

**The Globalization of the
U.S. Small Business
Innovation Research (SBIR)
Program**

Other titles in Annals of Science and Technology Policy

Firm Social Capital and the Innovation Process

Christopher Lee Parrish

ISBN: 978-1-63828-252-5

*The U.S. Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) Program:
An Assessment and an Evaluation of the Program*

Albert N. Link

ISBN: 978-1-63828-168-9

Industrial Innovation Policy in the United States

William B. Bonvillian

ISBN: 978-1-63828-090-3

*The Returns to Publicly Funded R&D: A Study of U.S. Federally
Funded Research and Development Centers*

James A. Cunningham and Albert N. Link

ISBN: 978-1-68083-944-9

*Innovation Barriers, Indicators and Policies: Coevolving
Concepts in the History of Innovation Studies*

Diego R. de Moraes Silva, Nicholas S. Vonortas and André T. Furtado

ISBN: 978-1-68083-930-2

*Government Royalties on Sales of Pharmaceutical and Other Biomedical
Products Developed with Substantial Public Funding: Illustrated with the
Technology Transfer of the Drug-Eluting Coronary Stent*

Robert S. Danziger and John T. Scott

ISBN: 978-1-68083-820-6

The Globalization of the U.S. Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program

Edited by

Albert N. Link

University of North Carolina at Greensboro
anlink@uncg.edu

now

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

Annals of Science and Technology Policy

Published, sold and distributed by:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 1024
Hanover, MA 02339
United States
Tel. +1-781-985-4510
www.nowpublishers.com
sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 179
2600 AD Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The content of the book was originally published in *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*, vol. 8, no. 1-2.

ISBN: 978-1-63828-367-6
© 2024 Now Publishers Inc

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

Annals of Science and Technology Policy
Volume 8, Issue 1–2, 2024
Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief

Albert N. Link
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
United States

Editors

David Audretsch
Indiana University

William Bonvillian
MIT

Barry Bozeman
Arizona State University

Kaye Husbands Fealing
Georgia Institute of Technology

John Hardin
North Carolina Board of Science and Technology

Mariagrazia Squicciarini
OECD

Wolfgang Polt
Joanneum Research Institute

Nicholas Vonortas
The George Washington University

Editorial Scope

Topics

Annals of Science and Technology Policy publishes survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- Literature reviews of technology and innovation policies
- Historical case studies of technology development and implementation
- Institutional histories of technology- and innovation-based organizations
- Analyses of policies attendant to technology development and adoption and diffusion
- Studies documenting the adoption and diffusion of technologies and subsequent consequences
- Studies of public and private research partnerships (cross sectional, over time, or case based)
- Assessments and evaluations of specific technology and innovation policies
- Analyses of ecosystems associated with the technology and/or innovation development
- Cross observational (e.g., cross-agency or cross-country) comparisons of technology and innovation policies

Information for Librarians

Annals of Science and Technology Policy, 2024, Volume 8, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 2475-1820. ISSN online version 2475-1812. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Contents

Introduction to the Special Issue on the Globalization of the U.S. Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program	1
<i>Albert N. Link</i>	
Public Support of SMEs in the Republic of Turkey	9
<i>Nilay Unsal</i>	
The Small Business Innovation Research Program in Australia	29
<i>David B. Audretsch and Allan O'Connor</i>	
Drivers of Entrepreneurial Performance: An Assessment of the PIPE Program in Brazil	40
<i>Gustavo Hermínio Salati Marcondes de Moraes, Bruno Brandão Fischer, Sergio Salles-Filho and Nicholas Vonortas</i>	
Korea Small Business Innovation Research (KOSBIR)	64
<i>Irineu de Souza Lima Júnior, Soo J. Sohn and Nicholas S. Vonortas</i>	
Japan's SBIR Scheme	79
<i>Masatoshi Kato and Alex Coad</i>	

Recent Development of Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Programs in Taiwan	96
<i>Jianqiang Chen, Pei-Fang Hsieh and Po-Hsuan Hsu</i>	
The UK Small Business Research Initiative	119
<i>James A. Cunningham</i>	
SBIR in The Netherlands	155
<i>Martijn van Hasselt</i>	
Stimulating R&D and Commercialization Activity in New Zealand: An Overview and Case Analysis of Callaghan Innovation's Grants and Technology Incubator Programme	176
<i>Conor O'Kane, Urs Daellenbach, Sally Davenport and Simon Wakeman</i>	

Introduction to the Special Issue on the Globalization of the U.S. Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program

Albert N. Link

University of North Carolina at Greensboro, USA; alink@uncg.edu

ABSTRACT

This Introduction briefly summarizes the legislative history of the SBIR program in the United States and then offers a country-by-country overview of international programs aimed at similarly stimulating the innovative behavior of small firms.

Albert N. Link (2024), "Introduction to the Special Issue on the Globalization of the U.S. Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 8, No. 1-2, pp 1-8. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000028-1.

©2024 A. N. Link

References

- Cunningham, J. A. and A. N. Link (2021). *Technology and Innovation Policy: An International Perspective*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Joint Hearings (1979). *Joint Hearings before the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Select Committee on Small Business, and to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Small Business*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Link, A. N. and M. Van Hasselt (2023). *Small Firms and U.S. Technology Policy*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- van der Walt, T. and W. Blankley (1999). “South African strategies for the promotion of research and technology innovation: Towards effective collaboration and new business development”. *Industry and Higher Education*. 1: 15–24.

Public Support of SMEs in the Republic of Turkey

Nilay Unsal

*Ankara University, Turkey; unsaln@ankara.edu.tr,
unsalnlay@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The Republic of Turkey adopted a policy in the early 1980s to support private sector R&D. However, the country's legislative process for supporting R&D in small firms had not started another decade. The government's realization of the importance of small businesses in the national and international markets led to establish the Small and Medium-Sized Industry Development Organization (KOSGEB) in 1990 (Public Law 3624). Aspects of KOSGEB mirror aspects of the U.S. SBIR program.

Nilay Unsal (2024), "Public Support of SMEs in the Republic of Turkey", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 8, No. 1–2, pp 9–28. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000028-2.

©2024 N. Unsal

References

- Bolukbas, N. S. (2020). “KOSGEB ve TUBITAK. AR-GE Destekleri Etki Deęerlendirmesi. Stratejik Arařtırmalar ve Verimlilik Genel M¼d¼rl¼ę¼, T.C. SAnayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlıęı”. URL: <https://www.sanayi.gov.tr/assets/pdf/birimler/SAVGMAr-GeDestekleriDegerlendirmesi2.pdf>.
- Elci, S. (2003). “Innovation policy in seven candidate countries: The challenges”. In: *Innovation Policy Profile*. Vol. 2.7. Turkey.
- European Commission (2021). *SME Country Fact Sheet*. Turkey. URL: https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2021-09/turkey_-_sme_fact_sheet_2021.pdf.
- Giray, F., M. Çınar, and S. Güzel (2015). “R&D in function of direct public supports to SMEs: An exploratory study in Turkey, economic review”. *Journal of Economics and Business, University of Tuzla, Faculty of Economics, Tuzla*. 13(1): 29–36.
- Iřık Maden, S., M. A. Dulupçu, and O. Sungur (2014). *KOBİ desteklerinin istihdam büyümesine etkisi: Isparta ve Burdur örneęi*. Giriřimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi.
- KOSGEB (2006). *KOSGEB annual report 2006*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2006_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.

- KOSGEB (2007). *KOSGEB annual report 2007*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2007_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2008). *KOSGEB annual report 2008*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2008_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2009). *KOSGEB annual report 2009*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2009_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2010). *KOSGEB annual report 2010*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2010_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2011). *KOSGEB annual report 2011*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2011_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2012). *KOSGEB annual report 2012*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2012_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2013). *KOSGEB annual report 2013*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2013_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2014). *KOSGEB annual report 2014*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2014_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2015). *KOSGEB annual report 2015*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2015_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.

