ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of
ZBW
Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Cincera, Michele; Veugelers, Reinhilde

Working Paper

Young Leading Innovators and EU's R&D intensity gap

IPTS Working Papers on Corporate R&D and Innovation, No. 07/2010

Provided in Cooperation with:
Joint Research Centre (JRC), European Commission

Suggested Citation: Cincera, Michele; Veugelers, Reinhilde (2010) : Young Leading Innovators and EU's R&D intensity gap, IPTS Working Papers on Corporate R&D and Innovation, No. 07/2010, ISBN 978-92-79-17039-3, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Seville, https://doi.org/10.2791/46766

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/202123

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

JRC Technical Notes

IPTS WORKING PAPER on
CORPORATE R&D AND INNOVATION - No. 07/2010

Young Leading Innovators and EU's R&D intensity gap

Michele Cincera and Reinhilde Veugelers

October 2010

JRC EUROPEAN COMMISSION

ipts Institute for Prospective Technological Studies

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Directorate-General for Research

The ***IPTS Working Papers on Corporate R&D and Innovation*** address economic and policy questions related to industrial research and innovation and their contribution to European competitiveness. Mainly aimed at policy analysts and the academic community, these are scientific papers (relevant to and highlighting possible policy implications) and proper scientific publications which are typically issued when submitted to peer-reviewed scientific journals. The working papers are useful for communicating our preliminary research findings to a wide audience, to promote discussion and feedback aimed at further improvements. The working papers are considered works in progress and are subject to revision.

These *IPTS Working Papers on Corporate R&D and Innovation* can take the form of more *policy-oriented notes*, mainly addressed towards EU policy-makers. They present policy implications derived from our own research and the views of the most prominent authors in the field, with appropriate references.

The present Working Paper (No. 07/2010 – August 2010) is issued in the context of ***the Industrial Research Monitoring and Analysis (IRMA)***[1] activities that are jointly carried out by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) – Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS) and the Directorate General Research - Directorate C, European Research Area: Knowledge-based economy.

IRMA activities aim to improve the understanding of industrial R&D and Innovation in the EU and to identify medium and long-term policy implications. More information, including activities and publications, is available at: http://iri.jrc.es/ and http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/

The main authors of this paper are Michele Cincera (European Commission, DG JRC-IPTS and Université Libre de Bruxelles) and Reinhilde Veugelers (Bruegel, CEPR and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven).

The *IPTS Working Papers on Corporate R&D and Innovation* are published under the editorial responsibility of Fernando Hervás, Pietro Moncada-Paternò-Castello, Andries Brandsma, Michele Cincera and Enrico Santarelli at the Knowledge for Growth Unit – Economics of Industrial Research and Innovation Action of IPTS / Joint Research Centre of the European Commission.

Contact information – F. Hervás
European Commission, Joint Research Centre - Institute for Prospective Technological Studies
Edificio Expo
C/ Inca Garcilaso, 3
E-41092 Seville (Spain)
Fax: +34 95 448 83 26; E-mail: jrc-ipts-kfg-secretariat@ec.europa.eu
IPTS website: http://ipts.jrc.ec.europa.eu/; JRC website: http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu
DG RTD-C website: http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/index_en.htm

Legal Notice
Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

IPTS WORKING PAPER on CORPORATE R&D AND INNOVATION - No. 07/2010
Full electronic version of the paper can be downloaded at http://iri.jrc.es/

JRC60284
EUR 24325 EN/7
ISBN 978-92-79-17039-3
ISSN 1018-5593
ISSN 1831-872X
doi:10.2791/46766

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

© European Union, 2010

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Spain

[1] IRMA activities are according to the approach set out in "Investing in research: an action plan for Europe" (COM, 2003) and in further Communications of the Commission: "More Research and Innovation – Investing for Growth and Employment – A common approach", COM (2005) 488 final, "Implementing the Community Lisbon Programme: A policy framework to strengthen EU manufacturing – Towards a more integrated approach for industrial policy", COM (2005) 474 final.

Abstract

Innovation in the European Union remains weak according to a number of key 'input' indicators, especially R&D investment by the business sector, and there are relatively few signs of progress. From a firm-level perspective, Europe's innovation gap relative to the US results from an inappropriate industrial structure in which new firms do not play a significant role, especially in new high-tech sectors.

This view of a structural EU innovation deficit has many supporters. But it has received little or no thorough empirical investigation. This paper aims to address this 'evidence gap'. We find that compared to the US, the EU has fewer young firms among its leading innovators. But this accounts for only about one-third of the EU-US differential. The largest part of the differential is due to the fact that young leading innovators in the EU are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts. Further unravelling shows that this is almost entirely due to a different sectoral composition. We thus confirm that the EU-US private R&D gap is indeed mostly a structural issue.

JEL Classification: O 32

Keywords: dynamics of firms, age of firms, EU-US R&D gap

1. Introduction

Innovation in the European Union remains weak according to a number of key 'input' indicators, especially R&D investment by the business sector. Furthermore, there are relatively few signs of progress, despite the EU's Barcelona target of increasing investment in research to three percent of GDP, which was established in 2000 (EC Key Figures 2010).

Compared to the United States the EU private R&D deficit primarily manifests itself in ICT goods and services. This correlates with the EU's lower specialisation in these R&D-intensive, high-growth sectors of the 1990s (O'Mahoney & van Ark, 2003; Denis *et al*, 2005; EC Key Figures, 2005; Moncada *et al*, 2009). Further, firm-level evidence suggests that the EU's R&D deficit in the information technology sector may reflect constraints on the rapid growth of new, technology-based entrants in the EU compared to the US[1].

From this firm-level perspective, the continued business R&D deficit seems a symptom rather than a cause of the EU's weakness in innovation; the cause seems rooted in the structure and dynamics of EU industry and enterprise[2]. Europe's innovation gap is a consequence of its industrial structure in which new firms fail to play a significant role in the dynamics of the industry, especially in the high-tech sectors. This is illustrated by their inability to enter markets and to subsequently grow into market leaders. The creative-destruction process encounters significant obstacles in the EU, undermining Europe's growth potential (Aghion *et al*, 2007).

This structural EU innovation-deficit story has many supporters, but has received little or no thorough empirical investigation. This Policy Contribution aims to address this 'evidence gap'. We decompose the latest European Commission Joint Research Centre – Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (JRC-IPTS) Industrial R&D Scoreboard (European Commission, 2008) of leading innovators in terms of global R&D expenditures by age cohort. We compare the innovation profile of young versus old leading innovators in the scoreboard and examine how the contribution of young leading innovators can explain the EU's lagging leading innovation performance.

