GE Global Innovation Barometer 2013 Results – Focus The Netherlands
GE global innovation barometer methodology

Now in its third edition and spanning across 25 countries, the GE Global Innovation Barometer is an International opinion survey of senior business executives actively engaged in the management of their firm Innovation strategy.

The survey is conducted by StrategyOne a consulting and research company and funded by GE. The barometer examines the way business executives around the world appreciate the framework for Innovation their country has developed, it also details the perspective from business on the most efficient policies to support Innovation.

Finally it adopts a firm centric approach to better understand the way International businesses adapt their innovation practices and strategies in a challenging economic environment.

Sample covers a diversity of economic sectors

- Other Manufacturing: 17%
- Health: 13%
- Energy: 10%
- Automotive / Transport / Logistics: 10%
- Electronics: 10%
- Professional Services: 8%
- Industrial Products: 8%
- FMCG: 11%
- Other: 5%
- Telecom / Internet: 2%
- High-tech / IT: 6%
- Other economic sectors: 5%

8 out of 10 respondents are men (no quota)
Sample and fieldwork details

3100 phone interviews (in local languages)

25 markets (tracking in 20 markets for 2 years and 10 markets for 3 years)

Questionnaire average duration: 38 Minutes

Period: October 22nd to December 5th 2012

All respondents directly involved in the innovation strategy or process within their company. (28% C-Level).

Average company size is 1 200 employees

Average age of respondent is 43 years old.
The Netherlands Executive Summary
Innovation as a strategic priority for Dutch business

Innovation is a strategic priority for Dutch businesses (91% of Dutch respondents report innovation is a strategic priority for their business).

Various types of innovation are expected to drive the performance of Dutch businesses in the future and these are very much in line with the global average:

- the improvement of existing products or services (mentioned by 80%)
- the development of entirely new products (mentioned in second position by 70% of Netherland respondents)
- The development of new business processes to improve profitability (mentioned in third position by 61% of respondents).

Additionally 44% of Dutch respondents mention the development of new business model as promising way to boost future performance. While this is a lower priority for Dutch respondents when compared to the global average (52%), nearly half still consider it to be a strategic priority.
Abilities businesses must master in order to innovate successfully

To Innovate successfully respondents identify key abilities their businesses must master:

• Understand customers and anticipate market evolutions (82%)
• Attract and retain innovative people (72%)
• Identify and work collaboratively with the best business partners (68%)
• Allowing a specific budget for innovative activities (59%), seems to be a specific area of interest from Dutch business as the result in this market is 5 points higher than the global average
• Weeding out unpromising innovations at an early stage is also an area of specific interest (56%) and is a result higher than the global average
• Mining data inside and outside the company is as well a capability less strongly expressed in The Netherlands with 42% of respondents mentioning it as a key ability vs. 53% of the global sample.

Finally the interest from Dutch respondents in the development of new business models is not a strong priority as only 25% of Dutch respondents regard it as an important ability to successfully innovate vs. 45% of the global sample.
Evaluation of the Dutch framework for innovation

Overall the framework for innovation in The Netherlands is perceived as conducive for innovation by business executives from the other markets: 55% of business executives from the 25 markets regard the Dutch environment for innovation as strongly innovation conducive. This puts the country in the 11th position of the country ranking based on this indicator. When evaluating their own market, 83% of Dutch business executives report that their country has a strongly innovation conducive environment overall.

When asked to evaluate in more detail their environment for innovation, Dutch business executives provide interesting input.

On the negative side, the items connected to the protection of the copyright and the patent are more negatively evaluated than the global average. Trade regulations are also more negatively evaluated than the global average.

On the more positive side, Dutch business executives report higher satisfaction than the global average regarding government support and the ease with which companies can partner with universities for their R&D needs.
Dutch business executives make Innovation a strategic priority and rely on it to drive future performance, in fact: in The Netherlands, only 18% of respondents believe “Innovation has a negative impact on their economy” a result that is lower than the global average (30%).

