

October 2014  
Issue 77

Editor: Isabelle Ioannides

Assistant: Aurélie Therace

Disclaimer: The views expressed in the BEPA Monthly do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

ISSN: 2362-9665

Catalogue Number:  
NJ-AB-14-077-2A-N

## CONTENTS

<b>L'innovation est un processus permanent, dans tous les domaines...</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Innovation sociale: une décennie de changements</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Policies to support social innovation: Where they are and where they may be heading</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Social innovation in Europe in perspective</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Think Tank Twitter</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>BEPA News</b>	<b>10</b>

## EDITORIAL

*Par Jean-Claude Thébault*

### **L'innovation est un processus permanent, dans tous les domaines...**

Au début de la décennie, le BEPA a été à l'origine d'un rapport sur l'innovation sociale qui a fait date, tant en termes de définition d'un phénomène jusque-là mal connu que de conséquences sur les politiques publiques.

Certes, l'innovation sociale n'est pas réductible à l'histoire récente. Comme rappelé au fil des articles ci-après, le phénomène existe depuis fort longtemps ; en revanche, ce n'est que depuis peu qu'il bénéficie d'une conjonction exceptionnellement favorable à sa mise en lumière et à son développement : l'ampleur et la persistance de la crise économique qui a épuisé les voies de recours classiques pour lutter contre les diverses formes de déclassement ou d'exclusion sociale, la multiplication d'initiatives réussies qui conçoivent l'innovation sociale non comme une expérimentation limitée dans le temps et l'espace mais comme le maillon d'un véritable écosystème, enfin la prise en compte de ce sujet dans le champ des politiques publiques.

Le temps semble enfin venu, en effet, où l'on n'oppose plus l'économique et le social : aujourd'hui, l'innovation sociale n'est plus perçue comme synonyme de désengagement de la puissance publique ; la croissance n'est plus forcément le seul indicateur de la réussite d'une économie. Aujourd'hui, des réponses innovantes sont apportées à des problèmes sociaux nouveaux, qui sont traités avec efficacité et de manière pérenne. C'est tout le défi des politiques publiques – notamment européennes – que d'inclure ces réponses nouvelles dans leur champ, afin d'en faciliter l'émergence, d'en favoriser le développement et d'en soutenir la durabilité.

Et puisqu'il est ici question d'innovation, qu'il me soit permis d'informer nos lecteurs que le nouveau Président de la Commission européenne, Jean-Claude Juncker, a souhaité dès à présent transformer le BEPA en une nouvelle structure, dénommée Centre de stratégie politique européenne (EPSC). Sa mise en place se fera dans les semaines qui viennent ; je ne doute pas que nos successeurs témoigneront de la même curiosité intellectuelle et de la même passion européenne que celles qui nous ont animés tout au long de ces dernières années, et que vous avez partagées avec nous.

# 1 Innovation sociale: une décennie de changements

Par Maria Da Graça Carvalho\* et Pierre Goudin\*\*

Au début de son second mandat à la tête de la Commission européenne, le Président Barroso, sur la suggestion de son ami Diogo Vasconcelos, a souhaité que ses services s'intéressent plus concrètement au thème de l'innovation sociale. A la suite d'un atelier de travail organisé sur ce sujet en 2009, le BEPA (désormais EPSC) a ainsi publié en 2010 un rapport qui a fait date : à partir d'exemples tirés du terrain, il mettait en lumière l'émergence de ce phénomène et lui offrait un premier cadre théorique, proposant notamment une définition de la notion d'innovation sociale qui continue de faire référence. Ce rapport identifiait en outre les principales barrières qui faisaient obstacle au développement de l'innovation sociale, et proposait des pistes pour y remédier.

En quelques années, les évolutions qu'a connu ce mouvement se sont avérées considérables, justifiant la mise à jour du rapport de 2010 : c'est ce qui vient d'être fait avec la parution de *Social Innovation: A decade of changes*, élaboré par le BEPA (désormais EPSC).

Ce qui ressort clairement de ce document, c'est que depuis le début de la décennie, l'intérêt n'a cessé de croître pour l'innovation sociale, tant en termes de concept qu'en termes de réalisations concrètes. Aussi bien les autorités publiques que les ONG, les entreprises privées ou les individus y ont vu une réponse de plus en plus adaptée et efficace à des problèmes sociaux nouveaux, dans un contexte de budgets toujours plus contraints. La crise qui perdure depuis 2008 n'a fait qu'amplifier le phénomène.