- KOSGEB (2016). *KOSGEB annual report 2016*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/2016/KOSGEB_2016_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2017). *KOSGEB annual report 2017*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Kayit/KOSGEB_2017_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliye.
- KOSGEB (2018). *KOSGEB annual report 2018*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2018_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2019). *KOSGEB annual report 2019*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2019_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2020). *KOSGEB annual report 2020*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/Faaliyet%20Raporlar%C4%B1/KOSGEB_2020_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- KOSGEB (2021). *KOSGEB annual report 2021*. URL: https://webdosya.kosgeb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Dosya/Mali%20Tablolar/2022/KOSGEB_2021_Y%C4%B1%C4%B1_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf.
- Müftüoğlu, T. (2009). *SME Support Policies in Turkey After, 1990 (Review, Evaluation and Suggestions)*. Paris: Agence Française de Développement, mimeo.
- Olçay, G. A. and M. Bulu (2015). “Who should really get government support: An analysis of Turkish SME cases”. *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Development*. 6(1): 34–49. DOI: [10.1504/IJKBD.2015.069445](https://doi.org/10.1504/IJKBD.2015.069445).
- Özçelik, E. and E. Taymaz (2008). “R&D support programs in developing countries: The Turkish experience”. *Research Policy*. 37(2): 258–275.
- TUIK (2020). “Small and Medium Sized Enterprises Statistics, 2019”. URL: <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Small-and-Medium-Sized-Enterprises-Statistics-2019-37548&dil=2>.

World Bank (2009). *Turkey – National Innovation and Technology System: Recent Progress and Ongoing Challenges*. Washington, DC.
© World Bank. URL: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/18612>.

The Small Business Innovation Research Program in Australia

David B. Audretsch¹ and Allan O'Connor²

¹*Indiana University, USA*

²*University of South Australia, Australia; Allan.OConnor@unisa.edu.au*

ABSTRACT

To enhance both innovation in national defence and the competitiveness and innovative performance of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), the Small Business Innovation Research for Defence (SBIRD) was established by the Australian government in 1996. The goal of the SBIRD was to enhance specific challenges prioritized by the Government for Defence, and to enhance emerging technologies and in particular disruptive technologies. The SBIRD consists of two phases, similar to the U.S. SBIR program. Sufficient time has not elapsed for systematic evaluations and analyses of the impact of the program.

David B. Audretsch and Allan O'Connor (2024), "The Small Business Innovation Research Program in Australia", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 8, No. 1–2, pp 29–39. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000028-3.

©2024 D. B. Audretsch and A. O'Connor

References

- Australian Government, Department of Industry, Science and Resources (2017). “Australia 2030: Prosperity through innovation”. URL: <https://www.industry.gov.au/publications/australia-2030-prosperity-through-innovation>.
- Ferris, W. D. (2001). “Australia chooses: Venture capital and a future Australia”. *Australian Journal of Management*. 26(1-suppl): 45–64.
- Gregory, R. G. (1993). “The Australian innovation system”. In: *National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford University Press. 324–352.
- Innovation and Science Australia (2017). “Australia 2030: A plan for prosperity through innovation”. URL: <https://www.industry.gov.au/sites/default/files/May%202018/document/pdf/australia-2030-prosperity-through-innovation-full-report.pdf>.
- Jones, S. G. (2004). “From citadels to clusters: The evolution of regional innovation policies in Australia”. *R&D Management*. 34(1): 3–16.
- The Auditor-General (2005). “Administration of the R&D start program: department of industry, tourism and resources industry research and development board”. URL: https://www.anao.gov.au/sites/default/files/ANAO_Report_2005-2006_15.pdf.

Drivers of Entrepreneurial Performance: An Assessment of the PIPE Program in Brazil

Gustavo Hermínio Salati Marcondes de Moraes¹, Bruno Brandão Fischer², Sergio Salles-Filho³ and Nicholas Vonortas⁴

¹ *University of Campinas, Brazil*

² *University of Campinas, Brazil*

³ *University of Campinas, Brazil*

⁴ *The George Washington University, USA; vonortas@gwu.edu*

ABSTRACT

Knowledge-intensive entrepreneurial firms (KIE) represent a core part of this specific cohort of SMEs. Scientific capabilities need to be translated into market skills that allow creating R&D skills oriented towards innovation. This can be achieved through strategic decisions and deployments that facilitate the creation, sharing, and transfer of the company's knowledge base. Plus, strategic commitment to R&D can play multiple roles throughout the initial stages of KIE ventures: it enables the establishment of alliances, exploitation of external knowledge, and, as expected, new product development. The success of KIE ventures in Brazil is traceable to the PIPE Program (the acronym stands for Technological Innovation in Small Business), an initiative from the Research Foundation of the State of São Paulo, Brazil. This initiative dates back to 1997 and it follows a

Gustavo Hermínio Salati Marcondes de Moraes, Bruno Brandão Fischer, Sergio Salles-Filho and Nicholas Vonortas (2024), "Drivers of Entrepreneurial Performance: An Assessment of the PIPE Program in Brazil", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 8, No. 1–2, pp 40–63. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000028-4.

©2024 G. H. S. M. de Moraes *et al.*

similar structure to that of the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program in the US.

References

- Abubakar, A. M., H. Elrehail, M. A. Alatailat, and A. Elçi (2019). “Knowledge management, decision-making style and organizational performance”. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*. 4: 104–114. DOI: [10.1016/j.jik.2017.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2017.07.003).
- Acs, Z. J., E. Stam, D. B. Audretsch, and A. O’Connor (2017). “The lineages of the entrepreneurial ecosystem approach”. *Small Business Economics*. 49: 1–10. DOI: [10.1007/s11187-017-9864-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-017-9864-8).
- Adams, P., R. Fontana, and F. Malerba (2016). “User-industry spinouts: Downstream industry knowledge as a source of new firm entry and survival”. *Organization Science*. 27: 18–35. DOI: [10.1287/orsc.2015.1029](https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.1029).
- Agarwal, R. and S. K. Shah (2014). “Knowledge sources of entrepreneurship: Firm formation by academic, user and employee innovators”. *Research Policy*. 43: 1109–1133. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2014.04.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.04.012).
- Aldridge, T. T. and D. Audretsch (2011). “The Bayh-Dole act and scientist entrepreneurship”. *Research Policy*. 40: 1058–1067. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2011.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.04.006).
- Andersson, M. and H. Lööf (2012). “Small business innovation: Firm level evidence from Sweden”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 37: 732–754. DOI: [10.1007/s10961-011-9216-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-011-9216-9).

- Audretsch, D., A. Colombelli, L. Grilli, T. Minola, and E. Rasmussen (2020). “Innovative start-ups and policy initiatives”. *Research Policy*. 49: 104027. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2020.104027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104027).
- Audretsch, D. B., D. F. Kuratko, and A. N. Link (2016). “Dynamic entrepreneurship and technology-based innovation”. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*. 26: 603–620. DOI: [10.1007/s00191-016-0458-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-016-0458-4).
- Audretsch, D. and A. N. Link (2012). “Entrepreneurship and innovation: Public policy frameworks”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 37: 1–17. DOI: [10.1007/s10961-011-9240-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-011-9240-9).
- Audretsch, D. B. and A. N. Link (2019). “Entrepreneurship and knowledge spillovers from the public sector”. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. 15: 195–208. DOI: [10.1007/s11365-018-0538-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0538-z).
- Autio, E. and H. Rannikko (2016). “Retaining winners: Can policy boost high-growth entrepreneurship?” *Research Policy*. 45: 42–55. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2015.06.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2015.06.002).
- Ayoub, M. R., S. Gottschalk, and B. Müller (2017). “Impact of public seed-funding on academic spin-offs”. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 42: 1100–1124. DOI: [10.1007/s10961-016-9476-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-016-9476-5).
- Baker, T., A. S. Miner, and D. T. Eesley (2003). “Improvising firms: Bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process”. *Research Policy*. 32: 255–276.
- Belz, A., R. J. Terrile, F. Zapatero, M. Kawas, and A. Giga (2021). “Mapping the valley of death: Managing selection and technology advancement in NASA’s small business innovation research program”. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*. 68: 1476–1485. DOI: [10.1109/TEM.2019.2904441](https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2019.2904441).
- Breschii, S., J. Lassébieii, A. C. Lembckei, C. Menoniii, and C. Paunov (2019). “Public research and innovative entrepreneurship: Preliminary cross-country evidence from micro data”. *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*. DOI: [10.1787/0d057da7-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/0d057da7-en). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1787/0d057da7-en>.
- Brown, R. and C. Mason (2014). “Inside the high-tech black box: A critique of technology entrepreneurship policy”. *Technovation*. 34: 773–784. DOI: [10.1016/j.technovation.2014.07.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2014.07.013).

