



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

WAINOVA Assembly 2010 - Summary

Welcome and introduction (Luis Sanz). Participants are welcomed and the concept of the WAINOVA Assembly explained. For the benefit of Jose Freitas, Luis Sanz made a brief presentation about WAINOVA and how part of its mission is to provide global linkages and networking opportunities between the respective memberships. Forming this network of science and technology park and business incubator networks provides recognition of their necessary role in the industry and allows each association to learn and share ideas with others.

Mr. Jose Freitas

(Policy officer, Enterprise and Industry Directorate General, European Commission)

Jose Freitas discussed how the European Commission are developing programmes related to science and technology parks and business incubators and how they are looking at ways in which to improve connections with science parks, offering renewed policy leadership for this industry.

He introduced the European Enterprise Network which is the body of support for European SMEs based in technology and innovation. This network consists of 43 countries associated with 560 SMEs, with the countries including various outside of Europe such as China, Israel and USA.

The European Union is looking towards a new momentum for STPs in Europe. They would like to get more high tech projects and innovation in Europe and STPs are well suited to working in this area. Much support is given already to mainstream SME companies, but with a budget of 20million euros this is looking to be expanded in order to support other projects. Right now the EU is looking to open dialogues in order to discuss ideas for funding. Although DG enterprise department plays a small role in the entire innovation budget (over the last 7 years over 100 billion was spent) they can help in the ideas and shaping of these.

They see science parks as regional and local innovation eco systems, not just nurturing tenant firms but playing a key role in the innovation system and the EU would like to build on this. Jose Freitas explains the various dimensions of what science parks would need to do in order to strengthen their role as knowledge organizations for innovation and the important role of the science park managing team. This managing team could become more active in dealing with the knowledge generated in their parks and 'constituencies', and their regions and develop the concept of becoming service providers in the global market. The EU would encourage STPs to become more involved in public programmes, and network with other innovation-related bodies (such as the bodies linked to Enterprise Europe Network).

Jose Freitas asks how STPs can best fit in with European innovation system, as currently there are many bodies, parks, innovation support centres, and therefore understands the need for parks and therefore their associations to play a greater role. Although no concrete solutions could be given, some ideas put forward for providing more support from the EU was in the form of professional training for managers (even if not specifically focused on STPs), website



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

platform with resources, and mentions that although the STP industry is already very well established they see an opportunity for working together at a European level, increasing visibility of STPs outside of the industry. He highlights the importance of providing and developing more added-value jobs and working on the technology and development leading to this - this can be focused on the emerging industries, smart growth and green growth. He anticipates room for supporting these areas and high-tech in general, using STPs as a partner.

He presents the current programmes in place for promoting clusters and innovation, and how they have been working on innovation management tools and suggests there is room for WAINVOA to engage in the promotion and development of these and other programmes. The Commission believes that a new area is opening up with a greater focus on innovation and the current fund will probably be increased in order to incorporate this and related activities. This refers to Innovation Union 2011, which will be working on partnerships and improving the European Innovation system.

He concludes his presentation returning to the idea of working on STPs becoming a service provider to the global market. The EC sees STPs as a way of providing knowledge to others, and that they could do more as acting as brokers of the knowledge-base of their constituencies, sharing the STP tenants work and knowledge; and secondly the EC sees STPs doing things based on the Guggenheim model, although starting in New York, they now have affiliates all over the world. Jose Frietas emphasises that he is still just sharing thoughts on matter, but would look forward to future dialogues in order to develop any ideas.

Presentation of Madrid Network - new member of WAINOVA

Carlos Blanco - Director of Technology, Madrid Network

Madrid Network is an entity recently created with the intention to improve the innovation system in Madrid, looking to place Madrid in a more competitive status and by being international not just national.

