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Reflecting the first ten years of transnational cooperation in the centrope region at the interface of Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary and the Slovakia, the centrope policy seminar dealt with different aspects of multi-level governance: Models of institutional governance, the EU structural framework for transnational cooperation and the development of transnational regions in public-private partnership were discussed with representatives from the centrope region, other transnational regions and the European Commission.

Welcome and Introduction
Karl-Heinz Lambertz, President of Association of European Border Regions

Part 1  Transnational cooperation in polycentric metropolitan areas.
Lessons from the centrope region – achievements, best practices, flaws
• Kurt Puchinger, representative of centrope capacity Lead Partner Vienna
• František Kubeš, City of Brno, Office for City Strategy
• Johannes Lutter, centrope capacity Project Coordinator

Reflections by peer exchange initiatives partners from
• Euregio Meuse-Rhine: Björn Koopmans, Stichting Euregio Maas-Rhein
• Grande Region: Jean Claude Sinner, Ministry for Regional Development and Infrastructure, Luxemburg
• Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai: Stef Vande Meulebroucke, Agence de l'Eurométropole
Part 2  EU structural framework for transnational cooperation

- EGTC in practice – a suitable model for transnational governance?  
  Stef Vande Meulebroucke, Eurometropolis Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai  
  Jean Claude Sinner, Grande Region

- Responses by the European Commission  
  Michael Ralph, Adviser to the Deputy Director-General DG REGIO

- Making the most of ERDF funding – experiences of the Euregio Meuse-Rhine, INTERREG – EMR  
  Björn Koopmans, Euregio Meuse-Rhine

- Towards integrated territorial development in complex transnational regions – a centrope perspective on the 2014-2020 programme period  
  Alexander Wolffhardt, centrope Coordination Office

- Responses by the European Commission  
  Michael Ralph, Adviser to the Deputy Director-General DG REGIO

Part 3  Developing transnational metropolitan regions in public-private partnership

Public and private stakeholders in interaction. Developing effective strategies and translating them into activities

- Richard Schmitz, Vice-President Chamber of Industry and Commerce Karlsruhe and former Director of Brenner’s Park-Hotel & Spa, Baden-Baden and Jürgen Oser, Regional Council Freiburg, cross-border cooperation and European Affairs

- Ann-Sofie Andersson, Medicon Valley Alliance, Öresund Region

- Ralf Meyer, Regional development agency for the Technology Region Aachen (ELAT Eindhoven Leuven Aachen-triangle)
B  Key issues raised in the debate

- Multi-stakeholder involvement is essential for success: Next to the initiating public authorities (regions, cities) the national level, civil society and the market place must equally become engaged in the development of cross-border regions.

- No ideal model exists for the development of cooperation structures and each region must find its own way; however, comprehensive stakeholder involvement at the earliest possible stage seems indispensable.

- Trans-boundary cooperation is best conceived as supporting a process of metropolisation in polycentric regions, including a new approach to urban planning for metropolisation.

- Political commitment needs to be maintained beyond the initiating stage throughout the whole process. Primary goal of lobbying efforts must be the partner regions themselves, in order to keep them on board.

- The implementation of development strategies, future visions and the like is the actual testing ground for sustainability, regardless of the energy that may have flown into the process of formulating such strategies.

- Also in multilateral (three-country, four-country) cross-border regions most problems to be solved are essentially bilateral and a matter for only some of the partners – multilateral frameworks must allow for such “cooperation within the cooperation”.
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1. Within the framework of the overall theme of our conference, I want to talk about two issues:

2. 
   - Governance and
   - Sustainability without subsidies

But before going more into detail, let me remind you of some factors in the history of CENTROPE.

It was politically initiated in 2003 as a statement for cooperation between regions of Member States and non Member States. Since 2004, after the extension of the EU, it was a cooperation project between regions of an old MS and regions of new MS, living with a high dynamic of changes in administrative structures and the related persons in the new MS and a Schengen Border in between. Since 1st May 2011, when the labour market regulations in Austria finally ended, we can say we had at the first time working conditions on eye-level since then, for one and a half year.
So, I think we have to relate our “lessons learned” to these changing situations.

Talking about governance first of all needs a “reality check” about the nature of CENTROPE and the abilities of the stakeholders involved. CENTROPE started, as already mentioned, with a political “big bang” to initiate a cooperation process, using EU subsidies for a process-supporting multilateral INTERREG project.

