



European Association of Development Agencies
Association Européenne des Agences de Développement

Editeur Responsable : Christian SAUBLENS

EURADA NEWS

E

<u>SOMMAIRE</u>		<u>SUMMARY</u>	
EDITORIAL	1	EDITORIAL	1
DATES A RETENIR	1	IMPORTANT DATES	1
VIE DU RESEAU		LIFE OF THE NETWORK	
WIC La Baule 2006	2	WIC La Baule 2006	2
TRAVAUX DES MEMBRES		WORK OF THE MEMBERS	
Scottish Enterprise	3	Scottish Enterprise	3
FONDS STRUCTURELS		STRUCTURAL FUNDS	
Budget: Conseil 16/17 décembre 2005	4	Budget: Council 16/17 December 2005	4
Budget: Nouvelles propositions	4	Budget: New Commission Proposals	4
BREVETS		PATENTS	
Consultation en matière de brevets	5	Consultation in the field of patents	5
ENVIRONNEMENT		ENVIRONMENT	
Stratégie environnement urbain	9	Urban environment strategy	9
R D T		R T D	
Publications de l'Eurostat	10	Eurostat publications	10
Rapport AHO	11	AHO Report	11
European Innovation Scoreboard 2005 ...	12	European Innovation Scoreboard 2005	12
INTELLIGENCE TERRITORIALE		TERRITORIAL INTELLIGENCE	
Investissements Directs Etrangers	13	Foreign Direct Investment	13
APPEL D'OFFRES	14	CALL FOR TENDERS	14

EDITORIAL

The Secretariat is increasingly being approached in order to answer the question if it is possible to transfer a best practice from one region to another one.

The more I think about it, the more I believe it seems to be impossible due to the importance of intangible elements (culture, governance, leadership, marketing, branding, reputation, hierarchy in decision making, ...) and of critical mass (financial mass, talents, ...).

In the private sector, this difficulty in copying a "success story", in this instance ALDI, the so-called "hard discount" distribution group, was described as follows : *"This is a company which has always been concentrated on the bases of its job and which tried to improve everyday the smallest detail. This culture also explains why the ALDI concept is so difficult to copy. Everybody can see what happens in the shop, count the articles, check the quality. But what is impossible to copy is the behaviour"*. (Dieter Brandes, The Aldi Way of Success).

IMPORTANT DATES

13/14/15.3.06	EU Policy Update
23/24.3.06	FinNetSME mid-term conference (Kiel, D)
6/7.4.06	Round Table of Practitioners in Economic Development : RDAs and Universities (in partnership with the WIC La Baule Think Tank)
10/11.4.06	EBAN Congress (Prague, CZ)
15/16/17.5.06	Second World Forum on Regional Economic Development in Madeira
22/23.5.06	Automotive industries (Genk, B)
6/7/8.6.06	WIC La Baule 2006
17/20.9.06	IEDC Annual Conference (New York)
28/29.9.06	6th European Congress of CEEC RDAs (Bratislava, SK)

LIFE OF THE NETWORK

WIC LA BAULE 2006

You will find below the structure of the work of the World Investment Conference to be held in La Baule from 6 to 8 June 2006.

SPECIAL GUEST COUNTRY : RUSSIA

GUEST EUROPEAN COUNTRIES : UNITED KINGDOM / HUNGARY

GUEST MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRY : EGYPT

GUEST EUROPEAN REGIONS : BAVARIA / EMILIA ROMAGNA / VEST REGION

Germany

Italy

Romania

TUESDAY 6 JUNE

3:00 - 6:30 p.m.

Seminar on Euro Mediterranean process

Opening address by Dr. Mahmoud Mohieldin, Minister of Investment, Egypt (*tbc*)

Seminar on Euratlantic relationships

8:00 p.m.

Welcome dinner for speakers and partners

WEDNESDAY 7, JUNE

8:30 -9:00 a.m.

Registration and welcome Breakfast

9:00 - 9:30 a.m.

Opening address by a Russian government official (*tbc*)

Welcome to the guest countries and Regions

9:30 - 11:25 a.m.

