North Dakota Competitiveness: Creating a State Economic Strategy

For further material on regional competitiveness and clusters: www.isc.hbs.edu/econ-clusters.htm
For state economic profiles: www.isc.hbs.edu/econ-statesregions.htm

Professor Michael E. Porter
Harvard Business School

March 28, 2012
The Economic Challenge for Governors in 2012

Achieving Fiscal Stability

Enhancing State Competitiveness
What is Competitiveness?

• Competitiveness is the **productivity** with which a state utilizes its human, capital, and natural endowments to create value

• Productivity determines **wages, jobs, and the standard of living**

• It is not **what** fields a state competes in that determines its prosperity, but **how productively** it competes
Where Does Productivity Come From?

Businesses and government play **different but interrelated roles** in creating a productive economy

- Only **businesses** can create **jobs** and **wealth**
- **States** compete to offer the **most productive environment** for business
Agenda

1. How is your state doing?  
   State Performance Scorecard

2. Why?  
   Explaining your state’s performance, strengths, and weaknesses

3. Where to go from here?  
   Action Steps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosperity</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (+27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per Capita, 2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wages</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44 (+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Private Wage, 1998-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Creation</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (+44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment Growth,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Mobilization</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (+10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Working Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in the Workforce,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Productivity</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 (+27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per Workforce Participant,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Business Formation</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (+47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traded Cluster Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents per Employee, 2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster Strength</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36 (+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment in Strong Clusters,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading Clusters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by employment size, 2009 (national rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Processed Food (38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Heavy Machinery (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oil and Gas Products and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agricultural Products (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- #NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative State Prosperity Performance
2000 - 2010

Source: BEA. Notes: GDP in real 2005 dollars. Growth rate is calculated as compound annual growth rate.
Comparative State Labor Mobilization Performance
1999-2010

High but declining versus U.S.

High Labor Force Participation and Participation rising versus U.S.

Change in Proportion of Working Age Population in the Workforce, 1999-2010

Notes: Source BLS.

2012 State Competitiveness – Rich Bryden

Copyright 2012 Professor Michael E. Porter
Comparative State Labor Force Productivity Performance
2000-2010

Real Growth in Gross Domestic Product per Labor Force Participant, 2000-2010

Gross Domestic Product per Labor Force Participant, 2010

Sources: BEA, BLS. Notes: GDP in real 2005 dollars. Growth rate is calculated as compound annual growth rate.

North Dakota
Comparative State Employee Productivity Performance 2000-2010

High but declining versus U.S.

U.S. GDP per Employed Worker Real Growth: 1.42%

Highly productive and productivity rising versus U.S.

Low and declining versus U.S.

U.S. GDP per Employed Worker: $94,315

Low but rising versus U.S.

Sources: BEA, BLS. Notes: GDP in real 2005 dollars. Growth rate is calculated as compound annual growth rate.
Comparative State Innovation Performance
2000 - 2010

High and declining innovation

U.S. average Growth Rate of Patenting:
+2.25%

North Dakota

High and improving innovation rate versus U.S.

Low and declining innovation

U.S. average Patents per 10,000 Employees: 7.77

Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment
2. Cluster Development
3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment
2. Cluster Development
3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
Quality of the Overall Business Environment

Context for Firm Strategy and Rivalry

Rules and incentives that encourage local competition, investment and productivity
- e.g., tax policy that encourages investment and R&D
- Flexible labor policies
- Intellectual property protection
- Antitrust enforcement

Factor (Input) Conditions

Access to high quality business inputs
- Human resources
- Capital access
- Physical infrastructure
- Administrative processes (e.g., permitting, regulatory efficiency)
- Scientific and technological infrastructure

Demand Conditions

Sophisticated and demanding local needs and customers
- e.g., Strict quality, safety, and environmental standards
- Consumer protection laws
- Government procurement of advanced technology
- Early demand for products and services

Related and Supporting Industries

Local availability of suppliers and supporting industries

- Many things matter for competitiveness
- Economic development is the process of improving the business environment to enable companies to compete in increasingly sophisticated ways
Improving the Business Environment
Common Action Items

1. Simplify and speed up regulation and permitting

2. Reduce unnecessary costs of doing business

3. Establish training programs that are aligned with the needs of the state’s businesses

4. Focus infrastructure investments on the most leveraged areas for productivity and economic growth

5. Design all policies to support emerging growth companies

6. Protect and enhance the state’s higher education and research institutions

7. Relentlessly improve the public education system, the essential foundation for productivity in the long run
Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment

2. Cluster Development

3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
What is a Cluster?

