WORLD KNOWLEDGE COMPETITIVENESS INDEX 2002

Benchmarking the Globe's High Performing Regions

Robert Huggins, Robert Huggins Associates Hiro Izushi, Coventry Business School



WORLD KNOWLEDGE COMPETITIVENESS INDEX 2002

Benchmarking the Globe's High Performing Regions

Robert Huggins, Robert Huggins Associates Hiro Izushi, Coventry Business School





Published by Robert Huggins Business & Economic Policy Press

Meandros House, 54a Bute Street, Cardiff, CF10 5AF Wales, United Kingdom Telephone +44 (0)29 2066 2554 Fax +44 (0)29 2046 3067 http://www.hugginsassociates.com

Robert Huggins Associates is a division of Newidiem International

ISBN: 1-902829-05-0 © Robert Huggins 2002



Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Introduction	5
3	The Economics of Knowledge Competitiveness	7
4	World Knowledge Competitiveness Index - The Rankings	15
5	Human Capital Components	23
6	Knowledge Capital Components	35
7	Regional Economy Outputs	41
8	Knowledge Sustainability Components	45
9	Conclusions : Driving Knowledge-Based Growth	51
	References	56
	Data Sources	57



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many individuals to whom we are indebted for having a positive, and often vital, input into this research project. In the UK, we are grateful to Paul Lovejoy and Rashid Bashir at South East England Development Agency for having the foresight to commission the underlying research behind this on-going project. At Robert Huggins Associates, both Jonathan Day and Claire Ball have worked under extremely tight time-schedules to balance our requests with an array of other pending requirements. We wish to thank Gareth Purnell of Fusednet for arranging the publication of this report at short notice, and to Ian Courtney of TM Communications and David Howells of Rubicon Regeneration for their continuing support of our ideas and thoughts. Complementing our UK partners, the project has benefited from the insights and knowledge provided by a number of US partners: Jennifer Montana of Montana Associates, Yuko Aoyama and Guido Schwarz of Clark University. Also, we are much indebted to Masatsugu Tsuji and Masaru Ogawa of Osaka University, Japan, whose assistance was indispensable to the development of our method of producing a composite index.



Executive Summary

The World Knowledge Competitiveness Index 2002 is the first composite and relative measure of the knowledge economies of the globe's best performing regions. It represents an integrated and overall benchmark of the knowledge capacity, capability and sustainability of each region and the extent to which this knowledge is translated into economic value and transferred into the wealth of the citizens of each region.

Knowledge is the ingredient that underlies the competitiveness of regions, nations, sectors or firms. It refers to the cumulative stock of information and skills concerned with connecting new ideas with commercial values, developing new products and processes and, therefore, 'doing business in a new way'. At its most fundamental level, the knowledge-base of an economy can be defined as:

'the capacity and capability to create and innovate new ideas, thoughts, processes and products, and to translate these into economic value and wealth.'

The focus on a global study of regions is highly relevant, since there is an increasing appreciation that it is regions, rather than whole nations, that are competing in the new global economy. In other words, the globalisation and regionalisation of economies are progressing in tandem.

Through the establishment of a knowledge economy model, this study aims to analyse some of the core factors that will underlie the future development of regional knowledge-based economies.

The model we employ to analyse the knowledge-based regional economies is a multi-linked, cycle model representing knowledge creation and utilisation as well as capacity building. The model is made of four key components: (1) Capital Inputs; (2) Knowledge Economy Production; (3) Regional Economy Outputs (including Knowledge Economy Outputs); and (4) the Sustainability Link.

The world's most knowledge competitive region is Minneapolis-St Paul, with a Knowledge Competitiveness Index score of 147.6, followed by San Francisco (including Silicon Valley) – with a score of 146.4 – and Austin (145.1). Minneapolis-St Paul, along with San Francisco and Austin – as well as a number of other high-performing regions – are the world's best examples of knowledge competitive centres.



Minneapolis-St Paul's top ranking indicates that by our criteria it is the region with the most balanced and equitable knowledge-based economy for sustaining overall levels of growth and prosperity. Although it is does not dominate in any particular sector of economic activity, it has a strong spread of activity across key knowledge-based economic sectors.

The overall rankings are dominated by US regions, accounting for 49 of the top 90 of the world's most knowledge competitive regions. Furthermore, of the US regions, 45 are featured in the top 50 performers, with only 4 US regions performing below the index mean average of 100.

Europe is represented by 32 regions (with 10 from Germany as well as 3 each from the UK, Italy and the Netherlands). However, only 4 European regions feature in the top 50, led by Stockholm (Sweden) in 22nd position (119.4), and followed by Switzerland in 25th (117.0), Uusimaa (Finland) in 36th (111.7), and London (UK) in 50th (102.0).

Nine non-US or European regions are included in the rankings, led by Ontario (Canada) in 48th position (103.7), followed by Tokyo (Japan) in 54th (97.2), British Columbia (Canada) in 58th (95.5), and New South Wales (Australia) in 61st (89.7).

In general, the development of knowledge competitive centres is a long-term process, dependent on an ever-changing balance in the relative importance of the underlying conditions. In particular, there is a shift away from cost factors, physical infrastructure and regulatory policies, towards the importance of the non-physical knowledge-based infrastructure.

From an underlying assumption that the top-performing regions are developing via a common trajectory, we have identified two core drivers of knowledge-based growth. The first covers a combination of the improvement of ICT infrastructure and the mobilisation of human capital resources in economic production activity. The second is investment in R&D by business, alongside investment in education both at the primary, secondary and higher levels, all of which show a positive association with labour productivity. These drivers of knowledge-based growth are necessarily highly influential in determining the fortune of regions that aspire to reach a higher level of knowledge-based economic activity



Introduction

The World Knowledge Competitiveness Index 2002 is the first composite and relative measure of the knowledge economies of the globe's best performing regions. It represents an integrated and overall benchmark of the knowledge capacity, capability and sustainability of each region, and the extent to which this knowledge is translated into economic value and transferred into the wealth of the citizens of each region. Knowledge is the ingredient that underlies the competitiveness of regions, nations, sectors or firms. Through the establishment of a knowledge economy model, this study seeks to explore those factors driving regional knowledge-based development and productivity.

In almost any nation, there is an unequal distribution of wealth among its regions. In the UK, this is manifested in the 'North-South Divide': while regions in the southern half of the country, in particular London and South East England, are seen as the nation's core economic drivers, northern regions have suffered higher unemployment rates and lower income levels (Robert Huggins Associates, 2000). Many studies relate these divides to the different industries located and functions performed in these regions, and differences in supporting environments. Such supporting environments consist of, for example, universities and research establishments, service providers, and information and communication technologies (ICT) infrastructure. Therefore it appears logical to test whether the distribution of knowledge and the capacity of the knowledge economy are also unequal among regions. Subsequently, we have based our analysis at the regional level within a global framework.

The mode by which knowledge is produced has shifted from traditional linear processes of innovation to more complex incremental and iterative chain-link models based on the interactions between knowledge actors. The most prosaic example of this shift is the demise of large in-house assembly-line production, replaced by networked-based models of production. Within these models networked knowledge and information moves between firms in a non-linear manner, dependent on the development of the range of ever-changing products with which they are involved, i.e. a firm's position in the network will alter as requirements and demand shift.

The characteristics associated with these modes of knowledge production include: (1) a rapid rise in the number and types of sites where innovation occurs; (2) the stock of knowledge is an outcome of the intensity of interaction between knowledge actors; (3) the pattern and dynamics of these



interactions are constantly shifting, reflecting ever changing knowledge contexts; and (4) the density of interactions is increasing rapidly, as is the number of knowledge actors. The links between knowledge creation and diffusion processes, through individuals, organisations and systems, are clearly required to be understood as fully as possible, as knowledge becomes the key value creator in modern economies.

A clear understanding of knowledge-based economic activity has, so far, been limited by the number, type and quality of existing indicators. These indicators fail to capture the new processes by which knowledge is created and diffused. Also, unlike other capital goods, knowledge has no limiting or fixed capacity. For instance, the generation of a new idea may have a massive impact or no impact at all. This means that knowledge cannot be measured in simplistic quantitative terms, but must be evaluated as an overlapping mix of a wide array of variables, some of which are measurable, and some of which are currently not. Indeed, if knowledge is viewed in the same light as any other capital form this will limit the capacity for its understanding. Furthermore, difficulties in establishing new indicators are a reflection of the unique character of the knowledge-based economy.

It is our aim in this report to explore the relative knowledge capacity and capability across the world's best performing regions. The series of benchmarks we establish identify the relative strengths and weaknesses of individual regional economies in terms of their knowledge capacity, capability and utilisation. Furthermore, the features of the knowledge-based economy are far from remaining static but are evolving rapidly. Therefore, we aim to analyse some of the core factors that will underlie the future development of regional knowledge-based economies. The focus on a global study of regions is highly relevant, since there is an increasing appreciation that it is regions, rather than whole nations, that are competing in the new global economy. In other words, the globalisation and regionalisation of economies are progressing in tandem.

The following sections of this report consist of those listed below:

- Section 3 : The Economics of Knowledge Competitiveness
- Section 4 : The Rankings World Knowledge Competitiveness Index
- Section 5 : Human Capital Components
- Section 6 : Knowledge Capital Components
- Section 7 : Regional Economy Outputs
- Section 8 : Knowledge Sustainability Components
- Section 9 : Conclusions: Driving Knowledge-Based Growth.
- References
- Data Sources



The Economics of Knowledge Competitiveness

The sources of productivity and economic growth are increasingly based on the role that knowledge plays within and across economies. The concept of the knowledge-based economy has emerged from this increasing recognition of the requirement for the production, distribution and use of knowledge within modern economies. New Growth Theory, developed by the economist Paul Romer, proposes that knowledge has become the third factor of production, alongside labour and capital. Romer argues that knowledge is now in fact the basic form of capital and that economic growth is driven by its accumulation. Knowledge-driven economies are those in which knowledge generation and exploitation lead to the creation of wealth. The proposition of the evolution of economies into knowledge-bound entities results in learning and knowledge creation assuming paramount importance in the quest for prosperity.

DEFINING THE KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMY

We need to be very clear from the outset as to what we are referring to when we use the term knowledge-based economy. At its most fundamental level, the knowledge-base of an economy can be defined as:

'the capacity and capability to create and innovate new ideas, thoughts, processes and products, and to translate these into economic value and wealth.'

Knowledge is the ingredient that underlies the competitiveness of regions, nations, sectors or firms. The knowledge economy includes the skills of workers, the experience of firm managers and owners, as well as what the American economic geographer Edward Malecki terms the 'pulse of customers' needs and demands'. However, the question can reasonably be asked: how can we 'see' the knowledge economy? The following are a number of examples of knowledge economy recognition:

- Where the processes of production and their products have become increasingly complex and sophisticated.
- Where increasingly advanced knowledge and skills are required in the production process.



- Where there is an increasing reliance on specialist and idiosyncratic skills.
- Where there is a more extensive use and transfer of information (Malecki, 2000).

The above leads us to the question, what is knowledge? An informative way of answering this question is to break down the knowledge concept into a number of types, as follows:

- Know-what referring to factual knowledge
- Know-why referring to knowledge of the principles and laws of nature
- Know-how referring to skills or capability required to undertake a task
- Know-who referring to information on who knows what and who knows how to do what.

COMPETITIVENESS, INNOVATION AND KNOWLEDGE

The prosperity of a nation is based upon the productivity gained from the utilisation of its labour force, capital and natural resources (Porter, 1990). The productivity of nations is a function of the interplay of three factors:

- The political, legal and macroeconomic context
- The quality of the microeconomic business environment
- The sophistication of the operations and strategies of its firms.

As illustrated by Figure 1, these three factors determine the capacity of a nation to produce internationally competitive firms and support rising prosperity. The focus of the competitiveness challenge has clearly shifted towards the importance of innovation (Porter, 1999). Furthermore, from the 1990s onwards the competitiveness challenge facing advanced nations has been to adapt to the new environment of the global economy and to build a sound macro and micro-economic foundation. Many countries have moved forcefully towards reducing budget deficits, strengthening financial institutions and streamlining regulation.

At a more micro-level, many firms have made great strides in eliminating non-productive activities and resources (i.e. restructuring), renewing their market focus, and speeding up product and process improvement. There is no end in sight for these changes, and the competitiveness challenge is continually shifting. In the global economy, within which firms have increasingly good access to cheap raw materials and low-wage manual labour around the world, the creation of high value-added rests on innovation, i.e. the ability to create and transform new ideas into commercially valued new products and processes.



MICROECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS



Figure 1 : The Competitiveness Paradigm (Source: Porter, 1990)

Knowledge refers to the cumulative stock of information and skills concerned with connecting new ideas with commercial values, developing new products and processes and, therefore, 'doing business in a new way'. This may be called 'knowledge for innovation' or 'innovative knowledge'. While innovation is a process, knowledge consists of the process recipe and the ingredients to be processed. The knowledge-based economy can be defined as the sphere and nexus of activities and resources centred on and geared towards innovation. Therefore, as illustrated by Figure 2, the relationship between the concepts of knowledge, innovation and competitiveness are strongly associated and inter-linked.