The main question seems to be, what can regional authorities of different states directly contribute to the development of such a process, which aims at the general promotion of prosperity and quality of life?

We know that at least two things are possible:

- actions with a positive, harmonising impact at the framework-conditions for projects of the civil society and the business world, as far as there is formal competence available, and
- offering services, which can support and motivate national stakeholders, the business sector and the civil society to cooperate in reaching public goals, trying to facilitate a series of win-win situations.

Principally there is an unlimited potential for actions in the second field, and a very limited potential in the first one, because of different constitutional situations in the countries. The City of Vienna e.g. is member of the Conference of European Regions with Legislative Power. There is no similar situation in the rest of the CENTROPE region.
This seems to be a general limitation for cross-border cooperation projects, unfortunately in the core business of regional authorities, which has a crucial interface with the issue of “sustainability” of a cooperation project. The solution of this dilemma can be thought twofold:

- inclusion of central decision makers at the national level in the implementation of a regional project, or
- developing of a governance system at regional level for early as possible inclusion of non-governmental stakeholders in the process of regional cooperation.

Experience shows, that the second perspective is promising, because the process and only the process has the potential of sustainability, projects are ending and normally in parallel with the ending of subsidies and the interest of central national units to participate in regional projects is very limited.

So, the orientation at the development of a governance structure to manage a regional cooperation process including public and non-public elements is one of the main lessons learned, but needs as a prerequisite a correct, but also relaxed and robust relation between public authorities and the market, or the civil society, a relation which can be improved in Austria also in a lot of our neighbouring countries and even on European Program level.

So we all know that political commitment to a project, especially when public money is involved, must not be calculated as a stability factor in cross border regional cooperation. It seems to be true, that national public spending for transnational activities needs a very high European political consciousness, needs a political perspective and a long term view concerning the famous “value added”, which is not coming up in form of a successful performance at the next elections on community or regional level within some months.

Learned, that political commitment in this context is a factor of instability, it cannot be the aim to focus activities to reach a stable political ownership of the process. Stability in the ownership of the cooperation process more successfully can be found in the world of the civil society and the private sector, supported continuously by the administration and from time to time by the political sector. That means, that for sustainability reasons the main cost and a big part of ownership has to be sourced out from the public to the private sector, within a governance framework which secures an eye level cooperation between both sides as well as cross border.

We tried to prepare such a structure and procedure and a movement from project to process in the last 18 months of CENTROPE, the only period in the history of the project, where all partners could work on equal terms. And I am very optimistic, that it will work, because with ending of the subsidised project we are free in choosing the composition of stake holders, a freedom which is not given under the ERDF regulations. Mixed partner structures are not very appreciated in ETC projects, but unfortunately this seems to be the only guarantee for sustainability in cross border regional cooperation.

Conclusions
From a professional point of view, based on a lot of experience and some theory like “finding the truth in facts”, cross border regional cooperation has to be understood as an inclusive process, including from the beginning public and private stakeholders.

Subsidised ERDF projects, even excellent designed, should not be misunderstood as the process itself. Projects, if they allow following the inclusion principle, can highly support the development of such a process. Governance structures can be prepared within a project, but must be performed in the real world.

Cooperation needs stakeholders who can take over responsibilities autonomous, without dependence on decisions of a higher level, which is not a direct part of the cooperation process. This is a well known prerequisite of any group dynamic procedure, this is a well known prerequisite since Robert Axelrod published his famous book “The evolution of cooperation” in 1984. He asked the basic question:

“Under what conditions will cooperation emerge in a world of egoists without central authority?”

As long as regional authorities do have only a limited autonomy to decide upon cooperation, the sustainability of a project mainly owned by regional public authorities remains an open question.

As argued already earlier, regional cross border cooperation projects and the related subsidy programs should take this into account and should open the opportunity to design projects with a mixed stakeholder structure from the very beginning, if sustainability remains a highly important factor in project proposal evaluation.