## Des évolutions majeures dans le champ de l'innovation sociale

En quelques années, ce sont ainsi trois évolutions majeures que le secteur de l'innovation sociale aura connu :

- tout d'abord, les acteurs de l'innovation sociale ont changé : ce champ d'action était à l'origine considéré avec méfiance par les intervenants dans le domaine social, qui y voyaient un désengagement de l'Etat providence et une

privatisation de ses compétences. Aujourd'hui, une multitude d'acteurs se sont approprié les succès de l'innovation sociale ; ils y participent pleinement et les prolongent, que ce soit au niveau local, national ou européen ;

- les institutions elles-mêmes ont bougé : les autorités publiques, notamment dans les secteurs de la santé et de l'éducation, intègrent désormais l'innovation sociale dans leur propre façon de fonctionner et favorisent à travers leurs politiques de nouvelles formes de financement, de partenariats et d'alliances adaptés au mode opératoire de l'innovation sociale ;
- enfin, les idées relatives à l'innovation sociale se sont multipliées et diffusées : le nombre de recherches, d'études, de projets, d'expérimentations, de débats, de livres et d'événements ayant pour sujet l'innovation sociale est aujourd'hui considérable. Un véritable corpus intellectuel existe désormais, qui offre un cadre théorique solide à l'ensemble des concepts liés à celui d'innovation sociale.

La combinaison croissante de ces différents éléments a créé une dynamique nouvelle ; des changements majeurs ont ainsi été introduits dans l'approche et le fonctionnement de l'innovation sociale :

- le plus important d'entre eux est sans doute que les décideurs politiques sont désormais beaucoup plus attentifs à une redéfinition du lien entre les sphères économique et sociale : les concepts économiques de capital et d'investissement, par exemple, sont devenus aujourd'hui des instruments au service des politiques sociales, et la notion de responsabilité sociale des entreprises a quitté le champ du patronage pour celui, plus moderne, de l'inclusion ;
- un autre changement qui devrait s'avérer décisif dans les années à venir tient à la production même de l'innovation sociale. Cantonnés à l'origine à des initiatives et à des résultats locaux,

\* Au moment de la rédaction de cet article, Maria Da Graça Carvalho était conseillère principale dans l'équipe Analysis du BEPA (désormais EPSC). Elle est à présent conseillère au sein du Cabinet du Commissaire Moedas.

\*\* Au moment de la rédaction, Pierre Goudin était conseiller au BEPA.

strictement circonscrits et non reproductibles, les idées et les projets que génère l'innovation sociale s'inscrivent désormais dans un continuum de création qui établit un véritable écosystème favorable à l'émergence, à la croissance et au développement de cette innovation ;

- la capacité à mesurer plus précisément les phénomènes d'innovation sociale apparaît comme le dernier progrès en date dans ce champ. Une telle capacité s'avère en effet très importante alors que les innovations sociales n'ont cessé de se multiplier : en prendre l'exacte mesure devrait aider à démontrer, par exemple, que l'innovation sociale est une façon efficace de répondre durablement aux besoins sociaux qu'elle satisfait localement.

### **Le rôle accru de la Commission européenne en faveur de l'innovation sociale**

A ce stade, il convient de souligner que l'Union européenne n'est pas restée insensible, ni inactive, face à ces changements. Nombre de ses politiques, de ses programmes et de ses instruments financiers ont été élaborés, mis en œuvre et rendus accessibles au bénéfice de l'innovation sociale. D'abord favorisée au travers de politiques spécifiques, l'innovation sociale a progressivement été intégrée dans toutes les réflexions stratégiques à long terme de la Commission européenne.

De fait, la remise à l'honneur du concept d'économie *sociale* de marché, en tant que ligne directrice de la stratégie Europe 2020, a fortement contribué à orienter la prise en compte du concept d'innovation sociale dans les politiques définies et mises en œuvre au sein de l'Union européenne. Les différentes mesures prises dans le cadre du renforcement du marché unique ont renforcé cette tendance. Les programmes de financement, à commencer par les fonds structurels, se sont ouverts à des pratiques innovantes, en vue de traiter les questions sociales et sociétales.

Au final, les multiples initiatives lancées avec le soutien de la Commission européenne ont couvert quatre champs principaux : la gouvernance, la finance, le renforcement des capacités et la recherche. Ainsi, les dispositifs d'aide à l'innovation sociale au sein de l'Union européenne sont moins fragmentés ; ayant gagné en visibilité, ils contribuent à la mise en place d'un véritable écosystème à l'échelle européenne.

