



# **POLICY TRANSFER**

## **LARS WP5 Report**

**Varis Putnins**



EUROPEAN  
REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT  
FUND



## Contents

1. INTRODUCTION .....	4
2. OUTPUT 5.1. INTERACTION ON POLICIES BETWEEN SENDERS AND RECEIVERS .....	5
2.1. OUTPUT 1 – Guidelines for selecting good practices, organizing focus group meeting and reporting them .....	5
2.2. OUTPUT 2 – The listed description of the selected good practices .....	13
2.2.1. Hamburg University of Applied Sciences .....	13
2.2.2. Innlandet .....	16
2.2.3. Latvia .....	18
2.2.4. Lithuanian Innovation Centre (LIC) .....	22
2.2.5. Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics (LAEI) .....	26
2.2.6. Ostrobothnia .....	30
2.2.7. Päijät-Häme .....	33
2.2.8. Västerbotten .....	35
2.2.9. The chosen good practices .....	39
3. OUTPUT 5.2. STRATEGIES OF CHANGE – IMPLEMENTING SMART POLICY CHANGES .....	40
3.1. Hamburg University of Applied Sciences .....	40
3.2. Innlandet .....	45
3.3. Latvia .....	49
3.4. Lithuanian Innovation Centre .....	54
3.5. Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics .....	60
3.6. Ostrobothnia .....	65
3.7. Päijät-Häme .....	69
3.8. Västerbotten .....	77
4. OUTPUT 5.3. MAPPING OF BARRIERS TO CHANGE AND UNEXPECTED RESISTANCE TO CHANGE – CHALLENGES IN GOVERNANCE OF SMART SPECIALIZATION .....	82
4.1. Hamburg University of Applied Sciences .....	82
4.2. Innlandet .....	84
4.3. Latvia .....	86
4.4. Lithuanian Innovation Centre .....	88

4.5.	Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics .....	90
4.6.	Ostrobothnia .....	92
4.7.	Päijät-Häme .....	94
4.8.	Västerbotten .....	96
CONCLUSIONS.....		99

# 1. INTRODUCTION

Through WP4 an extensive search across all regions in order to identify potential good practices and challenges was undertaken, expectations of possible transfers of policies were tested and possible barriers addressed. Based on these achievements, during WP5 partners tested the methods to transfer good practices (on bridging the gaps) to regions with problems. The aim of WP5 is to strengthen the institutional capacity and governance of Smart Specialization programs and partnerships through transfers of good practices and dialogues on policy improvements, thus paving the way for new strategies and experimental pilot actions undertaken in WP6.

All good practices are based on unique preconditions. Accordingly, transfers are not seen as “cut and paste” operations. Instead, analysis and comparative material generated in WP 2, 3, and 4 are used as inputs to interconnected dialogues aiming at "translation" of good solutions between regions. Through "translation", certain elements of the good practice are seen in connection with the situation and preconditions in the receiving region, as points of departure to identify possible solutions, adapted to local conditions. These solutions might be quite different from the "original" good practice because they are taken out of their original context and adapted to a new. A well-developed method in this "translation" is the "learning history approach". This process is organized through networks between specific pairs of regions who "have something to learn from each other".

This report describes the activities and outputs of WP5:

- Output 1 – interaction on policies between senders and receivers. This output consists of two parts - guidelines for selecting good practices, organizing focus group meetings, and reporting them made by WP5 leader –Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (Latvia) and the process and listed description of every partner selected good practices. Also, the summary table is included in this report.
- Output 2 – strategies of change. In this section, a detailed report on every partner change model is described. The change model is activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice. During the activities for Output 2, every partner organized a focus group meeting and did benchmark. These processes are described as well. Also, SWOT analysis for each change model is provided.
- Output 3 mapping of barriers to change and unexpected resistance to change. This section gives more information on challenges, barriers, and opportunities in translating good practices. In this section partners also analyzed the preconditions for implementing the good practice as well as identified the next steps.

## **2. OUTPUT 5.1. INTERACTION ON POLICIES BETWEEN SENDERS AND RECEIVERS**

### **2.1.OUTPUT 1 – Guidelines for selecting good practices, organizing focus group meeting and reporting them**

#### **Work Package 5: A 5.1 Interaction on policies between senders and receivers - guidelines**

The participating regions in this activity will define:

- 1) Their development challenges concerning regional connectivity between quadruple helix actors;
- 2) Check the list and analysis of good practices;
- 3) Evaluate if any of the good practices analysed in the WP4 will match to their challenges.

These guidelines consist of several parts:

- 1) Selecting good practice;
- 2) Organising focus group meeting, incl. the template for presentation;
- 3) Reporting on focus group meeting and discussions.

#### **1) Selecting good practice**

In order to provide good practice from sending region such activities should be done (and every LARS partner did these activities):

- 1) Make the relevant stakeholder analysis for companies, public organisations, universities and NGO at the certain sector of the economy at particular region;
- 2) Make interviews with stakeholders and combining the results in a comparative analysis Q4 table to see the gaps;
- 3) Organise 1<sup>st</sup> focus group to verify the results of interviews, gaps and their causes and the ideas for preliminary good practices;
- 4) Make a detailed analysis of selected good practices and introduce with it other partners. Such factors were analysed – drivers, main actors, connectivity, the importance of involved stakeholders, first mover, main learning, etc.;
- 5) Based on conclusions and information gathered before, choose one good practice which could be offered to receiving regions, and provide more information to partners about it;
- 6) Present this one good practice in Transnational learning seminar;
- 7) Make the final report and description for your own good practice (WP4).

As the description of how to choose the good practice from sending region is provided, now let's take a look at how to choose the good practice from other regions and how to do the matching:

- 1) Get familiar with all information about chosen good practices from partners;
- 2) During Transnational learning seminar present all good practices from sending regions;

- 3) Together with stakeholder choose one good practice which is the most relevant in your (receiving) region;
- 4) Make analysis and comparison

As the main idea for the LARS project is to bridge the gaps, selecting good practice is based on comparing the situation in sending region and receiving region.

For good practices to be more transparent, these guidelines provide a Table for selecting good practices (Annex 1).

The next steps are:

- 1) Every partner should fill in the information on their provided good practice in sending region (column “offered” and the last 3 columns). This table offers to combine not only factors just for one good practice itself (which are described in WP4 reports), but also to combine information from WP2 and WP3. Here is no need to describe all factors once more but more important is to combine them by using numbers – where possible;
- 2) Every partner should fill in columns “needed” describing the situation in their (sending) region (information in rows will be the same);
- 3) Combine in one table results for sending (offered) and receiving (needed) region;
- 4) Do the math based on instructions below the table. You can transfer this table to Excel for making calculations.

An example of how to fill in the table is provided. NB! This is just an example and does not reflect any of partners.

- 5) But as we know figures can be misleading, so for this step some descriptive analysis for preliminary chosen practice on such questions should be provided:
  - a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?
  - b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?
  - c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?
- 6) If the analysis of chosen good practice (4<sup>th</sup> step) responds to the situation in the receiving region, the work is done. If, after making an analysis on 4<sup>th</sup> step, the partner understands that there are problems and this good practice doesn’t respond to the situation in receiving region, so take the second “place” (from numbers in table) and do the 4<sup>th</sup> step once again. It should be done as many times as needed to get the match;
- 7) Clearly state the chosen good practice (the match).

**Task for partners: Please send the table with filled “offered” column from your region (sending region) and “needed” column for your region (receiving region) to WP5 leader till 3<sup>rd</sup> of February.**

**WP5 leader will make calculations and combine tables for every partner.**

## 2) Organising focus group meeting

The selected good practice from a “sender” region will be presented concretely in a focus group meeting in a “receiving” region. The focus group meeting will be organised by the partner organisations of LARS but the participants of the focus group meetings are the target group consisting of **public administrators, policymakers, intermediate organisations and other quadruple helix actors (universities, companies)**. They can at least partly be the same participants as in the regional focus group meeting on gap analysis and gap indices (part of WP2, period 2) since they are already somewhat familiar with the idea of gaps and the idea of improvement of regional connectivity as a precondition for successful S3 and entrepreneurial discovery process.

The participants should have **key positions** in the public administration, policymakers, and other quadruple helix actors. In the focus group meeting, the representative of sending region (LARS partner) will present the story of good practice based on the good practice analysis made in WP4. During the focus group, you don’t need to describe the methodology how did you choose the good practice (Table for selecting good practice) but put more effort into describing the practice itself. The participants will then benchmark the elements of selected good practice in their own context.

The idea of the focus group meeting is to evaluate more thoroughly the elements of selected good practice and translate these elements into the need and context of the receiving region using the benchmarking approach. For benchmarking use the elements from Table for selecting good practice should be used.

The benchmarked and translated elements of the good practices will then lead to the strategy of change in the “receiving region”. It is also possible to select two potential and transferable good practices based on the good practice analysis made in WP4, compare them or their element and try to translate them in the focus group meeting organised in the receiving region. It is possible even to combine the transferable elements of two good practices and translate them in the context of receiving regions. However, it will be a more complex exercise, so the template is provided just for transferring one good practice.

If you need some more and concrete information about the selected good practice you can either contact the sending region or even organise a study visit.

Please use the provided PowerPoint template to structure the focus group meeting and take some pictures during the meeting.

**Task for partners: Organise focus group meeting during February**

### **3) Reporting on focus group meeting and discussions**

Based on conclusions from focus group meeting but also using your own experience which you gained through interviews, comparative analysis, 1<sup>st</sup> focus group meeting, transnational learning seminars, other discussions with both internal stakeholders and LARS partners during the meeting, please prepare reports for Activity 5.2. and 5.3.

**Task for partners: Make reports according to the template (Annex 2) for Activities 5.2. and 5.3. and send them to WP5 leader till the end of March**

## Annex 1

Table for selecting good practices

REGION: _____																
1	2		3						4		5		6	7	8	9
Region	Gaps		Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						Value chain level <b>Level 1</b> Design/ Redesign/Development <b>Level 2</b> Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material <b>Level 3</b> Production <b>Level 4</b> Distribution <b>Level 5</b> Marketing/ Sales/Service <b>Level 6</b> Consumption <b>Level 7</b> Collection <b>Level 8</b> Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling <b>Level 9</b> Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		Driver		Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	Opportunity for success (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Degree of transferabili ty (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Su m
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed				
A	Companies- universities <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	Companies – universities <i>Fill with information needed for your regions</i>	2 <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	3 <i>Fill with information needed for your regions</i>	2 <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	2 <i>Fill with information needed for your regions</i>	3 <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	2 <i>Fill with information needed for your regions</i>	1-5 <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	9 <i>Fill with information needed for your regions</i>	Company <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	University <i>Fill with information needed for your regions</i>	1 <i>Fill with information from your region</i>	2 <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	2 <i>Fill with information offered from your region</i>	22 <i>Do not fill</i>
B	Public organisations – companies	Companies – universities	1 <i>Do not fill</i>	3 <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	3 <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	1-3 <i>Do not fill</i>	9 <i>Do not fill</i>	Company <i>Do not fill</i>	University <i>Do not fill</i>	1 <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	18 <i>Do not fill</i>
C	NGOs - companies	Companies – universities	3 <i>Do not fill</i>	3 <i>Do not fill</i>	1 <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	1 <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	1-9 <i>Do not fill</i>	9 <i>Do not fill</i>	NGO <i>Do not fill</i>	University <i>Do not fill</i>	2 <i>Do not fill</i>	3 <i>Do not fill</i>	1 <i>Do not fill</i>	21 <i>Do not fill</i>
..	..	..	..													



If in columns 2, 4, 5 there is a match, then 3 points, if no match – 0 points. For 1st column relationships towards stakeholders are not important. Company-university and university-company is a match.

**LARS**  
**Work package 5**  
**POLICY TRANSFER**

Region: \_\_\_\_\_

The contents

- 1. Selecting good practice**
- 2. Focus group meeting**
- 3. Strategies of change**
- 4. Mapping of barriers to change and unexpected resistance change**

**1. Selecting good practice**

Please include your table and answer to following questions:

TABLE

- a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?
- b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?
- c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?
- d. Clearly state the chosen good practice (the match).

**2. Focus group meeting**

Please describe the organisational part of the focus group! When did it happen? How many stakeholders were there? What do they represent?

**3. Strategies of change (Output 5.2.)**

- a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region):

- i. Are the gaps the same in your region and sending region;
  - ii. Are the stakeholders and they parameters the same in your region and sending region;
  - iii. Is the value chain level the same in your region and sending region;
  - iv. Are the drivers the same in your region and sending region;
- b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?
- c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice;
- d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made;
- e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities;
- f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.

<b>Strengths:</b> characteristics of the project that give it an advantage over others.	<b>Weaknesses:</b> characteristics of the project that place the project at a disadvantage relative to others.
<b>Opportunities:</b> elements in the environment that the project could exploit to its advantage.	<b>Threats:</b> elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the project.

Strengths and weaknesses are frequently internally-related, while opportunities and threats commonly focus on the external environment.

#### 4. Mapping of barriers to change and unexpected resistance change (Output 5.3.)

- a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?
- b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?

- c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?
- d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?
- e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region

## **5. Conclusions and the reflections on the whole process**

NB! You don't need obligatory to answer all the questions in the template. Some of them are just to give directions and ideas.

## **2.2.OUTPUT 2 – The listed description of the selected good practices**

### **2.2.1. Hamburg University of Applied Sciences**

#### **a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?**

Based on the input and on the story behind the good practise from the WP4 report we choose the good practise from Ostrobothnia as a practise to learn from. Even though the good practise from Ostrobothnia seems not to be the perfect match, it has some important similarities with the Hamburg case.

The highest match is considered to be the good practise from Päijät Häme. This is a company driven good practise, where the engagement of universities is missing. In Hamburg, there is a lack of involvement from companies and the universities are very active. However, the companies in Päijät Häme are active because they are motivated to improve their situation and because they are in a problematic situation. Companies in Hamburg are still in a comfortable situation and don't see the need for change.

#### **b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?**

The good practise from Ostrobothnia has also a university as a driver, but it is more advanced over time and in the development of the helices. Hamburg's innovation system for circular economy is still fragmented and it could learn from Ostrobothnia how to improve the cooperation. The Hamburg case side shows no big gaps, but it does not show high level of cooperation either.

The grain cluster from Päijät Häme could be an example how to bridge the gaps in Hamburg. This practise connects industry companies and universities, research institutes and NGOs, fostering circular economy for more efficient and innovative use of resources. Common goals lead to strong commitment of all actors. Companies can engage seeing some short-term business advantages coming from joint the projects.

#### **c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

Yes

REGION: Hamburg																
1	2		3						4		5		6	7	8	9
Region	Gaps		Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						Value chain level <b>Level 1</b> Design/ Redesign/Development <b>Level 2</b> Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material <b>Level 3</b> Production <b>Level 4</b> Distribution <b>Level 5</b> Marketing/ Sales/Service <b>Level 6</b> Consumption <b>Level 7</b> Collection <b>Level 8</b> Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling <b>Level 9</b> Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		Driver		Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	Opportunity for success (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Degree of transferabili ty (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Su m
			Urgency		Legitimacy		Power									
		Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Neede d			
Innlande t (Opplan d)	Companies - Universities	University - Company	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5	4	Public organisat ion	Compa ny	3	3	2	29
Paijat- Hame	Companies - Universities	University - Company	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5, 7, 8	4	Compan y	Compa ny	2	3	2	31
LITHU ANIA (Alanta)	University - government	University - Company	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-9	4	Universi ty	Compa ny	2	3	2	25
Region Västerb otten	NGO – public sector	University - Company	3	3	2	3	3	3	1-5, 9	4	NGO	Compa ny	2	2	3	27
LITHU ANIA (LIC)	companies – public institutions	University - Company	3	3	2	3	2	3	1,3,9	4	NGO	Compa ny	2	3	2	23
Ostrobot hnia	Universities – companies	University - Company	2	3	2	3	2	3	9	4	Universi ty	Compa ny	2	2	2	24

(univers ity platform s)																
LATVI A	NGO - companies	University - Company	2	3	1	3	2	3	1-5	4	NGO	Compa ny	3	3	2	25

## 2.2.2. Innlandet

GION: Innlandet (Oppland)																
1 Region	2 Gaps		3 Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 – medium; 3 – high						4 Value chain level Level 1 Design/ Redesign/Developmen t Level 2 Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material Level 3 Production Level 4 Distribution Level 5 Marketing/ Sales/Service Level 6 Consumption Level 7 Collection Level 8 Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantlin g Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		5 Driver		6 Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 – low	7 Opportunity for success (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 – high	8 Degree of transferabili ty (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 – high	9 Sum
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Neede d				
Päijät-Häme	Companies - Universities	Universiti es - Companie s	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5, 7, 8	9	Compan y	Comp any	2	3	2	28
LITHUANIA (Aialanta)	University - government	Universiti es - Companie s	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-9	9	Universit y	Comp any	2	3	2	25
Region Västerbotten	NGO – public sector	Universiti es - Companie s	3	3	2	3	3	3	1-5, 9	9	NGO	Comp any	2	2	3	27
LITHUANIA (LIC)	companies – public institutions	Universiti es - Companie s	3	3	2	3	2	3	1,3,9	9	NGO	Comp any	2	3	2	26
Ostrobothnia (universi ty platform s)	Universities – companies	Universiti es - Companie s	2	3	2	3	2	3	9	9	Universit y	Comp any	2	2	2	27
Hamburg	University - NGO	Universiti es - Companie s	1	3	1	3	1	3	1-9	9	Universit y	Comp any	2	2	3	22
Latvia	NGO companies	Universiti es - Companie s	2	3	1	3	2	3	1-5	9	NGO	Comp any	3	3	2	22

### a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?

According to this methodology it seems that the best practise from Päjä-Häme, Västerbotten and Ostrobothnia is most relevant for Innlandet. The practice from Päjä-Häme and Västerbotten is focusing on cluster establishment, while the best practice from Ostrobothnia is a platform based dialog between the university and the companies and other stakeholders.