A geographically concentrated group of interconnected companies and associated institutions in a particular field

**Traded Clusters**
- Compete to serve national and international markets
- Can locate anywhere
- 30% of employment

**Local Clusters**
- Serve almost exclusively the local market
- Not directly exposed to cross-regional competition
- 70% of employment
Example: Massachusetts Life Sciences Cluster

- Teaching and Specialized Hospitals
  - Biological Products
  - Biopharmaceutical Products
  - Research Organizations
    - Specialized Business Services
    - Specialized Risk Capital
    - Specialized Research Service Providers
    - Analytical Instruments Cluster
    - Educational Institutions
      - Harvard, MIT, Tufts, Boston University, UMass

- Cluster Organizations
  - MassMedic, MassBio, others

- Health and Beauty Products
- Surgical Instruments and Suppliers
- Medical Equipment
- Dental Instruments and Suppliers
- Ophthalmic Goods
- Diagnostic Substances
- Containers
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Example: Houston Oil and Gas Cluster

**Upstream**

- Oil & Natural Gas Exploration & Development
- Equipment Suppliers (e.g., Oil Field Chemicals, Drilling Rigs, Drill Tools)
- Specialized Technology Services (e.g., Drilling Consultants, Reservoir Services, Laboratory Analysis)

**Downstream**

- Oil & Natural Gas Completion & Production
- Subcontractors (e.g., Surveying, Mud Logging, Maintenance Services)
- Business Services (e.g., MIS Services, Technology Licenses, Risk Management)

**Oilfield Services/Engineering & Contracting Firms**

- Gas Gathering
- Gas Processing
- Gas Trading
- Gas Transmission
- Gas Distribution
- Gas Marketing

- Oil Transportation
- Oil Trading
- Oil Refining
- Oil Distribution
- Oil Wholesale Marketing
- Oil Retail Marketing

**Specialized Institutions** (e.g., Academic Institutions, Training Centers, Industry Associations)
Strong Clusters Drive Regional Performace

- Specialization in **strong clusters**
- **Breadth** of industries within each cluster
- Strength in **related clusters**
- Presence of a region’s clusters in **neighboring regions**

- **Job** growth
- Higher **wages**
- Higher **patenting** rates
- Greater **new business** formation, growth and survival

*On average, cluster strength is much more important (78.1%) than cluster mix (21.9%) in driving regional performance in the U.S.*

Clusters and Economic Diversification

Note: Clusters with overlapping borders or identical shading have at least 20% overlap (by number of industries) in both directions.
The Evolution of Regional Economies
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Traded Cluster Composition of the North Dakota Economy

Overall change in the North Dakota Share of US Traded Employment: 0.04%

North Dakota Overall Share of US Traded Employment: 0.24%

Employees 1,500 =

Traded Cluster Composition of the North Dakota Economy (continued)

North Dakota Overall Share of US Traded Employment: 0.24%

Overall change in the North Dakota Share of US Traded Employment: 0.04%

Change in North Dakota share of National Employment, 1998 to 2009
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North Dakota Job Creation in Traded Clusters
1998 to 2009

Net traded job creation, 1998 to 2009:
+11,317

Indicates expected job creation given national cluster growth.*

* Percent change in national benchmark times starting regional employment. Overall traded job creation in the state, if it matched national benchmarks, would be 651.
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North Dakota Wages in Traded Clusters vs. National Benchmarks

North Dakota average traded wage: $41,853

U.S. average traded wage: $56,906

### On average, cluster strength is much more important (78.1%) than cluster mix (21.9%) in driving regional performance in the U.S.

