

level:	
Workpackage Number:	WP 8
Workpackage Title:	Innovation Support
Task Number:	T8.2
Task Title:	Fostering innovation and adapting good practices

Submission Date:	September 19, 2013
Task Leading Partner:	DLR/BMBF
Contributing Partners:	UNU-MERIT, MPI

Document Revision History

Version	Date	Comment	Author
(1)	September 19, 2013	draft	Ulrike Kunze
(2)	September 2013	Input	Rene Wintjes
(3)	September 2013	QA	Athanasia Halatzouka, Nikos Zaharis
(4)	November 12, 2013	Final version	Ulrike Kunze

Executive Summary

This deliverable outlines the task dealing with the collection, selection and adaptation of innovation measures identified as good practice examples. On the basis of Deliverable D8.50 (collection of 45 good practice examples from EU Member States and the Western Balkans), eight innovation schemes were presented during a First Review Meeting in April 2012 in Tirana (Albania) and discussed with stakeholders from the region. In a Second Review Meeting in April 2013 in Skopje (FYR of Macedonia), four schemes chosen out of these eight measures were looked at in more detail and adaptation schemes in view of a possible implementation were discussed. These four schemes are: Innovation Officer, Strategic Innovation, Innovation Voucher Scheme and Soft Landing Platforms. The results of the First and Second Review Meetings are described in this deliverable. As a follow up, four Task Force Meetings will be organised in the second half of 2013 (Task T8.5). The aim is to draft for each of the four schemes a suggestion for a pilot project for the implementation of the scheme in one of the Western Balkan country or in the region.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	6
2	FIRST REVIEW MEETING (TIRANA, ALBANIA APRIL 4 AND 5, 2012).....	7
3	SECOND REVIEW MEETING (SKOPJE, FYR OF MACEDONIA, APRIL 23 AND 24, 2013)	9
4	CONCLUSIONS.....	10
	APPENDIX A: FIRST REVIEW MEETING.....	11
	APPENDIX B: SECOND REVIEW MEETING.....	24

List of Tables

Table 1: Table presenting the results of the analysis of the evaluation forms	8
Table 2: Innovation schemes ranked first rank for each of the Western Balkan country	9
Table 3: Ratings of the complexity of implementation.....	21
Table 4: Ratings of the budget needed for implementation.....	21
Table 5: Ratings of the level of implementation (number of counts).....	22
Table 6: Ratings of complexity of implementation vs. budget needed.....	23
Table 7: Ratings of feasibility of implementation in own country (all participants)	23
Table 8: Ratings of feasibility of implementation in own country (only WBC participants).....	23

1 Introduction

As part of WBC-INCO.NET's Work Package 8 on Innovation support, the underlying task of this report is to present selected good practice examples of innovation measures adaptable to the region of the Western Balkan countries or to some individual countries of the region.

This task was performed in three steps:

- (1) A collection of 45 good practice examples from EU Member States and Western Balkan countries was performed and the examples were presented in a deliverable (D8.50 "Good practice examples of innovation policy approaches and instruments in the EU Member States and the Western Balkans" submitted in November 2011¹).
- (2) Eight of these examples were chosen, and then presented and discussed during a First Review Meeting on Innovation Good Practice Measures held on April 4 and 5, 2012 in Tirana (Albania) (see Chapter 2). The selection of the eight schemes out of the 45 examples from D8.50 was based on a questionnaire answered by the meeting participants.
- (3) Out of these chosen eight measures, four selected good practice examples were looked at in more detail during the Second Review meeting held on April 23 and 24, 2013 in Skopje (FYR of Macedonia) (see Chapter 3). During the meeting, adaptation schemes were developed for these four measures in view of an implementation in the WBC region.

In this deliverable, the event and the outcome of the Review Meetings are described and some follow up activities are announced for the second half of 2013.

¹ <http://wbc-inco.net/object/document/7884>

2 First review meeting (Tirana, Albania April 4 and 5, 2012)

Based on the collection of 45 good practice examples of innovation policy approaches and instruments (Deliverable D8.50)², a review meeting was held in Tirana/Albania on April 4 and 5, 2012 in the frame of Task T8.2. For the meeting, eight examples were chosen as most suitable and interesting for the Western Balkan countries in view of a possible implementation. During the First Review Meeting, these eight selected good practice examples of innovation measures were presented by invited external experts in charge of the examples (f. ex. managers of the respective schemes). The presentations of the Workshop can be found at: <http://wbc-inco.net/object/event/6394>.

Participants of the meeting were innovation stakeholders, WBC-INCO.NET partners from the Western Balkan countries (especially the Ministries in charge of Science, Research and Innovation/Economy), invited innovation experts from the region and the project partners dealing with Task T8.2.

The agenda and the list of participants can be found in Appendix A (1 and 2) of this Deliverable.