In Innlandet we have for the resent year been working on establishing Norwegian Wood Cluster containing the value chain Wood Construction, which is out chosen value chain in the LARS-project. This cluster has members from most of the levels in the value chain and is based on much of the same principles as The Cluster of Forest Technology (Västerbotten) and The grain cluster (Päjä-Häme).

The Bioeconomy Network described by Västerbotten is also an important topic in Norway. Cooperation between regions to highlight the potential of landbased bioeconomy is needed in a country based on income from oil and gas. The government have launched and national bioeconomy strategy and an action plan to follow. It is however need for concretization of actions and a supplement of economic instruments to achieve growth in the bioeconomy. This requires better cooperation between regions toward national governments.

### b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?



As described in WP3 there is a need to improve the dialog between the companies and the universities. A statement from the first focus group meeting was; “this is a problem we have to solve”.

We find the story behind the platforms established in Ostrobothnia very similar to the situation in Innlandet. In many ways the dialog between the companies and universities are improving due to different activities. To further improve this dialog according to the results from the survey we find the platform-based approach from the University of Vaasa interesting.

This kind of platform, or door opener to the universities, can be a good supplement to FORREGION. FORREGION is the good practice from Innlandet to the LARS-project.

The region is also involved in other initiatives and project focusing on the same topics. An example is the BioBord initiative. Biobord platform is part of a piloting phase of RDI2CluB-project, founded by EU and Interreg Baltic Sea Region. It will be important to find synergies between best practice identified in LARS and the pilot in the RDI2Club-project.

**c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

Both the transnational learning seminar and in the dialogue with other stakeholders, as an alternative to focus group meeting, confirms that the good practice is interesting and that Innlandet should consider implementing this good practice.

### 2.2.3. Latvia

REGION: LATVIA																
1 Region	2 Gaps		3 Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						4 Value chain level <b>Level 1</b> Design/ Redesign/Development <b>Level 2</b> Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material <b>Level 3</b> Production <b>Level 4</b> Distribution <b>Level 5</b> Marketing/ Sales/Service <b>Level 6</b> Consumption <b>Level 7</b> Collection <b>Level 8</b> Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling <b>Level 9</b> Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		5 Driver		6 Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	7 Opportunity for success (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	8 Degree of transferabili ty (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	9 Su m
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Need ed				
Innlande t (Opplan d)	Companies - Universities	Companie s – universitie s	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5	9	Public organisat ion	Public organi sation	3	3	2	29
Paijat- Hame	Companies - Universities	Companie s – universitie s	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5, 7, 8	9	Compan y	Public organi sation	2	3	2	25
LITHU ANIA (Alanta)	University - government	Companie s – universitie s	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-9	9	Universi ty	Public organi sation	2	3	2	25
LITHU ANIA (LIC)	companies – public institutions	Companie s – universitie s	3	3	2	3	2	3	1,3,9	9	NGO	Public organi sation	2	3	2	26
Ostrobot hnia (univers ity)	Universities – companies	Companie s – universitie s	2	3	2	3	2	3	9	9	Universi ty	Public organi sation	2	2	2	27

platforms																
Hamburg	University - NGO	Companies – universities	1	3	1	3	1	3	1-9	9	University	Public organisation	2	2	3	22
Region Västernorrland	NGO – public sector	Companies – universities	3	3	2	3	3	3	1-5, 9	9	NGO	Public organisation	2	2	3	27

**a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?**

Based on the calculations the Innlandet (Oppland) offered good practice (FORREGION) got the most points – 29 points. In the second place after matchmaking and calculations process are two good practices – from Ostrobothnia and Vasterbotten – 27 points for both. In order to analyze these good practices further, a more detailed analysis should be made. Despite the fact, that Region Vasterbotten got the second-highest result, it shouldn't be chosen as the good practice because it doesn't respond to the gaps which we need to fill. As filling the gaps is a crucial point for the next activities, this good practice is not chosen as good practice. So the two practices are left. Based on the data from the table we can see that mostly parameters are the same but the value chain levels with Ostrobothnia match more so this will be the chosen good practice from the table.

**b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?**

As we can see, the chosen good practice fills the gaps we have and which we want to bridge. However, not only the gaps are important but the story behind it as well – how it all started, etc. The story behind this good practice is relevant in the receiving region because both regions focus on a regional level, both regions have certain preconditions, for both regions, there is pressure from society that urgent changes are needed. As stated in the good practice story “local companies have become more accustomed to the researchers” and “research field has also changed as researchers have seen that phenomena-based and multi-disciplinary research opens new avenues for research”. Also, the main goal of the platform – to create an innovative and unique research and applied research very well corresponds to the need of our region. The idea that this platform is like a tool for the active involvement of companies is the idea which we need in our region. Also, the open-door approach is something that we could transfer to our region. These points are very crucial for our region so for sure we can conclude that the story behind the good practice is relevant to our region.

**c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

The transnational learning seminar was held on the 16th of October. During this seminar, all good practices from sending regions were presented to local stakeholders. Similar to the table described in section a, the stakeholders mostly were interested in Oppland's and Ostrobothnia's good practices. Participants admitted that those two practices at the same time have common and different aspects. But at the end of the day, stakeholders couldn't say which practice is better and which should we use further. Stakeholders agreed that for every good practice there are elements and aspects for which could we learn. But to sum up the discussions – yes, transnational learning seminar confirmed the good practice from Ostrobothnia as the good practice which could be transferred and implemented. Of course one of the main conclusions from the discussions was that we can't simply take this good example and try to implement it in our region (even if there is a

match and the story corresponds) to our needs. This good practice needs to be translated. The process of translation is described in the next sections of this report.

## 2.2.4. Lithuanian Innovation Centre (LIC)

REGION: Lithuania															
1	2		3						4		5		6	7	8
Region	Gaps		Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						Value chain level <b>Level 1</b> Design/ Redesign/Development <b>Level 2</b> Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material <b>Level 3</b> Production <b>Level 4</b> Distribution <b>Level 5</b> Marketing/ Sales/Service <b>Level 6</b> Consumption <b>Level 7</b> Collection <b>Level 8</b> Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling <b>Level 9</b> Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		Driver		Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	Opportunity for success (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Degree of transferability (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high
			Urgency		Legitimacy		Power								
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed			
LITHUANIA	companies – public institutions	business – universities	3	3	2	3	2	3	1,3,9	1,3,7,8,9	NGO	Public organisation, NGO	2	3	2

REGION: Lithuania (LIC)										
1	2	3			4	5	6	7	8	9
Region	Gaps	Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high			Value chain level <b>Level 1</b> Design/ Redesign/Development <b>Level 2</b> Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material <b>Level 3</b> Production <b>Level 4</b> Distribution <b>Level 5</b> Marketing/ Sales/Service <b>Level 6</b> Consumption <b>Level 7</b> Collection <b>Level 8</b> Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling <b>Level 9</b> Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider	Driver	Risk of failure (1- 3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	Opportuni ty for success (1- 3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Degree of transferabi lity (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	S u m

	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed				
Innlandet (Oppland)	Companies - Universities	companies – universities	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5	1,3,7,8,9	Public organisation	Public organisation	3	3	2	32
Paijat-Hame	Companies - Universities	companies – universities	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5, 7, 8	1,3,7,8,9	Company	Public organisation	2	3	2	28
LITHUANIA (Alantaa)	University - government	companies – universities	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-9	1,3,7,8,9	University	Public organisation	2	3	2	25
Region Västernorrland	NGO – public sector	companies – universities	3	3	2	3	3	3	1-5, 9	1,3,7,8,9	NGO	Public organisation	2	2	3	27
Ostrobotnia (university platforms)	Universities – companies	companies – universities	2	3	2	3	2	3	9	1,3,7,8,9	University	Public organisation	2	2	2	27
Hamburg	University - NGO	companies – universities	1	3	1	3	1	3	1-9	1,3,7,8,9	University	Public organisation	2	2	3	22
LATVIA	NGO - companies	companies – universities	2	3	1	3	2	3	1-5	1,3,7,8,9	NGO	Public organisation	3	3	2	25

**a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?**

Based on the research and activities made by LARS project partners and their prepared outputs Lithuanian Innovation centre identified 2 main good practices that partly correspond to the needs of Panevezys regional stakeholders and could be considered as the potential new initiative that might be implemented into to Panevezys region's innovation ecosystem. Those two good practices are:

1. Oppland's good practice driven by public institution: FORREGION. The main task is to promote a greater focus on R&D activities in businesses with little or no R&D experience in order to increase their internal capacity to innovate, create value and their competitiveness.
2. Päijät-Häme's good practice driven by public institution: Grain Cluster which aims to connect food and beverage industry companies and public actors and via them universities, research institutes and NGOs

However, none of these two practice were meeting all those demands that Panevezys region had, consequently we needed to find other examples that could help to improve cooperation between helixes in Panevezys region. During period 5 LARS project partners held an international WP4 workshop where LIC had an opportunity to discuss this issue, whether other regions have institutions that might help to coordinate and facilitate partnerships between business and universities. Partners from Päijät-Häme region presented their great initiative Lahti Regional Development Company (LADEC). It helps entrepreneurs and businesses in founding, growing, networking, developing and locating a business, in addition to internationalisation. With the help of partners from Päijät-Häme we managed to collect all necessary information that was very relevant in the benchmarking procedure.

**b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?**

The main task was to evaluate whether the implementation of such a good practice as LADEC would allow to fill the main gaps that exist in Panevezys region. The most significant challenge that was noticed during the survey phase is vague collaboration between companies and universities.

Empirical research results suggested that SMEs are interested in the closer cooperation with partners from universities or research institutes, in order to maximize their productivity and improve their products companies are always looking for the ways how they could collaborate with actors that are more experienced in R&D activities. However, there are various obstacles that hinder from creation of successful partnerships. First of all, regional companies struggle to find an appropriate partner that could be a reliable partner and help them with a specific problem by offering some kind of R&D services. Usually R&D institutions are comparatively inactive, even though they have a brilliant know-how in various fields, they are unaware how they can offer it as a product for SMEs and other actors. This is becoming a big challenge for the regional value chain as connections between two most important helixes is pretty weak. Thus, region really needs a connecting part that would work as an intermediary between these helixes and would disseminate information about fields of expertise of R&D center and demands from the SMEs. Finland has a great experience in solving this problem, by filling this empty "intermediary" part in the innovation ecosystem by regional development agencies that usually execute functions of business facilitator. These organizations help to connect and find a common language between different type of organizations, as usually these two different entities are speaking in two different languages and it



is really hard to agree on the terms how they can cooperate. In those cases, the main problem is not the willingness of private entities to execute R&D activities and cooperate with universities, but the satisfaction of this collaboration. Thus, it is really important to evaluate the possibility to establish a new regional development agency, than would have enough expertise and resources to establish new ties between different regional actors.

**c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

As a result, the good practice presented by Pääjat-Häme region – LADEC was selected as the relevant one. The benchmarking process proved that it might help to achieve results that are currently prioritized. Panevezys region needs a central institution that could help to create an entrepreneurial and cooperative culture among all innovation actors. First of all, Panevezys region needs a coordinating actor that would connect all innovation actors in the region and set the direction for the whole region and each organization that could be part of regional value chain. The main aspects that we would like to transfer from LADEC into Lithuanian innovation ecosystem:

- The structure of main functions and activities;
- Areas of expertise in consulting companies;
- Coordination of relevant innovation actors.

### 2.2.5. Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics (LAEI)

REGION: Lithuania, Alanta School of Technology and Business																
1	2		3						4		5		6	7	8	9
Region	Gaps		Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						Value chain level <b>Level 1</b> Design/ Redesign/Development <b>Level 2</b> Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material <b>Level 3</b> Production <b>Level 4</b> Distribution <b>Level 5</b> Marketing/ Sales/Service <b>Level 6</b> Consumption <b>Level 7</b> Collection <b>Level 8</b> Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling <b>Level 9</b> Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		Driver		Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	Opportunity for success (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Degree of transferability (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Sum
			Urgency		Legitimacy		Power									
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed				
Innlandet (Oppland)	Companies - Universities	University – public organisations	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5	9	Public organisation	Public organisation	3	3	2	26
Paijat-Hame	Companies - Universities	University – public organisations	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5, 7, 8	9	Company	Public organisation	2	3	2	22
Region Västernorrland	NGO – public sector	University – public organisations	3	3	2	3	3	3	1-5, 9	9	NGO	Public organisation	2	2	3	27
LITHUANIA	companies –	University – public	3	3	2	3	2	3	1,3,9	9	NGO	Public organ	2	3	2	26

A (LIC)	publi c instit ution s	organi sation s										isatio n				
Ostro bothn ia (univ ersity platfo rms)	Univ ersiti es – comp anies	Unive rsity – public organi sation s)	2	3	2	3	2	3	9	9	Univ ersity	Publi c organ isation n	2	2	2	24
Hamb urg	Univ ersity - NGO	Unive rsity – public organi sation s	1	3	1	3	1	3	1-9	9	Univ ersity	Publi c organ isation n	2	2	3	22
LAT VIA	NGO - comp anies	Unive rsity – public organi sation s	2	3	1	3	2	3	1-5	9	NGO	Publi c organ isation n	3	3	2	22

**a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?**

Based on the previously implemented research in LARS regions and calculations, the summary table suggests choosing the Vasterbotten practice for the Lithuanian case in circular bioeconomy - Alanta School of Technology and Business. From the interviews done in previous stages of project implementation on collaboration expectations and experiences it was observed, that the greatest collaboration gaps in the field of the selected area of intervention for smart specialization development – circular bioeconomy (biogas production from manure and wastes), are in collaboration with governments, universities and NGOs. Accordingly, Vasterbotten practice demonstrates good collaboration experiences regarding a similar area of intervention, i.e. bioeconomy, and the gaps observed in Lithuania in developing bioeconomy as smart specialization.

**b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?**

Vasterbotten practice looks suitable by proposing good conditions for transnational learning of how to close the observed gaps in Lithuania, using their collaboration experiences, since their gaps are significantly smaller in the areas which are vibrant in the Lithuanian case. Vasterbotten story

behind gives particular insights that might prove the relevancy of this practice to the receiving region – Lithuania in closing the observed gaps.

First, Vasterbotten practice follows the same broad goal in the selected area of intervention – bioeconomy. It is stated by Vasterbotten, that “Growth in the bioeconomy needs to be largely based on specific regional conditions. Through sustainable use of bioresources, EU regions can help solve global challenges such as a growing population, over-exploitation of resources, environmental pollution and climate change. The potential of Swedish regions to contribute to the bioeconomy needs greater emphasis” (WP4 Report, p. 50). The same emphasis is declared by the Government of Lithuania, by setting ‘Bioeconomy’ as one of the Smart specialization targets in Lithuania. Moreover, despite the fact, that Vasterbotten practice is implemented in the forest sector, it holds the same ambitions as Lithuania in the circular bioeconomy field (biogas from manure and wastes): “The EU has high ambitions for climate and environmental work where the forest and bioeconomy are important for the circular economy of the future. To make it possible to achieve regional, national and European sustainable economic development, regions development must be placed in a wider context as well as development work (including legislation) at both national and the EU level must be placed in a regional context.” (WP4 Report, p. 50–51).

Second, Vasterbotten practice demonstrates the sound collaboration success, in a form of networking: “In this light the Bioeconomy network started to take its form.” Thus the form of organization, i.e., networking via various types of platforms and others, in Lithuania are recognized as crucial success factors for closing the collaboration gaps for developing the Smart specialization in bioeconomy.

Third, Vasterbotten practice proposes, how their collaboration experiences help improve public policy in terms of regional strategies and make them work: “Common to all regions is the need for regional strategies, such as food security and forestry. Here, the national food strategy has already been strengthened through collaboration with more regions are those included in the network<...>. Regions are developing strategies for both developing the food industry and the forest industry in Västernorrland and the idea is that strategy work should contribute to accelerating development <...>. The network has been able to join forces and connect actors to exchange valuable lessons learned in the region. By fiscal meetings they have been able to get better insights what is needed for developing the bioeconomy in the regions but also the opportunity to meet with national and EU policy developer to get new insights and better monitoring the process. The structure for the meetings is to have one part internal and the other part is to invite key actors for bioeconomy.” (WP4 Report, p. 51). Since the greatest Lithuanian collaboration gap in bioeconomy exists with governments, Vasterbotten practice would teach Lithuanian government representatives and relevant stakeholders getting together for developing regional strategies in bioeconomy and at the same time would help improve collaboration skills on collective decision-making. Vasterbotten states, that “Decisions that promote development of the bioeconomy require knowledge of each region’s potential”. The lack of such kind of understanding is the most evident reason for observed Lithuanian gaps in bioeconomy. All the more, Vasterbotten issues, that “This knowledge exists but must be communicated both in Sweden at large and throughout the EU. Many of Sweden’s

regions are already monitoring bioeconomic policies and stimulating development locally. The bioeconomy network can increase the effectiveness considerably through collaboration.” (WP4 Report, p. 52).

