An assessment of the impact of innovation policy on the regional economies of Europe

Pablo Casas^a **Tryfonas Christou**^a Abián García Rodríguez^a Nicholas Lazarou^a Patrizio Lecca^b Philippe Monfort^c Simone Salotti^a

> ^aEuropean Commission - JRC Seville, Spain¹ ^bICADE, Universidad Pontificia Comillas, Spain ^cEuropean Commission - DG REGIO, Belgium

University of Crete Department of Economics Research Seminars

 $^{^{1}}$ The views expressed in this presentation solely belong to the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or positions of the European Commission.

In a nutshell

- We aim to evaluate the economic impact of the EU Horizon 2020 policy funding from 2014 to 2022.
- To do so, we incorporate R&D-based semi-endogenous growth in a spatial dynamic general equilibrium model with 235 EU regions.
- We find that the policy has a positive impact on GDP, with considerable territorial heterogeneity.
- GDP gains are expected to remain significant after the program ends due to the process and product innovations of H2020 funds.
- Regression analysis reveals the importance of regional initial conditions to explain GDP and competitiveness effects.
- Our results suggest that innovation policy is key to promote regional development, and highlight the essential role of the entrepreneurial state as a creator of the knowledge economy.



- ▶ NASA's Apollo program: a huge, gov-led moonshot project
- U.S. government has been the orchestrator of the groundbreaking innovation needed to put a man on the moon.

Entrepreneurial state and innovation policy

- State-promoting innovation policy is crucial for funding basic research (Mazzucato, 2011), whereas the risk-averse private sector focuses on applied research (Castelnovo & Florio, 2020).
- "Entrepreneurial state" (Mazzucato, 2011 & 2015) More active role of the state driving innovation (and growth).
- Entrepreneurship as a spillover mechanism (Audretsch and Feldman (2004)).
- Shift of the focus of innovation policy: from market failures to national innovation issues and now to societal problems (Schot & Stenimueller, 2016).
- Tackling societal challenges requires supranational cooperation, with innovation policies considering regional diversity and the role of regional economies (Calignano (2022)).
- ▶ In EU: European innovation policy through Horizon programmes.

The European innovation policy - Horizon 2020

- EU Horizon 2020 (H2020) research and innovation programme is one of the largest funds under a single political authority (Mazzucato, 2018); budget of almost €74 billion.
- Designed to drive economic growth and job creation, focusing on scientific excellence and addressing societal challenges.
- Societal challenges include, among others: inclusive, innovative and reflective societies; smart, green and integrated transport, climated action and environment.
- EU Horizon 2020 is well studied in the literature:
 - Impact on innovation (Veugelers et al. (2015)), firm growth (Mulier and Samarin (2021)) and GDP growth (Pollex and Lenschow (2018)).
 - Creation of collaborative networks (Kosztyan et al. (2024)).
 - Motivation to participate (Enger (2018)).

EU H2020: Characteristics and throwbacks

- Competitive Funding: Financial support through proposal calls.
- Inclusivity: Open to EU and international participants (researchers, businesses and innovators)
- Collaboration: Promoted partnerships among universities, industry, and research centers.
- Lack of Mission Alignment: No missions to link projects to broader challenges; but should be addressed to make the mission concept stronger and more effective (Larsson (2022)).
- Insufficient Monitoring: Monitoring focused only on individual project evaluations.

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Territorial distribution of the H2020 funds in EU regions

2014-2021 annual average, % of 2017 GDP



Funds are concentrated in Central Europe and in most developed regions of EU Member States.

RHOMOLO model

- RHOMOLO is the European Commission's spatial computable general equilibrium model developed and maintained by TEDAM team and DG REGIO.
- Used to study RRF (Barbero et al. 2024), Cohesion policy (Crucitti et al. 2023), and policy governance (Gianelle et al. 2024), among other things.
- The model covers the EU NUTS 2 regions and disaggregate their economies into 10 NACE Rev. 2 sectors; RoW is modelled as an exogenous external aggregated region.
- Main blocks
 - Households: consume final goods and services.
 - Firms: goods/services production under monopolistic competition.
 - Reg. governments: collect tax & provide public goods/transfers.
 - Trade: costly and modelled using iceberg transport costs.

