

Geography of Innovation and Sustainability Transitions

GEIST Working Paper series

GEIST Working Paper No. 2021(1)

New directions for RIS studies and policies in the face of grand societal challenges

Franz Tödting

Vienna University of Economics and Business

E-mail: franz.toedting@wu.ac.at

Michaela Trippl

University of Vienna

E-mail: michaela.trippl@univie.ac.at

Veronika Desch

University of Vienna

E-mail: veronika.desch@univie.ac.at

Cite as: Tödting F., Trippl M. and Desch V. (2021) New directions for RIS studies and policies in the face of grand societal challenges. *GEIST - Geography of Innovation and Sustainability Transitions*, 2021(01), GEIST Working Paper series.

New directions for RIS studies and policies in the face of grand societal challenges

March 2021

Franz Tödting¹, Michaela Trippl² and Veronika Desch³

¹ Vienna University of Economics and Business; email: franz.toedting@wu.ac.at

² University of Vienna; email: michaela.trippl@univie.ac.at

³ University of Vienna; email: veronika.desch@univie.ac.at

This is a pre-print version of a paper that has been submitted for publication to a journal.

Abstract

The regional innovation system (RIS) approach has become a widely used framework for examining the dynamics of innovation across space as well as for crafting policies aimed at promoting the innovation capacity of regions. The dominant focus of RIS studies and regional innovation policies has been on technological innovation that drives competitiveness and economic growth. In light of persistent environmental and social challenges such as climate change, health problems, and growing inequalities, this narrow understanding of innovation appears to be obsolete. This article claims that the RIS approach requires critical rethinking and reassessment to provide a solid basis for informing the next generation of regional innovation policies. We explore how RIS scholarship and policies could benefit from engaging more deeply with an alternative understanding of innovation. Inspired by recent work on responsible innovation, mission-oriented and transformative innovation policies, we develop the notion of ‘challenge-oriented RIS’ (CORIS). In contrast to conventional understandings of RIS, this approach embraces a broader and more critical understanding of innovation, captures the directionality of change, opens up to new innovation actors and novel coordination mechanisms between various stakeholders and territorial scales, and pays more attention to the application side and upscaling of innovation within the region and beyond. Acknowledging that regions vary in their capacity to fashion transformative change and challenge-oriented innovation, the paper outlines new directions for place-based innovation policies.

1 Introduction

Over the past decades, the regional innovation system (RIS) concept has become a powerful framework for explicating why regions vary markedly in their innovation performance and why such spatially variegated patterns tend to persist over time (Asheim et al., 2019). It has also proven to be a major source of inspiration for regional policy makers. Questioning ‘one size fits all’ policy approaches (Tödttling & Trippel, 2005), RIS scholarship has provided a sound foundation for the design and implementation of more place-based innovation policies. The recent uptake of smart specialisation (Foray, 2015) in Europe and elsewhere is a prime example of this.

Following Schumpeter (1911), the prevalent interest of conceptual and empirical RIS studies as well as of regional innovation policies has thus far been on technological, organisational and marketing innovations and their economic effects in terms of enhanced competitiveness and stimulation of economic growth. In the face of persistent environmental and social challenges such as climate change, pollution, growing inequalities and poverty, this focus of RIS scholarship and policies appears to be too narrow and becomes more and more obsolete (see, for instance, Tödttling & Trippel, 2018; Coenen & Morgan, 2020). We contend that the RIS notion requires critical rethinking to provide a useful basis for informing modern regional innovation policies. This article draws inspiration from the growing body of work on mission-oriented (Mazzucato, 2018), challenge-oriented (Raven & Walrave, 2018) and transformative innovation policy (Schot & Steinmueller, 2018; Diercks et al., 2019) to address the question how the RIS approach and regional innovation policies could be further developed and reoriented to today’s grand societal challenges.

This remainder of this article is organised as follows. The next section provides a review of recent concepts of innovation policy and transformative change. Section 3 presents a critique of conventional RIS approaches and policies and outlines how RIS scholarship could benefit from emerging debates on alternative understandings of innovation and modern innovation policy. Section 4 introduces the notion of challenge-oriented RIS (CORIS). In section 5 we take the Austrian region of Vorarlberg as an example, illustrating some core features and processes of the region’s evolving CORIS in relation to a specific challenge, i.e. climate change and mobility. Section 6 concludes and identifies some key questions for future research.

2 Recent concepts of innovation policy and transformative change

In view of current societal challenges, the RIS approach requires fundamental rethinking and modification. Fruitful ideas and key elements in this regard can be found in the mission-oriented approach to innovation policy, the responsible research and innovation concept, and transformative innovation policies, among others. These literatures suggest that rather than solely facilitating technological and business innovation for economic growth and strengthening established innovation systems, the focus of innovation policy needs to shift towards tackling grand societal challenges and should aim at a more fundamental transformation of innovation systems.

These new innovation policy perspectives are based on and complemented by approaches that argue for a broader understanding of innovation that includes social and institutional innovations besides those in technological and business fields (Avelino et al., 2019; Moolaert & MacCallum 2019). It relates also to a more dynamic and comprehensive view on

innovation systems such as expressed in the Technological Innovation System (TIS) concept. TIS scholars do not only emphasise knowledge generation and exchange but pay attention to a wider set of system functions or processes (such as entrepreneurial experimentation, market formation, resource mobilisation, legitimacy) that shape the generation of innovation *and* their implementation and exploitation (Bergek et al., 2008). Furthermore, the multi-level perspective (MLP) with its focus on socio-technical system transformation has informed new policy concepts (Geels, 2002, 2004). A key argument is that confronting grand societal challenges requires more than technological and business innovation, namely a fundamental system change (see, for example, Markard et al., 2012; Coenen et al., 2015). MLP studies analyse transformative shifts in systems of production and consumption that go along with disruptive technological innovation and changes in markets, infrastructure, user practices, policies and governance.

The mission-oriented approach to research and innovation policy (Mazzucato, 2013, 2018; Mazzucato et al., 2020) reflects efforts to achieve major scientific, technological or societal breakthroughs, like finding new sources of energy (e.g. renewable energy, atomic fusion reactors), exploring new ways of mobility (e.g. self-driving vehicles) or fighting certain diseases (e.g. cancer or COVID-19).

