

**1 Klaipeda**

**Erik Arnold**

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: .... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	7	The proposal explains how the desired effects will be achieved – there is a clear intervention logic and some work has been done on the specific situation of the valley that can be deeped later on
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	4	The identified need is to raise the knowledge-intensity of a specific group of branches and activities in order to increase competitiveness
2.2. To what extent is the Vision’s conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	4	The focus of the valley is less high tech than desired in overall policy, but it rests on a solid industrial base
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	4	The outline justification is clear. It will need later refinement and a persuasive argument is needed for the research vessel
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	7	The proposal is clear about how the investments fit into the functioning of the

			valley and how they will improve this
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	4	Yes – foreign investors are named. Unfortunately they are the kind of organisations that do not have money to invest
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	8	This is not a high-growth cluster but forms part of Lithuania's economic spine. There are prospects for respectable growth
2.7. Does the Vision:			
2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)?	3	1	More thinking is needed about how the valley will operate in practice and its governance. These are unclear
2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough?	2	2	Yes, but again more detailed thinking is needed about the mechanisms involved
2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	5	2	Not specified but implicit in the cooperations
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	8	Almost 3m Lit. Not an absolutely large sum, but good for the industries involved and it seems to be a clear commitment
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised:			
2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted?	2	2	Yes
2.9.2. Are private investments attracted?	5	4	Yes, but not very big
2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	3	2	Yes but need more clarification
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	3	Fair. Need more detail

3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	4	Good. Need more detail
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	4	Fair. Need more detail
Total	100	70	
Expert's comments			

---

**Ken Guy**

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: ..... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	8	The intended effects of the vision are broadly in line with the overall goals of the Valleys initiative and look likely to be achieved if successfully implemented.
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	4	The argument for the valley is well made. Current R&D capability in the marine science area is weak and fragmented and needs to be strengthened and focused if Lithuania is to be a player on the international scene. Such strengthening will also enhance innovation prospects.
2.2. To what extent is the Vision's conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic	5	4	The valley's development objectives and tasks map well onto

documents substantiated?			those specified in the 'concept' document.
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	3	The figures provided are clear and well presented. Without additional data on typical building and equipment costs in Lithuania, however, it is difficult to assess whether the figures are reasonable or not.
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	6	More information on the current weak and fragmented state of R&D capabilities is needed to assess added value, but if it is as weak as portrayed the added value of the vision should be considerable.
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	7	Admirable steps have been taken to secure foreign investment.
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	7	The overall impact on economic competitiveness is unlikely to be considerable, but the impact on sustainable development could be significant.
2.7. Does the Vision:			
2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)?	3	2	Integration is good, but more could be said about modes of interaction. Yes, though this section could be usefully elaborated.
2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough?	2	1	
2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	5	4	
			Industrial associations are involved and committed.

2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	7	Appears satisfactory.
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised: 2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted? 2.9.2. Are private investments attracted? 2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	2 5 3	2 4 2	Yes. Yes. The relationship with the S&T Park is not clear.
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	2	These roles need to be further clarified. It is not clear, for example, how the current activities of the initiators will alter once the new labs are constructed.
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	4	Satisfactory.
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	4	More data on time scales and milestones are needed.
Total	100	71	
Expert's comments	See below		

## 2 Nemunas

### Erik Arnold

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: .... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of	10	7	While the proposal promises a lot and describes many activities, it does not explain well the link

Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?			between the proposed actions and the desired benefits.
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	3	The proposal describes generic needs to increase innovation in Lithuania and outlines areas of opportunity but does not identify specific needs in the area
2.2. To what extent is the Vision’s conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	5	The proposal clearly conforms with the generic, national goals
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	2	No. The budgets are internally inconsistent and not justified. They are not related to an intervention logic or to each other.
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	5	The link between investment and effects is simply assumed. There is no explanation of how this will be achieved.
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	6	The plan foresees investments by foreign companies, but it is not clear that there is any basis for this beyond hope. How this will work is “not fully identified”.
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	9	The proposers recognise the need to activate and support supply chains. More specificity is needed about this
2.7. Does the Vision: 2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their	3	2	There is a description of internal communications among