### **Les pistes à privilégier**

En vue de mettre définitivement l'innovation sociale au cœur de l'agenda européen, trois axes de réflexion, d'investigation et d'action ont été identifiés au cours de ces travaux :

- améliorer la gouvernance en relation avec l'innovation sociale, ce qui passe en particulier par un soutien plus large et plus permanent du rôle du secteur public (à tous les niveaux : européen, national, régional et local) en termes d'innovation, notamment sociale, mais aussi par un renforcement du lien entre innovation sociale et secteur privé (en particulier en améliorant le cadre juridique qui permettra le développement de partenariats durables), enfin par le fait de faire de la responsabilité sociale des entreprises un élément essentiel et systématique de l'analyse et du mode opératoire de toute activité économique ;
- approfondir nos connaissances en matière d'innovation sociale : les avancées obtenues ces dernières années en termes de mesure de l'impact et de cartographie justifient qu'on continue le travail entrepris. Certains champs d'étude encore inexplorés mériteraient d'être défrichés, en particulier l'interaction entre innovation sociale et secteur de la santé. Le rôle croissant des technologies de l'information et de la communication dans l'innovation sociale justifierait qu'il soit lui aussi mieux pris en compte ;
- soutenir, encourager et améliorer l'environnement de travail des entreprises : l'acte pour le marché unique (Single Market Acts – SMA – I & II) et l'initiative pour l'entrepreneuriat social (Social Business Initiative – SBI) y ont déjà considérablement œuvré ; des efforts doivent encore être poursuivis dans certains domaines, tel que l'accès des PME aux financements, ou le recours aux marchés publics comme véritable outil de la politique sociale.

Les interactions qui naîtront de l'effort porté sur ces trois pistes d'amélioration de l'innovation sociale pourraient donner un résultat inattendu par son ampleur ; c'est en tout cas là que réside la clé du basculement d'un processus fragmentaire vers un processus véritablement systémique de création de l'innovation sociale.

## 2 Policies to support social innovation: Where they are and where they may be heading

By Geoff Mulgan\*

Social innovation has always been with us in Europe – from kindergartens to the Red Cross, welfare states to ecocities – Europeans have been restless creators of new possibility. But over the last decade social innovation has, for the first time, become an overt concern of policy-makers in Europe and around the world. Behind this burgeoning interest – which is as visible in the United States, Latin America, India and China – lies a simple premise: that progress in fields like care and education requires systematic experiment and creativity, just as it does in science, technology and business.

This argument is now widely accepted. So is the argument that, just as in science and technology, innovation in society needs carefully crafted investment and support. But the actions that follow are complex and policy-makers are only just beginning to grapple with how best to design funds, laws, labs and programmes that can achieve demonstrable impact against the challenges of ageing, discrimination or youth unemployment. Their challenge is not helped by confusion over boundaries – social innovation continues sometimes to be confused with neighbouring fields, such as social enterprise, social entrepreneurship or social investment. There are important overlaps, just as business innovation overlaps with enterprise, entrepreneurship and investment. But no one in business would make the mistake of thinking that they are all the same.

### Responses to the need for social innovation

So far, the policy responses to social innovation have been very varied. President Obama set up an office for social innovation in the White House with a small fund for supporting NGOs. In Seoul, the mayor and his administration have gone further than any other government authority in making social innovation a defining feature of his tenure, focusing on ambitious programmes for the sharing economy and citizen engagement. His engagement in social

innovation has perhaps helped him win a landslide re-election earlier this year. Colombia set up a centre for social innovation within its government, focused on action to alleviate extreme poverty. And, earlier this year, Alberta in Canada committed itself to a one billion dollar social innovation endowment, though its exact form remains unclear.

If we look more broadly across the world, policy actions to support social innovation fall under five main headings. The first is funding, and across the world many governments have now created funds open to bidding for innovative projects in society, sometimes emphasising new ideas, and at other times emphasising formal experiments (like France's "Fonds d'Expérimentation pour la Jeunesse") and 'scaling'. Examples include Hong Kong, Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom's "Big Society Capital" fund and India's "Inclusive Innovation Fund".

A second group of policies has adapted more traditional technology support. Agencies, such as Sitra in Finland and Vinnova in Sweden, are leaders in this respect, combining investment in new hardware and software with experiments to discover better ways of delivering healthcare or reducing carbon emissions.