The main idea is to regard innovation as a means to achieve particular societal goals rather than to see it as an end in itself. This approach emphasises the directionality of the innovation process by identifying *ex-ante* problems that should be targeted and solved by innovating agents. Nowadays this includes grand societal challenges such as climate change, social inequalities, or ageing societies. The implementation of the mission-oriented approach is often linked to the notion of the entrepreneurial state, implying a perception of governments as a lead risk taker for investing in innovations (Mazzucato, 2013). Potential policies include, for instance, government sponsorship and research on societal challenges such as ‘green energy’ and other fields. Arguably, this approach assumes a largely benevolent government that is commanding sufficient resources for funding such missions (Coenen & Morgan, 2020). Hekkert et al. (2020) regard a societal challenge-based mission as ‘an urgent strategic goal that requires transformative systems change directed towards overcoming a wicked societal problem’ (p. 76). The authors introduce the notion of mission-oriented innovation systems (MIS) that are defined as networks of agents and sets of institutions contributing to the development and diffusion of innovative solutions to define, pursue and complete a societal mission (Hekkert et al., 2020).

There is a growing awareness that ‘innovations can also have negative outcomes and may even exacerbate societal challenges, rather than contribute to tackling them’ (Diercks et al. 2019, p. 882). A broader societal perspective (beyond a narrow economic one) should take such outcomes into account. The literature on responsible research and innovation (RRI) incorporates norms and values in the innovation process and moves societally desirable innovation outcomes centre stage (Owen et al., 2012; Stilgoe et al., 2013; Von Schomberg, 2013). While traditional innovation policy models highlight the need of coping with negative externalities of new technologies, RRI intends to orient the innovation process better towards societal goals¹. Like the mission-oriented approach, the literature on responsible research and

¹ The literature on RRI has so far not been strongly related to the innovation system literature and vice versa (Schlaile et al, 2017). Coenen and Morgan (2020) point to a severe limitation of the RRI approach, arguing that its main focus is on the design and framing of research and innovation processes and respective programmes, while little is said about its implementation. It is not very explicit about the capabilities and institutions needed to make it happen.

innovation call for greater attention to directionality in the innovation process and the purpose of innovation.

Traditional innovation policies have been aiming at economic competitiveness and growth and the main focus has been on correcting structural innovation system failures such as infrastructural failures, capabilities failures, network failures, and institutional failures (Lundvall & Borrás, 2005; Weber & Rohracher, 2012; Fagerberg et al., 2013). The burgeoning literature on transformative innovation policy puts socio-technical system change into focus (Schot & Steinmüller, 2018). Systems fulfilling basic needs (such as energy, mobility, food, water) are seen to require fundamental shifts in order to become truly sustainable. This implicates social, behavioural and technological changes in an interrelated and often radical way. It includes changing skills, infrastructures, industry structures, products, regulations, user preferences and cultural patterns. Since elements tend to be aligned and may reinforce each other, system innovations and transitions are cumbersome and long-term processes that involve multiple actors, including civil society and users (Schot & Steinmüller, 2018; p. 1562). Weber & Rohracher (2012) propose that policies for transformative change should address four types of failure, that is, directionality failures, demand articulation failures, policy coordination failures, and reflexivity failures (see also Raven & Walrave, 2018). Actions have to be taken by a broad and diverse set of actors both to formulate and to address those challenges. Since resistance from incumbent networks benefitting from the current situation can be very strong, the policy mix needs to address also the de-stabilization of existing locked-in sociotechnical systems and networks that may include industries, users, civil society and (parts of) governments (Kivimaa & Kern, 2016).

Arguably, the approaches discussed above are insensitive to geographical context. Yet, they provide fruitful starting points for revisiting RIS scholarship and regional innovation policies. Our literature review points to some major common issues in this regard, including a broader understanding of innovation, consideration of societal challenges and goals (directionality), the inclusion of new innovation agents, and a new and enriched role of policy.

3 RIS scholarship and policies: beyond the state of the art

How can the RIS approach benefit from engaging with current debates on modern innovation policies as outlined above? Before distilling some key insights in this regard, we take stock of the main arguments of the RIS concept. Over the past three decades, various territorial innovation models (for an overview, see Moulaert & Sekia, 2003) have sought to explicate the uneven distribution of innovation in space. The RIS concept can be seen as a synthesis of research on the topic (Cooke, 1992; Asheim et al., 2019). It casts light on how interactive learning between multiple actors (primarily firms, research and educational bodies, intermediaries, policy makers) underpins regional innovation activities in the firm sector. Key actors and the networks that knit them together are viewed as being embedded in and influenced by the institutional set-up in regions. The innovation capacity of regions is thus understood as the outcome of the interplay of and systemic interdependencies between three RIS elements, that is, actors, networks and institutions. Scholars also accentuate that RISs are open systems in which actors access knowledge and other resources needed for innovation through extra-regional production and innovation networks. Further, RIS dynamics are influenced by national and international policies and institutional framework conditions. In other words, the performance of a RIS does not only depend on what happens inside the system but also on processes that take place outside the system's territorial boundaries. A large body of work has demonstrated that regions show varying endowments of key elements

of RISs (see, for instance, Isaksen & Trippel, 2017) and that regions and their innovation systems differ markedly in the ways in which they are inserted into global production and innovation linkages (MacKinnon, 2012; Trippel et al., 2018). This has helped to overcome one-size-fits-all policies (Tödtling & Trippel, 2005) and stimulated academic debates about the nature of ‘region-specific’, place-based policy approaches and practices (Barca et al., 2012).

The conventional RIS approach has many merits but it is also fair to argue that RIS scholarship has thus far not engaged sufficiently with recent debates on modern innovation policies outlined in section 2. In particular, the following aspects need consideration in revising and extending the RIS concept.

First, RIS scholarship has thus far not sufficiently taken account of the *broader understanding of innovation* that has emerged over the past few years (Tödtling & Trippel, 2018; Coenen & Morgan, 2020). The traditional RIS approach centres too much attention on technological and business innovation, leaving other innovation types (such as social innovation, user innovation, institutional innovation) emerging in the economy but also in other realms (public sector, civil society, regional and urban communities) aside (Warnke et al., 2016; Moulaert & MacCallum, 2019).

Second, there are calls to *address societal challenges* such as climate change, social inequalities, and the aging society, also at a regional scale. This implies to lead the innovation process *in certain directions* in order to solve such societal problems (Foray, 2018; Tödtling & Trippel, 2018). The purpose of innovation is not limited to fostering economic competitive advantage as the traditional RIS approach suggests. Instead, innovation is rather seen a response to social needs, informed by ideological norms and values (Bryden & Gezelius, 2017, Coenen & Morgan, 2020).

Third, it is argued that the innovation and policy process should be *more inclusive, participatory and open* towards various kinds of users and stakeholders such as affected interest groups and civil society organisations, also at the regional scale. In other words, opening-up the innovation process to a broad variety of innovative agents besides firms and their support organisations gains in importance.