RHOMOLO RnD A spatial model of semi-endogenous growth

- We incorporate R&D-based semi-endogenous growth in RHOMOLO, a spatial dynamic general equilibrium model.
 - Integration of R&D-driven endogenous growth and interregional technological spillovers, using a modified discrete-time R&D model originally developed by Jones (1995, 2005).
 - Similar approach as in Butler and Pakko (1998), Diao et al. (1999), and the EC's DSGE model QUEST (2022).
- When the policy takes place, each region finances its contribution (according to its GDP share), with distortionary labour taxation.

The policy can affect regional economies through channels affecting public investment and firm productivity.

RHOMOLO RnD: New capital varieties

Firms engage in R&D activity to produce a new design using existing stock, skilled labour, and taking into account regional spillovers:

$$\underbrace{\Delta H_r}_{Blueprints} = -\delta^H H_r + v \cdot \underbrace{Z_r^{\zeta}}_{R\&D \ spillovers} \cdot \underbrace{H_r^{\phi}}_{R\&D \ stock \ Skilled \ labour} \cdot \underbrace{J_r^{\gamma}}_{labour}$$
(1)

- \triangleright ν : efficiency of R&D process
- δ^{H} : depreciation rate of knowledge
- > γ : elasticity of R&D production to the number of researchers
- ζ : spillover effects coming from the rest of the other EU regions.
- $\blacktriangleright \phi$: elasticity of the common stock of knowledge to the production of new designs
 - φ < 0: rate of innovation decreases with the level of knowledge
 φ > 0: rate of innovation increases with the level of knowledge
 φ = 1: full endogenous growth

RHOMOLO RnD: Modeling regional spillovers

Following Coe and Helpman (1995), we model reg. spillovers as:

$$Z_{r'} = \rho_{r'} \cdot \left[\sum_{r} H_r \cdot V_{r,r'} \right]$$
(2)

V_{r,r'}: share of goods of region r imported from region r'.

- \triangleright ρ : regions have partial capacity to capture R&D developed elsewhere.
- In brief, regional spillovers Z_r are modeled based on the *import* share of goods from other regions and the regions' capacity to capture external R&D.
- Thus, regions able to stimulate their own R&D policies can become a growth factor for other regions, through knowledge spillovers.

RHOMOLO RnD: Production function

Value added output is produced in a CES combination of public capital (KG_r^d) , private capital $(K_{r,i})$ and labour $(L_{r,i})$:

$$Y_{r,i} = \left(\mathcal{K}\mathcal{G}_r^d \right)^{\psi} \left[\zeta_{r,i}^{\mathcal{K}} \left(\mathcal{H}_r \mathcal{K}_{r,i} \right)^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + \zeta_{r,i}^L \mathcal{L}_{r,i}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}$$
(3)

where we assume that:

- Accumulated knowledge, H_r, enters the production function as a form of capital-augmenting technological change.
- Effective public capital KG^d_r is an unpaid production factor (Barro (1990), Baxter and King, (1993)).
- ψ : elasticity of value added to public capital.
- σ : elasticity of substitution of private capital and labour inputs.
- ζ^{K} , ζ^{L} : share parameters of private capital and labour inputs respectively.

Calibration

- 235 NUTS2 EU regions and 10 sector economies.
- 2017 data using social accounting matrices (SAMs) García Rodríguez et al. 2023.
- ▶ Bilateral transport costs (Persyn et al. (2022)).
- Unemployment rates, employment by skills, fixed costs are calibrated on the basis of the annual European Regional Economic Accounts data, the EU Labour Force Survey, the European Structural Business Statistics.
- Structural and behavioural parameters of the model are common across regions and based as standard in the literature.

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

How we work

- The model is solved following a recursive dynamic approach, starting from a baseline initial equilibrium calibrated for 2017.
- The model remains in a steady state unless an exogenous shock occurs, such as public investment increase or firm productivity policies.
- Our simulations include the model with distortionary labour taxation or lump sump taxation.
- We present general equilibirum effects on GDP and welfare.
- Then, we examine how regional characteristics affect the impact of the policy by running regressions on simulated data.