- Cabrilo, S. and S. Dahms (2018). “How strategic knowledge management drives intellectual capital to superior innovation and market performance”. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 22: 621–648. DOI: [10.1108/JKM-07-2017-0309](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-07-2017-0309).
- Chatterji, A., E. Glaeser, and W. Kerr (2014). “Clusters of entrepreneurship and innovation”. *Innovation Policy and the Economy*. 14: 129–166. DOI: [10.1086/674023](https://doi.org/10.1086/674023).
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colombelli, A., L. Grilli, T. Minola, and B. Mrkajic (2020). “To what extent do young innovative companies take advantage of policy support to enact innovation appropriation mechanisms?” *Research Policy*. 49: 103797. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2019.05.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.05.006).
- Colombo, M. G., L. Grilli, and S. Murtinu (2011). “R&D subsidies and the performance of high-tech start-ups”. *Economics Letters*. 112: 97–99. DOI: [10.1016/j.econlet.2011.03.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2011.03.007).
- Colombo, M., P. Mustar, and M. Wright (2010). “Dynamics of science-based entrepreneurship”. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 35: 1–15. DOI: [10.1007/s10961-009-9114-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-009-9114-6).
- Cowling, M. (2016). “You can lead a firm to R&D but can you make it innovate? UK evidence from SMEs”. *Small Business Economics*. 46: 565–577. DOI: [10.1007/s11187-016-9704-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9704-2).
- Cunningham, J. A. and A. N. Link (2021). “Latent technology as an outcome of R&D”. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 162: 120371. DOI: [10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120371](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120371).
- Czarnitzki, D. and J. Delanote (2013). “Young innovative companies: The new high-growth firms?” *Industrial and Corporate Change*. 22: 1315–1340. DOI: [10.1093/icc/dts039](https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dts039).
- Desouza, K. C. and Y. Awazu (2006). “Knowledge management at SMEs: Five peculiarities”. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 10: 32–43. DOI: [10.1108/13673270610650085](https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270610650085).
- Faul, F., E. Erdfelder, A. Buchner, and A.-G. Lang (2009). “Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses”. *Behavior Research Methods*. 41: 1149–1160. DOI: [10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149](https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149).

- Ferreira, J., J. Mueller, and A. Papa (2020). “Strategic knowledge management: Theory, practice and future challenges”. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 24: 121–126. DOI: [10.1108/JKM-07-2018-0461](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-07-2018-0461).
- Fini, R., M. Perkmann, M. Kenney, and K. M. Maki (2023). “Are public subsidies effective for university spinoffs? Evidence from SBIR awards in the University of California system”. *Research Policy*. 52: 104662. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2022.104662](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104662).
- Fischer, B. B., S. Queiroz, and N. S. Vonortas (2018a). “On the location of knowledge-intensive entrepreneurship in developing countries: Lessons from São Paulo”. *Brazil Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*. 30: 612–638. DOI: [10.1080/08985626.2018.1438523](https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2018.1438523).
- Fischer, B., S. Salles-Filho, C. Zeitoum, and F. Colugnati (2022). “Performance drivers in knowledge-intensive entrepreneurial firms: A multidimensional perspective”. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 26: 1342–1367. DOI: [10.1108/JKM-03-2021-0264](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2021-0264).
- Fischer, B. B., P. R. Schaeffer, N. S. Vonortas, and S. Queiroz (2018b). “Quality comes first: University-industry collaboration as a source of academic entrepreneurship in a developing country”. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 43: 263–284. DOI: [10.1007/s10961-017-9568-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-017-9568-x).
- Fisher, G. (2012). “Effectuation, causation, and bricolage: A behavioral comparison of emerging theories in entrepreneurship research”. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*. 36: 1019–1051. DOI: [10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00537.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00537.x).
- Gemmell, R. M. (2017). “Learning styles of entrepreneurs in knowledge-intensive industries”. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*. 23: 446–464. DOI: [10.1108/IJEBr-12-2015-0307](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBr-12-2015-0307).
- Gicheva, D. and A. N. Link (2016). “On the economic performance of nascent entrepreneurs”. *European Economic Review*. 86: 109–117. DOI: [10.1016/j.euroecorev.2015.07.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2015.07.018).
- Gimenez-Fernandez, E. M., F. D. Sandulli, and M. Bogers (2020). “Unpacking liabilities of newness and smallness in innovative startups: Investigating the differences in innovation performance between new and older small firms”. *Research Policy*. 49: 104049. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2020.104049](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104049).

- Guerrero, M., D. Urbano, and F. Herrera (2019). “Innovation practices in emerging economies: Do university partnerships matter?” *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 44: 615–646. DOI: [10.1007/s10961-017-9578-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-017-9578-8).
- Hahn, D., T. Minola, and K. A. Eddleston (2019). “How do scientists contribute to the performance of innovative start-ups? An imprinting perspective on open innovation”. *Journal of Management Studies*. 56: 895–928. DOI: [10.1111/joms.12418](https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12418).
- Hair, J. F., G. T. M. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt (2022). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hottenrott, H. and R. Richstein (2020). “Start-up subsidies: Does the policy instrument matter?” *Research Policy*. 49: 103888. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2019.103888](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.103888).
- Inkinen, H. (2015). “Review of empirical research on intellectual capital and firm performance”. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 16: 518–565. DOI: [10.1108/JIC-01-2015-0002](https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-01-2015-0002).
- Inkinen, H. (2016). “Review of empirical research on knowledge management practices and firm performance”. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 20: 230–257. DOI: [10.1108/JKM-09-2015-0336](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-09-2015-0336).
- Kantis, H. D., J. S. Federico, and S. I. García (2020). “Entrepreneurship policy and systemic conditions: Evidence-based implications and recommendations for emerging countries”. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*. 72: 100872. DOI: [10.1016/j.seps.2020.100872](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2020.100872).
- Laihonen, H. and S. Mäntylä (2018). “Strategic knowledge management and evolving local government”. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 22: 219–234. DOI: [10.1108/JKM-06-2017-0232](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2017-0232).
- Lanahan, L., A. M. Joshi, and E. Johnson (2021). “Do public R&D subsidies produce jobs? Evidence from the SBIR/STTR program”. *Research Policy*. 50: 104286. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2021.104286](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104286).
- Lerner, J. (1999). “The government as venture capitalist: The long-run impact of the SBIR program”. *Journal of Business*. 72: 285–318. DOI: [10.1086/209616](https://doi.org/10.1086/209616).
- Lerner, J. (2002). “When bureaucrats meet entrepreneurs: The design of effective ‘Public Venture Capital’ programmes”. *The Economic Journal*. 112: F73–F84. DOI: [10.1111/1468-0297.00684](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00684).