Forth, RIS studies have long focused on the supply side of innovation, explaining where innovation is generated in technological, sectoral and geographical spaces. Less attention has been paid to the *application side*, that is how regions use and apply innovations generated and produced in the region or elsewhere to solve concrete problems on the ground (Tödtling et al., 2020). The determinants of regional application capacities (the capacity of regions to anchor or embed solutions) are blind spots in many conventional RIS studies. Regional innovation policies, thus, should aim at the broader set of generation, adoption, application and upscaling of innovation. This includes also a better coordination between innovation and other policy fields, such as environmental or health policies, that would be necessary to achieve particular intended outcomes (Diercks et al., 2019).

Fifth, the conventional RIS literature is often dealing only with the design of ‘smart’ strategies and the proposal of a proper set of tools. They do not take account of the complexities and problems of *implementing* these policy concepts (Flanagan & Uyarra, 2017). This has severely limited their overall effectiveness in achieving policy goals and their ability to transform industrial structures and innovation systems.

Sixth, many RIS studies depart from the assumption that innovation is always positive,

ignoring that it may also have a *dark side*, leading to unfavourable outcomes (Coad et al., 2021). Arguably, innovation may not only lead to creative destruction (Schumpeter, 1911) but also to destructive creation (Soete, 2013). In other words, innovation may create more problems than it solves. As Schot & Steinmüller (2018, p. 1562) remind us: ‘... many technologies are deeply implicated in persistent environmental and social problems’. RIS studies and policies should take this aspect of innovation effects better into account by focusing on measures that have a high potential to tackle grand societal challenges at the regional scale. This includes regulations e.g. in the transport, housing or production sectors that reduce or prevent negative societal outcomes of particular innovations.

Finally, there are calls for a *new role of the state*. The role of policy should clearly go beyond classical STI and innovation systems policies, since there is the need to address societal challenges in a broader way. Due to the widening of the goals, actors and affected groups, it seems important that policy actors take account of a more complex innovation landscape. Besides the traditional role of funding and infrastructure provision, this includes a stronger role of organising and coordinating a more open innovation process, e.g. by setting up policy platforms, coordination of cross-cutting themes and working groups (representing technological, business, ecological, and social topics). Such a policy approach needs to include a wide variety of actors and interest groups. It also requires mechanisms to deal with conflicting interests within such complex actor constellations.

4 Towards challenge-oriented regional innovation systems and policies

As outlined in the previous section, today’s societal challenges call for a reorientation of RIS studies and regional innovation policies. In this section, we seek to initiate a discussion of how the RIS approach could be modified. To this end, we propose the notion of challenge-oriented RIS (CORIS).

Table 1: Conventional and challenge-oriented RIS: key differences

	Conventional RIS	Challenge-oriented RIS
Type of innovation	Innovation in the regional corporate sector: technological, organisational, marketing innovation	Innovation in the regional corporate sector and in other realms (public sector, civil society, regional and urban communities: technological, user, social, institutional innovation)
Purpose of innovation	Economic growth & competitiveness of the regional economy	Grand societal challenges and problems faced by the region
Effects of innovation	Focus on positive effects (strong pro-innovation bias)	Focus on multi-dimensional effects of innovation: bright and dark sides
Actors, networks, institutions	Firms, universities, state, intermediaries knit together in stable (local and non-local) networks and embedded in a static multiscale institutional landscape	Conventional RIS actors and ‘new’ innovation agents (civil society, public sector actors, users, etc.) knit together in / influenced by dynamically developing networks and evolving institutional configurations at multiple scales
Production and application sides	Supply side (generation/production of innovation in the region)	Supply side and demand / application side (diffusion / upscaling of innovation in the region)

Source: own compilation

In contrast to traditional accounts of RIS, the CORIS approach embraces a broader and more critical understanding of innovation, captures the directionality of change, opens up to new innovation actors and novel coordination mechanisms between various stakeholders and territorial scales, and pays more attention to the application side and upscaling of innovation within the region and beyond (Table 1).

In short, CORIS could be understood as (those parts of a) RIS that feature a challenge orientation. As explicated further below, regions often face various challenges at the same time. CORIS are RIS that show the capacity to (i) mobilise existing actors, resources (assets), networks and institutional configurations, and (ii) include new actors, create new assets and networks, and engage in institutional change in order to tackle those challenges.

This definition partly overlaps with but also differs from similar concepts such as mission-oriented innovation systems (MIS) (Hekkert et al., 2020, p. 77), which are defined as *‘the network of agents and set of institutions that contribute to the development and diffusion of innovative solutions with the aim to define, pursue and complete a societal mission’*. MIS form around a particular mission or challenge. A CORIS, in contrast, is not necessarily confined to a particular challenge. It rather constitutes the wider regional (territorial) framework, reflecting the capacity of regions to address various and partly interrelated challenges. An example would be the environmental problem of climate change and the socio-economic problem of fighting unemployment in a peripheral or old industrial region. Activities geared towards battling climate change can stimulate the creation of jobs in new green economic fields but may also cause further job losses due to closures of polluting industries. Similar relations might exist between fighting both health-related and labour market challenges (i.e. creating jobs in health-related services). For CORIS policies to be effective it is important to take such relationships among different challenges in a region into account.

At a more concrete and operational level, particular challenges (such as CO₂ reduction) might be addressed by one or more CORIS initiatives (such as energy efficient buildings, improvement of public transport, or introduction of e-mobility). A particular region, thus, can address one or several challenges with different CORIS initiatives in each. Like challenges, CORIS initiatives are interrelated. Ideally they should complement each other in order to fight a particular challenge (e.g. investment in e-mobility and in renewable energy), but they may also be unrelated (energy efficient buildings and e-mobility), or there might also be cases of conflicts (e.g. over scarce resources).

Arguably, this does not imply that a CORIS is well equipped to solve all the challenges a region is facing in the same way. CORIS may well show a stronger capacity to tackle some problems or challenges better than others. Much depends on the innovation capacity of public and private actors, availability of assets – including natural resources and other assets such as industrial, human, infrastructural, material ones (MacKinnon et al., 2019) – historically grown networks and institutional configurations. These inherited place-based structures and RIS elements can provide both potentials and constraints to the initiation and upscaling of challenge-oriented innovation in regions (Hansen & Coenen, 2015; Trippl et al., 2020).

CORIS help to grasp to what extent and in which ways RIS are able to mobilise (broadly defined) innovative agents who play a significant part in the experimentation, development, application and upscaling of innovative solutions that are geared towards solving societal challenges at the regional level. Like traditional RIS, CORIS build on a multi-actor approach

but they differ from the former by including not only firms and actors in the research and government domains. They open up to a more diverse set of actors beyond triple helix settings, including public sector organisations, NGOs, users, citizens, etc. who take part in experimenting with challenge-oriented innovations that help to address specific regional problems. In CORIS, established actors (policy makers, universities, etc.) may take on new roles and ‘new actors’ may enter the stage, initiating and supporting challenge-oriented innovation activities. Their motivations for getting involved can be very different (Hekkert et al., 2020), ranging from expected economic gains (firms) to willingness to solve own needs (users), civic engagement, and a normative stance regarding the challenge (NGOs). They may also reflect organisational roles like universities that educate and train students, intermediaries that facilitate networking, or banks that provide financial assets.