Figure 2 : Competitiveness, Innovation and Knowledge



Knowledge is not - as is sometimes presumed - necessarily confined within 'high technology' industries. Also, although scientific and technical knowledge created by scientists and technologists is a major source of innovation, it is only a part of the value creation process, and must be allied with the conversion of this knowledge into commercial value. Such conversion involves discerning and meeting the needs of customers. Porter (1999) argues that 'there are no "low tech" industries - only low technology companies that fail to incorporate new ideas and methods into their products and processes.'

Hence, the utilisation of a dichotomy between high-technology industries and low-technology industries, based solely on the proportion of employees deemed to be R&D-based, is not a wholly appropriate analytical tool. Instead, we adopt another distinction: 'knowledge-based firms' and 'non-knowledge-based firms'. While 'knowledge-based firms' actively pursue innovation, with a significantly high proportion of their employees involved in producing high value-added, 'non knowledge-based firms' tend to lag behind in the race for the creation, acquisition and transformation of knowledge.

THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY MODEL

The model we employ to analyse the knowledge-based regional economies, as illustrated by Figure 3, is a multi-linked cycle model representing knowledge creation and utilisation as well as capacity building. The model reflects the latest thinking on the innovation process, which sees it as a process whereby agents in different domains (e.g. different departments/divisions of private firms, universities, research laboratories, governments) interact with one another through feedback loops (e.g. Klein and Rosenberg, 1986). We extend this thinking to the regional level and add a component that reproduces and sustains the whole system's innovative capacity.

At the heart of the model's extension to the regional level is our understanding that regional clusters of various agents, embodying networks among them, constitute a key to innovative activity. The model is made of four key components: (1) Capital Inputs; (2) Knowledge Economy Production; (3) Regional Economy Outputs (including Knowledge Economy Outputs); and (4) the Sustainability Link. Each of these components, with the exception of Knowledge Economy Production, has representative variables, while Knowledge Economy Production is regarded as a production function that transforms Capital Inputs into Regional Economy Outputs.

Capital Inputs consist of four groups: Knowledge Capital, Human Capital, Financial Capital, and Physical Capital. Until recently, economists used to account for economic outputs (or growth) of regions/nations by 'capital' and 'labour'. 'Capital' refers to physical units of, or fixed investments in, production such as land, plants, machinery and equipment while 'labour' is simply counted by the number of 'heads' in employment (or working population). Under this framework, a residual that cannot be explained by those two factors is often seen as an indicator of technical change.

This traditional accounting model has given way to new models due to two key developments in economic theory: human capital theory and endogenous models of economic growth. Human capital theory recognises skills and expertise gained through education and training as investment made by, and embodied in, individuals. This is a departure from the traditional models of economic growth that do not distinguish any differences between individuals.

Endogenous economic growth theory views the accumulation of knowledge as a key source of



long-run economic growth, and acknowledges the creation of knowledge by private-sector firms, through a Schumpeterian competition (i.e. temporary monopoly of economic gains deriving from new knowledge by its inventor), as an internal (i.e. endogenous) factor.

The four groups of Capital Inputs in our model incorporate these developments in economic theory. While Physical Capital refers to capital in the traditional parlance of economics, Financial Capital emphasises the liquidity of financial resources mobilised into new areas of growth and knowledge (e.g. products, sectors, industries) through sources such as venture capital.

Knowledge Capital is the raw material of the knowledge economy, referring to the region's capacity for, or its resources aimed at, creating new ideas. Ideas in this realm are not necessarily created with consideration for commercial applications, with the sources of such new ideas ranging from universities and research establishments to firms, individuals and other organisations. Included as a form of Knowledge Capital is the intermediary throughput produced during the course of converting knowledge into commercial values. Finally, Human Capital indicates the capacity of individuals in the region to create, understand and utilise knowledge for the creation of commercial values.

The combination of the four types of capital within the region results in the production of knowledge-based goods and services containing high value-added. These knowledge-based goods and services, which we term Knowledge Economy Outputs, form part of the total outputs of the region's economic activity, Regional Economy Outputs. The distinction between Knowledge Economy Outputs and Regional Economy Outputs signifies our assumption that innovative knowledge outputs embodied in goods and services are not always translated evenly into the wealth the region's inhabitants will enjoy.

The cycle is completed by the requirement for Knowledge Sustainability. Unless part of the wealth created is re-invested into Capital Inputs, and particularly Knowledge Capital and Human Capital, to support their reproduction and further development, the medium to long-term prosperity of the regional economy will be undermined.





Figure 3 : Knowledge Economy Model

RESEARCH DESIGN

In order to establish the globe's high-performing regions in the first instance, we analysed gross domestic product (GDP) per capita for the majority of regions across the world between 1995-1998. Those included in this study are those who have performed above the mean in terms of GDP per capita during this period.

The majority of European regions are based on European Union's definition of regional units, NUTS-1. Because of the definition, some nations are included as regions (i.e. Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg). Further, regions in Finland and Sweden are based on NUTS-2, a lower level of units. In addition, two non-EU member countries, Switzerland and Norway are included in the analysis. As with Denmark, Ireland and Luxembourg, these two small nations are treated as regions.

The US regions are based on the units called consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSAs) and metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs). MSAs, defined by the US Census Bureau, consist of a set of counties and represent a single labour market with a one to two-hour commute from edge to edge. CMSAs, consisting of a set of Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSAs), include the county hinterlands of two or more large central cities that are adjacent to each other. Also, as the suffix attached to each region suggests, some CMSAs extend over more than one state. Compared with counties, cities and states, both MSAs and CMSAs analysed in this study are better units for economic analysis as they well reflect the boundaries of clusters of firms in related industries.



Those non-US or European regions making the final cut consist of :

- Tokyo, Japan
- Kanagawa, Japan
- Osaka, Japan
- Kyoto, Japan
- Ontario, Canada
- British Columbia, Canada
- New South Wales, Australia
- Singapore
- Hong Kong, China

For a similar region for some small countries in Europe, Singapore is included in the analysis as a region state.

Owing to data availability and compatibility between regions in Europe, the US and the rest of the World, the following variables are selected for the global analysis:

HUMAN CAPITAL COMPONENTS

- Economic Activity Rate
- Number of Managers per 1,000 inhabitants
- Employment in IT and Computer Manufacturing per 1,000 inhabitants
- Employment in Biotechnology and Chemicals per 1,000 inhabitants
- Employment in Automotive and Mechanical Engineering per 1,000 inhabitants
- Employment in Instrumentation and Electrical Machinery per 1,000 inhabitants
- Employment in High-Tech Services per 1,000 inhabitants

KNOWLEDGE CAPITAL COMPONENTS

- Per Capita Expenditures on R&D performed by Government
- Per Capita Expenditures on R&D performed by Business
- Number of Patents Registered per one million inhabitants

REGIONAL ECONOMY OUTPUTS

- Labour Productivity
- Mean Gross Monthly Earnings
- Unemployment Rates

KNOWLEDGE SUSTAINABILITY

- Per Capita Public Expenditures on Primary and Secondary Education
- Per Capita Public Expenditures on Higher Education
- Secure Servers per one million inhabitants
- Internet Hosts per 1,000 inhabitants

METHODOLOGY UNDERLYING THE WORLD KNOWLEDGE COMPETITIVENESS INDEX

All data are first converted so that the mean and variance of each variable are set at zero and one respectively. After the standardisation, a multivariate data reduction technique called factor analysis is applied to the data set. Factor analysis is used to simplify complex and diverse relationships that exist among a set of observed variables by uncovering common dimensions or factors that link together the seemingly unrelated variables, and consequently provide insight into



the underlying structure of the data. In general, those dimensions are uncorrelated with one another.

To extract the common part of variations among the original variables (i.e. commonalities), an extraction method called image factoring is employed. The dimensions obtained are then rotated. A rotation method called varimax is used with Kaiser normalisation. While identifying common dimensions of the underlying structure, factor analysis also shows the location of each case (i.e. region in this study) within the underlying structure, by providing the case's scores for the dimensions identified. We use these scores for the dimensions as sub-composite indices.

Subsequently, we were required to aggregate these sub-composite indices with a view to obtaining a single composite. A quantitative analytical technique called Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) is used to obtain a single composite index from the above sub-composite indices. DEA is a linear programming technique originally developed for the estimation of the relative efficiency of a set of units (called decision making units, DMUs) producing a set of outputs from common inputs. It neither assigns weights to variables with any dependent variable chosen a priori, nor assigns weights set a priori. Instead, it seeks set of weights for each unit that maximises a weighted sum of variables, with the constraint that no units have a weighted sum larger than one. As a result, each unit receives a score between 0 and 1.

This process is repeated for all units in the data set, giving each unit a score unique to each iteration. Finally a geometric mean of all the scores is taken for each unit, providing a DEA score. In the following analysis all scores are converted into the figures whose average is 100, facilitating an intuitive understanding of the regions' positions in our league table.



World Knowledge Competitiveness Index -The Rankings

The world's most knowledge competitive region is Minneapolis-St Paul, with a Knowledge Competitiveness Index score of 147.6, followed by San Francisco (including Silicon Valley) - with a score of 146.4 - and Austin (145.1). Minneapolis-St Paul's top ranking indicates that by our criteria it is the region with the most balanced and equitable knowledge-based economy for sustaining overall levels of growth and prosperity. As Table 1 illustrates, the rankings are dominated by US regions, accounting for 49 of the top 90 of the world's most knowledge competitive regions. Furthermore, of the US regions, 45 are featured in the top 50 performers, with only 4 US regions performing below the index mean average of 100.

Europe is represented by 32 regions (with 10 from Germany; as well as 3 each from the UK, Italy and the Netherlands). However, only 4 European regions feature in the top 50, led by Stockholm (Sweden) in 22nd position (119.4), and followed by Switzerland in 25th (117.0), Uusimaa (Finland) in 36th (111.7), and London (UK) in 50th (102.0). Nine non-US or European regions are included in the rankings, led by Ontario (Canada) in 48th position (103.7), followed by Tokyo (Japan) in 54th (97.2), British Columbia (Canada) in 58th (95.5), and New South Wales (Australia) in 61st (89.7).

Part of the reason in understanding why Minneapolis-St Paul should head the overall rankings is that although it is does not dominate any particular sector of economic activity, it has a strong spread of activity across key knowledge-based economic sectors, in particular: IT and computer-related manufacturing (index score: 162.9); instrumentation and electrical machinery (index score: 245.6); and communication, computer services and R&D (index score: 133.4). Despite recent global repositioning in the ICT sector, San Francisco and Austin possess a similar strength in economic activity across core knowledge-based sectors.

These knowledge competitive centres also perform above average on a range of other measures. In the case of Minneapolis-St Paul these consist of: very high economic activity rates (ranked 1st with a score of 131.2); above average proportion of employees within managerial occupations (ranked 20th with a score 145.2); very high R&D expenditure by businesses (ranked 3rd with a score of 270.3); high proportion of patent registrations (ranked 5th with a score of 268.7); high levels of expenditure on primary and secondary education (ranked 7th with a score of 149.1); and very high levels of expenditure on higher education (ranked 2nd with a score of 175.9). Strength in these factors is at the core for creating and sustaining a high-performing centre of knowledge



competition. Minneapolis-St Paul, along with San Francisco and Austin – as well as a number of other high-performing regions – are the world's best examples of these centres of knowledge competition.

The manner in which knowledge is created, acquired and transformed helps understanding of why such regional knowledge competitive centres are becoming more relevant to the economic activities of industries and firms. At first glance it might be argued that advances in information and telecommunication technologies support the notion that knowledge is geographically ubiquitous, leading to the dissolution of spatial centres as an economic force. However, this proves to be a mistaken belief, particularly if utilising the conceptualisation of knowledge in terms of codified knowledge (explicit and readily transferable) and tacit knowledge (implicit and difficult to codify). Although the latter type is often deeply embedded within individuals, it is a vital component of a firm's competitive performance.

Given the difficulty in transferring tacit knowledge, its movement across firm boundaries is highly reliant on the existence of trust-based interactions between individuals, as well as labour mobility between firms. Trust-based interactions are mobilised and facilitated, or hindered, by a region's socio-economic business culture. As for labour mobility, it tends to operate within local labour markets. Furthermore, labour markets for highly skilled workers are often anchored to universities and research institutes through spin-offs and the employment of graduates, as well as knowledge exchange between industry and universities. These reinforce, rather than weaken, the concentration of knowledge-based economic activities at the regional level. The formation and development, and in some cases decline, of knowledge competitive centres takes place in a complex mix of the local and global environment, which is summarised in Figure 4.