“Attractiveness on the move” session

By Ernst and Young, EURADA and Invest in France Agency

11:30 – 12:45 a.m.

CEOs’ roundtable “Energizing the world”

1:15 - 2:45 p.m.

Lunch - Award ceremony for European Regions

by Danuta Hübner, EU Commissioner for Regional Policy(*tbc*) and a representative of the Committee of Regions

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Workshops

1. *Partnership between universities, regions and business to shape and nurture the knowledge and know-how of the future*
2. *Fast growing SMEs: laying the foundations for the European Googles of the future*
3. *Promoting a new image for Europe*
4. *The Single Market—opening up new frontiers to the East, North and South?*
5. *Aerospace: the European industrial policies of tomorrow*

5:45 - 6:30 p.m.

Closing session by French Official

8:00 p.m.

Gala dinner under the patronage of Ministers for Economic, Financial and Industrial Affairs

THURSDAY 8, JUNE

8:00 - 9:30 a.m.

Theme breakfasts “Moving forward with Lisbon agenda reforms”

1. *Pharmaceutical industry: how to manage innovation needs and social policy costs?*
2. *ANIMA / Barcelona Process: Investment Opportunities call in the Mediterranean*
3. *Euratlantic/ Boosting North American investments in Europe*
4. *Regional Economic Development: boosting local competitiveness*

9:45 - 11:00 a.m.

CEOs’ roundtable “Designing a smart social model”

11:00 - 11:30 a.m.

Coffee break

11:30 - 12:45 a.m.

CEOs’ roundtable “Networking infrastructures of growth”

- 1:15 - 2:45 p.m.** **Lunch - Award ceremony** “The Best Investments in Europe”
- 3:15 - 5:30 p.m.** **Dialogue between executives and European officials**
LA BAULE-WIC high-level Group proposals by Sir Francis Mackay, Chairman of Europe+ think tank and Chairman of Compass Group
European guest countries Prime ministers: “Our answers for a more attractive and competitive Europe”
Special address by H.E. Ahmed Nazif, Prime Minister, Egypt (tbc)
LA BAULE 2006 declaration by José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission (tbc)
- 8:00 p.m.** Informal and networking dinner

The leaflet relating to the 2006 Awards is enclosed to the present issue of Eurada-News.

WORK OF THE MEMBERS

[SCOTTISH ENTERPRISE \(UK\)](#)

Equity Risk Capital Market for Young Companies in Scotland 2000-2004

by Gavin Don Equitas and Prof. Richard T. Harrison, School of Management and Economics, Queen's University Belfast

We have reproduced below the following few excerpts :

This report presents the findings of the annual Scottish Risk Capital Survey for the calendar year 2004. The Risk Capital Survey and this report are based on a unique data set which tracks investments made in Scottish young private companies each year. This data set now includes transaction information on all risk capital investments in young Scottish companies since 2000. The Risk Capital Survey tracks investments by reference to records of deals filed at Companies House – the UK company register – supported where appropriate by other market intelligence. As such this is the only systematic annual survey of its kind carried out in Europe.

The volume of risk capital flowing into the market could imply that the difficulties in raising capital reported by many companies and their advisors are not a function of the shortage of risk capital but could be caused by:

- *lack of market visibility and efficiency*
- *a lack of 'investment readiness' in the businesses seeking finance, or*
- *that there are many more candidates for capital than can be supplied.*

Specifically, we have identified a major structural gap in the Scottish risk capital market – the Anvil – which will constrain the ability of growing Scottish companies to develop and exploit their full potential. This gap for development and expansion capital is reinforced by two additional features of the risk capital market:

- *the withdrawal of the VC investment community from new investment to concentrate on following through on existing portfolio companies;*
- *the increase in the number of companies entering the funding pipeline with start up and early stage finance from Angel and Hybrid investors.*

The report can be downloaded from Scottish Enterprise's web site :

http://www.scottish-enterprise.com/sedotcom_home/services-to-business/businessfinance/equity.htm

It is also available from the EURADA Secretariat.