As outlined above (see section 2), tackling specific regional challenges often demands a bundling and combination of various (technological and non-technological) innovations, and institutional and infrastructural changes. In CORIS, public and private actors coordinate their challenge-oriented innovative activities to develop complementary technological, institutional and other innovative solutions. This often involves modifying broadly defined regional assets and place-based structures through agentic processes (MacKinnon et al., 2019; Tripl et al., 2020). In this context, it deems important to consider not only change agency (Battilana et al., 2009; Isaksen and Jakobsen, 2017) but also maintenance agency, i.e., agency that is oriented towards securing the persistence of existing structures, thus countering pressures for change (Henderson, 2020; Jolly et al., 2020). Maintenance agency might be an important source of failure of challenge-oriented innovation.

We also propose paying close attention to the dynamics of challenge-oriented innovation networks and initiatives in CORIS. As noted above (section 3), tackling specific problems in regions requires more than developing challenge-oriented innovations in regions or experimenting with and applying solutions imported from elsewhere. Their upscaling in the region is pivotal for wider change. There are strong reasons to assume that driving forces and barriers, actor constellations, as well as network and institutional dynamics differ between the initiation/formation phase and the upscaling phase, calling for ‘phase-specific’ CORIS policies.

Finally, it is important to emphasise that the evolution of CORIS is not only driven by its ‘internal’ (that is, regional) dynamics but is often essentially shaped by non-local influences and its connections to the ‘outside world’. RIS are inserted into national and supranational regulatory and policy frameworks and innovation dynamics often include actors and factors from local to global scales (Binz & Truffer, 2017). Policy impulses from higher spatial scales, national and supranational institutional barriers, importation of innovations developed elsewhere (Tödting et al., 2020), trans-local learning networks (Loorbach et al., 2020), and so on may thus affect how challenge-oriented innovations unfold in regions.

5 CORIS and the challenge of climate change and mobility transitions in the region of Vorarlberg

In this section, we want to illustrate and further explore through a case analysis the features of CORIS as introduced above. Which implications are resulting from adopting the challenge-oriented perspective? What are issues and deficiencies about CORIS that must be taken into further consideration? Based on a literature review, we zoom in on the case of the Austrian region of Vorarlberg and its emerging CORIS, addressing in particular a specific challenge,

that is, climate change with the focus set on mobility and energy production. We have chosen this case because this region was one of the first to introduce an initiative addressing the challenge of climate change in a more comprehensive way covering both the sectors of transport and energy, and including a broad range of actors in the public and private sector.

The region of Vorarlberg is located in the most western part of Austria, bordering Germany, Switzerland and Liechtenstein. Hosting around 400,000 inhabitants, it is the smallest of all Austrian federal states (Statistik Austria, 2020). The region spans over a territory of 2,600 km² and shows a higher population density than the national average (Statistik Austria, 2020). Historically, the region of Vorarlberg was characterised by a strong textile manufacturing sector. Till today, the industrial sector is the cornerstone of the region's economy. Mechanical and electronic engineering as well as metals industries play an important role (Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung, 2015a: p. 10). The region features an above average economic performance in national as well as European comparison (Statistik Austria, 2015). Innovation is mainly driven by companies: In 2014, 80% of the R&D expenditures were carried out by businesses, while public R&D expenditures are below the Austrian mean (Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung, 2015a). Within this context, the Smart Specialisation Strategy of Vorarlberg is shaped around the goals of development of the R&D sector and stimulation of company-driven innovation potentials (ÖROK, 2016). Underlying is the framing of innovation as a means to strengthen economic competitiveness and ensuring regional prosperity, as stated in the recent strategy paper on science and research (Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung, 2015a). Accordingly, Vorarlberg's RIS policy appears to focus predominantly on economic growth and the perception of innovation as generated through the interaction of R&D organisations and companies.

However, there is also evidence that over the past few years a broader understanding of innovation and pursuit of other goals than economic competitiveness gained in importance in the region, reflecting an increasing 'challenge-orientation' of actors and policies. The emerging CORIS, however, is representing not more than a 'niche', co-existing with the still dominating traditionally oriented RIS (see above). The following subsections disentangle some essential features of Vorarlberg's CORIS, zooming in on challenge-oriented innovation activities and policies in the field of mobility. Before doing so, we provide a short overview on key characteristics of transformation activities of the mobility sector.

Setting the scene: innovation and transformation of mobility systems

Mobility is organised within a socio-technical system, which is defined as 'a configuration of products, processes, services and infrastructures, regulations, skills, preferences, expectations, and actors' (Schot, 2016, p. 447). In order to transform the mobility sector the implementation of singular new technology is not enough. Rather, it is the combination of multiple forms of innovation that matters, ranging from technological, infrastructural, social, to institutional innovations. Thus, the transformation of the mobility sector is reconfigurational (Hodson et al. 2017). Examples for the multiple fields of innovations needed are – besides the car itself – the batteries and the charging stations, employers promoting sustainable modes of transport for employees, awareness strategies, new infrastructure for ride-sharing, and so on. Furthermore, mobility is energy-intensive and thus closely connected to the energy sector and energy innovations. Since transitions towards more sustainable regional mobility systems demand innovations in multiple realms, a diverse set of actors needs to be mobilised, including – among others – firms, public administrations, NGOs, politicians, and residents. These actors often have different expectations, support different conceptions of sustainability, and pursue

different agencies and strategies. This can both enhance and hinder collective learning processes at the regional level.

Although the focus of this article is on the regional scale, one needs to take into account that the region and its mobility system are integrated in transregional processes, cross-scale relationships (Haarstad, 2016), and in a global institutional context. Institutional configurations are shaping mobility systems to a high degree. They are set across multiple levels of governance. National and European mobility concepts and policy regimes in terms of infrastructure, e.g. train lines and stations, highways, energy supply, and legal issues, e.g. regulations have a strong effect on regional mobility innovations and transitions (Hodson et al., 2017).