Finally, Vasterbotten practice includes step-by-step process, how it was developed and refers to concrete tools that had been applied for increasing collaboration success in the field of bioeconomy (WP4 Report, p. 52). Thus such good practice can significantly increase Lithuanian representative’s understanding of the working mechanisms for smart specialization development in bioeconomy development, since transnational learning seminar in Lithuania elucidated a lack of knowledge and experience in the field, but at the same time proved existing interest to close the gap.

**c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

The transnational learning seminar in Lithuania partly proved the research findings. However, during the transnational learning seminar in Lithuania, stakeholders took a more holistic view on presented good practices and offered to take into account one more practice - Ostrobothnia (university platforms), which did not count the highest score according to the used methodology in WP5 (transferability score for Lithuania is 24). Nevertheless, from stakeholder’s point of view, this practice might be helpful to learn from when closing the gap observed in Lithuania in the area of bioeconomy development. Namely, the platform’s methodology received an interest from stakeholders, especially after discussing the collaboration gap with governments in Lithuania. Ostrobothnia stated, that platforms could be organized by anyone, not just universities and they were, by nature, not tied to a specific industry and therefore could be applied anywhere.

During the transnational learning seminar, Lithuanian stakeholders recognized various forms of networking being especially useful for closing the observed gaps.

### 2.2.6. Ostrobothnia

REGION: Ostrobothnia																	
1	2		3						4		5		6	7	8	9	
Region	Gaps		Involved stakeholders (1-3)						Value chain level		Driver		Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	Opportunity for success (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Degree of transferability (1-3) 1 – low 2 – medium 3 - high	Sum	
			1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						Level 1 Design/Redesign/Development								
			Urgency		Legitimacy		Power		Level 2 Raw Material/Secondary Raw Material Level 3 Production Level 4 Distribution Level 5 Marketing/Sales/Service Level 6 Consumption Level 7 Collection Level 8 Recycling/Reparation/Dismantling Level 9 Science/Technology/Knowledge Provider								
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed					
Innlandet (Oppland)	Companies - Universities	Public org.- companies	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5	9	Public organisation	Public organisation	3	3	2	26	
Paijat-Hame	Companies - Universities	Public org.- companies	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5, 7, 8	9	Company	Public organisation	2	3	2	22	
LITHUANIA (Alanta)	University - government	Public org.- companies	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-9	9	University	Public organisation t	2	3	2	25	
Region Västernorrland	NGO – public sector	Public org.- companies	3	3	2	3	3	3	1-5, 9	9	NGO	Public organisation	2	2	3	27	
LITHUANIA (LIC)	companies – public institutions	Public org.- companies	3	3	2	3	2	3	1,3,9	9	NGO	Public organisation	2	3	2	29	
Hamburg	University - NGO	Public org.- companies	1	3	1	3	1	3	1-9	9	University	Public organisation	2	2	3	22	
LATVIA	NGO - companies	Public org.- companies	2	3	1	3	2	3	1-5	9	NGO	Public organisation	3	3	2	22	

**a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?**

LIC practise has scored the highest points, mostly due to fitting value chain and risk, as well as potential for success. However, when presenting the good practises, regional stakeholders were more interested about the good practises from Oppland, Hamburg and Lithuania (Alanta), because those were considered to be very relevant for the region.

**b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?**

After presenting the good practises, they were all considered relevant to bridge gaps in regional collaboration.

Despite the close ties between universities and large companies in Ostrobothnia, SMEs in Ostrobothnia seem to have similar problems as SMEs in Oppland. This makes the FORREGION case relevant in Ostrobothnia.

Oppland case is directly answering one recognised gap (collaboration between SMEs and universities). The story is also relevant, but the institutional frameworks and practices are different, which makes the inclusion of good practise challenging. The Norwegian regions have own funds supporting research relevant for the regions. This institutional framework is important for FORREGION.

**c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

Yes, but the concrete application of the good practise is not yet clear. It is evident that the good practise is not transferrable directly as it is, but requires adjustments. The idea behind the good practise was recognised to be important for the region. There is a need to “translate” the practice in a way which makes it compatible with the institutional framework in Finland.



### 2.2.7. Päijät-Häme

**a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?**

We have already good experiences of cooperation between some big cluster companies and universities. The problem is that companies that benefit from the university cooperation are often large, leading companies. Smaller companies do not feel that they benefit as much. Our region needs models to increase companies' awareness of university services. The understanding of universities and public actors must also be increased in relation to the needs of companies. We also need new, systematic ways to bring companies and researchers together. That is why we chose Vaasa Open innovation platform as a good practise to apply to our region.

**b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?**

Our region's biggest recognized challenges and gaps are related to company-university cooperation. Especially SME's aren't very active users of services that universities and research institutes offers. Both big and small companies in the region feel, that the universities don't manage well enough in commercialization of innovations. Even if there are services such as business incubators and other start up services, the results have been poor. It is mostly due to a lack of knowledge, expertise and funding.

Open university platforms seemed to be the most relevant practise to try to fill previously mentioned gaps.

**c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

Yes, it did. In transnational learning seminar, held at 28<sup>th</sup> August 2019, Vaasa open innovation platform -model was the most interesting case for stakeholders. In that meeting we discussed that our regional innovation system should be more open to all players, we need new open arenas where developers, student, researches and SME's can meet. Situation in Päijät-Häme region is now very fruitful for change. Region got now its own University, Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology (LUT). LUT University also merged with Lahti and Saimaa Universities of Applied Sciences. That gives our region more possibilities to build attractive and valuable research and development environment for companies.

Annex 1  
Table for selecting good practices

REGION: Pajjat-Hame																
1	2		3						4		5		6	7	8	9
Region	Gaps		Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 - low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						Value chain level Level 1 Design/ Redesign/Development Level 2 Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material Level 3 Production Level 4 Distribution Level 5 Marketing/ Sales/Service Level 6 Consumption Level 7 Collection Level 8 Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		Driver		Risk of failure (1-3) 1 - high 2 - medium 3 - low	Opportunit y for success (1- 3) 1 - low 2 - medium 3 - high	Degree of transferabi lity (1-3) 1 - low 2 - medium 3 - high	Su m
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Need ed				
Innland et (Oppland)	Companies Universities	Universities – Companies	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-5	9	Public organis ation	Univer sity	3	3	2	26
LITHU ANIA (Alanta)	University - governmen t	Universiti es – Compani es	2	3	2	3	2	3	1-9	9	Univer sity	Univer sity	2	3	2	28
Region Västerb otten	NGO – public sector	Universiti es – Compani es	3	3	2	3	3	3	1-5, 9	9	NGO	Univer sity	2	2	3	27
LITHU ANIA (LIC)	companies – public institutions	Universiti es – Compani es	3	3	2	3	2	3	1,3,9	9	NGO	Univer sity	2	3	2	26
Ostrobo thnia (univer sity platfor ms)	Universiti es – companies	Universiti es – Compani es	2	3	2	3	2	3	9	9	Univer sity	Univer sity	2	2	2	20
Hambu rg	University - NGO	Universiti es – Compani es	1	3	1	3	1	3	1-9	9	Univer sity	Univer sity	2	2	3	25
LATVIA	NGO - companies	Universiti es – Compani es	2	3	1	3	2	3	1-5	9	NGO	Univer sity	3	3	2	22

Good practice from table results (total points) - Ostrobothnia

## 2.2.8. Västerbotten

REGION: Vasterbotten																
1	2		3						4		5		6	7	8	9
Region	Gaps		Involved stakeholders (1-3) 1 – low; 2 - medium; 3 - high						Value chain level <b>Level 1</b> Design/ Redesign/Development <b>Level 2</b> Raw Material/ Secondary Raw Material <b>Level 3</b> Production <b>Level 4</b> Distribution <b>Level 5</b> Marketing/ Sales/Service <b>Level 6</b> Consumption <b>Level 7</b> Collection <b>Level 8</b> Recycling/ Reparation/Dismantling <b>Level 9</b> Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider		Driver		Risk of failure (1-3) 1 – high 2 – medium 3 - low	Oppor tunity for succes s (1-3) 1 – low 2 – mediu m 3 - high	Degr e of transf erabili ty (1-3) 1 – low 2 – mediu m 3 - high	Su m
			Urgency		Legitimacy		Power									
	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Needed	Offered	Need ed				
Innlande t (Opplan d)	Companies - Universities	Companie s – universitie s	2	2	2	3	2	2	1-5	6-9	Public organisat ion	Public organi sation	3	3	2	27
Paijat- Hame	Companies - Universities	Companie s – universitie s	2	2	2	3	2	2	1-5, 7, 8	6-9	Compan y	Public organi sation	2	3	2	26
LITHU ANIA (Alanta)	University - government	Companie s – universitie s	2	2	2	3	2	2	1-9	6-9	Universi ty	Public organi sation t	2	3	2	23
LITHU ANIA (LIC)	companies – public institutions	Companie s – universitie s	3	2	2	3	2	2	1,3,9	6-9	NGO	Public organi sation	2	3	2	24

Ostrobothnia (university platforms)	Universities – companies	Companies – universities	2	2	2	3	2	2	9	6-9	University	Public organisation	2	2	2	25
Hamburg	University - NGO	Companies – universities	1	2	1	3	1	2	1-9	6-9	University	Public organisation	2	2	3	20
LATVIA	NGO - companies	Companies – universities	2	2	1	3	2	2	1-5	6-9	NGO	Public organisation	3	3	2	20

**a. Which practice should be chosen as a good practice based on the table? Why this practice?**

Based on the table Västerbotten should chose Oppland (1) as our good practises scouring the highest. In close second is Päijät-Häme (2) with one point lower as well as Ostrobothnia (3) in a close third.

**b. Does good practice fill the gaps? Is the story behind the good practice (from WP4 report) relevant to the situation in the receiving region?**

The table's results reflect the history of the good practices described in WP4 where Västerbotten prioritised InoLab - Ostrobothnia and FORREGION -Oppland as interesting good practices that can be used for overcoming the gaps in the region.

However, there were also differences between the report in WP4 and the table where Västerbotten also identified Industry 4 Panevėžys - Lithuania (LIC) as an interesting example but it was ranked slightly lower in the table (4th place) where instead Päijät-Häme got a higher result ( 2nd place). The gaps for Västerbotten is relatively small but that is most emergency for Västerbotten is to strengthen the cooperation in the triple helix where the most significant collaboration gap can be found between universities and companies.

**c. Did the Transnational learning seminar confirm that this good practice could be transferred and implemented?**

There are few points that distinguished the three who ranked highest as well as the selected case from previous discussions and workshops in the region. During the workshop we discussed all alternatives to possible good practices in the table with a special focus on those who rank highest when they were also those that were relevant based on previous discussion during the whole LARS process.

As several of them are interesting and were seen as good alternatives for support Västerbotten's innovation ecosystem, Oppland and Ostrobothnia's case was discussed more in depth as the method was considered particularly suitable for strengthening collaboration between actors in academia and companies where the biggest gaps are identified for Västerbotten.

Oppland good practice was seemed as a good method and Västerbotten could learn how public organisations be more active and act as intermediaries to connect companies with little or no R&D capacity with universities or other research and science institutions to push innovations. In the way the public organisations have set up the grants was very interesting to the stakeholders but due Sweden's state aid rules this seems as something difficult to transfer.

In the end Ostrobothnia's good practice was chosen as the project will be useful in order to bridge the gap within SME and university collaboration.

During the workshop, Ostrobothnia case was considered a priority as the method bridges the biggest gaps for Västerbotten, can be transformed to the region, and that it strengthens the long-term continuity of collaboration between companies and universities and was considered relevant

to strengthen collaboration in specific S3 areas. Västerbotten's process to revise the region's smart specialization strategy was also considered as a relevant time to test the Ostrobothnia method.

### 2.2.9. The chosen good practices

Receiving region	Sending region (the chosen good practice)
Hamburg	Päijät-Häme
Innlandet	Ostrobothnia
Latvia	Ostrobothnia
LIC	Päijät-Häme
LAEI	Västerbotten
Ostrobothnia	Innlandet
Päijät-Häme	Ostrobothnia
Västerbotten	Ostrobothnia

### **3. OUTPUT 5.2. STRATEGIES OF CHANGE – IMPLEMENTING SMART POLICY CHANGES**

#### **3.1. Hamburg University of Applied Sciences**

##### **Focus group meeting**

The focus group meeting for WP5 was supposed to be held on the 26<sup>th</sup> of March 2020. Due to the Corona virus situation in Hamburg, the University caused the cancellation of all meetings until the 15<sup>th</sup> of May. The focus group meeting had to be cancelled as well.

Therefore, the discussion of another event was used for the required results for WP5. The senate chancellery Hamburg invited stakeholder from universities and public administration interested in circular economy to a first workshop as part of the City Science Initiative organised by the European Commission. The aim of this initiative is to answer the question of how cities can be better introduced to the future research programme Horizon Europe and, linked to how cities can tackle their challenges (e.g. circular economy) in cooperation with science. This question was discussed together with stakeholders from public administration from economy, environment, energy and waste management and researchers from different universities working in the field of circular economy at the 21<sup>st</sup> of January 2020. In this workshop, the LARS approach was presented together with the circular economy project FORCE which is the LARS good practise for Hamburg. Several different activities were discussed to improve circular economy in cities:

1. Establishment of a network and a coordinating body
  - a. Development of a city-wide network by connecting the already existing several subject-specific networks
  - b. Establishment of a platform for exchange and cooperation
2. Establishment of regional value chains for circular economy
  - a. Where ever possible and depending on the amount of waste the establishment of regional value chains in circular economy should be established. This could be possible for example for construction waste. It seems to be more difficult for plastic or WEEE.
3. Digital Transformation
  - a. Microchips with information about the respective material in the material itself could facilitate recycling and circular economy



4. Instruments
  - a. Legislation, Waste Management Act, waste management plans, Commercial Waste Ordinance
  - b. Mandatory guidelines for sustainable public procurement
  - c. Development of a regional Circular Economy Management Plan for Hamburg based on the Hamburg climate plan
  - d. Definition of long-term objectives
  
5. Cooperation between Science and City
  - a. research project as possibility to cooperate and test new ideas in pilot cases

### Strategies of change

- a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region).

	Sending region Pjäijät Häme offer	Receiving (your) region needs
<b>Gaps</b>	<i>Companies – universities</i>	<i>Universities - companies</i>
<b>Stakeholders and parameters (urgency, legitimacy and power)</b>	<i>Urgency - 2</i> <i>Legitimacy - 2</i> <i>Power - 2</i>	<i>Urgency - 3</i> <i>Legitimacy - 3</i> <i>Power - 3</i>
<b>Value chain levels</b>	<i>Level 1-5, 7, 8</i>	<i>Level 4</i>
<b>Drivers</b>	<i>Companies</i>	<i>Public Authority</i> <i>Engagement of companies</i>

*i. Are the gaps the same in your region and sending region?*

#### Gaps in Hamburg (receiving region):

- Gaps in Hamburg were small
- Companies are not very interested in cooperation with other partners;
- Low companies' expectations and experiences
- Gap on national and regional level at cooperations between public organisations;
- Cooperation between public organisations in regional development and innovation networks on regional and on national level show the biggest gaps.
- Public organisations have the highest expectations according to their cooperations with other public organisations.
- Cooperation between universities and companies is low
- Universities in Hamburg are also not too keen to cooperate on national level, as many universities are competitors in international funding opportunities and biggest gaps relate to this national level cooperation with other universities.
- Universities also lack experiences with NGOs
- Biggest gaps on NGOs cooperation with companies regarding production networks on a regional level, and regarding innovation networks on regional and national level.

#### Gaps in Pääjat Häme

- Gaps in Pääjat-Häme were small.
- Biggest gap in values was between public sector and NGO's. NGO's in this case are companies interest groups and farmers' union.
- Public sector is having big expectations towards NGO's. That's partly because of lack of knowledge, what can NGO's role be in innovation process? NGO's have expertise but they don't have resources to facilitate cooperation. When discussing with respondents this gap between public sector and NGO's didn't come out.
- Gaps between universities and companies and gaps between companies and public sector were small, but many challenges were identified in discussions and in focus group meetings. When the gaps are very small, the change of "old habits" can be difficult to justify.

The most important gaps in the two regions might be the same, but they describe different situations. In both regions, the gap between universities and companies is important. However, this derives from different points of view. Universities and NGOs are better engaged and are the main drivers in the Hamburg case, while companies are not very much engaged and are not very motivated to cooperate. Public organisations are important partners in Hamburg. In Pääjat Häme companies are the main drivers. The gap in Pääjat Häme derives from a low engagement of universities and different concepts of the role of NGOs.

*ii. Are the stakeholders and the parameters the same in your region and sending region?*

Different stakeholders with different roles in the value chain and different levels of urgency, power and legitimacy. In Pääjat Häme companies are the driver of the process. Universities, NGOs and public authorities have less legitimacy, less urgency and public authorities have less power there.