STRUCTURAL FUNDS

BUDGET : CONSÉQUENCES OF THE COUNCIL DECISIONS OF 16/17 DECEMBER 2005

	16/17.12.05		EU Proposal	
	%	Bn €	%	Bn €
Convergence objective	81.7	251.3	78.5	264.0
Competitiveness and employment	15.9	48.9	17.2	57.9
Territorial co-operation	2.42	7.5	3.94	13.2

BUDGET : NEW COMMISSION PROPOSALS

Further to the European Parliament refusal to adopt the Council perspectives, the Commission is trying to submit a new proposal which would include, among other things, the following elements :

- ✓ €5 billion to react to a changing world;
- ✓ €3.5 billion for the new European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

Note : This is a defensive proposal ("react to" and "globalisation adjustment") rather than a proactive proposal to strengthen the competitiveness of the regions.

PATENTS

CONSULTATION IN THE FIELD OF PATENTS

The European Commission has launched a public consultation in the field of patents.

Deadline to participate in the consultation : 31.3.06

The text of the consultation is available on DG Markt's web site

http://europa.eu.int/comm/internal_market/indprop/patent/consultation_en.htm

It is reproduced below.

Questionnaire

On the patent system in Europe

INTRODUCTION

The field of intellectual property rights has been identified as one of the seven cross-sectoral initiatives for the Union's new industrial policy as set out in the Commission Communication launched on 5 October 2005. Stimulating growth and innovation means improving the framework conditions for industry, which include an effective IPR system.

In 1997, the Commission launched the idea of a Community Patent in its Green Paper on promoting innovation. This was taken up by Heads of State and Government in the conclusions of the Lisbon European Council of March 2000, who called for a Community patent to be available by the end of 2001. The Community Patent proposal, establishing a unitary system of patent protection for the single market, has formally been on the table of the Council since 2000 but overall agreement is yet to be achieved. The Commission remains convinced that an affordable Community Patent would offer the greatest advantages for business: we owe it to industry, investors and researchers to have an effective patent regime in the EU. Commissioner McCreevy has stated his intention to make one final effort to have the proposal adopted during his mandate. Until the time and conditions are ripe for that effort, the interim period should be used to seek views of stakeholders on an effective IPR system in the EU.

Views are therefore sought on the patent system in Europe, and what changes if any are needed to improve innovation and competitiveness, growth and employment in the knowledge-based economy.

Please note that this consultation focuses on the overall legal framework. Accompanying measures, such as information, awareness raising or support training, are outside the scope of consultation.

The document that follows contains a number of questions: In answering them we would invite you to be as detailed as you can. Supporting evidence and statistics are also welcome.

On the basis of the feedback the Commission intends to organise a hearing in Brussels in early summer 2006.

This consultation is open to all, and will be closed on **31 March 2006**.

The Commission services will publish a report on the outcome of this consultation. It will be available on the Internal Market and Services Directorate's General website.

Please either email us at:

Markt-D2-patentstrategy@cec.eu.int

Or send your response by post to:

Mr Erik Nooteboom

Head of Unit

Industrial Property Unit

Internal Market and Services Directorate General

European Commission

1049 Brussels Belgium

PRIVACY STATEMENT

Please be sure to **indicate** if you **do not consent** to the **publication** of your personal data or data relating to your organisation with the publication of your response.

The contact data provided by the stakeholder make it possible to contact the stakeholder to request a clarification if necessary on the information supplied.

By responding to this consultation you automatically give permission to the Commission to publish your contribution unless your opposition to publish your contribution is explicitly stated in your reply. The Commission is committed to user privacy and details on the personal data protection policy can be accessed at: http://europa.eu.int/geninfo/legal_notices_en.htm#personaldata

For further information please contact Ms Grazyna PIESIEWICZ at grazyna.piesiewicz@cec.eu.int or at +32.2.298.01.24.

