

Gatekeepers of Knowledge versus Platforms of Knowledge: from potential to realized absorptive capacity

Longhi, Christian; Thomas, Catherine; Lazaric, Nathalie

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Longhi, C., Thomas, C., & Lazaric, N. (2008). Gatekeepers of Knowledge versus Platforms of Knowledge: from potential to realized absorptive capacity. *Regional Studies*, 42(6), 837-852. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400701827386>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu>. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu>. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this document must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



**Gatekeepers of Knowledge versus Platforms of Knowledge:
from potential to realized absorptive capacity.**

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2006-0147.R2
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	L86 - Information and Internet Services Computer Software < L8 - Industry Studies: Services < L - Industrial Organization, L96 - Telecommunications < L9 - Industry Studies: Transportation and Utilities < L - Industrial Organization, N9 - Regional and Urban History < N - Economic History, O3 - Technological Change Research and Development < O - Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth
Keywords:	High tech clusters, Knowledge, Gatekeeper, Platform of Knowledge, Sophia Antipols

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Gatekeepers of Knowledge *versus* Platforms of Knowledge: from potential to realized
4 absorptive capacity.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Nathalie Lazaric

11
12 GREDEG – University of Nice Sophia Antipolis and CNRS, 250 rue Albert Einstein, Sophia
13 Antipolis, 06560 Valbonne, France, lazaric@gredeg.cnrs.fr
14

15
16
17
18
19 Christian Longhi (corresponding author)

20
21 GREDEG – University of Nice Sophia Antipolis and CNRS, 250 rue Albert Einstein, Sophia
22 Antipolis, 06560 Valbonne, France, longhi@gredeg.cnrs.fr
23
24
25

26
27
28 Catherine Thomas

29
30 Université Paul Verlaine – Metz and GREDEG – University of Nice Sophia Antipolis and CNRS,
31 250 rue Albert Einstein, Sophia Antipolis, 06560 Valbonne, France, thomas@gredeg.cnrs.fr
32
33
34
35

36
37 First submitted: June 2006

38
39 Accepted: September 2007
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Abstract. The development of clusters rests on geographical proximity, cognitive interactions
48 as well as entrepreneurial initiatives. Sophia-Antipolis, a multi-technology cluster, is a good
49 illustration of the type of challenges local systems of innovation face in creating positive
50 knowledge externalities. This paper shows that if the existence of ‘gatekeepers of knowledge’
51 can generate the potential implementation of ‘absorptive capacity’, its effective realization
52 requires some additional effort regarding the transfer of knowledge into the cluster. The
53 concept of ‘platform of knowledge’ defined shows how a project of knowledge codification
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 could generate externalities by creating new opportunities for effectively combining and
4
5 absorbing knowledge.
6

7
8 Key words. High tech clusters, Knowledge, Gatekeeper, Platform of Knowledge, Sophia
9

10 Antipolis

11
12 JEL Code R11, O3, L20, L86
13
14

15
16
17 Résumé. Le développement des clusters repose sur la proximité géographique, les interactions
18
19 cognitives et les initiatives des entrepreneurs. Sophia-Antipolis, un cluster fondé sur plusieurs
20
21 technologies, est une bonne illustration des obstacles que les systèmes locaux d'innovation
22
23 doivent franchir pour créer des externalités de connaissance positives. Cet article montre que
24
25 l'existence de 'relais de connaissance' ('gatekeepers of knowledge') peut engendrer des
26
27 capacités d'absorption potentielles, mais que leur réalisation effective implique des efforts
28
29 supplémentaires relatifs aux transferts de connaissance dans le cluster. Le concept de 'plate
30
31 forme de connaissance' proposé montre comment un projet de codification des connaissances
32
33 peut générer des externalités en créant des opportunités nouvelles pour combiner et absorber
34
35 des connaissances.
36
37
38
39

40
41 Mots clefs. Cluster high tech, connaissance, plate forme de connaissance, Sophia Antipolis.
42

43
44 JEL Code R11, O3, L20, L86
45
46

47
48 Die Entwicklung der Cluster hängt von der geographische Nähe, kognitiven Interaktionen und
49
50 Initiativen der Unternehmer ab. Sophia Antipolis, ein Multi -Technologie Cluster, ist eine
51
52 gute Illustration der Hemmnisse, die die lokalen Innovationssysteme überwinden müssen, um
53
54 positive Externalitäten zu schaffen. Dieser Artikel zeigt, dass die Existenz von
55
56 „Wissensrelais“ („gatekeepers of knowledge“) potentielle Absorptionsfähigkeiten erzeugen
57
58
59
60

können, aber ihre effektive Realisation zusätzliche Anstrengungen bezüglich der Wissenstransfers in dem Cluster erfordern.

Das Konzept der vorgeschlagenen „Wissensplattform“ zeigt, wie ein Projekt zur Kodifizierung des Wissens Externalitäten hervorrufen kann, indem neue Gelegenheiten geschaffen werden um Wissen zu kombinieren und zu absorbieren.

Schlagwörter: High-Tech Cluster, Wissen, Wissensplattform, Sophia Antipolis

JEL Code R11, O3, L20, L86

Guardianes del conocimiento *frente* a plataformas del conocimiento: de la posible capacidad absorbente a una realidad.

Nathalie Lazaric, Christian Longhi and Catherine Thomas

Abstract.

El desarrollo de las aglomeraciones radica en la proximidad geográfica, las interacciones cognitivas y las iniciativas empresariales. Sophia-Antipolis, una aglomeración multitecnológica, ilustra a la perfección el tipo de retos a los que se enfrentan los sistemas locales de la innovación a la hora de crear efectos externos positivos de conocimiento. En este artículo demostramos que si la existencia de ‘guardianes del conocimiento’ puede generar la posible aplicación de ‘capacidad absorbente’, su realización eficaz requiere un esfuerzo adicional con respecto a la transferencia de conocimiento en la aglomeración. El concepto de ‘plataforma del conocimiento’ que se a definido muestra de qué forma podría un proyecto de codificación del conocimiento generar efectos externos al crear nuevas oportunidades para combinar y absorber eficazmente el conocimiento.

Key words.

Aglomeraciones de alta tecnología

Conocimiento

Guardián

Plataforma del conocimiento

Sophia Antipolis

JEL Code R11, O3, L20, L86

Introduction

High technology clusters are strategic *loci* of creation of knowledge and resources. In the context of the 'learning economy' their role has recently been emphasized in France with the creation of the 'poles of competitiveness' ¹ as keystones of regional policy. These 'poles' are supposed to be interconnected and open to their environment; such integration into global innovative networks appears to be an important condition for their viability. A vast amount of literature has emphasized the crucial role of space in building localized capabilities and learning (Maskell and Malmberg 1999, Keeble *et al* 1998 among others). In this context, space is no longer considered as a container but as a set of potential interactions between different sets of actors (Coffey and Bailly 1996; Rychen and Zimmermann 2006).

Our article aims to illustrate such interactions inside clusters; *i.e.* their ability to create local knowledge, to diffuse and absorb it during innovative projects. We shall show that these conditions may fluctuate according to the local organisational set ups implemented in the cluster. Indeed, Markusen (1996) has shown that different forms of territories could coexist. Consequently the same geographical area can evolve into diverse organizational forms depending on the specific small events and feedbacks in the area (Arthur 1990).

We shall illustrate why the development of clusters rests on the creation of local competencies through geographical proximity, cognitive interactions as well as entrepreneurial initiatives. We shall introduce the distinction between potential and realized 'absorptive capacity' (Zahra and George, 2002) so as to show the necessity of re-examining

1
2
3 the notion of ‘gatekeepers of knowledge’ and of discussing its possible evolution into a new
4
5 one: that of ‘platform of knowledge’. The Sophia Antipolis Information and Communication
6
7 Technology cluster (thereafter ICT cluster), one of the main European high tech centres, will
8
9 be investigated. This cluster was created recently enough for us to provide an overview of its
10
11 history, and of the ‘small events’ that have contributed to intensify its local interactions.
12
13

14
15 The first part of our article discusses issues related to knowledge at territorial level.
16
17 Local systems, as well as what we understand as proximity, have evolved substantially over
18
19 time, mainly because of the globalization of innovation processes that characterises modern
20
21 economies. This is one of the reasons why knowledge codification may provide opportunities
22
23 to change the traditional roles and may create a knowledge-fostering dynamic and a capacity
24
25 to reinforce local competitive advantage. In the second section of the article, we provide an
26
27 historical overview of Sophia Antipolis, so as to illustrate some of the local conditions that
28
29 have contributed to transforming the ‘satellite platform’ into a ‘platform of knowledge’.
30
31 Finally, the third section contains a description of a specific dynamic at work locally that has
32
33 contributed to the development of the ICT cluster. This dynamic will be illustrated through
34
35 the presentation of the ‘Knowledge Management Platform’ project (thereafter KMP), which
36
37 has generated various externalities.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 1. Localized learning and knowledge dynamic

51
52 The creation of localized capabilities is a delicate process generating knowledge externalities
53
54 that have to be channelled both inside and outside the cluster. In traditional districts
55
56 ‘gatekeepers of knowledge’ assume this role. However the evolution of traditional districts
57
58 and the creation of high tech clusters necessitate the development of new knowledge
59
60