- Link, A. N. and C. J. Ruhm (2009). “Bringing science to market: Commercializing from NIH SBIR awards”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 18: 381–402. DOI: [10.1080/10438590802208166](https://doi.org/10.1080/10438590802208166).
- Liu, J., H. Zhou, F. Chen, and J. Yu (2022). “The coevolution of innovation ecosystems and the strategic growth paths of knowledge-intensive enterprises: The case of China’s integrated circuit design industry”. *Journal of Business Research*. 144: 428–439. DOI: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.02.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.02.008).
- Malerba, F. and M. McKelvey (2020). “Knowledge-intensive innovative entrepreneurship integrating Schumpeter, evolutionary economics, and innovation systems”. *Small Business Economics*. 54: 503–522. DOI: [10.1007/s11187-018-0060-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-018-0060-2).
- Meyer, M. (2003). “Academic entrepreneurs or entrepreneurial academics? Research-based ventures and public support mechanisms”. *R and D Management*. 33: 107–115. DOI: [10.1111/1467-9310.00286](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9310.00286).
- Murray, F. (2004). “The role of academic inventors in entrepreneurial firms: Sharing the laboratory life”. *Research Policy*. 33: 643–659. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2004.01.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2004.01.013).
- Oliveira, M. M., C. C. Fernandes, R. Sbragia, and F. M. Borini (2019). “Startups and technology transfer from universities and research centers—an analysis of the impact on launching new products”. In: *Startups and Innovation Ecosystems in Emerging Markets*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. 17–35. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-10865-6_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-10865-6_2).
- Paoloni, M., D. Coluccia, S. Fontana, and S. Solimene (2020). “Knowledge management, intellectual capital and entrepreneurship: A structured literature review”. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 24: 1797–1818. DOI: [10.1108/JKM-01-2020-0052](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-01-2020-0052).
- Protogerou, A., Y. Caloghirou, and N. S. Vonortas (2017). “Determinants of young firms’ innovative performance: Empirical evidence from Europe”. *Research Policy*. 46: 1312–1326. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2017.05.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.05.011).
- Santarelli, E. and H. T. Tran (2013). “The interplay of human and social capital in shaping entrepreneurial performance: The case of Vietnam”. *Small Business Economics*. 40: 435–458. DOI: [10.1007/s11187-012-9427-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-012-9427-y).

- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). *Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency, Source*. The Academy of Management Review.
- Schaeffer, P. R., M. Guerrero, and B. B. Fischer (2021). “Mutualism in ecosystems of innovation and entrepreneurship: A bidirectional perspective on universities’ linkages”. *Journal of Business Research*. 134: 184–197. DOI: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.039).
- Shane, S. (2009). “Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy”. *Small Business Economics*. 33: 141–149. DOI: [10.1007/s11187-009-9215-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-009-9215-5).
- Siegel, D. S. and C. Wessner (2012). “Universities and the success of entrepreneurial ventures: Evidence from the small business innovation research program”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 37: 404–415. DOI: [10.1007/s10961-010-9186-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-010-9186-3).
- Soetanto, D. and S. Jack (2016). “The impact of university-based incubation support on the innovation strategy of academic spin-offs”. *Technovation*. 50–51: 25–40. DOI: [10.1016/j.technovation.2015.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2015.11.001).
- Stam, E. and K. Wennberg (2009). “The roles of R&D in new firm growth”. *Small Business Economics*. 33: 77–89. DOI: [10.1007/s11187-009-9183-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-009-9183-9).
- Symeonidou, N. and N. Nicolaou (2018). “Resource orchestration in start-ups: Synchronizing human capital investment, leveraging strategy, and founder start-up experience”. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*. 12: 194–218. DOI: [10.1002/sej.1269](https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1269).
- Temouri, Y., V. Pereira, G. W. Muschert, V. Ramiah, and M. Babula (2020). “How does cluster location and intellectual capital impact entrepreneurial success within high-growth firms?” *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 22: 171–189. DOI: [10.1108/JIC-02-2020-0066](https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-02-2020-0066).
- Thomas, V. J., M. Bliemel, C. Shippam, and E. Maine (2020). “Endowing university spin-offs pre-formation: Entrepreneurial capabilities for scientist-entrepreneurs”. *Technovation*: 96–97. DOI: [10.1016/j.technovation.2020.102153](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2020.102153).

- Toole, A. A. and D. Czarnitzki (2009). “Exploring the relationship between scientist human capital and firm performance: The case of biomedical academic entrepreneurs in the SBIR program”. *Management Science*. 55: 101–114. DOI: [10.1287/mnsc.1080.0913](https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1080.0913).
- Vedula, S. and P. H. Kim (2019). “Gimme shelter or fade away: The impact of regional entrepreneurial ecosystem quality on venture survival”. *Industrial and Corporate Change*. 28: 827–854. DOI: [10.1093/icc/dtz032](https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtz032).
- Venkitachalam, K. and H. Willmott (2017). “Strategic knowledge management—insights and pitfalls”. *International Journal of Information Management*. 37: 313–316. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2017.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2017.02.002).
- Villani, E., C. Linder, and R. Grimaldi (2018). “Effectuation and causation in science-based new venture creation: A configurational approach”. *Journal of Business Research*. 83: 173–185. DOI: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.10.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.10.041).
- Zack, M. H. (1999). “Developing a knowledge strategy”. *California Management Review*. 41: 125–145. DOI: [10.2307/41166000](https://doi.org/10.2307/41166000).

Korea Small Business Innovation Research (KOSBIR)

Irineu de Souza Lima Júnior¹, Soo J. Sohn² and Nicholas S. Vonortas³

¹*University of Campinas, Brazil*

²*Science and Technology Policy Institute (STEPI), South Korea*

³*The George Washington University, USA; vonortas@gwu.edu*

ABSTRACT

The foreign exchange crisis in 1997 also led the Korean government to pursue economic revitalization, and part of the strategy was to improve the global competitiveness of local SMEs. Korea was the first East Asian country to establish, in 1998, a research and development (R&D) support program focused on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) sculpted on the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program in the United States. The Korea Small Business Innovation Research (KOSBIR) was created in the context of an internationalization policy and open economy movement in the 1990s, followed by the Korean membership in the OECD. The KOSBIR program is reviewed in this monograph.

Irineu de Souza Lima Júnior, Soo J. Sohn and Nicholas S. Vonortas (2024), "Korea Small Business Innovation Research (KOSBIR)", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 8, No. 1–2, pp 64–78. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000028-5.

©2024 I. de Souza Lima Júnior *et al.*

References

- Cin, B.-C., Y.-J. Kim, and N. S. Vonortas (2017). “The impact of government R&D subsidy on firm performance: Evidence from Korean SMEs”. *Small Business Economics*. 48(2): 345–360.
- Hong, S. (2015). “The development and performance of the KOSBIR program”. *Korea Institute for Industrial Economics and Trade Research Paper No. 15/IER/20/1-2, KIET Industrial Economic Review*. 20(1): 20–35. URL: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4204283>.
- Jin, S. and K. Lee (2020). “The government R&D funding and management performance: The mediating effect of technology innovation”. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, MDPI, Basel*. 6(4): 1–13. DOI: [10.3390/joitmc6040094](https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6040094).
- Kang, H. and J. S. Mah (2015). “R&D policy for small and medium-sized enterprises in Korea”. *Science, Technology and Society*. 20(1): 1–20. DOI: [10.1177/0971721814561391](https://doi.org/10.1177/0971721814561391).
- Kwon, S. (2019). “Analysis of the performance of the Korean government’s R&D subsidy for small businesses”. *MPA/MPP/MPFM Capstone Projects*. 321. URL: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/mpampp_etds/321.
- Lee, H. and Y. Seo (2017). “Comparative study of R&D performance by government funding methods for ICT SMEs”. *The Journal of the Korea Contents Association*. 17(5): 34–44.

- Lee, S. and J. Joo (2018). “Government R&D support for SMEs: Policy effects and improvement measures”. *KDI Journal of Economic Policy*, 40(4): 47–63. DOI: [10.23895/KDIJEP.2018.40.4.47](https://doi.org/10.23895/KDIJEP.2018.40.4.47).
- Ministry of SMEs and Startups (2020). “SME technology innovation support by government/public institutions: 2019 performance and 2020 plan (draft). A bill to the Presidential Advisory Council on S&T”. URL: <https://online.fliphtml5.com/lukuo/rwje/#p=1>.
- Ministry of SMEs and Startups (2021). “SME technology innovation support by government/public institutions: 2020 performance and 2021 plan (draft). A bill to the Presidential Advisory Council on S&T”. URL: <https://online.fliphtml5.com/lukuo/piyf/#p=1>.
- STEPI (2017). *Analysis of Status and Performance of R&D Support for SMEs*. Science and Technology Policy Institute. STEPI Insight. 211.
- STEPI (2022). *A study on the improvement of KOSBIR*. STEPI report 2022-03. URL: <https://www.stepi.re.kr/site/stepiko/report/View.do?reIdx=1040&pageIndex=1&cateCont=A0202&searchYear=&searchCondition=&searchKeyword=&searchSort=#modall>.