The case of the e-mobility model region ‘VLOTTE’ in Vorarlberg, Austria

Context and rationales

Facing environmental problems due to climate change and air pollution, the region of Vorarlberg established Austria’s first e-mobility model region VLOTTE in 2008. The main objective of this challenge-oriented initiative was to test the application of various forms of electric mobility innovations. Further, in 2009 the regional parliament of Vorarlberg set the strategic goal of achieving regional energy autonomy by 2050 (Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung 2015). Thus, VLOTTE was soon included in the region’s ambitious goals in the energy field (Ryghaug et al. 2019). Consideration of the ‘mobility-energy nexus’ became apparent in VLOTTE’s core objective, that is, to enhance low-emission and low-carbon mobility fed by regionally produced renewable energy. Thus, two overarching goals, that is, reduction of emissions resulting from mobility and the expanded production and use of local renewable energies were aligned to each other.

Taking a closer look at the development of VLOTTE, two stages can be identified. In the initiation phase, the e-mobility model region received funding from the national Energy and Climate Fund to test the broad applicability of e-mobility in the region. In the upscaling phase, the challenge-oriented initiative was narrowed down. VLOTTE became a business branch of the local energy service provider Illwerke vkw with the core activity being the wider uptake of automotive electric mobility and the expansion of the charging infrastructure and renewable energy supply. This shift in orientation – from the application of different forms of e-mobility and their combination/intermodality towards an exclusive focus on electric cars – reveals how directionality may change during the life span of a challenge-oriented initiative.

Multiple innovations at the application side

Vorarlberg does not host an automotive industry. Thus, the technologies and e-vehicles are imported from other countries. Consequently, a focus on innovations at the application side is at the core of VLOTTE (Tödtling et al., 2020). Therefore, experimentation with and local adaption of technologies generated elsewhere, social and institutional innovations (e.g. car leasing contracts with the local energy provider, development of a diverse charging network, conversion to electric vehicle fleets) and their coevolution are of central importance. This points to the significance of CORIS’ capabilities to foster multiple – and complementary – forms of innovation, and to forge their interplay, thus fashioning the reconfigurational dimension of socio-technical transformations. This is inextricably linked to the capacity of the CORIS to mobilise a broad set of actors, to develop challenge-oriented networks, and to harness and reorient institutional endowments.

CORIS: Actors, networks, institutions

Due to the broad agenda in the initiation phase and the necessity to engage in manifold innovation activities (see above), the set of actors involved comprised a diverse mix of public and private service providers, policy actors, research organisations, and users. Especially the public sector took a strong hold. A central role was played by the local utility and energy provider Illwerke vkw, of which the region of Vorarlberg holds 98 percent of the shares. Illwerke vkw was one of the main initiators of VLOTTE, ensured the electricity supply, integrated a large rooftop photovoltaic system and built an e-car park. It also installed charging infrastructure, and provided leasing contracts for electric cars. As a locally established actor it enjoys public trust which was crucial to support the adoption of early e-vehicles including non-matured technology (Martin, 2018). It was thus an incumbent actor in the energy sector who played a leading role in challenge-oriented innovation processes in the regional mobility system. Illwerke vkw made use of its established position to implement new technologies, to fashion cross-sectorial links and to mobilise other actors in the course of the development of VLOTTE. Further, in the course of the development of the challenge-oriented initiative, VLOTTE became one of the business branches of the energy provider (see above). In consequence, economic as well as environmental objectives were pursued. Accordingly, Illwerke vkw can be considered a firm level *and* system level agent at the same time (Isaksen et al. 2019).

Beside Illwerke vkw, a large number of other actors and their agencies drove the evolution of VLOTTE. The local research organisation Kairos (Wirkungsforschung und Entwicklung GmbH), an independent non-profit organisation, was the first actor in Vorarlberg's challenge-oriented initiative who followed up with e-mobility. Kairos developed an e-mobility concept for the region and further collaborated intensively with Illwerke vkw in order to become becoming Austria's first e-mobility region. Vorarlberg's successful application for financial support from the national Climate and Energy Fund can be seen as the outcome of collaborative links between these two key CORIS actors, coalescing Kairos's concept with Illwerke vkw's capacity to carry out the concept. Eventually, becoming part of the national e-mobility model region programme and its funding was a crucial moment for the further development of this challenge-oriented initiative in Vorarlberg.

Other actors involved were the public transport provider Vorarlberger Verkehrsverbund who integrated electrically powered buses into their fleet and the regional environmental association Umweltverband Vorarlberg as well as the Energy Institute Vorarlberg, which provided assistance for acquiring electric cars and advice for activities aiming at the aspired energy autonomy. The regional assurance company Vorarlberger Landesversicherung contributed by covering for the costly batteries (Martin, 2018). In the private sector a local carsharing provider converted its fleet to mostly electric cars, which raised visibility and helped to break down barriers towards e-mobility for private users. As local car trading companies were not able to adapt and offer adequate consultations and services for electric cars and e-mobility, these tasks were filled by Illwerke vkw (Martin, 2018). Altogether, a broad group of users, including public regional and municipal administrations, businesses as well as private persons, took part. Experience and feedback from these users were crucial in the maturing process as they helped to adapt and improve the technologies according to their needs. With the upscaling of the challenge-oriented initiative, the set of actors was further growing (e.g. more business owners and restaurants were enlisted to enable the supply of charging stations to their employees and customers, (Ryghaug et al. 2019)).

Taking a closer look at the formation and evolution of networks in this initiative reveals a number of interesting insights. Many actors involved knew each other previously. Some of them even had organisational links, e.g. Illwerke vkw and the Energy Institute met up regularly (Martin, 2018). The strong connection between Illwerke vkw and the regional government is considered a particularly relevant factor in the success of the VLOTTE project (Ryghaug et al., 2019). In other words: pre-existing links facilitated the formation of challenge-oriented innovation networks and alignment of activities to funding opportunities. Regional policy actors were important to foster the building of network structures and to induce learning processes by organising networking meetings, bringing actors together to share information about their projects, measures taken, and so on. Users were integrated by solicitation of feedback and usage analysis (Martin 2018). It is also important to note that network characteristics changed over time. In the experimentation phase, when the terrain was mostly unknown, the cooperation among key actors needed more personal interaction and was time-intensive compared to later stages, when the challenge-oriented initiative became increasingly consolidated and positions were clear and tasks divided.

The adoption process of e-mobility and regional socio-technical transformation were influenced in essential ways by regional institutional factors. Worth mentioning is the strong environmental consciousness in Vorarlberg, which is also reflected in the regional objective of energy autonomy and which clearly favoured the experimental implementation of new mobility forms. Due to the smallness of Vorarlberg and its peripheral location in Austria, other key factor were trust (see above) and a strong regional identity, fostering collaboration between diverse actors (Martin, 2018). Furthermore, setting the goal of becoming energy autonomous by 2050, that is, institutional change, offered a fertile ground for the adoption of e-mobility fed by local energy production. It can indeed be seen as a guiding collective vision that helped to channel activities geared towards fostering the transformation of the mobility system. Institutional barriers to the adoption of e-mobility were construction regulations, which complicated the implementation of charging infrastructure (Martin, 2018).