**Productivity Depends on How a State Competes, Not What Industries It Competes In**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Traded Wage versus National Average</th>
<th>Cluster Mix Effect</th>
<th>Relative Cluster Wage Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>+27,171</td>
<td>7,028</td>
<td>20,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>+24,102</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>20,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>+16,169</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>11,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>+13,535</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>9,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>+9,573</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>9,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>+6,651</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>4,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>+5,652</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>+5,319</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>3,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>+2,658</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>+1,662</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>-754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>+352</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>-2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>+164</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>-10,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>-930</td>
<td>-2,417</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>-3,970</td>
<td>-995</td>
<td>-2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>-4,280</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-4,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-5,322</td>
<td>-1,102</td>
<td>-4,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>-5,576</td>
<td>-425</td>
<td>-5,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>-6,387</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>-6,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-7,021</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>-8,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>-7,705</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>-9,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>-8,057</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>-9,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>-8,176</td>
<td>-2,544</td>
<td>-5,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>-9,245</td>
<td>-4,330</td>
<td>-4,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>-9,284</td>
<td>-2,495</td>
<td>-6,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>-9,791</td>
<td>-2,290</td>
<td>-7,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>-10,359</td>
<td>-1,304</td>
<td>-9,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>-10,427</td>
<td>-1,425</td>
<td>-9,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>-10,934</td>
<td>-3,563</td>
<td>-7,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-11,007</td>
<td>-1,559</td>
<td>-9,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>-11,722</td>
<td>-3,516</td>
<td>-8,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>-11,777</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>-12,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>-11,992</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>-14,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-12,172</td>
<td>-3,156</td>
<td>-9,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>-12,554</td>
<td>-4,840</td>
<td>-7,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>-13,368</td>
<td>-1,572</td>
<td>-11,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>-13,572</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>-14,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>-14,277</td>
<td>-2,365</td>
<td>-11,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>-14,394</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>-15,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>-15,276</td>
<td>-5,067</td>
<td>-10,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>-15,378</td>
<td>-4,560</td>
<td>-10,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>-16,043</td>
<td>-12,555</td>
<td>-3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>-16,123</td>
<td>-288</td>
<td>-15,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>-16,215</td>
<td>-5,024</td>
<td>-11,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>-16,379</td>
<td>-968</td>
<td>-15,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>-16,606</td>
<td>-2,721</td>
<td>-13,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>-16,645</td>
<td>-3,894</td>
<td>-12,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>-18,671</td>
<td>-787</td>
<td>-17,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>-19,942</td>
<td>-5,291</td>
<td>-14,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>-20,073</td>
<td>-2,259</td>
<td>-17,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>-20,968</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-21,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LQ, or Location Quotient, measures the state’s share in cluster employment relative to its overall share of U.S. employment. An LQ > 1 indicates an above average employment share in a cluster.
Cluster Development
Common Action Items

1. Build on the state’s **existing and emerging clusters** rather than chase “hot” fields

2. Pursue economic diversification **within clusters** and **across related clusters**

3. Create a private sector-led **cluster upgrading program** with matching support for participating private sector cluster organizations
   - Government should **listen** and **remove obstacles** to cluster improvement

4. **Align** other state economic policies and programs with clusters

Clusters provide a framework for organizing the implementation of many public policies and public investments to achieve greater effectiveness.
Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment
2. Cluster Development
3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
Geographic and Governmental Influences on Productivity

Nation

Neighboring State

State

Neighboring State

Metropolitan Areas

Rural Regions
Defining the Appropriate Economic Regions

The economies of states are often an aggregation of distinct economic areas with differing circumstances.

