# CHARTER OF SCIENCE PARKS OF WALLONIA
# QUALITY APPROACH

Taking into account IASP's official definition of science parks and at the same time their own regional contexts, the managers of science parks in Wallonia, admitted as members of the SpoW (Science Parks of Wallonia) network, consider a science park is necessarily distinct from classic parks of economic activity because of:

- the presence of technology actors from the business world (companies) and actors from the scientific community;
- the great value of the infrastructures and especially of the services specifically adapted for responding to the constant need of these technological companies to innovate and for contributing in this way to keeping them at the forefront of their sector;
- a structural and operational link set up between the management of the park and a partner research institute that is actually involved.

By signing the present charter, the managers of the science parks of Wallonia and the associated research institutes would like to reinforce this specificity.

Their aim is to reinforce the internal coherence of the network by harmonising their development policy and by establishing firm and objective criteria for new members.

They would like to develop their distinctive characteristics at the regional, national and international levels.

They therefore commit to taking a step towards progress to increase the concentration of technology actors in their park and to improve the quality of what they offer, of infrastructures and of services, specifically adapted to the companies established in their park. This agreement comprises the three points listed below:

1. Proportion of technologically innovative activities:

The managers of the science parks of Wallonia agree to progressively achieving or maintaining, of the total number of occupants or the total number of jobs in the park:
80% of the technological actors falling within an innovative process, compared with a maximum of 20% of the actors carrying out activities of 'general use',[1] according to the categories defined in the official 'paper' presented by joint agreement to the IASP annual conference – Helsinki 2006 (*cf. extract in the annex : point 2.2.1.2 ( p.3) + table "categories of players"* (p.6)).

[1] The details of the classification of the companies and services affected by these different categories are provided in the annex to the attached document. In summary, the actors for whom the proportion is minimised (20% max.) are companies of goods or services unconnected to R&D but useful to the smooth operation of the companies (maintenance, supplies, etc.) or useful for the 'community' of the park (cafeteria, sports, etc.), as well as non-innovative technological companies (who use existing traditional technologies) and the companies in categories other than those cited in the document.

To this end:

They commit to implementing a selection process for applicant companies to establish in their park, including imperatively a scientific expert in the area related to the company's activity where it is a matter of assessing the intensity of the R&D activities within the applicant company and the technologically innovative nature of its activities in relation to technological advances in the sector. This scientific expert, from the partner research institute in the science park, will assist in this way in determining to which category of technology actor the applicant corresponds (*cf. annex 1: table*). The work of this expert is of course not required for applications that fall within the 'general use' category.

They further commit to progressive implementation of internal procedures to update data related to the activities of their occupants and to the relationship that they maintain with the research.

2. Specific infrastructures:

The parties to the present charter agree to look for the means and to do everything possible so that the high technology companies have, in the park, the infrastructures adapted to their specific needs. These might include, for example, specialised incubators, company centres fitted with high-tech equipment or platforms of scientific equipment available to the companies.

3. Permanent provision of services for technological activities:

The managers of the science park support a trend of technological activities in the park. They therefore commit to establishing a plan of action that will allow ongoing provision of services aimed at:

- encouraging exchanges between the park's industrial actors and the research actors and networking their competencies;
- facilitating technology transfer and industrial research contracts for the companies in the park;
- advising and supporting the companies in their approaches to technological innovation (intellectual property, etc.)
- stimulating and supporting creation of high-tech companies;
- disseminating technological information.

The managers of the science parks of Wallonia are committed to the competent actors in these matters, including technology transfer services, scientific intermediation of the universities or the partner research centres, the B.I.C.s, being actually involved in the park's technological activities.

The park adopting the distinctive criteria of the present charter and engaged in this quality approach is acknowledged 'science park of Wallonia'.

Date: ..... For the designated science park.....