The following Good Practice Examples were presented:

1. Innovation Voucher Scheme (Netherlands)
2. Strategic Innovation (Netherlands)
3. Innovation Officer (Netherlands)
4. Knowledge Management Centre (Hungary)
5. KOpEE (Koblenz Network for Open Entrepreneurship Engineering, Germany)
6. Soft landing Platform Services (Germany/Croatia)
7. Integrated Destination Management System (Germany/Bulgaria)
8. VINNVÄXT (Sweden)

Furthermore, introductory remarks on the importance of intermediary support structures were given as well as presentations³ on linkages with two other initiatives:

- the OECD Regional Competitiveness Initiative (RCI) in the frame of the Programme "Investment Compact for South East Europe"
- the Project on the Regional R&D Strategy on Innovation for the Western Balkan countries coordinated by the World Bank and the RCC (Regional Cooperation Council).

² <http://wbc-inco.net/object/document/7884>

³ : <http://wbc-inco.net/object/event/6394>

After the presentations, the good practice examples were discussed by the participants in view of a possible implementation in the Balkans.

An evaluation form (see Appendix A, 3) was distributed and filled by the participants. In this form, comments to the schemes presented were given and different ratings were attributed (complexity of the measure, budget needed for implementation, level of implementation: regional, national, sub-national, feasibility - see Appendix A, 4).

A first analysis on the feasibility question answered in the evaluation forms provided the results presented in Table 1 (and in table 6 of Appendix A, 4).

Nr. of example presented in meeting	Name of good practice example	Ranking of feasibility (1=high, 9=low)	Rank
1	Innovation Voucher	2,8	1
6	Soft landing platform services	3,9	2
3	Innovation Officer	4,3	3
2	Strategic Innovation	4,4	4
8	VINNVÄXT	4,6	5
7	Integrated destination management system	4,9	6
4	Knowledge Management Centre (KMC)	5,7	7
5	KOpEE	6,0	8

Table 1: Table presenting the results of the analysis of the evaluation forms

The individual comments made by the participants on the eight good practice examples are compiled in Appendix A, 4.

As a result, it was decided to follow up on this First Review Meeting by focusing on the four highest ranked good practice examples:

1. Innovation Voucher Scheme (Netherlands)
2. Strategic Innovation (Netherlands)
3. Innovation Officer (Netherlands)
4. Soft landing Platform Services (Germany/Croatia)

These four examples have been chosen for the Second Review Meeting where these measures and possible adaptation were discussed.

3 Second review meeting (Skopje, FYR of Macedonia, April 23 and 24, 2013)

The Second Review Meeting took place in Skopje (FYR of Macedonia) on April 23 and 24, 2013. In the focus of the interest were the four innovation schemes highest ranked after the First Review Meeting in April 2012 in Tirana. The agenda as well as the list of participants of the meeting can be found in Appendix B (1 and 2).

Therefore, during the Second Review Meeting, the four innovation schemes

1. Innovation Voucher Scheme (Netherlands)
2. Strategic Innovation (Netherlands)
3. Innovation Officer (Netherlands)
4. Soft landing Platform Services (Germany/Croatia)

were presented by the external experts / managers in charge of the schemes from The Netherlands and Germany and then discussed by all participants in detail. The presentations are available at <http://wbc-inco.net/object/event/11702>. The focus was on the adaptation of the original schemes to the situation in the Western Balkan region. Examples from Albania, Montenegro, FYR of Macedonia and Croatia as well as the innovation strategy from the FYR of Macedonia were also highlighted and discussed in the meeting.

Furthermore, a representative of the project WBinNO (Innovation policy learning from Norway in Western Balkans) gave detailed information on the project. Its objective is to assist policy makers in the Western Balkan countries to develop and implement innovation policies by way of identifying appropriate 'good' practices in other countries and through the analysis of their emerging innovation systems (<http://wbc-inco.net/object/project/9980> and <http://www.forskningsradet.no/servlet/Satellite?c=Prosjekt&cid=1253964262660&pageName=norqlobal/Hovedsidemal&p=1224698160110>).

An evaluation form was filled by the participants grouped per Western Balkan country (Appendix B, 3). They designated ranks to each of the schemes referring to their country's interest in a possible, feasible and realistic implementation of the schemes. Taking into account these rankings done by the WBC participants, the following interest was demonstrated by putting the respective scheme on rank 1:

Rank	Topic	Interest expressed by
1	Innovation Voucher scheme	Croatia, Kosovo*
2	Innovation officer	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia
3	Strategic Innovation	Montenegro
4	Soft Landing Platforms	Albania, FYR of Macedonia

Table 2: Innovation schemes ranked first rank for each of the Western Balkan country

*This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

The results of the Second Review Meeting will be taken up in follow up activities within the frame of the new Task 8.5 in the second half of 2013. For each of the four innovation schemes Innovation Voucher Scheme, Strategic Innovation, Innovation Officer and Soft landing Platform Services, a Task Force Meeting will be organised in the WBC region involving the countries having expressed interest. Together with the experts responsible for the innovation schemes, concrete steps towards the implementation of the schemes will be discussed. The results of the Task Force Meetings will then be a suggestion for pilot projects including a feasibility study.