And I think it should.
Transnational cooperation in polycentric metropolitan areas: Lessons from centrope

Johannes Lutter, centrope capacity project coordinator
František Kubeš
City of Brno, Office for City Strategy
GDP per capita at Purchasing Power Parities
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Factor of success

» High-ranking political commitment
Factor of success
» Joint financing & implementation
Partner engagement

Factor of success

» Continuity in staff resources
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**centrope** before 2009

- **CZ**
- **SK**
- **AT**
- **HU**

**centrope** after 2009

- **CZ**
- **SK**
- **AT**
- **HU**
Factor of success

» Multi-sectoral approach
Factor of success

» A transnational perspective

FDI per 1000 inhabitants

Period: 2003 – March 2010
Employment rates by age groups in centrope (2010, in %)

Development of unemployment rates in centrope (2000-2010, in %)
**Education Structure of the Workforce**

- EU27
  - Tertiary Education: 15.4%
  - Secondary Education: 20.0%
  - Low Education: 62.0%

- CENTROPE
  - Tertiary Education: 42.9%
  - Secondary Education: 62.0%
  - Low Education: 22.6%

**Education levels of immigrants & emigrants**

- Natives
  - High Skilled: 23.1%
  - Medium Skilled: 35.4%
  - Low Skilled: 21.7%

- Immigrants from rest of the world
  - High Skilled: 64.2%
  - Medium Skilled: 17.3%
  - Low Skilled: 53.4%

- Emigrants
  - High Skilled: 12.7%
  - Medium Skilled: 17.3%
  - Low Skilled: 25.0%
Factor of success

» Joint strategy development
Factor of success
» Multi-level dialogue
Factor of success

» Develop lobbying power
Factor of success

» Visible results
Factor of success

» Stakeholder mobilisation
Strategic cooperation – example
Automotive Cluster centrope

Factor of success
» Awareness
Strategic cooperation
Tourism marketing application: www.tourcentrope.eu
Eurometropolis Lille – Kortrijk – Tournai & its strategic program 2014-2020
a metropolitan and territorial crossborder strategy

Stef Vande Meulebroucke – Directeur général

24/10/12
## Competence levels involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRAIN</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National / Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAM/METRO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERWAY</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLE</td>
<td>Regional / Local</td>
<td>Regional / Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>Regional / Local</td>
<td>Regional / Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Top-down

- **European Level**
  - 1 States
  - 2 Regional
  - 3 Provincial
  - 4 Intermunicipal

### Bottom-up

- Mayor’s conference
- Forum of Civil society
Strategic Program 2014-2020 : objectives

- Choosing the fundamental priorities of the Eurometropolis EGTC for the period 2014-2020

- Articulate at best the UE 2020 strategy with the territorial cross border needs

- Once elaborated, the strategy will be the base for making the priorities of the Eurometropolis clear to all representatives of the relevant European Operational Programmes
Strategic Program 2014-2020: first orientations

- Develop the economic potential of the Eurometropolis
  - Renforce InnovEurometropolis & the 4 chosen eurometropolitan topclusters
  - Create a (more) integrated cross border labour market
- Strengthen the internal transport and the external accessibility
- Develop the blue and green network as a framework for territorial valuation and attractivity

Eurométropole - Eurometropool

Eurometropolis 2014-2020

areas with a transversal multiplicator impact:
- culture
- tourism
- energy/climate
- health/socio-medical

Develop the economic potential concentrating on intelligent specialization and an integrated cross border labor market

Strengthen internal transport and external accessibility

Develop the blue and green network as a framework for territorial valuation and attractivity
The Proximity Europe

starts in places like

www.eurometropolis.eu
EGTC Secretariat of the Summit of the Greater Region

Jean-Claude Sinner

Ministry for Sustainable Development and Infrastructure
- Spatial Planning Department -

1995 – 2009 in charge of cross-border cooperation

Notification Authority for EGTC
( Art. 4 of Reg. 1082/2006 )
The Greater Region

1 independent MS: Luxembourg

2 German Länder: Saarland and Rheinland-Pfalz

3 Belgian entities: the Walloon Region, the French Speaking Community and the German Speaking Community

4-5 French actors:
- the State (Préfecture de Région)
- the Conseil Régional de Lorraine
- the Conseils Généraux Meurthe-et-Moselle and Moselle (and Meuse).
Some statistics

- Area: 65,400 sq. km
- Population: 11,4 million
- Density: 173 l/sq. km (from 100 to 409)
- Total GDP: 315 billion €

Main problems:
- Big economic differences between Luxembourg and surrounding parts;
- Cross-border commuting to Luxembourg: over 150,000 p.;
- No big cities > Cross-border polycentric metropolitan area
- Partners have quite different competences

Institutions

Based on an international Agreement from 2005
(replacing an older one of 1980)

- “Summit of the Greater Region”
- prepared by a WP of Personal representatives of the Members of the Summit (Senior Officers);
- and thematic and ad-hoc WP;
- an Economic and Social Council
- an Assembly of Parliamentarians, and and and

- It is mainly a top-down cooperation
Current management

Rotating Presidency (2 years) manages the whole process:
- Meetings (chair, logistics and content)
- Staffing
- Financing

- Greater Region has no budget!!