In this context, Dutch businesses expect renewed support and innovation incentives from policymakers, particularly regarding:

• Fighting red tape and bureaucracy for companies trying to access innovation public funding (33%), showing further evidence of wanting to allow more room for innovative activities.
• Education: 29% of respondents want to encourage a stronger entrepreneurial culture in the education system through stronger linkages between students and business savvy individuals and 22% want to better align students curricula with the needs of business.
• 23% want to ensure that confidentiality and trade secrets are adequately protected
Collaborative innovation as the way forward

Growing trends from the barometer indicate that innovation can start from all kind of economic actors (over 87% of Dutch respondents in 2013 believe that SMEs and individuals can be as innovative as large companies).

This validates the perception that collaboration is key to innovate more successfully. 82% of Dutch respondents report that their firm has increasingly been looking at innovation through the collaborative angle. Furthermore, 90% of respondents agree their firm would be more successful at innovation through partnership than if their company went about it alone.

Business in The Netherlands would like to partner first to improve existing products (87% which is 12 points higher than the global average), access new technology (87% and 8 points higher than the global average), enter new markets (74%) and speed up time to market (85% and 13 points higher than the global average).

The barriers to collaborative innovation are also clearly identified: lack of protection of confidentiality/IP (65%), and a lack of trust in partnerships plus a fear of talent poaching (both at 46%) are considered the main barriers. It is also interesting to note that not feeling that there is enough time to manage partnerships (39%) is higher than the global average.
Innovation is a strategic priority for business globally
Innovation on top of business agenda: 91% of respondents would say it is a strategic priority for their company (vs. 91% average)

Q1. *Would you say that for your company innovation is…:* 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Global Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very high strategic priority</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A quite high strategic priority</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A quite low strategic priority</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very low strategic priority</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovation types and business performance: looking back and looking forward
What kind of Innovation drove business performance in the past in The Netherlands?

Q2. What kinds of innovation have contributed most to your company’s performance in the past few years?

Netherlands results vs. 25 markets Global Average

- The improvement of existing products or services: 80% (Netherlands) vs. 83% (Global)
- The development of entirely new products or services: 72% (Netherlands) vs. 63% (Global)
- The development of more affordable new products and services for the customer: 57% (Netherlands) vs. 55% (Global)
- The development of new business processes to improve profitability: 55% (Netherlands) vs. 61% (Global)
- The development or improvement of products customized to local circumstances or conditions: 54% (Netherlands) vs. 55% (Global)
- The development of more sustainable and eco-friendly processes, products or services: 44% (Netherlands) vs. 52% (Global)
- The development of new business models: 35% (Netherlands) vs. 46% (Global)
- The development of new customer services: 30% (Netherlands) vs. 39% (Global)
A future gazing exercise: what will drive future business performance in The Netherlands?

Q3: What kinds of innovation do you expect to contribute the most to your company’s performance in the future?

The Netherlands results vs. 25 markets Global Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Global</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The improvement of existing products or services</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of entirely new products or services</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of new business processes to improve profitability</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of more affordable new products and services for the customer</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of more sustainable and eco-friendly processes, products or services</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development or improvement of products or services customized to local circumstances or conditions</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of new business models</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of new customer services</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key abilities innovative firms master better
To Innovate successfully business need to master market insight, technology development, partnerships, talent and culture

Q4. How important do you think these abilities are for a company to innovate successfully? (Importance grade on 10 points, % High importance [Top 3 boxes])