intercommunication scheme (description)?			actors but it is not clear what it means in practice
2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough?	2	2	The plan provides for interworking between research and education
2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	5	3	Spin-offs and commercialisation are envisaged but there is no wider strategy for this
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	6	The plan states that companies have made commitments but the nature of these is not explained
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised:			
2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted?	2	1	Municipal land but not funds are mentioned
2.9.2. Are private investments attracted?	5	3	Company commitment is mentioned but not described
2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	3	2	Implicitly in the labs to be constructed
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	3	The operations are barely described and the governance description is sketchy
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	3	No evidence from this proposal
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	2	Poor
Total	100	64	
Expert's comments			

**Jakob Edler**

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions	Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley)
--	--

(hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....		(hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: ..... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	7	The proposal claims to achieve most of the effects of the valley concept and further strategic documents. However, the process by which this is to be achieved is not always clear, in some parts (entrepreneurship) it is good, in others (spill over to existing business) it could be improved.
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	3	Sustainable food chains and bio-energy as a way to make agriculture contribute to climate change goals is an important societal need.
2.2. To what extent is the Vision’s conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	4	This appears very high, the economic effect, however, seems to be a promise rather than a clear cut strategy, and much more explicit commitment and visions of business would be needed in the second stage.
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	3	A sound judgement would need to know the annual budgets of the institutes. From judging the R&D activities of the by far biggest company involved the budget seems to be rather high.
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	7	More cooperative research in the areas of that valley will certainly result in various forms of added value. However, the cluster effect of the valley, the cross fertilisation, has not been demonstrated clearly. Individually, the areas are important, but as a whole, the added value of clustering them must be made more explicit.

2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	5	Not really, the conditions to attract foreign firms (not subsidiaries of Lithuanian firms) to the country are not convincing, there is a lack of a unique selling point, a specific niche through a unique combination of skills and approaches (see also accompanying note).
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	9	The envisaged impact, as formulated on the last pages of the proposal, is very significant, the issues tackled (food and food safety, sustainability, bio-energy) are key, and if the effects could be realised, the added value would be great.
2.7. Does the Vision: 2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)? 2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough? 2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	3 2 5	2 2 4	It does give a good idea of joint strategies and research labs. How the huge a task of integrating such heterogeneous a group would be provided for is not fully clear. The management structure seems appropriate, but the basis for the research integration has not been made explicit. The joint commercialisation aspect is hinted at (technology transfer activities) and the incubator activities seem reasonable.
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	6	See accompanying note, the contribution does not seem to be very broad, and financial details are missing in terms of contribution.
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised: 2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted? 2.9.2. Are private investments attracted? 2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	2 5 3	0 2 3	Not explicit  Yes, but not made explicit
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	3	The various roles and how they interlink in terms of management, responsibility, commitment etc is not clear, it is not made explicit how the University as such would live up to its commitment and devise strategies for integration and adaptation to

			the new valley.
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	3	
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	3	
Total	100	66	
Expert's comments	See accompanying note		

## 3 Santaka

## Erik Arnold

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: ..... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	7	The intervention logic is not clear from the proposal: it does not say how intervention will lead to effects. Nonetheless, there is fair evidence of stakeholder commitment and the outline of processes that will develop tactics
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	3	The needs discussed are generic. We miss analysis at the level of the 4 areas to be tackled.
2.2. To what extent is the Vision’s conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	4	The vision largely conforms to national objectives. It includes a certain amount of lower-tech activity, but this is a sensible use of existing strengths.
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	1	The budgets are not justified; nor is there a logic that ties them together or to outcomes
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	5	Only generic arguments are given for assuming the benefits will result. However, stakeholder commitment increases