- Need to create a certain continuity, mainly on staff issues
- Need to assure a common financing on a permanent basis

Objectives on the EGTC

The objective is to be the secretariat of the Summit of the Greater Region

- Not a secretariat for the Greater Region
- The Greater Region is not the EGTC

- Membership is linked to membership in the Summit
- EGTC shall be based in Luxembourg
Administrative Facts

- Membership is based on 5 territories, as well as funding
- The Director comes from the Rotation Presidency
- Besides that a “gérant” and other staff, including translators
  - Statutes foresee a current budget
  - and a project budget

Added value

- EGTC is a first step
- Better transition between the Rotating Presidencies
- EGTC is the employer
- EGTC assures the financing of the cooperation process
- But has no political role
Other EGTC in Luxembourg and the Greater Region

- EGTC to manage the Interreg A program «Greater Region» (the only one in Europe)
- EGTC Belval-Alzette: Brownfield regeneration at the French border
- EGTC Secretariat of the Summit
- EGTC EUKN having only Member States as members
Centrope policy seminar
13/11/2012 @ Brussels

Making the most of ERDF funding
experiences of the EMR

Björn Koopmans
coordinator Euregio Meuse-Rhine

Please note that the views expressed here aren’t necessarily the views of the EMR
Outline presentation

1. Introduction Interreg EMR

2. Reflection 20 years Interreg

3. Perspective 2014-2020
1. Introduction Interreg EMR

Eligible area

Priorities

Budget

Process
Eligible area

EUREGIO

MAAS-RIJN • MAAS-RHEIN • MEUSE-RHIN

Administrative Delimitation = Administrative Gliederung = Division Administrative

Foundation = 5 partner regions

INTERREG EMR = 14 program partners

European Union supports this project through the INTERREG IV-A programme. The European Union invests in your future.

Conc. www.citizencom.com
Priorities: 65% EU Lisbon/Gothenburg goals

Strengthening of the economic structure, promotion of knowledge, innovation and creation of more and better jobs
entrepreneurship * competitiveness * technology * R2B * labour market * tourism
65%

Nature and environment, energy, natural resources and mobility
nature and landscape * renewable energy resources * local public transport
18%

Quality of life
cultural diversity * public safety * health care * labour market mobility
11%

Technical assistance
technical assessment of proposals and monitoring of projects
6%

Budget: 72 million EUR (ERDF) => 144 million EUR
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS
INTERREG IV A EMR PROJECTS!

Project idea

Submission of trilingual project draft to RA

DRAFT CALL

Discussion of draft in JTS meeting

First joint consultation of draft in „GO/NO GO session“ of OP partners

Official submission of application form to JTS, talking account of remarks of OP partners

Technical evaluation by JTS and check of compatibility with OP partners

Second „GO/NO GO session“ of OP partners

Official decision is taken by monitoring committee

RA  Regional Antenna
MA  Managing Authority
JTS  Joint Technical Secretariat (+ MA + RA)
OP  Operational Programme
2. Reflection 20 years Interreg

from I to IV - overview

from I to IV - assessment
From I to IV - overview

4 generations of ETC - INTERREG A - EMR

Interreg II (1994-1999): 37 million EUR (ERDF) = 120 projects
Interreg III (2000-2006): 52 million EUR (ERDF) = 97 projects
Interreg IV (2007-2013): 72 million EUR (ERDF) = 51 projects

some succes stories...to be continued

healthcare

life sciences

police

labour mobility

culturE

cluster policy
From I to IV - assessment

- sound management
- good output
- lever for cooperation
- strategic development

+ administrative burden
- longterm impact
- post-project sustainability
- “operational” program

next slide
From I to IV - assessment

Management

RA

N+2

Project development

Decisionmaking

Implementation

Program

Audit

Strategy

Projects

Crossborder
3. Perspective 2014-2020

Challenges programs

Comments Proposals EC

Status report Interreg V EMR
Challenges programs

Governance: top down vs bottom up
Priorities: less-is-more vs one-size-fits-all
Programming: general vs specific
Monitoring: output vs outcome

level of control
political influence
borderline crossover
Comments Proposals EC

Thematic concentration

HOCUS FOCUS

Administrative simplification

LEAN & MEAN

border regions as barometer of EU2020

member states?
Status report Interreg V EMR

In general:
rather slow but steady as we go

Right now:
stocktaking investment priorities & eligible area
EMR Development Plan Conference
13/3/2013 @ St-Vith (B)
Thank you for your attention!