Economic channels to model innovation policy

According to official impact assessment (EC, 2024):

- ▶ 40% of the H2020 funding are allocated to basic research.
- ▶ 60% to applied research.
- 1. Basic research funding occurs via public investment increase:
 - Public investment
 - temporary increase in regional public capital stock benefiting all firms (supply-side effect of the policy).
- 2. Applied research funding is assumed to:
 - Reduce the user cost of capital \Rightarrow increase private investment.

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Subsidise R&D workers: ⇒ reduction of R&D labour cost positively affects capital productivity via the accumulation equation.

Results: Macroeconomic impact of EU H2020

GDP impact regional distribution (% dev. from steady state GDP), periods 10 and 40



▶ Period 10: Distortionary taxation ⇒ short/medium-run negative effects.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ → □ ・ つくぐ

Period 40: All regions have positive GDP impact in the long-run.

Results: Welfare impact of EU H2020

Compensating variation of consumption, Distortionary taxation, period 40



Negative effects in several Central European regions. Northern European regions as well as regions in Italy and Greece have high welfare impacts.

Results: Welfare impact of EU H2020

Non-distortionary taxation, period 40



With non-distortionary taxation results are milder.

Results: The importance of initial conditions

Regional cross-sectional regression analysis on **simulated changes GDP** in periods 10 and 40, using pre-shock economic variables as explanatory variables:

- ▶ Initial value of capital share of total income (Tamura et al. (2019))
- Measure of backward/input-output linkages (Miller and Blair (2009))
- Regional openness (Zachariadis (2004))
- Initial level of unemployment rate

We also perform regression analysis at the regional level on the **simulated change in exports** using as explanatory variables additionally:

- Initial share of exports to trading partners benefiting directly from H2020 funds.
- Initial share of exports to regions with higher R&D intensity.

Results: Determinants of the impact on regional GDP

	Dependent	variable: Per	centage chan	ges in GDP	
	T=	=10	T=40		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Shock	39.660***	40.682***	27.840***	23.992***	
	(2.346)	(2.271)	(2.618)	(2.263)	
6h. Kap		0.651***		1.229***	
		(0.149)		(0.148)	
O Linkages		0.015		0.053***	
		(0.015)		ges in GDP =40 (4) 23.992*** (2.263) 1.229*** (0.148) 0.053*** (0.015) 0.066*** (0.021) 0.003 (0.020) 0.618*** (0.157) -0.802*** (0.157) -0.802*** (0.102) 235 0.581 0.570	
Open H20		0.058***		0.066***	
		(0.022)		(0.021)	
Dpen R&D		0.062***		0.003	
		(0.020)		(0.020)	
Jnemp. rate		-0.335**		0.618***	
		(0.158)		(0.157)	
Constant	-0.137***	-0.692***	0.095***	-0.802***	
	(0.012)	(0.102)	(0.014)	(0.102)	
Observations	235	235	235	235	
\mathbb{R}^2	0.551	0.649	0.327	0.581	
Adjusted R ²	0.549	0.640	0.324	0.570	

Results: Determinants of the impact on regional GDP

- The exogenous H2020 shock explains more than 50% of the variability in short-run GDP deviations from the steady state.
- Moving from the short run to the long run the importance of the exogenous shock diminishes (32.7% R², H2020 is deployed over 8 years).
- Introducing the calibrated shares as explanatory variables:
 - Initial conditions play a much more important role in the long-run where they contribute in explaining an additional 30% of variability.
 - Regions with higher capital share and trade openness to trading partners receiving substantial H2020 funding are more prone to a larger GDP impact in the long-run.
 - Regions with stronger backward linkages benefit from the increased demand generated by the policy.
 - Unemployment rate is negative in the short-run but positive in the long-run; distortionary taxation effects.