In Spain 2% of GDP is spend on R&D and the government is looking to increase this to 4% in ten years, which links with one of the main goals that Madrid Network wishes to achieve. They aim to merge the triple Helix entities - industry, university and administration. Madrid Network is an initiative of IMADE and therefore in this way is linked with Government. Madrid Network comprises over 600 bodies, including institutions and universities. The two main arms are clusters (x 12) and technology parks (x 6) and each follow a strategic path that was outlined some years ago focusing on 12 main sectors: aerospace; renewable energy; security, financial; audiovisual; automotion; biotechnology; tourism; graphics; logistics and Spanish language.

Madrid Network regards itself as a service provider, as an umbrella entity for all of those companies and organisations in the network. They provide financial or tax advice etc, but the main services are detection of new projects and business and thus increasing business figures of the institutions in the network. There is also a networking service which is obvious but is



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

very important, and essential for the smaller companies allowing everyone to mix with other sectors.

There is very good infrastructure in Spain, such as high speed trains and airports etc, and Madrid Network talks with companies behind these large projects and can connect them to other regions all over the world. Madrid Network frequently works with other countries to help with infrastructure in their countries. They also have technological projects - they are now financing 15 projects in very specific sectors via the regional development agency, trying to increase and promote innovation in the region.

TOPIC 1: Sponsorship for science park and incubator associations - What are good strategies for getting sponsorship? How much money can be obtained from this?

Luis Sanz (IASP)

IASP is new at sponsorship as a whole. Previously it was something that was not needed and also conferences are often one of the main items available for sponsorship but as it is an IASP member that organizes the event and thus looks for their own sponsors, this is not so easy for IASP as an association.

Why is the IASP looking at sponsorship now? IASP needs more money, as membership fees cannot cover everything and members want new and improved services. IASP has dedicated some time to learn and to discuss options with experts and people with experience in this field as it was felt that before knocking on doors a comprehensive strategy was needed. IASP now has this strategy which covers the main things on offer, but a final value still needs to be placed. Value for money is still a great mystery and something that needs to be tested. Things that are attractive for sponsors overall: conferences; database; knowledge based assessment tool called the IASP Strategigram, which is proving to be very interesting; workshops; many links to many companies; IASP's global nature... In fact, all WAINOVA associations deal with interesting, exciting, and relevant concepts - innovation, technology, green - all of which are hot right now and if used well would be a good hook for potential sponsors. Luis Sanz explains that this is the basic outline of what is on offer, but it is still to be determined to who this should be targeted - medium-large companies? public bodies?

Other issues to be dealt with are whether IASP should be offered as a whole, or separate elements to offer partial sponsorships. Both have their pros and cons, although corporate sponsorships may be easier to handle initially, the ongoing maintenance can be very delicate. Picking the right company is crucial because inevitably your name gets associated with that brand.

Following on with this strategy, IASP has received some interest in sponsorships, but have not entered into negotiations yet. The main problem now is to determine market value, but for IASP sponsorship must become one of the important avenues of income revenues in years to come.



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

Eileen Walker (AURP)

Eileen Walker discussed AURP's experience with sponsorships, and thought it important to understand where each is coming from; she asks each association representative to explain their situation:

AURP: From founding 25 years ago AURP has always been involved in sponsorship raising and sponsorship forms a major pillar of how the association is supported. Non-profit associations in the USA typically are not supported by the government.

RPTE: No experience with private sponsorship, all government funding.

XPCAT: Mainly government supported and have not had any private funding. They tried once with a specialised company, with the intention to provide sponsors, but had no success. Joan Bellavista highlighted that perhaps this was not the right company, but it was not a good experience.

SiSP: Have no experience of sponsorship, only for yearly conferences where local companies are sponsors.

APTE: So far have no private funding. They see it as a possible option in the future, but it is difficult right now given the economic situation.

TPANZ: No experience in sponsorship apart from conference organisation on an annual basis

QRPTA: Receives no sponsorship from any private source, but does receive sponsorship from governments.

Madrid Network: Have experience in both areas.

