The origin of economic growth in the knowledge era

Economic growth of countries, regions and cities emerges as the aggregate results of a set of preconditions, resources and actors that transform knowledge into economic useful knowledge.
From linear models to complex systems

- linear model of innovation, where knowledge flows are modelled as the straightforward result of a production function made by scientific and economic inputs → unrealistic approach

- Innovation can take many forms, originate from different sources and diffuse in many ways, it is more a process than a single event

- Innovation is therefore the result of a complex interaction between productive actors and institutions that is influenced by the cultural context

- What exactly is a complex system? Martin and Sunley (2007, p. 577) define it as: “a systems is complex when it comprises non-linear interactions between its parts, such that an understanding of the system is not possible through a simple reduction to its component elements”.

Properties of a complex system

1. **Distributed nature.** Complex systems are multi-scalar diffused with the entrenchment of actors and relationships.

2. **Openness.** Complex systems have blurred boundaries that continuously interact with the external environment.

3. **Non-linear dynamics.** Complex systems do not follow the same script and show feedback and interactions among their sub-systems.

4. **Limited functional decomposability.** Complex systems can be decomposed into sub-systems, but the temporal validity is uncertain and dynamic.

5. **Emergence and Self Organisations.** New orders emerge from the interaction of agents and structures that autonomously interact in many different ways.

6. **Adaptive behavior and adaptation.** Complex systems and their components critically re-act to the changing condition of the same system and of the external environment.

7. **Non-Determinism and non-tractability.** Complex systems cannot be pre-determined ex-ante in all their future functions and morphs.
The introduction of National Innovation Systems

Box 1

National innovation systems: definitions

A national system of innovation has been defined as follows:

- “... the network of institutions in the public and private sectors whose activities and interactions initiate, import, modify and diffuse new technologies.” (Freeman, 1987)

- “... the elements and relationships which interact in the production, diffusion and use of new, and economically useful, knowledge ... and are either located within or rooted inside the borders of a nation state.” (Lundvall, 1992)

- “... a set of institutions whose interactions determine the innovative performance ... of national firms.” (Nelson, 1993)

- “... the national institutions, their incentive structures and their competencies, that determine the rate and direction of technological learning (or the volume and composition of change generating activities) in a country.” (Patel and Pavitt, 1994)

- “... that set of distinct institutions which jointly and individually contribute to the development and diffusion of new technologies and which provides the framework within which governments form and implement policies to influence the innovation process. As such it is a system of interconnected institutions to create, store and transfer the knowledge, skills and artefacts which define new technologies.” (Metcalfe, 1995)
The rational of unit of analysis (National level)

- State supports **learning mechanisms** of innovation
  
a) Preconditions → education  
b) R&D facilities  
c) Norms and laws that enable and/or hinder innovation  
d) Many working mechanisms in the public sector contribute (directly or indirectly) to the innovation development process (e.g. finance, cultural environment, Infrastructure, Vision)
A brief focus on Institutions

- Institutions are “the rules of the game in a society” (Douglass North)
- Institutions are "a set of humanly devised behavioral rules that govern and shape the interactions of human beings, in part by helping them to form expectations of what other people will do." (Lin and Nugent)
- Can be formal (laws, regulations) or informal (norms, patterns of behavior, conventions, moral codes)

Source: Rodrick, 2016
Typologies of institutions

- Market-creating institutions
  - property rights (incl. corporate governance)
  - contract enforcement

- Market-regulating institutions
  - anti-trust, prudential regulation, environmental and safety regulations, etc
  - labor market institutions
  - correction of market and coordination failures
    - “Industrial policies”

- Market-stabilizing institutions (macroeconomic management)
  - monetary, fiscal and currency arrangements

- Market-legitimizing institutions
  - redistribution
  - social insurance
  - political democracy

Source: Rodrick, 2016
An Entrepreneurial State?