			the likelihood that benefits will be obtained.
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	8	The proposal identified subsidiaries of foreign companies already involved and describes other companies to be targeted for FDI.
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	7	The proposal states that quantification is not possible, then goes on to make quantified claim that is not justified by argument. The strengths of the location and players means the prospects for benefits must be fair, however.
2.7. Does the Vision: 2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)? 2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough? 2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	3  2  5	2  2  3	Yes, but not in a manner that can be operationalised Yes  Yes, but how this to take place and under what conditions is not described
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	7	Some sort of commitment has been obtained but is not described in the proposal
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised: 2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted? 2.9.2. Are private investments attracted? 2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	2 5 3	1 3 3	None are described in the proposal Company contributions are promised An infrastructure for commercialisation is foreseen
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley	5	3	Their roles are only

initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?			minimally described in the proposal
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	3	Not well described but they cover many of the needed categories
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	3	There are many elements but it is not clear how they fit together. The role of the medical school is especially unclear, since it seems to connect to little industrial activity
Total	100	65	
Expert's comments			

### Jakob Edler

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – <b>SANTAKA.</b>		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: ..... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	5	The enumeration of all goals in the latter parts shows that the proposers have thought about the major aspects, the process of how they will be achieved is not always fully clear, however. While there is strong integration within each of the four areas, there is very little cross-fertilisation between the four areas and a broader mobilisation of firms is not demonstrated.
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need	5	3	See above, the need is

for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?			the economic effect is well formulated, but which societal needs are satisfied through more activities in the issue areas is not fully developed.
2.2. To what extent is the Vision's conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	4	See above, overview of how the valley relates to the strategic goals of Lithuania, but not much is said about the sectorial, technological goals
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	3	The assumptions of an upgrade of all the facilities and the growth of scientific activities underlying the budget are not substantiated enough, the relation to business R&D spent and the budget is very unbalanced.
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	6	If one accepts the premise of a horizontal infrastructure valley (rather than a technological or sectoral), then the added value for the region and Lithuania can be sufficient. The potential in increased entrepreneurship and spin offs could be exploited more.
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	8	There is a sound basis through existing collaborations and concrete plans to engage more in FP 7.
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	7	To bring more innovation into traditional industry is a key to the competitiveness of Lithuania in the future. The scientific progress is only elaborated fairly in the proposal, the

			support of sustainable development of society is not elaborated much
2.7. Does the Vision:	3	2	Governance structure seems appropriate, integration of firms fine.
2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)?	2	2	Common research up to “merger” of institutes with company R&D
2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country’s economic breakthrough?	5	3	Spin offs are poorly dealt with, but the idea to engage in a “search for innovation” also on the market side will enhance the responsiveness of the valley
2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?			
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	7	This is hard to judge as clear numbers are not given. Commitment of founders and partners in general appears to be good
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised:			
2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted?	2	1	The public fund section demonstrates funds from National Programmes, not from local sources.
2.9.2. Are private investments attracted?	5	2	From the information the evaluator had, attraction of private funds appear obvious, but are not explicitly given.
2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses’ research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	3	2	See above, commercialisation general good, start ups not really developed.
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	3	The governance page is standard, Council has good membership, the role of individual Universities is not fully elaborated, it is not clear how the strategic leaders of the three big public institutions are

			involved.
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	4	
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	3	
Total	100	65	
Expert's comments	See attached note		

## 4 Vilnius

## Erik Arnold

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: ..... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	4	The vision is broad and ambitious, addressing a very significant concentration of research capabilities, but it is supply-driven, undifferentiated among areas of potential impact and not specific in how it will be implemented or achieve effects
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	3	Only described at the generic level. Not at all clear what the needs are in Vilnius
2.2. To what extent is the Vision’s conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	4	The interest in high tech is consistent with the goals but the vision is unspecific
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	0	There is no budget
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	4	There is no intervention logic described below the generic level
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	0	No

2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	4	The generic argument implies there will be an impact but it is not treated in any specific way
2.7. Does the Vision:			
2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)?	3	2	In terms of governance but not operations
2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough?	2	1	Yes, but how is not made clear
2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	5	3	Via science parks
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	3	Unclear
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised:			
2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted?	2	1	Some – unspecific
2.9.2. Are private investments attracted?	5	3	Unclear
2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	3	3	In science parks
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	3	Only in terms of governance, not operations
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	2	Poorly articulated
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	2	Under-analysed
Total	100	43	
Expert's comments			