IASP: (as explained)

AURP: Eileen Walker adds that they are now following the idea of looking at public funding

RETIS: They have public sponsorship from French ministries, and have sponsorship from private companies for events/workshops etc.

ANPROTEC: Receive partial sponsorship - for conferences. This is both public and private funding for this, in theory destined for conference but can be used as you see fit. Also ANPROTEC has several contracts with governmental institutions which acts a supporting agency for many of our projects.

UKSPA: The association would not exist without sponsorship, and up to 40% of overheads are covered by sponsorship. There is no support from the national or local government. Up to 1 day a week is spent negotiating deals and UKSPA takes what they can. They have a lot of experience in this area and also spend a lot of time on contra-deals - for example, getting IT services for free in return for brand exposure.



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

ADT: Receive no financial support from government. They hold two member assemblies per year and use these to get financial support. These events are organised by members and the host tries to find financial support, and also ADT finds financial support. This can be very hard work and depends very much on region where the assemblies are held.

RETA: Benefits from significant support from the regional government and European development funds, but have had a severe cut in this government support in recent years. They have no experience with private sponsorship.

EBN: They have been one of the forerunners in getting public money and until end of 90s went well. They do not regard this so much 'sponsoring' and don't like to use this word. This is because they are very active in getting service contracts and position the association as a service provider. For private sponsorship they have had some experience and were lucky around the year 2000 and got some big deals, and whilst these were good cash-wise but didn't lead anywhere afterwards. Difficult with the conference where members are the host, and difficult to name value of what is on offer. Nowadays they almost end up losing money on some deals and a lot of time and money spend on gaining credibility and providing support and value to sponsors.

BASTIC: Only recently a formal legal ass, no sponsorship as such, but do have labeled events where there is support from companies and association members provide sponsors, either financially or in technical support.

Overall it can be seen that some associations may have more support than others, but post-crisis the most important element is value, and unless the sponsorship package is well designed and delivered then sponsors will not be satisfied.

Participants differentiated between public funding and sponsorship. Sponsors are looking for value for their money and it is important to establish what levels to sell. Sometimes focusing on a range of levels is better than one large deal as then you are not left with a hole afterwards if things don't work out. The most important issue is to quantify your association's reach and looking at it in a global sense assessing your benefits to a sponsor. The standard elements available such as logo exposure, e-letters, presentations, and events, do not really constitute what is 'on sale'. What is really on offer are the deals sponsors can make with members. The association enables these deals and partnerships, and in this case 50,000 euro is nothing compared to a potential deal. As well as these differences outlined, there are also differences between sponsorship and a business project. For example, arranging business meetings etc for your sponsor which then turns into something even more added-value.

However, dealing with sponsorship requires a serious amount of human resources. It needs structure too and the ideal situation is if this structure is embedded in your team rather than being outsourced as you need intimate knowledge of the product on offer, in this case the association. Much effort is needed in making sure you deliver what is promised and maintaining relationship and in keeping track of what is being given. Sponsors nowadays want an absolute return on investment, and therefore you should have a tracking system in place in



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

order to follow the referrals, deals and contacts going on. Even though the sponsors are not 'investors' they seem to regard it like that, and demand to see value for money. Therefore, do you hire someone else to do this in order to prove that value? And up to what point do you spend the money you gain from sponsorship in paying someone to manage them?

In any case, your staff attitude is very important the person handling the sponsors must have high level functions and be fully aware of the association's values and mission statement. Up to 33% of income can be covered by private sponsorship and so therefore training is very important for the staff but also for Board members who must be kept fully informed and aware of who is who.

The matter of sponsor hunters is difficult, as you have to maintain sponsors and manage them, not just find them. Expectations have to be managed and carefully handled and Business Development Officers (or equivalent) are very valuable in doing this job. Even though sponsor hunters can open doors and then you manage the sponsor from there, the overall consensus is that you may as well start off with someone in your team, which avoids mismanagement and a lack of control.

