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Foreword

“Innovation is the market introduction of a technical or organisational novelty, not just its invention.” Joseph A. Schumpeter

A vibrant and inclusive innovation ecosystem is essential to fulfil the European Union’s commitment to the green and digital transitions and contribute to a strong European recovery, economic and social cohesion, and global leadership in key technologies and innovative solutions.

More than ever in recent history, collaboration on innovative solutions is needed for social and economic recovery, environmental sustainability and resilience. The urgent challenges of today are fundamentally complex and systemic and will not be solved by individual actors, regions or territories in isolation. It is of utmost importance that the value of innovation is maximised for all so as to ensure an equitable diffusion of benefits. This can be achieved with innovation ecosystems drawing on, and interconnecting, the strengths of national, regional and local ecosystems, encouraging the involvement of all actors and territories, and making better use of all the talents across Europe.

The European Commission collects best practices and feedback from a wide range of innovation stakeholders in order to promote a more cohesive and integrated European innovation ecosystem that is capable of transforming scientific excellence into the innovations of tomorrow by addressing persisting barriers. An example of this is Europe’s Innovation Ecosystem Survey conducted during August and September 2021. I have the pleasure to present the results of the survey in this report.

The survey collected contributions from the different innovation actors, such as start-ups, SMEs, business support organisations, universities and research organisations, incubators and accelerators, investors and local, regional and national authorities.

The survey aimed at collecting stakeholders’ views on the challenges European innovation ecosystem actors are facing, which opportunities they see ahead, and what are their visions and ideas for future actions. The survey focused on a set of areas most relevant for innovation to thrive, namely: skills and people, funding/financing, regulatory environment and innovation ecosystems.

The ability of territories to participate and benefit from innovation is uneven and the answers provided in this survey highlight this divide. To achieve a thriving innovation ecosystem in Europe, there are bridges that still need to be built using as a foundation Europe’s richness in diversity and strength in collaboration.

The results of the survey will help policymakers, both at the European and the national level, expand their knowledge on the existing bottlenecks within Europe’s innovation ecosystems and inform future actions to address the barriers to transforming European research excellence into innovative solutions.

Together we can create environments where peoples’ ideas can connect and innovation can thrive.

Mariya Gabriel
European Commissioner for Innovation, Research, Culture, Education and Youth
December 2021

1 Austrian political scientist
Executive Summary

During the summer of 2021, the Commission conducted a survey for innovation stakeholders in regards to their views on the challenges that Europe’s innovation ecosystem actors are facing, the opportunities they see ahead, and their visions and ideas for future actions. The collected results have been analysed in the following report with the aspiration to draw conclusions and gather ideas to enhance Europe’s innovation performance and address persistent problems which hamper innovation. This was achieved by drawing on the knowledge and expertise of a wide range of stakeholders and innovation ecosystem actors. This report identifies persistent innovation barriers and recommends ways forward, towards a more cohesive and integrated European innovation ecosystem that is better capable of transforming scientific excellence into the innovations of tomorrow.

To achieve this, the survey was structured around three main categories of questions: the existing challenges; the vision of stakeholders; and the proposed actions organised by intervention areas (skills and people, funding/finance, regulatory environment and innovation ecosystems).

In a nutshell, acknowledging the challenge of transforming the higher education sector to strengthen the links between education, research, and innovation, the respondents stress as an essential action the promotion of entrepreneurship in education and training programmes across all age groups. Additionally, respondents put forward that better leveraging EU R&I funding programmes remains a big challenge. According to their responses, it is necessary to leverage EU R&I funding instruments, in particular the EIC and the EIT/KICs to support and accelerate scale-ups. Concerning the regulatory environment, the respondents considered it is important to the decrease of the regulatory burdens and red tape which affect all businesses, and particularly start-ups. They indicated as an essential action the creation of spaces for experimentation and testing of innovative solutions. Finally, in regards to the innovation ecosystems, the respondents noted the difficulty of intersectoral collaboration, technology/knowledge transfer and mobility between innovation actors, mostly between universities, public research institutions, research and technology organisations and businesses. To overcome this issue, it is primarily proposed to enhance local innovation networks among innovation actors (academia, industry, public bodies, civil society and citizens) and reinforce network connectivity between them.

Overall, the report analyses the input received and highlights the importance of the following factors for future policymaking:

- the need for a clear direction for innovation (defined in relation to societal challenges);
- the need for more transparency and co-creation during policymaking processes;
- the necessity for increased innovation cohesion and better synergies between different funding programmes; and
- the need to further work to improve the regulatory framework for investments.

These results were also analysed from a geographical perspective, which reveals the existence of some differences among stakeholders based on their country of affiliation (cohesion, non-cohesion and any other country).

Following the publication of the survey’s results, the European Commission will be in the position to expand its knowledge of the existing bottlenecks within Europe’s innovation ecosystems and will be able to utilise these outcomes for further deployment of future actions.
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INTRODUCTION

1 Context

This report presents the results of the stakeholder’s survey on Europe’s Innovation Ecosystem, which was organised by the European Commission from the 9th of August until the 15th of September 2021. This survey aimed to gather the views of a wide range of stakeholders on how to strengthen the European innovation ecosystem and improve innovation cohesion in Europe. Its findings feed the ongoing analysis and reflections on the evolution of the European innovation ecosystem, Cohesion Policy programmes and the role of smart specialization approaches.

The main objective of the survey was to identify ways towards a more cohesive and integrated European innovation ecosystem capable of transforming scientific excellence into the innovations of tomorrow, by identifying and collecting recommendations to address the persistent innovation barriers.

A vibrant and inclusive innovation ecosystem is essential to fulfil the European Union’s (EU) commitment to the green and digital transitions and contribute to a strong European recovery, economic and social cohesion, and global leadership in key technologies and innovative solutions. It is also essential to support the process of economic and social convergence of the less prosperous regions towards higher levels of prosperity by ensuring that the benefits of innovation are spread better across the EU and that all regions contribute to delivering the green and digital transition.

This report summarizes the views of 239 stakeholders on the challenges and opportunities that Europe is facing in the domain of innovation, as well as their vision and ideas for diffusing innovation across Europe in a better way. It contains also proposals provided by respondents for concrete measures that have the potential of being replicated, customised or scaled up at local, regional, national or European level.

Respondents span a wide range of innovation stakeholders, including start-ups, SMEs, business support organisations, universities and research organisations, incubators and accelerators, investors and local, regional and national authorities.

The authors would like to thank DG REGIO.G1’s Smart Growth and Connectivity Team, in particular Vincent Leiner, Karolina Tilman, and Beatriz Figueiredo Eschholz for their very useful inputs and co-drafting, as well as RTD’s Directorate A colleagues for their comments.

2 Structure of the Survey

The survey was composed of two main sections: “Section I - About you“ and “Section II - Your chance to shape a stronger European Innovation ecosystem and boost innovation cohesion in Europe!“ Under Section II, multiple-choice questions were structured around the following three categories: “needs and challenges”; “your vision”; and “your ideas for actions”, based on broad intervention areas. These were:

1. Needs and Challenges

(What are the most important needs and challenges that Europe is facing in the domain of innovation? In particular, for developing break-through innovations, scaling up firms, investing in innovation and bridging the innovation divide in Europe):

- General approach (to innovation);
- Skills/people (access to skills, talents, knowledge and ability);
- Funding/financing (public and private investments in R&I);
• Regulatory environment /single market (sufficiently innovation-friendly regulations);

• Innovation ecosystems (strengthening local innovation ecosystems and the development of an interconnected and inclusive innovation ecosystem at European level).

2. Your Vision (How would you respond to these needs and challenges? What opportunities can we create? Indicate your vision of a European innovation approach).

3. Your ideas for action (How would you support innovation at the European, national, regional or local level?):

• Skills/people;

• Funding/financing;

• Regulatory environment;

• Innovation Ecosystems.

Respondents had three options to express their key priorities among the listed possible replies under each category. Each question also provided an option “other”, which offered respondents the opportunity to add a free text reply in order to complement the provided choices with elements and issues they deemed missing. Moreover, respondents were then asked to rate the responses they selected on a scale from 1 to 3 (1 being least important, 3 being most important).

In a separate section, respondents were asked to share up to three examples of best practices (What existing initiatives, policies or programmes help improving the innovation performance at European, national, regional or local level?) that would have the potential to be replicated, customised or scaled up at European level. For each example, they were asked to briefly describe the practice and indicate its demonstrated impact, adding web links where available. In the following chapters, this report will provide an overview of the input received from respondents. Finally, the main takeaways from the survey and the potential next steps will be presented.