A third group addresses the conditions for innovation: new legal forms to make it easier to combine financial and social goals; new reliefs for social investment; new asset classes such as social impact bonds to assist the spread of innovation; and opening up data.

A fourth group emphasises places: hubs, incubators, accelerators and zones. Bilbao pioneered a social innovation park and Europe now has numerous social innovation incubators.

Finally, a fifth group emphasises teams and structures – labs and innovation teams – often within or on the edge of government. Some of these were covered in a recent study for Nesta

\* Geoff Mulgan is Chief Executive of Nesta, a UK-based innovation charity.

and Bloomberg Philanthropy, and they include many in Europe, such as France's "Region 27" and Denmark's Mindlab.

## **Social innovation in Europe – some progress, but more needed**

Partly thanks to BEPA's (now EPSC) pioneering work a few years ago, Europe is seen around the world as a leader. Through Horizon 2020, it has launched numerous programmes combining technological and social innovation – recognising that the former without the latter risks being hugely wasteful in fields such as ageing. It has backed networks (for example, a network of incubators and the very successful umbrella "Social Innovation Europe"); prizes (with 1,300 applicants for this year's prize for creative uses of technology to tackle unemployment); and academic research. And action in neighbouring fields, for instance the "Social Business Initiative", has provided added impetus.

But it would be fair to say that the European Commission's steps so far have been exploratory. There are important gaps, particularly in relation to adoption, evidence and capacity. So, looking ahead, while we should expect each of the existing families of policy to evolve, deepen and become more effective – for example, as funds learn how to achieve more impact for every euro spent – we should also hope for advances in other, complementary fields.

### *Pushing forward with digital social innovation*

One of the most important fields to develop further will be digital social innovation. This is an extraordinarily dynamic field at the moment, stretching from open hardware initiatives like Arduino, to citizen-led sensing networks such as "Smart Citizen" from Barcelona, and thousands of new apps and web tools in use both in cities and civil society.

There is no doubt of the huge potential of digital technologies to transform how we organise everything from health to democracy, money to consumption. But many of the pioneers face serious barriers, particularly in public services, that have successfully resisted the more radical options. No public services have seen dramatic

reinventions comparable to those achieved in retail by Amazon, in the organisation of knowledge by Wikipedia or in money transfers by m-Pesa, mainly because incumbent public services have been powerful enough to resist new entrants with new ideas. Before long we will need a serious debate about how the potential can be realised. This discussion is part of a much larger debate on how to achieve gains in public sector productivity.

### *Evidence-based policy-making*

The final part of the jigsaw is evidence and adoption. Innovation is of little use unless it delivers improvements; and it is of little use unless it spreads. Yet it is still remarkable how poor social systems and governments are at adopting the best ideas from elsewhere.

A common misinterpretation of social innovation is that everyone should innovate with their own solutions. Yet most progress comes from the adoption, and sometimes adaptation, of innovation. A big push is underway to promote adoption, for example with common 'standards of evidence' to help policy-makers and practitioners judge which innovation deserves to spread. How well do we know if these initiatives work? Have they, for example, been tested with control groups in many different settings? Google claims to have run 12,000 randomised experiments in just one year, with about 10 percent of these leading to business changes. Experimentation is also mainstream in science, medicine and international development. But it is not routinely used in social or economic policy.

From a standing start, social innovation policy has come a long way quickly. Europe is beginning to piece together a reasonably comprehensive set of tools, and member states are following suit. But if we are honest, the scale of innovation is still far too modest relative to the scale of the challenges facing Europe and the world. And some of the biggest barriers to making an impact lie in the entrenched power of incumbents who, not surprisingly, would prefer social innovation to remain the domain of small pilots with NGOs. Before too long some difficult choices will need to be made if the full potential of social innovation is to be realised.

### 3 Social innovation in perspective

By *Agnès Hubert*

When a stakeholder's workshop was organised for the President of the Commission by BEPA (now EPSC) in January 2009, references were made not only to the many initiatives that were developed by the EU in the late 1990s, but also to alternative socioeconomic models which gained prominence in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, including the development of cooperatives, associations and mutual societies. Five years later, the idea that financial profit cannot be the only driving force behind growth is gaining recognition and the efficiency and legitimacy of stakeholder involvement is gaining ground. However, there are indications that something bigger is happening with regards to social innovation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The amount and diversity of players in this field is growing every day; the interest of public and private institutions in social innovation *per se*, as well as the opportunities it can offer are increasing. These developments and prospective studies suggest that it is becoming increasingly necessary to prioritise citizen empowerment, to encourage a radical shake-up of the political system and business in order to create a more resilient, inclusive and sustainable future.