*iii. Is the value chain level the same in your region and sending region?*

No, level 9, science, technology and knowledge is missing in Pääjat Häme, while in Hamburg universities are the driver. Therefore, Hamburg has a need for a better involvement of companies and Pääjat Häme needs a stronger involvement of universities. So far, there are no companies from value chain level 4 involved in Hamburg.

*iv. Are the drivers the same in your region and sending region?*

No, companies in Pääjat Häme, universities in Hamburg

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?**

As identified in the discussion with different stakeholders public institution and the policy level should take over the leadership and act like a moderator in this process

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

Stronger involvement of companies, may be by involving economic NGOs like the chamber of commerce and establishing a circular economy platform or a forum with stakeholders from all four helices to discuss and prepare political decisions

**d. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

Economy, policy, legislation and society have to change from a linear approach to a circular approach with reuse, repair and recycling instead of take, make dispose. This demands to rethink most ongoing processes. dialog and cooperation along the whole value chain is necessary for that. This will be only possible if public organisations will lead and organise the process and legislation and policy will support. Knowledge transfer between universities and companies must be improved. A clear benefit for companies must be visible. Customer demand, legislation, recycling targets could be motivation. Universities and companies could analyse benefits in pilot trials.

**e. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><b>Strengths:</b> characteristics of the project that give it an advantage over others.</p> <p>Many different stakeholders are engaged, policy and legislation supports transfer on European level</p> <p>Awareness of society as consumers is growing</p> <p>Region or city as responsible player for waste management,</p> <p>Pioneering role of cities</p> <p>Innovation process</p>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b> characteristics of the project that place the project at a disadvantage relative to others.</p> <p>Dependency on willing cooperation of companies</p> <p>Change is slow</p>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b> elements in the environment that the project could exploit to its advantage.</p> <p>Consumer awareness</p> <p>Political debates</p> <p>Connection to climate change management</p> <p>Technological development</p>	<p><b>Threats:</b> elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the project.</p> <p>Cooperation sometimes is connected to single persons and their willingness to engage</p> <p>Market development</p>

### 3.2. Innlandet

#### Focus group meeting

Due to the Corona-virus lock-down we were not able to organize the focus group meeting as planned. The quality assurance of the chosen best practise and identification of the criterias for successful implementation of the new practice is made by dialogue with these relevant stakeholders:

- ✓ Mr Ola Rostad, FORREGION
- ✓ Mr Torbjørn Skogsrød, Norwegian University of Science and Technology
- ✓ Mr Knut Skinnes, Norwegian Wood Cluster

This dialog verifies that the suggested best practice is very relevant for us. Specially the university find the Finnish practice interesting and they are willing to discuss a possible implementation in the future.

#### Strategies of change

**a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region).**

Table shows the benchmarking between Ostrobothnia and Innlandet. We see that the gaps are the same in the two regions, universities - companies. The story behind the platforms is like the current status Norway and Innlandet. The universities have to get more external funding for financing their projects, and the public organisations and public fundings also demands company approach and participation in the projects. In 2016 the University of Gjøvik became a part of Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU). For the wood-based value chain in our region this was an opportunity to get in touch with one of the best technology-hubs in Norway. Therefor NTNU is an important member of the Norwegian Wood Cluster.

From a public view it is desirable that our companies utilize the opportunities in hosting this university in our region, and we stimulate a higher degree of cooperation.

	<b>Sending region</b>	<b>Receiving (your) region</b>
<b>Gaps</b>	<i>Universities - Companies</i>	<i>Universities - Companies</i>
<b>Stakeholders and parametrs (urgency, legitimacy and power)</b>	<i>Urgency - 2</i> <i>Legitimacy - 2</i>	<i>Urgency - 3</i> <i>Legitimacy - 3</i>

	<i>Power - 2</i>	<i>Power - 3</i>
<b>Value chain levels</b>	<i>Level 9</i>	<i>Level 9</i>
<b>Drivers</b>	<i>University</i>	<i>Company</i>

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?**

The leader of the process is most likely to be the Cluster organization Norwegian Wood Cluster (NWC) which includes both relevant companies and one of the universities. However, NWC have for the time being a limited number of member organisations/companies. In the initial process it is more likely that the Public organisation hold the initiative through a regional planning process. In these processes there are close cooperation between the quadruple-helix actors, but it is Innlandet County Council who is responsible for the planning process.

The follow-up of the plan with relevant action plans are however a shared responsibility between the different stakeholders.

After the initial phase the establishment and administration of the platform must be the responsibility of the universities.

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

The regional reform in Norway gives us some opportunities to see how we work with innovation in a new way. We are currently working on a new Planning strategy for the new region Innlandet (Oppland + Hedmark). The planning strategy is the overarching strategic planning document, which defines the need for different regional plans. In Innlandet we have defined four different regional plans, and the most relevant for this purpose is Regional plan for innovation, value creation and competence. The main goal for this regional plan is to facilitate innovation and ensure that Innlandet is better prepared to meet the need for rapid change and competence in the future.

This regional plan will make the base for the regional authority's priorities regarding value creation and competence the coming years. This includes new ways of interaction in the quadruple-helix.

To change existing governance structures a well coordinated regional strategic process with involvement of all stakeholders is good place to start.

**d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made.**

We must expect that this kind of initiatives need financial support in the beginning, in addition to the universities own efforts. To get financial support from public organisations and instruments the measures should be anchored in prioritized regional political strategies. Initiatives like this must be anchored at top level at all the stakeholders, but specially at the universities and the regional political level.

**e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

The dialog according possible changes will be a natural part of a planning and strategy process that the regional political level will working on independently of this Interreg-process. Since we must establish this dialog anyway, this is a good opportunity to introduce alternative actions to increase innovation and value creation, and improve the connectivity between universities and companies.

**f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><i>Strengths:</i> characteristics of the project that give it an advantage over others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a regional strategy process going on</li> <li>• A cluster organisation is established</li> <li>• A base in the FORREGION project with competence brokers and public funding for R&amp;D</li> <li>• Existing initiatives such as different Technology Transfer Offices and the Norwegian Catapult Centre</li> <li>• Political goodwill (regional level)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Weaknesses:</i> characteristics of the project that place the project at a disadvantage relative to others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of resources among the companies, specially the SMEs</li> <li>• New initiatives can be perceived as treats to existing organisations</li> <li>• Stakeholders finds det process regarding regional plans less relevant</li> </ul>
--	--

<p><b>Opportunities:</b> elements in the environment that the project could exploit to its advantage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further development of FORREGION and the dialog with the researchers</li> <li>• Higher utilization of existing instruments and initiatives</li> <li>• The need for innovation after global crisis such as Covid-19.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b> elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of continuity in the organization. Change of leading persons</li> <li>• Adequate access to financial instruments</li> <li>• Lack of coordination with other instruments and initiatives</li> <li>• Dividing priorities between different regions and between regional and national level</li> </ul>
---	--



### 3.3. Latvia

#### Focus group meeting

At the beginning it was planned to organise on 26<sup>th</sup> of March. But due to the Covid-19 outbreak it was impossible to organise face-to-face meeting so the focus group was organised online on 2<sup>nd</sup> of April. The online focus group was organised in Zoom platform and was very good attended. The following stakeholders were on the board during the focus group meeting: Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (MoEPRD), Ministry of Economics, Ministry of Education and Science, Investment and Development Agency of Latvia, Vidzeme planning region, Zemgale planning region, Kurzeme planning region, Liepaja city administration, Business Union of Latvia. Mostly the stakeholders represented public sector but the attendees of this focus group meeting are working with universities, NGOs and companies (Q4 actors) on a daily basis. Some of them already have participated in previous LARS project activities – interviews, 1<sup>st</sup> focus group, transnational learning seminar etc., but some of them were not familiar with the LARS project before and admitted that the idea of transferring the good practices is very good.

During the focus group MoEPRD representative Varis Putniņš introduced the participants with the idea of LARS project, approach, goals and results. Also the chosen good practice (university platforms) was presented. The policy transfer and translation to our region was analysed. After that fruitful discussions among stakeholders on strategies of change, barriers, unexpected resistance arise. There were discussions about the best way to implement the good practice. The summary of discussions is described in the next sections of this report.

#### Strategies of change

**a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region):**

	<b>Sending region - Finland</b>	<b>Latvia</b>
<b>Gaps</b>	<i>Companies – universities</i>	<i>Companies – universities</i>
<b>Stakeholders and parametrs (urgency, legitimacy and power)</b>	<i>Urgency - 2</i> <i>Legitimacy - 2</i> <i>Power - 2</i>	<i>Urgency - 3</i> <i>Legitimacy - 3</i> <i>Power - 3</i>

<b>Value chain levels</b>	<i>Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider</i>	<i>Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider</i>
<b>Drivers</b>	<i>University</i>	<i>Public organisation</i>

*i.Are the gaps the same in your region and sending region?*

As we can see, the gaps which the chosen good practice can offer to bridge are the same which our region needs to bridge and it is the gap between companies and universities.

*ii.Are the stakeholders and they parameters the same in your region and sending region?*

Our region needs the parameters of stakeholders (urgency, legitimacy, and power) to be at level 3 so it means – at a high level but this good practice offers all parameters of stakeholders at the level 2 – medium. So it means that the needs and expectations are higher than the good practice can offer. It doesn't mean that this good practice can't be implemented but in means that some stakeholders should be changed and this good practice can't be transferred as it is in the sending region but it should be translated. It means that the core values and ideas remain the same but some adjustments regarding other descriptive factors are needed.

*iii.Is the value chain level the same in your region and sending region?*

The value chain level is the same – Level 9 – Science/Technology/Knowledge provider. It means that good practice can satisfy the needs we have in our region. But we must pay the attention that this variable (value chain level) is specific for LARS project and can be used only in the context of transferring the good practice in LARS project.

*iv.Are the drivers the same in your region and sending region?*

The sending region offers university as a driver but our region needs public organisation as a driver so it means that some adjustments should be done here as well in order to have successful transferring of good practice.

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?**

The benchmarking process showed that the biggest difference is in the driver section. During the transnational learning seminar and other discussions with relevant stakeholders, we came to the

conclusion that this good practice should be implemented at the regional level. But as in the sending region, the regional universities are not so powerful stakeholders as it is in the good practice example, it would be hard for universities to be as a driver. Also at the moment the urgency and resources for universities are not at so high extent to implement this good practice so we agreed that the driver in our region should be public organization and more concrete – the planning region. But it doesn't mean that the public organization will be the only stakeholder. It is very important to have regional universities in this platform because they have academic and research capacity. The planning region is a kind of second-level local government level, but it is not elected directly – it consists of the leaders of local municipalities from one region. As representatives from planning regions said during the focus group – they already have done similar activities and with the support from MoEPRD they could be as a driver for these processes but in order to do that they need some more clear guidelines and the initiative from MoEPRD. So we can say that the driver should be the regional public organization but the starter should be MoEPRD.

But some participants during the focus group said that we can't determine who needs to be the driver. It should turn out as a natural process and there could be different drivers in different regions because the needs for every region are different and even if the legitimacy for the same organization could be the same, power is different. The most important thing isn't who the driver is but that there is some actor/stakeholder who initiates the process and other stakeholders join around it. It could be either public organization or university or some NGO, or some companies as a cluster.

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

The governance structure, in general, is suitable to implement this good practice but changes are needed. At the moment the planning regions are not so powerful stakeholders as they should be if they are stated as the drivers for change model. For them to be more active and powerful some functions regarding not only entrepreneurship should be distributed from the national and local level to the regional level.

Also, the role of local governments should be bigger. This is not an element from sending region but it came out as a translated element during transnational learning seminar, focus group, and other activities. Local municipalities in this platform (system) could work in two directions – firstly, they could be as a demander (buyer) of new and innovative products and services through public procurements but local municipalities could work as a supporter for the companies (industry), for example, providing them with infrastructure and communications.

**d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made.**

For the change model to be successful it is important that nobody is forced to implement it (open-door policy). Of course, there should be guidelines and support from then national authorities as

well as this platform should be connected to activities at the national level but the main decisions should be made at the regional level because the situation in every region (we have 5 of them) is different and from the perspective of national level not always we can make the best decisions.

**e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

The changes and the change model on the one hand in something unique in the region and such type of activities have been implemented only on some projects, not permanent basis but on the other hand, the proposed change model is connected to existing activities. For example, the idea of regional cooperation platform (regional innovation and knowledge platform) is established in Regional policy strategy 2021-2027. Also at the moment, the administrative-territorial reform is happening in Latvia. This reform also includes the discussion about the role of local municipalities and regional stakeholders (planning regions) in such type of cooperation platform. Also, the smart specialization strategies and their implementation from the responsible national authorities are considered to be the future of regions and the tool for regional development. The planned change model isn't interfering with ongoing operations even opposite – it complements the ongoing activities and gives the impact on them.

**f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><i>Strengths:</i> characteristics of the project that give it an advantage over others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional actors have done similar activities before</li> <li>• Regional actors have preconditions to be as a drivers</li> <li>• There is an urgent need to such platform</li> <li>• The project can help to bridge the gaps</li> <li>• Change model is clear</li> </ul>	<p><i>Weaknesses:</i> characteristics of the project that place the project at a disadvantage relative to others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovation networks at the regional level are fragmented</li> <li>• Problems with strong leadership can occur</li> <li>• Local municipalities are struggling with the attraction of investments</li> <li>• This activity could be just project-based and with no future</li> <li>• Lack of financial resources</li> </ul>
<p><i>Opportunities:</i> elements in the environment that the project could exploit to its advantage.</p>	<p><i>Threats:</i> elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the project.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political willingness to support such type of activities</li> <li>• Technologies are more developed than the usage of them so there is a potential to even these factors</li> <li>• Environmental issues pressures to work on more environmentally friendly solutions</li> <li>• Companies need innovative solutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies don't see their role in smart specialization strategy and in cooperation activities</li> <li>• The unstable economical environment due to Covid-19</li> <li>• Legislative aspects can slow down the implementation of cooperation activities</li> <li>• The debate on how to use public resources more effectively can negatively affect this change model</li> </ul>
--	--

### **3.4.Lithuanian Innovation Centre**

#### **Focus group meeting**

**Country (region):** Lithuania, Panevezys region

**Date of transnational learning seminar:** 10 March, 2020

**Place:** Panevezys, Lithuania

**Number of stakeholders attending focus group meeting:** 10

**Stakeholders were representing:**

- Panevezys Council (Public institution),
- Enterprise Lithuania (Public institution),
- Confederation of Lithuanian industrialists (NGO),
- Lithuanian Robotics association (NGO),
- Panevezys vocational training center (University),
- Panevezys Mechatronic center (Research center),
- Robolabas (NGO),
- Lithuanian Innovation Centre (NGO).

#### **Strategies of change**

**a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region).**

The main goal of the meeting in Panevezys was to initiate a structural change in Panevezys county and consider the opportunity to implement a good practice suggested by Pääjat-Häme. Also, it was important to find relevant partners who could actively contribute to the implementation of new actions and take certain responsibilities.

In order to get a holistic view of how LACED is working in Pääjat-Häme region and to learn more deeply about its activities, discover the main regional stakeholders that contributes to this organization and identify the schemes of collaboration with regional companies, we organized a transnational study visit and meetings in Lahti region. Together we took main regional stakeholders – the representative of Panevezys municipality, this public institution has the biggest resources and power to initiate new actions in Panevezys County. Thus, it was of a high priority to convince the main managing authority that particular actions could convert into really successful economic, social and demographic results.

The main learnings and knowledge brought from the study-visit was presented to all stakeholders that participated in the Panevezys focus group meeting. During the stakeholder meeting together with the most important regional organizations we discussed the gaps of these good practises the regional connectivity, enabling factors for this connectivity and in general the factors for probable failure and success.

In the meeting we noticed that the first common feature that both regions - Pääjat-Häme and Panevezys county – are sharing is the same type of gap between quadruple helices:

- Previously conducted research indicated that the biggest gap of Pääjat-Häme region was between public sector and NGO's, however in further discussion this gap didn't come out as important as gap between universities and companies and gaps between companies and public sector. These gaps were highlighted in discussions and in focus group meetings. It was noted that these gaps are very small, but it is really hard and also import to overcome them, as the change of "old habits" can be very difficult challenge. Even though cluster model works quite effectively, companies want to increase the cooperation with universities and with public sector. First of all, companies would like to see Universities more actively contacting and communicating to companies about their research and development services. Secondly, company owners' think that university and research institutes representatives must learn to use language that companies can understand. Companies also expect that project managers and researchers will do their homework about businesses and would be able to provide focused cooperation that adds value.

The gaps identified in Pääjat-Häme region reflect the situation in Panevezys County quite well. Advanced manufacturing companies in Lithuania are mostly cooperating among themselves. They do not see much value in cooperation between other helices. Smaller companies are seen more open for collaboration with other organizations than bigger companies, as big companies usually have their own R&D departments, therefore they do not need to buy these services from external actors. Universities are also seen as important partners, but they follow their own logic, which makes it difficult for companies to cooperate with them. Universities' R&D efforts are not directly applicable to business purposes according to companies. They also lack the ability to sell their expertise.