Contact: bjornkoopmans@euregio-mr.eu

Information: www.euregio-mr.eu
Integrated territorial development: A centrope perspective on the 2014-2020 programme period

Alexander Wolffhardt
Europaforum Wien/centrope coordination office

A future for centrope in ETC?
- centrope, a special case
- ETC allowing for centrope post-2013 – not yet
- Suggestions from a centrope perspective
centrope, a special case

A cooperation framework on the EU lifeline

Basic (political, administrative) cooperation & cross-border governance fully dependant on EU funding due to

» lack of resources among partner regions & cities
» different levels of commitment among partners
» lack of ownership on national level

centrope, a special case

centrope in ETC programmes: an uneasy fit

5 bilateral cross-border programmes
1 transnational programme of 8 countries
centrope, a special case

centrope ETC projects so far

» 2004-2007 BAER Building a European Region I & II
   Parallel projects with single consortium
   in cross-border programmes AT-CZ, AT-SK & AT-HU

» 2009-2012 centrope capacity
   Single project with multilateral agency
   in transnational programme CENTRAL EUROPE
   Priority Area „Enhancing competitiveness and attractiveness
   of cities and regions - developing polycentric settlement
   structures and territorial cooperation”

ETC allowing for centrope post-2013
– not yet

Commission proposals...

» ERDF spending to be more targeted, thematically
   concentrated & in line with Europe 2020

» 11 thematic objectives, 4 of which to be selected as
   Priority Axes in each Cooperation Programme

» 10 issue-specific thematic objectives

» Thematic Objective 11 „Enhancing institutional
   capacity”, in ETC priority can be given to:
   „Promoting legal and administrative cooperation
   and cooperation between citizens and institutions”
ETC allowing for centrope post-2013 – not yet

... that would mean for centrope
» Basic cooperation & governance framework to be supported under Thematic Objective 11
» But only if included as 1 of 4 Priority Axis either in transnational CENTRAL EUROPE or in at least 3 of the 5 bilateral cross-border programmes
» Cannot be taken for granted!

Suggestions from a centrope perspective

Options for more flexible rules suiting centrope
» Make choice for Thematic Objective 11 easier – allow for more than 4 PAs (or cross-cutting PA Enhancing Institutional Capacity as add-on option)
» Allow for some (e.g. 20%) of the available funds to be spent flexibly, as long within Thematic Objectives
» Include a Mini-Programme strand (like in the interregional programme) in the transnational programmes
» Simplify rules on flexibility re. operations outside the programme area & encourage utilisation
Public and private stakeholders in interaction
The Tri-National Metropolitan Region of the Upper-Rhine (TMO)

Schmitz, Vice-President, Chamber of Commerce, Karlsruhe
Jürgen Oser, Regierungspräsidium Freiburg

Some basic facts about the Upper Rhine Region

- Area: 21.518 km²
- Population / km² : 274
- Demographic growth
  (1990-2006): 10.6%
- Cross border commuters: 90,000
Institutional Structure of the Tri-National Metropolitan Region

- Tri-National Circle of the four pillars’ representatives
- Joint Working-Level of the Coordinators
- Politics
- Business
- Research / Universities
- Civil Society
- Annual conference including all actors of the four pillars ("small trilateral conference")

Founding of the TMO
December 9th, 2010 in Offenburg

- Signing of the national Offenburg Declaration
- Signing of the regional foundation declaration
Pillar I: Politics (and Administration)

Cooperation between the foreign ministries in charge of the Upper Rhine Region

Cross-border cooperation within the regional neighbourhood (regional government and parliament)

Cooperation within the local neighbourhood (EURODISTRICTS)

Cooperation within the net of the 10 biggest towns of the Upper Rhine Valley

Tri-National Metropolitan Region of the Upper Rhine
Région métropolitaine du Rhin supérieur
Pillar II: Map of Companies situated within the TMO

Gross domestic product of about 208 bn. €

(compare: Finland, Denmark and Ireland)
Project Example: Tourism-Cluster

3 countries – one destination

Tri-National Metropolitan Region of the Upper Rhine
Région métropolitaine du Rhin supérieur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower Rhine Valley</th>
<th>Toskana</th>
<th>Südtirol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface</strong></td>
<td>21 518 km²</td>
<td>22 990 km²</td>
<td>7 400 km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>6 Mio</td>
<td>3.8 Mio</td>
<td>500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overnight Stays</strong></td>
<td>18.3 Mio</td>
<td>22.2 Mio</td>
<td>22.9 Mio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Example: Tourism-Cluster

- Upper Rhine Valley is cofinanced by the European Union and the INTERREG IV A Upper Rhine program with a duration from 2009 to 2012.