Intercommunal representative:

Research institute representative:

*Annex: Extract Paper SPoW – IASP – Helsinki 2006 + detailed table "categories of players"*

ANNEX: PAPER FOR THE 2006 IASP WORLD CONFERENCE – HELSINKI
*cf. extract: point 2.2.1.2 and the table "categories of players"* (p.6)

(…)

## 2.2.1. CRITERION 1: CONCENTRATION OF HIGH-TECH ACTIVITIES

SPoW has selected two elements to take into consideration in order to encourage Wallonia's science parks to increase the proportion of high-tech activities on their sites, and which in turn creates the need to set up the tools and services that are dictated by these players' specific profiles (technological culture), to wit:

- upstream: selection of the park's tenants;
- downstream: the proportion of high-tech activities requiring innovation (as opposed to general activities) present in the park and measured quantitatively.

### 2.2.1.1. Selection of the park's tenants

Each science park that opts for the Walloon science park label scheme must have set up a clear selection process for the park's tenants that includes the use of a scientific expert.

Selection process:
The tenants will be selected from the applications submitted to the park's manager.
The science park's manager must have set up a mixed selection committee involving the research institution that is linked to the park and, in so doing, enabling a scientific expert in the area under consideration to be involved in the decision, in order to evaluate the applicant business's activities according to two essential elements, namely,

- the internal high-tech activity (need for innovation) and
- the potential for collaboration with a research institution.

### 2.2.1.2. The quantitative inventory: pilot census

*a. Inventorying a science park's tenants*

SPoW conducted a pilot census of the tenants of three Walloon science parks, *i.e.*, Louvain-La-Neuve Science Park, Crealys (Gembloux), and Liège Science Park.

The aim of this exercise was to take stock of the players present in the parks, by entity, and to classify them in categories of players according to their degree of technological innovativeness.

The definitions of these categories varied considerably as the pilot census advanced. SPoW began with a limited number of relatively general categories but as it encountered the actual cases in the field, SPoW was forced to flesh out these definitions based on a definition of innovation taken from the Oslo Manual:

(2nd Edition, 93 pp., OECD Publishing) and to envision subcategories in order to avoid subjectivity as much as possible in classifying a science park's tenants. The detailed table that was finally adopted is given in the attached pages (six main categories and their subdivisions).

In line with this classification, SPoW split the players into a proportion to maximise and a proportion to minimise, as follows.

Proportion to maximise: players with a technological profile engaged in a process of innovation:
- research centres (both public and private ones);
- innovative technological businesses (that is to say, that are involved in developing or improving significantly products and/or services through technological innovation), and their private research centres even more so, while accepting the non-R&D divisions of innovative technological businesses (the R&D of which is conducted on another site);
- services that are specifically useful to the development and good working of research or innovation (training, advice, intellectual property expertise, and so on);
- technological businesses that are not innovative, provided that they use advanced technologies and adapt them for their activities, have also been allowed in this proportion to maximise.

Proportion to minimise: non-technological or non-innovative technological players:
- businesses that produce or sell goods and/or services that are not linked to R&D but are useful for the smooth operation of the businesses in the park (maintenance services, various supplies, etc.) or useful to the park's "community", to the individuals on the premises (cafeteria, sports club, etc.);
- non-innovative technological businesses (goods and/or service that are not technologically novel) and rely on the use of existing traditional technologies; and
- other businesses.

SPoW stresses that the classification of a science park's tenants that it advocates requires relatively in-depth knowledge of the said players' activities. This knowledge is possible only if a real relationship of physical proximity exists between the park's manager and tenants. This is the case of Wallonia's science parks, given their relatively small sizes (from 40 to 135 businesses) and the frequency of the events that they organise, which are so many opportunities to meet the tenants.

Based on its experience, SPoW estimates that the Walloon science parks involved in the labelling process must aim to consist of 80% players with technological profiles and involved in an innovation process. The proportions for the three Walloon science parks that we evaluated ranged from 75 to 85%.

These percentages are currently calculated from the distribution of the relative number of corporate entities housed in the science park in question. However, it is clear that the relative proportions of jobs in the same categories must also be

taken into account, for such figures can make a significant contribution to a science park's characterisation. Consequently, SPoW believes that technological players involved in an innovation process should also make up at least 80% of a park's total labour force in terms of relative jobs. The results for the three Walloon science parks included in the pilot census ranged from 82 to 91%.

*b. Inventorying a park's collaborative research*

SPoW feels that examining the collaboration that exists between a park's businesses and research institutions is also something to take into account to assess the park's "scientificness".

