

SUSANNE NIES

Head of IFRI office in Brussels, senior research fellow with the IFRI governance and geopolitics of energy programme

Summary

The workshop has been dedicated to the issue how to generate, but exploit as well the new technologies in order to improve the knowledge economy.

Mr. Pisani-Ferry

As Mr. Pisani-Ferry stated in his introductory remarks, knowledge has become today a key to competitiveness. If the US have been for long the uncontested leader in the field, they are in losing that role today. The EU lags behind and continues to do so; the Lisbon strategy is a wishful thinking. Human capital is essential, and we observe a commoditization of labor. Labor movement and migration heavily matter, but remain very slow and insignificant in Europe, whereas they reach $\frac{1}{4}$ in the US. In EU the investment in human capital is also very slow, compared, again, with the US. This is in a complete contradiction with our self-perception: Europe does believe in fact since the 70s that it is a human capital economy, but in fact we are a capital intense goods economy.

The quality of education matters heavily. The last Shanghai ranking of universities states that the best performing country within the EU is Sweden, but, again, one has to be careful, since the ranking is based on the best performing universities, equivalent to the MIT, which, as for the MIT, is not representative for the state of education in the US as a whole. As for priorities for governments, the EU could help fostering more competition among EU member states. Erasmus for example insists more on the cultural dimension, but does not affect really the curriculum. Therefore, one has to focus and target the Master level, which is cheaper, and much more efficient. Migration of skilled people has to be a priority for the EU: there is many competent people beleaguering the EU, but obstacles are too important, and they cannot get in. All these debates on Blue Cards, Green cards – they did not lead far for the time being.

Bertrand Collomb

We need everything for the development of a basic knowledge economy. On the European level, the Lisbon Strategy did not really lead very far. Japan is very successful, or India, with Bangalore. Knowledge is directly linked to education. In Europe unfortunately we do not witness, improvement, but deterioration. We also face difficulties with social and cultural diversity. In India in the opposite, we witness important differences, Brazil is also very bad, but nevertheless, it works in some places. It is very difficult nowadays to attract people to hard sciences, and brain drain is a common feature. Innovation is a cultural phenomenon, and conservatism prohibits it in Europe; change is considered as a problem, not a chance. Also, enterprises in Europe remain reluctant with respect to new technologies, they do not use them enough. Public private relationships heavily matter. The MIT is financed 40% by the state, and 60% by enterprises. This is a perfect example for public private partnership. Research domains of the future are clearly energy, climate change, and in order to make long-term research with unclear outcome happen, we need funding. We had in France the Beffa plan, innovation centers, centers of excellence, but nevertheless, the effort remains fragmented. There is the project for a European center of excellence, pushed by Mr. Barroso.

Anatoly Torkunov

We have a specific Russian project to face today's challenge of the knowledge economy. One important idea is to reduce significantly the number of universities: Russia has today some 1800, it wants to reduce them to 50. Is this a good idea? One has to check, and to witness then. MGIMO is an exception from the picture in Russia in that sense that we cooperate very heavily with Russian enterprises, but also international, like BP, who sponsor some special training programmes, especially masters, as had been said before, because of the positive equation of return on



investment for the Masters. Enterprises are setting up their own competing corporate universities. The process Bologna had a positive impact, but we have to cope more with the changes.

Debate

The debate focussed on the technology perspective, presented by a representative from Google, on developing countries, with the example of Kenya, the GDP impact of research, as well as the role of companies in education. The public private relationship was as well an issue, coming thus back to the major topic of the World Policy Conference: the role of states, governance. Participants considered that the state has to set a regulatory framework, especially in Europe. In the end, participants discussed the impact of a failure in coping with the knowledge economy: If we do not make it, what are the consequences? Muddling through, no grand design, was one of the most probable answers.

Anatoly Torkunov (MGIMO) and Susanne Nies (Ifri) discussed a concrete training project which would be a “Brugge of policies”, especially energy policy: Ifri and MGIMO could set up a training cycle for EDDU-27 member states, as well as Russia and ENP states, focussing on European energy policy. This would be an excellent means to contribute to the emergence of a new European, less national energy generation.