Japan's SBIR Scheme

Masatoshi Kato¹ and Alex Coad²

¹*Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan; mkato@kwansei.ac.jp*

²*Waseda University, Japan*

ABSTRACT

Following the SBIR program in the U.S. in 1982, a similar program has been enacted in Japan in 1999, officially known as the Law for Facilitating Creation of New Business, but often referred to as the Japanese SBIR programme. Japan's SBIR scheme aims to increase opportunities for SMEs with technology development capability, to receive support for their R&D, and to support the commercialization of outcomes from such activities, based on the Small and Medium-sized Enterprises Business Enhancement Act. This monograph highlights a peculiar characteristic of the Japanese SBIR scheme compared to the U.S. program, namely Japan's SBIR recipients are relatively old.

References

- Axtell, R. (2018). “Endogenous firm dynamics and labor flows via heterogeneous agents”. In: *Handbook of Computational Economics*. Vol. 4. 157–213. URL: [10.1016/bs.hescom.2018.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.hescom.2018.05.001).
- Balasubramanian, N. and J. Lee (2008). “Firm age and innovation”. *Industrial and Corporate Change*. 17(5): 1019–1047.
- Bloom, N., J. Van Reenen, and H. Williams (2019). “A toolkit of policies to promote innovation”. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 33(3): 163–184.
- Coad, A. (2018). “Firm age: A survey”. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*. 28(1): 13–43.
- Coad, A., A. Segarra, and M. Teruel (2013). “Like milk or wine: Does firm performance improve with age?” *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*. 24: 173–189.
- Dutta, S., T. B. Folta, and J. Rodrigues (2022). “Do governments fund the best entrepreneurial ventures? The case of the small business innovation research program”. *Academy of Management Discoveries*. 8(1): 103–138.
- Eshima, Y. (2003). “Impact of public policy on innovative SMEs in Japan”. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 41: 85–93. DOI: [10.1111/1540-627X.00068](https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-627X.00068).

- Fukao, K. and H. U. Kwon (2006). “Why did Japan’s TFP growth slow down in the lost decade? An empirical analysis based on firm-level data of manufacturing firms”. *Japanese Economic Review*. 57(2): 195–228.
- Haltiwanger, J., R. S. Jarmin, and J. Miranda (2013). “Who creates jobs? Small versus large versus young”. *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 95(2): 347–361.
- Honjo, Y. (2015). “Why are entrepreneurship levels so low in Japan?” *Japan and the World Economy*. 36: 88–101.
- Hoshi, T. (2006). “Economics of the living dead”. *Japanese Economic Review*. 57(1): 30–49.
- Howell, S. T. (2017). “Financing innovation: Evidence from R&D grants”. *American Economic Review*. 107(4): 1136–1164.
- Inoue, H. (2020). “Collaboration networks on inventors and firms”. In: *Co-patenting: An Analytic Tool for Cooperative Research and Development*. Tokyo: Springer. 9–40.
- Inoue, H. and E. Yamaguchi (2017). “Evaluation of the small business innovation research program in Japan”. *Sage Open*. 7(1): 2158244017690791.
- Ito, K. and T. Matsuura (2010). “Productivity analysis using government statistical micro data”. *RIETI policy discussion paper series 10-P-010, Research Institute for Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI)* (in Japanese).
- Lerner, J. (1999). “The government as venture capitalist: The long-run impact of the SBIR program”. *Journal of Business*. 72(3): 285–318.
- Martin, S. and J. T. Scott (2000). “The nature of innovation market failure and the design of public support for private innovation”. *Research Policy*. 29(4–5): 437–447.
- Motohashi, K. (2005). “University-industry collaborations in Japan: The role of new technology-based firms in transforming the national innovation system”. *Research Policy*. 34(5): 583–594.
- Nishimura, K. G., T. Nakajima, and K. Kiyota (2005). “Does the natural selection mechanism still work in severe recessions?: Examination of the Japanese economy in the 1990s”. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 58(1): 53–78.

- OECD (2019). *OECD Economic Surveys: Japan 2019*. Paris: OECD Publishing. DOI: [10.1787/fd63f374-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/fd63f374-en).
- Seki, T. (2008). “What are the SME policies and measures in Japan?: The outline of SME promotion policies in Japan, bulletin of Hannan University the Hannan Ronshu”. *Social Science*. 44(1): 173–190.
- Shibata, T. (2006). *Japan, Moving Toward a More Advanced Knowledge Economy, 1: Assessment and Lessons*. World Bank Publications.
- Sørensen, J. B. and T. E. Stuart (2000). “Aging, obsolescence, and organizational innovation”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 45(1): 81–112.
- Storz, C. (2006). *Small Firms and Innovation Policy in Japan*. Taylor & Francis.
- Takahashi, K. and Y. Hashimoto (2022). “Small grant subsidy application effects on productivity improvement: Evidence from Japanese SMEs”. *Small Business Economics*: 1–28.
- Umemura, M. (2014). “Crisis and change in the system of innovation: The Japanese pharmaceutical industry during the lost decades, 1990–2010”. *Business History*. 56(5): 816–844.
- Watanabe, M., J. Yoshino, J. Yokota, S. Takatani, Y. Minamizaki, K. Tsuda, and T. Sasaki (2021). “Institutional reform of SME technological innovation system (SBIR system in Japan): The act partially Amending Basic Act on science and technology and related acts”. *Journal of the Japan Society for Intellectual Production*. 17: 93–102.

Recent Development of Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Programs in Taiwan

Jianqiang Chen¹, Pei-Fang Hsieh² and Po-Hsuan Hsu³

¹*National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan*

²*National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan*

³*National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan; pohsuanhsu@m.x.nthu.edu.tw*

ABSTRACT

The Standards for Identifying Small- and Medium-sized Enterprises published by the Ministry of Economic Affairs (MOEA) in Taiwan launched Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) programs in February 1999. The programs are intended to subsidize domestic SMEs that develop new technologies, products, and services to, as well as expected to fill SMEs' funding gap and reduce their uncertainty with respect to innovation. This monograph describes the evolution of these programs.

References

- China Daily News (2021). “Kaohsiung companies’ innovative R&D under SBIR accepts 232 applications, setting a new record”. URL: <https://today.line.me/tw/v2/article/YoKYLp>.
- Commercial Times (2014). “SBIR in Taoyuan county is fruitful, funding to be expanded next year”. URL: <https://readers.ctee.com.tw/cm/20141022/a23aa23/564040/share>.
- Executive Yuan Youth Advisory Committee (2017). “Entrepreneurial SBIR – review of the entrepreneurial concept competition”. URL: <https://advisory.yda.gov.tw/01/blog/post/106-9-1>.
- Introduction of Small Business Innovation Research in Taiwan (2022). “The small and medium-sized enterprises (SME)”. URL: <https://www.sbir.org.tw/dlsec/SBIR>.
- Kaohsiung City Government (2020). “Collection of Achievements of Kaohsiung City SBIR (2008–2020)”. URL: <https://96kuas.kcg.gov.tw/sbir/effect/109>.
- MOEA (2021). *White Paper on Small and Medium Enterprises in Taiwan*, URL: <https://www.moeasmea.gov.tw/list-en-2572>.
- SBIR Taiwan (2022a). “Approved Lists of SBIR Programs (2008–2021)”. URL: <https://www.sbir.org.tw/consultation/list>.
- SBIR Taiwan (2022b). “Collection of Achievements of SBIR Programs (2008–2018)”. URL: <https://www.sbir.org.tw/achievement/performance>.

