurship studies	Industrial park or hotel
University Education	Greenhouse	START	Science or Technology Park
University Research	Greenhouse	START	Research or Science Park
Technology Companies	Spin-out	IUC	High Tech Industrial or Tech. Park
Business ideas	Start Your Own Business	Jobs and Society and IUC	Industrial park
Inventions	Inventors Club	Jobs and Society and IUC	Industrial park

Greenhouse = name of pre-incubator
 Start = name of incubator
 IUC = industrial development centre
 Start Your Own = courses for newstarters

Baltic Sea Region and the Euroregion Baltic

The situation in the Euroregion Baltic is in some ways different from other areas in the Baltic Sea Region. As have been discussed in an earlier work on Baltic organisations covering the time from 1989, I have found that three major organisations were doing a lot of networking creation. The Union of Baltic Cities, Baltic Sea States Subregional Association and Baltic Chambers of Commerce Association all made a major contribution in the 90:s to build up relations and trust in the region.

On a lower level there were the different forms of twinning; cities, regions and other cooperations, which also made a lot to open up for the discussions that can now be developed further.

At the same time I found that the EU money, transferred through Interreg projects, had over time a more profound impact on the development of the region. Here can be mentioned the work done in the two major corridors, the 'Baltic Palette' from Stockholm via Helsinki to St Petersburg, including Tallinn and Riga and 'String' from Skåne via Copenhagen down to Hamburg.

A third, somewhat weaker, corridor has also been established between Skåne, Vorpommern and Szczecin called Euroregion Pomerania. This corridor is now extended to Berlin in the Interreg project Baltic Pearl.

The fourth corridor, Euroregion Baltic, is probably the weakest of the four and need a very good performance to be able to compete. The region can be treated as a "subcontractor" to the bigger ones but can also establish itself as a region of its

own. To be able to do that, there is a need to develop both research and higher education and to transfer that knowledge into the new type of companies.

It can be too easy to think that the cities in the new EU-countries will best compete with low salaries as seen in table 1. Of course these differences can and will be used but they will diminish over time and when the firms can no longer compete with low salaries they will have to do it with their skills. But to build up high-tech skills take more than a decade.

Table 1. GDP per head 2000

Dollar at purchasing power parity. Financial Times, 021211.

Denmark	27 250	Germany	24 920
Sweden	23 970	Finland	24 570
Poland	9 000	France	24 420
Latvia	7 070	UK	23 550
Lithuania	6 980		
Russia			

A part of a possible success would be if the new EU-countries can learn from their Nordic neighbours to use the new IT technologies, both in doing business and in developing their administrations. One good example is to look at the excellent performance in using the Internet in Nordic countries. Table 2

Table 2. Internet users

Financial Times, 021213.

Sweden	56,4 %	Finland	43,9 %
Denmark	48,4 %	UK	33,6 %
Latvia	7,7 %	Germany	29,0 %
Poland	7,2 %	France	18,8 %
Lithuania	6,2 %	Greece	13,0 %

(In short, 1994 there were about 1000 web pages and 5 million users in the world. In 1999 there were more than 400 million pages and 100 million users. Traffic on the Internet is said to double every 100 days. Fukuyama 2001).

Short summary of the inquiry, Sweden and Denmark

City	Name	Year	Capital million €	Turnover million €	Number	
					empl.	firms
Västervik	Developing Centre	1988	0,235	0,7	6-7	
Oskarshamn	Business Centre	1998	0,010	0,13	2	80
Ronneby	Soft Center	1985	0,050		6	70
Växjö	Vidéum SP ¹	1986	2,0	6,5	15	70
	Internet City	1998	-	0,13	1,5	65
Karlskrona	Telecom City	1993				32
Kalmar	Kalmar Science Park	1994	0,1	0,3	2,5	30
	Kalmar Bioscience	1996	0,01	0,1	1	10
Bornholm	Erhvervshuset i Nexö	2001			2	5

In the final report, these figures will be accompanied by maps over the sites and cities.

The Swedish parks and their specialties

Växjö Vidéum	IT, telecom, environment, heavy vehicles, wood and building technology
Karlskrona Telecom city	IT/Telecom
Ronneby Soft Center	IT software
Kalmar Science Park	telecom, IT, biotech, environment technology
Oskarshamn Development Centre	Automotive, energy
Västervik, Development Centre	Polymer

1

Vidéum Växjö is also a real estate owner.