Figure 4 : The Knowledge-based Firm and its Environment



In general, the development of knowledge competitive centres is a long-term process dependent on an ever-changing balance in the relative importance of the underlying conditions. In particular, there is a shift away from cost factors, physical infrastructure and regulatory policies, towards the importance of non-physical knowledge-based infrastructure. This knowledge-based infrastructure is lubricated with a socio-economic business culture that provides feedback loops between knowledge actors. Although this culture cannot be directly measured by any existing data across the regions, it would appear that this culture is strongest within those regions exhibiting a highlevel of knowledge competitiveness. To an extent, there is a supporting evidence of this in the form of the large number of studies relating the high-performance of Silicon Valley in the San Francisco region to its integrated business culture.

The following sections of this report unpack the individual elements constituting the World Knowledge Competitiveness Index.



Table 1 : World Knowledge Competitiveness Index

RANK	KNON REGION COMPETITI	WLEDGE VENESS INDEX	RAN	KNO K REGION COMPETITI	WLEDGE VENESS INDEX
1	Minneapolis-St. Paul. US	147.6	46	Oklahoma City, US	104.6
2	San Francisco. US	146.4	47	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	104.5
3	Austin. US	145.1	48	Ontario, Canada	103.7
4	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	144.3	49	Pittsburgh, US	103.6
5	Washington, US	138.1	50	London, UK	102.0
6	Raleigh-Durham, US	136.9	51	South East, UK	101.7
7	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	135.4	52	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	98.3
8	Boston, US	133.8	53	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	97.5
9	Atlanta, US	132.5	54	Tokyo, Japan	97.2
10	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	128.6	55	New Orleans, US	96.7
11	Seattle, US	127.0	56	Eastern, UK	96.3
12	Kansas City, US	126.8	57	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	96.2
13	Columbus, US	124.1	58	British Columbia, Canada	95.5
14	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	122.1	59	Norway	95.1
15	Louisville, US	121.7	60	Denmark	92.4
16	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	121.5	61	New South Wales, Australia	89.7
17	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	121.2	62	Hamburg, Germany	87.9
18	Chicago, US	121.2	63	Île de France, France	87.1
19	Rochester, US	120.0	64	West-Nederland, Netherlands	85.1
20	Orlando, US	119.7	65	Singapore	84.6
21	Nashville, US	119.7	66	Berlin, Germany	83.8
22	Stockholm, Sweden	119.4	67	Luxembourg	83.6
23	Portland-Salem, US	119.3	68	Bayern, Germany	81.5
24	Hartford, US	119.0	69	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	81.0
25	Switzerland	117.0	70	Hessen, Germany	81.0
26	New York, US	116.5	71	Ostösterreich, Austria	80.5
27	Richmond-Petersburg, US	116.3	72	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	79.8
28	Indianapolis, US	116.1	73	Ireland	79.1
29	San Diego, US	115.3	74	Osaka, Japan	77.1
30	Sacramento-Yolo, US	115.1	75	Westösterreich, Austria	76.5
31	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	114.3	76	Kanagawa, Japan	75.6
32	Philadelphia, US	114.1	77	Bremen, Germany	73.6
33	Milwaukee-Racine, US	113.4	78	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	73.5
34	Jacksonville, US	113.2	79	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	72.4
35	Phoenix-Mesa, US	113.2	80	Brussels, Belgium	71.6
36	Uusimaa, Finland	111.7	81	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	71.3
37	Los Angeles, US	111.5	82	Niedersachsen, Germany	70.0
38	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	110.7	83	Kyoto, Japan	67.6
39	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	110.4	84	Saarland, Germany	64.6
40	Las Vegas, US	110.0	85	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	63.3
41	St. Louis, US	109.8	86	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	62.8
42	Memphis, US	109.8	87	Hong Kong	59.7
43	San Antonio, US	107.8	88	Lazio, Italy	54.7
44	Cleveland-Akron, US	106.7	89	Lombardia, Italy	53.3
45	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	105.9	90	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	50.7



WORLD KNOWLEDGE COMPETITIVENESS INDEX 2002











Human Capital Components

Human Capital in our model consists of developing a measure of the availability of human inputs for the production of knowledge within each regional economy, including economic activity and knowledge workers. The level of economic participation within a region or nation is a fundamental indicator of its 'vibrancy' and human capital capacity at the macro-level. With sufficient labour market engagement there is little opportunity for long-term and on-going knowledge investment. Indeed, high levels of economic participation are a prerequisite for a socially cohesive living and working environment, as well as an economy that is not over-dependent on its public welfare system. As Table 2 indicates, economic activity rates vary considerably even among the globe's highest performing regions.

The highest levels of economic activity are amongst the regions of the United States, with highest ranking being Minneapolis-St Paul, with a participation rate 31.2% above the high-performing mean. The highest ranked European region, in 10th position, is Sweden's Stockholm (111.7). The lowest ranked region is Lazio in Italy (73.8), followed by Brussels (78.7). This variation is necessarily based on opportunities to enter the labour market, the prevailing system of social security and welfare, age-related demographics, as well as a complex mix of social and cultural variables.



Table 2 : Index of Economic Activity by Region

RANK	REGION INDEX OF EC	ONOMIC CTIVITY	RANK	REGION INDEX OF EC	ONOMIC
1	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	131.2	46	Hartford, US	101.0
2	Austin, US	124.7	47	Philadelphia, US	101.0
3	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	120.3	48	South East, UK	100.8
4	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	117.6	49	Cleveland-Akron, US	100.0
5	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	116.5	50	British Columbia, Canada	99.7
6	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	116.0	51	Tokyo, Japan	99.2
7	Atlanta, US	114.4	52	Eastern, UK	98.7
8	Orlando, US	114.4	53	London, UK	98.5
9	Raleigh-Durham, US	112.8	54	Kanagawa, Japan	98.1
10	Stockholm, Sweden	111.7	55	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	97.4
11	Nashville, US	111.7	56	New York, US	97.2
12	Portland-Salem, US	111.2	57	West-Nederland, Netherlands	96.5
13	Kansas City, US	111.2	58	San Diego, US	96.4
14	Columbus, US	110.7	59	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	96.2
15	Seattle, US	109.8	60	Usaka, Japan	95.8
16	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	109.3	61	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	95.4
17	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	108.7	62	Nortoik-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	95.2
18	Louisville, US	108.5	63	Dittaburah US	95.1
19	Indianapolis, US	108.1	64	Kyota Japan	94.0
20	Milwaukee-Racine, US	107.0	66	Now Orloans, US	94.5
21	San Francisco, US	107.0	67	Hong Kong	94.4 Q/ /
22	Chieses US	106.6	68	Bayern Germany	03.5
23	Washington US	106.6	69	Noord-Nederland Netherlands	92.7
25		106.3	70	Westösterreich Austria	92.7
26	Boston US	106.1	71	Berlin, Germany	91.8
27	Uusimaa Finland	106.1	72	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	91.6
28	Rochester, US	105.8	73	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	91.4
29	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	105.8	74	Ostösterreich, Austria	91.1
30	Singapore	105.4	75	New South Wales, Australia	90.8
31	Oklahoma City, US	105.3	76	Hamburg, Germany	90.2
32	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	105.2	77	Hessen, Germany	89.1
33	Jacksonville, US	104.9	78	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	89.0
34	Richmond-Petersburg, US	103.6	79	Ireland	89.0
35	Switzerland	103.5	80	Niedersachsen, Germany	85.6
36	Ontario, Canada	103.2	81	Bremen, Germany	83.2
37	Memphis, US	102.9	82	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	83.0
38	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	102.3	83	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	81.2
39	Sacramento-Yolo, US	102.1	84	Luxembourg	80.5
40	Norway	102.0	85	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	80.2
41	St. Louis, US	102.0	86	Saarland, Germany	79.9
42	San Antonio, US	101.7	87	Lombardia, Italy	79.9
43	Los Angeles, US	101.4	88	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	79.9
44	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	101.2	89	Brussels, Belgium	78.7
45	Denmark	101.1	90	Lazio, Italy	73.8



The importance of the number of managers within firms is that innovation - whether it is product, process or organisational - is usually stimulated and co-ordinated through those workers with management responsibilities. The pervasiveness of the global knowledge economy can, to some extent, be equated by the fact employment growth is largely occurring through the expansion of managerial and professional/technical occupations. These non-production employees are now more generally termed knowledge workers.

As shown by Table 3, the proportion of such knowledge workers is highest in Australia's New South Wales region, with an index score of 256.4. This is partly explained by the fact that the region covers the city of Sydney, which is the location of a large proportion of professional and technical businesses in Australia. In second position is the UK's Eastern region, covering the high-tech hub of Cambridge, with a score of 241.2, followed by the US regions of Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill (192.2) and Raleigh-Durham (191.1). The lowest ranked region is Sarland (2.2) in Germany, followed by a cluster of West European regions. The low ranking of the German regions reflects the continuance of an organisational model of work that is still highly hierarchical, with many workers still classed as 'blue-collar'. To some extent, there appears to be an association between the number of managers in a region, and the proportion of small firms within the respective regional economy.



Table 3 : Index of Number of Managers (Managers per 1,000 Inhabitants)

RANK	REGION IN MAI	IDEX OF NAGERS	RANK	REGION II MA	NDEX OF NAGERS
1	New South Wales, Australia	256.4	46	Tokyo, Japan	111.2
2	Eastern, UK	241.2	47	San Antonio, US	107.6
3	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	192.2	48	Las Vegas, US	105.5
4	Raleigh-Durham, US	191.1	49	Los Angeles, US	100.5
5	Ontario, Canada	182.9	50	New York, US	98.3
6	British Columbia, Canada	182.7	51	Seattle, US	98.0
7	Austin, US	182.5	52	San Diego, US	97.9
8	South East, UK	180.8	53	Sacramento-Yolo, US	96.1
9	Washington, US	173.1	54	Kanagawa, Japan	95.2
10	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	164.1	55	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	91.6
11	Nashville, US	162.6	56	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	88.5
12	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	161.9	57	Rochester, US	88.3
13	Atlanta, US	161.8	58	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	84.6
14	Norway	157.4	59	Osaka, Japan	83.5
15	Kansas City, US	156.9	60	Kyoto, Japan	78.3
16	Boston, US	153.5	61	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	78.2
17	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	151.8	62	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	73.2
18	Columbus, US	151.7	63	West-Nederland, Netherlands	72.9
19	Milwaukee-Racine, US	148.7	64	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	68.0
20	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	145.2	65	Singapore	63.5
21	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	143.1	66	London, UK	55.9
22	Chicago, US	140.5	67	Stockholm, Sweden	55.3
23	San Francisco, US	140.4	68	Hong Kong	40.9
24	Oklahoma City, US	138.1	69	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	39.3
25	Louisville, US	136.8	70	Uusimaa, Finland	36.9
26	Hartford, US	136.5	71	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	29.5
27	St. Louis, US	133.0	72	Denmark	27.7
28	Orlando, US	131.8	73	Luxembourg	25.1
29	Cleveland-Akron, US	131.5	74	Brussels, Belgium	25.1
30	Memphis, US	131.0	75	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	21.3
31	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	129.9	76	Ireland	19.9
32	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	129.8	77	Bayern, Germany	17.3
33	Richmond-Petersburg, US	129.1	78	Lombardia, Italy	16.2
34	Île de France, France	128.1	79	Hessen, Germany	15.4
35	Portland-Salem, US	125.5	80	Hamburg, Germany	13.9
36	Switzerland	125.1	81	Bremen, Germany	11.8
37	Philadelphia, US	124.8	82	Berlin, Germany	11.8
38	Indianapolis, US	124.3	83	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	9.7
39	New Orleans, US	122.8	84	Lazio, Italy	8.8
40	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	122.5	85	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	7.9
41	Pittsburgh, US	121.1	86	Niedersachsen, Germany	7.8
42	Phoenix-Mesa, US	118.0	87	Ostosterreich, Austria	6.5
43	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	115.0	88	Westosterreich, Austria	6.4
44	Jacksonville, US	114.0	89	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	4.0
45	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	111.4	90	Saarland, Germany	2.2



KNOWLEDGE-BASED SECTORS AND EMPLOYMENT

The concept of knowledge-based and non-knowledge-based sectors is used to distinguish between industries with higher or lower levels of research and development activity. Knowledge-based sectors, therefore, clearly offer a higher potential for innovation, and subsequently competitive advantage. Within this study we have created five broad groups of knowledge-based sectors, in order to undertake an analysis of employment. It is our hypothesis that some sectors have a higher propensity for developing a knowledge-driven economy. The five sectors consist of:

- IT and computer manufacturing communication equipment, computer and office equipment, electronic components and accessories.
- Biotechnology and chemical sectors pharmaceuticals, drugs, chemicals and chemical products.
- Automotive and high-tech mechanical engineering motor vehicles and transport equipment, machine tools and equipment.
- Instrumentation and electrical machinery precision and optical instruments, electrical transmission and distribution equipment lighting and wiring equipment.
- High-tech services software and computer related services, telecommunications, research, development and testing services.