Another follow-up of the Second Review Meeting was a contact between the M6 Educational Centre (<http://www.m6.edu.mk/>), an executive education training centre based in Skopje (FYR of Macedonia) and INI-Novation (Germany). Dimitar Osmanli, Executive Director of the M6 Educational Centre contacted Wolfgang Kniejski, chairman of InI-Novation regarding a seminar planned for September, 27, 2013 that will be dealing with Innovation Management asking if he could teach a one day seminar on technology transfer processes and methodologies.

4 Conclusions

In this deliverable, the course and the outcomes of the First and Second Review Meetings are described. From a high number of innovation schemes (45 measures) that were identified as good practice examples from EU Member States and the Western Balkan countries, a selection of eight measures most suitable for the transfer to the region was performed. The aim was to get closer to a possible implementation of some of the schemes in the Western Balkans.

Innovation experts from the WBC have discussed vividly with the experts in charge of the innovation measures from EU Member States to be transferred to the region; the objective was to find approaches how to establish innovation funding support mechanisms in their countries – at national or regional levels. The good experience of the innovation experts in charge of the measures from The Netherlands and Germany paved the way for developing ideas for a feasible adaptation to the situation in the Western Balkan region.

Certainly it is a challenge to come to an implementation of one or more schemes in the Western Balkan countries, as a number of barriers and restrictions have to be overcome. The situation in the region is not comparable to the country of origin of the innovation measures. A way to surmount these hurdles could be the drafting of pilot projects during four Task Force Meetings planned in Task T8.5 for the second half of 2013. In these follow up activities of T8.2, a tailor made recipe for a later implementation of the measures in the region should be elaborated together with the experienced experts.

Appendix A: First Review Meeting

1) Agenda

WBC-INCO.NET
HIGH LEVEL REVIEW MEETING



**Good Practice Examples on Innovation
for the Western Balkan countries
April 4 and 5, 2012**

Venue: Hotel Tirana International, Albania

Aim:

Presentation of selected good practice examples from Deliverable 8.50; discuss questions in view of possible implementation by interested WBC partners; Round Table statements by WBC representatives on further action

Results:

Lay the basis for the further development of adaptation schemes of some good practice examples in view of a possible implementation in the WBC; selection of policy instruments to address in the next phase.

Wednesday April 4, 2012

9:00	<p>Chair: Bashkim Sykja, METE, WBC-INCO.NET partner</p> <p>Welcome by the host Majlind Lazimi, Chief of Minister's Cabinet, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Energy, Albania</p> <p>Tour de Table All participants</p> <p>The WBC-INCO.NET project and its innovation activities; background, aims and expected results of the review meeting Ulrike Kunze, PT-DLR, WBC-INCO.NET partner</p>
9:45	<p>Introductory remarks: the importance of intermediary support structures by Jean Severijns / Netherlands</p>

	<p>Presentation of Good practice example 1: Innovation Voucher Scheme by Jean Severijns / Netherlands</p>
11:00	<p>Coffee Break</p>
11:15	<p>Chair: Bastian Raue, BMBF, WBC-INCO.NET partner</p> <p>Presentation of good practice example 2: Strategic Innovation by Jean Severijns / Netherlands</p> <p>Presentation of good practice example 3: Innovation Officer by Adrianus van Ginneken, Syntens / Netherlands</p>
13:00	<p>Lunch</p>
14:00	<p>Chair: Ulrike Kunze, PT-DLR, WBC-INCO.NET partner</p> <p>Presentation of Good practice example 4: Knowledge Management Centre by Dr. Tibor Dóry, Széchenyi István University, Knowledge-Management Centre / Hungary</p>
15:00	<p>Presentation of good practice example 5: KOPEE (Koblenz Network for Open Entrepreneurship Engineering) by Dr. Kornelia van der Beek, University of Koblenz-Landau/Germany</p>
16:00	<p>Coffee Break</p>
16:15	<p>Chair: René Wintjes, WBC-INCO.NET partner</p> <p>Presentation of good practice examples 6 and 7: Soft landing Platform Services and Integrated Destination Management System by Wolfgang Kniejski, INI-novation / Germany</p>
17:15	<p>Wrap up of first day, first results Chair</p>

17:30	End of the First Day
19:00	Dinner Venue: Steak House Restaurant/Kompleksi Taiwan