Section 1 - Basic principles and features of the patent system

The idea behind the patent system is that it should be used by businesses and research organisations to support innovation, growth and quality of life for the benefit of all in society. Essentially the temporary rights conferred by a patent allow a company a breathing-space in the market to recoup investment in the research and development which led to the patented invention. It also allows research organisations having no exploitation activities to derive benefits from the results of their R&D activities. But for the patent system to be attractive to its users and for the patent system to retain the support of all sections of society it needs to have the following features:

- clear substantive rules on what can and cannot be covered by patents, balancing the interests of the right holders with the overall objectives of the patent system
- transparent, cost effective and accessible processes for obtaining a patent
- predictable, rapid and inexpensive resolution of disputes between right holders and other parties
- due regard for other public policy interests such as competition (anti-trust), ethics, environment, healthcare, access to information, so as to be effective and credible within society.

1.1 Do you agree that these are the basic features required of the patent system?

1.2 Are there other features that you consider important?

1.3 How can the Community better take into account the broader public interest in developing its policy on patents?

Section 2 – The Community patent as a priority for the EU

The Commission's proposals for a Community patent have been on the table since 2000 and reached an important milestone with the adoption of the Council's common political approach in March 2003 [<http://register.consilium.eu.int/pdf/en/03/st07/st07159en03.pdf>; see also http://europa.eu.int/comm/internal_market/en/indprop/patent/docs/2003-03-patentcosts_en.pdf]. The disagreement over the precise legal effect of translations is one reason why final agreement on the Community patent regulation has not yet been achieved. The Community patent delivers value-added for European industry as part of the Lisbon agenda. It offers a unitary, affordable and competitive patent and greater legal certainty through a unified Community jurisdiction. It also contributes to a stronger EU position in external for a and would provide for Community accession to the European Patent Convention (EPC). Calculations based on the common political approach suggest a Community patent would be available for the whole of the EU at about the same cost as patent protection under the existing European Patent system for only five states.

Question

2.1 By comparison with the common political approach, are there any alternative or additional features that you believe an effective Community patent system should offer?

Section 3 – The European Patent System and in particular the European Patent Litigation Agreement

Since 1999, States party to the European Patent Convention (EPC), including States which are members of the EU, have been working on an agreement on the litigation of European patents (EPLA). The EPLA would be an *optional* litigation system common to those EPC States that choose to adhere to it.

The EPLA would set up a European Patent Court which would have *jurisdiction* over the validity and infringements of European patents (including actions for a declaration of noninfringement, actions or counterclaims for revocation, and actions for damages or compensation derived from the provisional protection conferred by a published European patent application). National courts would retain jurisdiction to order provisional and protective measures, and in respect of the provisional seizure of goods as security. For more information see [http://www.european-patent-office.org/epo/epla/pdf/agreement_draft.pdf]

Some of the states party to the EPC have also been tackling the patent cost issues through the London Protocol which would simplify the existing language requirements for participating states. It is an important project that would render the European patent more attractive.

The European Community is not a party to the European Patent Convention. However there is Community law which covers some of the same areas as the draft Litigation Agreement, particularly the "Brussels" Regulation on Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments (Council Regulation no 44/2001) and the Directive on enforcement of intellectual property rights through civil procedures (Directive 2004/48/EC). [http://europa.eu.int/eurlex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_195/l_19520040602en00160025.pdf] It appears that there are three issues to be addressed before EU Member States may become party to the draft Litigation Agreement:

- (1) the text of the Agreement has to be brought into line with the Community legislation in this field
- (2) the relationship with the EC Court of Justice must be clarified
- (3) the question of the grant of a negotiating mandate to the Commission by the Council of the EU in order to take part in negotiations on the Agreement, with a view to its possible conclusion by the Community and its Member States, needs to be addressed.

Questions

- 3.1 What advantages and disadvantages do you think that pan-European litigation arrangements as set out in the draft EPLA would have for those who use and are affected by patents?
- 3.2 Given the possible coexistence of three patent systems in Europe (the national, the Community and the European patent), what in your view would be the ideal patent litigation scheme in Europe?