Despite the current global slowdown, high-technology sectors, in particular IT and computer manufacturing, still form an increasingly important component of international trade, and are generally more internationalised than traditional sectors. Throughout the world three regions dominate the field for IT and computer manufacturing (see Table 4) as measured by employment density. The highest ranked is Austin (751.1), with more than seven-fold the high-performing mean, which is the home of Dell Computers and the chip manufacturer Sematech. Second is San Francisco (493.0), which includes the famous Silicon Valley cluster of IT and computer firms such as Apple, Sun Microsystems, Intel, Hewlett-Packard and National Semiconductor. In third position is Portland-Salem (323.2), followed by the Kanagawa (302.5) region of Japan, the headquarters of companies such as NEC, Fujitsu and Toshiba. The lowest ranked regions are Memphis (6.5), New Orleans (7.0) and Las Vegas (14.7).



Table 4 : Index of Regional Employment in the IT and Computer Manufacturing Sectors

RANK	INDEX OF IT & CON REGION MANUFAC		RANK	INDEX OF IT & CO	
	EMPL	DYMENT		EMPL	OYMENT
1	Austin, US	751.1	46	Philadelphia, US	59.0
2	San Francisco, US	493.0	47	Hartford, US	58.9
3	Portland-Salem, US	323.2	48	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	58.0
4	Kanagawa, Japan	302.5	49	Niedersachsen, Germany	55.3
5	Phoenix-Mesa, US	284.6	50	Atlanta, US	54.0
6	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	265.1	51	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	53.8
7	Boston, US	232.8	52	London, UK	53.2
8	Sacramento-Yolo, US	203.2	53	Indianapolis, US	52.8
9	Stockholm, Sweden	201.9	54	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	51.7
10	Ireland	199.6	55	Nashville, US	50.9
11	Uusimaa, Finland	188.5	56	New York, US	50.4
12	South East, UK	177.0	57	Seattle, US	50.3
13	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	170.7	58	Norway	49.0
14	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	162.9	59	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	48.8
15	Kyoto, Japan	162.7	60	Bremen, Germany	46.8
16	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	157.9	61	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	46.2
17	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	137.4	62	Pittsburgh, US	45.4
18	Hessen, Germany	129.7	63	Jacksonville, US	43.6
19	Ostösterreich, Austria	126.9	64	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	40.2
20	Raleigh-Durham, US	123.9	65	Brussels, Belgium	38.9
21	Eastern, UK	120.4	66	Cleveland-Akron, US	38.7
22	San Diego, US	117.8	67	Saarland, Germany	37.8
23	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	114.9	68	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	37.2
24	Osaka, Japan	106.0	69	Milwaukee-Racine, US	35.9
25	Bayern, Germany	101.7	70	St. Louis, US	30.2
26	Île de France, France	101.6	71	San Antonio, US	29.2
27	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	95.4	72	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	29.0
28	Berlin, Germany	95.3	73	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	28.9
29	Ontario, Canada	94.2	74	West-Nederland, Netherlands	26.0
30	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	88.9	75	Columbus, US	24.5
31	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	88.1	76	Washington, US	22.8
32	Lombardia, Italy	88.0	77	Westösterreich, Austria	22.1
33	Los Angeles, US	87.7	78	Louisville, US	21.1
34	Richmond-Petersburg, US	87.1	79	Kansas City, US	20.7
35	British Columbia, Canada	85.9	80	Tokyo, Japan	20.0
36	Denmark	85.4	81	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	19.1
37	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	81.4	82	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	17.2
38	Rochester, US	81.0	83	Las vegas, US	14.7
39	Oklahoma City, US	78.5	84	New Orleans, US	7.0
40	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	78.0	85	Switzerland	6.5 N/A
41	Chicago, US	72.6			N/A
42		/1.7			N/A
43	Hamburg, Germany	63.6		Now South Wales, Australia	N/A
44	Nortoik-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	62.9		New South Wales, Australia	N/A
45	Lazio, italy	62.0		Luxembourg	N/A



The biotechnology and chemical technology sectors are now widely recognised as having very particular human capital requirements that are often highly, and increasingly, knowledge-intensive. Table 5 indicates employment density in the biotechnology and chemical sectors, with the highest ranked being the German region of Hessen (322.5), followed by the US regions of Cincinnati-Hamilton (248.9) and Philadelphia (242.9). The lowest ranked regions are Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News (8.9), Las Vegas (10.8) and Orlando (15.6).

Historically, automotive and mechanical engineering has been responsible for capturing a highdegree of the human capital devoted to knowledge-intensive activities, particularly in certain regions. Although these sectors have been somewhat superseded in terms of knowledge intensity, they retain higher than average knowledge inputs. Table 6 is a measure of employment density in the more 'traditional' knowledge-based sectors of automotive and mechanical engineering. Unsurprisingly, the highest ranked region is the motor hotspot of Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint with a score of 354.3, followed by Germany's Baden-Wurttemburg (295.8), the traditional European powerhouse of engineering and car manufacturing. In third place is another German region, Bayern (234.7), which includes the city of Munich, followed by Seattle (229.3). The lowest ranked region is Las Vegas (6.0), followed by Austin (16.7) and the Brussels (18.4) region of Belgium.

Instrumentation and electrical engineering are key knowledge 'support' sectors, providing high value-added equipment for a very wide range of 'front-line' sectors. Table 7 highlights employment density in the instrumentation and electrical machinery sectors, with by far the leading region being Rochester (753.8), with a score more than seven times higher than the index average. Rochester is followed by Milwaukee-Racine (285.7) and the German regions of Bayern (275.2) and Baden-Wurttemburg (259.0).



Table 5 : Index of Regional Employment in the Biotechnology and Chemicals Sectors

RANK	INDEX OF BIOTECHI REGION & CHEMICAL EMPLO	NOLOGY SECTOR DYMENT	RANK	INDEX OF BIOTECH REGION & CHEMICAL EMPL	NOLOGY SECTOR OYMENT
1	Hosson Cormany	222.5	46	Lazio Italy	92.4
2	Cincinnati-Hamilton LIS	2/8 9	47	Minneanolis-St Paul US	91.1
2		240.9	48	Pittsburgh US	88.2
З Д	Nordrhein-Westfalen Germany	242.9	49	Berlin Germany	86.2
5	Viaams Gewest Belgium	224.3	50	Bremen Germany	83.4
5		216 5	51	Brussels Belgium	81.7
7	Paleigh-Durham US	204.4	52	Ontario Canada	80.4
8	Pichmond-Detersburg LIS	100 3	53		801
9	Grand Panids-Muskegon-Holland LIS	199.5	54		78.1
10		176.2	55	British Columbia, Canada	73.3
11	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria LIS	175.6	56	Saarland Germany	67.4
12	Zuid-Nederland Netherlands	173.5	57	Dallas-Fort Worth US	62.6
12		175.5	58		61.6
1/	South East UK	150.6	59	Kvoto Japan	60.9
14		150.0	60	Boston US	601
15	Creenshere-Winsten-Solem-High Deint US	142 E	61	Salt Lake City-Orden US	58.2
17		143.5	62		56.5
10	Usaka, Japan	143.1	63	San Francisco IIS	55.7
10		141.4	64		54.4
19	Kansas City, US	140.3	65		521
20	St. Louis, US	133.0	66	Hartford US	100
21	Stockholm, Sweden	131.5	67	Detroit-App Arbor-Flint US	49.9
22		127.6	68	Austin US	43.4
23	Dayern, Germany	120.5	69	Pochester US	43.2
24	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	124.6	70	San Diogo US	43.2
25	Daten-wurttemberg, Germany	124.4	70	Washington US	27.9
20		110.0	72	Denver-Boulder-Greeley US	36.5
21	Niederseebsen Cormony	110.7	73	Jacksonville LIS	36.0
28	Nedersachsen, Germany	117.0	74		30.0
29	New Orleans, OS	1171	74	Tampa-St Detersburg-Clearwater US	31.4
30		116.7	76	Luxombourg	30.9
22	New York, US	116.7	70	West Palm Beach-Boca Paton US	27.2
32		115.0	78	Oklahoma City US	2/ 9
33	Louisville, US	115.9	70	San Antonio LIS	27.9
34	Chicago US	112.0	80	Portland-Salem US	10 /
35	Cilicayo, US	100.0	81	Miami-Fort Lauderdale LIS	17.4
27		109.9	82		171
37	Emilia-Romagna, italy	107.6	83	Sacramento-Volo IIS	15.9
38	Milwaukee-Racine, US	105.3	94	Orlando US	15.5
39		104.0	85		10.9
40	Sectors LIK	100.5	96	Norfolk-Virginia Roach-Nowport Nows US	10.8
41	Edstern, UK	98.4	80	Switzerland	0.9
42	New South Wales, Australia	97.4		Norway	N/A
43	Noora-Nederland, Netherlands	96.1		Hong Kong	N/A
44	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	95.9			N/A
45	lokyo, Japan	95.3		Singapore	N/A



Table 6 : Index of Regional Employment in the Automotive and Mechanical Engineering Sectors

RAN	INDEX OF AUTOMOTIVE & NK REGION MECHANICAL ENGINEERING SECTOR EMPLOYMENT		RAN	INDEX OF AUTOM REGION MECHANICAL ENGIN SECTOR EMPL	INDEX OF AUTOMOTIVE & MECHANICAL ENGINEERING SECTOR EMPLOYMENT	
1	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	354.3	46	Tokyo, Japan	78.3	
2	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	343.2	47	Phoenix-Mesa, US	76.5	
3	Bayern, Germany	234.7	48	Berlin, Germany	75.4	
4	Seattle, US	229.3	49	Los Angeles, US	75.0	
5	Milwaukee-Racine, US	228.5	50	Portland-Salem, US	74.6	
6	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	220.2	51	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	74.3	
7	Niedersachsen, Germany	206.1	52	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	73.4	
8	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	183.4	53	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	73.3	
9	Hartford, US	182.3	54	Ostösterreich, Austria	69.9	
10	Saarland, Germany	181.4	55	Kansas City, US	69.6	
11	Hessen, Germany	173.1	56	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	68.6	
12	Cleveland-Akron, US	164.4	57	Columbus, US	66.6	
13	Indianapolis, US	162.3	58	Atlanta, US	63.2	
14	Lombardia, Italy	162.0	59	Memphis, US	62.7	
15	Bremen, Germany	161.8	60	San Diego, US	61.6	
16	Louisville, US	159.2	61	Boston, US	60.7	
17	Nashville, US	155.1	62	Pittsburgh, US	60.4	
18	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	154.8	63	Ireland	52.7	
19	St. Louis, US	146.2	64	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	52.4	
20	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	136.9	65	Philadelphia, US	52.2	
21	Kanagawa, Japan	135.5	66	West-Nederland, Netherlands	49.8	
22	Eastern, UK	131.6	67	Stockholm, Sweden	49.7	
23	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	130.8	68	Orlando, US	48.4	
24	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	127.2	69	San Francisco, US	46.0	
25	Osaka, Japan	125.2	70	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	45.6	
26	Rochester, US	120.3	71	Jacksonville, US	42.9	
27	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	112.4	72	Richmond-Petersburg, US	36.9	
28	Denmark	108.7	73	Lazio, Italy	35.9	
29	South East, UK	106.5	74	San Antonio, US	35.6	
30	Westösterreich, Austria	105.6	75	London, UK	35.0	
31	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	104.7	76	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	27.6	
32	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	100.3	77	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	27.3	
33	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	99.7	78	New York, US	25.9	
34	Oklahoma City, US	99.2	79	Washington, US	24.9	
35	Ontario, Canada	99.0	80	Raleigh-Durham, US	23.6	
36	Hamburg, Germany	96.0	81		23.4	
37	Buttalo-Niagara Falls, US	92.8	82		20.2	
38	British Columbia, Canada	90.3	83	Drussels, Belgium	16.4	
39	Uusimaa, Finland	88.8	84	Austin, US	16.7	
40	New Orleans, US	87.3	85	Las vegas, US Switzerland	6.U	
41	lie de France, France	86.0		Nerway	N/A	
42	Nyoto, Japan Zuid Nederland, Nettradaut	85.6			N/A	
43	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	84.0			N/A	
44	Chicago, US	81.3		Now South Wales Australia	N/A	
45	Greensporo-winston-Salem-High Point, US	80.9		New South Wales, Australia	IN/A	



Table 7 : Index of Regional Employment in the Instrumentation and Electrical Engineering Sectors