Thursday April 5, 2012

9:00	Chair: Bastian Raue, BMBF, WBC-INCO.NET partner Welcome by chair Presentation of Good practice example 8: VINNVÄXT by Lars-Gunnar Larsson, VINNOVA / Sweden
10:10	The shift towards demand side innovation policies by René Wintjes, UNU-MERIT / Netherlands
11:00	Coffee Break
11:20	Chair: Kujtime Stefani, METE, WBC-INCO.NET partner Possible linkages to OECD Project (RCI – good practice examples in the WBC) (Working Title) by Milan Konopek, OECD / France <i>tbc</i>
11:40	Possible linkages to Worldbank Project (R&D Strategy on Innovation for the WBC) (Working Title) by Dusan Vujovic, Worldbank
12:00	Chairs: René Wintjes, UNU-MERIT and Ulrike Kunze, PT-DLR Wrap-up and conclusions; next steps, discussion by the chairs Closing Remarks and Outlook Bashkim Sykja, METE, Albania, WBC-INCO.NET partner
13:00	Lunch, Departure

2) List of participants

Afentaki	Evi	GSRT	GR	pafe@gsrt.gr
Agolli	Edmond	ARTI	AL	edmond.agolli@akti.gov.al
Bahja	Endri	AIDA	AL	endri.bahja@aida.gov.al
Belada	Ljiljana	DDSME	MNE	ljiljana.bozovic@nasme.me
Dragasevic	Mladen	RCC	BiH	Mladen.Dragasevic@rcc.int
Hasanovic	Alma	Ministry of Civil Affairs	BiH	alma.hasanovic@mcp.gov.ba
Jelicic	Damir	Ministry of Science, Education and Sports	CRO	damir.jelicic@mzos.hr
Knezevic	Tijana	Ministry of Education and Science Republic of Serbia	RS	tijana.knezevic@mpn.gov.rs
Konci	Besnik	MASH	AL	Besnik.Konci@mash.gov.al
Konopek	Milan	OECD	FR	Milan.KONOPEK@oecd.org
Krasniqi	Besnik	University of Prishtina	Kosovo*	krasnigibesnik@hotmail.com
Kunze	Ulrike	DLR	DE	ulrike.kunze@dlr.de
Kutlaca	Djuro	MPI	RS	djuro.kutlaca@pupin.rs
Larsson	Lars-Gunnar	VINNOVA	SW	Lars-Gunnar.Larsson@VINNOVA.se
Lazimi	Majlind	Chief of Minister's Cabinet, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Energy	AL	majlind.lazimi@mete.gov.al
Manga	Lindita	ALCDF	AL	lmanga@alcdf.org
Nedovic	Viktor	Ministry of Education and Science	RS	viktor.nedovic@nauka.gov.rs
Osdautaj	Murteza	Ministry of Education, Science and Technology	Kosovo*	murteza.osdautaj@gmail.com
Proseku	Idlir	AIDA	AL	idlir.proseku@aida.gov.al
Raue	Bastian	BMBF	DE	bastian.raue@bmbf.bund.de
Sataric	Dragan	Ministry of Education and Science Republic of Serbia	RS	dragan.sataric@nauka.gov.rs
Senk	Voijn	Faculty of Technical Sciences, University of Novi Sad	RS	vojin_senk@uns.ac.rs
Severijns	Jean	Province of Limburg	BE	jmj.severijns@home.nl
Stefani	Kujtime	METE	AL	kujtime.stefani@mete.gov.al
Suci	Suada	AIDA	AL	suada.suci@aida.gov.al
Svarc	Jadranka	Institute Ivo Pilar	CRO	Jadranka.Svarc@pilar.hr
Sykja	Bashkim	METE	AL	bashkim.sykja@mete.gov.al
Tibor	Dőry	KMC Győr	HU	doryti@sze.hu
van der Beek	Kornelia	University of Koblenz-Landau	DE	vanderbeek@uni-koblenz.de

van Ginneken	Adrianus	SYNTENS	NL	ad.vanginneken@syntens.nl
Vujosevic	Nikola	DDSME	MNE	nikola.vujosevic@nasme.me
Vujovic	Dusan	Worldbank	RS	ddvujovic@gmail.com
Vukobratovic Karan	Marina	Ministry of Education and Science Republic of Serbia	RS	marina.vukobratovic@mpn.gov.rs
Wintjes	René	UNU-MERIT	NL	r.wintjes@maastrichtuniversity.nl
Wolfgang	Kniejski	INI-Novation	DE	kniejski@ini-novation.com
Xhaferi	Silvana	British Chamber of Commerce, Tirana	AL	silvanaxhaferi@abcci.com

*This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

3) Evaluation form

HIGH LEVEL REVIEW MEETING

Good Practice Examples on Innovation for the Western Balkan countries
April 4 and 5, 2012; Venue: Hotel Tirana International, Albania