#### An unsustainable present

As opposed to previous movements with similar aspirations, social innovation has entered the EU political agenda in conjunction with welcoming factors. As documented in two recent OECD reports and two bestsellers, *The Spirit Level* (Wilkinson and Pickett 2009) and *Capitalism in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Piketty 2013), these factors include: the increasing difficulties of welfare systems to respond to new needs when faced with a more affluent, more unequal, larger and older population; rapid changes in production processes; increasing threats to the environment and the depletion of natural resources; the rise of a hyper-connected society that brings people closer together; a high level of disenchantment with the political class; and the catalytic effect of the 2008 crisis.

This mix of realities has drawn together large and diverse constituencies in the search for different ways to solve the problem. Civil society

organisations and local authorities, which have been confronted with the most direct consequences of the crisis, have used imagination and resources to implement other ways of creating an inclusive society, respect for the environment, resource efficiency and social cohesion. In addition, private corporations have an increased interest in 'responsible' projects and public authorities adapt their regulatory framework to social enterprises. As described in the latest BEPA (now EPSC) publication on social innovation, the Europe 2020 strategy (with its seven flagship initiatives) has provided the necessary framework and resources to nurture, experiment, scale up and spread social innovation throughout the policy spectrum.

#### Resetting the course of action with the Europe 2020 strategy review

There is still a long way to go. The European Commission has implemented a comprehensive ten-year strategy for smart, inclusive and sustainable growth, aiming for the EU to be "a front runner in advocating a growth model going simply beyond the growth of GDP". However, the European Council of March 2015 that, following the mid-term review exercise, will vote to reset the course of the Europe 2020 strategy, will come to the bitter realisation of its shortcomings. While the EU is on course to reach two of its targets at the end of the decade (in education and climate/energy), it is far from meeting its objectives in the areas of research, employment and poverty reduction. According to the Commission Communication on the mid-term review on Europe 2020, the target was to lift at least 20 million people out of the risk of poverty and social exclusion, but the number of people in this situation in the EU has increased from 114 million in 2009 to 124 million in 2012.

This Communication, which was open to public consultation until 31<sup>st</sup> October, reaffirms that the reasons for insisting on smart, inclusive and sustainable growth are as paramount in 2014 as they were in 2010. Recalling the list of monetary and financial governance measures that have been

\* *Agnès Hubert is Associate Researcher in the "Research and Teaching Programme on Gender – PRESAGE" at Sciences-Po Paris.*

accepted by member states to overcome the crisis, the Communication also underlines that it was only in December 2013 that the Council agreed to include a non-binding scoreboard on employment and social indicators in the joint employment report.

## Coherence is a conundrum

It will be difficult – both for the Commission when drawing recommendations after the close of the public consultation, and for the European Council in March when adopting a revised course of action for the next five years – to find a sense of coherence in the review exercise.

Looking ahead to the next five years, during which time employment will rightfully be a priority, a number of questions remain unanswered. What jobs are likely to produce growth and reduce poverty without damaging the environment? What kind of growth is likely to create jobs without increasing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and excessive use of resources? What sort of green economy is likely to create social inclusion and increased growth? Some argue that part of the answer may lie in the dematerialisation of production and the use of new technologies, or circular economy; others work on finding new ways to address poverty and exclusion. These are all necessary components and the European Commission has largely prepared the ground for political action.

Another crucial element to the “Smart, Inclusive and Sustainable Strategy” is to widen the concept of growth beyond GDP at European and international levels. Here again, the European Statistical Systems and the European Commission have worked intensively with the OECD and the UN to develop accurate and timely indicators to overcome the environmentally and socially counterproductive effects of using only the GDP as a measure of growth. The next steps now include: first, embedding this new agenda in the European Semester governance process (by deploying binding environmental sustainability and social cohesion indicators to complement GDP); and second, developing a convincing narrative for citizens to embrace change.

## Social innovation and the positive value of change

Change is the underlying cause of fear for some, and the only means of survival for others. The way

change is perceived normally depends on individual understanding of what we are likely to gain or lose from it. The speed and complexity of change in the current period blurs the picture and generates a sense of insecurity, which often translates into votes of protest or the alienation of society/citizens.