RANK	INDEX OF INSTRUMEN REGION AND ELECTRICAL ENGIN SECTOR EMPLO	TATION EERING DYMENT	RANK	INDEX OF INSTRUMEN REGION AND ELECTRICAL ENGIN SECTOR EMPLO	NTATION IEERING OYMENT
	Destastes US	750.0	10	Seblecuia-Heletain Correction	00.0
1	Rochester, US	753.8	46	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	80.2
2	Milwaukee-Racine, US	285.7	47	Stocknoim, Sweden	76.7
3	Bayern, Germany	275.2	40		75.9
4	Minneanelie-St Dayl US	259.0	49 50		7/ 2
5	Roston US	192 /	51	Bremen Germany	71.6
7	San Francisco LIS	103.4	52	Seattle US	71.1
8		1671	53	Comunidad de Madrid. Spain	70.7
9	Kvoto, Japan	164.3	54	Atlanta, US	68.1
10	Lombardia. Italy	149.1	55	Columbus, US	67.2
11	Hessen, Germany	145.7	56	New York, US	66.5
12	Indianapolis, US	144.8	57	Niedersachsen, Germany	65.1
13	Tokyo, Japan	142.2	58	Saarland, Germany	57.9
14	Raleigh-Durham, US	140.6	59	London, UK	57.9
15	South East, UK	138.7	60	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	56.4
16	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	133.8	61	Phoenix-Mesa, US	55.2
17	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	131.0	62	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	54.1
18	Hartford, US	128.6	63	Jacksonville, US	51.7
19	Osaka, Japan	128.1	64	Kansas City, US	51.3
20	Cleveland-Akron, US	124.5	65	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	48.6
21	Kanagawa, Japan	123.9	66	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	47.4
22	Eastern, UK	123.7	67	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	46.1
23	Berlin, Germany	120.8	68	Nashville, US	45.1
24	Los Angeles, US	119.9	69	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	43.4
25	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	116.8	70	Lazio, Italy	37.8
26	Ostösterreich, Austria	115.4	71	Washington, US	34.9
27	Westösterreich, Austria	112.8	72	Oklahoma City, US	34.5
28	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	112.1	73	Brussels, Belgium	33.6
29	Chicago, US	107.6	74	West-Nederland, Netherlands	33.1
30	Ireland	105.9	75	Sacramento-Yolo, US	26.1
31	Austin, US	100.0	76	Richmond-Petersburg, US	25.4
32	San Diego, US	99.0	77	Ontario, Canada	23.7
33	Île de France, France	98.3	78	Louisville, US	23.2
34	Hamburg, Germany	97.2	79	British Columbia, Canada	21.6
35	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	97.0	80	San Antonio, US	20.3
36	Denmark	96.1	81	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	19.6
37	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	95.5	82	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	19.3
38	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	95.2	83	New Orleans, US	17.9
39	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	85.8	04	Las vegas, US Switzorland	9.0
40	Memphis, US	85.3		Norway	N/A
41	Pillspurgn, US	84.5		Hong Kong	N/A
42		04.4 84.0		Singanore	N/A
45	Viaams Cowest Belgium	92.6		New South Wales Australia	N/A
44	Portland-Salom US	91.0			N/A
45	For tiallu-Salelli, US	01.9		Lakembourg	N/A



It is crucial to recognise that high value-added service sectors are increasingly important sites for human capital and innovation. Despite recent criticisms of the new economy concept and the crisis within the associated sector, it is clear that ICT and associated development is at the very heart of knowledge-driven economics. The growth of the Internet and enhanced telecommunications are the keys to creating a global knowledge community. In general, high-tech services provide the base for facilitating global communication, as well as being vitally important for mobilising knowledgebased development within and across sectors.

Table 8 represents an index of employment density in high-tech service sectors. The top ranked regions are Denver-Boulder-Greeley (218.5), Switzerland (207.9), San Francisco (198.1) and Washington DC (191.7). In general, the top ranked regions are predominately in the US, although Sweden's Stockholm is ranked in 7th position. The lowest ranked regions are Kyoto in Japan (27.4), Bremen (31.0) in Germany, and Noord Nederland (39.9).



Table 8 : Index of Regional Employment in the High-Technology Service Sectors

RAN	REGION	INDEX OF HI TECHNOLOGY SERVI SECTOR EMPLOYME	GH CE NT	RANK	INDEX REGION TECHNOLOGY SECTOR EMPL	OF HIGH SERVICE .OYMENT
1	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	5 218	.5	46	Pittsburgh, US	89.5
2	Switzerland	20	7.9	47	Memphis, US	88.3
3	San Francisco, US	19	B.1	48	Sacramento-Yolo, US	88.1
4	Washington, US	19	1.7	49	Berlin, Germany	86.3
5	Uusimaa, Finland	186	.5	50	Phoenix-Mesa, US	85.4
6	Kansas City, US	172	.2	51	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	85.4
7	Stockholm, Sweden	169	.2	52	Richmond-Petersburg, US	84.8
8	Atlanta, US	16	9.1	53	Ireland	83.6
9	Raleigh-Durham, US	168	.4	54	Hessen, Germany	78.6
10	Louisville, US	16	1.1	55	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	77.6
11	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	160	.8	56	Hamburg, Germany	77.4
12	Tokyo, Japan	15!	5.7	57	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	5 76.4
13	South East, UK	150	0.0	58	Cleveland-Akron, US	75.7
14	Boston, US	149	.8	59	Ostösterreich, Austria	74.4
15	Seattle, US	139	.2	60	Los Angeles, US	74.1
16	Île de France, France	138	.4	61	Bayern, Germany	73.6
17	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	133	.4	62	Kanagawa, Japan	73.5
18	London, UK	133	.3	63	Oklahoma City, US	72.6
19	Austin, US	13	1.1	64	Luxembourg	72.6
20	Columbus, US	129	.8	65	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	72.3
21	Eastern, UK	122	.9	66	Brussels, Belgium	71.3
22	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	122	.4	67	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	71.2
23	San Diego, US	118	.0	68	British Columbia, Canada	69.3
24	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hi	II, US 114	.6	69	Las Vegas, US	68.7
25	New York, US	112	.8	70	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	67.0
26	Denmark	112	.0	71	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	64.3
27	Nashville, US	11	.9	72	Lombardia, Italy	64.2
28	Chicago, US	11	.4	73	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	64.0
29	Indianapolis, US	10	7.2	74	Osaka, Japan	62.4
30	Orlando, US	105	.5	75	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	61.1
31	West-Nederland, Netherland	ds 105	.0	76	New Orleans, US	59.0
32	Milwaukee-Racine, US	10	1.9	77	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	57.2
33	St. Louis, US	10	.2	78	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	55.6
34	Houston-Galveston-Brazori	a, US 9	B.1	79	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	52.4
35	Jacksonville, US	9	7.6	80	Niedersachsen, Germany	49.9
36	San Antonio, US	9!	5.7	81	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	48.7
37	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clear	water, US 95	.2	82	Saarland, Germany	46.4
38	Lazio, Italy	9:	3.7	83	Westösterreich, Austria	44.9
39	Philadelphia, US	92	.8	84	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	39.9
40	Portland-Salem, US	92	.5	85	Bremen, Germany	31.0
41	Comunidad de Madrid, Spai	n 92	.5	86	Kyoto, Japan	27.4
42	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	9	1.9		Norway	N/A
43	Ontario, Canada	9	.5		Hong Kong	N/A
44	Rochester, US	9	.3		Singapore	N/A
45	Hartford, US	90	.8		New South Wales, Australia	N/A



Knowledge Capital Components

Knowledge capital consists of the raw material of the knowledge economy, referring to the region's capacity for creating new ideas and for transforming such new ideas to create commercial value. Research and development expenditure is an indication of attempts to enlarge the knowledge base and inputs to the process of searching for knowledge. In recent years, government expenditure on research and development has decreased with the reduction in defence expenditure. This has prioritised the requirement for increased innovation expenditure by businesses, although public expenditure still represents an important lever for knowledge development.

Table 9 ranks public/government expenditure per head of population. The rankings are dominated by three regions: Washington DC (763.0), Hong Kong (486.4) and Richmond-Petersburg (327.5). As might be expected, there is a degree of association between government R&D expenditure and the location of state and/or federal government administrative centres. At the other end of the index are Louisville (6.3) and the Japanese regions of Tokyo (6.6) and Osaka (8.8), highlighting the dearth of government involvement in innovation in these regions.

Business expenditure on research and development highlights the intensity of efforts to innovate, particularly through technological process development. It is, therefore, an important indicator of innovation capability. At the head of the rankings are (see Table 10) the US high-tech hubs of Boston (322.8) and Seattle (272.7) and Minneapolis-St Paul (270.3). In a reversal of its lofty position in the index of government R&D expenditure, the lowest ranked region is Hong Kong with a score of a mere 2.4, followed by New Orleans (4.9) and Saarland (14.2) in Germany.



Table 9 : Index of Research and Development Expenditure by Government Per Capita

RANK	INDE REGION EXPEN GO'	X OF R & D DITURE BY /ERNMENT	RANK	INDEX REGION EXPENDIT GOVEL	OF R & D TURE BY RNMENT
1	Washington, US	763.0	46	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	65.7
2	Hong Kong	486.4	47	Jacksonville, US	65.7
3	Richmond-Petersburg, US	327.5	48	Brussels, Belgium	64.4
4	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, L	IS 314.9	49	Philadelphia, US	62.4
5	Berlin, Germany	286.4	50	Raleigh-Durham, US	57.3
6	Lazio, Italy	276.9	51	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	57.3
7	Boston, US	255.7	52	Saarland, Germany	54.9
8	Uusimaa, Finland	249.9	53	Hessen, Germany	54.0
9	Bremen, Germany	207.9	54	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	53.9
10	Île de France, France	201.0	55	New York, US	53.9
11	Los Angeles, US	196.9	56	Portland-Salem, US	52.6
12	San Francisco, US	196.9	57	Phoenix-Mesa, US	50.5
13	San Diego, US	196.9	58	London, UK	49.5
14	Sacramento-Yolo, US	196.9	59	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	47.2
15	South East, UK	181.6	60	Rochester, US	47.2
16	Hamburg, Germany	177.5	61	Lombardia, Italy	46.5
17	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	166.1	62	Switzerland	45.6
18	Norway	148.9	63	Austin, US	45.1
19	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	143.4	64	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	45.1
20	Singapore	137.4	65	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	45.1
21	Luxembourg	133.3	66	San Antonio, US	45.1
22	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	119.3	67	Atlanta, US	42.2
23	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	104.6	68	Las Vegas, US	41.5
24	New South Wales, Australia	104.5	69	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	40.4
25	West-Nederland, Netherlands	104.4	70	Stockholm, Sweden	37.8
26	Seattle, US	103.5	71	Pittsburgh, US	36.7
27	Eastern, UK	99.3	72	St. Louis, US	35.6
28	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	97.4	73	Memphis, US	32.3
29	Denmark	94.3	74	New Orleans, US	28.9
30	Columbus, US	93.8	75	Nashville, US	28.9
31	Cleveland-Akron, US	93.8	76	Ireland	27.1
32	Chicago, US	89.7	77	Oklahoma City, US	23.3
33	Ostösterreich, Austria	83.8	78	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	17.5
34	Westösterreich, Austria	83.2	79	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	17.0
35	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	83.1	80	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	17.0
36	Niedersachsen, Germany	82.3	81	Hartford, US	16.8
37	Bayern, Germany	81.5	82	Kansas City, US	16.2
38	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	81.1	83	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	14.2
39	Ontario, Canada	79.5	84	Kyoto, Japan	13.9
40	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	75.7	85	Milwaukee-Racine, US	13.4
41	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	75.5	86	Kanagawa, Japan	11.2
42	British Columbia, Canada	75.0	87	Indianapolis, US	9.1
43	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	65.7	88	Usaka, Japan	8.8
44	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	65.7	89	lokyo, Japan	6.6
45	Orlando, US	65.7	90	Louisville, US	6.3