Evaluation Form		Your Name:							
Nr. agenda	Nr. D 8.50	Name of policy scheme	Comments (e.g. a strength, weakness, opportunity, barriers for implementation)	Rate the complexity of implementation (1=very low, 2=low, 3=average, 4=high, 5=very high)	Rate budget needed for implementation (1=very low, 2=low, 3=average, 4=high, 5=very high)	Could you imagine implementing this scheme at the following level...?			Give ranking of feasibility 1 (highest) – 9 (lowest)
						Regional or local (within your country)	National (your country)	WBC-level (cross-border)	
1	1	Innovation Voucher							
2	2	Strategic Innovation							
3	16	Innovation Officer							

4	11	Knowledge Management Centre (KMC)							
5	6	KOpEE							
6	4	Soft landing Platform Services							
7	3	Integrated Destination Management System							
8	10	VINNVÄXT							

4) Analysis of the evaluation form

4.1 Individual comments

- Innovation Voucher:
 - I would like to do something similar
 - Projects about IV are already taking place in the WBCs. This idea will find good ground for implementation
 - Unclear mandate; Dispersion into projects for financial reasons
 - It seems useful, simple, cheap
 - In my country the problem is to find money for implementing
 - Good method for financing some innovation activities
 - very good project/scheme, well presented
 - must be accompanied with expertise, not only money
 - Very good explanation SWOT analysis for implementation IV and very useful for NIS
 - stimulates supply for innovation support services, it can be misused in Balkans, to reduce that we should introduce fee paid by companies too
 - easy accessible, low administrative burden
 - great idea, lean procedure, trigger further research on collaboration
 - good example, pushing SMEs close to research community, strong rules for using vouchers

- Strategic Innovation:
 - strength opportunity
 - This example would be good to develop into a project for WBC if financing would be assured (EC for example)
 - How to attract SMEs and companies?; Looks rather useful
 - Require broader innovation infrastructure, developed agencies (300 employees), very complicated process
 - There are some political problems in the Balkans that interfere in
 - good implementation of customer connectivity on innovation and good internal and external SWOT as well
 - all 3 (1,2,3) in close connection forming one unit
 - May be little academic – an alternative could be CEO??? – networks which are much cheaper to implement
 - good explanation for connectivity model includes vertical, horizontal and especially customer connectivity; SWOT analysis as well (standard questions)
 - important but our degree of development not high
 - good strategic view of an organisation, education / training for consultants
 - quite analytical, should relied on experienced personnel
 - capacity building

- Innovation Officer:
 - Results in WBC might not be good as in NL; society and policy is not developed to the level where implementation of this idea would be successful
 - Lack of personnel

- Something for high unemployment
- excellent example on organisation process development with focus on SMEs helping to increase their ability
- very attractive, stimulating, beneficial, visible activity , the best explained one
- Can be combined with “unemployment activities” by the governments, we have tested this
- good example for improving innovation capability and outputs in SMEs play an importance; the action requires partnership with the other countries and regions through WBC
- innovation experts are important but the local capacities are limited; it is best to do regional and increase capacities
- take away constraints of time and know-how the right person (IO) has to be found
- very useful for companies to have a dedicated person deals with innovation
- more suitable for developed countries

- Knowledge Management Centre:
 - In BiH already these types of centres/infrastructure exists. They are new centres which development is based on donors’ support. Rather they could further develop than to create a new ones
 - A lot of opportunities, practical
 - A problem is a gap between “mapping” ??? and their practical use
 - Human capacities will be maybe problem, budget too
 - good implementation of different methods of financing inventions and innovations
 - Needed, Sweden has already implemented this in all universities / colleges
 - through results there is a good numbering about indicators, with their widespread explanations which are useful for TTO in the universities
 - important
 - good to support students and teachers to develop and start business
 - an extended TT office tailored to local needs
 - this example is fitted to a single university

- KOpEE:
 - The concept is too vague, not determined goals and purpose
 - good example
 - Long term approach necessary and than a 3-year project is not enough, must be anchored at the top university management level
 - good example, little bit confusion in interpretation
 - very important and good to implement in the Balkans
 - good to create an entrepreneurial culture within a university
 - design floating to entrepreneurship, awareness raising, ??? matching means and projects
 - high developed country, this kind of dealing with innovation system is far away from us; so confusing

- Soft landing platform services:

- The platform could provide service to universities and companies from WBCs. A project for WBCs could be a good with this service
 - Business lines = strengths & Govt. and Chambers – weaknesses; Excellent
 - It seemed very useful, practical, “down to earth”, connection of businesses in the region
 - Important but there are a lack of budget for implementing
 - excellent example of cooperation and organisation whole process – each step is developed in details
 - Many interesting points, concrete examples, easy-following presentation stressing crucial points
 - Important and a new type of Innovation Investments where you don't focus on establishment of production plants but individual enterprise
 - good example of cooperation on each level and process
 - takes a time to build up the network, if the network is there it will be strong
 - connecting and intersectoral collaboration to exploit and valorise R&D results
 - this example is about company doing intermediary business
- Integrated destination management system:
- Brilliant
 - Interesting
 - Very important for each country to apply for this system
 - good example
 - Many interesting points, concrete examples, easy-following presentation stressing crucial points
 - Important but we have similar projects going on, but this one is better
 - good example how to develop tourism
 - Tourism focused, private consulting system
 - example how to develop tourism on innovative way
- VINNVÄXT:
- To have good impact in WBCs, this example would require significant level of funding from outside or from WBCs govt.
 - High level (financial and organizational), very hard (impossible) to reach in WBCs
 - Intangible know-how to support and monitor clusters are missing, how to transfer this knowledge
 - Can be implemented in my country but circumstances are completely different
 - good concept of implementation of different mechanisms for supporting the development of R&D&I environment, partnership and coordination of resources
 - The project itself is great, but as for comparison and budget issue, it is not clear if we could implement, not clear basic procedures
 - Complex implementation but could start
 - good concept about regional growth through innovation system includes no innovation, no long term competitiveness, focus on innovation system and R&D policy, economic and industrial policy, trade policy, financial funds

- it is good to have an impact analysis when identified and build, a cluster is a strong economic force
- complex scheme, assuming collaborating culture among regional actors
- cluster system in developed country; partly lecture, partly Swedish example

4.2 Voting outcomes: Tables presenting the results of the analysis of the evaluation forms

		Rate the complexity of implementation (1=very low, 2=low, 3=average, 4=high, 5=very high)
1	KOpEE	2.7000
2	Innovation Voucher	2.7813
3	Knowledge Management Centre	2.8000
4	Soft landing platform services	3.0333
5	Integrated destination management system	3.0667
6	Innovation Officer	3.2500
7	Strategic Innovation	3.2667
8	VINNVÄXT	3.4615

Table 3: Ratings of the complexity of implementation

		Rate budget needed for implementation (1=very low, 2=low, 3=average, 4=high, 5=very high)
1	KOpEE	2.8182
2	Innovation Officer	2.9688
3	Knowledge Management Centre	3.0000
4	Innovation Voucher	3.0625
5	Strategic Innovation	3.1071
6	Soft landing platform services	3.1429
7	Integrated destination management system	3.1429
8	VINNVÄXT	3.8571

Table 4: Ratings of the budget needed for implementation

		Regional or local (within your country)
1	Innovation Voucher	13
2	Innovation Officer	10
3	Knowledge Management Centre	9
4	Integrated destination management system	9
5	KOpEE	7
6	Soft landing platform services	7
7	VINNVÄXT	7
8	Strategic Innovation	6
		National (your country)
1	Innovation Voucher	13
2	Innovation Officer	13
3	Strategic Innovation	12
4	Knowledge Management Centre	12
5	KOpEE	11
6	Soft landing platform services	11
7	VINNVÄXT	11
8	Integrated destination management system	10
		WBC-level (cross-border)
1	Innovation Voucher	9
2	Soft landing platform services	8
3	Strategic Innovation	7
4	Innovation Officer	7
5	Knowledge Management Centre	7
6	Integrated destination management system	7
7	VINNVÄXT	7
8	KOpEE	2

Table 5: Ratings of the level of implementation (number of counts)

		the complexity of implementation * budget needed for implementation
1	KOpEE	7.6091
2	Knowledge Management Centre	8.4000
3	Innovation Voucher	8.5176
4	Soft landing platform services	9.5333

5	Integrated destination management system	9.6381
6	Innovation Officer	9.6484
7	Strategic Innovation	10.1500
8	VINNVÄXT	13.3516

Table 6: Ratings of complexity of implementation vs. budget needed

	All participants	Give ranking of feasibility: 1 (highest) - 9 (lowest)
1	Innovation Voucher	2.9333
2	Strategic Innovation	4.5000
3	Soft landing platform services	4.5357
4	Innovation Officer	4.6667
5	Integrated destination management system	5.2308
6	KOpEE	5.5556
7	Knowledge Management Centre	5.7500
8	VINNVÄXT	5.8846

Table 7: Ratings of feasibility of implementation in own country (all participants)

	Only WBC	Give ranking of feasibility: 1 (highest) - 9 (lowest)
1	Innovation Voucher	3.3333
2	KOpEE	3.4545
3	Soft landing platform services	3.7083
4	Integrated destination management system	4.0833
5	Strategic Innovation	4.1818
6	Innovation Officer	4.9167
7	Knowledge Management Centre	5.2727
8	VINNVÄXT	5.9545