- Understand customers and anticipate market evolutions: 81% (Netherlands 82 (+ 1 pt))
- Attract and retain innovative people: 73% (Netherlands 72 (- 1 pt))
- Develop new technology: 66% (Netherlands 58 (- 8 pts))
- Identify and work collaboratively with the best business partners: 66% (Netherlands 64 (- 2 pts))
- Create an environment and culture conducive to Innovation: 64% (Netherlands 55 (- 9 pts))
- Manage and take risks: 60% (Netherlands 54 (- 6 pts))
- Invest on long term innovative projects: 59% (Netherlands 54 (- 5 pts))
- Allocate a specific budget for Innovation activities: 54% (Netherlands 59 (+ 5 pts))
- Challenge generally accepted practices and ways of working: 54% (Netherlands 49 (- 5 pts))
- Mine data inside and outside the company: 53% (Netherlands 42 (- 11 pts))
- Manage an innovation pipeline with a structured business process: 52% (Netherlands 42 (- 10 pts))
- Weed out unpromising innovations at an early stage: 51% (Netherlands 56 (+ 5 pts))
- Come up with new business models: 45% (Netherlands 25 (- 20 pts))
- Create an environment and culture conducive to Innovation: 42% (Netherlands 25 (- 9 pts))
- Attract investors to fund innovative programs: 34% (Netherlands 25 (- 9 pts))
- Develop new technology: 34% (Netherlands 25 (- 9 pts))
- Identify and work collaboratively with the best business partners: 34% (Netherlands 25 (- 9 pts))
- Challenge generally accepted practices and ways of working: 34% (Netherlands 25 (- 9 pts))
Increased competition and protectionist temptation: A global innovation vertigo?
The net positive impact of Innovation on local economies is challenged by 30% of respondents: a globalization anxiety?

Q5-2. By creating more competition among businesses and making some products and services obsolete, innovation has a negative impact on my country’s economy (% Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / Unsure</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The positive impact of Innovation on local economies is challenged: greater competition and shorter business lifecycles

Q5-2. By creating more competition among businesses and making some products and services obsolete, innovation has a negative impact on my country’s economy
Opening up the market or national preference, paradoxical tensions seem to exist within global business

Q9. What are the main priorities your country should focus on to efficiently support innovation?

Q9-8. Promote domestic rather than imported technological development via preferences in government procurement

Q9-11. Promote the importation of innovative technologies by opening the market further to foreign trade and investment
Expectations regarding the policy focus to be adopted are contradictory and vary greatly from one market to another.

Q9. What are the main priorities your country should focus on to efficiently support innovation? (%Top 2 grades = very high priority)

- Promote importation of innovative tech. by opening the market further to foreign trade and investment
- Promote domestic rather than imported technological development via preferences in government procurement

Graph showing data for various countries.
Role of SMEs and need for greater localization: the trend keeps building up globally
A growing consensus around the need for innovation to be embracing the specificities of local market needs

Q5. 1 - More than ever before, innovation needs to be localized to serve specific market needs

Average 20 markets 2012: 76%
Average 20 markets 2013: 84% (+ 8pts)
Innovation can be originated anywhere

Q5. 3 - More than ever before, SMEs and individuals can be as innovative as large companies

Average 20 markets 2012: 79%
Average 20 markets 2013: 84% (+5pts)
A contraction of the Global environment for Innovation
How do respondents evaluate their country’s Innovation framework? No major change in Global ranking, strong new entries

Index on 100 points summarizing the perceptions of respondents regarding 13 dimensions of the Innovation framework of their country.
## The Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Agree 2013</th>
<th>Gap / 2012</th>
<th>Gap / Average 25 markets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government and public authorities allocate an adequate share of their budget to support innovative companies</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+ 19 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental support for innovation is efficiently organized and coordinated</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+ 19 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is quite easy for companies to partner with universities for their R&amp;D needs</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+ 10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local universities and schools provide a strong education model for tomorrow's innovate leaders</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+ 3 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private investors are supportive of companies that need funding to innovate</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-private partnerships have proved effective in supporting innovation</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society as a whole is accepting of taking risks as part of the innovation process</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 7 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society as a whole is supportive of innovation, there is an appetite for innovation among young generations</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general public is convinced of the value innovation can bring to their day-to-day life</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The protection of the copyright and the patent are effective</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speed at which innovative products are brought to market is adequate</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 4 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade regulations are not preventing firms from being commercially successful</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 6 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed results per component & market
Q6. 1 - Private investors are supportive of companies that need funds to innovate

Private investment stagnation, a positive exception in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Africa</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Korea</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 20 markets 2012: 59%
Average 20 markets 2013: 57% (-2pts)
IP protection a growing concern, including in China

Q6. 2 - The current IP protection system does not present barriers to innovation

Average 20 markets 2012: 64%

Average 20 markets 2013: 59% (-5pts)
Contrasted evolution regarding universities’ ability to train talents