1
2
3 combinations so that their growth can be sustained. 'Gatekeepers of knowledge' may have
4
5 some limitations in this cognitive process. Their *transferring function* may not always be
6
7 effective in a network where knowledge has to be efficiently distributed. For this reason such
8
9 actors could evolve by transforming themselves into knowledge creators. This requires a shift
10
11 in their approach to knowledge sharing from closure to disclosure. The effective realization of
12
13 'absorptive capacity' by cluster's members plays a vital role in sustaining such
14
15 entrepreneurial initiatives.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 1.1. Knowledge platform or how to move beyond the traditional role of 'knowledge 24 gatekeepers' 25 26

27
28 How knowledge is created and diffused at local level is a crucial issue for academics,
29
30 practitioners and politicians. This question is not new and has for a long time been discussed
31
32 in the debate concerning the geography of innovation. Audresch and Feldman (1996), in a
33
34 seminal work on R&D investments underline the propensity for industrial activity to cluster
35
36 spatially in order to benefit from knowledge externalities. However the real question is not
37
38 that of the clustering effect, which has long been observed, but the differences in localization
39
40 behaviours and in the ability to capture these externalities. These differences could be
41
42 explained through the concept of 'knowledge filter', a concept that translates the diversity
43
44 with which the different actors convert existing opportunities into real innovations and
45
46 products (Acs *et al.*, 2003). Indeed, the traditional rhetoric according to which can
47
48 automatically be transformed into industrial products, is not sufficient to explain knowledge
49
50 spillovers. New knowledge can be exploited by the actors but these opportunities, which have
51
52 to be discovered, do not emerge spontaneously. On the contrary, before it can become an
53
54 opportunity, knowledge has to be identified clearly. There is a filter between the stock of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 knowledge and its use, *i.e.* an absorptive capacity on the part of the recipient and the emitter
4
5 for successful combination to occur (Acs *et al.*, *ibid*).
6
7

8
9 The basic attributes of knowledge concern these various externalities and its potential
10 openness. Knowledge is distributed among various decentralized units and needs to be shared
11 and absorbed in a local context. As Schumpeter claimed long ago, knowledge has to be
12 combined in order to produce innovation. This alchemy is far from automatic because some
13 opportunity must pre-exist in order for viable interactions to occur (Nahapiet and Ghoshal,
14 1998). This shows that motivation is essential for such exchange to be beneficial. Indeed
15 without the engagement of the firms and actors, knowledge will retain its “sticky” nature and
16 will reinforce the ‘knowledge filter’ mentioned above (Szulzanski, *et al*, 2004).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 If we assume that knowledge is distributed among various groups, communities or
29 firms, knowledge is also spatially bounded. In this context, the globalization of innovation is
30 concomitant with its localization emphasizing why both tacit and codified knowledge are
31 necessary for sustaining knowledge creation². Because of its complexity, the innovative
32 process has to be regulated and coordinated, so that the ‘absorption capacity’ of each
33 organisation can be increased (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 In the description of a Chilean cluster in Cochagua Valley, Giuliani and Bell (2005)
44 define ‘a cluster’s absorptive capacity as the capacity of a cluster to absorb, diffuse and
45 exploit extra-cluster knowledge’ (*ibid*, p. 49). Firms with higher absorptive capacities are
46 more likely to build external ties so as to reinforce their innovative capacities. The absorptive
47 capacities of the local actors vary, preventing the uniform diffusion of knowledge. For
48 example, some firms may transfer more knowledge than they initially receive and play an
49 active role; others may act as ‘net absorbers’. This variety generates an imbalance during
50 interactions depending on the knowledge base of the firms and their position in the cluster.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 network in transferring knowledge while being strongly connected to external sources of
4
5 knowledge; others are ‘active mutual exchangers’, i.e. characterised by the right balance of
6
7 absorption and diffusion of knowledge, while others still may appear to play the role of ‘weak
8
9 mutual exchangers’ with a balanced role of absorber. External stars have strong ties with
10
11 external sources of knowledge and limited connections within the cluster, while ‘isolated
12
13 firms’ have no strong connections either within or outside the cluster (Giuliani and Bell, *ibid*,
14
15 p. 60).
16
17
18
19

20 This *external openness* however, is related to the territory’s specificity. Usually
21
22 industrial districts are characterised by an important degree of similarity between the
23
24 knowledge bases of the various actors. In the Chilean Wine cluster, the main problem is that
25
26 of renewing the traditional knowledge base by importing fresh ideas. In high tech clusters, the
27
28 opposite situation may exist because firms have diverse knowledge bases with external
29
30 connections and consequently need to increase their *own interactions* in order to combine
31
32 knowledge efficiently. In spite of this significant difference, the question of the governance of
33
34 knowledge – i.e. implementing common rules in order to enhance the actors’ capacity to
35
36 combine knowledge - is common to all clusters. In clear, ‘technological gatekeepers’ - in the
37
38 sense given by Giuliani and Bell (*ibid*) - or ‘knowledge gatekeepers’ - according to Morrison
39
40 terminology- do exist and are not just a fable. Let us be more explicit on their relative
41
42 attributes.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The ‘gatekeepers of knowledge’ can be present during coordination and learning
50
51 process (Allen 1977; Morrison 2004; Rychen and Zimmermann 2006). According to Morrison,
52
53 gatekeepers constitute ‘a small community, they are at the core of an information network,
54
55 they are exposed to external sources of information, and the linkages they develop with
56
57 external actors are mostly informal’ (Morrison, *ibid*, p. 7). They are at the heart of the
58
59
60

1
2
3 network and could either create ‘network externalities’ or restrict knowledge access
4
5 intentionally or unintentionally. In effect they have various roles:

- 6
7
8 - a knowledge *searching function* for capturing external sources of information,
9
10 - a *transcoding function* for translating the meaning of such an information,
11
12 - a *transferring function* for disseminating accumulated and local knowledge (Morrison, *ibid*
13
14 p. 8).
15
16

17
18 If this latter function is not realized, the existence of knowledge variety cannot
19
20 generate new combinations and lead to a lack of local innovation.
21
22

23
24 In his seminal work on clusters, Porter has described their main attributes: their
25
26 potential upgrading role, in the industrial specialization, through the presence of fruitful
27
28 interactions concerning the demand side (Porter, 2000). These externalities result from the
29
30 combinations of close and distant interactions, their mobilization materializing into local
31
32 capabilities. The difference between traditional districts and high tech clusters resides in the
33
34 latter’s ability to provide new knowledge combinations adapted to future markets and future
35
36 products present in the region. This local coordination and local entrepreneurship can be
37
38 promoted by leaders firms or ‘gatekeepers of knowledge’ (Morrison *ibid*; Albino *et al*, 1996).
39
40 However the ‘knowledge filter’ may obstruct the operation of a real *transferring function*
41
42
43
44
45 between each local firms or institutions.
46
47

48
49 In order to avoid this problem, a ‘platform of knowledge’ could be built inside the
50
51 cluster so as to regulate external and internal linkages. Its purpose is to overcome the
52
53 traditional obstacles to cooperation, and promote the development of suitable interactions
54
55 between the different sources of technological know-how, so as to reinforce the combinative
56
57 capabilities, create viable rules and finally realize the *transcoding* and *transferring* functions.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our basic hypothesis, therefore, is that a cluster can benefit from latent ‘network externalities’
4
5 between organizations to innovate.
6
7

8
9 In high tech clusters, the main issue is not so much the creation of external links,
10 which are already present, but the reduction of the ‘cognitive distance’ between firms that
11 belong to various technological fields. A balance must be found between local and global
12 learning within technological trajectories so as to facilitate the creation of new opportunities
13 with existing knowledge bases. The network could be envisaged here as a means of going
14 beyond the traditional dilemma between exploitation and exploration and of offering both
15 specialization and variety generation:
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 ‘Networks offer the benefit of both specialization and variety generation. The superior abilities of
27 markets to generate variety are a commonplace belief... The converse of this statement is that firms are superior
28 vehicles for the accumulation of specialized learning... Specialization and variety are antithetical within the
29 firm, but define complements within a network (...) network capabilities...are not specific to a firm, but
30 represent joint gains to coordination and learning’ (Kogut, 2000: 406).
31
32
33
34
35

36 The ‘platform of knowledge’ may regulate knowledge spillovers, by creating
37 ‘Marshallian externalities’ related to gains of specialization and interactions between
38 organisations that need to accumulate know-how in a specific technological field (the
39 exploitation stage) or, on the contrary, by creating ‘Jacobian externalities’ that facilitate the
40 search and exchange of complementary knowledge (the exploration stage). This trade off is
41 crucial for coping with existing opportunities and for promoting evolution in the face of
42 disruptive changes imposed by technological progress and globalisation (Iammarino and Mac
43 Cann, 2006).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 However the governance of ‘network externalities’ requires the development of
56 specific capabilities to avoid the absorption of knowledge by a small group of firms. The
57 ‘platform of knowledge’ may be designed *via* a codification of knowledge, which makes it
58
59
60

1
2
3 possible to go beyond the traditional role of knowledge gatekeepers. Codification however is
4
5 only one aspect of knowledge creation; the other is the development of shared knowledge and
6
7 tacit knowledge between the members of a community (Lazaric *et al*, 2003).
8
9