### Ken Guy

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....	Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: .....
--	---

		Initiator 2: ....	
		...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	4	The intended effects of the vision are broadly in line with the overall goals of the Valleys initiative but do not look likely to be achieved if implemented as described.
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	3	The concentration of STI resources around Vilnius is considerable, but there is an obvious need for these resources to be rationalised and strengthened. Although this public need exists, however (score 4/5), there is little in the current Vision to suggest that this need will be fulfilled (score 2/5).
2.2. To what extent is the Vision’s conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	2	Although the Vision promises to concentrate and upgrade the infrastructure, improve linkages between R&D and innovation actors and activities, and establish knowledge clusters, there is little in the document to substantiate these claims.
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	1	No figures are provided for buildings. The only figure provided is for equipment, but there is nothing in the document to substantiate this

			figure.
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	3	There is little in the Vision describing the extent of the changes to be made, never mind the added value resulting from them.
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	2	Although the need to attract and cater for FDI is recognised, there is little to suggest that the proposed Valley concept will attract this FDI.
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	5	There is little doubt that a meaningful rationalisation and concentration of STI resources around Vilnius would have a significant impact on the national economy. This Valley Vision, however, does not inspire confidence that impacts of this nature will be attained.
2.7. Does the Vision:			
2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)?	3	1	Although some aspects of the rationalisation and strengthening of capacity are mentioned, the logic of the proposed configuration of sites and centres is weakly presented.
2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough?	2	1	Although much is said on this topic, it is difficult to see exactly what is being proposed.
2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	5	2	This is also difficult to ascertain.
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	4	This is not clear.
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised:			

2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted?	2	1	None of the information on financial commitments is clearly presented.
2.9.2. Are private investments attracted?	5	1	
2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	3	1	
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	2	Not clear at all.
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	2	Although investment in new buildings and equipment and the rationalisation of existing resources will undoubtedly strengthen capacity in the vicinity of Vilnius, it is difficult to see the value added by this particular interpretation of the Valley concept.
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	2	Not clear at all.
Total	100	37	
Expert's comments			

## 5 Santariskės

## Erik Arnold

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: ..... 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – ....		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: ..... Initiator 2: ..... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	3	This is a generic discussion of opportunities, based on little analysis of the real conditions, strengths and weaknesses in the valley and a naïve appreciation of research-industry linkages and the way innovation works in pharmaceuticals
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	2	There is no analysis of specific need – only generic statements about innovation weaknesses at the national level
2.2. To what extent is the Vision’s conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic documents substantiated?	5	4	This is a high-tech field with potential to fit the national strategy
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	1	The budget appears to be 300 mLit. No details or justifications are given
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	3	Only generic arguments are given
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered	10	4	FDI is mentioned as a possibility but does not appear to have been

(a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?			analysed or discussed with potential investors
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	6	The impact envisaged is not described or given scale, but can be assumed to be fairly large – although the proposal gives little basis for expecting it to be realised
2.7. Does the Vision:			
2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)?	3	2	To some degree
2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough?	2	2	Yes, but the mechanisms are not described beyond 'cooperation'
2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	5	2	There is no real commercialisation discussion. Other characteristics of the proposal imply there will probably not be joint commercialisation
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	4	An existing science park is mentioned but the level of commitment is unclear, as is the commitment form business more generally
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised:			
2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted?	2	2	Yes. No details
2.9.2. Are private investments attracted?	5	2	Probably. No details
2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	3	2	Possibly, but no shared facilities are envisaged until the late stage of the project
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	2	Only the rudiments are described
3.2. How adequate are the activities for	5	1	Need much more

achieving the objective of the Vision?			development
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	1	No details provided
Total	100	43	
Expert's comments			