Pääjat-Häme region has already set up new activities that are directed to close these gaps between companies and universities, thus Panevezys County has a huge potential to learn from these lessons and start structural changes.

National			
Companies	1.23	0.78	Universities
1.63	0.73	0.00	0.00
0.25	1.33	0.25	1.11
Public	-0.25	0.63	NGO's

Table 1 Quadruple helix cooperation – national expectations – experience gaps



- The second implication mentioned during stakeholder meeting was that we are trying to compare activities that were implemented in different economic sectors - Regional Council of Päijät-Häme made an intervention in the area of Bio- and Circular Economy, meanwhile Panevezys region is known for its strengths in advanced manufacturing sector. Nevertheless, it was agreed that the main task should be the identification of actors and actions in Panevezys' advance manufacturing value chain that would match the actors and their roles in Bio- and Circular Economy value chain. Regional Council of Päijät-Häme were looking for the solution how to add more value on bio-based side streams coming out from production, also one of their priorities was resource efficiency and minimization of carbon footprint. All these operations require a lot of R&D capacity and regional council aims that these operations would be handled by local companies or universities, as this allows to expand a regional value chain. The same vision has representatives of Panevezys Council, they would like to witness more regional companies executing their activities not only in raw materials, production or product collection, but they would like to see increasing number of companies working with design, recycling and research and development activities. Cause these changes would allow to be ahead of the flow of the 4th industrial revolution and to become a recognised robotics hub in Europe. It was discussed that Panevezys region as Päijät-Häme region in Bio- and Circular Economy sector has all the necessary resources and capabilities to foster the development of new more advanced parts of value chain. Panevezys city is rich with talent, engineering competences, scientific community that is very strongly focused on robotics and mechatronics – skills that can be applied locally, regionally and internationally.

Panevezys region has one missing part that is really important for further development – coordinating organization, that would provide all the necessary information for business and other organizations that would be interested in developing new business ideas or scale new products. Päijät-Häme region has already solved this issue as they have a Lahti Regional Development Company (LADEC) which is the main coordinator in the region which works as a one-stop-shop for companies that want to cooperate with other actors and need any kind of support: from funding to internationalization issues. Päijät-Häme region is a good evidence how companies can initiate cross-sectoral collaboration projects, nevertheless those projects won't be possible if Lahtis Regional Development company would not exist, as it provides valuable contacts also important information about funding for innovation projects that could encourage the cooperation. All participants of regional stakeholder meeting agreed that this type of organization that would coordinate all regional stakeholders is necessary for Panevezys County as the region is full of potential, however regional companies are not sure where they can get the information they need.

	<b>Päijät-Häme region</b>	<b>Panevezys County</b>
<b>Gaps</b>	1. Between universities and companies	1. Between universities and companies.



	2. Between companies and public sector	
<b>Stakeholders</b>	1. Companies 2. Clusters 3. Councils 4. Universities	1. Councils 2. Companies 3. NGOs
<b>Value Chain level</b>	Offering: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8	Need: 1, 3, 7, 8, 9
<b>The key drivers</b>	Regional municipalities	Regional municipalities

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change.**

Another exercise that was conducted during the stakeholder meeting, was mapping of regional innovation ecosystem by evaluating their capabilities and knowledge in order to estimate how those actors could contribute to the establishment of regional development agency services portfolio. It was decided to take an example of LADEC and make a Panevezys municipality (public institution) the main owner of regional development agency, in Finland the City of Lahti owns 75% of LADEC, other owners are cities and municipalities in Päijät-Häme (altogether - 7), companies, universities and institutions of higher education operating here in Päijät-Häme. The same structure was considered in Panevezys region, as stakeholders evaluated the capacity of other smaller regional municipalities to contribute to the establishment of regional development agency by adding financial and human resources. Thus, we decided that model which is publicly driven would be the best option for Panevezys region as it was successfully tested in Finland and it ensures the accessibility of such important innovation support services. One of success factors is the scale and reach of these services, that all regional companies and universities would be aware of them and ready to use in case of the demand. As a result, it is of great significance to establish an agency that would be open for every entity that would be interested in using its services.

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

In addition to the identification of an owner and the managing board of regional development agency, we aimed to find regional organizations that would be ready to provide services in those areas where employees of regional development agency would have a very limited knowledge or capacity. Those services are mostly related with topics of business development or innovation

management which could be outsourced by other public organizations. We proved the validity of particular services on the example of LADEC's services portfolio:

1. Networking and peer learning;
2. Marketing cooperation (such as joint stands and participation at fairs);
3. Cooperation in employee-related matters (recruitment, mutual utilization of workforce);
4. External communication and marketing of the network's expertise and success stories
5. Business development services (internationalization, product development, development of business operations);
6. Organizing joint training and coaching;
7. Helping to find capital funding and venture capitalist;
8. Production of information on themes that are important to the companies;
9. Planning development projects and investments;

**d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made.**

In the end of the meeting it was agreed that Panevezys Municipality as a main driver of this action plan should continue to create a structure of a regional development agency in a close collaboration with other regional partners. The new entity should have a clear role and objectives to help for SMEs to grow and succeed on international scale. The main focus should be put on help in reskilling of people, prototyping new products, reframing their factories to meet digitalization requirements, adopting new business models and improving their processes.

**e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

We decided that services nr. 1, 2 and 3 could be executed by the regional development agency on their own, but in order to ensure the quality and quantity of other services regional development agency should establish partnership with other organizations. The tasks nr. 4 and 5 could be served by Lithuanian innovation centre, the tasks nr. 6, 7 and 8 could be given to Enterprise Lithuania and the questions related to investment and regional development projects could be advised with Invest Lithuania. The list of these services might be broadened in the future in accordance to the recommendations provided by Pääjt-Häme region, regional stakeholders or by identifying the demand from local companies.

**f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><i>Strengths:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The new model would help to exploit a current knowledge and labour force.</li> <li>- New model would connect more public organizations, NGOs and other entities</li> </ul>	<p><i>Weaknesses:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Model depends on inner resources and competences that employees have.</li> </ul>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New model would expand the spectrum of services for business entities.</li> <li>- The regional one-stop-shop for enterprises will be created.</li> <li>- There will be a leading organization in regional development.</li> <li>- Model of collaboration with clusters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The most active actors in this model are NGOs or SMEs (Clusters), not the public institutions.</li> <li>- Activities of regional development agency are mostly funded by public money or European funds.</li> <li>- Has few activities related with education of young professionals.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Opportunities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear focus on one regional strength (advanced manufacturing)</li> <li>- Industry 4.0 agenda</li> <li>- EU funding opportunities that are directed to digitization</li> <li>- Cooperation with formal and non-formal education organizations.</li> <li>- Active participation of mechatronic center</li> <li>- Pro-activity of currently established NGOs</li> <li>- Comparatively small (geographically) region.</li> <li>- New transport infrastructure (Railbaltic)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Threats:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Worsening demographic situation</li> <li>- Low popularity of local universities and universities of applied science.</li> <li>- Unattractive image of engineer position for young generation.</li> <li>- Model is dependent on the support from local government.</li> </ul>

### 3.5. Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics

#### Focus group meeting

Initially Focus group meeting was planned for the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020 to discuss selection of good practice example for Lithuania – Vasterbotten good practice. Focus group meeting was canceled on 20 March 2020 because of pandemic situation with Conora-19 in Lithuania and the whole Europe.

Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics have organised another type of meeting – an on-line discussion with identified stakeholders using phone calls. Content of the on-line discussion:

- Representing content of selected good practice (Vasterbotten case);
- Discussion if this case can close the gaps identified by Lithuanian case the selected area of intervention for smart specialization development – circular bioeconomy (biogas production from manure and wastes), in collaboration with governments, universities and NGOs.

On-line discussion was organised on 23 March 2020. Participants of the on-line discussion meeting: 6 persons, representing public institution, academia, and private company. In more details:

- 2 representatives from Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Lithuania were invited that took part as stakeholders in this project from very beginning and expressed their interest in implementation of good practices already in 2<sup>nd</sup> Focus group meeting in Lithuania.
- 3 representatives from academia: Alanta Scool of Technology and Business, Lithuanian institute of Agrarian Economics.
- Cesta – private company.

#### Strategies of change

**a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region).**

	<b>Sending region</b>	<b>Receiving (your) region</b>
<b>Gaps</b>	NGO – public sector	University – public organisations

<b>Stakeholders and parameters (urgency, legitimacy and power)</b>	Urgency - 3 Legitimacy - 2 Power - 3	Urgency - 3 Legitimacy - 3 Power - 3
<b>Value chain levels</b>	Level 1-5 Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider	Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider
<b>Drivers</b>	NGO	Public organisation

*i. Are the gaps the same in your region and sending region?*

The sending region has good collaboration experiences (minimal or no gaps) in the areas, which are most problematic for receiving region (biggest collaboration gaps in Lithuania related to the passive and isolated role of governments, NGOs, and universities in particular cases).

Gaps in sending region are NGO and public sector. Gaps in receiving region are university and public organisations.

*ii. Are the stakeholders and their parameters the same in your region and sending region?*

Stakeholders in the sending and receiving regions are similarly represented by its composition in terms of helixes. At the same time, there exist natural differences of stakeholders in sending and receiving regions due to the specific field of researched activity. Namely, in the Lithuanian case (receiving region), stakeholders are selected as relevant for biogas production from manure and wastes, whereas in Vasterbotten case (sending region) stakeholders represent the forest sector. However, both good practices are parts of Smart specialization in bioeconomy field. Due to the observed interest from the receiving region towards another Ostrobothnia (university platforms) case, stakeholders are from the energy sector.

*iii. Is the value chain level the same in your region and sending region?*

The sending region's (Vasterbotten) good practice is placed in value chain levels 1-5 and 9, while the receiving region needs good practice on level 9.

*iv. Are the drivers the same in your region and sending region?*

The sending region states, that their regional actors have together joint forces for development and through this place-based approach that targets an entire community and aims to address issues that

exist at the regional level that leads to gaps a joint approach can avoid duplication of effort, create critical mass and a vision to create economic opportunities (WP4 Report, p. 53). The receiving region hold potential that may serve for the transferability success. First, the key driver in the receiving region are the right people at the right place (human resources) - idea-addicts, who are able to devote their time and hold excellence both for technical issues and for further assistance. Second, they hold sufficient power and legitimacy to put received collaboration experience into actual practice at a right place – for educating future “zero-waste” farmers. Third, there is a common goal both for the sending and receiving region – to accelerate bioeconomy in the EU. Fourth the receiving region is open and ready to allocate resources for closing taking the practice from sending region into action. Finally, the sufficient trust bridge is already built among receiving region’s stakeholders to act in the area.

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?**

The receiving region suffers from the passive role of government and NGOs in the selected area of intervention. According to the implemented research in previous project stages, the greatest issue in the field was to start collaborating among helixes in a very simple way – start talking together on the questions that cannot succeed when decisions are taken by a sole helix or only particular lobby group of stakeholders. The driver, in this case, should be necessarily placed in government helix, which currently holds the highest power, urgency, and legitimacy by composing working groups on national and regional development strategies, which further are aligned into National Strategies and its implementation mechanisms locally. There exist interest to change, however, the start of the process should be placed in the highest level, i.e. government, since the bottom-up interest and potential are very high, nevertheless, currently, it remains unheard.

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

The existing governance structure is too static, strictly hierarchic and based on understanding, that government is most important and knows all the ways particular issues should be solved. The existing hierarchy should be necessary to change into a more flexible collaborative network, in which representation of interests in the area of intervention would be fair and professional in terms of helixes stakeholders. The sender of major selected good practice (Vasterbotten) and the supporting one (Ostrobothnia) both hold sufficient experience and good practice transfer tools (i.e. flat networking structures), that would be useful in solving the existing problems in receiving region.

**d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made.**

The change-related decisions will be made through continuous communication and collaborative working in the selected area of intervention among all stakeholders. Firstly, the permanent network (working group in the bioeconomy) will be composed of relevant stakeholders from all four helixes, fairly and equally represented according to the power, urgency, and legitimacy. Secondly,

the acting network for bioeconomy development will continuously take part in strategic decisions made for regional development in Lithuania. Particular actions and tools will be suggested to include in regional developments programmes and plans. Government representatives will be provided with evidence-based recommendations on how to develop the Smart specialization in bioeconomy, namely – biogas production from manure, wastes, and other residues. All results from the above-mentioned decisions will be submitted for consideration to the Government of the Republic of Lithuania.

**e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

The described and implemented changes after the transfer of good practice from the sending region will accelerate flattening the existing hierarchical structure of decision-making in the selected area of intervention. The analysis of existing practice throughout the project elucidates that the receiving region holds many structures and bodies that are responsible for the field of bioeconomy in Lithuania. However, in most cases, it was observed, that they do not network, do not communicate, moreover – do not know or don't want to know each other for some subjective reasons. Just after a few first focus groups after LARS tasks, the positive direction regarding the will to collaborate was observed. The trust among helix stakeholders start increasing, the potential is high. After good practice transfer from the sending region(s), it is expected to make the collaboration through networking open, live and acting, and this would help to close the observed gaps in Lithuania.

**f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><i>Strengths:</i> characteristics of the project that give it an advantage over others.</p> <p>Right people in the right place;</p> <p>Good trust among stakeholders conditions;</p> <p>Big will in making a change in the area of intervention;</p> <p>Broad knowledge in the area of intervention;</p> <p>Good collaboration and communication skills of good practice-transfer organizers.</p>	<p><i>Weaknesses:</i> characteristics of the project that place the project at a disadvantage relative to others.</p> <p>Passive and isolated role of government (unwillingness to change);</p> <p>Inability to define clear priorities for smart specialization (too many areas);</p> <p>The too big focus from government on lobbies instead of public interest.</p>
--	--

<p><i><b>Opportunities:</b></i> elements in the environment that the project could exploit to its advantage.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure for biogas production in Lithuania from manure, wastes and other residues (already established biogas plants);</p> <p>People who hold excellence and ambition in the field of biogas production;</p> <p>The already existing informal network of bioeconomy stakeholders, formed through LARS activities.</p>	<p><i><b>Threats:</b></i> elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the project.</p> <p>The active role of lobby groups in the area of intervention;</p> <p>Unfavorable political processes - changes in human resources in Ministries (political-confidence posts after elections), which are already in the network with goodwill.</p> <p>Rejection from the government to include bioeconomy-related changes into National and regional development strategies, programmes and action plans.</p>
---	--



### 3.6. Ostrobothnia

#### Focus group meeting



Picture from the 13.3 meeting

Focus group meeting was held 13.3.2020 at 13-15 o'clock in Kärppä-hall, at the Regional Council of Ostrobothnia. In total 7 persons were present (three from Universities, three from public organisations and one from NGO). Besides active project group, there were only one public organisation representative and one NGO representative present.

Focus group meeting was held on the same day, when first corona-case was discovered in the region. One big event was cancelled in the region (Energyweek), which meant that many participants (who were organisers) had their hands full on making cancellation procedures. Our participants asked for e-meeting (four people said that they will participate) and we arranged this possibility, but in the end only two participants (one NGO and one public organisation) came to the meeting and none participated via e-meeting. Some informed us that they need to participate in emergency meetings and therefore had to cancel their participation. This exceptional situation affected our participation rates thus heavily.

Focus group discussion was opened by Jerker Johnson, who welcomed the participants and showed the work, which has been done in the region. Focus was on future projects, like LARS extension. These welcoming words were followed by presentation of the LARS background and the process so far, as well as the current situation by Antti Mäenpää. Åge Mariussen was presenting the FORREGION case, as well as the concept of knowledge brokering and the different aspects related to that. It was clearly established that knowledge broker should act as translator which means the broker are embedded in both helices and have understanding of both sectors.

This was followed by the benchmarking table, which was used as a way to verify that Opplands good practise (FORREGION) is matching the gaps, which were discovered during WP3 and WP4. This was followed by discussion on the practicalities of the potential pilot, as well as general development goals in the region. Overall the gaps, good practises and early suggestions for actions were considered relevant for the region.

### Strategies of change

#### a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region).

	Sending region	Receiving (your) region
<b>Gaps</b>	<i>Companies – universities</i>	<i>Companies – universities Companies-public organisations Universities-public organisations</i>
<b>Stakeholders and parametrs (urgency, legitimacy and power)</b>	<i>Urgency - 2 Legitimacy - 2 Power - 2</i>	<i>Urgency - 3 Legitimacy - 3 Power - 3</i>
<b>Value chain levels</b>	<i>Level 1-5 (development to production)  We consider this to include also 9</i>	<i>Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider</i>
<b>Drivers</b>	<i>Public organisation</i>	<i>Public organisation</i>

Opplands case was considered to be a match regarding gaps (companies (SMEs)-universities), main stakeholders (SMEs and universities) and drivers (public organisation) in the region. We however decided to leave out value chain levels from the benchmarking, because the value chains are LARS-project specific and thus our stakeholders could not know them beforehand. This worked well and stakeholders recognised a match between the received and needed good practise.

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?**

It was agreed, based on Åge's presentation that students cannot act as knowledge brokers (which was suggested in November's meeting), as the brokers need to know both academic and practical fields and this requires more experience. One suggestion was that University platforms might act in this role. However, university platform leaders sadly had to cancel their participation due to corona situation and this made it impossible to discuss with them directly. Levon-institute (University of Vaasa's institution, which sells teaching for companies) was also suggested to be able to take the role of knowledge broker, but this was also impossible to verify because lack of relevant experts.

