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Contextualisation:
Revision of **Structural Funds** after 2006 to have full coherence with dictates of Lisbon (2000).

European Union points to catch up, within 2010, “an economy based on the more **competitive** and dynamics economy”, full employment, equipping itself of a method “of open coordination”.

The economic and social increase becomes a support for a **sustainable** policy of **cohesion** towards **integration** of the environmental dimension (Council of Göteborg, 2001)

The Kok Final Report: “**Facing the Challenge. The Lisbon Strategy for growth and employment**” (November 2004);

The study **Adaptation of Cohesion Policy to the Enlarged Europe and the Lisbon and Gothenburg Objectives** by the European Parliament's Committee on regional development (provisional version, January, 2005);

The **Communication from Mr. Almunia** (2005) to the Commission “**Sustainable Development Indicators to monitor the implementation of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy**”. 
Scoping of research

Conceptual Approach:

The research integrates the traditional ideas/indicators of competitiveness and sustainability, defining a territorial competitiveness in sustainability (This concept is to be distinguished from that of “sustainable competitiveness” which is commonly intended only in economic terms):

i) sharing at UE level a new and common proposal
ii) looking for new measuring and interpretative models
iii) being better linked to the territorial reality and its organisation and management
iv) developing common programs and territorial plans
v) supporting transnational co-operation
Working hypotheses and main aims of the research project

Having integrated the literature review presented in the FIR, some innovative scientific hypotheses are applied to the ESPON 3.3 project as follows:

1. **systemic vision** where economy, territory and environment are considered as a whole system
2. carrying capacity of the economic/territorial/environmental systems as common base for regions and states to be “competitive in sustainability”
3. **Strategic Environmental Assessment** as logical common standard procedure to evaluate the territorial carrying capacity
4. **GIS** as the best instrument to manage the complexity of the knowledge in a system
The **methodological approach** is based on a qualitative-quantitative conceptual theory and used the results of other ESPON projects to calculate the **territorial capability**.


- **Innovation & Research** (ICT, R&D, Innovation, Human capital, Age)
- **Global/local interaction** (ICT, R&D, Innovation, SMEs, Human capital, Employment, Transport)
- **Quality** (SMEs, Human capital, Employment, Climate, Public health, Natural resources, Poverty, Transport, Age)
- **Use of resources and funds** (ICT, Innovation, Employment, Human capital, Age, Climate, Public health, Natural resources, Poverty)

The 3.3 project reconsiders the indicators’ relationship in the vision of the **Sustainable Territorial Management Approach** – STeMA.

It defines the “playground” for every determinant and contribute to determine the **status quo** and **vulnerability judgments**, to calculate the state and the risk of compromising the system/determinant with respect to the Structural Funds plan.
The Modified Porter’s Diamond and the new determinants (synthetic indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local demand</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global/local interaction</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of resources and funds</td>
<td>Regional cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic localization</td>
<td>Innovation &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators and the connection of the determinants to the territorial typologies
The Indicator’s Sinergy Tree (GIS framework)
3.3 TPG decided to make two complementary mapping activities to perform a comparison:

- **The first** based on the short-list of indicators (12 of the 14 “Spring Report” indicators)
- **The second** related to the new methodology only for the determinant “Innovation & Research”

The maps included in the SIR concern the determinant “Innovation and Research”.

Data refer to the year 2001, with few exceptions, scattered across nations/indicators, ranging at most +/- 2 years.

As a general rule, the classification of the data values in 4 ranks for the successive combinations and processing, has been performed taking into account the average and the standard deviation of the distribution of indicators’ values across the nations.

At the moment, the number and the “recipe” of indicators’ combination is being changed towards the possibility of NUTS2 mapping; the above approach to territorial ranking will therefore become more statistically significant.
Example of “Spring Report” indicators