We find that compared to the US, the EU has fewer young firms among its leading innovators. But this effect only accounts for about one-third of the EU-US differential. The largest part of the differential is due to the fact that young leading innovators in the EU are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts. Further unravelling shows that this is almost entirely due to a different sectoral composition. Young leading innovators in the US are found in R&D-intensive young sectors, with biotechnology and internet being the clearest cases. We thus confirm that the EU-US private R&D gap is indeed mostly a structural issue. Bridging this gap will require the EU to nurture more young firms in young sectors, enabling them to grow to become young leading innovators.
We proceed as follows: section 1 presents the scoreboard data being used. Section 2 describes the innovation profile of young firms in the scoreboard. Section 3 examines the

[1] Bartelsman *et al* (2004) found that post-entry performance differs markedly between Europe and the US, which suggests a potential indication of the importance of barriers to firm growth as opposed to barriers to entry. Cohen and Lorenzi (2000) argued that the US economy is a more hospitable environment than the EU for new firms to grow. Based on an analysis of the top 1000 global firms in terms of market capitalisation which were listed in Business Week in 1999, they found that information technology was by far the most important sector for explaining the difference in the total number of new giants between the two regions. Cohen and Lorenzi show that of the 355 US firms included in this list, 33 percent were created after 1950. In contrast, of the 181 EU firms in the list, 14 percent were created after 1950. Information technology accounted for more than 70 percent of the difference between the two geographical regions (Cohen and Lorenzi, 2000, p. 125).
[2] This has also been diagnosed in the former EU Research Commissioner Janez Potocnik's KfG (Knowledge for Growth) Expert's Group Report (O'Sullivan, 2007) or van Pottelsberghe (2008).

extent to which young leading innovators can account for the EU-US R&D gap. Section 4 examines the contribution of young leading innovators to the differences in EU-US R&D growth performance. Section 5 summarises the main findings. Box 4 sets out caveats to the analysis and suggestions for further research. Policy conclusions are discussed in an accompanying Bruegel Policy Brief (Veugelers and Cincera, 2010).

2. The leading innovators dataset

We start with the set of firms that belongs to the EU-1000 and non-EU-1000 biggest[3] R&D spenders in the 2008 edition of the EU Industrial R&D Investment Scoreboard[4]. This dataset has been augmented with information on the date of the establishment of firms[5]. The information on the age of firms allows us to distinguish between young and old leading innovators.

As the scoreboard database only records the biggest R&D spenders, 'young firms' are not *small* start-ups. Indeed, the average size for the young firms in our sample is 10,000 employees worldwide. Some top 'young firms' in our sample (by R&D size) are Amgen, Cisco, Google, Microsoft, Oracle and Sun. As it includes (almost) no firms with fewer than 250 employees, the scoreboard dataset is not suited for analysing the small and medium-sized enterprise dimension.

The 'young firms' in our analysis are a group of firms that have managed on their own, i.e. without being taken over, and in a relatively short timespan since their birth (after 1975), to grow into world leaders deploying substantial R&D resources. We will label them young leading innovators (which we call *'yollies'*) to differentiate from old leading innovators (*'ollies'*).

In addition to the age of firms, the dataset also contains information on the following variables: main industrial sector (according to the Industry Classification Benchmark – ICB), country of origin, net sales, number of employees, and R&D investment for each year for the period 2004-07. The geographic classification of firms is done on the basis of ownership and not by location of the activities[6].

Because data is missing for some firms, the final sample includes 1077 firms. The dataset is representative of 96.1 percent of the R&D carried out in 2007 by the top 2000 global corporations listed in the 2008 industry R&D scoreboard. This is itself representative of more than 80 percent of the total worldwide R&D in the private sector (business enterprise R&D or BERD)[7]. Twenty-nine percent of our sample firms are from the EU, 38 percent from the US, 19 percent from Japan and 14 percent from the rest of the world (RoW)[8].

[3] By 'big' we mean companies with R&D investment of more than €35m in 2007.
[4] The European Commission JRC-IPTS has since 2004 collected annual data on companies investing the most in R&D worldwide (the EU Industrial R&D Investment Scoreboard. See: http://iri.jrc.ec.europa.eu/research/scoreboard.htm)
[5] Age information has mainly been sourced from the websites of companies. This information has been crosschecked with other databases (eg Amadeus). We use the very first year of the firms' creation, ie *exnihilo* creation. In case of a merger and acquisition (14.9 percent of cases), the age of the oldest merged entity is considered.
[6] All activities of the firm are presented as consolidated in the scoreboard. We have no information on the geographic and sectoral distribution of firms' activities.
[7] See for instance European Commission (2006).
[8] Rest of the world (RoW) includes as most important countries Canada (14 firms), China & Hong Kong (10), India (12), Israel (8), Norway (7), South Korea (18), Switzerland (33) and Taiwan (33).

3. Why Yollies matter?

3.1. The importance of Yollies for R&D, sales and employment

Thirty-four percent of all leading innovating firms in our sample are 'young', i.e. were born after 1975. Sixteen percent are 'very young', born after 1990. As can be seen from Figure 1 on page 4, the share of yollies in the number of firms is greater than their share in net sales, employment and R&D. Yollies represent 10 percent of net sales, 12 percent of employment and 19 percent of R&D in our sample. Yollies are typically smaller in size, employment and R&D budget than ollies.

Yet yollies are major innovators. As their share of R&D is greater than their share of net sales, yollies are more R&D oriented than ollies. Figure 2 illustrates this more clearly by showing the R&D intensity (i.e. R&D-to-sales-ratio) of firms by age group. The average R&D intensity of yollies is almost twice as high as that of old firms, at 6.3 percent relative to 3.2 percent.

Figure 1. Share of YLI firms in R&D, sales and employment



Source: Bruegel/European Commission JRC-IPTS.

Figure 2. R&D intensity (RDI) by age-class



Source: Bruegel/European Commission JRC-IPTS.

3.2. How young innovative firms shape 'young' R&D-intensive sectors?

A number of industry and services sectors are particularly associated with yollies. Table 1 shows the sectors in which yollies are prominently present. The sectors that have an above-average share of R&D done by yollies are identified as 'young sectors'. These sectors are internet, biotechnology, software, semiconductors, telecoms equipment, computer hardware, computer services, health equipment and services[9]. Young sectors are therefore basically a health/biotechnology and ICT story[10]. Table 1 also covers the electronics, telecoms services and pharmaceuticals sectors. These sectors are also present in the health/biotech and ICT nexus, and have a sizeable proportion of yollies, but young companies are much less pivotal in total R&D in these sectors.

Internet is essentially a post-1990 sector, as all companies in this sector were born after 1990. Biotechnology and software are also young sectors, with almost no old companies in the scoreboard. The semiconductor sector has a rather high number of yollies, but these are smaller in (R&D) size compared to the older firms in the sector. The same holds for telecoms equipment, computer hardware and computer services.

The telecoms services sector is not particularly characterised by the presence of yollies (despite the deregulation in this sector). The yollies in the sector are also smaller in R&D size. The pharmaceutical sector is a twin sector with biotechnology. Although about one-third of its leading innovators are young, yollies represent only three percent of total R&D done in this sector.

Young sectors (the first eight rows in Table 1), represent about 29 percent of the R&D performed by the 1077 companies in the dataset. All these young sectors are also high R&D-intensity sectors, i.e. their R&D intensity is more than twice the total average in the sample. The only exceptions are computer hardware and computer services. Almost all high R&D-

[9] It should be noted that travel and leisure also has 50 percent of yollies, but there are only in total 10 companies in this sector (and none in the EU). This sector is therefore not reported in the analysis. 10. Dedicated environment sectors are not yet well represented in the scoreboard.
[10] Dedicated environment sectors are not yet well represented in the scoreboard.

intensity sectors are 'young sectors'[11]. The only R&D-intensive sector that is not a young sector is pharmaceuticals. The only ICT sector that is not a young sector or a R&D intensive one is telecoms services.