The UK Small Business Research Initiative

James A. Cunningham

Newcastle University, UK; james.cunningham@newcastle.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

The UK has adopted aspects of the US SBIR programme which was established in 1982. The UK version of the programme, established in 2001 was titled the Small Business Research Initiative. The programme was later labelled a failure in that it did not reflect the anticipated performance in terms of participation by government departments or spending contracts of the similar programme US SBIR. At the end of 2007 improvements were made and a newly reformed version of the initiative was created. By 2008 a new UK SBRI programme was launched that mirrored more of the US SBIR programme. Responsibility to coordinate and drive the UK SBRI programme was given to Innovate UK (previously known as the Technology Strategy Board) and the then Department of Trade and Industry. This monograph describes the evolution of the UK program.

James A. Cunningham (2024), "The UK Small Business Research Initiative", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 8, No. 1–2, pp 119–154. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000028-8.

©2024 J. A. Cunningham

References

- Adams, S. B. (2011). “Growing where you are planted: Exogenous firms and the seeding of Silicon Valley”. *Research Policy*. 40(3): 368–379.
- Alexander, A., D. P. Martin, C. Manolchev, and K. Miller (2020). “University-industry collaboration: Using meta-rules to overcome barriers to knowledge transfer”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 45(2): 371–392.
- Andersen, M. S., J. W. Bray, and A. N. Link (2017). “On the failure of scientific research: An analysis of SBIR projects funded by the US National Institutes of Health”. *Scientometrics*. 112(1): 431–442.
- Audretsch, D. B. (2003). “Standing on the shoulders of midgets: The US Small Business Innovation Research program (SBIR)”. *Small Business Economics*. 20(2): 129–135.
- Audretsch, D. B. and M. Belitski (2020). “The role of R&D and knowledge spillovers in innovation and productivity”. *European Economic Review*. 123: 103391.
- Audretsch, D. B. and A. N. Link (2019). “The fountain of knowledge: An epistemological perspective on the growth of US SBIR-funded firms”. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. 15(4): 1103–1113.

- Audretsch, D. B., A. N. Link, and M. van Hasselt (2019b). “Knowledge promoting innovation in small firms: Evidence begets knowledge: University knowledge spillovers and the output of scientific papers from U.S. Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) projects”. *Scientometrics*. 121(3): 1367–1383.
- Audretsch, D. B., A. N. Link, and J. T. Scott (2019a). “Public/private technology partnerships: Evaluating SBIR-supported research”. In: *The Social Value of New Technology*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 264–278.
- Audretsch, D. B., J. Weigand, and C. Weigand (2002). “The impact of the SBIR on creating entrepreneurial behavior”. *Economic Development Quarterly*. 16(1): 32–38.
- BEIS (2017). “SBRI review – BEIS evidence document”. URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/662366/SBRI_review_-_BEIS_evidence_document_20171120.pdf.
- Borrás, S. and S. Schwaag Serger (2022). *The Design of Transformative Research and Innovation Policy Instruments for Grand Challenges: The Policy-Nesting Perspective*. Science and Public Policy.
- Chowdhury, F., A. N. Link, and M. van Hasselt (2022). “Public support for research in artificial intelligence: A descriptive study of US Department of Defense SBIR projects”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*: 1–13.
- Coad, A. and E. Tredgett (2015). “The shaky start of the UK Small Business Research Initiative (SBRI) in comparison to the US Small Business Innovation Research programme (SBIR)”. *Working Paper*. Birkbeck College, University of London, London, UK.
- Compagnucci, L. and F. Spigarelli (2020). “The third mission of the university: A systematic literature review on potentials and constraints”. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 161: 120284.
- Connell, D. (2012). “Innovation myths and lead customers: Game changing policies to improve the commercialisation of research, written evidence, science and technology commons select committee, UK Parliament”. URL: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmsctech/348/348we05.htm>.

- Connell, D. (2017). *Leveraging Public Procurement to Grow the Innovation Economy: An Independent Review of the Small Business Research Initiative, November 2017*. London, UK.
- Connell, D. and J. Probert (2010). *Exploding the Myths of UK Innovation Policy*. Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge.
- Cunningham, J. A., E. E. Lehmann, and M. Menter (2022). “The organizational architecture of entrepreneurial universities across the stages of entrepreneurship: A conceptual framework”. *Small Business Economics*. 59(1): 11–27.
- Cunningham, J. A. and A. N. Link (2015). “Fostering university-industry R&D collaborations in European Union countries”. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. 11(4): 849–860.
- De Silva, M., L. Gokhberg, D. Meissner, and M. Russo (2021). “Addressing societal challenges through the simultaneous generation of social and business values: A conceptual framework for science-based co-creation”. *Technovation*. 104: 102268.
- Feldman, M., E. E. Johnson, R. Bellefleur, S. Dowden, and E. Talukder (2022). “Evaluating the tail of the distribution: The economic contributions of frequently awarded government R&D recipients”. *Research Policy*. 51(7): 104539.
- Fernandes, G. and D. O’Sullivan (2021). “Benefits management in university-industry collaboration programs”. *International Journal of Project Management*. 39(1): 71–84.
- Gicheva, D. and A. N. Link (2013). “Leveraging entrepreneurship through private investments: Does gender matter?” *Small Business Economics*. 40(2): 199–210.
- Gicheva, D. and A. N. Link (2022). “Public sector entrepreneurship, politics, and innovation”. *Small Business Economics*. 59(2): 565–572.
- Gill, D., T. H. W. Minshall, C. Pickering, and M. Rigby (2007). “From ‘technological revolution’ to the ‘knowledge economy’: A review of support for innovation and entrepreneurship in the UK”. 15th High Tech Small Firms, 14–15 June 2007, Manchester Business School, Manchester, UK.
- Granstrand, O. and M. Holgersson (2020). “Innovation ecosystems: A conceptual review and a new definition”. *Technovation*. 90: 102098.

- Hayter, C. S. (2015). “Public or private entrepreneurship? Revisiting motivations and definitions of success among academic entrepreneurs”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 40(6): 1003–1015.
- Hayter, C. S. and A. N. Link (2020). “Governance mechanisms enabling inter-organizational adaptation: Lessons from grand challenge R&D programs”. *Science and Public Policy*. 47(2): 271–282.
- Innovate UK (2014). “What Innovate UK has funded”. URL: <https://www.ukri.org/what-we-do/what-we-have-funded/innovate-uk/>.
- Jones, S. E. and N. Coates (2020). “A micro-level view on knowledge co-creation through university-industry collaboration in a multinational corporation”. *Journal of Management Development*. 39(5): 723–738.
- Joshi, A. M., T. M. Inouye, and J. A. Robinson (2018). “How does agency workforce diversity influence federal R&D funding of minority and women technology entrepreneurs? An analysis of the SBIR and STTR programs, 2001–2011”. *Small Business Economics*. 50(3): 499–519.
- Keller, M. R. and F. Block (2013). “Explaining the transformation in the US innovation system: The impact of a small government program”. *Socio-Economic Review*. 11(4): 629–656.
- Kochenkova, A., R. Grimaldi, and F. Munari (2016). “Public policy measures in support of knowledge transfer activities: A review of academic literature”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 41(3): 407–429.
- Lanahan, L. (2016). “Multilevel public funding for small business innovation: A review of US state SBIR match programs”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 41(2): 220–249.
- Lanahan, L., A. M. Joshi, and E. Johnson (2021). “Do public R&D subsidies produce jobs? Evidence from the SBIR/STTR program”. *Research Policy*. 50(7): 104286.
- Link, A. N., C. A. Morris, and M. van Hasselt (2019). “The impact of public R&D investments on patenting activity: Technology transfer at the US environmental protection agency”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 28(5): 536–546.