**List of maps:**
- 1. GDP<sub>PPS</sub> per capita in 2002
- 2. Labour productivity in 2002
- 3. Employment rate in 2002
- 4. Employment rate of older workers in 2002
- 5. Expenditure on education in 2001
- 6. Expenditure on research & development in 2001
- 7. Expenditure on information technology in 2002
- 9. Long-term unemployment rate in 2002
- 10. Greenhouse gas emissions in 2002
- 11. Energy intensity of economy in 2002
- 12. Volume of freight transport in 2002
## Innovation & Research Determinants: GIS operational procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinants</th>
<th>Typologies</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation &amp; Research</td>
<td>Virtual Society</td>
<td>Virtual shareholders</td>
<td>Virtual Population</td>
<td>(n^*) internet users/(pop) tot Espon 1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virtual stakeholders</td>
<td>Virtual Firms</td>
<td>(n^<em>) firms with internet access/ (n^</em>) tot firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge creation education</td>
<td>Virtual Institutions</td>
<td>(n^<em>) municipalities with internet access/ (n^</em>) tot municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Innovative Structures</td>
<td>Knowledge creation education</td>
<td>Education structures</td>
<td>(n^*) universities students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human capital (structure)</td>
<td>youth index (pop. 0-15; (pop) Tot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative dependency index (pop. 0-15; pop. 15-40; pop. over 40; (pop) Tot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human capital (education)</td>
<td>population with tertiary education/(pop) tot, population in life-long learning/(pop) tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation Status quo</td>
<td>Knowledge creation facilities</td>
<td>R&amp;D infrastructures</td>
<td>(n^<em>) Science Parks that are members of the International Association of Science Parks (ISAP)/ (pop) tot, (n^</em>) Business Innovation Centres/(pop) tot, (n^*) most actively publishing Universities and Public Research Institutes/(pop) tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Telecommunication development (map 1.2.2)</td>
<td>Old technologies ((n^<em>) fixed lines/(households), (n^</em>) mobile/(pop), (n^<em>) households with TV/ (n^</em>) households tot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New technologies ((n^<em>) PCs/(pop), (n^</em>) broadband subscribers/(pop), (n^*) internet servers/(sup))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of Map at Typology level
Map 5 – Virtual society
Example of Map at Typology level
Map 12 – Knowledge Innovative Structure

Legend

KNOWLEDGE INNOVATIVE STRUCTURES

- incomplete data
- high
- medium high
- medium low
- low
Example of Map at Typology level

Map 13 – R&D Infrastructure
Example of judgements
Innovation “status quo” and “vulnerability”
First results - Map 17 Territorial capability
I&R Determinant synthesis at Regional Level

- This draft map shows the result of the Determinant “Innovation & Research” according to the revision of method described in the SIR.
- The approach to combining heterogeneous indicators has been a mix of matrix ranking and based on a “systemic quali-quantitative” matrix class reduction.
Draft results – Territorialization of I&R Determinant: synthesis at National level + Urban rural typologies

Legend

In this map, Urban-Rural typologies are superimposed to the map describing the performance in the field of the determinant “Innovation & Research”, as a first attempt to territorially contextualize the determinant itself.
First results -2- case studies

Case Study Sample, by NUT3

choice relevant criteria

i) Geographic representativeness of the EU
ii) Variability of spaces considering different economic, social and settlement structures
iii) Different potentials and handicaps
iv) Multi-level analysis (NUT III and NUT II) and Multi-regional scope (transnational and transborder regions)
policy recommendations

At the moment a comparison among the issues concerning the various ESPON projects has been made, in order to provide a review of ESPON policy recommendations relevant to the Lisbon/Gothenburg strategy in the territorial impact projects to strengthen competitiveness within the framework of sustainable development

The first results suggest:

• To discuss the revision of the open method of coordination (OMC) introduced by the Lisbon Strategy and integrate it with the Community Method
• To integrate the SEA into economic and financial assessment
• To strengthen the inter-institutional integration by planning and project cooperation to stop the more accentuated competitive tensions at regional level
• To strengthen real policies of internal cohesion within the Member States
• To strengthen the synergies with national policy, to obtain a major impact on regional development
• To make combined use of the Structural Funds in order to finance the regional development programmes and to broke the sectoral point of view
• To strengthen the network cooperation into the Community Initiative Programmes (CIPs).
• To make increased use of private funding
next steps: towards TIR (sept. 2005)

- Final Indicators Selection and List
- Algorithm and Qualitative-Quantitative Weights Definition
- Regional Checks
- GIS and SINERGY Network
- Maps of all Indicators and Determinants to Calculate the Territorial Capacity to be Competitiveness in Sustainability
- Detailed Policy Recommendations at National and Regional Level