3 Methodology of the Analysis

The following analysis will present the quantitative and qualitative findings of the survey. Chapter 2 will offer a detailed breakdown of the demographics of the respondents, including which type of innovation they are most involved and interested in. Chapter 3, 4, and 5 will lay out the analysis of the multiple-choice questions under the three main sections of the survey: Needs and challenges, vision, and actions. Each subchapter will reiterate the questions and answer options, provide a detailed breakdown of the replies received, and highlight main findings of the open text replies.

Moreover, in order to gain some insights into the geographic dimension of the received replies, the survey report elaborates on findings derived from an analysis of the country of reference of the respondents, which have been divided into three categories: countries with access to the Cohesion Fund, “cohesion countries”, (Bulgaria, Czechia, Estonia, Greece, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia), countries without access to the Cohesion Fund “non-cohesion countries”, (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden), and others (such as multi-national organisations and third countries).

Lastly, chapter 6 presents twelve examples of best practices that were selected for their impact and potential to be replicated and scaled up elsewhere. After a review of the total
of 122 viable\(^2\) examples that respondents provided, they were categorised according to their relevance under the four main intervention areas (Skills/people; Funding/financing; Regulatory environment; Innovation Ecosystems). A comprehensive overview of all viable examples of best practices can be found in the annex.

\(^2\) An example was considered viable when it contained reference to a specific project, programme, or practice. General comments without such references were not taken into account in the context of this report.
DEMOGRAPHICS

The survey received a total of 239 responses from respondents active in all 27 EU Member States. The country from which the most of the responses were collected is Germany, followed by France, Italy and Spain. These four countries represented 31% of the sample cohort. 22% of these respondents have activities in more than one EU country. The survey was answered by 163 respondents from non-cohesion countries, 34 from cohesion countries and 42 stakeholders that were categorised under ‘Other respondents’. Moreover, this survey covered a wide range of different organisation sizes, as large organisations employing more than 500 people provided 28% of the responses, while micro organisations with less than 10 employees captured 23%. The other half of this sample is completed by small and medium organisations, which have between 10 and 500 employees.

The respondents in the survey represented a wide range of innovation stakeholders, including:

- Universities and Research Organisations;
- Individual Researchers, Innovators and Citizens of EU Member States;
- SMEs, Businesses and Startups;
- Business Support Organisations, Business Angel, Accelerator and Funding Agencies;
- Regional and Local Authorities and Ministries;
- Start-up Associations, NGOs and Interest Groups.

Following this categorisation to facilitate the analysis of the results, Figure 1 below provides the shares of these categories among respondents in this survey. Particularly, it shows that Research Organisations and Individual Researchers, Innovators and Citizens captured almost half of the sample, aggregating 47%. However, there is a substantial representation of the market per se as well since SMEs, Business and Startups together with Business Support Organisations comprised 34% of the responses. To that extent, it could be argued that through this sample many different angles of innovation ecosystems will be captured providing possible valid insights.
A final remark for this section on demographics in this report concerns the innovation preference of the respondents, namely the type of innovation that they are most involved or interested in. For this question, 82% of the respondents reported ‘Technological Innovation’ as their main field of involvement a share, which indicated the highest convergence of the sample. In addition, 36% of the respondents named ‘Deep tech’ as the main field of interest and 31% of the respondents declared that they are involved in social innovation. Figure 2 below shows the shares of all the possible options in the survey.
NEEDS AND CHALLENGES

In this section of the survey report, the stakeholders had the chance to provide their views and input on the most important needs and challenges for innovation. To that extent, this section investigates first the general approach regarding innovation according to the respondents, and then proceeds to more case-specific questions which concern skills and people (access to skills, talents, knowledge and ability), funding and financing (public and private investments in R&I), regulatory environment and single market (sufficiently innovation-friendly regulations) and finally innovation ecosystems (strengthening local innovation ecosystems and the development of an interconnected and inclusive innovation ecosystem at European level).

1 General Approach

The general approach question provided the respondents with five possible responses including an “other” option. The stakeholders could choose up to three options from:

- Deliver innovation that contributes to the EU’s political ambition for Europe’s green and digital transition;
- Have clear and focused innovation policy objectives across the EU and MS policies;
- Promote breakthrough and deep tech innovations and the role of start-ups as key dynamic players and drivers of innovation;
- Implement an inclusive and broad approach to innovation policy that notably ensures the inclusion of less developed European regions;
- Other (please specify).

Figure 3 below provides an overview of the respondents’ responses to this question. It is recorded that the three most popular answers were “Deliver innovation that contributes to the EU’s political ambition for Europe’s green and digital transition”, “Promote breakthrough and deep tech innovations & the role of start-ups as key dynamic players and drivers of innovation” and “Have clear and focused innovation policy objectives across the EU and MS policies”. Each option comprised 66%, 64% and 62% of the replies respectively. Among these three options, the stakeholders have indicated the promotion of breakthrough and deep tech innovations and the role of start-ups as key dynamic players and drivers of innovation as the most important option averaging 2.5 points out of 3 on the scale provided in the survey. It is also significant to mention that this answer was primarily supported by Research Organisations and Individual Researchers, Innovators, and Citizens.
Regarding findings concerning the geographical dimension of the replies to this question, Figure 4 provides a breakdown of replies by cohesion countries, non-cohesion countries, and “other respondents”, the last category comprising responses attributed to groups of countries, including outside the EU. Particularly, it could be observed that there is a consensus among the respondents from the non-cohesion countries that “deliver innovation that contributes to the EU’s political ambition for Europe’s green and digital transition” is one of the most important options as 74% of them have chosen it. Furthermore, 55% of other respondents and 41% of the respondents from the cohesion countries have included this option among their choices, showing that cohesion countries are focusing slightly more on their own immediate needs rather than EU political ambitions.

It could be highlighted that among the three options which collected the most votes, as depicted in Figure 3 above, respondents from the cohesion countries converged mostly towards the option of “Promote breakthrough and deep tech innovations and the role of start-ups as key dynamic players and drivers of innovation” as 71% of them mentioned it in their choice. For the other respondents' group, respondents converged towards the third most voted option, namely “Have clear and focused innovation policy objectives across the EU and MS policies” as it was picked by 64% of them. Finally, it is argued that cohesion countries are attaching much more importance to the question of addressing the innovation divide between the more and less developed regions. This is indicated by 76% of responses from the cohesion countries to “Implement an inclusive and broad approach to innovation policy that notably ensures the inclusion of less developed European regions” against 33% of responses from the non-cohesion countries.
As reported before, the survey offered the possibility to respondents themselves to add an open answer according to their opinion through the “other” choice. 41 EU stakeholders provided additional input and a convergence towards some specific proposals can be identified. Particularly, respondents emphasised the importance of:

- Enforcing European Data Spaces in all open public calls/tenders/procurements;
- Wider access to innovation support services & infrastructures for deployment of innovative solutions;
- A more transparent governance model for European industrial ecosystems and strategic value networks.

2 Skills and People

The skills and people question presented the respondents with six different, possible responses including the “other” option. The stakeholders had to choose from:

- Tertiary education or vocational training that can provide the necessary skills;
- Scarcity/shortage of appropriate skills or talent on the labour market;
- More balanced participation of women and cultural and social diversity;
- Policies that reflect that innovation is increasingly coming from sources other than research and researchers (entrepreneurs, students, academia, industry, public sector, civil society);
- Transforming our higher education sector to strengthen the links between education, research, and innovation;
- Other (please specify).

Figure 5 below provides an overview of the respondents’ responses to this question. It can be noted that two options were particularly popular among respondents, namely “Policies that reflect that innovation is increasingly coming from sources other than research and researchers (entrepreneurs, students, academia, industry, public sector, civil society)” and “Transforming our higher education sector to strengthen the links between education, research, and innovation”. These options recorded 57% and 71% of...
the total replies respectively and they were primarily supported by Research Organisations and Individual Researchers, Innovators, and Citizens. Among these two options, the stakeholders have indicated the “Transformation of our higher education sector to strengthen the links between education, research, and innovation” as the most important option averaging 2.6 points out of 3 on the scale provided in the survey.