Section 4 – Approximation and mutual recognition of national patents

The proposed regulation on the Community patent is based on Article 308 of the EC Treaty, which requires consultation of the European Parliament and unanimity in the Council. It has been suggested that the substantive patent system might be improved through an approximation (harmonisation) instrument based on Article 95, which involves the Council and the European Parliament in the co-decision procedure with the Council acting by qualified majority. One or more of the following approaches, some of them suggested by members of the European Parliament, might be considered:

- (1) Bringing the main patentability criteria of the European Patent Convention into Community law so that national courts can refer questions of interpretation to the European Court of Justice. This could include the general criteria of novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability, together with exceptions for particular subject matter and specific sectoral rules where these add value.
- (2) More limited harmonisation picking up issues which are not specifically covered by the European Patent Convention.
- (3) Mutual recognition by patent offices of patents granted by another EU Member State, possibly linked to an agreed quality standards framework, or "validation" by the European Patent Office, and provided the patent document is available in the original language and another language commonly used in business.

To make the case for approximation and use of Article 95, there needs to be evidence of an economic impact arising from differences in national laws or practice, which lead to barriers in the free movement of goods or services between states or distortions of competition.

Questions

- 4.1 What aspects of patent law do you feel give rise to barriers to free movement or distortion of competition because of differences in law or its application in practice between Member States?
- 4.2 To what extent is your business affected by such differences?
- 4.3 What are your views on the value-added and feasibility of the different options (1) – (3) outlined above?

4.4 Are there any alternative proposals that the Commission might consider?

Section 5 – General

We would appreciate your views on the general importance of the patent system to you.
On a scale of one to ten (10 is crucial, 1 is negligible):

5.1 How important is the patent system in Europe compared to other areas of legislation affecting your business?

5.2 Compared to the other areas of intellectual property such as trade marks, designs, plant variety rights, copyright and related rights, how important is the patent system in Europe?

5.3 How important to you is the patent system in Europe compared to the patent system worldwide?

Furthermore:

5.4 If you are responding as an SME, how do you make use of patents now and how do you expect to use them in future? What problems have you encountered using the existing patent system?

5.5 Are there other issues than those in this paper you feel the Commission should address in relation to the patent system?

(1) If you would like the Commission to be able to contact you to clarify your comments, please enter your contact details.

- (a) Are you replying as a citizen / individual or on behalf of an organisation?
- (b) The name of your organisation/contact person:
- (c) Your email address:
- (d) Your postal address:
- (e) Your organisation's website (if available):

(2) Please help us understand the range of stakeholders by providing the following information:

- (a) In which Member State do you reside / are your activities principally located?
- (b) Are you involved in cross-border activity?
- (c) If you are a company: how many employees do you have?
- (d) What is your area of activity?
- (e) Do you own any patents? If yes, how many? Are they national / European patents?
- (f) Do you license your patents?
- (g) Are you a patent licensee?
- (h) Have you been involved in a patent dispute?
- (i) Do you have any other experience with the patent system in Europe?

Please either email us at:

Markt-D2-patentstrategy@cec.eu.int

Or send your response by post to:

Mr Erik Nooteboom

Head of Unit

Industrial Property Unit

Internal Market and Services Directorate General

European Commission

1049 Brussels

Belgium

ENVIRONMENT

THEMATIC STRATEGY ON THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

The European Commission has just adopted a communication on a thematic strategy on the urban environment which deals with technical guidance by the local authorities in the following sectors :

- integrated environmental management
- sustainable urban transport plans
- exchange of best practice in the EU
- training
- using other Community support programmes.

The document also deals with topics such as :

- climate change
- nature and biodiversity
- quality of life
- sustainable use of natural resources.

RTD

EUROSTAT PUBLICATIONS

Early 2006, the Eurostat has just published two reports relating to the following subjects :

- National patent indicators
- Employment in high technology.