- With a budget of 2 million Euros and 31 project partners it promotes the Upper Rhine abroad and supports education and innovation within the region.

- Promotion topics are:
  - Wine & Dine; Art & Culture; Architecture & Heritage; Tradition & Events; Nature & Landscape

Project Example: Tourism-Cluster

Partners:

Tri-National Metropolitan Region of the Upper Rhine
Région métropolitaine du Rhin supérieur
Project Example: Tourism-Cluster

Learn all about the project on the trilingual website:
www.upperrhinevalley.com

Project Example: Region of Stars

Since 2008 the Chambers of Commerce in the Tri-National Metropolitan Region of the Upper Rhine created a tri-national network called "Region of Stars" to promote the extraordinary culinary heritage and the high density of excellent restaurants.
Project Example: Region of Stars

In 2011 Michelin edited a bilingual “Guide Rouge” for the Region – where over 60 restaurants are listed with one or more stars. A revised edition will forthcome in 2013.

Pillar III: The Scientific Network

- 25 Institutions of higher education
- 170,000 Students
- 167 Research Institutions
Project example: The cross-regional scientific initiative

Tri-National Metropolitan Region of the Upper Rhine
Région métropolitaine du Rhin supérieur

Pillar IV: Civil Society
Project example: „Forums Citoyens“
Strasbourg, Karlsruhe, Basel (since 2010)
Thank you very much for your attention!

www.rmtmo.eu
Medicon Valley Alliance
Creating Opportunities

Ann-Sofie Andersson, Project Manager

Key messages

It is all about attractiveness

Triple Helix – a challenging and rewarding structure

Tradition in collaboration

Strategic initiatives for a bright future
Medicon Valley

attractiveness
Three Main Activities

Network / Events

Lobby

Strategic Initiatives

It is all about attractiveness

Triple Helix – a challenging and rewarding structure

Key messages

Tradition in collaboration

Strategic initiatives for a bright future
It is all about attractiveness

Triple Helix – a challenging and rewarding structure

Key messages

Tradition in collaboration

Strategic initiatives for a bright future
Tradition in collaboration

- Medicon Village
- US Nanomedicine Tour
- Regional PhD
- Science Parks

It is all about attractiveness

Key messages

Triple Helix – a challenging and rewarding structure
Attractiveness consists of many components

- Favourable framework conditions
- Access to highly qualified manpower
- High quality of life
- Networks and platforms for collaboration
- Access to capital
- Advanced technology
- Mix of SMEs and large companies
- World-class Universities & research institutions
- Developed infrastructure

Need for a common strategy to realise the full potential

Access to highly qualified manpower

Access to capital

Advanced technology

Mix of SMEs and large companies

World-class Universities & research institutions

Developed infrastructure
A **Beacon** is a unique combination of regional scientific strongholds, built on a cross-disciplinary platform and addressing future demands.
Beacon strategy for differentiation of Medicon Valley

Combined existing strongholds, smart and flexible
- Focus in on identified key areas
- Adapt to future trends and demands
- Collaborate across disciplines and borders
- Focus on pre-competitive collaborations to create open innovative platforms

reality check
Center Organisation

State of the art laboratory equipment
Center Output

2020 Vision

- At least 4 Beacons are implemented through private and public funding and firmly anchored in Medicon Valley
- Beacons have reached a high international standard through recruitment of local and global talents that produce high ranked science
- Increased yearly growth in life science industry
- An environment of open innovation is established
- Strong collaborative relationships exist between academia and industry in both Sweden and Denmark
It is all about attractiveness

Triple Helix – a challenging and rewarding structure

Key messages

Tradition in collaboration

Strategic initiatives for a bright future
Overview

1. Review: ELAt + TTR = TTR ELAt

2. Translating strategy into actions:
   The examples TTC and GCS

3. Outlook and conclusions
In the heart of Europe’s main Delta

- Population: ~ 44 mln.
- Regional GDP: € ~ 1 trln.
- Networks of Mainports & Brainports including Brussels
- Strong in services, science, technology, industry, agro-food, transport
- Important centres within convenient travel distance
- Global gateway to mainland
- 45 % of logistics market share to Europe (incl. internat. activities)