Paradoxically, recent forward-looking exercises (see, for example, the RAND Report, *Europe's Societal Challenges*, <http://europa.eu/espas/pdf/espas-report-societal-trends.pdf>) indicate a growing trend towards citizen empowerment. This trend is confirmed by bottom-up initiatives by individuals and organisations committed to producing innovative responses to social issues, responses that incorporate a meaningful vision for change.

Social innovators and entrepreneurs are supported by social scientists, economists and management theorists who, each in their field, affirm the failure of the current system in recovering from the crisis and point to the need for more empathetic, socially constructive structures that promote growth and individual well-being. As a telling example, management experts, such as Michael Porter and Mark Kramer in a much commented article in the *Harvard Business Review*, have heavily criticised the short-sighted vision of business that transfers activities to locations with the lowest labour costs in order to maximise profit at any cost, and views value creation narrowly while ignoring customers' real needs in the process. For these theorists, the solution lies in the principle of shared value, whereby the economy is put at the service of social progress, with the aim to address societal needs and challenges.

In 1820, Robert Owen, the industrialist utopian and father of the cooperative movement, wrote a programme that could be interpreted as a 19<sup>th</sup> century draft of the Europe 2020 strategy. He argued that, “society may be formed so as to exist without crime, without poverty, with health greatly improved, with little, if any misery, and with intelligence and happiness increased a hundredfold; and no obstacle whatsoever intervenes at this moment except ignorance to prevent such a state of society from becoming universal”. Utopians at the time thought they had reached the dawn of a new era. Yet they had neither the data nor the institutions to carry their project forward. We, on the contrary, do.

## 4 Think Tank Twitter

*Think Tank Twitter (TTT) aims to provide regular information and updates on what is produced by think tanks and research centres across Europe (and beyond) on EU policy issues. As an analogy to the original Twitter, each summary – or tweet – does not exceed 140 words, rather than characters. Those who wish to signal new publications for possible inclusion can send them to the email address [bepa-think-tank-twitter@ec.europa.eu](mailto:bepa-think-tank-twitter@ec.europa.eu)*

### Two Steps to Avert another Eurozone Crisis

This paper identifies two options that could help the EU exit the crisis and restore confidence in the EU: a common reduction of the European tax burden on labour, and the smart implementation of the Stability and Growth Pact in the upcoming European semester. It also analyses the differences between the French and Italian cases, arguing that the two countries are in radically different positions vis-à-vis the Stability and Growth Pact. With a fiscal deficit that exceeds the proposed percentage-of-GDP limit (3%), France is in the so-called ‘corrective arm’, while Italy, which has remained committed to keeping fiscal debts below this limit and intends to continue to do so, is in the ‘preventive arm’. This is a crucial distinction when applying the margins of flexibility under the Pact’s current rules.

<http://www.lisboncouncil.net/publication/publication/113-economic-intelligence-two-steps-to-avert-eurozone-crisis.html#sthash.rjiTRtZW.dpuf>

### Building Growth in Europe: Innovative financing for infrastructure

This report suggests that more and better investment in infrastructure would lay the foundations for long-term growth and job creation in Europe. The authors formulate eight recommendations that can be undertaken without additional financial resources: the development of a pan-European infrastructure strategy; the creation of a European Infrastructure Agency; the fostering of an effective collaboration between the public and private sectors; the implementation of policies that aim to match supply and demand of capital; the improvement of the allocation of Structural and Cohesion Funds; the promotion of the use of project bonds; the ‘bundling’ or merging of smaller projects that cannot reach a dimensional threshold; and finally, the promotion of higher infrastructure investment in countries with wider fiscal space.

[http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/field/field\\_document/20140930EuropeFinancingInfrastructureSubacchiPickfordTentoriHuang.pdf](http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/field/field_document/20140930EuropeFinancingInfrastructureSubacchiPickfordTentoriHuang.pdf)

### The Review of the Europe 2020 Strategy: From austerity to prosperity?

The author argues that the Europe 2020 strategy would benefit from allowing countries to apply more flexibility, when – and only when – they adopt structural reform and ensure good governance. By establishing such a ‘new deal’, Europe 2020 could succeed in supporting EU transition from austerity to prosperity. The author thus suggests revising the Europe 2020 strategy to include initiatives on infrastructure, the internal market and administrative capacity at all levels of government. In addition, the author considers that restoring the centrality of Europe 2020 will require better and up-to-date indicators, a set of consistent and comprehensive flagship initiatives, a bottom-up approach to target setting; a stronger set of incentives and conditionalities, more consistency with cohesion policy, and more coherence with EU legislation and national reform programmes.