It is worth underlying the following findings :

- ✓ *In 2002, patent applications to the EPO from the European Union, the United States and Japan were 59 756, 46 819 and 24 494 respectively. Whilst the USPTO granted 87 116 patents to US inventors in 1999, only 24 733 were awarded to inventors from the EU-25 and 32 178 to inventors from Japan.*
- ✓ *In 2002, within the EU-25, Germany was the largest contributor to patent applications to the EPO (41.0%), fare ahead of France (14.3%) and the United Kingdom (12.1%).*
- ✓ *Among the EU-25 Member States, three countries led in patenting activities in relative terms (by million inhabitants and/or per million labour force). These were Germany, Sweden and Finland. Indeed, considering patents per million inhabitants, Germany registered 297 patent applications to the EPO (129 to USPTO), Sweden 290 (157) and Finland 307 (143).*
- ✓ *The United States specialised their patenting activities in "Physics" whereas the European Union specialised in "Performing operations; transporting". Most of Japan's patent applications to the EPO were in the "Electricity" domain whereas most of its patents granted by the USPTO were in "Physics".*
- ✓ *Expressed as a proportion of total employment (in relative terms), German regions led in high and medium high tech manufacturing. In 2004, among the fifteen leading regions in the EEA and Switzerland, twelve were German.*
- ✓ *In the Knowledge Intensive Services, seven out of the fifteen leading regions were in fact capitals: Inner and Outer London (UK), Stockholm (SE), Oslo og Akershus (NO), Région Bruxelles-Capitale (BE), Ile de France (FR) and Berlin (DE).*
- ✓ *Among the 25 regions that increased employment in high tech KIS most between 1999 and A2004, eight were Spanish, including the Comunidad de Madrid.*

AHO REPORT : CREATING AN INNOVATIVE EUROPE

Early January, an independent experts group submitted a report relating to a strategy aiming at creating an innovative Europe.

The text, which exists only in English, is available from the Secretariat. We have reproduced the following paragraphs :

*At the core of our recommendations is the need for Europe to provide an **innovation-friendly market** for its businesses, the lack of which is the main barrier to investment in research and innovation. This needs actions on regulation, standards, public procurement, intellectual property and fostering a culture which celebrates innovation. A combination of supply and these measures to create demand should be focused in **large scale strategic actions**. We identify several examples: **e-Health, Pharmaceuticals, Energy, Environment, Transport and Logistics, Security, and Digital Content**. An **independent High Level Coordinator** should be appointed to orchestrate European action in each area.*

*We see the 3% target as an indicator of an Innovative Europe, not as an end in itself. Measures are needed to increase **resources** for excellent science, industrial R&D and the science-industry nexus. Productivity of R&D must be increased. The proportion of structural funds spent on research and innovation should be trebled.*

*Far greater **mobility** is needed at three levels: **Human resources** need a step change in mobility across boundaries; **Financial mobility** requires an effective venture capital sector and new financial instruments for the knowledge-based economy; **Mobility in organisation and knowledge** means cutting across established structures to allow new linkages to be made through the instruments of European technology platforms and clusters.*

(...)

*Use **public procurement** to drive demand for innovative goods, while at the same time improving the level of public services.*

(...)

Intellectual property systems – including national and Community legislation, court systems, assistance services, etc. – also structure the market and the knowledge economy. European intellectual property systems provide a high level of protection but suffer from drawbacks such as national discrepancies and high costs, which hamper both developers and users of technology, especially when considering cross-border collaborations and transactions.

(...)

We have identified some examples of key areas where a market for innovation can work and public policy can have a significant role, as they have for past successes such as GSM and Airbus. The sectors listed account for a large portion of GDP and impact upon the daily lives of citizens. These are not the only areas for concerted action but nonetheless focus and concentration of resources is necessary. They are e-Health, Pharmaceuticals, Transport and Logistics, Environment, Digital Content, Energy, and Security. We comment briefly on each below, except for the last two, as these are being dealt with by other Hampton Court follow-up reports.

(...)

***Science-industry collaboration is a necessity. The open innovation system is a reality**, meaning that firms, universities and research centres must work closely together while at the same time preserving their distinctive contributions. The rapid emergence of outsourcing (now 10% of business R&D) and further development of R&D collaboration emphasise the need for an effective European market for R&D services where the best matched partners can easily identify each other, wherever they are located, and work together without bureaucratic impediment. Important changes are going on with an increasing emphasis upon durable partnerships across a broad spectrum of activities.*

(...)