As far as the geographical dimension is concerned and the preferences of the respondents from cohesion, non-cohesion and other respondents, a relevant consensus was recorded on the most chosen option, namely “Transforming our higher education sector to strengthen the links between education, research, and innovation”. More specifically, 66% of the respondents coming from non-cohesion countries selected this option. The convergence was higher in the case of respondents from other countries where 74% voted for this option and was the highest in the case of cohesion countries’ respondents where 88% considered the transformation of higher education as the most essential element to enhance individual competences.

The second most voted option in this category namely, “Policies that reflect that innovation is increasingly coming from sources other than research and researchers (entrepreneurs, students, academia, industry, public sector, civil society” was chosen by 52% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 62% of respondents from other and 76% from cohesion countries. There was no other option where respondents from any geographical category demonstrated higher preference than those mentioned above.
Under the “other” option that provided a free text field, 31 respondents complemented the pre-defined multiple-choice answers with their own input. Some frequently referred to themes emerged from the analysis of these replies:

- Enhancing entrepreneurial skills among researchers and the general public, especially soft skills (e.g. idea generation, risk-taking, networking). were mentioned multiple times;

- The importance of reflecting on innovation and entrepreneurship better in school curricula (among the entire education chain), but in particular to foster young talents (primary and secondary education);

- Open innovation was highlighted, in terms of openness of the entire ecosystem, as well as knowledge circulation and IP frameworks;

Closely related to openness of the Union’s ecosystem, the need for improved accessibility of the ecosystem and mobility within in for international talent was expressed by several stakeholders.

### 3 Funding/ Finance

The Funding/Finance question presented the respondents with seven different, possible responses including the “other” option. The stakeholders had to choose from:

- Access to finance in general;

- Availability of risk finance;

- Availability of public support;

- Availability of alternative finance (crowdfunding, etc.);

- Incentives for private investors;

- Better leverage of EU R&I funding programmes;

- Other (please specify).
Figure 7 below provides an overview of the respondents’ responses to this question. It can be noted that two options were mostly chosen by the respondents, namely “Access to finance in general” (47%) and “Better leverage of EU R&I funding programmes” (56%). These options were considerably important for the SMEs, Business & Start-ups category. Among these two options, the stakeholders have indicated “access to finance in general” as the most important option, averaging 2.4 points out of 3 on the scale provided in the survey.

Figure 7. Needs & Challenges of Innovation: Funding and Financing

The geographic analysis identified that all 3 categories (cohesion, non-cohesion, and others) considered a better leverage of EU and R&I funding programmes to be the most important with more than 50% of respondents choosing this option (53% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 65% from cohesion countries and 60% from other countries or multinationals). Interestingly, the greatest difference in voting choices when taking into consideration the regional aspect, appeared to be in the votes for “Availability of risk finance” where 53% of respondents from cohesion countries selected this compared to 37% from non-cohesion countries.

Figure 7. Needs & Challenges of Innovation: Funding and Financing with geographical dimension

Under the Funding/Finance section of the Needs and Challenges segment, 28 respondents provided additional input through the “other option”. Several convergences between replies could be documented:

Figure 8: Needs & Challenges of Innovation: Funding and Financing with geographical dimension
The importance of defining key policy objectives and orientations that reflect public interests (such as the twin transitions) was highlighted by various respondents;

Providing more proof-of-concept financing;

The need to increase transparency of public funding decisions;

Broadening access to funds to citizens and actors beyond incumbent beneficiaries and big institutions was expressed as a priority need, closely related to the need to better communicate on funding opportunities and exploring alternative ways of allocating funding (e.g. randomized small-scale trials);

Multiple stakeholders mentioned that private funding needs to be better leveraged.

4 Regulatory Environment

The Regulatory Environment question presented the respondents with eight different, possible responses including the “other” option. The stakeholders had to choose from:

- Reinforcing the internal market and tackling fragmentation/multiple national regulatory regimes that create obstacles to the cross-border development and diffusion of innovations and firms’ scale-up;

- Decreasing regulatory burdens and red tape affecting all businesses, but particularly start-ups;

- Adjusting product market regulations and standards that prevent, hinder or make uncompetitive the development and marketing of innovations, notably due to the inability to combine innovation support with the safeguard of socio-environmental requirements;

- Public procurement rules that take into account the innovation dimension or reward innovative solutions;

- Better access and possibility to re-use data and knowledge;

- Greater influence on global standard-setting relevant to innovation;

- More opportunities for innovation co-creation, crowd-sourcing and/or policy experimentation;

- Other (please specify).

Figure 9 below provides an overview of the respondents’ responses to this question. It can be noted that two options were most chosen by the respondents, namely "Decreasing regulatory burdens and red tape affecting all businesses, but particularly start-ups" (50%) and "Reinforcing the internal market and tackling fragmentation/multiple national regulatory regimes that create obstacles to the cross-border development and diffusion of innovations and firms’ scale-up" (45%). Among these two options, the stakeholders have indicated the latter as the most important option, averaging 2.5 points out of 3 on the scale provided in the survey. These options were primarily supported by Research Organisations, Individual Researchers, Innovators & Citizens and Business Support Organisations.
Regarding the geographic analysis of the Regulatory environment question, the results showed that "Decreasing regulatory burdens and red tape affecting all businesses, but particularly start-ups" was supported by all three categories with and at greater level by cohesion Countries (62%) compared to 45% of respondents from non-cohesion countries and 60% from the other respondents category. The second most voted option for cohesion countries respondents was "More opportunities for innovation co-creation, crowd-sourcing and/or policy experimentation" with 44% of stakeholders selecting this. However, for respondents from non-cohesion and other countries, the second most voted option was "Reinforcing the internal market and tackling fragmentation /multiple national regulatory regimes that create obstacles to the cross-border development and diffusion of innovations and firms’ scale-up" with 47% and 48% respondents selecting it respectively.
Furthermore, under the “other” option, 16 respondents complemented the multiple-choice answers with further comments. Several observations can be drawn from the analysis of frequently cited issues:

- Regulatory sandboxes and exemptions for experimental development were expressed as a key need by several respondents;
- More sensitivity of regulations to account for the particular needs of SMEs was highlighted;
- Demand-driven, alternate, and simplified procurement pathways were identified as an area of interest to stakeholders.

5 **Innovation Ecosystems**

The Innovation Ecosystems question presented the respondents with ten different possible responses including the “other” option. The stakeholders had to choose from:

- Improved investment opportunities;
- Coordination of R&I funding programmes across EU, national and regional levels;
- Intersectoral collaboration, technology/knowledge transfer and mobility between innovation actors, in particular between universities, public research institutions, research and technology organisations and businesses;
- Better infrastructures for deployment of innovative solutions;
• Wide diffusion of knowledge, data and innovations across EU Member States and regions;

• Reduce the persistent innovation divide between regions across Europe;

• Innovation policies that are sufficiently tailored to specific regions, including less developed regions;

• Wider access to innovation support services in less developed regions of Europe;

• Improved administrative and institutional capacities at local or regional level to access finance and manage R&I investments;

• Other (please specify).

Figure 11 below provides an overview of the respondents’ responses to this question. It can be noted that two options were most chosen by the respondents, namely “Coordination of R&I funding programmes across EU, national and regional levels” (49%) and “Intersectoral collaboration, technology/knowledge transfer and mobility between innovation actors, in particular between universities, public research institutions, research and technology organisations and businesses” (57%). Among these two options, the stakeholders have indicated the latter as the most important option averaging 2.5 points out of 3 on the scale provided in the survey. These options were primarily supported by Research Organisations, Individual Researchers, and Innovators and Citizens.

Interestingly, one of the most voted options by the cohesion countries’ respondents, with 44%, was “Wider access to innovation support services in less developed regions of Europe”. That is in contrast with the fact that this option was chosen only by 7% of respondents from non-cohesion countries. The option that received the most votes from
all categories was “Intersectoral collaboration, technology/knowledge transfer and mobility between innovation actors, in particular between universities, public research institutions, research and technology organisations and businesses”, with 56% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 59% from cohesion countries and 62% from the other respondents, classifying intersectoral collaboration as of extreme relevance.

For cohesion countries, there is an emphasis on having “Better infrastructure for deployment of innovative solutions” with 35% rather than having a “Wide diffusion of knowledge, data and innovations across EU Member States and regions” with 9%. Finally, for non-cohesion countries it seems less important to "Reduce the persistent innovation divide between regions across Europe" with 12% than to achieve a "Wide diffusion of knowledge, data and innovations across EU Member States and regions” with 26%.