CORIS and its multi-scalar contexts

Place-specific CORIS structures and dynamics have – as shown above – had significant impact on the development of VLOTTE and thus on transforming Vorarlberg’s mobility sector. Yet, the emergence and development of the challenge-oriented initiative under consideration here can only be properly understood by taking multi-scalar contexts into account and by paying close attention to non-local actors and translocal networks. Institutional conditions and policy actors at national and supranational levels shaped challenge-oriented innovation activities towards e-mobility in Vorarlberg to a high degree. EU guidelines aiming at the decarbonisation of fuels created a beneficial environment for the experimental implementation of e-mobility systems (BMVIT 2016). The national level set incentives for innovation, encouraging regional transitions to low-emission mobility. It was the funding granted by the national Energy and Climate Fund that enabled the launch of VLOTTE as an e-mobility model region. Furthermore, extra-regional connections were built with other e-mobility model regions in Austria to enhance the exchange of experiences with strategy development and implementation and to promote inter-regional learning processes. This does not only demonstrate that the ‘non-local dimension’ can impact heavily on challenge-oriented initiatives at the regional level. It also shows that the capacity of CORIS and its actors to navigate through various spatial scales to mobilise resources for initiating and consolidating transformation processes in the regional environment is vitally important.

Discussion

The climate oriented e-mobility project VLOTTE could be seen as a CORIS initiative in an overall still conventionally oriented innovation policy setting that favours corporate innovation and economic competitiveness. Yet, the case of VLOTTE reveals a number of interesting insights into how CORIS facilitate addressing societal challenges at the regional level. The challenge-orientation of Vorarlberg's RIS manifests itself in the setting of well-aligned strategic goals and visions oriented towards sustainable transformation processes in the energy and mobility sector. This can be seen as main condition for the CORIS initiative, which helped triggering wider innovation processes that include complementary technological, social and institutional innovations. The case of VLOTTE also demonstrates how challenge-oriented actors mobilise regional and extra-regional resources and networks in order to boost the CORIS initiative to transform the regional mobility system. VLOTTE was driven by innovative actors – and their change agencies² – in the public sector and soon became populated by a large variety of actors who do not belong to traditional triple helix constellations. By successfully broadening the set of actors (inclusion of firms, users and other stakeholders) and by mobilising policy support from the region and beyond the challenge-oriented initiative gained wider acceptance. Vorarlberg increased its number of e-vehicles per capita significantly and became a leading e-mobility region. Regional, and national level policy actors promoted the experimental process by providing a protected niche for the new technologies by means of financial and network support.

However, the example under consideration here also points to the fact that innovation dynamics in CORIS could lead to solutions that diverge from the initial objectives. Starting with experiments oriented towards 'sustainable mobility systems' (that include both public and private transport and various modes of mobility), the transformation process became increasingly narrowed down, concentrating on electric cars only. This raises important questions about how visions in CORIS – and in challenge-oriented initiatives – evolve and how to ensure that innovation trajectories stay aligned with societal goals. In the case of VLOTTE the strong focus on electric cars may be hindering a more sustainable transformation of the mobility sector, encompassing problems that are related to disposing of used batteries, the fact that electric cars use a less carbon intensive fuel but still are an individual mode of transport that consumes a lot of valuable energy and need a lot of scarce space for driving and parking compared to public transport. This points to a potential dark side of challenge-oriented innovation and difficulties around the evaluation of success in a CORIS.

6 Conclusions and Outlook

The past years have seen a shift in the rationales for innovation policy. Addressing societal challenges such as climate change, degradation of ecosystems, and other problems that threaten human prosperity are increasingly ranking high on both research and policy agendas. This is reflected in a growing body of work on new approaches such as mission-oriented innovation policy, responsible research and innovation, and transformative innovation policy. In stark contrast to traditional frameworks, these novel approaches place societal challenges and directionality of change at centre stage and propagate a broader understanding of innovation, inclusion of new innovation agents and an enriched role of policy.

² In the case of VLOTTE, there is little evidence of maintenance agency.

In this article, we assert that RIS studies and policies have been slow in taking these advances into account. Much work in this field is still confined to analyse and provide support for technological and business innovation for economic competitiveness, thus building on a narrow understanding of innovation and featuring an uncritical view on its purpose. The article contents that RIS scholarship and policies need to grapple with the directionality of change, open up to a broader understanding of innovation (and its dark side) and pay more attention to the application of novel solutions to solve concrete challenges ‘on the ground’.

Our call for rethinking RIS scholarship and policies is not to deny that many environmental and social challenges are global in nature. Yet, tackling these challenges requires also actions at lower levels such as the regional level one. We propose the notion of CORIS to grasp how multiple actors (firms, public actors, consumers, civil society organisations, universities, and so on) coordinate their innovation activities to respond to (overlapping) pressing problems. CORIS are (those parts of) RIS that show the capacity to mobilise existing actors, resources (assets), networks and institutional configurations, and to incorporate new actors, create new assets and networks, and change institutions to tackle environmental and social challenges.

One can draw a number of conclusions for the next generation of regional innovation policies. Overall, CORIS policies move beyond the still dominant RIS policy approach and its orientation on deficiencies of the existing innovation systems, such as gaps in the research and education infrastructure, lacking qualifications and skills, or finance and venture capital. As argued above, such a limited perspective is not sufficient for dealing with current and future grand societal challenges. A wider and more radical approach should take into account future needs and potentials to tackle societal challenges both from a regional and global perspective. This includes the involvement of new actors, an engagement with sustainability goals, and new ways of coordinating more open innovation processes (Morgan, 2017). The stimulation of innovation should be complemented by ‘the purposive termination of existing institutions, (infra)structures, technologies, products and practices’ (Heyen et al., 2017, p. 326) that tend to inhibit or slow down the uptake of innovation. Consequently, RIS studies and policies need to pay more attention to destabilisation interventions (Kern & Kivimaa, 2016).

However, developing a RIS in the direction of a CORIS is not a straightforward and easy process. Several tasks and steps seem to be vital (Smits & Kuhlmann, 2004; Daimer et al, 2012; Foray, 2018), including the need to prioritise goals and interventions in order to take effective action. A broad participation of social groups, stakeholders, regional actors, and policy makers in shared vision building processes is deemed important in this context. It also involves dealing with potential conflicts of interest between actors involved, calling for balancing and coordination of activities based on strong capacities of communication and leadership in the policy system. For setting up and developing a CORIS initiative necessary financial, human and other resources and assets from the region and beyond have to be mobilised. Implementing and upscaling of CORIS initiatives requires commitment, investment and innovation activities in both the public and private sector. This calls for coordination of involved actors both within and between CORIS initiatives.