Table 8: Ratings of feasibility of implementation in own country (only WBC participants)

APPENDIX B: Second review Meeting

AGENDA



Second Review Meeting on innovation good practice examples: How to adapt innovation schemes to the Western Balkans

Date: April 23-24, 2013

Location: Skopje/FYR of Macedonia*

Venue: Hotel Holiday Inn, Mosa Pijade Str. 2, 1000 Skopje, FYR of Macedonia*

April 23, 2013

Chair: Suzana Arsova-Kostadinova, Ministry of Economy (FYR of Macedonia*)

9.00 – 9.10 Welcome

By Blerim Zlatku, State Advisor, Ministry of Economy (FYR of Macedonia)*

9.10 – 9.30 The WBC-INCO.NET project: Recap First Review Meeting in Tirana in April 2012

by Ulrike Kunze, German Aerospace Centre (Germany)

9.30 – 9.50 Tour de Table of Participants

9.50 – 10.15 The Strategy for Innovation and the Action Plan

By Romela Popovic-Trajkova, Cabinet of the Deputy Prime Minister in Charge of Economic Affairs (FYR of Macedonia)*

Questions & Answers; Discussion

10.15 – 10.45 Pilot and adaptation: Voucher scheme in the WBC Part I

By Nikola Vujosevic and Ljiljana Belada, DDSME (Montenegro), Jean Severijns (The Netherlands)

Questions & Answers; Discussion

* This term is used according to the project policy in the frame of the EU funded project WBC-INCO.NET.

Statements by participants and suggestions for follow up activities

10.45 – 11.00 Coffee Break

11.00 – 12.30 Pilot and adaptation: Voucher scheme in the WBC Part II

*By Nikola Vujosevic and Ljiljana Belada, DDSME (Montenegro),
Jean Severijns (The Netherlands)*

Questions & Answers; Discussion

Statements by participants and suggestions for follow up activities

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch

Afternoon session

Chair: Matthias Hack, Federal Ministry of Education and Research
(Germany)

13.30 – 15.30 Pilot and adaptation: Innovation Officer in the WBC

*By Alda Dharmo, AIDA (Albania) and Ad van Ginneken, Syntens
(The Netherlands)*

Questions & Answers; Discussion

Statements by participants and suggestions for follow up activities

15.30 – 15.45 Coffee break

15.45 – 17.30 Pilot and adaptation: Strategic innovation in the WBC

By Jean Severijns (The Netherlands), interactive Workshop

Questions & Answers; Discussion

Statements by participants and suggestions for follow up activities

17.30 Closure of the first day of the Workshop

20.00 Working Dinner at Restaurant “Stara Kuka”

April 24, 2013

Chair: Rene Wintjes, UNU-MERIT (The Netherlands) and Ulrike
Kunze, German Aerospace Center (Germany)

9.00 – 9.10 Welcome to second day

9.10 – 10.45 Pilot and adaptation: Soft-landing platforms in the WBC Part I

By Radmil Polenakovik, NCDIEL (FYR of Macedonia), Dalibor*

*Marijanovic, BICRO (Croatia) and Wolfgang Kniejski, ini-innovation
(Germany)*

Questions & Answers; Discussion

Statements by participants and suggestions for follow up activities

10.45 – 11.00 Coffee Break

11.00 – 11.45 Pilot and adaptation: Soft-landing platforms in the WBC Part II

By Radmil Polenakovik, NCDIEL (FYR of Macedonia), Dalibor
Marijanovic, BICRO (Croatia) and Wolfgang Kniejski, ini-innovation
(Germany)*

Questions & Answers; Discussion

Statements by participants and suggestions for follow up activities

**11.45 – 12.15 The Nordic model and innovation policy learning in the Western
Balkans**

*By Mark Knell, NIFU - Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation,
Research and Education (Norway)*

Questions & Answers; Discussion

**12.15 – 13.00 Final Discussion: Wrap up and conclusions, Planning for next
steps**

By Rene Wintjes, UNU-MERIT (The Netherlands)

Closing Words

By Imerali Baftijari, Ministry of Economy (FYR of Macedonia)*

13.00 – 14.00 Lunch

Departure

2) List of participants (as of April 19, 2013)

Second review meeting on innovation good practice examples: How to adapt innovation schemes to the Western Balkans - Skopje, April 23 and 24, 2013