Lastly, 18 respondents provided further comments on the needs and challenges of the Union’s innovation ecosystem. Themes that emerged include:

- Intersectoral collaboration among all ecosystem actors was mentioned multiple times, with a particular emphasis on educational institutions, start-up communities, non-academic inventors, and industry;
- Closely related, a fit-for-purpose IP framework was once again seen as an important basis for these collaborations;
- Upscaling and improving access to research and innovation infrastructures was expressed as another need;
- Considered interesting despite only one respondent raising this was the reduction of red tape on incentives for employee stock options.
VISION

In this section of the survey, the stakeholders had the chance to contribute with their vision for the future of innovation in Europe. The survey guided the stakeholders to present their thoughts in terms of both short and long-term vision for the European innovation ecosystem.

The "My vision would be" question provided nine different possible responses to the respondents:

- Give innovation a direction by focusing on delivering European leadership in innovations for the green and digital transitions and related economic and societal transformations;
- Adopt a broad scope for innovation policy covering technological, non-technological and social innovation and engaging with people, students and end-users;
- Stimulate a value-based, citizen-led and human-centric innovation approach, placing people at the centre of innovation;
- Increase the focus on defragmenting Europe’s internal market for innovations, and creating a pro-innovation regulatory and standard-setting environment;
- Increase the focus on mobilising long-term capital and risk finance for scale-up and diffusion of innovation;
- Increase the focus on inclusion and interconnection of innovation ecosystems across Europe;
- Increase the focus on capacity building in Europe’s local innovation ecosystems;
- Increase the focus on broadening innovation and technology adoption, addressing the innovation divide and regions at all levels of development;
- Other (please specify).

Figure 13 below provides an overview of the respondents’ responses to this question. It was recorded that the two answers chosen most frequently by the respondents were “Stimulate a value-based, citizen-led and human-centric innovation approach, placing people at the centre of innovation” (43%) and “Give innovation a direction by focusing on delivering European leadership in innovations for the green and digital transitions and related economic and societal transformations” (42%). The respondents indicated both responses as highly important (2.5). Furthermore, respondents have expressed a need to “increase the focus on capacity building in Europe’s local innovation ecosystems” (35%), and also to “adopt a broad scope for innovation policy covering technological, non-technological and social innovation and engaging with people, students and end-users” (35%).

It is also significant to mention that the top answers were primarily supported by Research Organisations, Businesses, and Technology Transfer Offices according to the analysis that followed.
The geographical analysis performed showed that the option with the most votes “Stimulate a value-based, citizen-led and human-centric innovation approach, placing people at the centre of innovation” was selected by 41% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 38% from cohesion countries, and 52% from the other respondents. However, the most chosen option by respondents from non-cohesion countries was “Give innovation a direction by focusing on delivering European leadership in innovations for the green and...” with 45%. For respondents from cohesion countries, “Increase the focus on capacity building in Europe’s local innovation ecosystems” was considered more important (59%) than for non-cohesion countries (32%). Moreover, cohesion countries are significantly more interested in “Increasing the focus on broadening innovation and technology adoption, addressing the innovation divide and regions at all levels of development” (47%) compared to other respondents (26%) and non-cohesion countries (14%).
Regarding the “other” option, 22 respondents expressed their vision in their own words. Notable themes included:

- Placing people and sustainability at the heart of innovation, arguably expressing stakeholders’ desire for more purpose-driven innovation;

- Closely related to the previous bullet, the need to define specific challenges or even a moonshot visionary project to identify the ‘direction’ of innovation and build and structure ecosystems accordingly was expressed several times;

- Conversely, one answer argued for innovation to be driven by creativity, market needs and technological progress, rather than societal challenges and political objectives;

- Strengthening foresight capacities in order to anticipate promising emerging technologies and solutions early on;

- Developing the ability of local and national innovation ecosystems and their actors to build or become part of international networks;

- Several respondents underlined the need for a holistic approach to innovation, acknowledging and engaging all innovation actors from the inception of an idea to the end-user.
ACTIONS

This section presents the responses of the stakeholders to the challenges and needs that were put forward in the first sections of the survey. Respondents were asked how they would suggest to support innovation at the European, national, regional or local level mirroring the same four categories from the first section, namely: skills/people, funding/financing, regulatory environment, and innovation ecosystems. Multiple choice replies in this section were conceptualised in relation to the corresponding questions from Section II.1. The results per category are demonstrated in the following subsections.

1 Skills and People

The results indicated that the transformation of the higher education sector to strengthen the links between education, research, and innovation is a major concern of EU stakeholders. Respondents had to select their preferences from the following options:

- Support underrepresented innovators (ensuring diversity);
- Create a more responsive educational/training system that responds (more rapidly) to new innovation skills and changing labour market needs;
- Promote entrepreneurship in education and training programmes across all age groups;
- Provide better support for social innovators;
- Develop easier/faster solutions for attracting foreign talent to Europe;
- Other (please specify).

Respondents showed a high preference for two specific options where a high consensus was shown (Figure 15). More specifically, the option of “promoting entrepreneurship in education and training programmes across all age groups” and the option regarding the “creation of a more responsive educational/training system that responds (more rapidly) to new innovation skills and changing labour market needs” (73% and 71% respectively). Additionally, EU stakeholders attributed the highest value on the importance scale to these two options, as they presented an average of 2.6 and 2.4 points respectively. These two options were supported primarily by Research Organisations, Individual Researchers, Innovators and Citizens and Business Support Organisations. Figure 15 below depicts the results obtained in absolute terms for all six options.

![Figure 15: Actions: Skills and People](image-url)
Considering the geographic analysis that was performed, the option with the most votes "Promote entrepreneurship in education and training programmes across all age groups" was selected by 67% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 85% from cohesion countries and 86% from the other respondents category. The option that followed in number of votes “Create a more responsive educational/training system that responds (more rapidly) to new innovation skills and changing labour market needs” registered a similar trend with 69% of respondents from non-cohesion countries and 88% from cohesion countries. However, for the other respondents category this option was only selected by 67% of stakeholders. These results indicate that enhancing education and training was seen as more of a priority for cohesion countries as compared to non-cohesion countries.

Moreover, 25 respondents decided to complement the provided multiple-choice options with their suggestions for actions under the “other” options. The following observations could be derived from their contributions:

- In line with the needs identified under the skills/talent theme of the previous section, several respondents suggested to focus new actions on young talent, e.g. to expose them to real-world challenges and opportunities, and developing their entrepreneurial skill set earlier on;

- Making ‘innovator’ an attractive and more accessible profession was highlighted;

- Digital skills, through digital learning/education programmes were identified as a key intervention area for further action, while it was also suggested that enabling non-digital natives to access consumer-oriented technologies through more intuitive applications should be considered;

- Developing targeted solutions to attract and retain foreign talent was emphasized by several respondents, again in line with the needs identified in the previous section.

- Lifelong learning and a holistic approach that not only fosters academic skills, but also important other soft, technical, and vocational skills emerged as a priority action area from the replies;
The issue of competitive salaries for researchers and innovators was raised, along with the suggestion of considering a basic income to alleviate financial pressures in these professions.

2 Funding/ Finance

From the needs and challenges section, the respondents’ views on this matter up to this point in the survey had revealed that a better leverage of EU R&I funding programmes was extremely relevant in particular to SMEs, Business and Start-ups. The stakeholders’ views on funding and financing were further explored with the following action options:

- Create conditions for mobilising/crowding-in more private funding;
- Leverage EU R&I funding instruments, in particular the EIC and the EIT/KICs to support and accelerate scale-ups;
- Create critical mass for Venture Capital in Europe through public support;
- Create conditions for strengthening Patient capital in Europe;
- Develop new forms of public-private high-risk financing;
- Launch joint or coordinated major innovative procurement initiatives;
- Make use of innovative procurement to promote development and market uptake of innovative solutions;
- Other (please specify).

Figure 17 below shows the most chosen option was indeed again to better "Leverage EU R&I funding instruments, in particular the EIC and the EIT/KICs to support and accelerate scale-ups" with 124 responses (52%) and also voted the most important with an average of 2.4 out of 3 on the importance scale. It was considered substantial for the SMEs, Business and Start-ups, and Business Support Organisation categories. Also to be noted in this section was the relatively high number of responses under the ‘other’ option, with 27 additional comments.