Also, due to this lack of participation there was discussion that before any concrete pilot measurements there is a need to map existing activities and policy instruments. This task might be taken by the UVA team, who should look at existing activities or otherwise verify that the pilot will avoid any duplicate actions with existing projects and actors. NGO representative expressed that especially duplicate activities would not be useful and there is no need to establish new institutions. (in WP3 analysis there were indeed comments that there already is a lot of development actors in the region), whereas mapping of existing activities and their lessons would help the pilot implementation.

It was also expressed that new funding opportunities would be welcomed and this is a major difference that makes the implementation of FORREGION difficult in the region, as national funding is scarce.

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

It was suggested that the good practise should not overlap with any currently existing activities and this requires thorough mapping of existing activities. Also, one of the main challenges was related to funding, because national funding is scarce. Therefore knowledge brokering should be organised based on these limitations. It was clearly requested that good practise should not add any new institutions, as there already are quite many development organisations in the region.

**d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made.**

Decisions will be made after mapping the existing activities. It is yet unclear which organisation might take the leading role, but university platforms or Levon-institute have been suggested. We have also received interest from Jakobstad region, who are interested to organise a pilot.

**e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

It was asked that good practise and the potential pilot should not interfere too much, or should not at least overlap with any existing activities. Ideally the pilot is able to help SMEs on their

collaboration with universities and creates innovative dialogue between new actors through knowledge brokering. This also hopefully manifest as projects, new products and other innovative solutions.

**f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><i><b>Strengths:</b></i> characteristics of the project that give it an advantage over others.</p> <p>It is a direct measurement taken to advance SME-university collaboration.</p>	<p><i><b>Weaknesses:</b></i> characteristics of the project that place the project at a disadvantage relative to others.</p> <p>There are already many development actors and the funding is scarce.</p>
<p><i><b>Opportunities:</b></i> elements in the environment that the project could exploit to its advantage.</p> <p>There is already quite good collaboration happening between larger companies and universities.</p>	<p><i><b>Threats:</b></i> elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the project.</p> <p>Current economic situation with corona, SMEs are very busy with daily activities</p>

### 3.7. Päijät-Häme

#### Focus group meetings

*February 17<sup>th</sup> 2020*

*Regional Innovation System and Spearheads – Workshop, over 40 participants*



Participants in this workshop were regional developers and representatives of universities, researchers, public authorities and there were also few participants from companies and NGO's. NGO's representatives were from companies' interest groups.

The keynote speaks were handled by experts from ELY-Center (Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment), Päijät-Häme Regional Council, Business Finland, Regional Development Company Ladec and Nordregio.

In Ladec's keynote speak were pointed out some weaknesses in our regional innovation system. Regional Development Company have been facing the same challenges than companies. Commercialization of innovations is not as successful as it should be. Either the commercialization know-how at universities is poor or the services are not reaching businesses. SME's and universities are not applying R&D funding enough. The target level in developing projects are weak and aspect of internationalization is usually missing.

Keynote speaker mentioned that we need efforts to developing university – SME cooperation and via that, raise RDI actions. He also pointed out, that Vaasa Open Innovation Platform is good practice, but the business environment in Päijät-Häme is very different. In the Vaasa region, where there are a few big global companies, surrounded by many small subcontractors. Subcontractors are dependent on orders from large companies. In this case, the leading companies will be able to require subcontractors to renew their activities in order to remain competitive.

In Päijät-Häme business environment is versatile and has much more SME's than international lead companies. Despite this difference, Vaasa concept might be applicable and is therefore worth a visit.

In workshop section stakeholders generate ideas to how companies in the region can get benefit of regional Smart Specialisation strengths, Circular Economy, Design and Sports and Experiences. They also ponder what kind of new cooperation models is needed to develop the region's companies and renew their businesses towards a green economy.

The following ideas and needs emerged for the development of the business sector in the region:

University / public driven actions

- ✓ **Open platforms for testing and pilots**, this needs common resources and collaboration of universities, companies and public funding
- ✓ **Brainstorms – together with all 4helixes** – competences and sharing it is important
- ✓ **Developing regional RDI profile** so, that region will be internationally attractive partner
- ✓ **Developing Niemi Campus to regional RDI center**
- ✓ **Creating functional and efficient innovation ecosystems**
- ✓ In any development actions, internationalization should be the goal
- ✓ Strengthening educational co-operation between vocational education and university education, especially in Circular Economy related studies
- ✓ Creating Green Innovation Fund for investors
- ✓ Enabling Risk funding to companies and technological demos for commercialization

To sum up workshop, results showed the need of open innovation platforms and that stakeholders from universities and from universities applied sciences wants to have more information about the structure and experiences of open innovation model.

## February 20. – 21.st 2020

*Lithuanian Innovation Center and City of Panevezys - Study visit in Lahti – Tautvydas Pipiras and Vytautas Kalinauskas*

Lithuanian interest in Lahti region was aimed towards the educational sector and company cooperation and especially the Regional development company and its functions. Cluster organisations in Lahti were interested in company – university cooperation in robotic cluster in the Panevezys region. Common themes of interest were Industry 4.0 and innovation ecosystems and how companies could benefit more universities and other educational institutes in their RDI actions.

This study visit included interesting discussions and presentations from Regional Development Company LADEC, LUT University research platforms, LAB University of Applied Sciences, both



Grain and Megatronic Clusters and companies like Hartwall beverages, Oilon burners and heat pumps and Kemppi welding machines and services.



*Visiting in LAB University of Applied Sciences*

Company – university cooperation was the topic in discussions with LAB University of Applied Sciences. LAB lecturers Mr Teijo Lahtinen and Reijo Heikkilä gave a presentation of the schools' research and development activities and laboratories. Both Lahti and Panevezys region has similar challenges such as where to get skilled workforce in the future. What kind of actions we need to increase interest of young people to study and work in the field of industry, robotics and automation. Universities and public sector should take stronger role to teach and encourage companies for using student projects and master thesis as RDI resource.

In conclusion, regions got some same kind of challenges. In the future it is possible to build network and joint projects to solve those challenges. Getting to know more about Regional Development Company's actions is going to be big help when Lithuanians are starting their own Regional Development Agency.

***Study visit to Vaasa with stakeholders in 25th March 2020 – Zoom - Web meeting (17 participants)***

Our study visit to Vaasa and Ostrobothnia was arranged via web meeting because of Corona situation. Our Stakeholder participants were from LUT University, LAB University of Applied Sciences, Helsinki University/Lahti University Campus, Häme ELY Center (funding), City of Lahti and Päijät-Häme Regional Council. Participate organisations from Vaasa were University of Vaasa and Ostrobothnia Regional Council.

Vaasa university has been succeeded in creating interesting cooperation model, open innovation platforms, between university, companies, public authorities and NGO's. Vaasa Energy Business Innovation Centre or VEBIC is a research and innovation platform hosted by the University of Vaasa. It brings together expertise from the research and business communities responding to the global needs of efficient energy production, energy business and sustainable societal development. Energy and sustainable development is one of the core focus areas of the University of Vaasa. As an open research infrastructure VEBIC has a central role in realizing the new strategy.

Innovation and Entrepreneurship InnoLab is a phenomenon-based, multidisciplinary open research platform with focus on open and user innovation, entrepreneurship, and public sector innovation and renewal. InnoLab also encourages the application of citizen science, open science, and design thinking. The goal of InnoLab is to create innovative and unique research and to promote new ways of doing science. The combining factors on the background are inclusion, creativity, reduced hierarchies, and active citizens.

The platforms have only been operational for a couple of years, so it is early to analyse the results, especially from business perspective. The experiences so far have been encouraging.

Stakeholders who participated in this workshop pointed out that there is a big need to develop university cooperation to collaboration in Päijät-Häme. The level of education in the region is low and that is why better and more flexible cooperation model is needed to create pathways from vocational education to university education. Universities should cooperate more in providing RDI services to SME's. The message regarding business services should be consistent and clear. Researchers must be able to sell results of their studies or make business of it. The results of the research should be able to be sold and applied more by companies in the region. Communication and different way of communication plays big role in this case. More openness is needed.

To sum up, all previous meetings ended up more or less to same challenge and need. Regional universities must develop their actions to be more attractive and lower the barrier for cooperation with companies. Regional cooperation must offer also arenas in where universities can present their RDI expertise and both companies and universities can meet each other. This transnational learning seminar with Vaasa already raised many ideas that the stakeholders have set out to develop together.

### **Strategies of change**

- a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region).**



i. Are the gaps the same in your region and sending region?

## Strategies of change (1/3)



- Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your region and the chosen good practice from sending region!

	Sending region	Receiving (your) region
Gaps	Universities - Companies	Companies - Universities
Stakeholders and parameters (urgency, legitimacy and power)	Urgency - 2 Legitimacy - 2 Power - 2	Urgency - 3 Legitimacy - 3 Power - 3
Value chain levels	Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider	Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider
Drivers	University	University

4

Vaasa as a sending region and Päijät-Häme as a receiving region, had similarities in gaps and challenges. Both regions need to strengthen cooperation between universities and companies. Difference was that in Päijät-Häme, only few big companies have used to work closely with universities. SME's will need more information and guiding for that.

The business environment in Päijät-Häme and in Vaasa are very different. In the Vaasa region there are a few big global companies, surrounded by many small subcontractors. Subcontractors are dependent on orders from large companies. In this case, the leading companies will be able to require subcontractors to renew their activities, usually with help of university, in order to remain competitive.

In Päijät-Häme business environment is versatile and has much more SME's than internationally oriented companies. Especially small companies need advices and help for using universities expertise in companies RDI actions.

ii. Are the stakeholders and they parameters the same in your region and sending region?

Yes, they are mostly. University stakeholders in Vaasa are having more power, legitimacy and urgency in innovation processes than university stakeholders in Päijät-Häme.

*iii. Is the value chain level the same in your region and sending region?*

When comparing value chain levels there is a lack in science/technology and knowledge providers in Päijät-Häme while Vaasa region has clearly pointed out the actors in that field. In Päijät-Häme lack is because cluster companies use other than regional science, technology and knowledge providers.

Cooperation with regional universities is one of the important ways to fund innovations and research in companies and Vaasa university with other stakeholders has succeeded in that and have been able to generate more funding to region. Grain cluster companies cooperate with national actors rather than regional and that means less funding and expertise to our region.

*iv. Are the drivers the same in your region and sending region?*

In Ostrobothnia University of Vaasa has strong and visible role in regional innovation ecosystem and in RDI actions in companies. University can offer suitable research services for Ostrobothnian companies. In Päijät-Häme regional universities and universities of applied sciences need to raise their profile and visibility to reach the same role in the development of the region. When comparing company profile in regions, Vaasa region has several big leading companies in few industries surrounded by subcontractors. Subcontractors are dependent on the success and needs of large, leading companies. So leading companies can strongly influence subcontractors and can make demands to raise the level of expertise and competence. Päijät-Häme business environment is more versatile in industries and has lot SME's. Needs of the companies are very different. Research services of regional universities cannot meet all those needs. Vaasa University's research and development services are very multidisciplinary.

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?**

Successful cooperation between companies and universities is major element in implementing Regional Smart Specialisation strategy. At the moment, both Ostrobothnia and Päijät-Häme are updating RIS3 strategies. Therefore, it is natural that Regional council is taking leadership and is the driver of the change. When the roles of the actors in the innovation process in the region are clear, the responsibilities can be divided between the actors and between RIS3 priorities. Regional Council should take on a stronger, more directing and active role and facilitate change in the implementation of the new collaborative model.

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

Change does not need structural changes from stakeholders. In particular, universities, other educational institutes and research institutes need to agree on a common approach and rules that different actors can commit to and follow.

**d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made.**

Stakeholders are committed and willing to do better cooperation that is valuable to our companies. That is based on discussions. Open innovation platform good practise is about communication and branding universities services and lower boundaries for companies to do more cooperation with universities. Decisions concerning for example communication activities, that are needed in piloting, are made in each stakeholder's organisation.

**e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

Based on previous discussions with stakeholders, it can be expected that the timing to test new models of cooperation will be perfect. New player in region, LUT University is taking its role in regional developing with bringing new research areas and competences. Other players must also rethink their role among that. RIS3 strategy is in updating process. Process gathers all actors together to develop innovation system. The process helps 4 helix actors to see the whole regional innovation system picture and their own role and services in promoting innovations. Regional council as an impartial actor is facilitating this process by promoting cooperation, collecting and sharing information. It is desirable for universities to emphasize in their communication what services they provide to the region's businesses and the commercialization of innovations.

The aims of change:

- ✓ Actors belonging in regional innovation system will be recognisable and their role are clear to other actors and especially to companies.
- ✓ The key players in the process speak the same language and the aims for the development of the region are the same and clear
- ✓ There will be more regular and frequent arenas and events for meeting others, innovate and create common understanding for future directions
- ✓ Regional innovation system's performance is systematically monitored and evaluated and it provides information for further development of the area.

**f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, “translate” and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <p><i>Timing is right</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ In Päijät-Häme region the time is good for applying new models because of other significant strategy processes are currently ongoing. Updating Regional Strategy of Smart Specialization is made in cooperation with regional stakeholders.</li> <li>✓ Lahti finally got own university and via this, more competence that companies in the region can use in their RDI. New approaches and platforms for cooperation are needed</li> </ul> <p><i>Common message and goal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The key players like Lahti Region Development Company Ladec and Lappeenranta Lahti University are both updating their messages concerning their role in regional innovation system, and their services to the companies.</li> <li>✓ With the help of LARS project Regional Council has been able to discuss with all 4 helix actors quite widely. Regional strategies of different actors have very similar goals.</li> </ul> <p><i>New forums for discussions is needed</i></p>	<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Platform is too university led – has companies got value from platforms?</li> <li>✓ Regions business environment are quite different</li> <li>✓ Universities are competing same funding resources and students - will the cooperation between universities succeed?</li> <li>✓ Lack of interest to go international</li> <li>✓ Are the regional development goals same as we think than what our politicians think?</li> <li>✓ Lack of regional competence leading the change</li> <li>✓ Universities don't offer the expertise that companies need</li> <li>✓ If the results of platform action/pilot cannot be measured, it will not bring enough value to the development</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Process is clarifying our regional strengths and via that we can find our spot in EU RIS3 platforms</li> <li>✓ Region will be interesting partner in EU level RDI research networks</li> <li>✓ Strong and effective collaboration between universities and companies in innovation processes is increasing regional attractiveness</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Resources to lead change, especially funding</li> <li>✓ Corona – can we get companies to join testing platform model or is all the time taken to repair the damages</li> </ul>

### 3.8. Västerbotten

#### Focus group meeting

Region Västerbotten had the focus group meeting in Umeå on the on March 24th 2020. It was a digital meeting to discussion with 18 participants from triple helix actors in the innovation ecosystem. We had a focus group discussion with representatives of 2 business support organizations, 5 from Universities and Science institutions, and 11 representants from the public authorities.

Before the meeting we agreed with all the participants to discuss the table of the good practises and the match for the region and the participants had the chance to read the report from WP4 and have the questions beforehand to prepare for the meeting. Therefore, each participant had an opportunity to prepare their position and proposals in advance. As a consequence, we had a very productive and constructive discussion. Participants were prepared to share their thoughts and inputs what innovative solutions in other regions could be best transferred and implemented. The following section provides the results of this focus group meeting, what finding we have identified.

Oppland's good practice was a very interesting example of how by actively linking SME to the University enhancing collaboration and knowledge brokering by connecting SME's with universities. Västerbotten has several SME and micro players who do not have the capacity to work with R&D. FORREGION is run by public institutions in Norway, but development agencies might be other solution in Sweden. Funding might be an issue and needs to be looked at and the need is lifted by creating a strong collaboration and shared vision between the public sector at regional and national level, companies and the university at national level, but is also important in order to have a breakthrough. In the region there is an initiative around Smart Industry that could link this initiative, but then it must be anchored with the companies in order to be successful and also have financial issues.

Päijät-Häme case study was very interesting how one has worked with clusters within grain and their long-term work looked very interesting. However, stakeholders saw that already similar initiatives exist in the region of the forest industry, which is one of Västerbotten's strongest industries and research area. Looking at how one can work to strengthen cluster collaboration was interesting with as the value chains were considered to be different, so the actors saw obstacles in being able to transform this example as well as "drivers" in the region.

University of Vaasa was the good practise that was identified as most emerging for the stakeholder and how to work with different platforms to lower boundaries for companies as well as public sector, NGOs and civil society to get in contact with universities (open-door policy). To offer a wide research networks with experts from different fields can strengthen the cooperation with the Universities in the regions that sometimes feels "far away from the companies reality" and that the platform leaders act as contact points and constantly search for options/institutions where scientific research might be needed outside university was something that the actors would learn more about. The "platform" thinking was also something that was saw as interesting, but to be able to

strengthen the whole innovation ecosystem Västerbotten, it was stated that it would be an added value to broaden the perspective and work with the whole Quadruple helix in the platforms.

The stakeholders also saw an opportunity to link the platforms offering the to the Oppland good practise offering knowledge brokering by connecting SME's with universities platforms linking enhancing collaboration with the SMEs.