Once upon a time in 2004

- The mayors of Eindhoven, Leuven and Aachen signed an innovation declaration of intent, towards top technology
- The acknowledgement of ongoing collaboration between all kinds of stakeholders and organisations in the Eindhoven-Leuven-Aachen regions, with the help of Interreg IIIB
- Philips with research activities in Eindhoven, Leuven and Aachen and a strong ASML-IMEC connection
- Initiatives to set up a joint Dutch-Flemish research unit: Holst centre
First step: ELAt

- A “bottom-up” initiative was started, exploring common ground and deploying common actions with the focus on:
  - Fostering entrepreneurship
  - Linking business and technology communities
  - Mapping and benchmarking
  - Strategy development (triple helix)

- As a network of networks it provided a context; ‘orchestrated chaos’
  - A joint coherent and focused approach, a strategy
  - Increasing ownership and stakeholders in action and sponsorship

Second step: „Top Technology Region (TTR)”-Initiative

In 2008 based on bilateral “letters of intent” between Netherlands, Flanders and NRW an additional “top-down” strategy on cross-border co-operation in technology-oriented economy, research, science & innovation involving six regions was brought to life

Partners:
- Provincie Limburg
- Provincie Noord-Brabant
- Province de Liège
- Provincie Limburg
- Provincie Vlaams-Brabant
- Land NRW
Basis: “TTR-smart specialisation analysis“

International benchmark study by BAK Basel Economics (CH)

TTR – Promising fields…

… for cross-border business- & technology-oriented cooperation

Health/Life-Sciences  High-tech-systems  Adv. materials/chemicals
Join forces: ELAt + TTR = TTR ELAt

**Triple Helix:** public, private & academia (No a priori leadership by public authority)

- **“Light” organisational structures**
- **Content- and market-driven**
  - Focus on distinctive knowledge domains and value chains
  - Building on strengths and growth potential
- **Dovetailing actions** bilaterally and multilaterally
- **Open innovation** in a cross-border innovation eco-system
- **Secure a key position** within a global network of innovation regions
TTR ELAt – „Smart specialisation“ action plan

Focus: Three „core competencies“ and six „strategic lines“

1. Review: ELAt + TTR = TTR ELAt

2. Translating strategy into actions:
   The examples TTC and GCS

3. Outlook and conclusions
towards Top Technology Cluster (TTC)
Creating new business- & innovation opportunities in the TTR ELAt-area

1. Cross-border business development in four promising fields:
   - Health/Life-Sciences
   - Advanced materials/chemicals
   - Energy
   - ICT

2. Stimulate innovation-oriented cooperation of companies by creating cross-border, SME-based cooperation consortia
... that cross-border economic opportunities are not yet grasped and basic framework conditions are underdeveloped:

- Knowledge about companies, R&D & universities at the other side of the borders is lacking
- Technology-oriented companies (esp. SMEs) still maintain only very few business activities across the borders
- National support tools for innovation & business across the borders are not or just poorly coordinated & do not meet SME-needs so far
Offer I: (inter)cluster networking

Meet entrepreneurs!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.09.2012</td>
<td>Aachen (D)</td>
<td>IT solutions energy logistics</td>
<td>B2B Matchmaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.09.2012</td>
<td>Hasselt (B)</td>
<td>Biomass valorization</td>
<td>Socialising &amp; B2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.09.2012</td>
<td>Maastricht (NL)</td>
<td>Smart Health (part 1)</td>
<td>Round table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.09.2012</td>
<td>Eindhoven (NL)</td>
<td>Innovations in dementia</td>
<td>Brokerage event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.09.2012</td>
<td>Eindhoven (NL)</td>
<td>Ambient Assisted Living</td>
<td>Socialising event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.10.2012</td>
<td>Aachen (D)</td>
<td>IT solutions in energy logistics</td>
<td>Brokerage event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11.2012</td>
<td>Liège (B)</td>
<td>Biocompatible materials</td>
<td>Intercluster event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.11.2012</td>
<td>Aachen (D)</td>
<td>Mobile computing</td>
<td>B2B Matchmaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.2012</td>
<td>Hasselt (B)</td>
<td>Smart health (part 2)</td>
<td>Round table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information see: ttc-innovation.eu
Offer II: Business & Innovation Development

**Get connected!**

- Find the right partner to develop your ideas to marketability
- We offer hands-on support from our BDS-managers to find the right partner across the borders
- Contact your regional BDS-manager (here: ICT)