Table 1. YLI and their presence in (young) high-tech sectors (in %)

	Share of YLI	R&D by YLI	RDI young	RDI old	Share of sector in Total R&D
Internet	100	100	10.9	.	1
Biotechnology	91	92	26.7	9.2	2
Software	86	88	15.3	13.8	4
Semiconductors	71	53	15.2	13.8	6
Telecom equipment	64	34	13.5	12.0	6
Computer hardware	63	36	3.8	4.6	4
Computer services	64	13	4.6	5.5	1
Health equipment	26	29	10.6	6.0	1
Average Young Sector	**71**	**52**	**11**	**8**	**29**
Electronics	26	9	6	2	5
Telecom services	30	11	1	2	2
Pharmaceuticals	28	3	15	16	17
Average all Sectors	**34**	**19**	**6**	**3**	

Note: See Appendix A.1. for a version of Table 1 with all sectors.

Box 1. Yollies and Ollies, differences in R&D intensity: A sectoral look

Table 1 seems to suggest that the difference in R&D intensity between yollies and ollies is mostly structural, i.e. due to a stronger presence of yollies in high-tech sectors, rather than intrinsic, i.e. yollies being more R&D intensive than their older counterparts in their sector. With a decomposition analysis, we can calculate the exact size of both effects (see Annex 2 for a more detailed description of the decomposition exercise):

$$RDI^{y} - RDI^{o} = \sum_{i} RDI_{i}\left(w_{i}^{y} - w_{i}^{o}\right) + \sum_{i} w_{i}\left(RDI_{i}^{y} - RDI_{i}^{o}\right)$$

The first term represents the structural effect and the second term the intrinsic one.

Total difference in $RDI^{y,o}$	Structural effect	Intrinsic effect
7.4	5.8	1.6
100%	78%	22%

Both structural and intrinsic effects are positive, but the structural effect is four times greater[1].

[11] The list of all R&D intensive sectors includes biotechnology, healthcare, internet, pharmaceuticals, semiconductors, software and telecoms equipment, i.e. all our young sectors minus computer hardware and software and pharmaceuticals.

With the exception of biotechnology (and internet by default), the young firms within young sectors are not significantly more R&D intensive than their older counterparts in these sectors[12]. This seems to suggest that if we ignore biotechnology and internet, albeit two important sectors, the higher overall R&D intensity of yollies can mostly be attributed to their presence in R&D-intensive sectors rather than to them being more R&D intensive than their older counterparts within their sector. Table 1 shows that old firms in young sectors are also more R&D intensive than average old firms, in response to competition from the young firms in their sector, and/or because they are doing the follow-up innovations on the breakthrough innovations of the young firms. The importance of this sectoral dimension for explaining the difference in R&D intensity between young and old firms is more rigorously examined and confirmed in Box 1.

3.3. Importance of Yollies for R&D and sales growth

Beyond their contribution to overall R&D, sales and employment, young firms being typically more dynamic can be expected to be even more pivotal contributors to growth in R&D and ultimate sales and employment growth. Table 2 presents the growth performance of yollies compared to ollies and their contribution to total growth. The superior performance of yollies (relative to ollies) is striking when looking at their dynamic R&D performance.

Table 2. R&D, net sales and employees, annual average growth of yollies and ollies (2004-07) (in %)

	Total growth	Growth yollies	Growth ollies	Yollies contribution to total growth
R&D	8	13	7	31
Net sales	9	14	8	16
Employees	3	5	3	20

Notes: Growth of Y defined as: $\Delta Y_t = (Y_t - Y_{t-1}) / \left(\frac{(Y_t + Y_{t-1})}{2} \right)$

The time period considered is 2004-07; i.e. differences are divided by three for an average annual growth percentage (AAGR).

The contribution of young to total growth is calculated as: $\left(\Delta Y_t^y \left(\frac{w_{t-1}^y + w_t^y}{2} \right) \right) / \Delta Y_t$;

For employees, calculations based on only 1009 firms.

The R&D growth rate of yollies is twice as high as for ollies[13]. Although the differential is somewhat smaller for sales growth, yollies also demonstrate higher sales and employment growth. Unfortunately, as the weight of yollies in total R&D is small (19 percent, see Table 1), the contribution of yollies to the total growth in R&D remains confined to 30 percent. For sales growth, this figure amounts to 16 percent, for employment 20 percent. These numbers are nevertheless greater than their weight in R&D, reflecting the stronger dynamic performance of yollies.

[12] As discussed by Jaumotte and Pain (2005), the results of analyses of the R&D deficit into these two components have been shown to be highly sensitive to the level of detail at which industries are compared: 'Typically, the proportion of the gap in R&D intensities explained by differences in industrial composition has been found to rise as the extent of disaggregation rises'. As we are already using a rather aggregated level of sector classification, the weight of the structural effect could be even higher in a more disaggregated analysis.

[13] Firms in the 2008 industry scoreboard show on average a strong upward trend in R&D in the period 2004-07, which is different from the stagnant business R&D-to-GDP ratios in the US and the EU.

Table 3 clearly shows that young sectors have a higher than average R&D growth rate, with the exception of telecoms equipment and services. Thanks to this higher growth performance, young sectors, representing 29 percent of total R&D investments in 2007, have a more substantial contribution to total R&D growth (2004-07), amounting to 37 percent.

In the young sectors, the contribution of the young firms to this above-average R&D growth is much more substantial (91 percent) than for the average sector (where it was 31 percent). This is not surprising, as yollies have a greater weight in total in these sectors (see Table 1). But the higher contribution of yollies is also due to a stronger growth performance of yollies in these sectors, especially in biotechnology and healthcare, but also in computer hardware and services. Only in telecoms equipment are the ollies on a par with the yollies. In telecoms services, yollies contribute almost nothing to total R&D growth, but this is not a young sector.

Table 3. R&D and net sales growth (in %) of yollies and ollies by sector (2004-07)

	Total Growth in R&D	Growth yollies	Growth ollies	Yollies contribution to total growth	Sector Contribution to total R&D growth
Pharmaceuticals	12	18	12	5	24
Biotechnology	14	16	1	98	4
Health Care	12	18	11	37	2
Computer hardware	7	13	5	58	4
Computer services	2	11	1	47	1
Internet	37	37		100	3
Semiconductors	9	12	7	61	7
Software	12	12	10	90	6
Telecom Equipment	12	12	12	33	10
Telecom services	12	3	13	3	3
Electronics	7	17	6	19	4
Average young sector	***13***	***18***	***9***	***91***	***37***

Notes: Shaded cells are the young sectors; first box is the health-box; second box is the ICT; Weights are expressed in R&D.
See Appendix A.2. for a version of Table 3 with all sectors[14].

4 Yollies and the EU's R&D gap

With young firms being more R&D intensive and being the driving force in young sectors with a high R&D focus, an obvious next step in the analysis is to check if this can explain the gap in the EU's R&D performance relative to the US.

4.1. Yollies by region

Of all YLI in the sample, 58 percent are US owned (218 firms) and 19 percent EU owned (59 firms). Correcting for the overall representation of US and EU firms in the sample, we see that the US with a ratio of 1.5, is 'overrepresented' in the population of YLI. Also, the rest of the world (RoW) has relatively more YLI (with a ratio of 1.5). The EU is 'underrepresented' in YLI with a ratio of 0.65. Japan is almost absent with a ratio of 0.08.

[14] Among the 'old' sectors, pharmaceuticals, telecom services and aerospace & defense have an above average R&D growth rate, while chemicals, automobiles and electric and electronic equipment are below average.