TOPIC 2: Data collection - to what extent do other associations collect and manage data from their membership, how do they do it, what it is used for?

Paul Wright (UKSPA) (also see PowerPoint presentation and accompanying documentation)

Within parks there are many companies and there is a great amount of data available here and UKSPA is the only one in a position to access this data and information from the science parks and their tenants. They receive frequent requests for information - knowledge about sectors, performance of one park vis-a-vis another, etc. You need data, information and knowledge in order to manage the innovation landscape. The important thing to remember is that this is not just data collection, but what you do with it is crucial as to how you translate it into knowledge. In addition to this, science park members need help to manage data and help to understand their own parks.

Paul Wright explains that over the past 20 years they have had a wholly paper system for their statistics and surveys, asking the same questions over this period of time, resulting in a paper overload in order to create annual statistics. UKSPA only had a 40% response rate which therefore means that the data collected may not have been all that representative or up to date.

From here UKSPA developed a new system to collect and collate data from parks. As UKSPA is a small association, staff-wise they therefore need to manage time and human resources well, and moving from a paper system to electronic helps this.

A key element for obtaining data was to contact parks on the right level - often information can come from someone else in a park team in order to improve data collection. They had found that up to 1 in 5 parks were 'disconnected' from the network and so UKSPA collected



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

data on their behalf. By 2008 this system was this online, the technology provided by a tenant in a science park - high value at no cost. UKSPA experienced an increase in data returns, up to 75%, and the UKSPA office filled in the blanks. It is here where this data can be turned into useful information and can now produce annual statistics - the same as before, but more informed, and now with the electronic system which can be analyzed and data can be extracted. This previously was not possible.

From this data management tool UKSPA can now provide a service to members but they wanted to go another stage further. Following interviews and workshops on data collection they found some negative responses, saying that although this survey data was interesting reading, it had no real use, or simply that the parks were not implementing it as a tool, finding that parks seemed to have no sense of urgency in performance measurement. However, they were interested in the impact on the economy and comparing their financial performance to other parks, and understand their performance in comparison to other parks in the region.

UKSPA have now developed a new tenants database, containing data on the 3,300 tenants, and as well as collecting the 'normal' data they also have information on the technology sectors and application areas - the knowledge of all these tenants and what they are doing. Although still a way from integrating this in the data management system, there is a lot of data to hand, and will be reproduced in a tenants directory in 2011. This directory is open to all - available to members but also to tenants, where it can provide information to tenants about their sectors or other sectors and this is a service provided directly to tenants.

With regards to the maintenance of this data, the IT solutions provider has provided a technology that enables UKSPA to automatically be notified to any changes in data (as taken from website).

Philippe Vanrie (EBN) (also see PowerPoint presentations)

EBN's key strategy is to build a strong community very focused on enablers, ECBICs, and they try to model specifications on how each of these organisations operate. EBN collects data and then sends it back with comments and ideas for improvement. This forms part of a structured platform of services to members.

Because this is an industry which is not so easy to describe, some time was taken over defining the core business of BICs, and EBN have developed this over years, not only to get to micro-specifications but also looking at social missions to look at what each one was doing. A problem in Europe is everyone is in a grey zone of intermediaries - there is not enough specification of deliverables. Everyone is doing everything and this supposes a problem for policy makers and planners. Describing a complex mission requires a complex specification.

BICs are innovation based incubators but as well as this, this description can be linked with a brand. In this case, the European Commission have allowed EBN to accredit these BICs with a



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

brand and a standard. This enables EBN to measure performance and to create an efficient data collection system.

This means that it is a quality system - an overall quality in a community of enablers. This protects the integrity of the label and the match between perception and reality. In order to sell this idea to members it is simply that it gives EBN and their members access to benchmarking, access to monitoring tool, and strategic thinking for business analysis tools. This allows managers to place themselves within the community via these marketing tools and can base this data from an EC accredited system.