10
11 Very recently the debate concerning regional knowledge platforms has galvanized the
12
13 attention of some authors and has led them to explore possibilities of regional development
14
15 involving various actors located within a cluster (firms, knowledge centre, research centre)
16
17 (Hammaakorpi and Melkas 2005, Harmaakorpi 2006, Cooke 2006, Asheim *et al* 2006). In the
18
19 case of Lahti in Finland, a regional platform has been developed to improve the absorptive
20
21 capacity of the cluster by identifying the various existing tendencies and by elaborating
22
23 various scenarios around the 'related variety' that could be created, reinforced or imagined
24
25 (variety along the traditional technological trajectory or between various technological
26
27 trajectories). The main objective is to look beyond this variety and 'enhance 'visualization'
28
29 and 'potentialisation' for the region' (Cooke, *ibid*, p. 14). This highly empirical reflection
30
31 emphasizes the importance of communication for preventing the emergence of the so called
32
33 'knowledge filter' and for benefiting from the real 'network externalities' that exist in the
34
35 cluster.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 The ambition of these regional development platforms is driven by the multipurpose
44
45 character of technologies present at diverse stages of the innovative process (Boschma 2005).
46
47 In order to exploit the generic technologies and their potential 'related variety', the platform is
48
49 a stimulating organisational set up to transcend traditional sectoral policies and to exploit
50
51 possible interrelatedness present inside diverse knowledge bases (Asheim *et al* 2006; Nesta
52
53 Saviotti 2006).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1.2. Creating localized capabilities: from ‘potential absorptive capacity’ to ‘realized
4 absorptive capacity’
5
6
7

8
9 It is generally acknowledged that the development of high technology clusters is not a
10 deterministic process, but the result of a chaotic and dynamic process through which activities
11 are coordinated and a common language is developed. (Malmberg and Maskell 1999;
12 Lorenzen and Foss 2003; Nooteboom 2003).
13
14
15
16

17
18 In effect a cluster
19

20
21 ‘... merges to the extent that a group of firms establish -intentionally and /or
22 unintentionally- mechanisms of coordination that strongly reduce the various transaction
23 costs involved in the process coordinating the process of innovation between legally
24 independent firms, and where these coordination mechanisms a specific to the set of
25 geographically bounded agents’ (Lorenzen and Foss 2003).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 This definition which goes beyond the classic argument of geographical proximity,
35 promotes the entrepreneurial willingness to coordinate the division of labour in order to
36 reduce transaction costs, create local capabilities and to diffuse a shared vision of business
37 growth among diverse technological trajectories (see also Cooke 2003). In this sense, clusters
38 are ‘organized markets’ aiming to reduce the cognitive distance between different firms
39 (Maskell and Lorenzen, 2003). Cognitive distance plays a pivotal role here because it
40 reinforces or reduces diversity within a network (Nooteboom, *ibid*; Kogut *ibid*), which may
41 become an obstacle³. Consequently the nature and the importance of the ‘cognitive distance’
42 between firms are critical for reducing the ‘knowledge filter’ in a cluster.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Clusters are essential for the exploration of new opportunities and for helping firms to
56 move beyond their traditional views of the market and technological trajectories. Firms can
57 absorb new external knowledge by creating combinations with localised or external firms. In
58
59
60

1
2
3 this sense, the cluster should not be reduced to a set-up stimulating the exchange of tacit
4 knowledge and shared understanding, but should be sufficiently open to allow the
5 dissemination of new ideas (be they tacit, articulated or codified). If openness is crucial for
6 the exploration of external markets and to the understanding of a successful cluster,
7 information accumulation however should not become a substitute for relevant knowledge⁴.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 The creation of localised capabilities, the reduction of transaction costs and the
16 building of a shared vision of the market for future technological opportunities, require an
17 original form of knowledge lying between the tacit and codified types. Clusters offer such
18 opportunities if knowledge is mobilized through local interactions and if existing
19 potentialities are utilized. Let us be more explicit on this point. Knowledge base is the
20 invisible part of the process which could be expressed in various competencies (technological,
21 organisational, and relational ones). Competences are knowledge in use whereas the
22 knowledge base is the vast amount not always materialized in the realization of products or
23 technologies. Indeed before having access to some elements of the knowledge base and its
24 possible interrelatedness, firms may have the opportunity to identify some competences
25 present at the regional level for evaluating their fitness with their prior knowledge. The
26 absorption of knowledge and is far to be an automatic procedure (Cohen and Levinthal 1990;
27 Boschma 2006). For obtaining some local competitive advantage at regional level, firms have
28 to mobilize energy to materialize potentialities inherent to their knowledge bases: i.e. their
29 potential absorptive capacity -thereafter PACAP- (Zahra and George, 2002). The realization
30 of absorptive capacity -thereafter RACAP- through effective innovation has to be initiated in
31 order to be created. The passage from PACAP to RACAP is not only a period going beyond a
32 simple discovery of knowledge base, but it also a stage where some competencies are
33 integrated. We argue, here, that while leader firms play a crucial role in absorbing and
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 enriching their own knowledge base, they may not have the motivation or the capacity to
4
5 invest their energy in the local community.
6
7

8
9 Various reasons could explain such behaviour. First of all, accumulation and/or
10 creation of knowledge may require some industrial prerequisites concerning the
11 complementarity between the different knowledge bases. More generally, this argument
12 concerns the knowledge-based industrial dynamics that make the process viable: the various
13 stages of development in the ICT value chain for example, the technological strategy of each
14 firm concerning the division of labour, the technological protocols facilitating or impeding
15 such cooperation. Secondly, institutional barriers may hinder knowledge diffusion by
16 preventing the disclosure of knowledge to the public or by creating a climate of suspicion
17 against the diffusion of academics results, or simply because of the absence of any
18 organization that would diffuse reliable information and knowledge to the local community
19 (Krafft, 2004).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 In a context where the diffusion and transfer of knowledge and know-how are
36 difficult, the actors have to be motivated and committed. This dynamic can be created if the
37 local actors benefit from working together in specific fields in order to create and develop
38 specific innovative products and produce original combinations of know-how. A spirit of
39 local entrepreneurship can emerge and enable the actors to convert this know-how into
40 innovations, as long as the social mechanisms at work locally are able to support these
41 exchanges and combinations. The *transferring function* can be fulfilled through the 'platform
42 of knowledge', which may provide opportunities to conduct new knowledge combinations. It
43 also creates some potential RACAP while generating indirect social integration mechanisms
44 for maintaining social compromises, particularly those related to knowledge diffusion.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 The following figure illustrates the mechanisms of absorptive capacity.
60

1
2
3 <Figure 1 here>
4
5

6 To summarize this debate, we argue that in a cluster, interactions and social
7 integration mechanisms are created in a dual process. The first part of this process is related to
8 the 'cognitive distance' that exists in the cluster, and the second part is political and related to
9 an effective mobilization and engagement of the local capabilities in order to overcome the
10 existing obstacles to cooperation (industrial and institutional ones notably).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 2. Sophia Antipolis: from Satellite Platform to Platform of knowledge. 22 23 24 25 26

27 The story of Sophia Antipolis illustrates how the conditions of the creation or development of
28 a localized knowledge base, the mobilization of internal or external knowledge, can change
29 according the organisational design or innovation regime that prevail locally. If Sophia-
30 Antipolis, born as a 'satellite platform' following Markusen's typology, has evolved to a high
31 technology cluster built around the telecommunication technologies, the presence of the
32 'knowledge filter' across the cluster significantly slows down the potential innovative
33 process. The diversity of the knowledge bases is critical here for the creation of localized
34 capabilities. The creation of a 'platform of knowledge' and the mobilization of various actors
35 related to ICT cluster may contribute to reducing such variety by reinforcing the social
36 mechanisms. The KMP project illustrates such a process of transformation of traditional
37 'gatekeepers of knowledge'. However as we will show, such a process is not an easy task and
38 the mobilisation of local actors is a by-product of various events leading to the gradual
39 emergence of local entrepreneurship.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.1. From satellite platform...

1
2
3 The choice of Sophia Antipolis for the development of a high-tech innovation cluster might
4 seem strange at first sight, since the region had neither an industrial nor a university base.
5
6 Nevertheless, the area did have some significant assets, including an international airport, a
7
8 pleasant climate and a cosmopolitan tradition. However, apart from the existence of
9
10 significant infrastructures nothing predisposed the region to high technology based economic
11
12 development.
13
14
15
16
17

18 Sophia Antipolis was the result of a succession of ‘small events’ that occurred during
19
20 the 1960s (for a detailed analysis of the Sophia Antipolis experiment see Longhi and Quéré
21
22 1994; Longhi 1999; Garnsey and Longhi 2004). A significant one, at the beginning of the
23
24 process of development, was the establishment in 1960 of an IBM research centre near Nice.
25
26 Texas Instruments soon followed IBM, a move that lent some credibility to the idea of a Sun
27
28 Belt effect. Still, these ideas might have come to nothing were it not for the influence of one
29
30 man, Pierre Lafitte⁵. He had a utopian vision of a rural ‘Quartier Latin’, a ‘City of Science
31
32 and Wisdom’, and endeavoured to transform this vision into a project. Another decision
33
34 proved crucial: France Telecom’s decision to set up an infrastructure base in Sophia
35
36 Antipolis was decisive in the creation of a national and international communication network.
37
38
39
40
41

42 Pierre Lafitte’s ideas were diffused quite quickly. The project took off to a fast start
43
44 thanks to the relocation of a number of external organisations into the area; these
45
46 organisations were attracted by the quality of the infrastructures existing in the area. The
47
48 French decentralisation process led to the relocation of several large public companies and
49
50 laboratories. This process was later followed by a campaign to promote the region, with an
51
52 emphasis on its climate attractiveness and its industrial facilities. Large multinational
53
54 companies (mostly American) chose Sophia Antipolis either as their European administrative
55
56 base or as a R&D centre in charge of adapting their products to the European markets. Global
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 firms invested heavily in the area, establishing self-contained units capable of operating
4
5 without any local links.
6
7