Among the US's leading innovators, more than half of them are YLI, as Table 4 documents. By contrast, Europe has only one out of five leading innovators as 'young'. For the US, YLI account for 35 percent of total R&D, for the EU this is a mere seven percent! Japan is the 'old' model with almost no young firms among its leading innovators.

Table 4. Share Presence of yollies by region(2007) (in %)

	EU	US	Japan	RoW	World
% yollies in firms	20	52	1.5	53	**34**
% yollies in R&D	7	35	0.5	27	**19**
% yollies in Net sales	5	16	1.5	27	**11**
% yollies in Employment	4	19	1.8	34	**12**

4.2. The innovative profile of Yollies by region

As Table 4 shows, yollies' share of R&D is higher than their share of net sales, both in the US and the EU, indicating that in these regions yollies have a higher R&D intensity compared to their older counterparts. But for the US this is more evident, leaving a higher R&D intensity differential for US yollies as compared to the EU, as Table 5 documents. For Japan and the rest of the world this is not the case. The yollies in the rest of the world have almost the same R&D intensity as ollies, while in Japan, yollies have a smaller R&D intensity than ollies.

Table 5. R&D intensity of yollies and ollies by region

	World	EU	US	JAP	RW
R&D intensity	3.6	3.0	4.6	3.7	2.7
Yollies' R&D intensity	6.4	4.4	10.2	1.2	2.7
Ollies' R&D intensity	3.2	2.9	3.5	3.8	2.7

The R&D intensity of EU companies (three percent) is on average smaller than that of US companies (4.6 percent). With the US benchmarked at 100, the EU's R&D intensity gap is 65 percent. This gap holds both for ollies and yollies. But the difference is more pronounced for yollies. While the EU's R&D intensity gap is 83 percent for ollies, for yollies it is 43 percent.

We further zero in on this gap in R&D intensity as it is the micro-equivalent of the macro business R&D-to-GDP ratio, pivotal since the Barcelona targets and the Lisbon strategy, as well as its successor the EU 2020 strategy.

The lower overall R&D intensity of EU leading innovators compared to the US can be explained by the combination of the following results:

- The EU has fewer yollies than the US. This matters because yollies have a higher R&D intensity;
- The EU-based yollies are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts;
- Also the EU-based ollies are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts.

With a decomposition analysis, we can calculate the exact size of these effects (Box 2 on the next page). This decomposition analysis shows that all three effects contribute to explaining the lower R&D intensity of EU leading innovators. It matters that the EU has fewer yollies than the US, but also that its yollies as well as its ollies are less R&D intensive compared to the US. But the most important component is the second factor, that EU based yollies are less R&D intensive than US yollies. This factor accounts for 55 percent of the total EU-US R&D-intensity

differential. The policy implications of this important finding are discussed in Veugelers and Cincera (2010).

With respect to Japan, the EU also has a gap in R&D intensity, albeit smaller than the US gap. This gap with Japan is entirely due to the superior R&D -intensity performance of Japan's old companies. The fact that the EU has more yollies than Japan and that they are performing better than their Japanese counterparts is not strong enough to compensate for the superior performance of Japanese ollies.

Box 2. Differences in total R&D intensity between the EU and the US decomposed by age

The difference in total R&D intensity between the EU and the US can be decomposed by age of firm in the following components (see Annex 2 for the exact formulas):

Structural effect: the difference in shares of the age groups between the US and the EU. A positive structural effect will capture that the EU has fewer companies of the high R&D-intensive type as compared to the US. These are the yollies.

Intrinsic effect: the difference in R&D intensity between the US and the EU for both age groups (young and old). A positive intrinsic effect will capture whether young/old companies in the EU are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts.

Both the intrinsic and the structural effects are indeed positive. In relative terms, the structural effect is the least important as it contributes 34 percent of the EU-US R&D intensity differential. This leaves 66 percent of the R&D intensity EU-US differential explained by the intrinsic effect. This intrinsic effect is to the tune of 84 percent caused by the young firms, ie 55 percent of the EU-US R&D intensity differential is explained by the lower R&D intensity of EU yollies as compared to US yollies.

Total difference in RDI $RDI^{US} - RDI^{EU}$	Structural effect	Intrinsic effect		
		Total	Young	Old
3.8	1.3	2.5	2.1	0.4
100%	34%	66%	55%	11%

4.3. A sectoral explanation for the EU-US yollies R&D intensity gap

As the young-intrinsic effect explains most of the difference in EU-US R&D intensity differential, we need to understand better why EU yollies are less R&D intensive than US yollies. Is it a case of wrong sectoral specialisation? Are EU yollies operating in less R&D-intensive sectors or are EU yollies less R&D intensive when compared to their US counterparts in the same sectors[15]?

[15] Alternatively to sectoral specialisation, it is more difficult to examine differences in size between EU and US young firms as a reason to explain the difference in R&D intensity in the scoreboard sample, as we only have

Again we use a decomposition analysis to calculate the sizes of these effects (see Box 3).

Box 3. Differences in Yollies R&D intensity in the EU and the US decomposed by sector

The difference in the R&D intensity of yollies in the US and the EU (i.e. the intrinsic effect of Box 2) can be decomposed along the sectoral dimension in the following components (see Annex 2 for the exact formulas):

Structural effect: the difference between the US and the EU in shares of the sectors in which the yollies are located. A positive structural effect will capture that the EU has fewer yollies than the US in high R&D-intensive sectors.

Intrinsic effect: the difference in R&D intensity of yollies between the US and the EU by sector. A positive intrinsic effect will capture whether yollies in the EU are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts within the same sector.

Total difference in RDI^y $RDI^{y,US} - RDI^{y,EU}$	**Structural effect**	**Intrinsic effect**
3.11	2.87	0.24
100%	92%	8%

Both the intrinsic and the structural effects are positive. But almost all of the difference in yollies' R&D intensity between the US and the EU is due to the structural effect (i.e. the different sectoral composition).

Although the difference in R&D intensity between the US and the EU for old companies was less important, it was nevertheless responsible for 11 percent of the overall R&D-intensity gap. A similar decomposition exercise can be performed for the ollies:

Total difference in RDI^o $RDI^{o,US} - RDI^{o,EU}$	**Structural effect**	**Intrinsic effect**
1.19	1.56	-0.37
100%	+131%	-31%

The largest factor explaining the difference in the case of ollies is again the positive structural effect, with US old leading innovators more present in high R&D-intensity sectors. But for ollies, the intrinsic effect is negative, i.e. EU ollies within the same sector are on average more R&D intensive than their US counterparts.

As Box 3 details, almost all of the explanation for the lower R&D intensity of yollies in the EU as compared to the US can be found in the different sectoral composition. Europe simply has fewer yollies in the high R&D-intensive sectors. Interestingly, this sectoral specialisation story also explains the difference in R&D intensity between the EU and the US for old companies and even more so, as the intrinsic effect for old companies turns out to be negative, i.e. within sectors old EU leading innovators are performing better than their old US counterparts.

leading innovators, which are already substantially sized. Within this sample of large leading innovators, the average size of the EU and US yollies does not seem to differ substantially (a US young leading innovator on average has 8300 employees, an EU young leading innovator 8500).

Therefore, the reason why EU ollies are performing on average worse than their US counterparts is entirely due to a different sectoral composition. Once corrected for this, EU ollies perform better than their US counterparts. Unfortunately, the ollies differential effect is of only minor importance in explaining the total EU-US differential effect (11 percent, see Box 2).