![Figure 17: Actions: Funding and Financing with geographical dimension](image-url)
The geographic analysis of the Funding/finance question identified that the “Leverage EU R&I funding instruments, in particular the EIC and the EIT/KICs to support and accelerate scale-ups” option was supported by 50% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 53% from cohesion countries and 57% from the other respondents category, which does not show an accentuated difference in actions envisioned by the different geographic categories. The second most chosen option “Develop new forms of public-private high-risk financing” was selected by 42% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 56% from cohesion countries and 43% from other respondents stakeholders.

Under the “other” option, 27 respondents decided to provide further input for potential actions to improve the funding/finance dimension of the Union’s innovation ecosystem. Several themes emerged from their open text replies:

- Once again, the need for more early development stage, proof-of-concept funding was highlighted by several respondents as a key intervention area that requires targeted actions;
- Indirect support measures such as favorable tax standards and decreasing the regulatory and administrative burden attached to many funding opportunities to improve the accessibility, were emphasised as being of great importance;
- Sharing best practices and methods related to funding and financing such as innovative public procurement was also mentioned.

### 3 Regulatory Environment

In relation to stakeholders’ previous responses regarding this matter, it was evident that a decrease in regulatory burdens and red tape affecting all businesses, but particularly start-ups, was of utmost importance. The stakeholders’ views on the Regulatory Environment were further explored with the following action options:
- Identify and remove regulatory burdens;
- Involve innovators in early discussions of regulations and standards with legislators and policymakers;
- Make information more easily/widely accessible about regulatory measures affecting emerging tech;
- Develop standards in priority policy areas concerning new technologies or innovations reaching commercial application;
- Create lead markets for breakthrough technologies and strategic innovations;
- Develop and promote frameworks/guidance for technology/knowledge transfer between academia and business;
- Create spaces for experimentation and testing of innovative solutions;
- Assist stakeholders in understanding state aid in the area of R&I;
- Other (please specify).

Figure 19 below shows that the “creation of spaces for experimentation and testing of innovative solutions” is thought to be a highly important action to be taken with 53% of respondents opting for this choice, followed by “involving innovators in early discussions of regulations and standards with legislators and policymakers” with 48% and the “identification and removal of regulatory burdens” with 46%. Also to note, the least voted option was related to “assisting stakeholders in understanding state aid rules in the area of Research and Innovation”. Regarding the importance scale, the first and third options described here were ranked the most important with an average of 2.5 out of 3. They were supported primarily by Research Organisations, Individual Researchers, Innovators and Citizens, and SMEs, Business and Start-ups.
The three most chosen options regarding the regulatory environment question were relatively equally supported by the three geographic categories, non-cohesion, cohesion and other respondents countries. Where the stakeholders' opinions diverged was in regards to the option “Develop and promote frameworks/guidance for technology/knowledge transfer between academia and business” where 53% of respondents from cohesion selected this option compared to 36% from non-cohesion countries. The previous analysis done on needs and challenges identified that “decreasing regulatory burdens and red tape affecting all businesses, but particularly start-ups” was especially important for respondents from cohesion countries. In this section on actions, the responses from cohesion respondents highlight this factor again since the identification and removal of regulatory burdens was among the top three of options for this group of stakeholders with 50%. 

**Figure 19: Actions: Regulatory Environment**

- Create spaces for experimentation and testing of innovative solutions
- Involve innovators in early discussions of regulations and standards with legislators and policymakers
- Identify and remove regulatory burdens
- Develop and promote frameworks/guidance for technology/knowledge transfer between academia and business
- Create lead markets for breakthrough technologies and strategic innovations
- Develop standards in priority policy areas concerning new technologies or innovations reaching commercial application
- Make information more easily/widely accessible about regulatory measures affecting emerging tech
- Assist stakeholders in understanding state aid in the area of R&I
- Other (please specify)
Furthermore, four stakeholders opted for providing more input through the “other” option. Based on the small number of specific suggestions, no common themes could be identified. Noteworthy contributions mentioned setting up free accessible synaptic legislation portals, and ensuring that regulatory discussions also take relevant scientific evidence into account.

4 Innovation Ecosystems

In relation to stakeholders’ previous responses regarding this matter, it was evident that there is a need for intersectoral collaboration, technology/knowledge transfer and mobility between innovation actors, in particular between universities, public research institutions, research and technology organisations and businesses. This option was strongly supported by Research Organisations, Individual Researchers, and Innovators and Citizens. The respondents' views on innovation ecosystems were further explored with the following action options:

- Develop bottom-up, place-based approaches of smart specialisation and use them to guide R&I investments and initiatives for reinforcing innovation ecosystems;
- Enhance local innovation networks among innovation actors (academia, industry, public bodies, civil society and citizens) and reinforce network connectivity between them;
- Improve/integrate information & service platforms at local level, and interconnect them at EU level;
• Develop pan-European ‘market places’ that connect ideas and research results with entrepreneurs and investors across Europe (supply and demand);

• Support networking among innovation actors of strategic value chains across local ecosystems, notably building on EU-level initiatives (e.g. European missions and Partnerships);

• Interconnect European innovation hubs;

• Foster synergies between different EU, as well as national and regional programmes;

• Other (please specify).

Figure 21 below shows the option with the highest number of votes (58%) related to networking: “Enhance local innovation networks among innovation actors (academia, industry, public bodies, civil society and citizens) and reinforce network connectivity between them”. This choice was also considered highly important for the majority of the respondents with an importance score of 2.4 out of 3, and particularly substantial for the SMEs, Business and Start-ups, and Business Support Organization categories.

The remaining votes were relatively evenly distributed among the other options. 22 respondents added comments under the option “other” with their own views regarding possible actions to take concerning the improvement of innovation ecosystems.

The geographic analysis performed regarding the innovation ecosystems question on possible actions revealed that the option with the greatest number of votes, “Enhance local innovation networks among innovation actors (academia, industry, public bodies, civil society and citizens) and reinforce network connectivity between them”, was chosen by 55% of respondents from non-cohesion countries, 58% from cohesion countries, and 69% from the other respondents category. To note, one of the areas where there was a divergence in opinion between the non-cohesion and cohesion categories was to
“Improve/integrate information & service platforms at local level, and interconnect them at EU level”, where 23% of stakeholders from non-cohesion countries selected this answer compared to 41% from cohesion countries.

Lastly, 22 respondents provided additional proposals for possible actions through the “other” option. Several common themes could be identified:

- Better defining and connecting ecosystems with societal challenges that have been identified, with one respondent suggestion to move from ‘smart specialisation’ to mission-driven approaches;
- Strengthening academia/non-academia collaboration and boosting the integrating role of universities;
- The need to open up European ecosystems and enhancing their capacity for international collaboration was expressed multiple times.
SUGGESTIONS OF BEST PRACTICES

Under the best practices section of the survey, respondents were asked to provide examples of existing initiatives, policies or programmes that could help improve the innovation performance at European, national, regional or local level. The stakeholders had the opportunity to share up to three examples that have the potential to be replicated, customised or scaled up by providing a brief description with links and the examples’ demonstrated impact.

A total of 122 best practices were received from respondents. For reasons of brevity, only 12 particularly suitable and impactful examples have been chosen for presentation in the context of this survey report. To facilitate the analysis and presentation, the examples were divided according to the four main intervention areas (Skills/people; Funding/financing; Regulatory environment; Innovation ecosystems). See the Annex for a comprehensive list of viable best practices as provided by respondents.

1  Skills/ People

Center for Interdisciplinary Research (CRI)

CRI is co-constructing and sharing new ways of learning, teaching, conducting research and mobilizing collective intelligence in the fields of life, learning and digital sciences, in order to address the UN’s sustainable development goals (SDGs).

Its operation has four main areas, namely:

1. Developing and hosting educational programs, from preschool to high school (Savanturiers - École de la Recherche), interdisciplinary Bachelor, Master, and PhD (EURIP Graduate School) as well as lifelong learning degree programs of the Université de Paris.

2. Conducting research within its INSERM-Université de Paris research Collaboratory Unit, advised and guided by a Scientific Advisory Board, composed of prestigious international scientific leaders.

3. Developing the #LearningPlanet initiative in partnership with UNESCO, of which it also holds a Chair, and AFD to inspire and empower learners of all ages who wish to identify, develop and amplify the most effective ways to learn how to solve problems together.

4. Building a living campus where innovative makers can set up digital infrastructures for learning communities to help them to resolve global challenges.

This example was chosen as a good practice since learners are immediately considered as autonomous and concrete operators of their own approaches and pedagogy, which generates significant leverage in terms of the scope of knowledge acquisition and dissemination.