8
9 The newly relocated companies had their own resources and their development could
10 have been pursued with no interactions between them. All decision-making and industrial
11 strategies were planned outside Sophia-Antipolis. So, despite the territorial proximity, the
12 'cognitive distance' between the various organisations (public and private) was significant in
13 the early stages of development and the interactions between them sparse. These small events
14 created a 'satellite platform' for using Markusen's (1996) taxonomy, i.e. a system directed
15 from outside, rich in external connections but deprived of internal linkages. Despite this, a
16 process that reinforced the early expansion soon set in. The agglomeration resulted in the
17 emergence of two main clusters of technological activity. The first cluster comprises
18 organisations specialised in the fields of computer science, telecommunications and
19 electronics. It was this first cluster that provided the impetus for the growth of the project and
20 structured the development of its industrial environment⁶. The second cluster is home to life
21 and health sciences. Thus, Sophia-Antipolis was composed of independent co-located firms
22 whose strategic choices were largely constrained by external decisions taken by the parent
23 companies. Nevertheless, these initial conditions played an important role in developing
24 future local and original resources (Longhi and Quéré, 1994).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 2.2. ... to crisis

51
52 The limits to the growth of Sophia Antipolis were strongly related to the conditions under
53 which it was created, i.e. lack of a local labour market, weakness of endogenous resources and
54 scarcity of SMEs and specialized services. Over time however, the accumulation of economic
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 activities on the site triggered a number of positive processes that mitigated these limitations
4
5 until a crisis occurred in the early 1990s.
6
7

8
9 A first process was related to the human capital present locally. The arrival of public
10 education and research institutes in Sophia Antipolis - as a result of the decentralisation
11 policy- (the Ecole des Mines, the CNRS and the INRIA⁷) play an important role in sustaining
12 endogenous growth. INRIA in particular played a fundamental role in structuring local
13 technological development, thus favouring the emergence of an endogenous innovative
14 capacity and local start-ups. However, this potential proved to be rather insufficient to train
15 the graduates required for the development of a local labour market. A significant event in
16 this regard was the decision to move some of Nice University's research institutes and PhD's
17 programmes to Sophia-Antipolis. The shift, which began in 1986, soon reached a critical
18 mass.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 A second element was the creation of service activities. Despite its heterogeneity, this
34 activity has grown significantly since 1982. Today, it represents 28% of all jobs and more
35 than 50% of all firms. Its growth can be partly explained by a catch up effect, due to the
36 original absence of services in a 'greenfield' site like Sophia-Antipolis. These various
37 elements have contributed to the reversal of the site's established trends of exogenous
38 oriented development and to the creation of some localized capabilities able to sustain local
39 innovative processes. However, in the 1990s doubts were raised concerning these
40 developments.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The crisis that characterized the early 1990s had a considerable impact on Sophia-
53 Antipolis. First, the crisis struck at the heart of the project's growth engine - i.e. the computer
54 science activities - which forced many large firms to downsize. Secondly, it gave rise to
55 serious doubts as to the validity of the project's development strategy, which was essentially a
56 marketing strategy attracting investments from large firms. Whereas the 1980s had been
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 characterized by multinational developments driven by market processes, the 1990s brought
4
5 on new forms of globalisation.
6
7

8
9 The nature of the globalisation process in high tech activities changed dramatically in
10
11 the 1990s (Veltz, 1993; Longhi, 2003; Maskell and Malmberg 1999) and the creation of
12
13 localized innovative activities proved to be crucial. As the development of specific
14
15 capabilities and knowledge is critical, location does matter. This explains why a new
16
17 development strategy, based on local resources and competencies, had to be generated. In this
18
19 context, knowledge creation and absorption became critical for the viability of the cluster,
20
21 generating a suitable balance between local and global interactions (Rychen and Zimmerman,
22
23 2006). Historically, only external relations seem to have been extensively developed, whereas
24
25 relations of proximity were underdeveloped, which prevented the development of social
26
27 integration mechanisms.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 2.3. ...and to the emergence of the future platform of knowledge

36
37
38 Following a period of instability in the early 1990s, new dynamics emerged in the area. The
39
40 growth regime shifted from exogenous to endogenous dynamics, and new interactions
41
42 between local firms and/or research institutes were generated (Garnsey and Longhi 2004).
43
44 The constraints were no longer related to a simple question of attractiveness, but to innovation
45
46 and knowledge, and its specific coordination. An important part in this change was played by
47
48 the park's professional associations, which initiated the development of local interactions.
49
50
51
52

53
54 The roles of the various business associations and clubs shifted from the traditional
55
56 lobbying to more collective and coordinated initiatives. The Telecom Valley Association was
57
58 one of the first initiatives in this regard. Originally created by the seven local
59
60 telecommunication majors, it now includes all the local actors in the field, be they public or

1
2
3 private, large or small organisations. Faced with a rapidly deteriorating economic position and
4
5 the risk of having to relocate away from the park, this network attempted to make visible the
6
7 local competencies that the actors had accumulated over time in the field of
8
9 telecommunications. This generated important externalities between the members of the
10
11 network and enabled them to share technological visions and resources and combine
12
13 complementary know-how. Today the area is a strategic centre for telecommunication
14
15 activities in Europe, with a specific advantage in wireless technologies. The main European
16
17 institutions defining the standards for telecommunications (ETSI) and Internet (WWW) are
18
19 located in Sophia Antipolis; this places the technopole at the heart of the innovation process
20
21 and makes it a strategic area for gathering information on future technologies. Telecom valley
22
23 is not the only organisation of its type: a number of associations and clubs connecting SMEs
24
25 (Imet, MITSA), research institutes (Persan) or specific technologies (Club Hi-Tech), with the
26
27 explicit aim of promoting networking and local collective learning processes, are present and
28
29 play a fundamental role in coordinating the innovative activities of firms, in providing
30
31 information about both technologies and markets and in developing local ties.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Another important evolution is related to the creation of new SMEs. Historically, spin-
40
41 offs were restricted to research institutions but the crisis shifted this process towards large
42
43 firms. Paradoxically, this creation of new SMEs occurred in the early 1990s, a period during
44
45 which employment growth slumped and large firms began downsizing and outsourcing. A
46
47 wave of 'forced' spin offs gave rise to the creation, by engineers formerly employed by the
48
49 large firms⁸, of local start-ups in software, multimedia, telecommunication and Internet
50
51 technologies. Though several of them subsequently disappeared with the end of the bubble and
52
53 euphoria concerning the 'new economy', the dynamic of creation of new resources was
54
55 maintained and was no longer restricted to large firms.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The shift towards an endogenous growth regime could not have occurred if the area's
4 training and research capabilities had not been developed or in the absence of industrial
5 interdependence. The existence of a local labour market, allowing for skilled labour mobility,
6 contributed to local development by facilitating the diffusion of tacit and technological know-
7 how (Keeble *et al.*, 1998). In addition to the qualified human resources supplied by the higher
8 education institutions, the process of downsizing and externalisation initiated by the large
9 firms led to the emergence of new qualified human resources in the local labour market⁹.

10
11
12 Overall, it has been observed that in the cyclical downturn the IT sector experienced in
13 the mid 2000s did not, actually, affect the cluster. A number of IT firms in Sophia Antipolis
14 continued to grow with only a slow decline in their activities, which could be interpreted as a
15 sign of the good functioning of localized innovation activities (Krafft, *ibid*). The recent move
16 of several multinational firms to Sophia Antipolis is the ultimate confirmation of the park's
17 technological and innovative potential and its position as 'pole of excellence' paves the way
18 for the acknowledgement of local capabilities. Indeed, the arrival of new firms involves
19 neither large investments nor the simple adaptation of existing products or services; they tend
20 to settle in the park as tenants with small units and grow locally drawing on local capabilities.

21
22
23 Growth, almost exclusively endogenous, is now the result of local processes inside the
24 cluster (Garnsey and Longhi, 2004). Moreover, expansion and high skills are concentrated in
25 the information technology sector¹⁰. The emergence this new regime and of new institutional
26 arrangements following the crisis shows that the resources accumulated in the 1980s were
27 sufficient to reconfigure the 'satellite platform'. Whereas public intervention had prevailed at
28 the beginning of the project, the process is now somewhat self-organised and driven by
29 private firms. In order to reinforce regional localized capabilities, Sophia Antipolis has to
30 build networks that will make it possible to sustain innovative activities with local partners.