4.4. Who specialises in young, high R&D-intensity sectors?

To further zero in on the sectoral composition effect explaining most of the EU-US differential in R&D intensity, we look at the sectors in which the EU specialises, i.e. where relatively more of its leading innovators (young and old), can be found.

Table A.2 in Annex 1 shows the sectors in which EU R&D is over-represented. It confirms the EU specialisation pattern in sectors characterised as medium R&D intensive, found also by Moncada *et al* (2009). These include aerospace, automobiles, chemicals, electrics, industrial machinery, telecoms services. None of these sectors are young or high R&D-intensive sectors. All of them are older, medium R&D-intensive sectors. Furthermore, automobiles, chemicals and electrics are sectors with below-average R&D growth.

When it comes to high R&D-intensive sectors, there are not many sectors where the EU holds a comparative technology advantage. In pharmaceuticals, the EU's Revealed Comparative Advantage index (RTA) is about 1. The only young and high R&D-intensive sector in which the EU is specialised is telecoms equipment.

The US by contrast is specialised in all young, high R&D intensive sectors: biotechnology, computer hardware, computer services, healthcare equipment and services, internet, semiconductors, software and telecommunications equipment. It is also specialised in pharmaceuticals. It therefore specialises in all high R&D-intensive sectors.

The only R&D-intensive sector in which Japan is specialised is computer hardware and services, while the rest of the world is specialised in semiconductors and pharmaceuticals.

4.5. Which sectors drive the R&D intensity gap of EU's young leading innovators?

Overall, while the US has 75 percent of its young leading innovators in high R&D- intensive sectors, the EU only has 52.5 percent of its yollies in these sectors. In which young and high R&D-intensive sectors are there fewer EU yollies? Table 6 on the next page provides a closer look at the sectors in the ICT and health nexus, most of them young and/or high-tech.

The sector most responsible for the structural effect in the EU-US yollies R&D intensity gap (see Box 3) is biotechnology, which is a young and high R&D-intensive sector. In this sector, as Table 6 details, the EU has fewer yollies than the US. In addition, EU biotechnology yollies are much less R&D intensive than their US counterparts. Biotechnology is hence both a structural and an intrinsic story. Also in pharmaceuticals, there are more yollies in the US than in the EU, enforcing the structural effect. The few yollies the EU has in this sector are, however, much more R&D intensive than their US counterparts, counteracting the overall positive intrinsic effect. In healthcare equipment, there are fewer yollies in the EU as compared to the US, reinforcing the structural effect from Box 3.

Table 6. Health & ICT sectors

	European Union					United States				
	Yollies RDI		**Ollies RDI**		**Yollies as % of firms**	**Yollies RDI**		**Ollies RDI**		**Yollies as % of firms**
Pharmaceuticals	25	*	15		5	14		15		6
Biotechnology	18		10	*	12	27		12	*	17
Health care	11	*	4		2	10		7		4
Computer hardware			6	*	0	6		4		7
Computer services	3	*	5	*	7	6	*	6	*	1
Internet					0	11				3
Semiconductors	17		16	*	10	18		16		20
Software	17		14	*	20	15		13		17
Telecom Equipment	18	*	13		3	14		11		8
Telecom Services	1	*	2		3			1	*	0
Electronics	6		6		9	5		5		2
All Sectors	4		3		100	10		4		100

Notes: * Disaggregating the data into sectors, geographic areas and age group leaves in many cases few observations for analysis, calling for caution when interpreting results. Cells with less than 5 observations are indicated by *; Young sectors in bold; first box is the health-box; second box is the ICT.

In the ICT nexus, semiconductors is the sector most responsible for the structural effect in the EU-US yollies RDI gap, while the internet sector is the clearest case of a structural EU yollies problem, as there are no EU leading innovators while in the US, they are all yollies. The EU also has relatively fewer of its yollies in computer hardware and telecoms equipment than the US. However, in software and computer services the EU has relatively more of its yollies than the US, but the Europeans are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts.

Within most ICT sectors, the difference in R&D intensity between EU and US yollies is small, confirming the low importance of the intrinsic effect overall. In some sectors, EU yollies are even more R&D intensive than their US counterparts. This holds, as Table 6 shows, in telecoms equipment. While the EU ollies too have a higher R&D intensity than their US counterparts, the positive differential is stronger for the yollies in this sector. There are unfortunately relatively fewer yollies and they are smaller in R&D volume, enforcing the overall structural effect from Box 3.

A digression on rest-of-the-world yollies:

Rest-of-the-world (RoW) yollies are concentrated in computer hardware, computer services, electronics, semiconductors and telecoms equipment (53 percent of RoW yollies are in these four sectors). With the exception of electronics, which is a medium R&D-intensive sector, these are young, R&D-intensive sectors. But in all these sectors, RoW yollies have a lower R&D intensity as compared to other yollies. So, while for the EU its yollies R&D-intensity gap with respect to the US is mostly structural, for the RoW the intrinsic effect is more dominant in explaining its yollies R&Dintensity gap with the US.

5. Yollies and the EU's R&D and growth performance

With young leading innovators having a higher R&D and sales growth rate, and being the driving force in young sectors with high R&D growth, a next step in the analysis is to check whether young firms are behind the differential in the R&D growth performance of the EU relative to the US.

5.1. EU-US differentials in growth profile of young leading innovators

Overall, the US has a better R&D growth performance than the EU. Japan, with its 'old' leading firm model records the lowest overall R&D growth, both for its ollies and yollies.

Table 7a. Annual average R&D growth (2004-07) of yollies and ollies by region (in %)

R&D	World	EU	US	JAP	RoW
Total Growth	8	7	10	5	13
Growth yollies	13	12	13	7	13
Growth ollies	7	7	8	5	12
Contribution of yollies to total growth	28	10	47	1	28

When comparing R&D growth performances within the same age category, the EU only has a small disadvantage relative to the US, both for yollies and for ollies. In the US, yollies have the highest contribution to overall R&D growth, being responsible for almost half of US R&D growth. In the EU by contrast, yollies account for only 10 percent of total EU R&D growth, despite their higher growth rate as compared to ollies, but because of their lower weight. Hence, the superior contribution of yollies to R&D growth in the US is mostly a structural effect, from having more yollies in sectors characterised by high R&D growth, not so much from having yollies with stronger growth performance.

Also on sales growth performance, the differences between the EU and the US are less pronounced when comparing within age categories. In both regions, yollies have a higher differential sales growth performance as compared to the US. The higher contribution of yollies to sales growth in the US is therefore only due to having more yollies. Japan is the only case where ollies have a higher sales growth performance than the yollies, further confirming its 'old' model.

Table 7b. Annual average net sales growth (2004-07) of yollies and ollies by region (in %)

Net Sales	World	EU	US	JAP	RoW
Total Growth	9	8	8	7	15
Growth yollies	14	12	13	4	18
Growth ollies	8	8	7	7	14
Contribution of yollies to total growth	27	6	23	1	31

5.2. A sectoral look into the EU-US R&D growth differential

Most of the difference in the contribution of yollies to total growth between the US and the EU is due to the EU having fewer yollies, as on average, the difference in growth performance of yollies in the US and the EU, is not big. To further unravel this effect, the next table looks at the R&D growth performance of US and EU yollies by sector, most particularly for (young) sectors in the ICT and health nexus.