### Strategies of change

**a. Describe the benchmarking process and results between the situation in your (receiving) region and the chosen good practice (sending region).**

	<b>Sending region</b> Ostrobothnia - university platforms	<b>Receiving region</b> Västerbotten
<b>Gaps</b>	<i>Universities - Companies</i>	<i>Companies - Universities</i>
<b>Stakeholders and parametrs (urgency, legitimacy and power)</b>	<i>Urgency - 2</i> <i>Legitimacy - 2</i> <i>Power - 2</i>	<i>Urgency - 2</i> <i>Legitimacy - 3</i> <i>Power - 2</i>
<b>Value chain levels</b>	<i>Level 9 Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider</i>	6-9
<b>Drivers</b>	<i>University</i>	<i>Public Organisation</i>

Universities in Västerbotten can learn and get inspiration how to lower boundaries between SME's and universities. Västerbotten's biggest gaps are between Universities and the companies in all areas of cooperation and Ostrobothnia's open innovation approach could bridge. Looking at the need for Västervottens stakeholders and parameters in the benchmarking process (urgency, legitimacy and power) it matches the Ostrobothnia's case well, even if the legitimacy was ranked higher for Västerbotten. During the stakeholder meeting the Västerbotten stakeholders thought that the parameters mirrors the the Ostrobothnia's case matches and some of them meant that the need is even higher in Västerbotten then the table result.

In regard to the value chain, Ostrobothnia's innovation platform can offer the technology/knowledge provider that match Västerbottens need.

The benchmarking process showed that Västerbotten need the public organisations to be the driver and it differs from the driver that Ostrobothnia's good practice can offer that is the University of Vaasa. In Västerbotten business structure, there are a few large dominant companies and most small companies SME / micro companies. To enable collaboration, NGOs were identified as important drivers during the entire LARS process to fill our gaps. In order to be able to transfer the good case of Ostrobothnia, we saw that it is primarily public actors who must be drivers since there is no NGO in the region that can shoulder this responsibility during the development phase and that we do not in the region have an NGO that was considered to fit this particular case, however, they are important collaborative partners.

**b. Identify clear leadership roles for changes. Who should be the driver? Who should start the process of change?**

For Västerbotten enabling this good practise the driver should be the public actors (Region Västerbotten) with the responsible for the Smart Specialisation Strategy. This was stated at the stakeholder dialogue so that the thematic platforms would be aligned with the regional policies as the Universities focus areas may not always be the same. It is crucial to have a long-term goal and perspective and to be able to transfer Ostrobothnia's good practice it is important to create a strong partnership between the Quadruple helix, but especially public sector, Universities, and companies. To build capacity because we need to have different drivers in different stages in the process and responsibilities can be divided between relevant actors when the roles of different actors are clear.

During the starting point we need to have all the key actors involved making it a priority and highlighting the need to connect companies, public sector and Universities together with the quadruple helix to strengthen the regions competitiveness through innovation.

In the second stage when setting up the platform and managing it is crucial to have a good manager that can connect the different actors to the platform and that the actors feel confident in. Preferable it should be an expert in the field with a strong knowledge and network.

**c. Suggestions for changing the existing governance structure to get the effort from good practice.**

Instead of making changes in existing governance structure we need to coordinate and simplify in existing system, as well as link to other ongoing work to strengthen the environment to enable the good practice in the best way for Västerbottens structure.



It is proposed between the Region Västerbotten (RV) and the University that a letter of intent on research collaboration be written. The intention statement means that the cooperation is further developed by the parties jointly establishing thematic platforms that strengthen the region's smart specialization. The aim is to create more benefit from research for Västerbotten's business sector, public sector, civil society as well as strengthen the research environments.

**d. Clarify how the change-related decisions will be made.**

It is important to have a good starting point and it is a need to gather local companies, NGO's and related university researchers to establish the collaboration and set common goals for the platforms to be able to agree on a common approach and rules that different actors can commit to and follow. We also see that it is important to have the people with the authority to make decisions from relevant stakeholders organisations, such as the rector and the university board, public organisations, cluster, etc. to be able to get a good start in the new cooperation. Region Västerbotten will start the process by initiating a meeting with the Universities to have a first dialogue and fits well with the ongoing initiative "Regional innovation leadership in Västerbotten" and the process of updating the Smart Specialisation Strategy.

**e. Clarify how the changes will interfere with ongoing operations and activities.**

To be successful transferring the good practises the process should not exist in a vacuum but hopefully overlap/stimulate to the ongoing processes. There is much going on in the region, large investments such as Europe's largest battery factory as well as the new situation we are facing with Covid-19. This is true not least regarding our work with our Smart Specialization Strategy and Forest Strategy, and how these processes proceed will also affect how our work within LARS and other initiatives will take form. Due to the current situation with Covid-19 it can be difficult to get actors to engage in a strategical process talking about long term benefits when many of the actors cannot right now plan for the future.

**f. Do a SWOT analysis of the proposed change model. Change model – activities and actions which should be done in order to transfer, "translate" and implement the chosen good practice.**

<p><i>Strengths:</i> characteristics of the project that give it an advantage over others.</p> <p>advance SME-university collaboration Long term commitment to strengthen the innovation capacity in the regions Platforms are flexible in the set-up and the method can be transferred to our region</p>	<p><i>Weaknesses:</i> characteristics of the project that place the project at a disadvantage relative to others.</p> <p>Need to have commitment from the stakeholders to be successful Take long-time to build a platform and the stakeholder can lose interest Lack of willingness of universities to participate and collaborate in the region and outside the purely scientific field.</p>
---	--



bridges the biggest gaps for Västerbotten Good time to test the method in relations to regional initiatives	No research institutions with the corresponding topics available
<p><i>Opportunities:</i> elements in the environment that the project could exploit to its advantage.</p> <p>More active research institutions with good cooperation to other helices Better knowledge of the initiative that is going on in the region Spill-over effects cooperating with various actors Better visibility and cooperation opportunity Identification of advantages for companies, short-term and long-term;</p>	<p><i>Threats:</i> elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the project.</p> <p>Lack of trust between the partners Lack of “divers” and commitment Different Cultures and collaboration Insufficient communication Different aim/No common goal No willingness to compromise, share experience or learn from others No sufficient funding. Companies cannot be motivated, because they don’t see the benefits Covid-19</p>

## **4. OUTPUT 5.3. MAPPING OF BARRIERS TO CHANGE AND UNEXPECTED RESISTANCE TO CHANGE – CHALLENGES IN GOVERNANCE OF SMART SPECIALIZATION**

### **4.1. Hamburg University of Applied Sciences**

**a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

Identified factors of failure are:

- Lack of trust: there is a lot of mistrust between the different stakeholders in the Hamburg case side. This is also reflected in the gaps. If there is no sufficient information about other stakeholders' goals and motivation, there is no motivation for cooperation, but a willingness to secure the own position. In Hamburg for example companies do not have much trust in universities.
- Ongoing low motivation of companies for cooperation
- Different Cultures: Public organisations, NGOs, universities and companies are working differently, have different goals and different ideas of engagement
- Insufficient communication: goals, communication and cooperation need to be well communicated to change something on the long run and to keep all stakeholders engaged it needs a sufficient and organised communication
- No common goal, companies cannot see a benefit for more engagement
- Backward-looking view, no willingness for change, "we've always done it this way"
- quadruple helices stay fragmented, lack of cooperation

How to overcome the risks? see b.

**b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

- Create a platform for circular economy, where all different groups of stakeholders could join the network and learn about already existing circular economy activities in different areas as part of a better networking, communication and cooperation
- Having the "right" persons in the right place, a person or department from a public institution should moderate the process of change, this person should be well known in the community and widely accepted by all different stakeholder groups
- Drivers with high power and legitimacy: A person from a public administration connected to waste topic would have this attributes
- Common goal: This is the most important factor of success in the Hamburg case. To get all stakeholders on board a common goal must be developed to get all different groups of stakeholders on board, the senate chancellery of Hamburg should lead the initiative, ministry of

environment and energy and the ministry of economy and development (responsible for the Smart Specialisation Strategy) should be engaged.

- Resources: Budget for personal, meetings (rooms, catering), budget for the set up of a circular economy platform for exchange and information, set up of a pilot project
- The gap universities and companies must be bridged and in general the involvement of companies must be improved
- Learn from others: learn from the good practise of Pjäijät Häme how to interest and involve companies
- Trustful and open communication: regular, open and transparent meetings and events

**c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**

A good practise or a strategy of change can only be established, if stakeholders from all helices are on board because there is a motivation and a common goal for change. In the case of Hamburg companies are not very motivated.

**d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

No

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region**

As described in section 2 the next steps for improving the cooperations for circular economy in Hamburg were discussed and agreed on in the meeting for the City Science Initiative in January:

- Public authority with high power and legitimacy must start a process for improving the innovation network for circular economy by establishing a circular economy stakeholder forum and platform. This will be not only a virtual platform but a forum with regular face to face meetings to discuss activities and policy recommendations
- Development of a common goal: To get all stakeholders on board a common goal must be developed to get all different groups of stakeholders on board, the senate chancellery of Hamburg should lead the initiative to develop a vision and a common goal for the activity.
- Inclusion of circular economy in the smart specialisation strategy: when Hamburg's Smart Specialisation Strategy will be revised, it should be discussed, if the topic circular economy could be added to the clusters.

## 4.2. Innlandet

**a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

The universities involved in this project operates at a national and international level. It can be challenging to get them involved in regional priorities, specially it there are different priorities between differ regions. In addition to our own strategies we must also keep an eye on other regions priorities and national priorities.

**b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

The implementation must be anchored as a follow-up of the regional planning strategy, where all stakeholders have been involved in the elaboration. The strategies coming out of the planning process will commit the stakeholders and specially the financial instruments.

It will also be important to participate at processes, strategies and working papers on national level. It is important to anchor our priorities and needs in national strategy documents.

**c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**

There is a high degree of transferability in the good practice. The challenges seem to the same and motivation from among the stakeholders to improve the connectivity is present. The preconditions are good as long as there is a common understanding of the challenges. There are also existing instruments to help stimulate a higher degree of connectivity, such as FORREGION and Biobord.

To improve the preconditions it would be necessary to establish permanent and predictable collaborative arenas with the leaders among the stakeholders. The Norwegian Wood Cluster is one arena that can be further developed.

**d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

There are other initiatives going and projects focusing on the connectivity between universities/R&D and the companies/enterprises. Some of them are containing many of the same elements as InnoLab, but not so many are related to the wood manufacturing industry.

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region**

The next step is a political decision on the Planning strategy. This will hopefully be made in June 2020. After that the work on the Regional plan for innovation, value creation and competence will start in autumn 2020. In this process the stakeholders must be involved from the beginning. Experiences from former strategy processes should indicate decision on the regional plan late autumn 2021/winter 2022. However, there is no obstacles for an earlier implementation if the universities find this way of dialog rewarding. The regional plan will be the arena for discussions between different stakeholders.

### 4.3. Latvia

**a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

One of the risks of failure would be – if no one will be responsible for the implementation, there won't be any result. As the regional innovation system and the information about already available support is fragmented, the situation that on the one hand, everybody is responsible but on the other hand – nobody is responsible can occur. The second risk of failure is that even the system is working, without willingness from involved stakeholders this cooperation platform won't be working. Also, there is a risk that LARS project could work as an initiator of this platform but after the project ends these activities will stop as well. To overcome this factor it is very important to establish these activities and recommendations in planning documents at both – national and regional levels.

To overcome hindering factors we must use the scoping approach because not all activities can be done at the regional level. For example, some big investment projects in the defence industry should be implemented at the national, not regional level, because investors are looking for big project. Industrial politics and activities should be done at the national level.

Of course, more explanatory work for all groups of stakeholders will be needed when this platform will start to work.

**b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

As the opportunity for success, we can mention that the external circumstances at the moment are at such degree that they will force to make some changes. Also as an opportunity for success, we can mention that some pre-activities have been done during the implementation of LARS project and the proposed change model won't be something completely new – at least for the stakeholders who have participated in LARS project.

**c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**

The transferability wouldn't be direct but there are preconditions to implement the good practice. However some of them, for example, the ability of local municipalities to work with companies and investors should be improved. But mainly the degree of transferability is enough.

**d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

As the alternative could be that cooperation activities and platform could be implemented more at the local, not regional level. Of course, the connection with the regional level is important but the main activities could be done at the local level. Also, there could be alternative drivers – not public organisations or universities (as in the sending region) but local communities, professionals.

Also, an alternative could be to have business incubators (they work both – at the national and regional level) as drivers. They have the necessary knowledge and experience but the problem with incubators is that they cover only one part of companies – the new companies. Mostly their focus is on smaller companies. But in this platform, all types of companies must be as stakeholders.

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region**

Before starting to implement this good practice the roadmap should be prepared. Such elements should be included – problems, solutions, stakeholders, time frame, responsibilities, etc. This activity also includes the mapping of existing support and innovation system. At the moment LARS project provides the description of strategies of change as well as the analysis of barriers, so the next step is the implementation and some “real” activities.

This activity could be done as a workshop (not transnational learning seminar or focus group meeting) with the active participation of local stakeholders. If the previous meetings were more like a presentation from LARS partners and then a discussion with stakeholders, this activity should bring not only the ideas but actions as well. With the help of the methods of design thinking, the best results could be achieved.

#### 4.4. Lithuanian Innovation Centre

**a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

Currently, one of the main challenges is finding the way how to structure a governance system in order to distribute the leadership in regional development agency, that it won't be too much dependent on one source of income – Panevezys municipality. Responsible people should secure that there would be more than one person or organization that has KPIs related with the establishment of functions of regional development agency. One of the biggest threats for a small region like Panevezys is that change or a retirement of one responsible person might not might impact the whole implementation process of newly created initiative, thus it is of high significance to establish a mechanism that would prevent from this kind of challenges.

**b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

The process of transferring such a good practice as LADEC could be made easier if there is a possibility to concentrate all resources on common challenge or common vision. In Pääjät-Häme region Circular Economy is one of the RIS3 priority areas, it has been connective theme for grain cluster companies for a long time and it is seen as one of the regional strengths where resources of the regional development organizations could be concentrated. Regional council of Pääjät-Häme has a clear vision to be “The world's most innovative grain cluster and ecosystem”, this is the main driving factor – the ambitions that legitimizes other decisions which are made toward that direction. When region has a clear vision, it is easier to convince public authorities that further resources should be dedicated to increase strengths or hide weaknesses of a particular area.

In Panevezys region it is quite clear that the main ambition is to become a leading Central / Eastern European hub for industrial robotics and automation. It was decided that for Panevezys there lies the opportunity to be ahead of the flow of the 4th industrial revolution and to become a recognised robotics hub in Europe. In addition to this, Panevezys County has already selected advanced manufacturing and robotics as their main regional priority and their goal is to concentrate their resources, policy, entrepreneurial and innovation capacity into development of this strategic area. Therefore, Panevezys has the main strength – support from decision makers that could lead to the future success of newly established regional development agency. Panevezys municipality sticks to its long-term strategic vision and promised to consider a reasonable budget for the establishment of regional development agency in Panevezys county.

**c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**



From the process of mapping the preconditions for the policy transfer from Finland to Panevezys County, we noticed that we have majority of the necessary parts included in the local ecosystem. First of all, there is an obvious aim to become a regional hotspot of industry 4.0 and Panevezys county has already set an objective that could help to achieve this goal: by promoting entrepreneurship and a business-friendly ecosystem also by implementing projects that encourage young people to choose technological sciences in Panevezys. Besides this we have a broad spectrum of organizations ranging from regional municipalities to business support organization that are ready to support the regional development agency with their knowledge and resources. On the hand, we have to take in account a difference between business and cooperation culture in Finland and Lithuania. Finnish companies have a great success-based experience in establishing high-tech companies which are basing their value proposition on R&D and unique knowledge, while in Lithuania for a long period of time the main competitive advantage was a lower price. Therefore, we would need to put additional effort to change a mindset of regional business owners by explaining how R&D based business could be more sustainable and profitable.

**d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

In regards to the objective to facilitate collaboration between business, education and science, we took into account another good practice – InoLab in Ostrobothnia – that is a university-driven good practice that might sparkle new networking opportunities in Panevezys region. However, it was decided that universities need to develop their capacities in order to actively drive the whole collaboration process, thus public organization-driven good practice was considered as more effective way to reach our goals.

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region**

The following steps will be taken to establish a new organization:

- o Decisions on structure and main functions of regional development agency.
- o Decisions and negotiations on the budget of regional development agency.
- o Creation of network: international companies, universities, national support agencies etc.

## 4.5. Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics

**a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

The key risks of failure to start implementing the proposed change model are mostly related to the external weaknesses and threats. The already observed in previous research and other political change processes passive and isolated role of government may cause unwillingness to change. At the same time, there might occur insufficient interest to get deeper into the good practice of receiving region, to understand it from the roots and to learn from it. Limited perceptual abilities to see the holistic picture of change and its benefits may disturb putting the proposed change model into practice. Among the key hindering factors unfavorable political processes - changes in human resources in Ministries (political-confidence posts after elections), which are already in the network with goodwill might be observed. There is also spectated big focus on lobby groups in the field of bioeconomy development instead of the pure will to serve the public interest. All of these might result in rejection of the proposed change model from the government to include bioeconomy-related changes into National and regional development strategies, programmes and action plans. The listed obstacles might be overcome with the use of already created strengths, namely, the already existing informal network of bioeconomy stakeholders, formed through LARS activities, gained expertise and skills in the field and people with excellence and big ambitions to make the change.