Youth Entrepreneurship Week

The Youth Entrepreneurship Week offers you the opportunity to work together with other students and partners from the startup community. It offers space for innovation, for the development of solutions for the Sustainable Development Goals and for digital ideas.

During a Youth Entrepreneurship Week, students experience the creative power they have and how they can use it in a solution-oriented way. They are expected to overcome challenges, gain confidence in their strengths and potentially become change makers. In
In this context, students will have the chance to recognize problems as opportunities, create solutions, build prototypes, develop business models and present their ideas.

This best practice was considered substantial as it depicts the importance of building entrepreneurial competences from an early life stage. It is expected that this will lead to a higher ambition from students to impact the world by starting their own ventures.

**Helsinki XR Center for connecting XR researchers, students and start-ups**

Helsinki XR Center, the home of Extended Realities, is an incubator for talent, a cultural hub for co-creation and learning for all XR artists, entrepreneurs, engineers, scientists, students and enthusiasts in the field of virtual and augmented reality.

1. Supports Finnish XR startups by for example offering office space and equipment, mentoring and access to the Finnish XR community,
2. Organizes various XR events for networking purposes,
3. Carries out different kinds of RDI (research, development & innovation) projects with universities and other organizations, and
4. Offers various services, such as XR Workshops for companies and organisations, special facility renting, venue services and business coaching for early-stage startups in Helsinki Arabia district

This example of best practice was chosen as since it opened its doors in 2019, the Helsinki XR Center has had the honour to collaborate with as many as 22 learning institutions and over 75 companies, offer working space, equipment and mentoring to over 25 developer hub teams, show our HXRC Showroom to over 1000 visitors, as well as produce dozens of XR events.

During the first years of existence, some of the most interesting topics have been virtual reality (VR) use in healthcare training, virtual event platforms and virtual humans.

### 2 Funding/Finance

**Transfer BONUS – Förderung des Technologie- und Wissenstransfers**

With the Transfer BONUS funding program, the Berlin Senate Department for Economics, Energy and Enterprises has created a measure that brings companies and scientific institutions together and creates synergy effects for both sides.

The aim of the funding program is to make it easier for companies to access science and research for their innovative ideas and to support their commercial exploitation. The goals include promoting entrepreneurship, innovation, expansion, modernization and sustainability.

Up to EUR 45,000 in funding for technology and knowledge transfer projects in Berlin. In the entry-level funding scheme, grants of up to EUR 7,500 are provided.

**Linea Internazionalizzazione Plus**

Linea Internazionalizzazione Plus promotes the internationalization of the Lombard entrepreneurial fabric through integrated development programs, with services and activities for participation in initiatives aimed at starting in a structured way and / or consolidating its business in foreign markets.
The financial envelope (co-financed with the POR FESR, under AXIS III – Action III.3.b.1.1 of the POR FESR 2014-2020 of the Lombardy Region) is equal to 7.5 million euros, of which 6 million for the part of financing and 1.5 million euros for the part of the non-repayable capital contribution.

Who is it for?

- SMEs registered in the Register of Companies and active for at least 24 months (excluding ateco codes A, L, K) with operational headquarters in Lombardy can apply.

The amount that can be requested is between 40 and 500 thousand euros. Up to 100% of the eligible costs are granted, of which 80% in the form of subsidized financing and the remaining 20% in the form of a non-repayable contribution. The duration of the loan is between 3 and 6 years, with a maximum pre-amortization period of 24 months. The nominal annual interest rate applied to the Loan is fixed and is equal to 0%.

**Innovation Norway**

Innovation Norway is a state-owned company and a national development bank. The company's programs and services are intended to stimulate entrepreneurship in Norway. Innovation Norway is also active in 30 other countries around the world.

Its intention is to support companies in developing their competitive advantage and to enhance innovation by providing to Norwegian companies access to a broad business support system as well as financial means. Innovation Norway provides competence, advisory services, promotional services and network services. Innovation Norway puts forward that, with the combination of the local industry knowledge and international networks with the business ideas and the motivation of entrepreneurs, the foundation for new successful businesses is created.

According to their most recent annual report, Innovation Norway has allocated in 2019 a total of EUR 160 million in loans and grants to start-up companies. Additionally, 127 start-up companies received start-up loans of EUR 20 million. A start-up loan provides start-up companies with capital that enables them to continue to build their company and commercialise their products faster.

This best practice is presented as in addition, together with 500 companies, 60 public-sector actors have participated in activities related to innovation partnerships, which are public-private collaborations that develop new solutions to major social challenges. 14 projects were fully operational at the end of 2019, five of which were started during the year. Finally, Innovation Norway has provided advice and guidance in relation to EU funding, and 38 Norwegian SMEs received a total of EUR 30 million in 2019 from the European Innovation Council (EIC) thanks to this support.

### 3 Regulatory Environment

**Leibniz Institute for Neurobiology (LIN) in Magdeburg**

Idea - Transfer - Application

These three keywords describe the classic way of exploiting research results. The application and communication of the knowledge generated in the economy and society by excellent basic research is also a central concern of the Leibniz Association.

LIN'S's Technology Transfer Officer assists in patent protection and commercial exploitation of intellectual property so that these publicly funded research projects find their way into application.
After more than 10 years of work, the LINCam was developed at the imaging core facility of the Leibnitz Institute for Neurobiology in Magdeburg. In 2017, the original Developers Dr.-Ing. Werner Zuschratter, Dr.-Ing. Yury Prokazov and Evgeny Turbin founded the spin-off company Photonscore to further develop this novel quantum light sensor and make it commercially available to various labs, institutes and companies.

This example of best practice was chosen due to the successful creation of the spin-off company Photonscore and the development of the LINCam that resolves photons spatially and temporarily at the same time. The solution for scanning-free time correlated single photon counting with megapixel positional resolution combined with 50 ps temporal accuracy.

**Buzer.de**

Buzer.de is a German private initiative that provides anyone interested with a quick, up-to-date and complete insight into current and previous federal law, Part I, at no cost. The starting side provides quick access to relevant legislative texts organised by thematic areas (tax law, traffic law, labour law, energy law, capital markets, etc.), as well as a list of the most recent amendments sorted by date.

For this purpose, in addition to the applicable regulations, the earlier versions are also archived, text amendments are identified by means of comparisons and highlighting, and each amendment is assigned to the respective underlying amending law. The texts of the amendment titles are also retrievable and searchable in full text. All norm citations are linked and can be followed by clicking on the citation. This eliminates the need to repeatedly search for the various cited standards, and even the amendment history can be accessed very quickly back to 2006 by clicking on the citation in each amendment title. However, the history can be accessed even more conveniently via the reference and amendment reference integrated in each title and explained below.

This example was chosen as a good practice regarding communicating and presenting relevant legal text and their amendments to interested stakeholders in an effective and comprehensible way.

### 4 Innovation Ecosystems

**La Ruche**

La Ruche is a national network that supports locally people who wish to enterprise or develop their activity in a sustainable and responsible manner.

Les audacieuses is an action carried out by La Ruche. It puts forward women in a context of societal innovation and accompanies them to deploy locally impactful projects that have a real influence on the nearby ecosystem. It combines innovation in practice and action for meaningful results.

Tailor-made and free 9-month support program that includes:

- Monthly and individualized operational monitoring by the teams from La Ruche Paris or Bordeaux
- A strategic mentoring program with an experienced entrepreneur
- Personalized coaching to strengthen leadership
- Several hours of advice with business experts
• Three collective training seminars at La Ruche Paris or Bordeaux

La Ruche Network was chosen as an example of best practice due to its demonstrated impact that includes:

• 130 Projects supported since the start of the program
• 104 locally created companies
• 80% 3-year business survival rate

**The Carnot Network**

The main objective of Carnot Institutes in France is to prepare the industrial and economic future by supporting all companies in their innovation and transformation strategies. Currently, there are 39 institutes across the country, and they offer a wide spectrum of skills to meet the R&I needs of companies in most economic sectors. To take advantage of their complementarities and make use of synergies for the benefit of their economic partners, they are organized in an operational network led by AiCarnot. Their permanent contact with companies allows them to understand and anticipate R&I responses for the different sectors of activity through a proactive action of scientific resourcing oriented by the need.

The Carnot Institutes rely on an approach of continuous improvement of the professionalism of their partnership relationship, from the first contact to the provision of deliverables and the collection of feedback, through the negotiation and project assembly phases.