• R&D is not enough → need to build a fertile absorptive capabilities system to transform R&D expenditure in a productive asset (network of alliances, internal competencies)

• A high number of startups do not contribute to long term growth in terms of productivity and employment

• Venture Capital finance too focused on short term commercialisation → tendency to not invest in more risky emergent sectors with a damage for scientific exploration
Startups impact

Intro: The long path from ideas to possible societal outcome

- **Possible societal outcome**
  - Nicha establishment
  - Path exploration (e.g., prototypes)
  - Incremental innovations

- **Successful Startups**
  - Long-term growth
  - Employment
  - Competition
  - Industrial productivity
  - Breakthrough innovations

- **Birth of New Startups**

- **Time**

- **R&D**
  - Early commercialisation

- **Value creation – market fit**

**Figure 2: Stages of venture capital investment**

- Basic and applied research
- Idea vetting and pre-commercial testing
- Establishing commercial viability
- Large-scale deployment

- Universities, government
- Venture capital

**VC impact**
The US Entrepreneurial State – the case of DARPA

• The **Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency** agency was created on February 7, 1958 one year after the Soviet Union launched the world’s first satellite, Sputnik 1.

• The goal was to avoid falling behind the Soviets, and to ensure that the United States remained a world leader in technology development.

• RPA was repurposed to do "high-risk", "high-gain", "far out" basic research, a posture that was enthusiastically embraced by the nation's scientists and research universities.

• Pivotal investment in breakthrough technologies for national security to expand technological frontier BEYOND the immediate requirement of the Military Services.

• Small units managed by leading scientists with budget autonomy, deeply intertwining between basic and applied research.
Innovations originated from the contribution of DARPA
TWO CASES FROM THE WORLD
ISRAEL

- Year of foundation: 1948
- Population: 9.3 million (2021)
- 22,070 km² (153 worldwide), more than half desert
- Most important cities: Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa

Source: World bank
ISRAEL: AN INNOVATION HOTBED

Source: SKEMA

https://finder.startupnationcentral.org/
Total Early Stage Entrepreneurial Activity Rate (TEA):
The percentage of entrepreneurs among the adult population, ages 18-64, who are at one of the first two stages of forming a business:

a. The Creation and Formation stage, during which the new enterprise has not paid out wages of any kind for over three months (Nascent).

b. The Young Business stage – salary or wages have been paid out for between 3-42 months (Baby Business).
Entrepreneurial Employee Activity (EEA):

The rate of individuals ages 18-64 in the population that are currently employed leading new developments or business ideas, or implementing new activities for the employer. This includes developing or launching new goods or services, or setting up a new subsidiary.
ENTREPRENEURIAL FACTSHEET

Level of knowledge of entrepreneurs

External Evaluation
ENTREPRENEURIAL FACTSHEET

Easiness of start a new business (perception)

Percentage of 18-64 population who see good opportunities to start a firm in the area where they live.
ENTREPRENEURIAL FACTSHEET

Self Perception

Percentage of 18-64 population who believe they have the required skills and knowledge to start a business
Chance or rational explanation?
ISRAEL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEM (peculiar traits)

A culture of doubt and argument and assertiveness (*chutzpah*)

The Israeli military serves as an incubator for high-tech start-ups and prepares its cadets for business environments

Strong sense of community

Immigration (to and from Israel)

Geopolitical dangerous and adverse natural conditions as incentive for “creativity”
Culture of doubt

- Culture of dissatisfaction → stubbornness and tendency towards a continuous improvement of existing things
- Attitude towards radicalness and challenge towards established rules (with strong argumentation)

Military service as a source of innovation

- IDF (Israel Defense Force) instilled a nonhierarchical culture that allowed soldiers to challenge superiors and organizational procedures (leadership by example versus power by status)
- Technological training during military service to design and lead innovation project
Geopolitical threats and climate adversity

• Geographical bounded by adversaries better equipped in terms of resources, population and territorial size

• Shortage of water pushed Israel to become a global leader in desert agriculture (drip irrigation and desalination)

Sense of community and value of culture

• A state officially built from scratch in 1948 with the will to build up a strong community

• Culture is considered a milestone for socio-economic development
Immigration and international links

FROM THE WORLD TO ISRAEL

• New argonauts from US in the 1970s
• Former Soviet Union in the 1990s
• Major part scientists, doctors, engineers, teachers, writers, journalists, musician and other profession with high level of HC

FROM ISRAEL TO THE WORLD

• From 2000s Israel entrepreneurs moved to California (Silicon Valley), New York, Boston and London

• Frequent travel between western countries and Israel → Not only transfer of entrepreneurial spirit but also management capabilities, who people that come back in Israel were usually to report in dedicated workshops
ESTONIA