**Wage Performance in North Dakota Metropolitan Areas**

**U.S. Growth Rate of Wages: 3.01%**

**North Dakota Growth Rate of Wages: 3.94%**

**U.S. Average Private Wage: $42,403**

**North Dakota Average Private Wage: $33,929**

**Growth Rate of Private Wages, 1998-2009**

- **Fargo MSA***
- **Bismarck MSA**
- **Grand Forks MSA***
- **Rest of State**

*Source: Census CBP, authors' analysis. Note: “Bubble” size in chart is proportional to employment in 2009.*

*North Dakota portion only*
Employment Performance in North Dakota Metropolitan Areas

**Source:** Census CBP, authors’ analysis. Note: “Bubble” size in chart is proportional to employment in 2009.

- **U.S. Growth Rate of Employment:** 0.52%
- **North Dakota Growth Rate of Employment:** 1.57%
- **U.S. Average Private Wage:** $42,403
- **North Dakota Average Private Wage:** $33,929

- **Fargo MSA***
- **Bismarck MSA**
- **Rest of State**

*North Dakota portion only

Note: "Bubble" size in chart is proportional to employment in 2009.
Geographic and Governmental Influences on Productivity

1. Influence and access federal policies and programs

2. Work with each metro area to develop a prioritized strategic agenda

3. Connect rural regions with proximate urban areas

4. Integrate policies and infrastructure planning with neighbors
Agenda

1. How is your state doing?  State Performance Scorecard

2. Why?  Explaining your state’s performance, strengths, and weaknesses

3. Where to go from here?  Action Steps
**Agenda**

1. How is your state doing?  
   State Performance Scorecard

2. Why?  
   Explaining your state’s performance, strengths, and weaknesses

3. Where to go from here?  
   Action Steps

↓

**Biggest Action Item of All**
Create an Economic Strategy

- What is the **distinctive competitive position** of the state or region given its location, legacy, existing strengths, and potential strengths?
  - What unique value as a business location?
  - For what types of activities and clusters?

Define the Value Proposition

- **Define the Value Proposition**

Develop Unique Strengths

- What **elements of the business environment** can be unique strengths relative to peers/neighbors?
- What **existing and emerging clusters** represent local strengths?

Achieve and Maintain Parity with Peers

- What **weaknesses** must be addressed to remove key constraints and achieve parity with peer locations?

- Economic strategy requires setting priorities and moving beyond long lists of separate recommendations.
# How Should States Compete for Investment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tactical (Zero Sum Competition)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strategic (Positive Sum Competition)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on attracting new investments</td>
<td>Also support greater local investment by existing companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compete for every plant</td>
<td>Reinforce areas of specialization and emerging cluster strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer generalized tax breaks</td>
<td>Provide state support for training, infrastructure, and institutions with enduring benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide subsidies to lower / offset business costs</td>
<td>Improve the efficiency of doing business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every city and sub-region for itself</td>
<td>Harness efficiencies and coordination across jurisdictions, especially with neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government drives investment attraction</td>
<td>Government and the private sector collaborate to build cluster strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harnessing the New Process of Economic Development

Competitiveness is the result of both **top-down** and **bottom-up processes** in which many companies and institutions take responsibility.

**Old Model**
- **Government** drives economic development through policy decisions and incentives

**New Model**
- Economic development is a **collaborative process** involving government at multiple levels, companies, teaching and research institutions, and private sector organizations
Example: Organizing for Economic Development

South Carolina Council on Competitiveness

- Chaired by a business leader and reporting to the governor
- Convenes working groups, provides direction and strength, holds working groups accountable

Executive Committee

Coordinating Staff

Cluster Committees

- Automotive
- Hydrogen / Fuel Cells
- Textiles
- Apparel
- Agriculture
- Travel and Tourism

Task Forces

- Cluster Activation
- Research / Investment
- Distressed / Disadvan. Areas
- Education / Workforce
- Start-ups / Local Firms
- Measuring Progress

Effective economic policy also requires coordination within government
Summary

• The goal of economic strategy is to enhance **productivity**. This is the only way to create jobs, high income, and wealth in the long run.

• Improving **productivity** and **innovation** must be the guiding principles for every state policy choice.

• Improving productivity does not require new public resources, but **using existing resources better**.

• Improving productivity demands that governors **mobilize the private sector**, not rely on government alone.

• Economic strategy is non-partisan and about getting **results**.
Next Steps

1. Reach out to your team

2. Reach out to the business community


The prosperity of the U.S. economy will depend more on the success of states in improving competitiveness than what happens in Washington.