Q6. 3 - Universities and schools provide a strong education model for tomorrow’s innovative leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average 2012 (%)</th>
<th>Average 2013 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Africa</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 20 markets 2012: 61%
Average 20 markets 2013: 55% (-6pts)
Lower financial support from Governments overall

Q6. 5- Government and public authorities allocate an adequate share of their budget to support innovative companies

Average 20 markets 2012: 47%
Average 20 markets 2013: 45% (-2pts)
The organization of government incentive to innovation is criticized

Q6. 6 - Governmental support for innovation is efficiently organized and coordinated

Average 20 markets 2012: 43%

Average 20 markets 2013: 39% (-4pts)
On the positive side: a growing appetite from young generations

Q6. 8 - Society as a whole is supportive of innovation, there is an appetite for innovation among young generations

Average 20 markets 2012: 76%
Average 20 markets 2013: 77% (+1pt)
On the positive side: greater societal support

Q6. 9 - The general public is convinced of the value innovation can bring to their day-to-day life

Average 20 markets 2012: 68%

Average 20 markets 2013: 73% (+5pts)
Q6. 10 - Society as a whole accepts that taking risks is part of the innovation process

On the positive side: greater tolerance to Innovation related risks

Average 20 markets 2012: 59%

Average 20 markets 2013: 63% (+4pts)
What policies would support Innovation most efficiently?
Education, fighting bureaucracy and protecting trade secrets evaluated as the most pressing priorities to support Innovation

Q9. What are the main priorities your country should focus on to efficiently support innovation?
Grade on 10 points where 10 means it should be a VERY STRONG priority and 1 a VERY LOW one, (% Top 2 grades)

- Encourage a stronger entrepreneurial culture in the education system through stronger linkages between students and business savvy individuals: 29 (-21 pts)
- Fight bureaucracy and red tape for companies willing to access funds and incentives allocated to innovation: 33 (-15 pts)
- Better align students curricula with the needs of business: 22 (-22 pts)
- Ensure that business confidentiality and trade secrets are adequately protected: 23 (-18 pts)
- Create a financial environment that encourages the development of venture capital: 15 (-23 pts)
Education, fighting bureaucracy and protecting trade secrets evaluated as the most pressing priorities to support Innovation

Q9 What are the main priorities your country should focus on to efficiently support innovation? Grade on 10 points where 10 means it should be a VERY STRONG priority and 1 a VERY LOW one, (% Top 2 grades)

- Create more incubators and facilities for start-ups to develop
- Promote domestic rather than imported technological development via preferences in government procurement
- Boost funding for public research programs
- Introduce results-based incentives for public research programs
- Promote the importation of innovative technologies by opening the market further to foreign trade and investment
- Implement an innovation and entrepreneurship awareness program promoting these values and targeting the general public
- Stimulate innovation through the use of commercially based public procurement

NETHERLANDS %

- 16 (- 20 pts)
- 6 (- 27 pts)
- 13 (- 18 pts)
- 4 (- 26 pts)
- 15 (- 12 pts)
- 7 (- 18 pts)
- 5 (- 15 pts)
### Clustering markets depending on Policy priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Priority</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>South Korea</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>UAE</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage a stronger entrepreneurial culture in the education system through stronger linkages between students and business savvy individuals</td>
<td>2rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight bureaucracy and red tape for companies willing to access funds and incentives allocated to innovation</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better align students curricula with the needs of business</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that business confidentiality and trade secrets are adequately protected</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a financial environment that encourages the development of venture capital</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more incubators and facilities for start-ups to develop</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote domestic rather than imported technological development via preferences in government procurement</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stronger regulation on talent mobility have had a noticeable impact on Business ability to Innovate

Q5-4. Over the last two years, it has become more difficult for companies to hire talented foreign citizens because of stricter visa requirements and it had a negative impact on their ability to innovate
What countries are perceived as displaying the most innovation conducive environment?
EVALUATION OF INNOVATION ENVIRONMENT

