



## **RNI CONGRESS – INNOVATION FORUM VIII**



### **New organizational modes for innovation processes**

Iut de Nîmes -Université de Montpellier  
8 rue Jules Raimu - Nîmes<sup>1</sup>  
4th and 5th June 2018

### **Session : Ecosystems - role in the processes of emergence and diffusion of innovations**

**Marcos Lima**

**École de Management Léonard de Vinci,  
marcos.lima@devinci.fr**

It's been almost 25 years since the publication of James Moore's (1993) seminal article "Predators and Prey: a new ecology of competition". Since then, "Innovation Ecosystems" has become a common expression among businesses, policy makers and academics. It expanded beyond the original biological metaphor intended by Moore to englobe any group of stakeholders who produce or consume innovative products and services, creating an evolving network of human, informational, financial and material resources. As such, the term can encompass anything from Alfred Marshall's "agglomeration", to Michael Porter's "clusters". The evolutionary nature of the metaphor borrows heavily from Nelson and Winter's (1982) National Innovation Systems, adding some emphasis on the "use side participants" of the network (Autio and Thomas, 2014), i.e. the marketplace. According to Oh et al. (2016), several other characteristics differentiate "innovation ecosystems" from alternative denominations such as Technology Parks, Regional Innovation Systems and Innovation Clusters: a) digitalization as a means to break barriers of time and space to collaboration; b) open innovation (borrowing, licensing, open-sourcing, crowdsourcing); c) the mimetic power of the ecological metaphor (easily adopted by practitioners and academics alike); d) emphasis on the role of "ecological niches"; e) emphasis on the systemic interactions among the stakeholders on both the "production side" and on the "use side" of innovation. Innovation

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. web site <http://www.iut-nimes.fr/acces> for access.

ecosystem types include corporate (open innovation) ecosystems; regional and national innovation ecosystems; digital innovation ecosystems and digital platforms; innovation districts and technopoles with their startup incubators and accelerators and university-based ecosystems. Among the limitations of this approach, contrasting views remain on the analogy to the natural ecosystem: on the one hand, Oh et al. (2016) mention its limits when it comes to considering the unsubstantiated claims of observable "complex system behavior" and the polysemy of the expression, which is used in so many different ways that no clear definition seems possible; on the other hand, Ritala and Almapanopoulou (2017) explain that, although some limits do exist, this analogy can properly inform the design of system-level innovation management activities if rigorously grounded on more conceptual and empirical evidence.

Innovation ecosystems are based on principles of integrated collaboration, co-created shared value in real and virtual environments, unleashed exponential technologies, and extraordinarily rapid adoption. They also capture the elemental characteristics of the constant transformation of networks: continual realignment of synergistic relationships of people, knowledge and resources for both incremental and transformational value co-creation. Alongside its enormous potential, however, innovation ecosystems also bring a few challenges. Through relationships, value co-creation networks evolve from mutually beneficial relationships between people, companies, and investment organizations. Requirements for responsiveness to changing internal and external forces make co-creation and agile structures an essential force in a dynamic innovation ecosystem. Borders are constantly blurring, formal and informal networks interplay, organizations have multiple memberships to dynamic and evolving structures. In such contexts ubiquity, self-organization, indirect coordination, and diverse multidisciplinary experimentations are allowed and encouraged.

## References

- AUTIO, E., & THOMAS, L. (2014). Innovation ecosystems: implications for innovation management. In in Dodgson, M, Philips, N., & Gann, D. M. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation Management*, Oxford University Press, 204-288.
- MOORE, J.F. (1993). Predators and prey: a new ecology of competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(3), 75-83.
- NELSON, R.R., & WINTER, S.G. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Harvard University Press.
- OH, D.S., PHILLIPS, F., PARK, S., & LEE, E. (2016). Innovation ecosystems: A critical examination. *Technovation*, 54, 1-6.
- RITALA, P., & ALMAPANOPOULOU, A. (2017). In defense of 'eco' in innovation ecosystem. *Technovation*, in Press.
- VALKOKARI, K. (2015). Business, innovation, and knowledge ecosystems: how they differ and how to survive and thrive within them. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 5(8), 17-24.

### **Key dates :**

- January 22 2018: Submission of communication proposals (abstract of 3 pages)
- February 16 2018: Answer of the scientific committee
- April 7 2018: Submission of the Final Text (from 10 to 25 pages)
- June 4 and 5 2018 : Innovation Forum

Communications will be selected for publication in the journals of the network (Innovations : REMI/JIEM, TechInn, Marché et Organisation)

<http://innovations.cairn.info/en/>

<http://www.editions-harmattan.fr/index.asp?navig=catalogue&obj=revue&no=130>

<http://www.openscience.fr/Technologie-et-innovation>

### **Registration fees:**

Researchers from universities and other public and private institutions: 200 euros

Phd Students: 150 euros

Registration fees include access to sessions, conference material, lunch and gala dinner