Table 8: Growth rate of R&D (2004-07) and contribution of yollies to total R&D growth Healthcare and ICT sectors

	European Union				United States			
	Ollies growth	**Yollies growth**	**Overall growth**	**Contribution of yollies to growth**	**Ollies growth**	**Yollies growth**	**Overall growth**	**Contribution of yollies to growth**
Pharmaceuticals	13	30	14	4	9	15	10	7
Biotechnology	8	12	11	78	-13	16	15	103
Health care	9	11	9	25	11	19	14	42
Computer hardware	2		2		1	11	7	93
Computer services	9	13	12	84	2	5	2	14
Internet					0	37	37	100
Semiconductors	5	6	5	63	7	11	9	53
Software	12	15	13	53	3	12	12	99
Telecom equipment	13	21	13	2	13	14	14	65
Telecom services	18	6	17	3	56	0	56	0
Electronic equipt.	1	22	6	83	4	14	6	34
TOTAL	7	12	7	10	8	13	10	47

Notes: Growth numbers are average annual growth rates (2004-07). Bold are the young sectors. First box is the health-box, second box is the ICT. In the internet sector the EU has no leading innovators. In the US, there are only yollies and internet has no 2004 value.

US yollies grow faster than EU yollies in biotechnology and healthcare. And since, on top of this, there are more yollies in the US in these sectors, the contribution of yollies to growth in these sectors is much greater in the US than in the EU. In pharmaceuticals, the EU's R&D growth performance is much stronger than the US. This differential growth performance holds both for ollies and yollies, but it is stronger for yollies. Unfortunately, there are few yollies in this sector.

In telecoms equipment, EU yollies grow faster than US yollies, but unfortunately there are few yollies in this sector, such that their contribution to growth in this sector is almost negligible. In software, EU yollies have grown faster than US yollies, but in this sector especially EU ollies have a strong positive growth differential relative to their US counterparts. In semiconductors, both EU ollies and yollies score below their US counterparts.

6. Summary of main findings

Young leading innovators, although typically smaller in R&D size than their older counterparts, have a higher R&D intensity and higher R&D and sales/employment growth rates. They shape 'young sectors' in the health and ICT nexus. All these young sectors are also R&D-intensive sectors, i.e. their R&D intensity is twice the total average. In these young sectors, old firms are also more R&D intensive, incited by the technological opportunities for new developments, perhaps pursuing follow-up innovations on the breakthrough innovations launched by the young firms and/or stirred by the competition of the young firms in their sector.

Young leading innovators in young sectors are pivotal for understanding the EU's gap in R&D performance as compared to the US. The superior US R&D performance can to a large extent

be attributed to young leading innovators playing a more pivotal role in the US R&D landscape. First, the EU has fewer young firms among its leading innovators than the US. But this effect only accounts for about one-third of the US-EU differential. The largest part of the differential (55 percent) is due to the fact that the young leading innovators in the EU are less R&D intensive than in the US. Also, old leading innovators in the EU are less R&D intensive due to the sector composition effect. When comparing within sectors, EU ollies are more R&D intensive than US ollies. But this differential is far less important in explaining the overall gap (11 percent).

Further unravelling why EU-based young leading innovators are on average less R&D intensive than their US counterparts shows that this is almost entirely due (92 percent) to a different sectoral composition. US-based young leading innovators are more present in high R&D-intensive young sectors. When looking within sectors, there are only minor differences in R&D performance of young leading innovators from the EU as compared those from the US.

The major implication from the analysis is that closing the EU-US private R&D gap is mostly a structural issue. It will mean the EU having more yollies, but especially having them in the new (R&D-intensive) sectors. The policy agenda needed to address this structural challenge is daunting. It is discussed in detail in Veugelers and Cincera (2010).

BOX 4: THE R&D SCOREBOARD/YOLLIES ANALYSIS, SOME CAVEATS

A number of caveats need to be mentioned, to caution the use of the results as well as to suggest avenues for future research.

On the age classification
The classification of companies into 'young' and 'old' has been done using the date of foundation of the company, or in case of M&A the age of the oldest entity. This creates a bias against rejuvenated older companies (such as Nokia or Syngenta) and sectors that went through technology and/or market transformations (such as telecoms services or media). This could matter for the analysis of EU-US differences if the EU is specialised in these 'transformed' sectors and if the EU would have more of these 'transformed' firms. Nevertheless, the analysis shows that these transformed sectors are not highly R&D intense, and that these older, transformed firms, in terms of their collective weight, do not offset the EU's 'yollies' disadvantage.

On the regional classification
Firms are classified as EU- or US-based depending on the ultimate ownership of the company and not by the location of its activities. When EU young firms are taken over by US entities, the R&D, growth and jobs created by these companies are accredited to the US rather than the EU. Our search of the websites of sampled companies suggests however that this phenomenon is not too pervasive.

Most of the leading innovators in the scoreboard, old and new, are active beyond their region of ownership. An analysis based on location of a firm's activities rather than ownership could yield different results.

On the size of the sampled firms
The analysis only covers firms that have reached an R&D size sufficient to qualify them for entering the scoreboard of largest R&D spenders. The EU's lack of yollies could thus be explained by i). a lack of start-ups and/or ii). a lack of firms growing large enough to feature in the scoreboard. The scoreboard data does not allow these possible explanations to be disentangled, though the separate problems of firm entry and firm growth come with different policy implications.

On R&D performance
The analysis only looks at R&D performance, showing that EU yollies persistently lag their US counterparts in this respect. But should we care about their R&D performance? Perhaps young EU firms are doing well on world markets, basing their growth not on R&D but on other less R&D-intensive strategies. The analysis does indeed suggest that the sales growth performance gap between EU and US yollies is smaller than the R&D gap and that EU young firms are based more in non high-tech sectors compared to US young firms.

On 2007
The analysis is a snapshot of 2007 only. Perhaps the EU is a latecomer in many new sectors such as the internet sector. EU yollies in these sectors are perhaps only more recently starting to appear in the scoreboard. The EU might also be more successful in other new emerging sectors, such as green technologies, which are only recently becoming large enough to feature in the scoreboard. Analysis of future releases of the scoreboard data may validate these optimistic views.

References

Aghion P., E. Bartelsman, E. Perotti and S. Scarpetta (2008) 'Barriers to exit, experimentation and comparative advantage', RICAFE 2 WP 056, London School of Economics.

Bartelsman E., J. Haltiwanger and S. Scarpetta (2004) 'Microeconomic evidence of creative destruction in industrial and developing countries', *Discussion Papers* 04-114/3, Tinbergen Institute.

Cohen, E. and J-H Lorenzi (2000) *Politiques industrielles pour l'Europe*, Conseil d'Analyse. économique Rapport 26, La Documentation française Denis, C., K. Mc Morrow, W. Röger and R. Veugelers (2005) 'The Lisbon Strategy and the EU's structural productivity problem', *European Economy*, Economic Papers 221, European Commission DG ECFIN.

European Commission (2005) *Key Figures 2005 on science, technology and innovation: towards a European Knowledge Area*, DG Research.

European Commission (2008) 'Analysis of the 2007 EU Industrial R&D Investment Scoreboard', *Scientific and Technical Report* series, Joint Research Centre - Institute for Prospective Technological Studies and DG Research, available at http://ftp.jrc.es/EURdoc/JRC45683.pdf

Jaumotte, F. and N. Pain (2005) 'Innovation in the business sector', *Economics Department Working Papers* no. 459, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Moncada, P., C. Ciupagea, K. Smith, A. Tubke and M. Tubbs (2009) 'Does Europe perform too little corporate R&D?' *Working Paper on Corporate R&D and Innovation* No11/2009, Institute for Prospective Technological Studies.