1
2
3 The Telecom Valley especially, and other associations, have played a key role in
4 changing the coordination processes that prevail in the system with the elaboration of a
5 'platform of knowledge'. Some pivotal firms have developed decisive innovations, related to
6 mobile technologies especially, or introduced new forms of knowledge in the area.
7
8 'Gatekeepers of knowledge' have emerged and present many similarities with the
9 organizational set up defined by Morrison (ibid) due to vertical cooperation. Furthermore, the
10 new ICT cluster is based on different interconnected, but 'cognitively distant' technologies -
11 ranging from microelectronics to telecommunications and software. The evolution from
12 geographical proximity to organized proximity is not a sufficient condition for the emergence
13 of knowledge and innovation from interaction of local firms or actors: face-to-face interaction
14 between two actors cannot alone generate synergies; the latter can only develop between two
15 individuals who share common representations (Torre and Rallet, 2005). These different
16 sectors have had to coordinate their R&D activities in mobile and Internet related
17 technologies for exploiting the 'related variety' present in the cluster. This technological
18 necessity has forced the associations and actors of Telecom Valley to get involved at local
19 level. However, some horizontal processes were still lacking for facilitating the absorption of
20 different knowledge bases across the different sectors.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Indeed, most of the endogenous growth has taken place through vertical productive
44 relationships in a number of specific technological trajectories. The potentialities provided by
45 the presence in Sophia-Antipolis of the main actors in ICT were not fully utilized; that is why
46 it was necessary to find a way of sharing different knowledge bases and of reducing the
47 cognitive distance. In this regard, the 'platform of knowledge' implemented by Telecom
48 Valley has devoted itself to reinforcing the linkages between the different actors present in the
49 area and to promoting and maintaining future collaborations through the implementation of
50 ICT tools. Knowledge needs to be shared before it can be applied and commercialised inside
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the cluster. In the following section we shall describe this process. The issue at stake is
4
5 fundamental for Sophia-Antipolis; the ‘knowledge filter’ is far from negligible, neither are the
6
7 divergences regarding new ideas, opportunities and gains offered to the innovators (Acs *et al.*,
8
9
10
11 ibid).

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 3. The KMP Project

20
21
22 The Telecom Valley association has grown rapidly as a main force in the collective dynamics
23
24 of Sophia Antipolis. It has promoted the development of socio-economic linkages between
25
26 the different actors (public and private, large and small organisations) of the telecom cluster
27
28 and is akin to a self-organized project born from the constraints that emerged during the crisis.
29
30 KMP is an intentional attempt to implement social integration mechanisms that will enable
31
32 the firms to enhance their capacity to combine knowledge absorptive capacity.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 3.1 The KMP Project as a ‘boundary object’ that reinforces social integration
40
41 mechanisms
42

43
44 At the beginning of the new millennium Telecom Valley’s objective was to increase
45
46 innovation and technical knowledge by establishing collaborative agreements between
47
48 academic and industrial players. This objective emerged because of the perception that a
49
50 network could facilitate the development of informal interactions and therefore promote
51
52 mutual understanding within and between the various technological trajectories present in the
53
54 area – which by nature represent a multi-technological field. Unlike industrial districts, the
55
56 firms in the Telecom Valley belong to different professional groups and so share neither a
57
58 similar vision concerning the implementation of innovative projects nor any communication
59
60

1
2
3 codes. For this reason, measures must be taken to facilitate knowledge transfer among the
4
5 various technological poles, so that new knowledge combinations and innovation can be
6
7 generated. In other words this includes the transformation of PACAP into RACAP. This
8
9 requires an increasing commitment of and an immaterial investment by all the local actors in
10
11 order to overcome the 'knowledge filter'.
12
13
14

15 16 17 18 *3.1.1 The goal of the KMP project* 19

20
21 The KMP Project, which was launched in 2002 and ended in 2005, is a good illustration of
22
23 this new initiative¹¹. Indeed, its objective was to elaborate an innovative Knowledge
24
25 Management Solution, including a map of the competencies present in the Telecom Valley
26
27 that would help identify the actors and projects, while facilitating cooperation. KMP is in fact
28
29 an experimental ICT infrastructure: a semantic web service of competencies enabling
30
31 networks of firms with different objectives to collaborate by guaranteeing information
32
33 consistency without requiring the diffusion of strategic information. The project had several
34
35 objectives, in particular:
36
37
38

- 39
40
41
42 - a description of firms' competencies (technical, organizational and relational ones) in order
43
44 to increase mutual understanding,
45
46
47 - the development of a common language to facilitate exchange and the combination of
48
49 competencies,
50
51
52 - the elaboration of a shared business vision, including an common understanding of market
53
54 characteristics and customer needs in order to accurately identify innovation opportunities.
55
56

57
58 In order to promote the combination of competencies within the cluster, the project
59
60 aimed to develop not only cooperation between the firms but also between the industrial and

1
2
3 academic actors. The users were part of the advisory board and were in permanent interaction
4
5 with the project team, which was composed of representatives of different academic
6
7 disciplines (economy and management CNRS (GREDEG) and Telecom Paris (GET),
8
9 computer science and ergonomics INRIA, telecommunication sciences ENST Bretagne
10
11 (GET)¹²). The main role of the advisory board was to reach a common validation at each stage
12
13 of the prototype's development¹³.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 *3.1.2 Methodology: History of the project and position of researchers*

22

23
24 The project was initiated by a few firms and driven by academic partners. Two of the authors
25
26 of this article have been involved in the project: one was the KMP coordinator and played the
27
28 role of intermediary between academic and industrial partners (public or private ones); the
29
30 other, had a more discrete role of observer; they followed the various stages of the project and
31
32 reported on the different opportunities provided and limitation associated with knowledge
33
34 codification. This direct involvement enabled us to collect a vast amount of data drawn from
35
36 interviews conducted at different stages of the project: at the beginning, during the
37
38 development of the ICT tool and after its launching in the cluster.
39
40
41
42

43
44 Indeed, inside the KMP project a methodology to implement a design research in the specific
45
46 case of the building of an artifact has been developed¹⁴. The design process (designers'
47
48 world) is composed of iterative loops (Akrich *et al.*, 2002)¹⁵. The users' world represents the
49
50 socio-technical network that supports the process of innovation. Users-pilots (or lead users)
51
52 are not the only components of this socio-technical network. In this perspective, the success
53
54 of a design project depends on the '*art of interressement*' i.e. to enlarge the socio-technical
55
56 network. To sum up, six main steps composing the design methodology have been
57
58 implemented:
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 1. The feeling of discomfort - to analyze the specific managerial problem to solve.
- 4
- 5 2. Building a theoretical support - as underlined by Romme and Endenburg (2006),
- 6 this step consists in building construction principles and design rules.
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 3. Uses scenarios – they focus on the interaction between a system and its
- 11 environment.
- 12
- 13
- 14 4. Building archetypes - in the specific case of an ICT tool design, these
- 15 archetypes consist of the successive prototypes (including user interfaces) resulting from the
- 16 co-evolution of the designers' world and the users' one.
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22 5. Experimentation - two complementary but no sequential phases composes this
- 23 step: on the one hand, interesting a growing number of heterogeneous actors (users,
- 24 professionals, bureaucrats, granters ...); on the other hand, evaluating the successive
- 25 prototype.
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31 6. The change process - the adoption-adaptation process progressively spreads and
- 32 transforms the organizational context. These transformations lead to an evolution of the
- 33 managerial problem, which results in a new design loop.
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38

39 Four loops have composed the KMP project: the first (2001/2002) has concerned the
40 elaboration of the project and the last (2005/2006) the transition phase has formed the
41 prototype to its industrialization. Loops 3 (2003) and 4 (2004) were the core years of the
42 design process. During these two loops 3 uses scenarios were built¹⁶.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49 A large number of interviews were conducted formally in order to identify the needs
50 of Telecom Valley and the objectives of the tools (see in *appendix 1*, the details and number
51 of these interviews). The objectives evolved with time. For example the initial aim of the
52 project was limited to the construction of a simple 'boundary object' (Cacciatori 2003). This
53 objective was surpassed and was expanded to the more ambitious development of a platform
54 of knowledge. In short, KMP initially assumed the *searching* and *transcoding function* but, as
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a result of its success the project shifted progressively to a *transferring function*. Let us be
4
5 more precise on this point.
6
7

8
9 The goals of the project evolved according to the different, cognitive or political,
10 constraints. Indeed the ideas and potentialities of such a 'platform of knowledge' were
11 unknown at the beginning and were discovered over time during the co-development of the
12 prototype. For example, in 2002, Telecom Valley association suggested that the KMP project
13 capture competencies in order to facilitate the identification of project partners. Progressively,
14 however, the project shifted toward the analysis of the cluster dynamic through the
15 identification of new value chains among the various technological poles (microelectronic,
16 computer science and telecom)¹⁷.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 3.2 Building a common space: generating and maintaining knowledge exchange and
32 combination
33

34
35 An important characteristic of clusters is their ability to create a space for collective learning
36 and to promote knowledge sharing. Dyer and Nobeaka (2000, p.353) underline that
37 knowledge sharing is facilitated if the actors can reach a shared representation of space. The
38 'platform of knowledge' generated many opportunities for the cluster, particularly through
39 emergence of a common representation of an open space with evolving boundaries. This
40 shared representation was developed in two stages, first, the representation of the telecom
41 value chain, drawn up in collaboration with local actors¹⁸, second, the representation of the
42 Telecom cluster, including all the cluster's stakeholders:
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 - Local Development Institutes (LDIs) in charge of promoting the cluster abroad and
55 attracting foreign investment and companies. Clubs and associations in charge of reinforcing
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 exchange in the cluster. These are considered to be the ‘facilitators’ of the relationships
4 established between academia, industry and consumers;
5

6
7
8 - Research Institutes and Telecom Standards Institutes, considered to be stakeholders; indeed,
9
10 the Research Institutes can benefit from partnerships with industrial actors and Telecom
11 Standards Institutes in their elaboration of new technological standards;
12

13
14
15 - Consultants in the domains of law, finance and management; they have a supporting role
16 and help ensure an efficient management of the economic and non-economic linkages in the
17 Telecom Value Chain.
18
19
20

21
22 The characteristics of the Telecom cluster are summarized in the figure below.
23