Short summary of the enquiry and telephone contacts in Poland, Kaliningrad, Latvia and Lithuania

Elblag	is on its way to establish a science park in the middle of 2003.
Tri-city	Pomeranian special economic zone and Pomeranian Technology Park. Established in June 2002. Owned by the City of Gdynia and Gdansk university.
Kaliningrad	We are still searching for contacts. A business incubator is found but they have financial problems and are negotiating with the city for economical support.
Klaipeda	They are looking into the potential of opening a science park. Possible start-ups are at the Klaipeda Free Economy Zone and Klaipeda University.
Liepaja	One business incubator was established but went into bankruptcy in 2001. In Liepaja discussions are going on to open (3?) science parks.
Ventspils	Ventspils Augstskola has had a discussion both on an incubator and an innovation centre. The situation still to be confirmed.
Kaunas	Has three well established science parks.

Wider outlook into Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania

To give the whole question a broader view we have also sent the questionnaires to other science parks in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. We have received one answer from Tallinn, three from Riga and one from Vilnius plus one from Telsiai (business incubator). The science parks in the capitals are all well established and we could also see the development of research parks. The only comment is that the capitals are the normal starting point for such processes because it is there where the biggest universities are located and where the inward investments are done. In Estonia, we have also looked at the Science Park in Tartu on the web.

Networking

The Swedish Science Parks are all members of Swedepark, which in turn is a member of the International Association of Science Parks (ISAP).

Västervik UC and Oskarshamn BC both have contacts with the University of Kalmar and Västervik has contacts with the University of Linköping too. Västervik is involved in EU Objective 2 projects.

Ronneby Soft Center have good contacts with former Soft Center International members and have close contacts with Blekinge Technical University and is also involved in various Interreg projects. The same goes for Telecom City Karlskrona, which also has special agreements with Telecom Valley in France and Telecom Corridor in Dallas, Texas.

Vidéum Växjö is located on the University campus and cover many branches. Vidéum is involved in a lot of EU-projects like environment with Kaliningrad. Internet City can be seen as the specialised branch of Vidéum on IT.

Kalmar Science Park has three branches and is networking with members in the former Soft Center International network, Medicon Valley Academy and Sustainable Sweden Southeast.

The Science Parks on the east side have different networks. The established parks have joined ISAP and BASTIC (Baltic Association of Science/ Technology Parks and Innovation centres). They have also offices for the IRC network (Innovation Relay Centres).

The smaller parks have started their networking in various ways. Within Lithuania there is a Leonardo da Vinci project "Training Network of Lithuanian Business Incubators" with Telsiai, KTU Regional Business Incubator in Kaunas and Latvian Technological Center (Riga).

Elblag has started its development process in close contact with Soft Center Ronneby and hopefully there will more of such cooperations within the Seagull Deverb project.

Final comments

The results so far show that the parks on the Swedish side are well under way. Bornholm has, due to lack of an own university, started more as a business centre but Bornholm has earlier shown its competence to work in EU-projects. The bigger cities in the east, like Kaunas, have also started but the smaller cities are in a very early phase.

In the subreport to VASAB 2010 +, called 'Urban systems, urban networking' (where I represented UBC) there was a clear description on the need of technology transfer program in the greater Baltic Sea Region. This has been accomplished by the states in the 'Wismar declaration' 20th September 2001.

There were among other important things the need for development of the southeast Baltic corridor mentioned.

The results of this small study will be used in the seminars and will also be the ground for the final report. That report will be more detailed in the description on the models earlier mentioned but will also reflect the ongoing process where a lot will have happened to the middle of 2004.

It shows so far a need to help the new centres to offer advice, knowledge transfer, which will later lead to exchange of knowledge through the newly built network.

Literature:

- Castells Manuel and Hall Peter, Technopoles of the World, London 1994
 Castells Manuel, The Rise of the Network Society, London 1996
 De la Mothe John editor, Science, Technology and Governance, London 2001
 Branscomb Lewis, Government Policy for Industrial Innovation, in de la Mothe
 Cozzens Susan, Autonomy and Accountability for Twenty-first-century Science and Technology Policy, in de la Mothe
 Marceau Jane, Science, Technology and the Tools of Politico-administrative Trade, in de la Mothe
 Drucker Peter, Managing for the Future, the 1990:s and beyond, 1992
 Etzkovitz Henry and Leydesdorff Loet editors, Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy, London 2001
 Harryson Sigvald, Managing Know-Who Based Companies, Arthur D. Little 2000
 Joash Ronald and Sommerlatte Tom, The Innovation Premium, Arthur D. Little 2001
 Malmborg Lars Interregionala organisationer i Östersjön (Interregional Organisations in the Baltic Sea region) Köpenhamn 2001
 Scherer F New Perspectives on Economic Growth and Technical innovation, Washington 1999
 VASAB 2010 +, subreport Urban Systems – Urban Networking 2001