**b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

The greatest opportunities for success to start to implement the activities are related to already identified strengths. Right people from the right places with sufficient power, urgency, and legitimacy to make change are already connected into an informal network in the selected area of intervention. Here exist sufficient trust among stakeholders from all helixes and all of them hold common interest in the field of bioeconomy development. Good communication skills of good practice-transfer organizers in the receiving region will add to the success.

**c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**

The degree of transferability would be sufficient for the region. There already exist particular preconditions to start the practice. There are already established biogas plants with professional experience, which need to be connected into a collaborative network to make a bigger change in the selected field of intervention since some of them stop operating due to the government's passiveness, inability to collaborate, inability to focus on articular development areas of smart specialization, and other related reasons. General preconditions already exist and are sufficient to

start implementing good practise. The only precondition should be fulfilled before starting the good practice implementation: it is necessary to do study visit in sending region to lean from the actual practice.

**d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

There is no other better alternative to implement good practice.

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region.**

The next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in receiving region are:

- Detailed examination of selected good practice should be made by receiving region's stakeholders;
- study visit into the good-practice sending region;
- organization of already existing informal network meetings regarding the selected field of intervention in bioeconomy;
- preparation of evidence-based recommendations on how to develop the Smart specialization in bioeconomy, namely – biogas production from manure, wastes, and other residues.
- submission of prepared suggestions and documents for consideration to the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Lithuania.

## 4.6. Ostrobothnia

- a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

Risks of failure relate to the willingness and ability of stakeholders to participate. Due to the exceptional times it may be difficult to organise mutual practises as overall collaborative efforts are now more challenging. If we assume, that corona emergency will diminish, then hindering factors relate to timetable of SMEs, and the ability and willingness of universities to approach SMEs. They are already doing mutual activities through course work etc., but the biggest issue is that the collaboration has required activity from SMEs, whereas universities have been more inactive to reach them. University platforms are a new activity, which are built to enhance collaboration, but they currently do this based on the idea of “open doors”, whereas Oppland’s good practise is more active as knowledge brokers “go through the door” to reach SMEs. This can only be achieved if some willing knowledge brokers can be discovered, who are willing to test more active approach.

- b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

If the good practise can be tested, it should reveal us how well this approach works in the region. It has the potential to make more collaboration in the region and open possibly new avenues for research as well.

- c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**

Transferability is not yet clear. Whereas Oppland’s case works in Norway, Finnish funding is scarcer. It might be useful to map different activities in different institutions, but these of course change constantly which makes it difficult to follow all of them. There has been some previous knowledge brokering activities (Allegro Living Lab etc.), which were inspected prior to the focus group discussion, but it would seem that they have been somewhat more general in nature, whereas FORREGION is very direct in its approach.

Biggest preconditions relate to finding willing stakeholders, as well as on mapping or otherwise verifying the current activities, so that there will be no overlapping activities. Both of these preconditions need to be met in order to test the pilot. However, preconditions are possible to be met by contacting stakeholders and by making interviews/organising discussions, depending on when situation returns to normal.

- d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

Yes, one suggestion was the utilisation of students, as they might solve challenges presented by SMEs and public organisations. This is not full knowledge brokering, but it helps in introducing students to SMEs and thus exchanging ideas between SMEs and universities. Idea is that students act as intermediaries between SMEs and universities and thus help in transferring knowledge from one organisation to the next.

Based on student activities, existing relevant institutions could set up positions as knowledge brokers, and try to recruit persons with the right qualifications, i.a. experiences both from research and the sectors of the relevant SMEs.

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region**

One option might be to make a report or plan on possible knowledge broker activity in Ostrobothnia. This report would consist on the questions, which we presented in the focus group: (Why pilot is needed?, Who needs to be in charge?, who benefits?, What steps are needed? etc.). One way forward would also be contacting potentially willing knowledge brokers (development organisations) and asking for their input on the challenges for knowledge brokering in the pilot. Besides this there is a need to look at any similar activities and ensure that the pilot is not doing duplicate work. There has been some former knowledge brokering activities in the region, which has not been a success and these could be looked upon to discover what could be done differently. One question could also relate to what sort of new functions might be needed to enhance knowledge brokering. All of this needs to happen through acknowledging the current corona situation, which has made any collaboration now more difficult and more uncertain.

## 4.7. Päijät-Häme

### **a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

There is some elements and ideas in open innovation platform that can be tested in Päijät-Häme, those are: joint branding and communication, giving “faces” to research that universities are offering, regular and systematic events and arenas where research and companies can meet, systematic future forecasting events.

If the implementing isn't working, it would be mostly because lack of time. The idea of open innovation platform is good and accepted by stakeholders, so the risk is quite small. Applying phase can take time. If we rush and for example just copy paste the open university model, it will be most likely that it goes wrong. We had to take time find actions and ways that are suitable for our regions needs.

All developing needs people and it is always possible that even if the goal is same, there is different opinions how to achieve those goals. If there are very different point of views in the working group or personal chemistries does not meet, piloting the practice can be tricky. This risk can be tackled by participating right persons on each relevant organisation to join planning and piloting actions. That person must have the power to make decisions and skills and good network to promote cooperation.

All these development actions should benefit the regional companies. Actions must increase the level on competences and knowledge. If companies feel that they can't get any value of these actions, pilot will be a failure. If we start testing platform model in Päijät-Häme, we had to present clearly, what companies can benefit from it. Business environment in Päijät-Häme is quite different than in Vaasa region. Innovation platforms can be used as showcases business openings through science and pilot projects.

Corona situation may lead to the need, that we must prioritized other development actions than developing innovation processes. It possible, that we don't get companies to join testing platform model actions. Convid-19 could also be a strength, businesses had to innovate new solutions for markets.

### **b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

Opportunities for implementing this practise will be good. Aims of the LARS project and Vaasa Open Innovation Platforms have been all interesting for our region's stakeholders. Now that we have our own university in the region, stakeholders are ready to rethink their roles and services in the innovation process.

Demands, from EU, that companies move towards carbon-neutral and green production, highlight the need to find new operating models.

**c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**

Preconditions are fine. Needs of the companies are jointly recognized and Universities and development organisations as well as public actors already have some actions that are similar that Vaasa Open university platform has, like hackathons, incubators, match making events for companies and students, business mills. At first, we must collect them and find out pros and cons about the existing models. This shows to actors that their work so far is recognized and good. First thing to do is to collect and recreate “old” actions under the same umbrella.

Also, the updating process of regional innovation strategy has gathered all 4 helix actors together so there has been different forums and arenas for discussions about regional challenges and development goals. New upcoming EU funding period and its aims has also activated regional actors, especially universities, to identify needs of the companies.

**d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

No there is not.

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region**

- Workshops with Vaasa university and stakeholders from Päijät-Häme to get more detailed practical information about open innovation platform and its structure, communication and events
- Workshops (2-3) for regional stakeholders to identify for example:
  - what are the actions, events and services that supports the idea of open innovation platform already here in Päijät-Häme
  - what should be the regional thematic areas or phenomenons that combines our regional strengths? (besides RIS3 priorities: Circular Economy, Design and Sports and Experiences)
  - roles and responsibilities of stakeholders
  - communications and branding
  - event ideas: circular economy and design, energy (LUt + Vebic), future forecasting, match events for companies and researchers
- RIS3 updating process during 2020 will clarify stakeholder’s roles in regional innovation system

## 4.8. Västerbotten

**a. What are the risks of failure in your regions to start to implement the proposed change model? What are the hindering factors and obstacles? How to overcome these factors? What different measures should be taken to overcome these factors?**

Risks identified:

- Prestige - competition between the actors and research institutions
- Engage organisations have no high power and legitimacy
- It is possible that platforms will fail, if collaboration culture is not strong enough
- Companies cannot be motivated, the more dominant companies will influence the direction so that smaller companies will be left out
- Different ambition and need- While the universities are focusing on the desire for large international project the companies needs are often practically directed toward concrete need for further development and innovation.
- Nor sufficient funding
- expectations of the platform are too ambitious in the beginning and no understanding for an “open process”

### **How to overcome these factors?**

It is important to keep the goals on a realistic and relevant level. The levelling of expectations and ambitions are important from the start.

- Have an open dialogue with the stakeholder to support building the platform to streamline the vision and the need in the region
- Learn from others - Contact other that have experience building a platform so you can learn from there process
- Locating important actors and join forces with potential drivers and important stakeholders with legitimacy
- Identification, explanation and bridging of gaps
- Agree on the vision
- Setting realistic project expectations and adjust expectations as soon as necessary
- Finding resources
- Having a flexible system that can meet the demand of the actors
- Decisions on structure and main functions of the platform



- Decisions and negotiations on the budget

**b. What are the opportunities for success to start to implement the proposed change model?**

InoLab in Ostrobothnia shows how open doors policy in Universities could create new networking opportunities for all innovation actors and spark new project ideas in the specific fields. By considering these learning Västerbotten see that we could establish more active relations between research institutions and entrepreneurs to initiate collaboration among different helixes new discoveries can often be found through the combination of different mind-sets and disciplines (cross-sectoral approach), lowers the organisational barriers and opens doors for wider society. The platforms allow for implementing the open-science concept, a rising trend in the global research field.

**c. Is the degree of transferability enough for your region? Are there preconditions for implementing good practice? Do you need to improve preconditions (some or all) before implementing the good practice?**

Yes. The transferability of the good practice appears good, if Västerbotten is able to get the commitment that is needed as well as seeing this as a long-term development building the knowledge and a strong ownership between the stakeholders. The preconditions are that the needs of the companies are equally recognized and have a strong influence building the platforms so it will contribute to the regional challenges and development goals.

**d. Are there alternatives to implement good practice?**

Oppland good practice was seemed as a good method and Västerbotten could learn how public organisations be more active and act as intermediaries to connect companies with little or no R&D capacity with universities or other research and science institutions to push innovations. One concrete suggestion for implementing the Ostrobothnia good practise was to connect it with the Oppland good practise. This suggestion might be widened to public sector as well, so that public organisations might be better at using innovation to bridge their own challenges. The opportunity to offer this service in the platform was emphasised as positive and could strengthen collaboration with SME's and the universities.

**e. Identify some next steps towards the implementation of selected good practice in your region**

- Region Västerbotten meeting about collaboration opportunities with the Umea University
- RIS3 updating process starting in the autumn 2020

- Workshops for our Regional Innovation Partnership to identify what connections and what is needed
- Dialogue with relevant stakeholders

## CONCLUSIONS

Despite the fact the WP5 activities needed to be implemented in a very tight time schedule and the Covid-19 outbreak appeared in the busiest moment of the WP5, all partners managed to organize focus groups and to make reports on WP5 especially on Outputs 5.2. and 5.3. which are the major outputs for the LARS project. These outputs are very essential for further activities because they give a solid background for the change model.

One partner (LIC) even managed to make a study visit to several regions in Finland which allowed them to make an ex-ante evaluation on how features of proposed good practice could be successfully transferred into their region. This visit allowed to indicate their weaknesses, strengths, and potential how their regional innovation ecosystem could be improved by starting actions that do not require a lot of resources.

LARS process and approach is a useful instrument to analyze the current situation in the regions and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the innovation systems. For some partners, more effort and time should have been spent on the stakeholder analysis as a basis for the research. The more stakeholders have engaged the greater the reliability of the data. However, in this kind of research project time is restricted. The very interesting step was the look on the transferability of the good practices in other regions and to benchmark the different kinds of processes.

This step in the project corresponds with already existing activities in some regions, for example, regional planning and strategy processes which have just started as a result of the regional reform process in Norway. This makes it more likely to manage to implement the chosen best practice in their region. These regional processes are based on a good dialogue between the stakeholders and will hopefully give a good start for implementing good practice.

The process of selection and transfer of good practice for closing gaps shows the potential to successful pilot action in partner regions.

This has been a good exercise to gathering what has been done so far with stakeholders and evaluate the current situation. This has helped to reflect on the challenges related to the pilot project in more detail. Reporting thou is really detailed if comparing that fact, that change is about doing better and more systematic cooperation between stakeholders. That doesn't need a heavy decisionmaking process. It needs more goodwill and hard work with people.

Stakeholders in every region have been active and their participation in meetings and workshops has been very good. Stakeholders have been in contact, asking more questions about LARS project and gave also ideas on how to develop cooperation.

It has been great to note that stakeholders have been really interested in the information that the project has produced about experiences and good practices regarding cooperation. Study visits and meetings with partners gave also good project ideas and inspiration for deeper cooperation.

Every partner has chosen their good practices according to the template and calculations and verified it through various aspects. In the table below the matches are listed.

Receiving region	Sending region (the chosen good practice)
Hamburg	Päijät-Häme
Innlandet	Ostrobothnia
Latvia	Ostrobothnia
LIC	Päijät-Häme
LAEI	Västerbotten
Ostrobothnia	Innlandet
Päijät-Häme	Ostrobothnia
Västerbotten	Ostrobothnia

The most chosen good practice to be transferred is from Ostrobothnia. It is worth mentioning that one region (LIC) during the first phase of choosing the good practice found another good practice from the same sending region. As the main idea of LARS project is to transfer the good practice, they made deeper research on this particular good practice and chose this as a good practice to transfer.

The analysis of selected good practices based on calculations verified this method.

In order to translate the good practice every partner organized a focus group and did the benchmarking process. The task was to compare the parameters (gaps, stakeholders, value chain levels, and drivers) from the sending region (the chosen good practice) with the needs of the receiving region.

Despite the fact that due to the COVID-19 outbreak a lot of public events were canceled, partners managed to do the benchmarking process. Hamburg tested LARS results during another event in January. Innlandet made dialogue between different stakeholders. Latvia, LAEI and Vasterbotten organized an online focus group. LIC, Ostrobothnia, and Pajjat Hame managed to have a face-to-face meeting. We can see that there are benefits for this situation as well – partners found more communication channels and opportunities with stakeholders.

Study trips have been useful in understanding more about the nuances of good practices and also for making useful connections; they seem to have made for more detailed and also tuned solutions to regional challenges. This is shown in the LIC case, as they discovered development organizations, which were missing from their region. They noticed that a piece was missing before they can try to do similar activities than in Finnish regions and decided to first focus on creating that piece, which is logical. Background indeed matters behind every good practice and it would seem beneficial to tap into this "practice" in order to get concrete ideas on how to proceed.

The benchmarking process revealed that the sending regions can offer what receiving regions need. In some regions, there were minor differences but the most important is that major parameters were the same.

Regarding gaps – the gap which most of the regions want to bridge is the gap between companies and universities. Only for one region, there was a different gap – between universities and public organizations.

The benchmarking process showed that the main driver for changes is considered to be public organizations (6 regions). For one region it was companies, and for another – universities. This means that the most effort in WP6 and implementing the change model should be put on public organizations because they are the actors with the most power and legitimacy, as well as resources. So it means that despite the fact, that gap is between companies and universities, the main implementation stakeholder should be public organization and especially at the regional level.

Regarding value chain levels – benchmarking analysis showed that mostly partners need good practices which covers value chain level 9 (*Science/ Technology/Knowledge Provider*). Only one partner need the good practice which covers different level. For all partners there is a match in this position.

Regarding stakeholders and their parameters – almost all partners need the parameters (urgency, legitimacy, power) of stakeholders to be at the highest level – level 3. Despite the fact that mostly sending regions can offer parameters at level 2, it shouldn't be considered as an obstacle in transferring the chosen good practices. It just means that deeper analysis on relevant stakeholders should be done in order to choose the right stakeholders.

A change model for every region was described and SWOT analysis for every proposed change model was made. The needed action, stakeholders, and decisions are clear for every partner. SWOT analysis showed the potential of transferring good practices.

As the biggest strength was mentioned that existing activities and preconditions are sufficient for the changes and that involved stakeholders want to cooperate more – they just need some tools and help. Opportunities for a change model to be successful are external circumstances – political willingness for changes, environmental issues as well as common EU attitude towards innovations. Weaknesses for change models are – changes are slow, not all stakeholders are with same interest and attitude and lack of resources.

During WP5 partners analyzed the potential impact of COVID-19. On the one hand, this is a big threat because of the unstable economical situation but on the other hand, the COVID-19 can be seen as an opportunity and factor for success because stakeholders now understand the need for changes and the role of innovations.

For the change model to be successful every partner analyzed the risks, the opportunities, the degree of transferability as well as an alternative. Also, the next steps were identified. At the moment every partner is aware of actions needed but of course, the COVID-19 situation can make some changes which will reflect more in WP6.

Different types of analyses (stakeholder, gap, SWOT etc.) are seen as useful tools for developing the regions and this project has introduced new tools for every region. It has been a good learning experience for all partners on different methods.

Regions are different; so it's good that partners have different focuses or scales for good practices. Some partners are able to go more along the original good practice ideas and some need to adjust their implementation to go alongside existing regional activities; this indicates that transnational learning is possible to do, but requires some thought.

Overall expectations for the pilot stage are big.