Global Evaluation /10 vs. Auto evaluation /10

Countries and their evaluation scores:
- USA: 8.0
- Brazil: 4.0
- Canada: 6.0
- Mexico: 5.0
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- China: 5.5
- India: 5.0
- Singapore: 4.5
- Australia: 4.0
- Japan: 7.0
- South Korea: 6.5
- Sweden: 5.0
- UK: 5.5
- Germany: 7.0
- Poland: 6.0
- UAE: 5.0
- Israel: 6.5
- Nigeria: 4.0
- South Africa: 4.5
- Ireland: 5.0
- Netherlands: 5.5
- Russia: 5.0
- Malaysia: 4.5
- Brazil: 4.0
How do Dutch business executives evaluate other markets’ Innovation environment?

Q8. For each of the following markets, how far would you say that they have developed an Innovation conducive environment?

% of respondents that evaluate a market innovation environment positively by giving it a grade between 7 an 10/10 points (Global perception vs. perception measured among Dutch respondents only)
Collaborative Innovation: review of drivers and barriers, experience and policy framework
Collaborative Innovation has a Global appeal

Q11: Measuring the appetite for collaboration

I am fully convinced that our firm could be more successful with innovation through partnership and collaboration than if we go about it alone

- % Agree: 87%
- % Agree: 90%

Our firm has been changing the way it looks at innovation to integrate more of the need for collaboration both inside and outside the firm

- % Agree: 82%
- % Agree: 82%

I think my firm is open to sharing the revenue stream or the revenue losses that could be generated through a collaborative innovation initiative

- % Agree: 73%
- % Agree: 69%
Partnership is globally seen as an opportunity to succeed

Q11 Measuring the appetite for collaboration
Q11-2: I am fully convinced that our firm could be more successful with innovation through partnership and collaboration than if we go about it alone

Average: 53%
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Emerging markets leading preparing even more strongly to partner

Q11 Measuring the appetite for collaboration
Q11-1: Our firm has been changing the way it looks at innovation to integrate more of the need for collaboration both inside and outside the firm

Average: 38%
Revenue sharing model: a more difficult question to solve

Q11 Measuring the appetite for collaboration
Q11-3: I think my firm is open to sharing the revenue stream or the revenue losses that could be generated through a collaborative innovation initiative

Average: 28%
### Reasons for collaborating

**Q15** Still on collaboration, what are the main reasons why your company would seek to collaborate with entrepreneurs or other companies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To access new technology</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enter new markets</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve an existing product or service</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To speed up time to market</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To invent a new product</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the profitability of an existing offer</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain insights and market intelligence</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To scale up</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To benefit from a company’s sales force</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share costs</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To license patents and technology</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To invent a new business model</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NETHERLANDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To access new technology</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>+8 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enter new markets</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve an existing product or service</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>+12 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To speed up time to market</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>+13 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To invent a new product</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the profitability of an existing offer</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain insights and market intelligence</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>+2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To scale up</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>+10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To benefit from a company’s sales force</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>+2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share costs</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>+15 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To license patents and technology</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To invent a new business model</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-13 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16. Still on collaboration, what are the main reasons why your company would be reluctant to collaborate with entrepreneurs or other companies? (% of respondent that selected the item as a barrier)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Protection of confidentiality / IP</td>
<td>65% (+ 1 pt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust in the partner company</td>
<td>46% (- 1 pt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent / Knowledge poaching</td>
<td>46% (+ 1 pt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a tested Collaboration Process and Collaboration Tools</td>
<td>28% (- 11 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fears over unequal revenue splits</td>
<td>40% (+ 4 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t know how to attract potential partners</td>
<td>25% (- 6 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t have time to allocate to managing the partnership</td>
<td>39% (+ 11 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know if my company is ready or able to be working in partnership</td>
<td>19% (- 9 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t have time to allocate to meeting possible partners</td>
<td>24% (+ 2 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company is bigger than ours</td>
<td>20% (- 2 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our culture is too closed</td>
<td>8% (- 10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company is foreign</td>
<td>13% (- 3 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company is foreign</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GE Global Innovation Barometer
2013 Results – Focus The Netherlands