

# Moscow Innovation Cluster: Key Concept Features and Coronavirus Stress Test

#### Evgeniy Kutsenko

Director of Russian Cluster Observatory Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge, Higher School of Economics

#### Saule Ismagulova

Expert at Russian Cluster Observatory Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge, Higher School of Economics

## Research goals and empirical strategy

- The goals of the paper are to reveal theoretic framework of a cluster functioning in large cities and how it works in an unstable situation like pandemics
- To do this, firstly we tried to elaborate on the existing economic, clusters and innovation development theories and selected those which could better apply for describing a cluster in a large city
- Secondly, we explored the revealed features on an example of a concrete cluster and then analyzed such specifics in the context of COVID crisis - for this we addressed to open statistical and descriptive information published on the official websites
- In this respect, we used the systematic literature review method combined with a case-study approach, as far as our research aims to combine practical insights with theory propositions

# Special cluster policy for megapolises: new features to capture specific urban effects and benefits

Expected features of an urban cluster (WHAT)	Effects and benefits urban clusters aimed to capture (WHY)	Theoretical underpinning (PROOF)
1. Broader initiatives with large number of participants (1000+)	Agglomeration effects (not just variety of fragmented cluster initiatives)	(Marshall, 1920), (Krugman 1991), (Mayneris et al., 2008), (Fujita et al., 1999)
2. Open membership for different industries, special interest in cross-sectoral topics	Jacobs' effects (not just MAR) Economic complexity (not just relatedness)	(Jacobs, J., 1969), (Hidalgo & Hausmann, 2009)
3. Transaction costs reduction is a core activity	Easy and cheap transactions and spread of tacit knowledge	(Couse, 1937), (North, 1992; Eggertsson, 1990) (Polányi, 1966)
4. Set of financial incentives for cooperation in innovation sphere	Launch of new collaborative innovation projects (not just networking or project acceleration)	(Lämmer-Gamp et al., 2011), (Sölvell et al., 2003), (Gallié et al., 2013), (Laur, 2015)
5. Participation of partners from outside	'Local buzz' +'global pipelines' (External relations are more important for cities due to their 'compactness' than for regions and countries)	(Bathelt et al., 2004)
6. Strong and permanent role of regional / city authorities	Preventing cooperation failures as a new public good Cluster inititive as a nudge agent for cooperation	(Samuelson, 1954), (Sunstein & Thaler, 2014)
7. Promotion of open innovation practices for all parties of triple helix	Different types of proximity - social, organizational, institutional and cognitive – are needed	(Boschma, Balland, de Vaan, 2014) (Chesbrough, 2003; Chesbrough, 2014),
8. Coordination, common priorities and agenda building	Clusters as meta-organisations (high-level coordination, not just set of unrelated collaborative projects)	(Ahrne & Brunsson, 2005, 2008); (Gulati et al., 2012); (Berkowitz and Dumez, 2016); (Berkowitz, 2018); (Lupova-Henry et al. 2001)





## Features of MIC

- MIC unites a large number of participants
- The membership in MIC is open for different industries
- MIC has a digital communication front-office in its core
- MIC sub-clusters as a space for personalised inter-firm interaction
- Financial state support of MIC members' cooperation
- Companies from other regions can participate in MIC as its partners
- MIC as a nudge agent for open innovation model





### 



# MIC sub-clusters as a space for personalised inter-firm interaction

- MIC members can gather into a sub-cluster (a bottom-up process) for the sake of making joint innovation project (or projects) in one or several economic fields.
- The requirements for creating a sub-cluster: initiation by a MIC member; at least 30 organisations – MIC members; common goal for uniting and at least one innovation project between two and more cluster members
- To present, 10 clusters have registered in MIC since the first one was created in June 2020





### Companies from other regions can participate in MIC as its partners

- Since May 2020, when cluster services became available to regional companies, 73 regions have already entered the cluster: the Moscow region, St. Petersburg (70% from these two regions), Vladimir, Kaluga, Nizhny Novgorod, Tula and Tver regions, Krasnodar Territory.
- The number of partners grew to more than 6500 in July 2021.

Platform services	Possibilities for regional partners	
Support measures navigator	Limited access	
Support measures calculator	Limited access	
Contract manufacturing exchange	+	
Renting premises	+	
Sub-clusters	Limited access	
Investment packaging	-	
Venture academy	-	
Piloting	Limited access	
Patent exchange	Limited access	
Moscow accelerator	+	
Technological contests	+	
Factoring	3000EEEEE33000EEEEE33000EEEEE33000EEEE33000EEEE33000EEEE33000EEEEE33000EEEEE33000EEEEE33000EEEEE33000EEEE	
Marketplace of goods and services	+	
Map of innovative solutions	+	

• International projects – agreements with the Joint Stock Company Zhongguancun Development Group, ZGC Group (China), Qatar International Financial Center (Qatar), Fintech Hub Limited (Kazakhstan)



thousands of applications and hundreds of participants.
Development programs held in 2020 attracted 145 mln RUB

of investment.

all the year with a scope of

Industry 4.0 / Internet of thing тс Venture Academy DF EdTech Challenge B2C / EdTech startups тс FutureBank / finance & marketing technology AP Travel Tech Challenge / travel industry Engineering Tech Social Tech Challenge 2021 тс PIPEINDUSTRYTECH / smart production Impact Challenge / sustainable development StartHub.Moscow TC – technological contests, AP – acceleration programs, DP – other development programs

## Lessons learnt from MIC case - new approach for urban cluster development is proved

- The bet on the maximum number of participants was proved during the crisis, their number increased.
- MIC could involve diversified participants. The degree of their heterogeneity has yet to be assessed by comparing their composition with the sectorial structure of Moscow.
- There is a need for digital services as they present an access to the opportunities required by business in COVID-19, as well as an advantage of a digital platform in implementing urgent regional government actions.
- There is a 'bottom-up' activity' in forming sub-clusters and it is more dynamic than the emergence of sectoral clusters before MIC formation.
- Theoretically, financial incentives should lead to the growth of joint projects. Future
  monitoring will allow to assess the effects of the government support.
- The cluster managed and continues to strengthen its ties with both Russian and foreign regions.
- The open innovation process in MIC has been expanded in pandemics over time the results of organized projects implemented may show the effectiveness of such initiative.
- Orientation on collective actions could be a new task for MIC