O'Mahoney, M. and B. van Ark (2003) *EU productivity and competitiveness: an industry perspective - can Europe resume the catch-up process?* Report to the European Commission.

O'Sullivan, M. (2007) 'The EU's R&D deficit and innovation policy', Report of the Expert Group on 'Knowledge for Growth', European Commission DG Research.

Philippon, T. and N. Veron (2008) 'Financing Europe's fast movers', *Policy Brief* 2008/01, Bruegel, Brussels.

Van Pottelsberghe, B. (2008) 'Europe's R&D: missing the wrong targets?', *Policy Brief* 2008/03, Bruegel, Brussels.

Veugelers, R. (2009) 'A lifeline for Europe's Young Radical Innovators', *Policy Brief* 2009/01, Bruegel, Brussels.

Veugelers, R., M. Cincera (2010) 'Europe's missing Yollies', *Policy Brief* 2010/06, Bruegel, Brussels.

ANNEX 1: Tables

Table A1. Contribution of yollies by sector

	Yollies as % of firms	Yollies share of R&D	RDI Yollies	RDI Ollies	Sector's share of total R&D
Aerospace & defence	20.5	3.1	4.5	2.8	4.2
Automobiles & parts	14.5	3.7	4.2	3.8	17.5
Biotechnology	90.9	91.8	9.2	26.7	2.2
Chemicals	11.0	4.1	3.2	0.8	4.5
Commercial vehicles & trucks	4.5	1.8	2.9	2.3	1.7
Computer hardware	63.4	36.4	4.6	3.8	4.6
Computer services	64.3	12.6	5.5	4.6	1.8
Construction & materials	0.0	0.0	0.9		0.6
Electrical components & equipment	19.4	10.2	3.3	4.1	2.6
Electricity	6.7	1.7	1.0	0.3	0.6
Electronic equipment & electronic office equipment	26.2	8.7	5.6	2.1	5.1
Fixed & mobile telecommunications	30.0	10.9	1.7	1.0	2.4
Food & drug retailers & general retailers	0.0	0.0	0.3		0.3
Food, beverages & tobacco	3.4	0.9	1.5	0.7	1.5
Gas, water & multi-utilities	0.0	0.0	0.3		0.2
General industrials	8.6	3.7	2.2	1.3	2.2
Health care equipment & services	25.6	28.6	6.0	10.6	1.7
Household goods	10.5	3.5	2.2	4.3	1.0
Industrial machinery	5.9	5.1	2.4	7.0	1.3
Industrial metals	11.1	5.6	0.7	3.2	0.6
Internet	100.0	100.0		10.9	1.0
Leisure goods	26.9	9.6	6.0	13.0	3.8
Media	30.0	9.2	1.7	1.1	0.5
Oil & gas	6.7	7.7	0.4	0.6	2.0
Personal goods	6.7	4.4	2.1	2.9	0.6
Pharmaceuticals	28.2	3.4	15.5	15.1	17.2
Semiconductors	70.7	53.1	13.8	15.2	6.7
Software	85.9	88.2	13.8	15.3	4.6
Support services	30.8	15.0	2.2	2.1	0.3
Telecommunications equipment	64.1	34.4	12.0	13.5	6.6
Travel & leisure	50.0	48.0	9.9	1.6	0.3
TOTAL	**33.7**	**18.9**	**3.2**	**6.4**	**100.0**

Table A2. RTA Indexes

	EU	Japan	US	RoW
Aerospace & defence	1.7	0.0	1.1	0.3
Automobiles & parts	1.4	1.5	0.6	0.3
Biotechnology	0.2	0.1	2.2	0.5
Chemicals	1.3	1.4	0.6	0.7
Commercial vehicles & trucks	1.3	0.6	1.0	0.8
Computer hardware	0.0	2.4	1.2	0.6
Computer services	0.2	1.2	1.7	0.3
Construction & materials	1.3	2.2	0.2	0.6
Electrical components & equipment	1.6	1.4	0.2	1.6
Electricity	1.6	1.4	0.0	2.2
Electronic equipment & electronic office equipment	0.2	2.2	0.4	3.5
Fixed & mobile telecommunications	1.7	1.1	0.2	1.7
Food & drug retailers & general retailers	2.1	0.0	0.9	0.0
Food, beverages & tobacco	1.0	0.9	0.7	2.1
Gas, water & multi-utilities	2.4	1.0	0.2	0.0
General industrials	0.6	0.8	1.5	0.7
Health care equipment & services	0.7	0.1	1.8	0.3
Household goods	1.0	0.5	1.6	0.0
Industrial machinery	1.9	0.9	0.2	1.2
Industrial metals	1.1	2.0	0.3	1.6
Internet	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.2
Leisure goods	0.4	3.8	0.4	0.1
Media	2.2	1.1	0.2	0.0
Oil & gas	1.0	0.1	0.8	3.1
Personal goods	1.1	0.9	0.7	1.9
Pharmaceuticals	1.0	0.5	1.1	1.5
Semiconductors	0.5	0.3	1.7	1.1
Software	0.6	0.0	2.0	0.3
Support services	0.9	0.4	1.2	1.7
Telecommunications equipment	1.6	0.0	1.1	0.8
Travel & leisure	0.0	2.8	1.1	0.6

Note: RTA are calculated as the share of the region in total sectoral R&D relative to the share of the region in overall R&D. A RTA value higher than 1 reflects that the region is technology-specialised in this sector.

Table A3. R&D annual average growth (2004-07) of yollies and ollies by sector (%AAGR)

	Total sectoral R&D Growth	Yollies' R&D growth	Ollies' R&D growth	Yollies contribution to sectoral R&D growth	Sector contribution to total R&D growth
Aerospace & defence	11	13	11	4	5
Automobiles & parts	5	-4	5	-4	11
Biotechnology	14	16	1	98	4
Chemicals	3	10	3	10	2
Commercial vehicles & trucks	12	13	12	2	2
Computer hardware	7	13	5	58	4
Computer services	2	11	1	47	1
Construction & materials	4	0	4		0
Electrical components & equipment	-2	6	-3	-25	-1
Electricity	5	45	5	10	0
Electronic equipment &electronic office equipment	7	17	6	19	4
Fixed & mobile telecommunications	12	3	13	3	3
Food & drug retailers & general retailers	18	0	18		0
Food, beverages & tobacco	3	33	3	8	1
Gas, water & multi-utilities	-1	0	-1		0
General industrials	6	31	6	14	2
Health care equipment & services	12	18	11	37	2
Household goods	7	8	6	4	1
Industrial machinery	10	25	10	10	1
Industrial metals	8	26	7	15	1
Internet	37	37	0	100	3
Leisure goods	1	21	0	112	1
Media	11	19	10	9	1
Oil & gas	13	19	13	10	3
Personal goods	6	1	6	1	0
Pharmaceuticals	12	18	12	5	24
Semiconductors	9	12	7	61	7
Software	12	12	10	90	6
Support services	4	4	4	13	0
Telecommunications equipment	12	12	13	33	10
Travel & leisure	14	15	12	75	0
TOTAL	**8**	**13**	**7**	**28**	**100**

Table A4: R&D intensity and proportion of yollies by region and by sector (in %)