Reinhard Goethe (Aachen)  
Geert Adriaens (Aachen/Leuven)  
Greet Bilsen (Leuven)  
Peter Simkens (Leuven/Eindhoven)  
Benny Daems (Hasselt)  
Michel Black (Liège)

Offer II: Business & Innovation Development

**Generate new business ideas!**

- Bring in your ideas, benefit from the creativity of other business people & explore new markets
- We offer bilateral talks as well as round tables with innovative entrepreneurs

Technology/Market-Roadmap  
Company-Round table  
Dedicated Workshops
Offer III: Enabling innovation projects

Benefit from „early-stage money“!

We offer „innovation vouchers“ for the very early stage of your cross-border consortia to verify & stimulate feasibility of a joint cross-border innovation project

- Granting free research / advice from a knowledge provider up to an amount of € 5,000,-- per business case (non-repayable grant)
- Eligible activities: Industrial research & experimental development (e.g. a feasibility study, a patent research, use of laboratories & state-of-the-art-equipment or prototyping & testing)

Innovation vouchers: SME-participation per region

- 10 SME profit directly
- Additionally 18 SME-partners involved
- Other partners: 9 (4 Big companies, 2 R&D, 3 Intermed.)
- In total: 37 partners so far
GCS

The new cross-border innovation funds

- Target: Stimulate cross-border cooperation of SMEs in the high-tech-sector of Greater EMR area by direct funding for joint cross-border innovation projects
- Volume: € 4.72 mln., provided as non-repayable grants
- Funding: Between € 100,000.-- to € 250,000.-- per innovation project (at least equal private contribution is mandatory)
- Eligible activities: Industrial research (50 %) & experimental development (40%) based on EC 800 / 2008
- Basic condition: At least two SMEs out of two different countries of Greater EMR area cooperate within innovation project
GCS highlights (II)

- Provision of funding: Via a competitive procedure
  - Only the best ideas win!
- Ranking of applications: By an independent tri-national expert-jury
- Two calls for proposal:
  1. Call: May 15th until September 15th, 2012
  2. Call: January 2nd until March 31st, 2013
- Staggered funding:
  1. Call: € 1.57 mln.
  2. Call: € 3.15 mln.
- Runtime innovation projects: To be carried out within a maximum period of 18 months!

Preliminary results (1st call):

- 24 applications
- Main domains: Health / Life sciences & High-tech-systems
- 89 project partners (incl. 65 SMEs)
- Total applied project costs: € 13.2 mln. (incl. € 5.1 mln. funding)
Overview
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Outlook & conclusions

Where we are now

- A strategic vision is in place, dovetailed with and incorporated in the TTR ELAt-initiative.
- The level of interaction and intensity of collaboration is gradually increasing. But it’s not easy and still hurdles are to overcome.
- In current times of crisis, more heterogenous networks may develop upon the framework laid out via ELAt and sustained by TTR ELAt (e.g. on our common challenge on attracting technically skilled people (brains) to our region).
Outlook & conclusions

The way ahead

- TTR ELAt is still making progress, steadily, with incremental steps and some big strategic achievements (like Holst Centre and the EIT co-located in KIC) and new activities to be set up (e.g., cooperation of high-tech-campusses, the "brains issue," the dovetailing of national fundings)

- Basically 'unorchestrated' now, but still ongoing
  - in heterogeneous networks (EIT-KIC Innoenergy, DSP Valley, Fablab),
  - driven by entrepreneurship (TTC, GCS)
  - with many supporting actors (Brainport, BOM, AGIT, LIOF, Leuven R&D, UHasselt, ULiège, various business networks etc.) operating under the TTR ELAt-umbrella
  - with ongoing strategic claim (OECD-study "Functional regions")

Outlook & conclusions

Conclusions, observations

- TTR ELAt means a network of networks, it was never an objective in itself.

- TTR ELAt strategy has brought awareness, acknowledgement, focus and scale: "orchestration" of activities and stakeholders, rather than a "binding" structure.

- A shared vision, common ambition and joint action, but... 'culture eats strategy for breakfast'
  - No matter how far reaching a vision or how brilliant the strategy, neither will be realized, if not supported by a region’s culture of networking collaboration.
  - That’s what we need to focus on and facilitate within TTR ELAt.
Thank you for your attention!

Your contact & more information:

r.meyer@agit.de
www.technology-region-aachen.com - www.agit.de