• Year of foundation: 1918 (independence from URSS 1991)

• Population: 1.3 million (2021)

• 45,228 km², more than half forest (24th smallest country in Europe out of 27)

• Most important city: Tallinn (almost 50% of the total population)
Framework conditions

ESTONIA and global average
## Framework conditions

**ESTONIA and global average**

### Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Value Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA)</td>
<td>0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Business Ownership Rate</td>
<td>0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Employee Activity Rate</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Value Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Job Creation Expectation Rate</td>
<td>0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Rate</td>
<td>0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services Sector Rate</td>
<td>0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some well-known cases
Path dependency of Estonia

LONG TECHNOLOGICAL TRADITION
• In 1960 Tallinn was chosen by the Soviet regime to host technical universities focusing on computer technology
• Legacy with Ericsson, which in 1900 was an emerging Swedish telecommunication company, setting up manufacturing facilities

GENERAL SHOCK
• After URSS dissolution in 1990-1994 the economy contracted by an estimated 36% → export collapsed, domestic demand fall

SMALL COUNTRY WITH LIMITED NATURAL RESOURCES

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FAVORABLE ENVIRONMENT
• Business friendly environment in terms of market trade policies, privatisation of state owned firms, tax system with zero tax on reinvested profits
The birth of «E-Estonia»

Pioneer in the concept of digital society

Estonia exploited internet and the IT capabilities accumulated to connect people, business and government, in 2000 Estonia become the first country to adopt a system of e-governance

In 2002 a digital national ID was introduced and free wi-fi contributing to define digital human rights

By 2000 telecommunications accounted for the largest share of Estonia’s export revenues

Specialisation in service platform and electronic payment systems
From KaZaA to Skype

KaZaA a file sharing programme that leveraged P2P networks across the internet

Developing the technology platform to enable voice call by sharing data similar to the way KaZaA did music files

Business experts analyse the strategic technological impact of this P2P technology and they find out telephony market as the ideal test bed

In the early 2000s the other enabling technologies such as broadband level were ready to complement the potential of exchange voice instead of pictures and text

While competition in the VOIP market increased business experts decide to adopt a blue ocean strategy, revolutionising the traditional telephone revenue model (zero cost of getting new users and running traffic; cost based on business development and software development)
Moving to the regional level
Challenging «national homogeneity»: the notion of Regional Innovation Systems

- All the same conditions within big nations?
- Spatial Variety matters? (e.g. local clusters?)
- 3 key arguments (Cooke, 1997)

1) Regional budget and adequate capabilities
2) Different learning pace made by sectorial specialization and entrepreneurial culture
3) Different productivity level
Measuring regional preconditions to innovative output

Outputs
- Productive Entrepreneurship

Resource endowments
- Physical infrastructure
- Demand
- Intermediaries
- Talent
- Knowledge
- Leadership
- Finance

Institutional arrangements
- Formal institutions
- Culture
- Networks

Stam and Van de Ven, 2021
Gli ecosistemi imprenditoriali italiani: un’analisi comparativa a livello provinciale

Siamo lieti di segnalare il report che il Macronodo INT di ARTES 4.0 ha prodotto in collaborazione con l’Università di Utrecht: un’analisi molto dettagliata sui fattori collegati e distintivi di un’imprenditorialità di successo e relativi all’ecosistema d’appartenenza (ad esempio: apparato istituzionale, livello di connessioni, cultura d’impresa, capitali perianti, servizi dedicati alle imprese e talento).