<http://www.ceps.eu/book/review-europe-2020-strategy-austerity-prosperity>

### Unlocking Europe’s Capital Markets Union

The report argues that the Commission under Jean-Claude Juncker needs to work towards the creation of a capital markets union. A detailed Action Plan should be developed and European Council and European Parliament support should be gained by early 2015. The objective should be to reduce unemployment and increase economic growth by developing viable non-bank sources of financing for the EU. It is freer markets rather than tighter control that will facilitate the development of a pan-European capital market and make national capital markets more effective. This can be achieved while observing the subsidiarity principle, meaning that there is no need to transfer power to supervise capital markets from national authorities to the EU institutions. Lastly, the UK should participate more vigorously in the capital markets union.

[http://www.cer.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2014/unlocking\\_europes\\_capital\\_markets\\_union\\_hugodixon\\_15.10.14-9870.pdf](http://www.cer.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2014/unlocking_europes_capital_markets_union_hugodixon_15.10.14-9870.pdf)



### **The EU and its Partners on Development: How strategic on the ground?**

This paper investigates whether cooperation between the EU and its strategic partners in the field of development is reflected on the ground in two developing countries, Nepal and Mozambique. In both cases the authors find that the cooperation in developing countries is constrained by a limited space, for the most part set by the partner's economic, security or political interests. They argue that enhanced dialogue between governments and greater support for EU delegations are needed, particularly in the changing global context of emerging powers. Such circumstances would enable the fuller use of the strategic partnership framework and would ensure that dialogues on development and commitments to collaboration between the EU and strategic partners happen on the ground.

<http://www.egmontinstitute.be/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/PB13.pdf>

### **The Air War against the Islamic State: The need for an “adequacy of resources”**

The United States has maintained from the outset that it is conducting an air campaign to weaken and degrade the Islamic State, not to change the military situation in Syria or to substitute for Iraqi political unity and the eventual use of Iraqi ground forces. While effective to a certain degree, the air campaign seems to be doing too little too slowly: it is failing to have the necessary impact in Iraq and is drifting towards major mission creep in Syria. By comparing it with the standards of recent conflicts, this publication highlights the problems of the current air effort that deserve attention. It concludes that history may well show that the US has embarked in leading and conducting an inadequate and high risk air campaign.

<http://csis.org/files/publication/The%20Air%20War%20Against%20the%20Islamic%20State.pdf>

### **Civil Society in the EU Integration of the Western Balkans**

This report focuses on the challenges of cooperation between governments and civil societies in the Western Balkan countries in six areas of chapters 23 and 24 of the EU accession negotiations. These include: effective monitoring of the implementation of action plans and strategies; human rights issues; migration and asylum policies; judiciary and justice system reforms; anti-corruption policies and activities; and civic education. The authors identify the problems of this cooperation in the above-mentioned fields by discussing the existing framework of strategies, legislation and action plans. They call on NGOs to act together to increase their effectiveness in sharing expertise with government on key reforms undertaken in the context of EU accession, and on governments to establish sustainable inter-sectoral consultation and monitoring bodies for the implementation of public policies.

[http://www.pism.pl/files/?id\\_plik=18260](http://www.pism.pl/files/?id_plik=18260)

### **International Justice and the Prevention of Atrocity**

The report argues that European countries must better coordinate policies on justice and atrocity prevention. Decisions on justice are too often taken separately from broader foreign policy goals. This risks isolating courts as countries fail to support their work in practice. In particular, states should avoid using justice as a tool to influence the dynamics of conflict. The UN Security Council should only exceptionally refer cases to the International Criminal Court (ICC), i.e. when it is confident that the UN will not later support political initiatives that ignore the ICC's demands. States should be mindful of the idea that such referrals always help the credibility of the ICC. They should rather give more attention to ensuring that peace agreements enhance later accountability and the growth of the rule of law.

[http://www.ecfr.eu/publications/summary/international\\_justice\\_and\\_the\\_prevention\\_of\\_atrocities#sthash.Hp9b5ISL.dpuf](http://www.ecfr.eu/publications/summary/international_justice_and_the_prevention_of_atrocities#sthash.Hp9b5ISL.dpuf)

## 5 BEPA News

### Arrivées

Le BEPA (désormais EPSC) accueille deux nouveaux stagiaires depuis le 1<sup>er</sup> octobre : Olivia Geymond, diplômée d'un double Master en Affaires Européennes de Sciences-Po Paris et la LES, et Federico Sacramati, qui termine un Master en Administration des Affaires à la London Business School.