Results: Determinants of the impact on regional GDP

	Dependent variable: Percentage changes in exports					
	T=	=10	T=40			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
Shock	33.447***	33.920***	22.858***	21.318***		
	(2.142)	(1.891)	(2.404)	(1.791)		
Sh. Kap		0.525***		1.061***		
		(0.128)		(0.121)		
Sh. ExpH20		0.084**		0.084**		
		(0.039)		(0.037)		
Sh. ExpR&D		0.140***		-0.004		
		(0.037)		(0.035)		
Unemp. rate		-0.042		0.984***		
		(0.137)		(0.130)		
Constant	-0.110***	-0.569***	0.122***	-0.561***		
	(0.011)	(0.075)	(0.013)	(0.071)		
Observations	235	235	235	235		
R ²	0.511	0.631	0.280	0.612		
Adjusted R ²	0.509	0.622	0.276	0.603		
Note:		*p	<0.1; **p<0.0	05; ***p<0.01		

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Results: Determinants of the impact on regional exports

- EU H2020 innovation policy aims to boost regional productivity, increase competitiveness (place competitiveness as in Storper (1997)) and stimulate exports of goods and services.
- ► The exogenous H2020 shock can explain the regional distribution of exports at 51.1% in the short-run but only at 28% in the long-run.
- Introducing the calibrated shares as explanatory variables:
 - Initial conditions are crucial to exploiting H2020 funding: R² increases in both periods.
 - Regions with strong capital shares and trade patterns can better leverage funding benefits.
 - Unemployment rate is positively significant in the long-run: a larger pool of available labour exerts less downward pressure on wages. Thus, competitiveness is improved through lower commodity prices.

Conclusion

- We evaluated the economic impact of the EU Horizon 2020 policy funding from 2014 to 2022.
- To do so, we introduced R&D-based semi-endogenous growth in a spatial dynamic general equilibrium model with 235 EU regions.
- We find that the policy has a positive impact on GDP, with considerable territorial heterogeneity.
- GDP gains are expected to remain significant after the program ends due to the process and product innovations of H2020 funds.
- Regression analysis reveals the importance of regional initial conditions to explain GDP and competitiveness effects.
- Our results suggest that innovation policy is key to promote regional development, and highlight the essential role of the entrepreneurial state as a creator of the knowledge economy.

Thank you for your attention!

Get in touch Email: tryfonas.christou@ec.europa.eu Personal website: https://sites.google.com/view/tryfonaschristou/

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

Appendix: Robustness and sensitivity analysis

Distortionary taxation vs lump-sum taxation

	Baseline parametrization				Alte	Alternative parametrization			
	Dist. tax		Non-Dist. tax		(a)		(b)		
	t = 10	t = 40	t = 10	t = 40	t = 10	t = 40	t = 10	t = 40	
Q1	-0.11	0.07	0.08	0.09	-0.05	0.10	-0.02	0.13	
Median	-0.04	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.01	0.18	0.04	0.21	
Q3	0.07	0.25	0.27	0.29	0.15	0.32	0.20	0.38	

- A crucial factor affecting the final outcome of our analysis in the financing of H2020.
- Distortionary taxation introduces negative supply-side effects that counteract the expansionary government stimulus.
- Using lump-sum taxation, the negative impact disappears in the short run: the supply-side stimulus dominates the demand-side effect of a reduction in household income.

Appendix: Robustness and sensitivity analysis

Distortionary taxation vs lump-sum taxation

	Baseline parametrization				Alte	rnative parametrization			
	Dist. tax		Non-Dist. tax		(a)		(b)		
	t = 10	t = 40	t = 10	t = 40	t = 10	t = 40	t = 10	t = 40	
Q1	-0.11	0.07	0.08	0.09	-0.05	0.10	-0.02	0.13	
Median	-0.04	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.01	0.18	0.04	0.21	
Q3	0.07	0.25	0.27	0.29	0.15	0.32	0.20	0.38	

Sensitivity analysis for key parameters in the model:

- Elasticity of output to public capital (ψ), elasticity of subsitution between capital and labour (σ), R&D spillover parameter (ρ).
- Two sets of parameters: (a): {ψ = 0.1; σ = 0.8; ρ = 0.2} and (b): {ψ = 0.12; σ = 1.2; ρ = 0.3}
- Median and first quietly improve significantly with the adjusted elasticity.