

Discussions on general topics of RIS3 in Kolding

Monitoring RIS3 strategies - How is monitoring done and what kind of indicators are used?

The monitoring in **South Savo** is based on 68 interviews of experts, (companies, RD organizations, development agencies, university, university consortium). In addition, there are quantitative and qualitative indicators used, for example, how much money is spent in different fields of RIS3 themes? In Finland the development of regional smart specialisation strategies was not very well coordinated from the national level. The Finnish regions have different systems and hierarchical levels of strategic documents; some have separate RIS3 documents, while in other regions the RIS3 is written in the regional strategy/regional plan. The monitoring at South Savo was only done to RIS3 strategy, not for the regional plan. The issue of skilled work force is an important topic in several medium-sized regions for upscaling and developing the regional smart specialisations. Funds from the ESF are used for improving the conditions, also tackled in the RIS3. In South Savo there are e.g. not enough skills on coding, because that kind of education is not available in the area.

South-Ostrobothnia monitors the regional development with qualitative and quantitative indicators once a year, including a peer review process. The RIS3 is not separately tackled, but jointly the regional strategy and the regional plan – as the impact is difficult to isolate. The reaction on the monitoring results takes place in the thematic working groups or e.g. by speeding up processes.

In **Satakunta** region national institutes get the newest data to monitor. This includes testing and inquiries among companies e.g. in digitalization – do companies see digitalization the same way as the public sector and how to influence this?

In **Kujawsko-Pomorskie** monitoring is an appendix to the RIS3 and is done at least once every three years, but it is not yet done. An evaluation will see how projects follow the RIS3. The methodology is based on a division of content and realisation of RIS3. Both Polish and international statistics are used, plus there is a need to gather information from other sources, e.g. NGOs and stakeholders. The indicators are within three main aims; education, science and economy. The monitoring lays the basis for a modification of the strategy implementation.

In **Östergötland** among others quantitative indicators are used with all associated challenges like a time lag from the intervention and the difficulty to really assign clear causal relations between indicators/results and the intervention. Results are also derived from differentiated evaluation methods for the individual innovation policy measures (e.g. clusters, projects, programmes) – how do they contribute to competitiveness and sustainability objectives – and for the ex-ante analysis of where to invest the regional money. There is also a network of 20 or more organizations which represents a specialist group with different actors who are looking at numbers and statistics, and know regional context where we source knowledge from them. The region does not lack ways to gathering knowledge, however the link to RIS3 might not always be clear. To put the focus of

resources which align with RIS3, larger initiatives might be promoted to reduce the policy fragmentation.

For **Kaunas** the national Lithuanian RIS3 strategy is in place. There was just a big discussion and big report summarizing the first three years, with roundtables organized by the National ministry who is the owner of RIS3. The report/analysis states the potential in business, in science and activity level in priority sectors (six fields with 20 priorities). The results are that only 4/6 field (11/20 priorities) have a critical mass and potential – therefore the rest is lagging behind. There is no leverage between science and business. As consequence there are further consultations and suggestions; e.g. to identify owners for each priority area. Adjustments will be perhaps done in late 2018. Maybe some measures are not included in the report, so the responsible institutions are still waiting for some projects and initiatives to materialize.

Also for **Tartu**/Estonia the smart specialisation strategy is on national level. The monitoring and strategic steering can be characterized as chaotic, delayed and with scattered responsibilities. Especially logical links between activities and results are missing, as well as potential adaptations. On the regional level South Estonia is one out of six counties doing specialisation on voluntary basis. There are annual round tables, but no responsible coordinating body – so that there is an ownership problem.

In **Riga** as well the RIS3 is on national, Latvian, level. A national monitoring appears not to be very existent and there is no territorial/spatial perspective. Thus, Riga Planning Region develops an own monitoring system which will be a geographic web platform, including expert analysis and displaying a territorial information system.

In **Lubelskie** the “RIS LV monitoring and evaluation plan” constitutes an integral part of the “Development Strategy LV 2020 Monitoring and Evaluation”. The RIS3 is part of the regional strategy. Quantitative measurements are measured under the specific themes. There is in place a large strategic and structured process by a regional territorial observatory, but receiving data and actual data is difficult, so that it is complemented by data from public institutions and think tanks to receive new data. To collect statistics on company/SME level remains difficult, despite e.g. the labour office puzzling together data. Sometimes meetings with cluster organizations are used for this or they are asked directly. Systems in the Polish regions are similar; each region follows the branches and builds a monitoring system according to it, sometimes also with a regional territorial observatory.

The process is more quantitative than qualitative and due to the many indicators the question is how to connect indicators and get a true picture of the situation.

Mecklenburg-Vorpommern set up a steering committee which is observing the RIS3 implementation. For each of the six defined fields of future development branches, one supervising head from “real life” was nominated, e.g. a manager of an IT cluster, or a university person in machinery. Thus, these heads of the branches/priorities have a double function but only few additional resources for the “implementation and monitoring of the RIS3” – amongst other at a large regional technology conference once a year.

The WP4 external experts asks: What would you improve in your regional monitoring system? Did you get any new ideas? How to get more impact of the monitoring system?

- Get to know the situation in the SMEs, how they have benefited, because they are core actors for creating welfare in the region in whatever sector
- It is a matter of resources also, personal resources, financial resources, to improve the link between RIS3 and companies. “Without the project I as intermediary would never deal with the strategy”.
- What do the companies need? We (are region) establish networks with Business Development Organisations to find out what they need and “what is energy efficiency”/what exactly constitutes the priority/specialisation.
- A need to get data at all (compared to what we’ve heard from other regions) – and have a body/strategical view to put the knots together and adapt instruments.

➔ **THE CONSEQUENCES OF MONITORING VARY GREATLY AND IT IS NOT EASY TO ADJUST UNSUCCESSFUL INSTRUMENTS**

- “What exactly to monitor” – most actors don’t care a minute about RIS3, but care about value
- Are existing structures enough? Should there be one person to link SMEs and managing authorities?

➔ **VERY DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL SET UPS AND CONSEQUENCES FOR MONITORING**

Sanna Inkeri, Lars Schieber