This Network was selected as a best practice example due to its demonstrated impact:

• 1,150 priority patents filed during the year, 2nd among French depositors
• 35,000 FTE research professionals including 9,500 doctoral students
• 10,200 research contracts per year including 4,900 with SMEs

**CeADAR**

CeADAR is Ireland’s national centre for Applied AI, a market-focused technology centre that drives the accelerated research, development, and deployment of AI and data analytics technology and innovation into businesses. CeADAR is the bridge between the worlds of applied research in AI and data analytics and their commercial deployment.

The centre is funded by Enterprise Ireland and IDA Ireland, headquartered in University College Dublin and is a partnership with the Technological University Dublin (formerly DIT). The work done by CeADAR focuses on developing tools, techniques and technologies that enable more people, organisations and industries to use analytics and AI for better decision making, unlocking hidden insights and sustained competitive advantage.

CeADAR has strengths in:

• predictive analytics
• machine and deep learning
• artificial intelligence
• real-time analytics
- text analytics and natural language processing
- data visualisation
- blockchain and smart contracts
- computer vision and image analytics.

The industry membership of CeADAR has grown significantly in recent years and currently there are 90 industry partners ranging from multi-nationals to indigenous SMEs spanning every industry vertical. This example was chosen as the Centre is the focal point of a thriving national ecosystem delivering frequent seminars, conferences, and members’ networking events throughout the year.

CeADAR was awarded the Dunn & Bradstreet prize for Best Analytics Research Group Ireland at the DatSci Awards and in November 2018 it received the European i-Spaces GOLD award from the Big Data Value Association in Brussels. CeADAR is the designated EU AI Digital Innovation Hub in Ireland and is one of only 30 across the EU.
FURTHER REMARKS AND TAKEAWAYS

After completing the extensive analysis of the respondents’ input, collected for this survey, this report attempts to provide some additional remarks which derive from the co-examination of different parameters which dovetail during the elaboration of the results. In particular, it is put forward:

- **Divergence of priorities between cohesion and non-cohesion countries.** Specifically, 59% of the respondents from the cohesion countries flagged that they envisage an increased focus on capacity building in Europe’s local innovation ecosystems. At the same time, 32% of the respondents from the non-cohesion countries considered that as substantial. Broadening innovation and technology adoption and addressing the innovation divide and regions at all levels of development is perceived as a priority in the cohesion countries more than in the non-cohesion countries. One out of two respondents from the non-cohesion countries highlighted the importance of this proposal the same time that only 14% of the stakeholders from cohesion countries voted for that option. In general, it could be argued that these results indicate a trend among non-cohesion countries to be more focused on EU-level, big-picture objectives, whereas cohesion countries are more interested in building local capacities and ecosystems.

- **The importance of a direction for innovation and ecosystems,** defined in relation to societal needs and policy objectives derived from them was highlighted. In this context, start-ups are key players to bring innovations to the market and their participation in pan-European clusters to drive innovation is considered essential. Besides, 64% of the respondents pointed the significance of promoting of breakthrough and deep tech innovations and the role of start-ups as key dynamic players and drivers of innovation.

- **The need for more transparent and inclusive policymaking processes,** in order to provide an opportunity to discuss the implementation of start-up friendly policies throughout the EU. Indeed, when the respondents were asked to indicate the essential actions for overcoming the existing regulatory barriers, half of them considered that it is essential to involve innovators in early discussions of regulations and standards with legislators and policymakers. To that extent an EU-level group could have substantial results and provoke positive impacts on this need.

- **The necessity of overcoming the innovation divide and fostering synergies between different funding programmes.** Specifically, one out of two respondents named the “Coordination of R&I funding programmes across EU, national and regional levels” as the most challenging issue for the improvement of the function of the innovation ecosystems.

- **The need to further work on improving the regulatory framework for investments and reducing red tape for businesses.** The stakeholders highlighted the big challenge of gaining access to funding. In fact, one out of two mentioned as a main challenge the “Better leverage of EU R&I funding programmes” or “Access to finance in general”. In addition, they also indicated that the biggest challenge in terms of the Regulatory Environment is to “Decrease regulatory burdens and red tape affecting all businesses, but particularly start-ups;” (50% of the responses).
## ANNEX

### 1 Skills/ People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of best practice</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academ’quis</td>
<td><a href="https://academ-quiz.inseec-online.com/AcademQuiz/">https://academ-quiz.inseec-online.com/AcademQuiz/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BerT</td>
<td><a href="https://www.bert.ihk.de">https://www.bert.ihk.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Interdisciplinary Research (CRI), Paris</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cri-paris.org/en">https://www.cri-paris.org/en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Hub Dedagroup Spa (Technology and Innovation Unit)</td>
<td><a href="https://scc-digitalhub.github.io">https://scc-digitalhub.github.io</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinamiza Innovación</td>
<td><a href="https://proyecto-dinamiza.es/">https://proyecto-dinamiza.es/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eship: Navigating Uncertainty</td>
<td><a href="https://www.biosymfonix.com/">https://www.biosymfonix.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European EdTech Alliance</td>
<td><a href="https://www.edtecheurope.org/">https://www.edtecheurope.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFG, Austria</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ffg.at/forschungskompetenzen-fuer-die-wirtschaft">https://www.ffg.at/forschungskompetenzen-fuer-die-wirtschaft</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemisch Institute for Biotechnology (VIB)</td>
<td><a href="https://vib.be/">https://vib.be/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki XR Center</td>
<td><a href="https://helsinki-xr-center.com/">https://helsinki-xr-center.com/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovatiesteunpunt  

Innovative university of Applied Sciences Germany BMBF Germany  
https://bmbfcluster.de

Koulu.me  
https://koulu.me

Microsoft Contact Office Support  
https://support.microsoft.com/home/contact?ContactUsExperienceEntryPointAssetId=2b102d44-b43f-4dd2-9ff4-23cf144cfb11