Sei interessato a saperne di più sull’ecosistema imprenditoriale dove operi la tua impresa? Vuoi conoscere lo stato di salute di possibili target territoriali per lo sviluppo del tuo business? Vuoi sapere quali teritori italiani hanno le migliori condizioni di partenza per creare una nuova opportunità di business?
Entrepreneurial Ecosystems metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional arrangement</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Institutions</strong></td>
<td>The institutional quality index developed by Nifo and Vecchione (2014) based on 5 groups of elements (corruption, governance, regulation, law enforcement, and social participation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture</strong></td>
<td>New firm formation rate (excluding the sole proprietorship firms) (Stam, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networks</strong></td>
<td>The number of Network Contracts between firms (&quot;Rete Contratto&quot;), established by Italian Law 33/2009 that represent an agreement tool that gives the possibility to firms to share one or more objectives and a common program, without creating a new legal entity (Leoncini et al., 2020). This policy tool has been mainly adopted by SMEs and therefore can be used as a proxy of connectedness degree within provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Physical Infrastructure | A composite indicator of three measures:  
|                    | Accessibility (travel time to urban centres and average speed in the provincial capital), and Digital infrastructure (percentage of the population with a broadband subscription)                                      |
| Finance           | Information on the innovative source of financing (Venture capitalist, Project Finance and Crowdfunding) as a proxy for the local financial development (cf. Michelacci and Silva, 2007).                                      |
| Leadership        | The number of Horizon2020 project coordinators. In this way we measure the capacity of the territories to coordinate and attract sources of innovation, measuring territorial leadership (Grillitsch and Sotarauta, 2019). |
| Talent            | human capital measure. Composite indicator:  
|                    | level of education of people (percentage of graduated and Ph.D.) and the engagement of firms in training activities to acquire new skills and competencies.                                      |
| New Knowledge     | Intramural R&D activities                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Demand            | The potential internal market of the ecosystems, measured with GDP per capita                                                                                                                             |
| Intermediate Service | the availability of business services that can nurture the activity of startups, sustaining them in consulting activities across different levels (e.g., legal, financial, strategical). As a proxy, we use the percentage of firms in knowledge-intensive market services in line with Leendertse et al. (2022). |
## Diagnosis of the EE elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Institutions Formali</th>
<th>Culture Imprenditoriale</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Infrastrutture Fisiche e Digitali</th>
<th>Finanza Innovativa</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Talento e formazione</th>
<th>Nuova Conoscenza</th>
<th>Potenziale di Mercato</th>
<th>Servizi alle Imprese</th>
<th>Indice Ecosistema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>LOMBARDIA</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>37.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>LAZIO</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>33.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>EMILIA-ROMAGNA</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>24.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>PIEMONTE</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>20.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trento</td>
<td>TRENTINO-ALTO ADIGE/SOTTO-ADIGE</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>FRIULI-VENEZIA GIULIA</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firenze</td>
<td>TOSCANA</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>19.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolzano/Bozen</td>
<td>TRENTINO-ALTO ADIGE/SOTTO-ADIGE</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brescia</td>
<td>LOMBARDIA</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genova</td>
<td>LIGURIA</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>16.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>LOMBARDIA</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>16.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>VENETO</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>TOSCANA</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>15.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padova</td>
<td>VENETO</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perma</td>
<td>EMILIA-ROMAGNA</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>PUGLIA</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>15.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modena</td>
<td>EMILIA-ROMAGNA</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>VENETO</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>13.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggio nell’Emilia</td>
<td>EMILIA-ROMAGNA</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantova e della Bresciana</td>
<td>LOMBARDIA</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena</td>
<td>TOSCANA</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicenza</td>
<td>VENETO</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional average
Spatial Distribution
Spatial Distribution
Interregional connection between entrepreneurial systems
Entrepreneurial Ecosystem at the local level – 105 Italian NUTS-3 regions
From self-containing to open systems

CLOSED SYSTEM

ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEM - LOCAL

LOCAL-BASED ENTREPRENEURS

OPEN SYSTEM

ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEM - REGION "A"

ENTREPRENEURS FROM REGION "A"

ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEM - REGION "B"

ENTREPRENEURS FROM REGION "B"

Toy problem
With 2 regions
Working mechanisms
Data collection

- 7259 innovative startups founded in the period 2016-2019
- 4838 found in JREIS with available information on founders (age, sex, birth of place, role)
- 2779 with at least a "non local" founder
- 1660 composed only by non local founders
- 5004 founders
- 2743 founders (16% Women and 45% under 45 years old)
Network of non-local founders mobility
Innovative startups and non-local founders by Italian NUTS-3 regions of 105 Italian NUTS-3 regions
DISCUSSION TIME

What are the main challenges for the future development of the two systems of innovation? Specify different mechanisms for the two countries.
Could you provide and (briefly) describe other examples of innovation systems with peculiar characteristics? (national or regional level)?
For Further insights...


https://www.uu.nl/sites/default/files/LEG_USE_WP-22-03.pdf

https://blog.artes4.it/gli-ecosistemi-imprenditoriali-italiani-unanalisi-comparativa-a-livello-provinciale