Early stage funding is particularly scarce in Europe because of the lack of a sufficient Business Angel community. The risk profile and the small scale investments at this stage deters professional venture capital. There is now more mobile wealth to tap in Europe but the system is far from adequate.

(...)

Strengthen the valuable role already being played by the European Investment Fund so that it maintains venture capital funding in the counter-cycle but also does this on market terms. The countercycle role should be stressed further to prevent an excessive technology boom returning when the market recovers.

(...)

Clusters and, more generally, regional agglomerations are often at the core of innovative development.

(...)

It is vital also to increase the productivity of R&D in Europe through a focus on excellence and a willingness to cut sub-standard or low priority research to free up resources to be spent on the best.

Structural funds are a key means of giving all regions a stake in the knowledge economy. The present expenditure on research and innovation should be trebled to a minimum voluntary commitment of 20% of these funds.

The EU budget should shift towards research and innovation and treat innovation as a horizontal objective in all budgets.

(...)

Financial mobility requires an effective venture capital sector and new financial instruments for the knowledge economy.

(...)

European technology platforms are needed to create and to take advantage of innovation-friendly markets. Resources should be focussed on the strongest prospects with €1 billion as a guide to scale.

Clusters provide an important setting for mobility and a multiplier for other measures. It is important to ensure that clusters are defined in terms of new market and knowledge relationships and not traditional sectors. Effective multi-level governance arrangements are needed.

(...)

EUROPEAN INNOVATION SCOREBOARD 2005

Published early January 2006, the report underlines among other things :

Based on their SII score and the growth rate of the SII (Summary Innovation Index), the European countries can be divided in four groups:

- Switzerland, Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Germany make up the group of “*Leading countries*”.
- France, Luxembourg, Ireland, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, Norway, Italy and Iceland all belong to the group of countries showing “*Average performance*”.
- Countries “*Catching up*” are Slovenia, Hungary, Portugal, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Latvia, Greece, Cyprus and Malta.
- Countries “*Losing ground*” are Estonia, Spain, Bulgaria, Poland, Slovakia, Romania and Turkey.

No short-term convergence is expected

Although many countries show signs of catching-up, none of these countries is expected to complete this process by 2010. Using a simple linear extrapolation of current performances and growth rates, only Hungary, Slovenia and Italy are expected to reach the EU25 average within 20 years. For the other countries this process will take even longer, for some even more than 50 years (cf. section 2.2). This also means that it would take more than 50 years for the EU25 to catch up to the US level of innovation performance.

Le rapport complet (en anglais uniquement) est disponible sur le site de Cordis ou au Secrétariat.

TERRITORIAL INTELLIGENCE

Updated version of the table on page 22 of Eurada-News Nr 261, 28.12.05.

Developments in the number of FDI in Europe				
	2004	2003	2002	2001
UK	563	453	369	388
F	490	313	253	267
D	164	111	154	172
PL	148	46	60	49
H	139	84	100	85
E	121	119	122	143
RU	116	109	86	76
CZ	112	90	98	89
B	107	77	73	91
S	97	76	70	90
RO	91	–	33	40
SK	83	–	–	–
IRL	76	46	51	61
DK	70	44	–	–
BG	64	–	29	19
P	37	37	32	26
NL	56	58	60	66
CH	44	–	–	–
I	33	–	29	52
A	35	32	51	52
TR	42	–	37	13
EE	32	–	–	–
TOTAL EUROPE	2 885	1 933	1 895	1 974

Source : Ernst & Young – EURADA Secretariat's compilation

CALL FOR TENDERS

eTEN 2006

O.J. C40, 17.2.06

Deadline : 19.5.06

Priority themes :

- eGovernment
- eHealth
- eInclusion
- eLearning
- Trust & Security
- Services supporting SMEs.

Two action types :

- * Initial deployment projects
- * Market validation projects