24
25 <Figure 2 here>
26
27

28 The collective representation has been the result of many interactions between the
29 Telecom Valley association and KMP’s advisory board. This figure, which has been a
30 preliminary result of the project, shows the configuration of exchanges that occur in this
31 sector. Indeed, starting with the end-user consumer (1), the value chain leads to seven nodes,
32 which are main sources of value creation. These are: Internet Access and Service Providers
33 (2); The Value-Added Re-sellers (3), the distributors that play an active role between the end-
34 user consumer and the terminal device (especially in guaranteeing information exchange); the
35 Content Providers (4); the Network Operators and Telecom Service Providers (5); the
36 Terminal Device Manufacturers (6); the Network Infrastructure Providers (7); and finally the
37 Application Developers (8). Most of the actors located in Sophia Antipolis belong essentially
38 to nodes 5, 6, 7 and 8, though some start-ups have begun developing node 4 i.e. software
39 applications. Of course this local representation of actors might not fully correspond to the
40 overall situation in which the firms find themselves at the level of their group.¹⁹
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In 2004, all the firms of Telecom Valley -as well as the 11 KMP project's pilot firms -
4
5 were asked to position themselves on this value chain. As a result, the members of Telecom
6
7 Valley adopted this value chain as their own. This shared representation of collective space
8
9 reinforced the collective identity and influenced the strategies of cooperation. For example,
10
11 the subsidiary of an American multinational group, which had been hesitant at the beginning
12
13 of the project, became eager to be a 'lead user' when it eventually managed to position itself
14
15 in the collective space.
16
17
18
19

20 Similarly, the shared representation of the Telecom Cluster has made it possible to
21
22 determine the boundaries of the Telecom Valley community. The ability to share this
23
24 representation has even become a *sine qua non* for becoming a member of Telecom Valley.
25
26 These shared representations motivate the firms to engage locally as they enable them, be
27
28 they industrial or academic organisations, to position themselves in the regional cluster.
29
30
31

32 Local actors may be aware of the effects of critical mass and of possible deficiencies
33
34 in certain technological fields, which in turn enables them to envisage new combinations with
35
36 other territories that might possess complementary competencies. In Sophia Antipolis, most
37
38 firms operate on segments 5, 6, 7 and 8. It is at the level of information providers (segment 4),
39
40 of IAP/ISP (segment 2), of firms that commercialise and/or assemble office and computer
41
42 equipment (segment 3) that these complementary competencies are needed. Telecom Valley,
43
44 which initially struggled to define itself, was reluctant to accept new members. Today
45
46 however, thanks to the modelling of the common space, Telecom Valley has opened its doors
47
48 to new members, and particularly to multimedia firms (segment 4). In this regard, the shared
49
50 image of the value chain facilitates the identification of value-adding knowledge
51
52 combinations and results in a shared visualization of these opportunities, which reduces the
53
54 knowledge filter and enhances the cluster's absorptive capacity (Zahra and George, *ibid*).
55
56
57
58
59
60

3.3 Codification of knowledge and the emergence of new forms of governance

Once the perimeter of the selected space has been determined, a portfolio of potential competencies can be defined in order to foster interactions through which collaborations can emerge (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, *ibid*). This representation is not only cognitive but also political, because it helps to identify the potential knowledge combinations among various and complementary resources used in different projects. For example, some interactions have been fostered in order to solve various problems such as:

- finding a suitable way of adding value to individual corporate competencies,
- finding a partner for solving problems in areas where internal competencies are insufficient,
- gaining a better understanding of partners' needs in order to improve the description of internal competencies,
- sharing resources in order to better exploit network competencies,
- creating a shared vision of the market in order to develop present and future projects.

3.3.1 A partial and limited disclosure of knowledge with an abstract representation of competencies

This codification had various objectives. Indeed the KMP project was a regional 'platform of knowledge' used by local actors in order to enhance their absorptive capacity at a local and a corporate level. The collective representation was aimed not to codify know-how but rather to identify competencies in order to combine them more accurately. This delicate process was achieved through a partial disclosure of information and a strategic approach to knowledge diffusion: competencies should not be described in depth and exhaustively; however, their description must be precise enough to make these competencies visible. This kind of approach

1
2
3 also opened opportunities for communication between firms, which can thus join the
4
5 cooperation process and find a suitable way of representing their activity.
6
7

8
9 Knowledge and competency are difficult to disentangle from specific contexts as
10
11 knowledge travels on the rails laid down by practice. They are difficult to separate from their
12
13 original context and consequently difficult to articulate and codify. Nevertheless, an abstract
14
15 representation -or ontology-, even if incomplete or partial is necessary in order to identify
16
17 them. So, articulation and codification can be useful even though they are intrinsically
18
19 complementary to the production of tacit knowledge (Lazaric *et al.*, *ibid*).
20
21
22

23 For this reason, an abstract representation of competencies based on four points: (1)
24
25 action, (2) key resources (technological, organizational or scientifically resources), (3)
26
27 deliverable, and (4) business activity, was put forward (Rouby and Thomas, 2004). These
28
29 levels of abstraction have made it possible to identify the competencies and to compare them,
30
31 taking into account the interests of the different actors looking for them. Once competencies
32
33 were identified and located, a precise description was suggested including details on
34
35 resources, patents, publications, R&D collaboration, and industrial partnerships. This
36
37 additional information was essential to a proper understanding of a partner's competencies
38
39 and was effectively based on 'know-what' (see Lundvall and Johnson 1994, on this point).
40
41 So, the codification used did not disclose the strategic aspects of a firm (its 'know-how' and
42
43 'know-who') but communicated a part of the relevant knowledge, a kind of 'show-how' put
44
45 in place to help actors in the cluster identify which organizations have certain competencies
46
47 and where they can be found (Roberts, 2000).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 3.3.2 *The local actors' involvement in the codification process.*

58
59
60

1
2
3 An important outcome of the KMP project was also that it revealed the nature of the various
4 existing competencies, in other words, their similarity and complementarity, in Richardson's
5 sense of the terms (1972). The similarity had to do with the competencies that shared the
6 same resources and actions whereas the complementarity was had to do with the
7 competencies found in the ICT sector that could be shared among different organizations. The
8 KMP project also publicized the existence of a need, within the Telecom Valley association,
9 for an understanding not only of the nature of competencies inside each firm but also of the
10 possible critical masses and complementarities. This leads local actors to increase awareness
11 of some of the cluster's strengths and weaknesses²⁰.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Moreover, by making those competencies more visible and by creating new forms of
26 governance within the Sopolitan cluster, the concepts of similarity and complementarity
27 have also had some structural effects within the cluster. For example SAME (Sophia
28 Antipolis Micro Electronics) is an association set up recently in order to reinforce R&D
29 policy within the microelectronic sector. This initiative was perceived by Telecom Valley as
30 representing a potential obstacle to visibility within the cluster. Telecom Valley argued that
31 different associations might hinder interactions (by introducing an overly fragmented new
32 division of labour within the cluster). This dispute was finally solved by clearly establishing
33 the different roles of the various associations in the cluster. Associations like SAME play a
34 crucial role by promoting technological innovations, others like Hi' tech or Telecom Valley
35 have of a more horizontal role, orienting markets and defining the future uses of some
36 products' innovations. So, the KMP project has given rise to a process of knowledge
37 articulation and codification among its members; it has structured the Sopolitan cluster
38 and transformed the role of the different associations by defining their specific role in
39 supporting knowledge combination or in orienting the long term strategy of firms more
40 clearly.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 More generally, the creation of a common language and the introduction of the
4 concepts of similarity and complementarity have enabled the various actors to improve their
5 ability to anticipate the value created by partnerships, by increasing their capacity to detect the
6 best opportunities and prospects. In 2005, for example, firms and organisations operating in
7 the PACA region²¹ adopted and started using these concepts so as to be able to participate in
8 the national project of 'poles of competitiveness', and particularly those of the SCS pole²².
9 These concepts enabled them to structure the presentation of the cooperation projects within
10 the SCS pole. Two types of projects were identified: the user oriented projects (i.e. combining
11 complementary competencies) and the technology oriented projects (i.e. combining similar
12 competencies and aiming for technological innovation)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Finally, through the establishment of a multi-sectoral ontology, which became the
28 common language of the actors involved, the KMP project directly facilitated the
29 identification and possible combination of technological competencies, and thus reduced the
30 cognitive distance. Through this process of articulation, which was implemented prior to the
31 codification, new tacit knowledge emerged and thus reinforced the local entrepreneurial
32 dynamic²³. The tacit knowledge, produced through the processes of social integration, enabled
33 the local actors to create an effective 'platform of knowledge'.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Conclusion

51
52
53 The history of Sophia Antipolis illustrates the evolving constraints a high tech cluster must
54 face in order to generate innovation and growth. We have described, in this article, the
55 gradual transformation of a 'satellite platform' into a high tech cluster with the emergence of
56 localized capabilities embedded into global innovative networks. The KMP project provides a
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 good example of such regional mobilization. Indeed '*gatekeepers of knowledge*' have
4 transformed some of their specific attributes by disclosing more knowledge. Their behaviours
5 were not entirely motivated by philanthropy but rather resulted, from an acknowledgment of
6 the spatial dimension of innovation and from the understanding that new rules of the games
7 have to be implemented in this 'organised market'.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 The 'knowledge platform', which has facilitated the implementation of a regulation of
16 external and internal links, facilitating the combinative capability and fulfilling the
17 *transcoding* function, is illustrative of this new form of governance. Though the *transferring*
18 *function* might be more difficult to evaluate right now with only a qualitative case study, the
19 emergence of a new collective interactive dynamic inside the cluster is not at all neutral.
20 Indeed, the KMP project has contributed to the emergence of this new dynamic at two levels:
21 at cognitive level and political level.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 First of all, the different representations of the collective space have had an effect on
34 the emergence of a collective identity, by making sense of the logics of action and by
35 reinforcing the actor's commitment to the community.
36
37
38
39