Table 10 : Index of Research and Development Expenditure by Business Per Capita

RAN	INDEX C K REGION EXPENDIT BU	OF R & D URE BY ISINESS	RANK	INDEX (REGION EXPENDIT BL	OF R & D TURE BY JSINESS
1	Boston, US	322.8	46	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	87.9
2	Seattle, US	272.7	47	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	84.5
3	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	270.3	48	Richmond-Petersburg, US	82.7
4	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	267.3	49	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	80.4
5	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	267.3	50	Nashville, US	77.9
6	Stockholm, Sweden	230.3	51	Phoenix-Mesa, US	76.8
7	Los Angeles, US	225.8	52	Milwaukee-Racine, US	76.3
8	San Francisco, US	225.8	53	Berlin, Germany	70.7
9	San Diego, US	225.8	54	Kansas City, US	70.1
10	Sacramento-Yolo, US	225.8	55	Memphis, US	67.5
11	Philadelphia, US	207.9	56	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	65.7
12	Hartford, US	197.4	57	St. Louis, US	65.1
13	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	186.4	58	Bremen, Germany	63.4
14	New York, US	180.5	59	Denmark	61.2
15	Kanagawa, Japan	156.3	60	Washington, US	57.9
16	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	152.8	61	Ostösterreich, Austria	56.9
17	Île de France, France	152.5	62	Westösterreich, Austria	56.5
18	Tokyo, Japan	141.7	63	Las Vegas, US	56.3
19	Eastern, UK	139.4	64	British Columbia, Canada	55.6
20	Uusimaa, Finland	137.2	65	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	53.8
21	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	127.7	66	West-Nederland, Netherlands	53.7
22	Rochester, US	127.7	67	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	51.1
23	Portland-Salem, US	123.1	68	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	50.1
24	Pittsburgh, US	122.5	69	Lombardia, Italy	49.6
25	Chicago, US	117.0	70	Norway	46.4
26	Bayern, Germany	110.9	71	Jacksonville, US	45.9
27	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	109.6	72	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	45.9
28	Brussels, Belgium	107.0	73	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	45.9
29	Switzerland	105.5	74	Orlando, US	45.9
30	Osaka, Japan	102.4	75	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	45.9
31	Hessen, Germany	101.1	76	Niedersachsen, Germany	45.7
32	Cleveland-Akron, US	98.6	77	Ireland	45.4
33	Columbus, US	98.6	78	Singapore	44.5
34	Hamburg, Germany	95.0	79	Atlanta, US	39.2
35	South East, UK	93.4	80	Louisville, US	37.7
36	Raleigh-Durham, US	92.5	81	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	37.0
37	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	92.5	82	New South Wales, Australia	32.6
38	Indianapolis, US	92.1	83	Lazio, Italy	31.7
39	Luxembourg	90.6	84	London, UK	28.2
40	Kyoto, Japan	90.5	85	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	25.4
41	Ontario, Canada	90.4	86	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	19.6
42	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	88.5	87	Oklahoma City, US	15.2
43	Austin, US	88.5	88	Saarland, Germany	14.2
44	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	88.5	89	New Orleans, US	4.9
45	San Antonio, US	88.5	90	Hong Kong	2.4



Patent registrations are a representation of the generation of new ideas and are the nearest proxy to direct indicators of knowledge formation and knowledge capitalisation. A high level of patent activity is often a reflection of high levels of applied research and development activity. Also, patent registrations are a strong indicator of knowledge derived from clustered relationships between both firms and other research institutions.

As Table 11 illustrates, patent registrations are dominated by US regions, which hold the first twelve rankings, led by Rochester (514.2), Austin (485.1), and followed by San Francisco (484.2), Raleigh-Durham (300.5) and Minneapolis-St Paul (268.7). Only three non-US regions are listed in the top twenty – 13th Baden-Wurttemberg (Germany); 14th Stockholm (Sweden); and 16th Uusimaa (Finland). The lowest ranked regions are Madrid (11.8) in Spain, Lazio in Italy (12.9) and Singapore (13.4). The spread of registrations across regions is very wide, and indicates that the top ranked regions in the US are undertaking patent activity at a rate far higher than the majority of regions.



Table 11 : Index of Patent Registrations Per Capita

RAN	K REGION INDEX OF REGISTR	PATENT	RA	NK	REGION INDEX OF	PATENT
1	Rochester, US	514.2	46		Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	64.9
2	Austin, US	485.1	47		Hamburg, Germany	61.1
3	San Francisco, US	484.2	48		Niedersachsen, Germany	60.9
4	Raleigh-Durham, US	300.5	49		Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	60.0
5	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	268.7	50		Eastern, UK	59.0
6	Boston, US	228.2	51		San Antonio, US	58.1
7	San Diego, US	219.3	52		Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	57.3
8	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	171.4	53		Louisville, US	57.0
9	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	167.3	54		Kansas City, US	55.8
10	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	164.3	55		Luxembourg	55.0
11	Portland-Salem, US	156.4	56		Ontario, Canada	54.4
12	Hartford, US	154.1	57		Westösterreich, Austria	54.2
13	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	149.2	58		Memphis, US	53.8
14	Stockholm, Sweden	147.6	59		Richmond-Petersburg, US	53.7
15	Seattle, US	144.8	60		South East, UK	53.2
16	Uusimaa, Finland	143.6	61		British Columbia, Canada	51.6
17	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	139.1	62		Berlin, Germany	51.1
18	New York, US	138.0	63		Saarland, Germany	49.6
19	Philadelphia, US	137.3	64		Oklahoma City, US	49.4
20	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	135.9	65		Denmark	47.7
21	Bayern, Germany	135.5	66		Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	46.8
22	Phoenix-Mesa, US	135.3	67		Orlando, US	46.1
23	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	135.0	68		Emilia-Romagna, Italy	45.4
24	Milwaukee-Racine, US	134.0	69		Jacksonville, US	43.9
25	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	131.5	70		Brussels, Belgium	43.4
26	Cleveland-Akron, US	130.1	71		Lombardia, Italy	43.0
27	Indianapolis, US	125.3	72		Nashville, US	42.3
28	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	125.1	73		Las Vegas, US	42.3
29	Pittsburgh, US	122.8	74		Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	42.0
30	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	121.7	75		Ostösterreich, Austria	37.2
31	Chicago, US	121.5	76		New Orleans, US	36.9
32	Hessen, Germany	109.8	77		West-Nederland, Netherlands	36.7
33	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	107.2	78		Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	29.9
34	Tokyo, Japan	104.9	79		Kanagawa, Japan	29.7
35	St. Louis, US	102.3	80		Bremen, Germany	27.5
36	Los Angeles, US	99.3	81		London, UK	25.0
37	Atlanta, US	95.9	82		Kyoto, Japan	22.2
38	Washington, US	94.7	83		Hong Kong	22.0
39	lle de France, France	89.5	84		Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	21.7
40	Columbus, US	81.7	85		Ireiand	19.8
41	Sacramento-Yolo, US	80.9	86		Norway	19.5
42	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	78.5	87		New South Wales, Australia	15.2
43	Switzerland	68.7	88			13.4
44	Osaka, Japan	68.1	89		Lazio, italy	12.9
45	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	67.2	90		Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	11.8



Regional Economy Outputs

Labour productivity is a crucial measure of regional performance, as it is influenced by a wide range of factors such as sector make-up, workforce skills, investment in innovation, and market competition. Productivity varies from GDP per capita and is partly a function of respective economic activity and unemployment rates. Therefore, the prosperity of all economies is highly dependent on their productivity rates.

The highest productivity rates, as illustrated by Table 12, are within the regions of Brussels (160.6), Hartford (155.1) and Luxembourg (144.5). The high ranking of all three regions reflects the significant levels of high value-added service sector employment within their economies. The lowest ranked regions are Kanagawa (67.6), Kyoto (71.7) and the Eastern region of the UK (71.9).

Earning levels are an indicator of the relative wealth and the standards of living within an economy, particularly the value-added generated from economic activity. It is also a strong proxy of the relative quality of jobs within an economy. As shown by Table 13, the regions with the highest average earnings are predominately in the US with their regions occupying 12 of the highest 13 rankings. The top three regions are New York (151.8), San Francisco (142.4) and Hartford (138.9). The three lowest ranked regions are Emilia-Romagna (58.1) in Italy, Singapore (60.5) and Lombardia (61.6) in Italy.

Table 14 illustrates the levels of unemployment within the regions, reverse ranked so that a high score indicates a lower level of unemployment. The majority of the US regions perform well, with them occupying the first six positions of the rankings, led by Raleigh-Durham (103.1), Richmond-Petersburg (103.0) and Austin (102.9). The lowest ranked are the European regions of Brussels (90.3), Berlin (90.6) and Madrid (91.0).



Table 12 : Index of Labour Productivity

RANK	REGION INDEX OF L PRODUC	ABOUR	RAN	NK REGION INDEX OF PRODU	LABOUR
1	Brussels, Belgium	160.6	46	Louisville, US	97.6
2	Hartford, US	155.1	47	Stockholm, Sweden	97.3
3	Luxembourg	144.5	48	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	96.9
4	Hamburg, Germany	135.1	49	Nashville, US	96.9
5	Tokyo, Japan	130.6	50	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	96.7
6	New York, US	130.5	51	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	96.6
7	Richmond-Petersburg, US	122.8	52	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	96.6
8	San Francisco, US	121.3	54	Indianapolis US	96.5
10	Singapore	120.0	55	Orlando US	95.6
11	Bremen Germany	119.2	56	Milwaukee-Racine, US	95.4
12	Buffalo-Niagara Falls. US	117.5	57	San Antonio, US	95.1
13	Sacramento-Yolo, US	116.1	58	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	94.6
14	Île de France, France	114.7	59	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	94.4
15	Washington, US	113.0	60	Kansas City, US	94.2
16	London, UK	112.9	61	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	93.8
17	Jacksonville, US	112.5	62	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	92.1
18	Rochester, US	111.2	63	Austin, US	91.8
19	Philadelphia, US	109.9	64	Ontario, Canada	91.3
20	Chicago, US	109.5	65	Portland-Salem, US	91.1
21	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	108.8	66	Uusimaa, Finland	90.9
22	New Orleans, US	108.7	67	New South Wales, Australia	90.1
23	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	108.5	68	Ostosterreich, Austria	90.0
24	Los Angeles, US	107.7	70	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	88.7
25	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria IIS	107.4	70	Osaka Janan	88.5
27	Lombardia Italy	106.9	72	West-Nederland. Netherlands	86.5
28	San Diego, US	105.8	73	Bayern, Germany	86.5
29	Seattle, US	103.8	74	Ireland	84.8
30	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	103.4	75	Oklahoma City, US	84.5
31	Columbus, US	102.9	76	Switzerland	83.3
32	Norway	102.7	77	Saarland, Germany	82.8
33	Las Vegas, US	102.5	78	British Columbia, Canada	82.3
34	Phoenix-Mesa, US	102.0	79	Westösterreich, Austria	81.9
35	Atlanta, US	101.5	80	Berlin, Germany	80.6
36	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	101.3	81	Hong Kong	80.2
37	Pittsburgh, US	100.8	82	Denmark	78.5
38	Cleveland-Akron, US	100.4	83	Niedersachsen, Germany	78.2
39	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	100.2	85	Schleswig-Holstein Germany	77.5
40 41	Grand Banids-Muskegon-Holland, US	900.1	86	South Fast UK	771
42	Hessen Germany	99.5	87	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	737
43	Minneapolis-St. Paul. US	98.6	88	Eastern, UK	71.9
44	Raleigh-Durham, US	98.1	89	Kyoto, Japan	71.7
45	St. Louis, US	97.9	90	Kanagawa, Japan	67.6



Table 13 : Index of Earnings (Mean Gross Monthly Earnings)

RAI	NK REGION IN EA	IDEX OF RNINGS	RAN	IK REGION E	INDEX OF ARNINGS
1	New York. US	151.8	46	Oklahoma City, US	101.5
2	San Francisco, US	142.4	47	Kanagawa, Japan	101.4
3	Hartford, US	138.9	48	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	101.0
4	Washington, US	136.8	49	San Antonio, US	100.8
5	Boston, US	135.4	50	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	99.3
6	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	132.0	51	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	98.7
7	Chicago, US	128.9	52	Hessen, Germany	97.8
8	Atlanta, US	124.3	53	Orlando, US	97.2
9	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	124.1	54	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	96.7
10	Philadelphia, US	123.9	55	Osaka, Japan	96.2
11	Memphis, US	122.8	56	Austin, US	95.7
12	Seattle, US	121.2	57	Brussels, Belgium	94.4
13	Tokyo, Japan	119.4	58	Bayern, Germany	93.8
14	Nashville, US	118.5	59	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	92.9
15	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	118.3	60	Niedersachsen, Germany	91.9
16	Los Angeles, US	118.3	61	Saarland, Germany	91.4
17	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	117.8	62	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	91.0
18	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	117.4	63	West-Nederland, Netherlands	89.9
19	Raleigh-Durham, US	116.9	64	Luxembourg	89.1
20	Cleveland-Akron, US	115.7	65	Denmark	88.9
21	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	115.2	66	Berlin, Germany	88.7
22	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	115.1	67	South East, UK	87.7
23	New Orleans, US	114.7	68	Kyoto, Japan	85.8
24	San Diego, US	114.0	69	Phoenix-Mesa, US	84.2
25	Sacramento-Yolo, US	113.4	70	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	82.8
26	Pittsburgh, US	113.3	(1	Lastern, UK	82.5
27	Richmond-Petersburg, US	113.1	72		02.2
28	Milwaukee-Racine, US	111.0	74	Noord-Nederland, Notherlands	76.5
29	St. Louis, US	110.6	75	Île de France, France	76.1
30	Kansas City US	109.8	76	Westösterreich Austria	75.8
32		109.0	77	Ireland	75.2
33		108.5	78	New South Wales, Australia	74.4
34	Bremen, Germany	108.4	79	Ontario, Canada	72.0
35	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	108.4	80	British Columbia, Canada	69.3
36	London, UK	108.4	81	Uusimaa, Finland	68.2
37	Hamburg, Germany	108.4	82	Lazio, Italy	66.8
38	Rochester, US	108.0	83	Switzerland	66.4
39	Jacksonville, US	107.0	84	Hong Kong	66.3
40	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	106.4	85	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	64.8
41	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	105.3	86	Stockholm, Sweden	64.8
42	Louisville, US	103.9	87	Norway	64.5
43	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	103.8	88	Lombardia, Italy	61.6
44	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	103.1	89	Singapore	60.5
45	Portland-Salem, US	101.6	90	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	58.1