### Evénements

Le rapport *The Future of Europe is Science*, préparé par les membres du Conseil Consultatif des Sciences et des Technologies (STAC), a été présenté le 5 octobre à Lisbonne lors d'une conférence organisée par l'équipe de la Conseillère Scientifique en Chef, le BEPA (désormais EPSC) et le Centre Commun de Recherche. Le Président Barroso, le Président du Portugal Cavaco Silva, les Commissaires Geoghegan-Quinn et Hedegaard et plusieurs éminents scientifiques y sont intervenus.

Le 10 octobre a eu lieu un séminaire de haut niveau pour présenter le rapport *Survey of Economic Reforms in the European Union 2008-2014* préparé par le BEPA (désormais EPSC) à la demande du Président Barroso. On comptait parmi les intervenants le Prof. Mario Monti, ancien Premier ministre italien, et Eckhard Wurzel, Senior Economist et directeur du secteur « Zone Euro et Union Européenne » à l'Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economique (OCDE). Le Président Barroso a prononcé le discours d'ouverture et a participé aux débats.

Le 21 octobre, le Groupe Européen d'Éthique (GEE) a organisé le 6<sup>e</sup> Dialogue International sur la Bioéthique, qui a réuni les présidents des Comités nationaux d'éthique des 28 Etats membres et de pays de tous les continents. Le 22 octobre, la plateforme de dialogue Union européenne – Union africaine sur l'éthique a discuté des pratiques dans ce domaine, a échangé sur les défis communs en matière de sciences et de nouvelles technologies ainsi que sur les moyens de les relever, notamment sur la crise Ebola et ses conséquences. S'en est suivie la Table Ronde ouverte au public portant sur l'éthique de la participation citoyenne dans le domaine de la santé, dont les résultats alimenteront le prochain Avis du GEE.

Du 27 octobre au 14 novembre 2014 se tient l'exposition « Space for our Future » à Bruxelles, au Berlaymont. La Commission européenne et l'Agence spatiale européenne ont travaillé de concert, avec le soutien du Centre national des études spatiales (CNES)

et d'Arianespace, pour présenter les réussites européennes dans le domaine spatial, les bénéfices concrets que celles-ci représentent pour les citoyens et leurs développements dans un futur proche.

Le 28 octobre, le livre *L'Europe corps et âme: un nouveau récit* a été présenté au Bozar à Bruxelles, en présence du Président Barroso et de nombreux artistes, scientifiques et intellectuels qui ont contribué au projet intitulé « Le Nouveau Récit pour l'Europe », lancé en avril 2013.

### Evénements à venir

Le 14 novembre, le Dr Didier Houssin, Directeur des technologies de l'énergie à l'Agence Internationale de l'Énergie (AIE) à Paris, présentera les principales conclusions de l'étude intitulée *Energy Technology Perspectives 2014*, qui analyse les tendances à long terme dans le secteur de l'énergie du point de vue des technologies. L'événement se focalisera sur les aspects d'actualité pour l'Union européenne, tels que la sécurité d'approvisionnement et le rôle du gaz dans la transition énergétique. Ce séminaire rassemblera les Directions générales les plus impliquées dans ces problématiques.

Du 18 au 20 novembre, sous les auspices de la Présidence italienne du Conseil de l'Union européenne, le Groupe Européen d'Éthique (GEE) et le Forum des conseils nationaux d'éthique des 28 Etats membres se réuniront à Rome pour discuter du thème du prochain Avis du GEE. Le Groupe rencontrera également le Conseil national italien d'éthique et le Dr James Wagner, Vice-Président de la Commission présidentielle américaine pour les études des problématiques bioéthiques.

Le 27 novembre, le EPSC en collaboration avec la Conférence des Eglises européennes (CEC) et la Commission des Episcopats de la Communauté européennes (COMECE), organise un séminaire de dialogue sur l'action commune contre la traite d'êtres humains. Cet événement rassemblera des experts venant d'organisations confessionnelles et de la Commission européenne pour échanger sur les mesures efficaces pouvant être mises en place pour lutter contre ce trafic, en particulier en Méditerranée.

### Publications

*Social Innovation : A decade of changes*. Brussels: Bureau of European Policy Advisers (BEPA – now EPSC), European Commission. Le rapport sera disponible en ligne prochainement.