NO.	Family Name	Name	Institution	Country	Email-address
1	Ajeti	Kastriot	BSCK	Kosovo*	k.ajeti@bsckosovo.org
2	Arsova-Kostadinova	Suzana	MoE-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	Suzana.a.kostadinova@economy.gov.mk
3	Atanasovska	Violeta	MoS-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	Violeta.Atanasovska@mon.gov.mk
4	Baftijari	Imerali	MoE-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	imerali.baftijari@economy.gov.mk
5	Bajrami	Kushtrim	KEC	Kosovo*	kbajrami@kec-ks.org
6	Belada	Ljiljana	DDSME	Montenegro	ljiljana.bozovic@nasme.me
7	Dhamo	Alda	AIDA	Albania	Alda.Dhamo@aida.gov.al
8	Gjermani	Jonian	AIDA	Albania	Jonian.gjermani@aida.gov.al
9	Hack	Matthias	BMBF	Germany	Matthias.Hack@bmbf.bund.de
10	Knell	Mark	NIFU	Norway	mark.knell@nifu.no
11	Knezevic	Tijana	MESTD	Serbia	tijana.knezevic@mpn.gov.rs
12	Kniejski	Wolfgang	Ini-Novation	Germany	kniejski@ini-novation.com
13	Krsteva	Violeta	State statistical office	FYR of Macedonia**	violeta.krsteva@stat.gov.mk

14	Kunze	Ulrike	DLR	Germany	ulrike.kunze@dlr.de
15	Kutlaca	Djuro	MPI	Serbia	djuro.kutlaca@pupin.rs
16	Ljubicic	Milena	Entrepreneurship center, University of Banja Luka	Bosnia and Herzegovina	milenaljubicic@gmail.com
17	Majstoroska	Jasmina	MoE-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	Jasmina.Majstoroska@economy.gov.mk
18	Marijanovic	Dalibor	BICRO	Croatia	dalibor.marijanovic@bicro.hr
19	Mateska	Ivana	Cabinet of the Deputy Prime Minister	FYR of Macedonia**	Ivana.Mateska@gs.gov.mk
20	Neziri	Mensur	CITT	Kosovo*	mensur.neziri@rks-gov.net
21	Nikolovska	Marina	MoS-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	Marina.Nikolovska@mon.gov.mk
22	Osmanaj	Ukë	MEST	Kosovo*	&ukosmanaj@gmail.com; Uke.Osmanaj @rks-gov.net
23	Petkovska	Stanka	MoS-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	Stanka.Petkovska@mon.gov.mk
24	Polenakovik	Radmil	NCDIEL	FYR of Macedonia**	radmilpolenakovik@yahoo.com ; radmil.polenakovik@ncdiel.mk
25	Popovic-Trajkova	Romela	Cabinet of the Deputy Prime Minister	FYR of Macedonia**	Romela.Popovic@gs.gov.mk
26	Senk	Voijn	UNS	Serbia	vojin_senk@uns.ac.rs
27	Severijns	Jean		Netherlands	jmj.severijns@home.nl
28	Stamnova	Anita	State statistical office	FYR of Macedonia**	anita.stamnova@stat.gov.mk

29	Stankovic	Mirjana	MoS-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	Mirjana.Stankovic@mon.gov.mk
30	Stefani	Kujtime	METE	Albania	Kujtime.Stefani@mete.gov.al
31	Stevanovic	Jelena	MFE	Serbia	jelena.stevanovic@mfp.gov.rs
32	Stojcev	Marijan	APPRM	FYR of Macedonia**	marjan@apprm.gov.mk
33	Stosic	Martin	Cabinet of the Deputy Prime Minister	FYR of Macedonia**	Martin.Stosic@gs.gov.mk
34	Trifunov	Anche	MoE-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	
35	Torbakov	Goran	Cabinet of the Prime Minister	FYR of Macedonia**	goran.torbakov@primeminister.gov.mk
36	Ugrinovska	Leana	Cabinet of the Deputy Prime Minister	FYR of Macedonia**	Leana.Ugrinovska@gs.gov.mk
37	Van Ginneken	Ad	SYNTENS	Netherlands	ad.vanginneken@syntens.nl
38	Vujosevic	Nikola	DDSME	Montenegro	nikola.vujosevic@nasme.me
39	Vukobratovic-Karan	Marina	MESTD	Serbia	marina.vukobratovic@mpn.gov.rs
40	Wintjes	René	UNU-MERIT	Netherlands	r.wintjes@maastrichtuniversity.nl
41	Zlatku	Blerim	MoE-MK	FYR of Macedonia**	

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSC 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

** This term is used according to the project policy in the frame of the EU funded project WBC-INCO.NET.

3) Evaluation form Second Review Meeting

Second review meeting. How to adapt innovation schemes to the Western Balkans
 Skopje, April 23 and 24, 2013

Please express your country's interest in implementation these 4 schemes by ranking them (1 = highest interest, 4 = lowest interest)

Country: _____

Innovation scheme	Interest in implementation (please rank from 1 = highest interest to 4 = lowest interest)	Please provide (if possible) a contact person (name and Email)
Voucher scheme		
Innovation Officer		
Strategic Innovation		
Soft Landing Platform Services		