By having this information to hand, EBN can present data to the EC and explain areas which need improvement, put forward ideas etc and have evidence to support what they are saying. This motivates people to get involved.

This is a tool to measure the performance of tenants. If you want to stay an accredited EBN full member, you must fill in the necessary information. All of it is based on self assessment tools, which means EBN trusts self-integrity of the BICs and in cases where this is not so, it is quickly detected. This information produces a database where BIC managers can be benchmarked next to other equivalents and come back with 20 key indicators in order to compare and contrast.

As well as this, the data can be used for many other things such as workshops, groups, newsletters. Master classes and training programmes have been reinvented on the basis of the data collected and this material forms the basis of training sessions for BIC managers.

All associations encounter the same problem: members love statistics but hate surveys. One of the problems is also that collection of data in science parks can be hard to compare as there are so many changes year on year. Another option would be to use a customer evaluation system and basing data and information on an internal customer satisfaction index rather than comparing parks from one country to another - comparing between regions, constituents.

It is difficult to gather a lot of data, and also the potential data is endless - a wise approach may be to narrow the type of data gathered, but then add intelligence to this data and thereby can offer more benefit to members by doing this - more than statistics. This is in fact a core business for an association such as those in WAINOVA.

A problem with this, especially with larger networks, is if you narrow the data to basic information, you risk having poor data. Ease and flexibility is important but you need good results. Even within national associations there are many different types of organisation where even at the same level, they do different things. When you think about implementing different surveys for different skills and areas this is clearly very difficult.



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

An association can deliver 3 things - indications about basic metrics to newcomers; statistics to managers, who are constantly seeking optimisation; and until this data existed, one could not feel comfortable presenting the STP situation without back-up - it provides security.

Despite it being difficult to collect data, all STPs essentially have the same data, it's just a matter of finding a way of accessing it - e.g. UKSPA extracting data from websites. In order to gather data, you have to find a way on insisting on it with the members - in the common interest for everyone. Once obtained, this data is essential - many parks don't know about other sectors, but if you have this information to provide them, this can lead to joint ventures, helping tenants and business development.

TOPIC 3: Association finance management - Sharing any ideas for income generation: How do others cope? What do associations do if they do not receive government funding of any kind?

David Fuller (TPANZ) (also see PowerPoint presentation)

David Fuller explains that with TPANZ he will be demonstrating the bottom end of scale financially speaking - and that they are currently in deconstruction mode, and an association in transformation. Australia is such a big country, the tyranny of distance is a severe impediment for getting people together, and at the moment TPANZ has 6 members representing 7 states (previously they had many more members). Some member parks are 30-40 years old and others are less than 5 years old resulting in two generations of parks. Some of the older ones are landlocked, and the energy and passion for the STP world is declining resulting in being more real estate operations.

TPANZ has drifted from being a formal association to being informal, and therefore now has no staff or assets and is run on the basis of working from the offices of the members. Members get together and discuss issues that they may have in common, but at the moment there are no means, or interest, in having formal conferences.

Therefore this is an example of going back before going forwards. So far there are no pressing financial issues, just need to survive, produce basic information and services and once TPANZ has collected more members and funding then they can build on these services and grow.

They reduced membership fees from 1000 AUD to 200 AUD, reflecting the type of meetings and activities which were really more of an informal gathering of friends. It is not much of a challenge to stay solvent as they have very few costs. TPANZ has a basic website, and relies on the offices of universities and state governments (not national government which doesn't yet have a well defined policy regarding STPs). TPANZ members get together and work on agendas and policies in innovation systems. They are now moving away from the idea of conferences, into themed workshops. Currently officially speaking only the President and Secretary of TPANZ are working on maintenance of the association; this is the end of one life cycle, and the beginning of another.



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

Therese Sjölundh (SiSP) (also see PowerPoint presentation)

SiSP is also in another part of life cycle and is also on a smaller scale than some other associations. SiSP was a voluntary association until this summer, when it was formalised (Therese Sjölundh has now passed Chairmanship over to Hans Müller) and for a long time have been trying to do a lot on not much money.