Table 14 : Index of Unemployment (Resersed Rankings)

RANK	II REGION (UN)EMPL	NDEX OF OYMENT	RANK	REGION (UN)EMPL	NDEX OF DYMENT
1	Raleigh-Durham, US	103.1	46	Seattle, US	100.7
2	Richmond-Petersburg, US	103.0	47	Pittsburgh, US	100.7
3	Austin, US	102.9	48	Portland-Salem, US	100.7
4	Hartford, US	102.4	49	Chicago, US	100.6
5	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	102.4	50	Philadelphia, US	100.6
6	Oklahoma City, US	102.4	51	Las Vegas, US	100.6
7	Luxembourg	102.4	52	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	100.5
8	Boston, US	102.3	53	Cleveland-Akron, US	100.5
9	Indianapolis, US	102.3	54	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	100.3
10	Columbus, US	102.3	55	Kyoto, Japan	100.3
11	Singapore	102.3	56	Ostösterreich, Austria	100.2
12	San Francisco, US	102.2	57	Kanagawa, Japan	100.2
13	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	102.2	58	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	100.1
14	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	102.2	59	Los Angeles, US	99.9
15	Orlando, US	102.2	60	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	99.9
16	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	102.2	61	Tokyo, Japan	99.9
17	Phoenix-Mesa, US	102.1	62	Lombardia, Italy	99.8
18	Nashville, US	102.0	63	Hong Kong	99.8
19	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	101.9	64	New Orleans, US	99.7
20	Atlanta, US	101.8	65	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	99.7
21	San Diego, US	101.8	66	Bayern, Germany	99.7
22	Switzerland	101.7	67	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	99.6
23	Washington, US	101.7	68	Stockholm, Sweden	99.5
24	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	101.7	69	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	99.4
25	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	101.7	70	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	99.1
26	Jacksonville, US	101.7	71	Denmark	99.1
27	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	101.7	72	Ontario, Canada	99.0
28	West-Nederland, Netherlands	101.7	73	Ireland	98.8
29	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	101.7	74	New South Wales, Australia	98.7
30	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	101.6	75	Osaka, Japan	98.5
31	South East, UK	101.6	76	Hessen, Germany	97.9
32	Kansas City, US	101.5	77	Uusimaa, Finland	97.6
33	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	101.5	78	British Columbia, Canada	97.4
34	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	101.4	79	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	97.2
35	San Antonio, US	101.4	80	London, UK	96.8
36	Louisville, US	101.4	81	Hamburg, Germany	96.7
37	Westösterreich, Austria	101.4	82	Niedersachsen, Germany	96.4
38	Norway	101.3	83	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	96.4
39	St. Louis, US	101.1	84	Saarland, Germany	96.0
40	Milwaukee-Racine, US	100.9	85	lle de France, France	94.2
41	Memphis, US	100.9	86	Bremen, Germany	93.0
42	Eastern, UK	100.9	87	Lazio, italy	91.1
43	Sacramento-Yolo, US	100.8	88	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	91.0
44	Rochester, US	100.8	89	Berlin, Germany	90.6
45	New York, US	100.7	90	Drussels, Belgium	90.3



Knowledge Sustainability Components

Knowledge sustainability represents each region's capacity for sustaining the long-term health of its knowledge creation and commercial exploitation capacities. In our model, this is represented by investment in future generations of knowledge workers and investment in Information and Telecommunication Technology (ICT) infrastructure. The following four variables are included:

Investment in Future Knowledge

- Per Capita Public Expenditures on Primary and Secondary Education
- Per Capita Public Expenditures on Higher Education

National ICT Infrastructure

- Secure Servers per one million inhabitants
- Internet Hosts per 1,000 inhabitants.

INVESTMENT IN FUTURE KNOWLEDGE

It is clear that future human and knowledge capital is currently embodied within those individuals undertaking education and training. Therefore, the resources dedicated to such education and training are an important source of knowledge investment. Much of the expenditure on education is set by national budgets, particularly for compulsory primary and secondary education in Europe, while higher education expenditure is a reflection of the number and type of institutions within a region. Tables 15 and 16 analyse regional expenditure of primary, secondary and higher education on a per capita basis.

Table 15 highlights primary and secondary expenditure per capita, with the scores for Europe and Japan based on national data. The top ranking is held by Switzerland (208.9) followed by a host of regions from the United States, led by New York (162.9). Luxembourg is placed sixth with a score of 153.3. The lowest ranked is Singapore (23.9) followed by Madrid (59.0) and the included German regions with a score of 64.8.



Table 15 : Index of Investment in Primary and Secondary Education (Per capita expenditure)

RANK	INDEX OF INVEST REGION PRIMARY & SECO EDU	MENT IN ONDARY CATION	RANK	INDEX OF INVEST REGION PRIMARY & SECI EDU	MENT IN ONDARY JCATION
		200.0	16	lasksomville US	101.6
2		208.9	40	Miami-Fort Lauderdale IIS	101.6
2	New York, US	150 4	48	Oklahoma City, US	100.5
З Д	Bochester US	158.6	49	Stockholm Sweden	99.9
5	Hartford US	158.0	50		99.2
6		153.3	51	New Orleans, US	98.6
7	Minneanolis-St. Paul US	1491	52	Ostösterreich. Austria	97.4
8	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	142.8	53	Westösterreich, Austria	97.4
9	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	142.8	54	Ontario, Canada	97.2
10	Milwaukee-Racine, US	137.8	55	British Columbia, Canada	97.2
11	Philadelphia, US	135.7	56	Nashville, US	89.9
12	San Antonio, US	127.8	57	Memphis, US	89.4
13	Austin, US	127.8	58	Île de France, France	86.5
14	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	127.8	59	Uusimaa, Finland	80.3
15	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	127.8	60	New South Wales, Australia	80.0
16	Pittsburgh, US	126.0	61	Washington, US	77.5
17	Seattle, US	124.8	62	Ireland	77.3
18	Indianapolis, US	124.1	63	Brussels, Belgium	76.4
19	Chicago, US	121.8	64	Vlaams Gewest, Belgium	76.4
20	Las Vegas, US	120.6	65	Eastern, UK	72.6
21	Portland-Salem, US	119.9	66	London, UK	72.6
22	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	116.4	67	South East, UK	72.6
23	Boston, US	115.9	68	Hong Kong	71.7
24	Atlanta, US	115.8	69	Lazio, Italy	71.4
25	San Diego, US	113.5	70	Lombardia, Italy	71.4
26	Sacramento-Yolo, US	113.5	71	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	71.4
27	Los Angeles, US	113.5	72	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	68.6
28	San Francisco, US	113.5	73	West-Nederland, Netherlands	68.6
29	Columbus, US	113.0	74	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	68.6
30	Cleveland-Akron, US	113.0	75	Tokyo, Japan	66.0
31	Richmond-Petersburg, US	112.1	76	Kanagawa, Japan	66.0
32	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	111.7	77	Kyoto, Japan	66.0
33	Norway	110.2	78	Osaka, Japan	66.0
34	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	110.2	79	Berlin, Germany	64.8
35	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	107.9	80	Hamburg, Germany	64.8
36	Kansas City, US	106.7	81	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	64.8
37	Denmark	106.5	82	Bayern, Germany	64.8
38	St. Louis, US	106.4	83	Bremen, Germany	64.8
39	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	105.4	84	Hessen, Germany	64.8
40	Phoenix-Mesa, US	102.3	85	Niedersachsen, Germany	64.8
41	Raleigh-Durham, US	101.9	86	Nordrhein-westfalen, Germany	64.8
42	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	101.9	87	Saariand, Germany	64.8
43	lampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	101.6	88	Someswig-Hoistein, Germany	64.8
44	Urlando, US	101.6	89		59.0
45	west Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	101.6	90	Singapore	23.9



Table 16 highlights expenditure on higher education by region. The dominance of the United States is once again profound, with the leading regions being Salt Lake City-Ogden (205.3), Minneapolis-St Paul (175.9) and Portland-Salem (169.6). The lowest performing regions are Luxembourg (10.7), the UK's Eastern region (23.5), Singapore (32.2) and Lombardia in Italy (33.9). With a small number of exceptions, investment in higher education is far greater in the United States compared to other regions and nations.



Table 16 : Index of Investment in Higher Education (Per capita expenditure)

RANK	REGION INDEX OF INVE IN HIGHER EDU	STMENT JCATION	RANK	REGION INDEX OF INV IN HIGHER ED	ESTMENT UCATION
1	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	205.3	46	Rochester, US	104.6
2	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	175.9	47	Hartford, US	101.9
3	Portland-Salem, US	169.6	48	Bremen, Germany	99.9
4	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	168.9	49	Las Vegas, US	98.2
5	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	168.9	50	Norway	93.3
6	Switzerland	164.7	51	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	88.8
7	Richmond-Petersburg, US	156.0	52	Ontario, Canada	88.3
8	Seattle, US	154.1	53	Tokyo, Japan	88.2
9	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	150.1	54	Kyoto, Japan	87.0
10	Milwaukee-Racine, US	150.1	55	Île de France, France	86.4
11	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	147.5	56	Washington, US	85.8
12	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	145.4	57	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	80.2
13	Indianapolis, US	142.1	58	Denmark	78.1
14	Raleigh-Durham, US	140.9	59	Boston, US	78.0
15	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, US	140.9	60	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	74.6
16	Louisville, US	140.8	61	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	74.6
17	Sacramento-Yolo, US	134.6	62	Orlando, US	74.6
18	Los Angeles, US	134.6	63	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	74.6
19	San Diego, US	134.6	64	Jacksonville, US	74.6
20	San Francisco, US	134.6	65	West-Nederland, Netherlands	72.6
21	Kansas City, US	132.4	66	Hessen, Germany	71.1
22	New Orleans, US	130.7	67	New South Wales, Australia	69.6
23	Brussels, Belgium	129.8	68	Saarland, Germany	69.3
24	Phoenix-Mesa, US	125.6	69	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	68.6
25	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	125.3	70	Ireland	65.2
26	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	124.9	71	Baden-Württemberg, Germany	63.5
27	Austin, US	124.9	72	Bayern, Germany	62.9
28	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	124.9	73	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	62.7
29	San Antonio, US	124.9	74	British Columbia, Canada	58.6
30	Oklahoma City, US	121.5	75	Westösterreich, Austria	58.5
31	Ostösterreich, Austria	120.9	76	Niedersachsen, Germany	58.1
32	Columbus, US	120.2	77	Lazio, Italy	57.9
33	Cleveland-Akron, US	120.2	78	Hong Kong	57.1
34	Philadelphia, US	118.6	79	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	51.0
35	Berlin, Germany	117.7	80	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	48.6
36	Memphis, US	113.7	81	Uusimaa, Finland	48.3
37	Pittsburgh, US	113.5	82	South East, UK	47.2
38	Atlanta, US	112.8	83	Singapore	43.2
39	Chicago, US	112.5	84	Usaka, Japan	40.7
40	Nashville, US	109.2	85	Viaams Gewest, Belgium	40.4
41	New York, US	107.4	86	nanagawa, Japan	36.1
42	St. Louis, US	106.4	87	London, UK	35.5
43	Stockholm, Sweden	106.2	88	Eastern LIK	33.9
44	Hamburg, Germany	104.8	89		23.5
45	Buttalo-Niagara Falls, US	104.6	90	Luxembourg	10.7



NATIONAL ICT INFRASTRUCTURE

A well-developed ICT infrastructure, in particular, access to fast broadband telecommunications services, is a prerequisite for moving knowledge effectively and efficiently within and across regions. Although broadband penetration data is unavailable for all our benchmark regions and nations, the OECD has collected certain data at the national level for its member states. In order to look in more detail at the ICT infrastructure we have analysed the number of secure servers and Internet hosts per capita in the nations covering the benchmarked regions (since regional data is unavailable for the majority of regions). Secure servers utilise encrypted software for e-commerce transactions, and therefore the number of such servers within a nation gives a strong indication of the level of e-business undertaken. The left-hand columns of Table 17 indicate that the highest proportion of secure servers per capita are in the United States (354.7), Australia (220.1) and Canada (188.6). The lowest proportions are within Hong Kong (13.3), Italy (20.5) and Spain (28.5).

The Internet is by far the most rapidly growing feature of ICT infrastructure, as it becomes an ever more important and powerful tool for the movement and diffusion of knowledge. The proportion of Internet hosts within a nation is a representation of the degree to which it is developing its 'wired economy'. The right-hand columns of Table 17 illustrate the number of Internet hosts per capita with the nations. The highest ranked nations are the United States (323.0), Finland (219.4) and Canada (175.4). The lowest ranked are Spain (21.7), France (26.5), and Luxembourg (42.1).

