

## Netherlands (NEN) position on:

March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013

Innovation process: interaction, tools & methods (AFNOR)

**Reference:** ISO/TS/P 233 'Innovation process: interaction, tools and methods' (2012-12-20)

**Vote:** Disapproval with justification and comments

The NEN position on the proposal is based on the results of two consultations: 1) a broad consultation during the start of the European Standardization project in 2009 (CEN/TC 389 Innovation Management) and 2) the market enquiry on both the Brazilian and French ISO proposals.

### Justification:

The stakeholder consultation performed by NEN acknowledges the added value that this new field of activity and related standards on innovation *could* have. Sharing and combining knowledge as well as supporting professionalism in the field of innovation are considered as important. However, the potential negative impacts and consequences appear to have overriding importance.

The decisive potential negative impacts and consequences include:

- The existence of such standards could become (in a formal or informal way) obliged in case of granting subsidies or for public procurement by public authorities or B2B.
- In case the standards will include requirements it is feared that it will followed by certification practices resulting in increased costs and possible slowdown of innovation projects.
- Organizations could perceive an obligation to use/implement the standards in order to prevent eventual liability risks (in the case of problems, negligence and/or non-applying the standard).
- Some stakeholders fear that standardization in the creative part of innovation process will limit flexibility in choosing methods and thus will be counterproductive.

The positive arguments mentioned by stakeholders are:

- Several local initiatives have been developed already and possibly there are more to come. However multiple local standards are clearly less desirable than a single international standard.
- A lot of innovation originates from small (and medium) organizations. They often lack the knowledge, tools, and resources to really make something out of it. A standard is a low threshold injection of that knowledge and tools. As such it can help organizations who have less experience with "open innovation" and indirectly can allow a better cooperation between them and more experienced organizations (added value for both).
- The initial phase of innovation is a kind of fuzzy- and chaos-like process which is probably difficult to support by standardization. However, as the innovation develops further the structural component is becoming increasingly important. Standards can play a supportive role in this phase, for instance by improving the quality of decision-making.
- Lots of innovations fail due to several reasons. A voluntary supportive standard with a choice of relevant practices, approaches and methods can significantly improve the results.
- A uniform common vocabulary can have benefits for interaction.

### Additional comment

- The ongoing European standardization project (CEN/TC389) should also be taken into account. To avoid duplication of efforts and possible conflicts, engagement and combining of all three standardization projects is encouraged. (ABNT NWIP 'Research, development and innovation – Process management')

**Relevant documents:**

- We discovered that an Innovation Management Standard has been developed by a Dutch-Canadian cooperation named Total Innovation Management (TIM) Foundation. It consists of the following 7 core documents: Innovation Management Standard, Assessment Checklist, Introductory Guideline and Assessment Notes, Implementation Guideline, Definitions Guideline, Metrics Guideline, Accreditation and Certification Guideline. For more information see <http://www.timfoundation.org/>
- Attention should be paid to the consistency of terminology with existing widely spread terminology in the OECD (Frascati Manual and Oslo Manual) and with the European Union - Horizon 2020, State aid rules for R&D&I.