### **Patries Boekholt**

Date of acceptance of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) Development Visions (hereinafter – Vision) and title: 2007 Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre – Santariskes		Initiator(s) of the Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centre (Valley) (hereinafter – Valley) filing the application: Initiator 1: Vilnius University Initiator 2: ..... ...	
Assessment criteria	Maximum score	Assigned score	Comments
1. How adequate is the assessment of the Vision effects on the implementation of the Vision development goals and objectives established in the Conception of the Establishment and Development of Integrated Science, Studies and Business Centres (Valleys) approved by Resolution No. 321 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 21 March 2007 (“Valstybės žinios” (Official Gazette), 2007, No. 40-1489) (hereinafter – the Conception)?	10	6	The initiators have well understood the basic philosophy of the governments Valley concept. However the plans for implementing this philosophy remain very general and are poorly developed in terms of practical plans and activities.
2. Conformity of the Vision to the establishment and development conditions of the Valleys as defined in the Conception:			
2.1. How well grounded is the public need for the Vision and what is that need (an issue which is sought to be resolved)?	5	3	There is little discussion of the public need in the Valley's plan although there is a discussion that it addresses needs such as human resources in R&D, investment of infrastructure, increasing R&D capacity and development of new treatment strategies
2.2. To what extent is the Vision's conformity to the national policy objectives as defined in the strategic	5	5	It fits the national policy objectives very well, particularly improving

documents substantiated?			public research and ensuring science-industry relations
2.3. Is the budget of the Vision well-grounded and reasonable?	5	1	No justification or breakdown is given for the estimated budget of 300 million LTL no
2.4. How well-grounded is the value added of public investments into the Valley and the perspectives of the increase of the value added?	10	6	There is not yet a good argument what the expected outcomes will be in terms of business development, more networking between the actors.
2.5. Have the possibilities to attract foreign investment been provided for and considered (a maximum score is assigned, if investments by international companies are foreseen)?	10	7	The possibility is discussed but there is no analyses that can substantiate in what areas oh health/pharma these can be expected
2.6. How significant is the envisaged impact on competitiveness of the national economy, on the scientific progress of the Vision and sustainable development of the society?	10	6	If successful an emerging health/ bio/ pharma sector could create new business ventures in the very long term. As the plans are not elaborated, it is not clear in how far the vision is addressing scientific progress
2.7. Does the Vision: 2.7.1. describe organisational integration of the Valley participants and contain their intercommunication scheme (description)? 2.7.2. provide for a joint scientific research studies to be carried out by the Valley participants, cooperation in the area of studies, strengthening of links between science and studies as well as their development towards the country's economic breakthrough? 2.7.3. foresee cooperation in the area of commercialisation of scientific results?	3 2 5	1 1 2	There is no clear description other than that an association will be established The main focus is on building a science park. The exact plans for science and studies are not developed Cooperation is foreseen but would need more thought on how this will happen.
2.8. How significant is the contribution and commitments made by private Valley development partners?	10	3	Apart from a list of companies, there is no indication of the private sector financial contributions and commitments
2.9. To what extent are financial and other interests harmonised:			There is no indication of the source

2.9.1. Are the funds from municipal budgets and other funds attracted?	2	0	/breakdown of the budget so funding is an unknown factor. The key of the plan is a facility for business R&D units and start-ups
2.9.2. Are private investments attracted?	5	0	
2.9.3. Are conditions provided for the setting up of businesses' research units and formation of knowledge-intensive business start-ups on the basis of commercialisation of research results?	3	3	
3. Vision implementation methodology:			
3.1. How clear are the roles of the Valley initiators and partners pointed out in the Vision?	5	1	There is no implementation plan or organisational chart
3.2. How adequate are the activities for achieving the objective of the Vision?	5	2	The development of the Science and Technology park are described in very broad lines, but no detailed activities
3.3. How consistent and clear is the implementation of the Vision?	5	2	Many elements need further elaboration
Total	100	49	
Expert's comments	This plan needs much further elaboration in terms of objectives, actors involved, activities and funding		