Sector	EU				US			
	RDI		Yollies as % of		RDI		Yollies as % of	
	yollies	ollies	firms	R&D	yollies	ollies	firms	R&D
Aerospace & defence	10.5	6.5	18.8	2.0	1.8	3.4	23.5	3.8
Automobiles & parts	3.6	4.7	7.7	0.6	4.2	3.8	35.3	14.5
Biotechnology	18.3	10.4	77.8	72.6	27.0	11.9	97.4	97.4
Chemicals	0.6	3.4	15.0	3.7	0.9	2.9	20.8	7.2
Commercial vehicles & trucks		3.6	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.7	11.1	4.4
Computer hardware		5.6	0.0	0.0	5.7	3.6	65.2	62.1
Computer services	3.5	4.5	80.0	80.1	6.1	5.7	25.0	4.7
Construction & materials		0.7	0.0	0.0		1.1	0.0	0.0
Electrical components & equipment	4.3	3.4	11.1	3.8	3.8	1.9	25.0	17.0
Electricity	0.3	1.1	20.0	3.4				
Electronic equipment &electronic office equipment	5.9	6.1	45.5	30.3	5.3	5.5	29.4	15.0
Fixed & mobile telecommunications	0.7	1.7	20.0	8.1		0.8	0.0	0.0
Food & drug retailers & general retailers		0.4	0.0	0.0		0.3	0.0	0.0
Food, beverages & tobacco		1.8	0.0	0.0		1.2	0.0	0.0
Gas, water & multi-utilities		0.2	0.0	0.0		1.7	0.0	0.0
General industrials		2.9	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.5	16.7	1.8
Health care equipment & services	11.1	3.8	8.3	21.3	10.5	7.5	36.4	32.3
Household goods	9.9	2.3	16.7	6.5	2.4	2.5	12.5	2.5
Industrial machinery	8.1	2.8	8.0	6.1		1.7	0.0	0.0
Industrial metals		0.5	0.0	0.0	6.6	0.8	50.0	33.8
Internet					10.9		100.0	100.0
Leisure goods	11.8	5.9	25.0	3.5	19.9	4.6	44.4	53.7
Media	0.9	2.9	20.0	5.0	1.2	0.2	66.7	65.1
Oil & gas		0.3	0.0	0.0		0.4	0.0	0.0
Personal goods		1.6	0.0	0.0		1.7	0.0	0.0
Pharmaceuticals	25.1	15.5	13.0	2.3	14.3	15.3	48.3	5.2
Semiconductors	17.2	16.1	75.0	70.3	18.4	16.0	72.9	44.9
Software	17.3	14.0	85.7	49.2	14.9	13.1	86.0	97.5
Support services	2.6	2.1	40.0	23.5	1.8	4.2	40.0	18.4
Telecommunications equipment	18.4	13.0	28.6	1.2	14.2	10.7	73.9	62.5
Travel & leisure					7.0	9.0	60.0	80.6
TOTAL	**4.4**	**2.9**	**20.1**	**7.1**	**10.2**	**3.5**	**51.7**	**35.1**

Annex 2: Decomposition formulas

Box 1:

$$RDI^{y} - RDI^{o} = \sum_i RDI_i \left(w_i^y - w_i^o\right) + \sum_i w_i \left(RDI_i^y - RDI_i^o\right)$$

where: RDI = R&D intensity defined as R&D investments divided by net sales

$$RDI^{y} = \sum_i w_i^y RDI_i^y$$

$$RDI^{o} = \sum_i w_i^o RDI_i^o$$

$$RDI_i = \left(RDI_i^y + RDI_i^o\right)/2$$

$$w_i = \left(w_i^y + w_i^o\right)/2$$

w_i^y = share of the sector in total number of young firms
w_i^o = share of the sector in total number of old firms

Box 2 :

$$RDI^{us} - RDI^{eu} = \sum_i \left(w_i^{*us,y} RDI_i^{us,y} + w_i^{*us,o} RDI_i^{us,o}\right) - \sum_i \left(w_i^{*eu,y} RDI_i^{eu,y} + w_i^{*eu,o} RDI_i^{eu,o}\right)$$

$$= \sum_i RDI_i^y \left(w_i^{*us,y} - w_i^{*eu,y}\right) + \sum_i RDI_i^o \left(w_i^{*us,o} - w_i^{*eu,o}\right) + \sum_i w_i^y \left(RDI_i^{us,y} - RDI_i^{eu,y}\right) + \sum_i w_i^o \left(RDI_i^{us,o} - RDI_i^{eu,o}\right)$$

structural young + structural old + intrinsic young + intrinsic old

where: $RDI_i^y = \left(RDI_i^{us,y} + RDI_i^{eu,y}\right)/2$

$$RDI_i^o = \left(RDI_i^{us,o} + RDI_i^{eu,o}\right)/2$$

$$w_i^y = \left(w_i^{*us,y} + w_i^{*eu,y}\right)/2$$

$$w_i^o = \left(w_i^{*us,o} + w_i^{*eu,o}\right)/2$$

$w^*_i{}^{us/eu,y/o}$ = share of young/old firms in the us/eu sector total number of firms

Box 3:

$$RDI^{us,y} - RDI^{eu,y} = \sum_i RDI_i^y \left(w_i^{us,y} - w_i^{eu,y}\right) + \sum_i w_i^y \left(RDI_i^{us,y} - RDI_i^{eu,y}\right)$$

The mission of the JRC-IPTS is to provide customer-driven support to the EU policy-making process by developing science-based responses to policy challenges that have both a socio-economic as well as a scientific/technological dimension.

European Commission
EUR 24325 EN/7 – Joint Research Centre – Institute for Prospective Technological Studies
IPTS WORKING PAPER on CORPORATE R&D AND INNOVATION - No. 07/2010
Title: Rates of returns to R&D of young worldwide leading innovative companies
Author(s): Michele Cincera (European Commission, DG JRC-IPTS and Université Libre de Bruxelles) and Reinhilde Veugelers (Bruegel, CEPR and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven).
Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
2010
EUR – Scientific and Technical Research Series – ISSN 1018-5593
Technical Note – ISSN 1831-872X
ISBN 978-92-79-17039-3
doi:10.2791/46766

Abstract

Innovation in the European Union remains weak according to a number of key 'input' indicators, especially R&D investment by the business sector, and there are relatively few signs of progress. From a firm-level perspective, Europe's innovation gap relative to the US results from an inappropriate industrial structure in which new firms do not play a significant role, especially in new high-tech sectors.

This view of a structural EU innovation deficit has many supporters. But it has received little or no thorough empirical investigation. This paper aims to address this 'evidence gap'. We find that compared to the US, the EU has fewer young firms among its leading innovators. But this accounts for only about one-third of the EU-US differential. The largest part of the differential is due to the fact that young leading innovators in the EU are less R&D intensive than their US counterparts. Further unravelling shows that this is almost entirely due to a different sectoral composition. We thus confirm that the EU-US private R&D gap is indeed mostly a structural issue.

The mission of the Joint Research Centre is to provide customer-driven scientific and technical support for the conception, development, implementation and monitoring of European Union policies. As a service of the European Commission, the Joint Research Centre functions as a reference centre of science and technology for the Union. Close to the policy-making process, it serves the common interest of the Member States, while being independent of special interests, whether private or national.

JRC
EUROPEAN COMMISSION

LF-NG-24325-EN-C

ISBN 978-92-79-17039-3

Publications Office