There are arguably many issues and questions that deserve due attention in future research on CORIS and challenge-oriented regional innovation policies. Thorough analyses are required for better understanding in which ways regions differ in their capacities to reorient their RISs in order to bring it in closer touch with grand societal challenges and why they respond differently to the same global challenges. To this end, mapping and exploring the relative importance of and interplay between a broad set of place-based structures and assets and

investigating the agency of key RIS actors, evolving networks and institutional dynamics should rank high on research agendas. Furthermore, addressing the question how policy actions and institutional arrangements at higher spatial scales, non-local public and private actors, trans-local networks and mobilisation of extra-regional assets influence the evolution of CORIS and shape regional challenge-oriented policies and initiatives appears important.

References

- Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung. (2015a). *Wissenschafts- und Forschungsstrategie 2020+*. Bregenz.
- Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung. (2015b). *Elektromobilitätsstrategie: elektrisch mobil. Elektromobilitätsstrategie Vorarlberg 2013-2020*. Bregenz.
- Asheim, B. T., Isaksen, A., & Trippl, M. (2019). *Advanced introduction to regional innovation systems. Elgar advanced introductions*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Avelino, F., Wittmayera, J.M., Pelb, B., Weaver, P., Dumitru, A., Haxeltine, A., Kemp R., Jørgensen; M.F., Bauler, T, Ruijsink, S., & O'Riorda, T. (2019). Transformative social innovation and (dis)empowerment. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 145, 195-206.
- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 65–107. doi:10.5465/19416520903053598
- Bergek, A., Jacobsson S., Carlsson B., Lindmark, S., & Rickne, A. (2008). Analyzing the functional dynamics of technological innovation systems: A scheme of analysis. *Research Policy*, 37, 407-429.
- Binz, C., & Truffer, B. (2017). Global innovation systems – a conceptual framework for innovation dynamics in transnational contexts. *Research Policy*, 46(7), 1284–1298. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2017. 05.012
- BMVIT (2016). *Nationaler Strategierahmen 'Saubere Energie im Verkehr'*. Wien.
- Bryden, J., & Gezelius, S. S. (2017). Innovation as if people mattered: the ethics of innovation for sustainable development. *Innovation and Development*, 7(1), 101–118. doi:10.1080/2157930X.2017.1281208
- Coad, A., Nightingale, P., Stilgoe, J., & Vezzani, A. (2021). Editorial: the dark side of innovation, *Industry and Innovation*, 28:1, 102-112. doi:10.1080/13662716.2020.1818555
- Coenen, L., Hansen, T., & Rekers, J. (2015). Innovation Policy for Grand Challenges. An Economic Geography Perspective. *Geography Compass*, 9(9), 483-496. doi:10.1111/gec3.12231
- Coenen, L., & Morgan, K. (2020). Evolving geographies of innovation: existing paradigms, critiques and possible alternatives. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 74(1), 13-24. doi:10.1080/00291951.2019.169206
- Cooke, P. (1992). Regional innovation systems: Competitive regulation in the new Europe. *Geoforum*, 23(3), 365–382. doi:10.1016/0016-7185(92)90048-9
- Daimer, S., Hufnagl, M., & Warnke, Ph. (2012). Challenge-oriented policy-making and innovation systems theory: Reconsidering systemic instruments. In: Koschatzky, K. (Ed.), *Innovation system revisited: Experiences from 40 years of Fraunhofer ISI research*. Stuttgart: Fraunhofer Verlag.
- Diercks, G., Larsen, H., & Steward, F. (2019). Transformative innovation policy: Addressing variety in an emerging policy paradigm. *Research Policy*, 48(4), 880–894. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2018.10.028

- Fagerberg, J., Martin, B. R., & Andersen, E. S. (Eds.) (2013). *Innovation Studies: Evolution and Future Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flanagan, K., & Uyerra, E. (2016). Four dangers in innovation policy studies – and how to avoid them. *Industry and Innovation*, 23(2), 177-188. oi:10.1080/13662716.2016.1146126
- Foray, D. (2018). Smart specialization strategies as a case of mission-oriented policy - A case study on the emergence of new policy practices. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 27 (5), 817–832. doi: 10.1093/icc/dty030
- Geels, F.W. (2002). Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: a multi-level perspective and a case-study. *Research Policy*, 31, 1257–1274.
- Geels, F. W. (2004). From sectoral systems of innovation to socio-technical systems: Insights about dynamics and change from sociology and institutional theory. *Research Policy*, 33(6–7), 897–920. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2004.01.015
- Haarstad, H. (2016). Where are urban energy transitions governed? Conceptualizing the complex governance arrangements for low-carbon mobility in Europe. *Cities*, 54, 4-10. doi:10.1016/J.CITIES.2015.10.013
- Hekkert, M. P., Janssen, M. J., Wesseling, J. H., & Negro, S. O. (2020). Mission-oriented innovation systems. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 34, 76–79. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2019.11.011
- Henderson, D. (2020). Institutional work in the maintenance of regional innovation policy instruments: evidence from Wales. *Regional Studies*, 54(3), 429–439. doi:10.1080/00343404.2019.1634251
- Heyen, D. A., Hermwille, L., & Wehnert, T. (2017). Out of the Comfort Zone! Governing the Exnovation of Unsustainable Technologies and Practices. *GAIA - Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society*, 26(4), 326–331. doi:10.14512/gaia.26.4.9
- Hodson, M., Geels, F., & McMeekin, A. (2017). Reconfiguring Urban Sustainability Transitions, Analysing Multiplicity. *Sustainability*, 9(2), 299. doi:10.3390/su9020299
- Isaksen, A., Jakobsen, S.-E., Njøs, R., & Normann, R. (2019). Regional industrial restructuring resulting from individual and system agency. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 32(1), 48–65. doi:10.1080/13511610.2018.1496322
- Isaksen, A. & Trippel, M. (2017). Innovation in space: the mosaic of regional innovation patterns. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 33(1), 122–140. doi:10.1093/oxrep/grw035
- Jolly, S., Grillitsch, M., & Hansen, T. (2020). Agency and actors in regional industrial path development. A framework and longitudinal analysis. *Geoforum*, 111, 176–188. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.02.013
- Kivimaa, P., & Kern, F. (2016). Creative destruction or mere niche support? Innovation policy mixes for sustainability transitions. *Research Policy*, 45, 205–217.
- Loorbach, D., Wittmayer, J., Avelino, F., Wirth, T. von, & Frantzeskaki, N. (2020). Transformative innovation and translocal diffusion. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 35, 251–260. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2020.01.009
- MacKinnon, D. (2012). Beyond strategic coupling: reassessing the firm-region nexus in global production networks. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 12(1), 227–245. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbr009
- MacKinnon D., Dawley S., Pike A., & Cumbers A. (2019). Rethinking path creation: a geographical political economy approach. *Economic Geography*, 95, 113–135.
- Markard, J., Raven, R., & Truffer, B. (2012). Sustainability transitions: an emerging field of research and its prospects. *Research Policy*, 41, 955–967.