- Link, A. N. and C. J. Ruhm (2009). “Bringing science to market: Commercializing from NIH SBIR awards”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 18(4): 381–402.
- Link, A. N. and J. Scott (2012a). “The small business innovation research program”. In: *ISSUES in Science and Technology*. 89–92.
- Link, A. N. and J. T. Scott (2012b). “Employment growth from the small business innovation research program”. *Small Business Economics*. 39(2): 265–287.
- Link, A. N. and J. T. Scott (2010). “Government as entrepreneur: Evaluating the commercialization success of SBIR projects”. *Research Policy*. 39(5): 589–601.
- Link, A. N. and J. T. Scott (2019). “The economic benefits of technology transfer from US federal laboratories”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 44(5): 1416–1426.
- Link, A. N., C. A. Swann, and M. van Hasselt (2022). *An Assessment of the US Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program: A Study of Project Failure (No. 22–7)*. University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Department of Economics.
- Lord Sainsbury of Turville (2007). *The Race to the Top: A Review of Government’s Science and Innovation Policies*. HM Stationery Office, 2007.
- Mason, G. and M. Nathan (2014). *Rethinking Industrial Policy Design in the UK: Foreign Ideas and Lessons, Home-Grown Programmes and Initiatives*. LLAKES Centre, Institute of Education, University of London.
- McDonald, F., D. Tsagdis, and Q. Huang (2006). “The development of industrial clusters and public policy”. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*. 18(6): 525–542.
- Miller, K., J. Cunningham, and E. Lehmann (2021). “Extending the university mission and business model: Influences and implications”. *Studies in Higher Education*. 46(5): 915–925.
- Minshall, T. (2008). “Evolution of UK government support for innovation”. In: *Creating Wealth from Knowledge*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 125–142.

- MIoR with the Enterprise Research Centre and OMB Research Ltd (2015). “A review of the Small Business Research Initiative, final report”. URL: <https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/IUK-061221-AReviewOfTheSmallBusinessResearchInitiative.pdf>.
- Nelles, J. and T. Vorley (2011). “Entrepreneurial architecture: A blueprint for entrepreneurial universities”. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des sciences de l’administration*. 28(3): 341–353.
- NESTA (2010). “Buying power? Is the small business research initiative for procuring R&D driving innovation in the UK?” URL: https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/buying_power_report.pdf.
- Østergaard, C. R. and I. Drejer (2022). “Keeping together: Which factors characterise persistent university-industry collaboration on innovation?” *Technovation*. 111: 102389.
- Owen, G. (2004). *Where are the Big Gorillas? High Technology Entrepreneurship in the UK and the Role of Public Policy*. London: Entrepreneurship and Public Policy Project, Diebold Institute for Public Policy Studies.
- Rigby, J. (2016). “The impact of pre-commercial procurement on innovation”. In: *Handbook of Innovation Policy Impact*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 382–402.
- Sá, C. M. and J. Litwin (2011). “University-industry research collaborations in Canada: The role of federal policy instruments”. *Science and Public Policy*. 38(6): 425–435.
- SBRI Healthcare (2014). “SBRI healthcare annual review 2014/15”. URL: <https://sbrihealthcare.co.uk/media/pages/impact-case-studies/impact-to-date/35e7fce9e3-1688551967/sbri-annual-review-2014-15.pdf>.
- SBRI Healthcare (2015). “SBRI healthcare annual review 2015/16”. URL: <https://sbrihealthcare.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/SBRI-Annual-Review-2.pdf>.
- Selviaridis, K. (2020). “Effects of public procurement of R&D on the innovation process: Evidence from the UK small business research initiative”. *Journal of Public Procurement*. 21(3): 229–259.

- Siegel, D. S. and C. Wessner (2012). “Universities and the success of entrepreneurial ventures: Evidence from the small business innovation research program”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 37(4): 404–415.
- Toole, A. A. and D. Czarnitzki (2007). “Biomedical academic entrepreneurship through the SBIR program”. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 63(4): 716–738.
- Tredgett, E. and A. Coad (2013). “The shaky start of the UK Small Business Research Initiative (SBRI) in comparison to the US Small Business Innovation Research Programme (SBIR)”. *SSRN Working Paper 2205156*.
- UK Government (2022). “SBRI: The small business research initiative”. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/sbri-the-small-business-research-initiative>.
- UKRI (2022). “Giving the public sector the edge. How the Small Business Research Initiative has driven public sector innovation”. URL: <https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/UKRI-13052-2-SBRIDrivingPublicSectorInnovation-FINAL.pdf>.
- Ullah, F. and P. Taylor (2007). “Are UK technology-based small firms still finance constrained?” *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. 3(2): 189–203.
- Wallner, M., J. Peterson, W. Swearingen, M. V. Zook, and R. Gaster (2021). “SBIR: A catalyst for innovation in the flyover states”. *Issues in Science and Technology*. 37(3): 82–84.
- Wessner, C. W. (2007). *SBIR and the Phase III Challenge of Commercialization: Report of a Symposium*. Washington DC: The National Academies Press.
- Wessner, C. W. (2008). *An Assessment of the SBIR Program at the National Science Foundation*. Washington: DC: The National Academies Press.

SBIR in The Netherlands

Martijn van Hasselt

University of North Carolina, USA, Greensboro; mnvanhas@uncg.edu

ABSTRACT

This monograph provides an overview of the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program as currently implemented in The Netherlands and reviews the available empirical evidence about its impact. The program was partially modeled after the US SBIR program and was first piloted in 2004. There are currently three variants of the program, executed by distinct government agencies. SBIR does not provide subsidies or grants, instead it is a pre-commercial procurement program, under which a government agency enters a contractual agreement with a private business to develop innovations and prepare them for commercialization. Like US SBIR, the program is competitive and takes a phased approach to funding. Two of the three variants specifically aim to stimulate the development of innovative solutions to large societal challenges. All three variants further aim to strengthen the innovative capacity of small and medium enterprises. The few program evaluations conducted to date provide limited empirical evidence about the realized benefits of SBIR in The Netherlands. It appears that the program remains somewhat underutilized, but survey evidence obtained from program participants suggests that SBIR stimulated the development of highly innovative products and services, which in turn led to further research and

development investments and spillover effects to other firms and sectors in the economy.

References

- Camerer, E. and H. Van Eijl (2011). “Demand-side innovation policies in the European Union”. In: *Demand-Side Innovation Policies*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, Chapter 12. DOI: [10.1787/9789264098886-18-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264098886-18-en).
- Centraal Planbureau (CPB) (2017). “Analysis and international comparison SBIR” (in Dutch). URL: <https://www.cpb.nl/publicatie/notitie-cpb-analyse-en-internationale-vergelijking-sbir>.
- Dialogic (2017). “Evaluation small business innovation research (SBIR)” (in Dutch). URL: <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/blg-820189>.
- Elert, N., M. Henrekson, and M. Sanders (2019). *The Entrepreneurial Society: A Reform Strategy for the European Union*. Springer Open.
- Hulsink, W., K. Suddle, and J. Hessels (2008). “Science and technology-based regional entrepreneurship in the Netherlands: Building support structures for business creation and growth entrepreneurship”. ERIM report series reference No. ERS-2008-048-ORG. URL: <https://repub.eur.nl/pub/13220/ERS-2008-048-ORG.pdf>.
- RVO (2021a). “SBIR calls (2011–2020)”. URL: <https://archieff43.sitearchief.nl/archives/sitearchief/20230630020000/https://www.rvomagazines.nl/rvopublicaties/2021/02/sbir-oproepen-2011--2020>.

- RVO (2021b). “SBIR manual for entrepreneurs” (in Dutch). Publication nr. RVO-064-2021/BR-DUZA. URL: https://english.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2021/03/SBIR_handleiding_voor_ondernemers_maart_2021.pdf.
- RVO (n.d.1). “SBIR commissioned innovation” (in Dutch). URL: <https://www.rvo.nl/subsidies-financiering/sbir>.
- RVO (n.d.2). “SBIR proposal submission” (in Dutch). URL: <https://www.rvo.nl/subsidies-financiering/sbir/offertes-indienen>.
- Sociaal-Economische Raad (SER) (2003). “Advice interaction for innovation” (in Dutch). Publication nr. 11. URL: www.ser.nl.
- Technopolis Group (2010). “First evaluation of Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) programs in the Netherlands” (in Dutch). URL: <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/blg-81409>.