Org Mode  
https://orgmode.org/

Plos  
https://Plos.org

Regional Innovation Impact of Universities  

Stack Overflow  
https://stackoverflow.com

Stanford d.school  
https://dschool.stanford.edu/

TRAIN-TO-NZEB  
http://www.train-to-nzeb.com/

UX Challenge Hub Innovazione Trentino  

Youth Entrepreneurship Week, Austria  
https://www.entrepreneurshipwoche.at

### 1 Funding/ Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of best practice</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC accelerator</td>
<td><a href="https://abc-accelerator.com/">https://abc-accelerator.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BayFOR</td>
<td><a href="https://www.bayfor.org/en/">https://www.bayfor.org/en/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMET Centers in Austria</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ffg.at/comet/success-stories">https://www.ffg.at/comet/success-stories</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Investment Scheme (EIS)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/venture-capital-schemes-apply-for-the-enterprise-investment-scheme">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/venture-capital-schemes-apply-for-the-enterprise-investment-scheme</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Ireland</td>
<td><a href="https://www.enterprise-ireland.com/en/funding-supports/researcher/funding-to-commercialise-research/">https://www.enterprise-ireland.com/en/funding-supports/researcher/funding-to-commercialise-research/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUREKA</td>
<td><a href="https://www.eurekanetwork.org/">https://www.eurekanetwork.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Fund Denmark</td>
<td><a href="https://innovationsfonden.dk/en">https://innovationsfonden.dk/en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Hochschule</td>
<td><a href="https://www.innovative-hochschule.de/">https://www.innovative-hochschule.de/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Norway</td>
<td><a href="https://www.innovasjonnorge.no/en/start-page">https://www.innovasjonnorge.no/en/start-page</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMU-innovativ</td>
<td><a href="https://www.bmbf.de/bmbf/de/forschung/innovativer-mittelstand/kmu-innovativ/kmu-innovativ_node.html">https://www.bmbf.de/bmbf/de/forschung/innovativer-mittelstand/kmu-innovativ/kmu-innovativ_node.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINEA INTERNAZIONALIZZAZIONE PLUS</td>
<td><a href="https://www.finlombarda.it/finanziamenti-e-servizi/finanziamenti/imprese/internazionalizzazione/linea-internazionalizzazione-plus">https://www.finlombarda.it/finanziamenti-e-servizi/finanziamenti/imprese/internazionalizzazione/linea-internazionalizzazione-plus</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public funding to develop PhDs in companies, Spain</td>
<td><a href="https://ciencia.sede.gob.es/pagina/index/directorio/PLAN+2017-2020_Ayudas+para+contratos+para+la+formaci%C3%B3n+de+investigadores+en+empresas+%28Doctorados+Industriales%29/language/es_ES">https://ciencia.sede.gob.es/pagina/index/directorio/PLAN+2017-2020_Ayudas+para+contratos+para+la+formaci%C3%B3n+de+investigadores+en+empresas+%28Doctorados+Industriales%29/language/es_ES</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example of best practice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Link</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Archive</td>
<td><a href="https://Archive.org">https://Archive.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzer.de</td>
<td><a href="http://www.buzer.de">www.buzer.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 56002 standard on Innovation Management</td>
<td><a href="https://www.iso.org/standard/68221.html">https://www.iso.org/standard/68221.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibniz Institute for Neurobiology (LIN) in Magdeburg</td>
<td><a href="https://www.lin-magdeburg.de/service/technologietransfer">https://www.lin-magdeburg.de/service/technologietransfer</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyVoice organization in Latvia</td>
<td><a href="https://myvoice.group">https://myvoice.group</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Free Software Foundation (FSF)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.fsf.org/">https://www.fsf.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4 Innovation Ecosystems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of best practice</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCELERATE Innovation in therapies for children and adolescents with cancer</td>
<td><a href="http://www.accelerate-platform.org">www.accelerate-platform.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIF</td>
<td><a href="https://www.aif.de/english/home.html">https://www.aif.de/english/home.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority</td>
<td><a href="https://www.phe.gov/about/barda/Pages/default.aspx">https://www.phe.gov/about/barda/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDVA</td>
<td><a href="https://www.bdva.eu/I-Spaces">https://www.bdva.eu/I-Spaces</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClusterXChange</td>
<td><a href="https://clustercollaboration.eu/clusterxchange">https://clustercollaboration.eu/clusterxchange</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital API Ecosystem</td>
<td><a href="https://www.e015.regione.lombardia.it/">https://www.e015.regione.lombardia.it/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEN Enterprise Europe Network</td>
<td><a href="https://een.ec.europa.eu/">https://een.ec.europa.eu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETP-ALICE</td>
<td><a href="https://www.etp-logistics.eu">https://www.etp-logistics.eu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Business Accelerator</td>
<td><a href="https://executivebusinessaccelerator.com/">https://executivebusinessaccelerator.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland Photonics</td>
<td><a href="https://www.photonics.fi/">https://www.photonics.fi/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiware4Water</td>
<td><a href="https://www.fiware4water.eu/">https://www.fiware4water.eu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization / Initiative</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global StartupCities</td>
<td><a href="https://www.startupcityssummit2021.com/">https://www.startupcityssummit2021.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenovate network</td>
<td><a href="https://greenovate-europe.eu/">https://greenovate-europe.eu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing4all</td>
<td><a href="https://hearing4all.de">https://hearing4all.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inDemand</td>
<td><a href="https://www.indemandhealth.eu/indemandmodel/">https://www.indemandhealth.eu/indemandmodel/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovvalley: Open Innovation Hub d’Abruzzo</td>
<td><a href="http://www.inno-valley.it">www.inno-valley.it</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Therapies for Children with Cancer in Europe</td>
<td><a href="https://www.itcc-consortium.org/">https://www.itcc-consortium.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Seda España</td>
<td><a href="https://silkspainstitute.com/">https://silkspainstitute.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inteligencia Turistica</td>
<td><a href="http://inteligenciaturistica.com/">http://inteligenciaturistica.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellimech</td>
<td><a href="https://www.intellimech.it/en/">https://www.intellimech.it/en/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in Toulouse</td>
<td><a href="https://www.invest-in-toulouse.com/">https://www.invest-in-toulouse.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland’s centre for applied AI CeADAR</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ceadar.ie/our-work/technology-demonstrators/">https://www.ceadar.ie/our-work/technology-demonstrators/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td><a href="https://www.iter.org/construction/construction">https://www.iter.org/construction/construction</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian SPRING National Green Chemistry Technological Cluster</td>
<td><a href="https://www.clusterspring.it/home-page/">https://www.clusterspring.it/home-page/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Ruche</td>
<td><a href="https://la-ruche.net/les-audacieuses/">https://la-ruche.net/les-audacieuses/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahti - European Green Capital 2021</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenlahti.fi">www.greenlahti.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.primes-innovation.com/">http://www.primes-innovation.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re Soil Foundation</td>
<td><a href="https://resoilfoundation.org/en/">https://resoilfoundation.org/en/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilient Rotterdam</td>
<td><a href="https://www.resilientrotterdam.nl/">https://www.resilientrotterdam.nl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Project</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdams Weerwoord</td>
<td><a href="https://rotterdamsweerwoord.nl/">https://rotterdamsweerwoord.nl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURITAGE</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ruritage.eu">https://www.ruritage.eu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemens Research and Innovation Ecosystems</td>
<td><a href="https://ecosystem.siemens.com">https://ecosystem.siemens.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUSH</td>
<td><a href="https://www.slush.org/">https://www.slush.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarter Italy</td>
<td><a href="https://appaltinnovativi.gov.it/smarter-italy">https://appaltinnovativi.gov.it/smarter-italy</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Carnot network</td>
<td><a href="https://www.instituts-carnot.eu/fr/exemples-de-partenariat-carnot-entreprises">https://www.instituts-carnot.eu/fr/exemples-de-partenariat-carnot-entreprises</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Knight Campus</td>
<td><a href="https://accelerate.uoregon.edu/innovation">https://accelerate.uoregon.edu/innovation</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse Aerospace</td>
<td><a href="https://toulouseaerospace.com/fr/actus/inovation-campus?page=1">https://toulouseaerospace.com/fr/actus/inovation-campus?page=1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-European Transport Networks</td>
<td><a href="https://transport.ec.europa.eu/index_en">https://transport.ec.europa.eu/index_en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS4EUROPE</td>
<td><a href="https://uas4europe.eu/ua-what/best-practices/globalisation_engagement_strategy_2030_for_higher_education/">https://uas4europe.eu/ua-what/best-practices/globalisation_engagement_strategy_2030_for_higher_education/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS4EUROPE Project 5G4Healthcare</td>
<td><a href="https://uas4europe.eu/ua-what/best-practices/project-5g4healthcare/">https://uas4europe.eu/ua-what/best-practices/project-5g4healthcare/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI ækstfonden</td>
<td><a href="https://vf.dk/en/">https://vf.dk/en/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaway.info</td>
<td><a href="https://Workaway.info">https://Workaway.info</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5 Multiple Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of best practice</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS Finland (1,2,4)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.businessfinland.fi">https://www.businessfinland.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIT Raw Materials (1,4)</td>
<td><a href="https://eitrawmaterials.eu/">https://eitrawmaterials.eu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Europe (1,2,4)</td>
<td><a href="https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/funding/funding-opportunities/funding-programmes-and-open-calls/horizon-europe_en#documents">https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/funding/funding-opportunities/funding-programmes-and-open-calls/horizon-europe_en#documents</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Deep Tech (1,4)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.lesdeeptech.fr">https://www.lesdeeptech.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIA (2,4)</td>
<td><a href="https://faia.fi">https://faia.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venture Centre of Excellence (2,4)</td>
<td><a href="https://eithealth.eu/project/venture-centre-of-excellence/">https://eithealth.eu/project/venture-centre-of-excellence/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting in touch with the EU

IN PERSON
All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

ON THE PHONE OR BY EMAIL
Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:
– by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
– at the following standard number: +32 22999696, or
– by email via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

Finding information about the EU

ONLINE
Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en

EU PUBLICATIONS
You can download or order free and priced EU publications from: https://op.europa.eu/en/publications. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en)

EU LAW AND RELATED DOCUMENTS
For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1952 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu

OPEN DATA FROM THE EU
The EU Open Data Portal (http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.
This report collected the views of a range of innovation stakeholders such as start-ups, SMEs, business support organisations, universities and research organisations, incubators and accelerators, on how to strengthen the European innovation ecosystem and improve innovation cohesion in Europe. Overall, 239 participants active in all 27 EU Member States answered the survey during August and September 2021.

The purpose of the survey was to collect views on the challenges Europe’s innovation ecosystem actors are facing, which opportunities they see ahead, and what their visions and ideas for future actions are. The report, as derived from the survey, should inform policy makers, at European and national level, on the existing challenges that stakeholders are facing within Europe’s innovation ecosystems and contribute towards expanding the innovation frontiers by mitigating the existing, identified barriers.

Studies and reports