- Martin, L. (2018). *Regionale Innovationssysteme und die Diffusion von Innovation - eine Untersuchung der Elektromobilitätsregion Vorarlberg*. Universität Wien, Wien.
- Mazzucato, M. (2013). *The entrepreneurial state: Debunking private vs public sector myths*. London: Anthem Press.
- Mazzucato, M. (2018). Mission-oriented innovation policies: Challenges and opportunities. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 27(5), 803–815.
- Mazzucato, M., Kattel, R. & Ryan-Collins, J. (2020). Challenge-Driven Innovation Policy: Towards a New Policy Toolkit. *J Ind Compet Trade* 20, 421–437. doi:10.1007/s10842-019-00329-w
- Morgan, K. (2017). Nurturing novelty: Regional innovation policy in the age of smart specialisation. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, Vol. 35(4), 569–583.
- Moulaert, F., & Sekia, F. (2003). Territorial innovation models: a critical survey. *Regional Studies*, 37(3), 289–302.
- Moulaert, F., & MacCallum, D. (2019). *Advanced Introduction to Social Innovation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Owen, R., Macnaghten, P., & Stilgoe, J. (2012). Responsible research and innovation: From science in society to science for society, with society. *Science and Public Policy*, 39, 751–760.
- ÖROK. *Politikrahmen zu Smart Specialisation in Österreich: Policy framework for smart specialisation in Austria* (Schriftenreihe / Österreichische Raumordnungskonferenz (ÖROK)). Wien.
- Raven, R., & Walrave, B. (2020). Overcoming transformational failures through policy mixes in the dynamics of technological innovation systems. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 153, 119297. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2018.05.008
- Ryghaug, M., Ornetzeder, M., Skjølvold, T., & Throndsen, W. (2019). The Role of Experiments and Demonstration Projects in Efforts of Upscaling: An Analysis of Two Projects Attempting to Reconfigure Production and Consumption in Energy and Mobility. *Sustainability*, 11(20), 5771. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11205771>
- Schlaile, M., Urmetzer, S., Blok, V., Andersen, A., Timmermans, J., Mueller, M., Fagerberg, J., & Pyka, A. (2017). Innovation Systems for Transformations towards Sustainability? Taking the Normative Dimension Seriously. *Sustainability*, 9(12), 2253. doi:10.3390/su9122253
- Schot, J. (2016). Confronting the Second Deep Transition through the Historical Imagination. *Technology and Culture*, 57(2), 445–456. doi:10.1353/tech.2016.0044
- Schot, J., & Steinmueller, W. E. (2018). Three frames for innovation policy: R&D, systems of innovation and transformative change. *Research Policy*, 47(9), 1554–1567. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2018.08.011
- Schumpeter, A., J. (2011). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. English edition: *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Harvard Economic Studies 46, 1934. Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Soete, L. (2013). Is innovation always good? In: Fagerberg, J. Ben R. Martin, B.R. & Andersen, E. S. (Eds.), *Innovation studies: Evolution and future challenges*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 134-144.
- Smits, R., & Kuhlmann, S. (2004). The rise of systemic instruments in innovation policy. *International Journal of Foresight and Innovation Policy*, 1(1/2), Article 4621, 4. doi:10.1504/IJFIP.2004.004621

- Statistik Austria (2015). *Regionales BIP und Hauptaggregate nach Wirtschaftsbereichen und Bundesländern*. Wien.
- Statistik Austria (2020). *Übersicht der Bundesländer*. Retrieved February 03, 2021 from https://www.statistik.at/web_de/klassifikationen/regionale_gliederungen/bundeslaender/index.html.
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, *42*, 1568–1580.
- Tödttling, F., & Tripl, M. (2005). ‘One size fits all?’: Towards a differentiated regional innovation policy approach. *Research Policy*, *34*, 1203–1219.
- Tödttling, F., & Tripl, M. (2018). Regional innovation policies for new path development - beyond neo-liberal and traditional systemic views. *European Planning Studies*, *26/9*, 1779–1795. doi:10.1080/09654313.2018.1457140
- Tödttling, F., Tripl, M., & Frangenheim, A. (2020). Policy options for green regional development: Adopting a production and application perspective. *Science and Public Policy*, *2020*, 1-11.
- Tripl, M., Grillitsch, M., & Isaksen, A. (2018). Exogenous sources of regional industrial change: Attraction and absorption of non-local knowledge for new path development. *Progress in Human Geography*, *42(5)*, 687–705. doi:10.1177/0309132517700982
- Tripl, M., Baumgartinger-Seiringer, S., Frangenheim, A., Isaksen, A., & Rypestøl, J. O. (2020). Unravelling green regional industrial path development: Regional preconditions, asset modification and agency. *Geoforum*, *111*, 189–197. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.02.016
- Von Schomberg, R. (2013). A vision of responsible research and innovation. In: Bessant, J., Owen, R., Heintz, M., (Eds.), *Responsible Innovation: Managing the Responsible Emergence of Science and Innovation in Society*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, pp. 51–74.
- Warnke, Ph., Koschatzky, K., Dönitz, E., Zenker, A., Stahlecker, T., Som, O., Cuhls, K., & Güth, S. (2016). Opening up the innovation system framework towards new actors and institutions. Fraunhofer ISI Discussion Papers Innovation Systems and Policy Analysis No. 49. Karlsruhe, ISI.
- Weber, K.M., & Rohracher, H. (2012). Legitimizing research, technology and innovation policies for transformative change: combining insights from innovation systems and multi-level perspective in a comprehensive ‘failures’ framework. *Research Policy*, *41*, 1037–1047.

For further information about the
GEIST Working Paper series, see:
www.geist-wp.com

Environmental Social Sciences

Eawag - Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology

Contact person: Johan Miörner

Überlandstrasse 133, 8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland

Tel.: +41-587-656493

E-Mail: johan.miorner@eawag.ch

<https://www.eawag.ch/en/department/ess/>

Department of Geography and Regional Research

University of Vienna

Contact person: Michaela Tripl

Universitätsstraße 7/5/A0528, 1010 Vienna, Austria

Tel.: +43-1-4277-48720

E-Mail: Michaela.tripl@univie.ac.at

<https://humangeo.univie.ac.at/>