Stimulating R&D and Commercialization Activity in New Zealand: An Overview and Case Analysis of Callaghan Innovation's Grants and Technology Incubator Programme

Conor O'Kane¹, Urs Daellenbach², Sally Davenport² and Simon Wakeman³

¹*University of Otago, New Zealand; conor.okane@otago.ac.nz*

²*Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand*

³*Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment, New Zealand*

ABSTRACT

Similar to the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) programme in the United States (US), New Zealand (NZ), like many other countries internationally, has designed policy settings that could increase R&D and commercialization activity. In this monograph, we discuss the establishment of Callaghan Innovation in NZ and provide an overview of some of the R&D grant programmes it has put in place over the last decade that most closely align to the goals of SBIR. The primary focus of our monograph is a detailed case overview on a specific Callaghan Innovation-administered initiative, namely the Technology Incubator programme. Specialized

Conor O'Kane, Urs Daellenbach, Sally Davenport and Simon Wakeman (2024), "Stimulating R&D and Commercialization Activity in New Zealand: An Overview and Case Analysis of Callaghan Innovation's Grants and Technology Incubator Programme", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 8, No. 1-2, pp 176-211. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000028-10.

©2024 C. O'Kane *et al.*

technology incubators were formed to identify and evaluate complex intellectual property (IP) from publicly funded universities or Crown Research Institutes (CRIs) and private R&D with the objective of supporting or forming (through investment and incubation services) deep-tech start-ups with global potential. We provide a detailed and critical overview on the policy intent, roll-out and performance of this technology incubator programme. We report on the changes made to try to make the programme more effective and conclude by noting some key differences between it and SBIR.

References

- Andersen, M. S., J. W. Bray, and A. N. Link (2017). “On the failure of scientific research: An analysis of SBIR projects funded by the US National Institutes of Health”. *Scientometrics*. 112(1): 431–442.
- Audretsch, D. B., A. N. Link, and J. T. Scott (2002). “Public/private technology partnerships: Evaluating SBIR-supported research”. *Research Policy*. 31(1): 145–158.
- Burrell, H. (2021). “Rocket lab, orion health received millions in growth grants”. *BusinessDesk*. URL: <https://businessdesk.co.nz/article/primary-sector/rocket-lab-orion-health-received-millions-in-growth-grants>.
- Cabinet Economic Development Committee (2019). “Minute of decision, technology incubator programme: Proposed changes, Dev-19-MIN-0001”. Received through official information act request.
- Cabinet Paper (2013a). “Repayable grants and incubator support programmes”. Minister of Science and Innovation, EGI (13) 216. Received through official information act request.
- Cabinet Paper (2013b). Cabinet business Committee minute of decision ‘repayable grants and incubator support programmes’, CBC Min (13) 6/6. Received through official information act request.
- Callaghan Innovation (2014a). “Appendix B, Callaghan innovation request for proposal – business incubation award 2014–2017”. Received through official information act request.

- Callaghan Innovation (2014b). “Appendix C, Callaghan innovation technology-focused incubator application document, business incubation award 2014–2017”. Received through official information act request.
- Callaghan Innovation (2022a). “Technology incubators”. URL: <https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/products/fund/deep-tech-incubators/>.
- Callaghan Innovation (2022b). “Callaghan innovation: New Zealand’s innovation agency”. URL: <https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/>.
- Callaghan Innovation (2022c). “Customer stories: Riding the roller-coaster”. URL: <https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/stories/riding-rollercoaster/>.
- Callaghan Innovation (2022d). “Getting started grants”. URL: <https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/products/fund/new-to-r-and-d-grant/>.
- Callaghan Innovation (2022e). “R&D funding”. URL: <https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/grants>.
- Callaghan Innovation (2022f). “R&D grants: Grant recipients”. URL: <https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/grants/tend-health>.
- Callaghan Innovation Act (2012). URL: <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2012/0094/latest/whole.html>.
- Creative HQ (n.d). URL: <https://creativehq.co.nz/>.
- Crown Entities Act (2004). URL: <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2004/0115/129.0/whole.html%5C#DLM330351>.
- Link, A. and J. Link (2009). “Small business innovation research program: An environment to enhance commercialization”. In: *Government as Entrepreneur*. Oxford University Press.
- MBIE (2016). Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment briefing paper ‘review of incubator programmes’, 15–16 3235. Received through official information act request.
- MBIE (2017). “Aide memoire technology incubators: Policy and implementation practices”, 0510 17–18. Received through official information act request.

- MBIE (2018a). “Coversheet: Research and development tax incentive”. URL: <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/1258-research-and-development-tax-incentive-regulatory-impact-statement>.
- MBIE (2018b). Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment briefing paper ‘the future of the incubator programme’ 18–19 0496. Received through official information act request.
- MBIE (2018c). Annex 1: The commercialization landscape of briefing paper ‘timing options for new contracts for incubator providers and the commercialization partner network’ 3468 17–18. Received through official information act request.
- MBIE (2018d). Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment briefing paper ‘planned review of incubator programme’ 2340 17–18. Received through official information act request.
- MBIE (2018e). Cabinet briefing paper ‘proposed changes to the technology incubator programme’, 1791 18–19. Received through official information act request.
- MBIE (2021). “Providing transitional support to R&D performing businesses”. URL: <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/assets/providing-transitional-support-to-r-d-performing-businesses.pdf>.
- MBIE (2022). Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment briefing paper ‘technology incubator programme – update and equity guidelines’ 2122–3391. Received through official information act request.
- MSI (Ministry of Science and Innovation) (2011). “Powering innovation: Improving access to and uptake of R&D in the high value manufacturing and services sector”. URL: <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/assets/e1abc58ac4/powering-Innovation.pdf>.
- New Zealand Government (2013). “Direction to Callaghan innovation-criteria for assessing proposals for funding”. URL: <https://www.gazette.govt.nz/notice/id/2013-go4582>.
- New Zealand Government (2018). “Direction to Callaghan innovation—criteria for assessing proposals for funding growth grant funding”. URL: <https://www.gazette.govt.nz/notice/id/2018-go4863>.

- New Zealand Government (2020). “Direction to Callaghan innovation—administration of a short-term loan scheme to support R&D-performing businesses in response to the COVID-19 crisis”. URL: <https://www.gazette.govt.nz/notice/id/2020-go3947>.
- New Zealand Government (2022). “History of the COVID-19 alert system”. URL: <https://covid19.govt.nz/about-our-covid-19-response/history-of-the-covid-19-alert-system/>.
- New Zealand Productivity Commission (2021). “New Zealand firms: Reaching for the frontier. Final report”. URL: <http://www.productivity.govt.nz/inquiries/frontier-firms/>.
- OECD (2007). “OECD reviews of innovation policy: New Zealand”. URL: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/science-and-technology/oecd-reviews-of-innovation-policy-new-zealand-2007_9789264037618-en.
- OECD (2019). “OECD economic surveys: New Zealand”. URL: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/oecd-economic-surveys-new-zealand-2019_b0b94dbd-en.
- OECD (2022). “Gross domestic spending on R&D”. URL: <https://data.oecd.org/rd/gross-domestic-spending-on-r-d.htm>.
- O’Kane, C. (2018). “Technology transfer executives’ backwards integration: An examination of interactions between university technology transfer executives and principal investigators”. *Technovation*. 76: 64–77.
- O’Kane, C., J. A. Cunningham, M. Menter, and S. Walton (2021). “The brokering role of technology transfer offices within entrepreneurial ecosystems: An investigation of macro-meso–micro factors”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*. 46(6): 1814–1844.
- O’Kane, C., V. Mangematin, W. Geoghegan, and C. Fitzgerald (2015). “University technology transfer offices: The search for identity to build legitimacy”. *Research Policy*. 44(2): 421–437.
- PwC (PricewaterhouseCoopers) (2020). “Research and development tax incentive: Review of implementation”. Report prepared for MBIE. URL: <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/15023-research-and-development-tax-incentive-review-of-implementation>.
- SBIR and STTR: America’s Seed Fund (n.d.). “About: The SBIR and STTR programs”. URL: <https://www.sbir.gov/about>.

- Wakeman (2017). “The impact of R&D grants on the performance of New Zealand firms. Productivity commission research note 2017/5. October 2017”. URL: <https://www.treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2024-05/pc-rp-the-impact-of-rd-grants-on-the-performance-of-new-zealand-firms.pdf>.