40 Secondly, the development of a common language (ontology of competencies,
41 concepts of similarity and complementarity) reduces the cognitive distance between the
42 various entities and the 'knowledge filter' by creating a shared representation of the
43 technological, scientific and managerial resources available in the cluster and of the
44 knowledge combinations that can potentially create value. The creation of a common
45 language has offered the local actors the possibility of benefiting from both 'Marshallian
46 externalities' (exploitation of the same technological trajectory) and 'Jacobian externalities'
47 (exploration of new combinations).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our case study leads to the conclusion that, in a network, the distinction between the
4 ability to absorb new knowledge and the ability to combine it effectively is essential. These
5 two processes require different organizational mechanisms. The absorption of new knowledge
6 (PACAP) could be driven by parent firms playing the role of partial gatekeepers of
7 knowledge. The combination of new knowledge with prior knowledge (RACAP) requires a
8 specific organizational mechanism. We have suggested that the concept of 'platform of
9 knowledge', based on a codification process, is useful for converting PACAP into RACAP.
10 Moreover the indirect result of the project has been the development of the social integration
11 mechanisms because the co-evolution of tacit and codified knowledge is a key element in
12 knowledge-related dynamics and in the establishment of a long-term competitive advantage.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 References

- 34
35
36 Albino V., Garavelli A.C., (1999), Knowledge Transfer and inter firm relationships in industrial
37
38 Districts: the role of the leader firm, *Technovation*, 19, 53- 64.
39
40 Allen, T. J. (1977), Managing the flow of technology: technology transfer and the dissemination of
41
42 technological information within the R & D Organization. MIT Press
43
44 Acs Z., Audretsch D., Braunerhjelm P., Carlsson B. (2003), The missing link: the knowledge filter and
45
46 endogenous growth, Working paper presented at the *Druid summer conference* on Creating,
47
48 sharing and transferring knowledge. The role of Geography, Institutions and Organization.
49
50
51 Akrich M., Callon M., Latour B., 2002, The key success in innovation Part I: the art of interessement.
52
53 *International Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol.6, n°2, pp. 197-206.
54
55 Arthur B. (1990), Silicon Valley Locational clusters: when do increasing Returns imply monopoly,
56
57 *Mathematical Social Science*, Vol. 19 n° 3, March, 116-131.
58
59 Asheim B., Coenen L., Vang J. (2005), Face-to-Face, Buzz and Knowledge Bases: Socio-spatial
60
implications for learning and innovation policy, CIRCLE Working Paper 2005/

- 1
2
3 Asheim B. *et al.*, (2006), Constructing Regional Advantage. Principles, Perspectives, Policies, Report
4
5 for the Directorate-General for Research, European Commission, Brussels
6
7
8 Audretsch D. B., Feldman M. (1996), R&D Spillovers and the geography of innovation and
9
10 production, *The American Economic Review*, vol. 86, n° 3, 630-640.
11
12 Bathelt H., Malmberg A., Maskell P. (2002), Clusters and Knowledge Local buzz global pipelines and
13
14 the process of knowledge creation”, DRUID working paper. Available through <www. Druid.dk.
15
16 Boschma R.A., 2005, Proximity and Innovation: A Critical Assessment, *Regional Studies*, Vol. 39.1,
17
18 February, 61-74,
19
20 Bresnahan, T., Gambardella, A., Saxenian A (2001), Old economy inputs for new economy outcomes:
21
22 cluster formation in the New Silicon Valleys, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 10.4, 835-860.
23
24 Cacciatori E. (2003), Organisational memory in innovative project based firms: a boundary object
25
26 perspective, *Paper presented at the DRUID Conference*, June 12-14, <www.druid.dk>.
27
28 Coffey W., Bailly A. (1996), Regional Science: back to the future? *The annals of Regional Science*,
29
30 vol. 30, Issue 2, 153-163.
31
32 Cohen W., D. Levinthal. (1990), Absorptive capacity: a new perspective on learning and innovation,
33
34 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128-152.
35
36 Cooke P. (2003), The role of Research In regional Innovation systems: new models meeting
37
38 Knowledge Economy Demands, *Regional Industrial Reports*, Cardiff University.
39
40 Cooke P. (2006), Between implicit and explicit knowledge: translational proximities and innovation,
41
42 Working paper DIME COPs: a driver for innovation and Competitive advantage, October 27-28.
43
44 Dyer J.H., Nobeoka K. (2000), “Creating and Managing a High-performance Knowledge-sharing
45
46 Network: The Toyota case”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, pp. 345-367.
47
48
49 Garnsey, E., Longhi, C. (2004), High Technology Locations and Globalization: Converse Paths,
50
51 Common Processes, *Int. J. Technology Management*, Vol. 28, n°. ¾, 336-355
52
53 Giuliani E. and Bell M. (2005), The micro-determinants of the meso-level learning and innovation:
54
55 evidence from a Chilean wine cluster, *Research Policy*, 35, 47-68.
56
57
58 Haarmakorpi V. (2006), Regional development Platform method (RDPM) as a tool for Regional
59
60 innovation policy, *European Planning Studies*, 14, 8, 1085-1105.

- 1
2
3 Haarmarkorpi V. Melkas H. (2005), Knowledge management in regional networks: the case of Lahti,
4
5 *European Planning Studies*, 15, (5), 641-660.
6
7
8 Hatchuel A., 2005, Towards an epistemology of collective action: management research as a
9
10 responsive and actionable discipline. *European Management review*, vol.2, pp. 36-47.
11
12 Iammarino S., Cann P. Mc (2006), The structure and evolution of industrial cluster: transactions,
13
14 technology and knowledge spillovers, *Research Policy*, 35, 1018-1036.
15
16 Johnson, B., Lorenz, E., Lundvall, B.-Å. (2002), Why all this fuss about codified and tacit
17
18 knowledge?, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 11, no. 2, 245-262.
19
20 Keeble D. *et al.* (1998), Collective learning processes and inter-firm networking in innovative high-
21
22 technology regions, ESRC Centre for Business Research, WP 86, March.
23
24
25 Kogut B., (2000), The network as knowledge: generative rules and the emergence of structure,
26
27 *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 405-425.
28
29
30 Krafft J. (2004) Entry, exit and knowledge: evidence from a cluster in the info-communication
31
32 industry, *Research Policy*, 33, 1687-1706.
33
34 Latour B., (1989) *La science en action*, Gallimard.Paris.
35
36 Lazaric N., Lorenz E. (1998),The learning dynamics of trust reputation and confidence, in *Trust and*
37
38 *Economic Learning*, Lazaric and Lorenz (eds) Edward Elgar, London, 1-20.
39
40 Lazaric N. (2003), Trust building inside the epistemic community: some investigation with an
41
42 empirical case study, forthcoming in F. Six and B. Nooteboom (eds), *The Process of trust in*
43
44 *organizations*”, Edward Elgar, Londres.
45
46 Lazaric N., Mangolte P.A., Massué M.L. (2003), Articulation and codification of collective Know
47
48 how in the steel industry: some evidence in the French blast furnace, *Research Policy*, 32, 1829-
49
50 1847.
51
52
53 Longhi C. (1999), Networks, collective learning and technology development in innovative high-
54
55 technology regions: the case of Sophia Antipolis, *Regional Studies*, Vol.33 n°4, 333-324.
56
57 Longhi C. (2003), Local systems and networks in the globalisation process, Distretti, pilastri, reti.
58
59 Italia ed Europa, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei and Fondazione Edison, Roma 8-9 April.
60

- 1
2
3 Longhi C., Quéré M. (1994), *Sophia-Antipolis : Vers une redéfinition du projet*, Rapport de recherche,
4
5 CNRS-LATAPSES.
6
7
8 Lorenzen M., Foss N. (2003), Cognitive coordination, institutions and clusters: an exploratory
9
10 discussion, in Brenner T. (Ed) *The influence of co operations, networks and innovations on*
11
12 *regional Innovation Systems*, Cheltenham Edward Elgar.
13
14 Lundvall B. Å., Johnson B. (1994) "The Learning Economy", *Journal of Industries Studies*, Vol. 1,
15
16 n°2, December, pp.23-42.
17
18
19 Markusen, A. (1996), Sticky places in slippery spaces: a typology of industrial districts, *Economic*
20
21 *Geography*, 72(3), 293-313.
22
23 Maskell, P., Malmberg A. (1999), Localised Learning and industrial competitiveness, *Cambridge*
24
25 *Journal of Economics*, 23, 167-185.
26
27 Morrison A. (2004) Do leading firms feed industrial districts? Evidence from an Italian furniture
28
29 districts, *Working paper presented DRUID conference*, January 2004.
30
31 Nahapiet J., Ghoshal S. (1998), Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage,
32
33 *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 23,. 242-266.
34
35 Nesta, L., Saviotti P. (2006), Firm knowledge and market value in biotechnology, *Industrial and*
36
37 *Corporate Change*, 15(4):625-652.
38
39 Nooteboom B. (2003) Problems and Solutions in Knowledge transfer, in Brenner T. (ed) *The influence*
40
41 *of co operations, networks and innovations on regional Innovation Systems*, Cheltenham Edward
42
43 Elgar.
44
45 Orlikowski W. (2000), Using technology and constituting structures: a practice lens for studying
46
47 technology in organizations. *Organization Science*, vol. 11, n°4, pp. 404-428.
48
49
50 Porter M. (2000), Location, competition and Economic Development: local clusters in a global
51
52 Economy, *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14, n° 1, 15-34.
53
54 Richardson G.B. (1972) "The Organization of Industry", *Economic Journal*, vol. 82, n°327, 883-896.
55
56
57 Roberts J., (2000), From know-how to show how, Questioning the role of information and
58
59 communication technologies in knowledge transfer, *Technology Analysis & Strategic*
60
Management, December, vol.12, Iss.4, 429-443.