They realized they needed to move on to next step, the association was receiving 50% finances from membership, and 50% from the government (which also meant a lot more work). They decided to raise the membership fees. As it is always complicated, they thought why not just take a big move and double them, and inform members of how they will get value for money. And so SiSP membership fees went from 1,000 euro to 2,000 and all except one member have stayed with them. This success has been due to the fact that previously they had been promised too much, and now what is offered is more realistic. They have now reduced activities, but they are more focused - passed from 4 meetings to 2; implemented a peer review programme; STP development programme; working groups to discuss specific issues; lobbying activities; publications (with statistics and presentations of parks).

SiSP has now set a platform and can now work as a more efficient body to work on behalf of members, and this was exactly how the raise in fees have been argued. This also means that a managing director, Magnus Lundin, has now been employed to run the association on a day-to-day basis.

Where does the finance come from in each association?

IASP: Roughly 40% from membership fees; 7% subventions, government funding; 53% projects, conference etc.

ADT: 50% membership fees; 30% projects/publications etc; 20%

UKSPA: 30% sponsorship; 50% membership fees; 20% publications etc

EBN: 40% membership fees; 40% projects (mainly public origin); 20% other activities

ANPROTEC: Roughly - 25% membership fees; 50% seminars and sponsorship; approx 10-15% training activities.

APTE: 60/70% membership fees; 30/40% public funding

QRPTA: 40% membership fees and projects; 60% subsidies

RETIS: 60% membership fees; 10-15% public funding; 25-30% sponsorship/services

RETA: 85% from regional government; 15% from national government or European programmes

XPCAT: 50% projects; 40% government funding; 10% fees

BASTIC: 100% membership fees



WAINOVA

World Alliance for Innovation

Participant list

	Organisation	Representative	Email address
1	ADT	Andrea Glaser	glaser@adt-online.de
2	ANPROTEC	Ary Plonski	Plonski2@usp.br
3	APTE	Soledad Díaz	sdiaz@apte.org
4	AURP	Eileen Walker	eileenwalker@mac.com
5	BASTIC	Raivo Tamkivi	Raivo.tamkivi@tehnpol.ee
6	EBN	Philippe Vanrie	pva@ebn.be
7	European Commission	Jose Freitas	Jose.Freitas@ec.europa.eu
8	IASP	Luis Sanz	Sanz@iasp.ws
9	IASP	Ebba Lund	lund@iasp.ws
10	IASP	Alicia Shelley	Shelley@iasp.ws
11	IMADE	Aurelio Garcia de Sola	aurelio.garciadesola@imade.es
12	IMADE	Alicia Hinojosa	ahinojosa@imade.es
13	Madrid Network	Jaime del Castillo	jaimedelcastillo@infyde.eu
14	Madrid Network	Carlos Blanco	Carlos.blanco@madridnetwork.org
15	QRPTA	Mario Monette	mmonette@technoparc.com
16	QRPTA	Pierre Belanger	pbelanger@sherbrooke-innopole.com
17	RETA	Lourdes Cruz	lcruz@reta.es
18	RETIS	Jean-Francois Balducci	Balducci@atlanpole.fr
19	RPTE	Francisco Berjón	Fberjon@parque-tecnologico.net
20	RPTE	Marian Ibarrondo	mibarrondo@parque-tecnologico.net
21	SiSP	Therese Sjölundh	Therese.sjolundh@sisp.se
22	TPANZ	David Fuller	dfuller@uow.edu.au
23	UKSPA	Paul Wright	Paul.wright@ukspa.org.uk
24	UKSPA	Jim Duvall	Jim.duvall@ukspa.org.uk
25	XPCAT	Joan Bellavista	jbellavista@pcb.ub.es

(Martin Maximian from Tecparques (Portugal) was unable to join the group at due to flight problems).