RANK	REGION INDEX OF	SECURE	RANI	K REGION	IN INTERNET	IDEX OF THOSTS
1	United States	354.7	1	United States		323.0
2	Australia	220.1	2	Finland		219.4
3	Canada	188.6	3	Canada		175.4
4	Switzerland	176.5	4	Norway		160.7
5	Luxembourg	150.1	5	Sweden		146.6
6	Sweden	135.2	6	Netherlands		112.5
7	United Kingdom	109.2	7	Hong Kong, China		106.6
8	Finland	97.9	8	Australia		103.4
9	Ireland	96.5	9	Denmark		100.0
10	Norway	90.3	10	Singapore		91.8
11	Austria	81.5	11	Switzerland		87.6
12	Denmark	80.2	12	Austria		79.4
13	Germany	67.6	13	United Kingdom		72.4
14	Netherlands	50.5	14	Belgium		54.7
15	Belgium	38.7	15	Italy		45.0
16	Singapore	33.9	16	Japan		44.8
17	Japan	33.8	17	Germany		43.7
18	France	32.3	18	Ireland		42.9
19	Spain	28.5	19	Luxembourg		42.1
20	Italy	20.5	20	France		26.5
21	Hong Kong, China	13.3	21	Spain		21.7

Table 17 : Index of National ICT Infrastructure - Secure Servers and Internet Hosts Per Capita



Conclusions : Driving Knowledge-Based Growth

Our study has sought to identify the key Drivers of Knowledge-Based Growth. The analysis of 90 top-performing regions around the globe provides a snapshot of the regions at one point in time, in this case, in the late 1990s. Underlying the use of late-1990s data is our assumption that the regions under analysis are progressing towards a higher level of the knowledge-based economy through a broad common trajectory. The time of the late 1990s is critical in our analysis, as many academics and policy makers consider that the development of the knowledge-based economy began sometime in the 1980s, and started to show its effects (particularly the long economic boom in the United States) in the 1990s.

In the process of producing the World Knowledge Competitiveness Index, we examined those dimensions that best account for the positions of the top-performing regions. Of the several dimensions identified, two are considered to be of paramount importance. According to our first dimension, the top-performing regions are all building up their ICT infrastructure and mobilising more human capital resources into economic production activity. The second identified dimension indicates an association between investment in knowledge and human capital and growth of labour productivity, through the sustainability link.

Table 18 highlights the GDP per capita of the benchmarked regions indexed to the mean average. It must be made clear that GDP does not equate to the available income within a region and is not a direct or overall measure of relative prosperity between regions. However, GDP is an indicator of a region's output, and therefore, to some extent, its level of economic development.

The highest GDP per capita is found in the regions of Hartford (160.9), Tokyo (144.2) and San Francisco (131.7). The lowest ranked regions are mainly located in Germany. Once again, the significant disparity highlights that even with these high-performing regions there are marked differences in the evolution of their economic development.



Table 18 : Index of Gross Domestic Product Per Capita

RAN	K REGION INDEX PER	OF GDP CAPITA	RAN	NK REGION INDEX PER	OF GDP CAPITA
1	Hartford, US	160.9	46	Bremen, Germany	100.1
2	Tokyo, Japan	144.2	47	Memphis, US	99.9
3	San Francisco, US	131.7	48	St. Louis, US	99.9
4	Richmond-Petersburg, US	131.3	49	Uusimaa, Finland	99.2
5	Hamburg, Germany	129.0	50	Salt Lake City-Ogden, US	99.0
6	New York, US	127.1	51	Cincinnati-Hamilton, US	98.7
7	Boston, US	125.5	52	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, US	97.6
8	Luxembourg	124.1	53	Pittsburgh, US	97.5
9	Dallas-Fort Worth, US	123.9	54	Ontario, Canada	96.1
10	Washington, US	119.0	55	Stockholm, Sweden	95.7
11	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, US	118.6	56	Lombardia, Italy	94.1
12	Minneapolis-St. Paul, US	118.5	57	San Antonio, US	93.0
13	Rochester, US	118.0	58	Switzerland	92.7
14	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, US	117.8	59	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, US	91.8
15	Brussels, Belgium	117.8	60	Hessen, Germany	91.6
16	Atlanta, US	116.4	61	Osaka, Japan	90.8
17	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, US	115.2	62	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, US	90.6
18	Seattle, US	115.1	63	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, US	90.6
19	Jacksonville, US	114.7	64	Emilia-Romagna, Italy	90.4
20	Columbus, US	114.6	65	West-Nederland, Netherlands	87.6
21	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, US	114.5	66	Oklahoma City, US	86.6
22	Austin, US	113.5	67	New South Wales, Australia	86.3
23	Sacramento-Yolo, US	113.3	68	Ostosterreich, Austria	85.8
24	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, US	113.0	70	Baden-Württemberg Cormany	00./ 05.6
25	Chicago, US	112.9	70	Dopmork	93.0
20	Raleign-Durnam, US	112.9	72	British Columbia, Canada	82.3
21	Bhiladalphia US	100.4	73		80.3
20		109.4	74	Hong Kong	79.2
30	Orlando IIS	108.0	75	Lazio, Italy	79.1
31		107.3	76	Westösterreich. Austrias	77.5
32	Norway	107.3	77	South East, UK	77.2
33	Louisville. US	107.2	78	Comunidad de Madrid, Spain	76.8
34	London, UK	107.1	79	Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany	76.5
35	Indianapolis, US	106.2	80	Ireland	75.6
36	Île de France, France	104.8	81	Singapore	75.0
37	Phoenix-Mesa, US	104.6	82	Zuid-Nederland, Netherlands	74.8
38	Milwaukee-Racine, US	104.5	83	Kyoto, Japan	74.1
39	Kansas City, US	104.4	84	Noord-Nederland, Netherlands	73.3
40	Los Angeles, US	104.3	85	Eastern, UK	72.6
41	Portland-Salem, US	101.8	86	Kanagawa, Japan	71.7
42	New Orleans, US	101.3	87	Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	71.0
43	San Diego, US	100.7	88	Berlin, Germany	71.0
44	Cleveland-Akron, US	100.3	89	Niedersachsen, Germany	69.4
45	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, US	100.3	90	Saarland, Germany	69.0



Figure 5 shows the association between GDP per capita and the World Knowledge Competitiveness Index. It is clear that there is a close association between them, indicating the importance of knowledge economy factors to the wealth and prosperity of regions.

Three ensuing figures present the relationships between labour productivity and various investments in Knowledge Capital (i.e. R&D expenditures by business in Figure 6) and Human Capital through the Sustainability Link (i.e. expenditure on primary and secondary education in Figure 7, and expenditure on higher education in Figure 8). Again, each of the figures indicates a positive association between the variables



GDP PER CAPITA





R&D EXPENDITURES BY BUSINESS







LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY

Figure 7 : Relationship between Labour Productivity and Expenditure on Primary and Secondary Education



LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY





Finally, if the growth of GDP per capita is a primary policy goal, our study of top-performing regions, and their development trajectory, finds that these regions are progressing towards this end via two main routes. The first includes a combination of the improvement of ICT infrastructure and the mobilisation of human capital resources in economic production activity. The second is investment in R&D by business, alongside investment in education both at the primary, secondary and higher levels, all of which show a positive association with the growth of production (as illustrated in Figure 9). These drivers of knowledge-based growth are necessarily highly influential in determining the fortune of regions that aspire to reach a higher level of knowledge-based economic activity.



Figure 9 : Knowledge Economy Factors & Productivity



REFERENCES

Abramovitz, M. 1956. "Resource and output trends in the United States since 1870." American Economic Review 46(2): 5-23.

Atkinson, R.D., and Gottlieb, P.D. 2001. The Metropolitan New Economy Index: Benchmarking Economic Transformation in the Nation's Metropolitan Areas. Washington, D.C.: Progressive Policy Institute.

Baptista, R., and Swann, P. 1998. "Do firms in clusters innovate?" Research Policy 27: 525-540.

Devol, R.C. 1999. America's High-Tech Economy: Growth, Development, and Risks for Metropolitan Areas. Santa Monica: Milken Institute.

Kline, S.J., and Rosenberg, N. 1986. "An overview of innovation." in R. Landau and N. Rosenberg (eds.) The Positive Sum Strategy: Harnessing Technology for Economic Growth, 275-305. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Massachusetts Technology Collaborative. 1998. Index of the Massachusetts Innovation Economy. Westborough: Massachusetts Technology Collaborative.

OECD. 1996. The Knowledge-based Economy. Paris: OECD.

OECD. 1999. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Scoreboard: Benchmarking Knowledge-based Economies. Paris: OECD.

Porter, M.E. 1990. The Competitive Advantage of Nations. New York: Free Press.

Porter, M.E. 1998. On Competition. Boston: Harvard Business Review.

Porter, M.E. 1999. "Innovative capacity and prosperity: the next competitiveness challenge." in World Economic Forum (ed.) The Global Competitiveness Report 1999, 54-65. New York: Oxford University Press.

Robert Huggins Associates (2001) UK Competitiveness Index 2001: Regional and Local Benchmarking. Cardiff: Robert Huggins Business and Economic Press.



DATA SOURCES

Data for European regions were assembled in conjunction with Eurostat (http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/).

For regions in the US, the sources include:

- US Census Bureau (http://www.census.gov/),
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (http://www.stats.bls.gov/),
- US Patent and Trademark Office (http://www.uspto.gov/),
- US Conference of Mayors (http://www.usmayors.org/),
- Bureau of Economic Analysis (http://www.bea.doc.gov/),
- and Department of Education (http://www.ed.gov/).

As for regions in the rest of the world, the following sources were used:

- Statistics Bureau and Statistics Center, Government of Japan (http://www.stat.go.jp/), Japan Patent Office (http://www.jpo.go.jp/), Economic and Social Research Institute, and the Cabinet Office of Government of Japan (http://www.esri.cao.go.jp/) (for regions in Japan);
- Statistics Canada (http://www.statcan.ca/) (for regions in Canada);
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (http://www.abs.gov.au/) and New South Wales Department of State and Regional Development (http://www.business.nsw.gov.au/) (for New South Wales, Australia);
- Census and Statistics Department, the Government of the Hong Kong (http://www.info.gov.hk/) (for Hong Kong);
- Swiss Federal Statistics Office (http://www.statistik.admin.ch/) (for Switzerland);
- Statistics Singapore (http://www.singstat.gov.sg/) (for Singapore);
- Statistics Norway (http://www.ssb.no/) (for Norway).

Data for international comparisons of R&D expenditures are available from the Institute for Statistics, UNESCO (http://www.unescostat.unesco.org/).

Figures of purchasing power parities used to harmonise monetary value are available from OECD (http://www.oecd.org/).





ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

Robert Huggins Associates is a research-based economics consultancy and think-tank. We provide an interface between academic expertise and commercial research consulting, within the fields of economic and business analysis and development, operating in an international environment.

Through us, clients are given access to the latest thinking, research, best practice, benchmarking and analysis of economic and business development issues. Our work is based on a high level of commercial and academic credibility, through the engagement of clients as knowledge partners.

We also operate through our own network of global partners – both commercial and academic – with whom we are able to share new thoughts and new solutions, which our clients are then able to action.

OUR APPROACH

Knowledge is proving to be the key driver of economic growth in an age where innovation is at the heart of competitiveness. Our expertise allows our clients to promote policies focused on expanding business growth through new initiatives, and enhancing knowledge-based entrepreneurial opportunities. Our key research interests include:

The Economics of Competitiveness – as the founders of the UK Competitiveness Report Series Huggins Associates are able to utilise our evaluative and analytical resources to better understand the issues facing regional and local economic development policymakers and strategists. As part of our portfolio we aim to provide futures forecasting and planning analysis that takes a detailed, yet realistic, view of the developments underlying growth at the global, regional, and local level.

New Modes of Business Growth - the business environment is constantly evolving, and changing its modes of operation. Those businesses that are able to adapt most effectively and efficiently within this changing environment will be those that succeed. At Huggins Associates it is one of our key research aims to constantly monitor this changing environment, and to inform relevant actors of new modes of business growth. For example, Huggins Associates has led the way in advocating the network capital-based mode of business growth. Also, we have undertaken considerable work on clustered business growth.

The Knowledge and Skills Economy Approach - human capital underpins business and economic progress. At Huggins Associates we have developed a range of analytical tools that measure the strengths, weaknesses and potential of regions and localities - as well as individual businesses - with regard to their knowledge and skills bases. We offer knowledge and skills audits and solutions by which economies and businesses are able to embed themselves in a more productive and wealthier environment.

huggins associates.com



 Robert Huggins Associates

 Meandros House 54a Bute Street Cardiff CF10 5AF Wales UK

 Tel +44 (0)29 2066 2554 Fax +44 (0)29 2046 3067
 Web www.hugginsassociates.com

 A division of Newidiem International. Registered in England & Wales number 3765341