- 1
2
3 Romme A.G.L., Endenburg G., 2006, Construction Principles and Design Rules in the case of Circular
4
5 Design Organization. *Organization Science*, vol.17, n°2, pp. 287-297.
6
7
8 Rouby E., Thomas C. (2004), La codification des compétences organisationnelles : l'épreuve des faits,
9
10 *Revue Française de Gestion*, March/april, n° 149, 51-68.
11
12 Rychen F., Zimmermann (2006), Clusters in the global knowledge based economy: knowledge
13
14 gatekeepers and temporary proximity, Working paper, GRECAM Marseille.
15
16 Szulanski G., Cappetta R., Jensen J. R. (2004), When and How trustworthiness Matters: Knowledge
17
18 Ttransfer and the Moderating Effect of Causal Ambiguity, *Organization Science*, Vol. 15,
19
20 September-October, 600-613.
21
22
23 Torre A., Rallet A, 2005, Proximity and Localization, *Regional Studies*, Vol. 39.1, February, 47- 59.
24
25 Van de Ven A.H., Johnson P. E., 2006, Knowledge for Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management*
26
27 *Review*, Vol.31, n°4, pp. 802-821.
28
29 Van Haken J. E., 2005, Management Research as a Design Science: Articulating the Research
30
31 Products of Mode 2 Knowledge Production in Management. *British Journal of Management*,
32
33 vol.16. pp. 19-36.
34
35 Veltz, P. (1993) D'une géographie des coûts à une géographie de l'organisation. Quelques thèses sur
36
37 l'évolution des rapports entreprises/territoires, *Revue Economique*, n°4.
38
39 Zahra, S. A., and George, G. (2002), Absorptive Capacity: A Review, Reconceptualization, and
40
41 Extension," *Academy of Management Review* (27:2), 185-203.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix

The co-development approach adopted for the KMP project requires a mechanism of high interaction locally. The interaction mechanism was organised around five main modalities:

i. Exploratory interviews of potential users (firms, organisations of regional development and research organisations). This first, familiarisation stage enables the actors to gain an understanding of the purposes of the tool, of the reasons why the client wishes to develop it, and to identify the key actors for the project.

ii. Semi-directive interviews of pilot users. Two types of interviews were conducted: The first type of interviews aimed to identify and map the different actors' competencies while the second type of interviews aimed to detect the practices and logics of action that recur during the construction of partnerships or projects of local development (user scenario)

iii. Ad hoc committees with the pilot users. These committees had a supporting function in specific codification processes and in determining the common space and establishing the ontologies of competencies.


iv. Pilot committees. The latter made it possible to evaluate and present (every three months) the intermediary results of the research team to the pilot users; This stage is essential to ensure the involvement of the users, to validate the legitimacy of the research team and to promote trust between the different stakeholders.

v. Interviews the purpose of which was to evaluate the solution, so as to be able to test, towards the end of the project, the elements proposed.

The table below is a synthesis of these different interactions between the researchers and local actors.


	2001-2002	2003	2004	2005-2006
Exploratory interviews	26			
Semi directive interviews : mapping		31	33	
Semi directive interviews : user scenario		24	28	
Ad hoc committees	22	30	24	19
Pilot committees	1	5	3	1
Evaluation of the device			12	9

Figure 1: Potential absorptive capacity and realized absorptive capacity



Source: Zahra and George, 2002, p. 192.

Figure 2: The ICT cluster in Sophia Antipolis



Source: Our research.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹ In French '*Pôles de Compétitivité*'.

² In contemporaneous economies, this problem can be solved through the existence of 'local buzz' or 'global pipelines' (Bathelt, Malmberg, Maskell, 2002). The notion of 'local buzz' refers here to the 'Marshallian atmosphere', particularly the fact that a milieu could emit a lot of noise. More precisely "buzz" refers to the information and communication ecology created by face-to face- contacts, co-presence, co-location of people and firms within the same industry and place or region (Bathelt, Malmberg, Maskell, *ibid*, p. 11). The term of global pipelines refers to the channel used in distant interactions for opening the cluster and establishing systemic linkages with external sources of information.

³ Notably if the distance is too wide, it may become an obstacle to the efficient combination of knowledge within a group of closely located firms.

⁴ Indeed '(...) a cluster which is more or less empty because its important actors are constantly travelling the world in order to build and maintain an extensive pipeline system will of course run an obvious risk of becoming less vibrant' (Bathelt, Malmberg and Maskell, 2002, p. 24). See also (Bresnahan, Gambardella and Saxenian 2001) in the same vein.

⁵ Pierre Lafitte was then Director of the renowned Ecole Nationale des Mines de Paris, one of French's 'Grandes Ecoles'.

⁶ These activities now represent around 75% of technology jobs in the technopole, involving both large French and international companies (R&D centres) and units of large research institutions.

⁷ The acronym stands for CNRS (Centre National de Recherches Scientifiques *i.e.* National centre of scientific research) and INRIA (Institut National de Recherche en Informatique Appliquée *i.e.* National Research Institute on informatics and Automation).

⁸ Many still have sub-contracting relationships with their parent firms and have maintained a high level of informal interactions to solve problems

⁹ Indeed, this qualified labour force is related to the ICT sector - characterised by a high turnover rate - which has given rise, in Sophia Antipolis, to new behaviours in terms of labour market.

¹⁰ More than half of the Sophiapolitan jobs are high-qualification jobs (executives and engineers) and in the information technology sector the proportion rises to over 70 %.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹¹ KMP Project has been subsidized by the Minister of Telecommunication RNRT network (Réseau National de recherches en télécommunications) http://www.telecom.gouv.fr/rnrt/projets/res_02-88.htm.

¹² The acronym GREDEG stands for Groupe de Recherche en Droit Economie et Gestion, GET : Groupe des Ecoles de Télécommunications. ENST: Ecole Nationale de Sciences et de Télécommunications.

¹³ This ‘step-by-step’ approach enabled the actors to progressively get involved in the process of adoption/adaptation of the prototype (Latour, 1989) and fostered trust relations among all the partners of the project (Lazarcic and Lorenz 1998). The validation rule was crucial in sustaining cooperation between the different networks of practice and members (the project team and the advisory team) without which it would have been impossible to give a sense to this dynamic (Lazarcic, 2003).

¹⁴ Design methodologies are specific modes of engaging in research. Especially, they are characterized by an active intervention process in the system in which the researchers act. In this perspective, a new figure of “engaged scholarship”, in which researchers and practitioners co-produce knowledge has emerged in the 90’s (David, 2000, Hatchuel 2005, Van Haken, 2005, Van de Ven and Johnson, 2006). This new figure, called “*mode 2 knowledge production*” is multidisciplinary and aims at solving complex and relevant field problems.

¹⁵ According to the structurational approach (Orlikowski, 2000), a separation between the designers’ world from the users’ world has been introduced.

¹⁶ Uses scenarios were the following ones: 1) competencies description and storage by TV members, 2) the TV cluster exploration and 3) queries when actors look for a partner.

¹⁷ This permanent involvement of the Telecom Valley association with the advisory team generated a dialogue concerning the limits and possibilities of codification, and in the process gave rise to a dynamic that went far beyond the initial objective a simple technical project. Progressively the members of the network adopted these ideas as their own and the Telecom Valley association imagined other scenarios for the development of the local ICT sector, which had not been part of the initial plans.

¹⁸ The construction of the Telecom Value Chain was based on the MIT “Telecom Value Chain Project” (URL: <http://mitsloan.mit.edu/research/clockspeed/main.html>) and was developed by a think-tank including both Telecom Valley members involved in the KMP project and researchers.

¹⁹ For instance, the local subsidiary of Hewlett-Packard (formerly Compaq) designs and commercialises Telecom Network Infrastructure solutions while the parent company is generally known to design and manufacture computer devices and solutions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

²⁰ Firms and LDIs have largely adopted this representation of potential combinations inside the cluster in order to create opportunities of promoting the cluster abroad.

²¹ PACA stands for Provence Alpes Côte d'Azur.

²² SCS stands for : Solutions Communicantes Sécurisées.

²³ Thus, the organisations located in the area had to clearly position themselves, which has led them to clearly define their logic of action and avoids “congestion effects” and problems of visibility between these various associations. The Vice-President of Telecom Valley claimed in 2005 that KMP has contributed to a clear identification of the clubs, allowing to achieve an efficient exploitation of competencies in Sophia Antipolis, the position and interests of all concerned being clear and known to all. The chairperson of the “club Energie” emphasizes that such clearly defined logics of action contribute to the emergence of a collective identity, a collective identity that “will enable Sophia Antipolis to develop in a sustainable manner”.