In this case, the following types of collaboration should be maximised:

- industrial research contracts (PhD theses, problem solving by scientific experts, improvement or development of new process or product, etc.);
- use of a patent or other technology transfer;
- analyses/tests;
- rental or lending of scientific equipment;
- structural partnership charter;
- chair/sponsorship/fellowships (research/education);
- further training or *à la carte* training schemes;
- undergraduate final projects and consultation of library holdings (to a lesser extent).

Under the category of "insignificant collaboration" we have:

- access to infrastructure (sport, etc.);
- student training; and
- hiring of young graduates.

Similarly, collaboration between technology businesses in order to develop innovative projects, the granting to a company of financing accepted by the Walloon Ministry of Research for R&D projects, and the level of scientific qualifications of the company's staff reflect an activity that fits in perfectly in a science park and can help classify the businesses in the various categories.

It is extremely difficult to take stock of all the research contracts in which a science park's businesses are involved. Consequently, such an inventory could not be exhaustive. Simply, when the information is known, the attention that is paid to it enables a park's manager to justify a given player's establishment in the park, given that the manager's role is also to create the conditions to encourage, even assist, such collaboration.

SPoW has concluded from its pilot quantitative inventory to evaluate the concentration of high-tech activity in a science park that the park's manager must set up internal procedures for updating the data about its tenants' activities and their research connections in order to be able to monitor the park's development at intervals to be determined. The classification *per se* must be evaluated by a mixed committee that includes an outside expert as well as the park's own expert, who has good knowledge of the activities being conducted in his park.

(…)

## TABLE : CRITERION 1 – INVENTORYING A SCIENCE PARK'S TENANTS:

## CATEGORIES OF PLAYERS

Based on definition of innovation taken from the Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Technological Innovation Data (2nd Edition, 93 pp., OECD Publishing)

| CATEGORY OF ACTIVITIES | SUBCATEGORY | |
|---|---|---|
| **Category I: RESEARCH CENTRES** (public or private) | | TO MAXIMISE |
| **Category II: INNOVATVE TECHNOLOGICAL BUSINESSES:** Businesses that have developed technologically new or significantly improved products (goods or services), processes, or combinations of products and processes over the period under consideration. | Category IIa: A private company's research centre | |
| | Category IIb: Using the outcomes of university research (spin-offs) | |
| | Category IIc: Devoting, on the science park's site, a large share of their activity to in-house R&D (researcher(s) + potential link with research centres or labs) | |
| | Category IId: Contracting R&D partnerships with a research centre or university, but without having in-house researchers (for projects managed on the science park site) | |
| | Category IIe: By acquiring new licences, know-how, products and/or technologies and making use of them on the site | |
| **Category III: NON R&D DIVISIONS/UNITS OF TECHNOLOGICALLY INNOVATIVE BUSINESSES** | Category IIIa: Technological division/unit of a company whose R&D is done on another site | |
| | Category IIIb: Non-technological division/unit of a company whose R&D and/or production is done on another site | |
| **Category IV: NON-INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGICAL BUSINESSES:** Businesses using existing technologies to offer products/services that are not technologically novel | Category IVa: Use of existing advanced technology (electronics, engineering, etc.) | Tolerated |
| | Category IVb: Use of traditional existing technology (machine-tools, etc.) | TO MINIMISE |
| **Category V: USEFULNESS TO R&D or TO TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION** | Businesses producing and/or selling useful goods and/or services (training, consulting, etc.) for the smooth operation of research or innovation activities | TO MAXIMISE |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Category VI:**<br><br>**GENERAL UTILITY** | Category VIa: TECHNICAL, USEFUL FOR BUSINESSES<br>Businesses producing and/or selling technical (but not R&D-related) goods and/or services that are useful for the smooth operation of the site's businesses | TO MINIMISE |
| | Category VIb: NOT TECHNICAL, USEFUL FOR BUSINESSES<br>Businesses producing and/or selling non-technical goods and/or services that are useful for the smooth operation of the site's businesses | |
| | Category VIc: USEFUL FOR INDIVIDUALS<br>Businesses selling services of use to the park's community | |
| **OTHERS** | | |