

Workshop Report

3rd ESDN Workshop

“Post-2010: The Future of the EU SDS and its Interface with the Lisbon Process”

Hosted by the [ESDN](#) in cooperation with the [Sustainable Development Observatory](#) of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC)

Brussels, 19 November 2008

**Gerald Berger & Markus Hametner
(ESDN Office)**

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION	3
THEMATIC OUTLINE	3
TOPICS	3
WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS.....	4
WELCOME ADDRESSES	5
KEYNOTE PRESENTATION I.....	5
MARTIN AHBE (SECRETARIAT-GENERAL, EUROPEAN COMMISSION): “CURRENT DISCOURSE, REVIEW MECHANISMS AND PLANNED INITIATIVES ON EU STRATEGIES POST-2010 – LISBON STRATEGY AND EU SDS”	5
PLENARY DISCUSSION: THE EU SDS AND ITS INTERFACE WITH THE LISBON STRATEGY PROCESS	9
KEYNOTE PRESENTATION II.....	11
R. ANDREAS KRAEMER (ECOLOGIC): “SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE FUTURE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE EU: SCENARIOS FOR THE POST-2010 PERIOD AND THE ROLE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”	11
WORKING GROUP RESULTS	12
WORKING GROUP 1: OVER-ARCHING EU DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY	13
WORKING GROUP 2: TWO PARALLEL STRATEGIES.....	14
PLENARY DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING GROUP RESULTS	15
CONCLUDING DISCUSSION.....	16
ANNEX I: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	22

Introduction

The 3rd ESDN workshop on “Post-2010: The Future of the EU SDS and its Interface with the Lisbon Process” took place in Brussels on 19 November 2008 and was hosted by the ESDN in cooperation with the Sustainable Development Observatory of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC). In total, 37 participants from 16 European countries attended the workshop, including ESDN members, members of the Sustainable Development Observatory, representatives of the European Commission and Eurostat, representatives of the European Environment and Sustainable Development Advisory Councils (EEAC) as well as invited experts. The list of participants can be found in Annex I of this report.

Thematic outline

At its meeting in March 2000, the Council of the European Union adopted a ten-year development programme, the so-called ‘Lisbon Strategy’, with the aim to make the EU the most dynamic and competitive economy in the world by 2010. The Lisbon Strategy was re-launched in 2005 and re-focused the priorities on growth and employment. Currently, the discussions about the future strategic development of the EU post-2010 have already begun, particularly on the future of the Lisbon Strategy: The European Council in its meeting in March 2008 “invite[d] the Commission, the Council and the National Lisbon coordinators to start reflecting on the future of the Lisbon Strategy in the post-2010 period” (Council of the EU, 2008, para 6). The first EU Sustainable Development Strategy (EU SDS) was adopted in 2001 and a renewed and updated version was adopted by the European Council in 2006. A first progress report was published in 2007 and a further one is to be undertaken in 2009. The similar timetables of these two review processes make a reflection about the interface and future of the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS for the period after 2010 necessary and timely.

Several questions emerge in this context which are of great relevance to the sustainable development (SD) community: What are the opportunities and threats of having one overarching EU development strategy or two separate strategies (i.e. post-Lisbon strategy and future EU SDS)? How would this influence the national strategy processes (i.e. National Reform Programmes and NSDSs, national reports on the implementation of these EU strategies)? Which aspects of SD are most relevant in the future strategic development process of the EU? How can the SD community be more comprehensively involved in the post-2010 debate? How to define or re-define the relationship between growth and SD?

Topics

The workshop consisted of three parts: In the first part, the workshop theme as well as current discourses, review mechanisms and planned initiatives on the EU SDS and the Lisbon Strategy for the period after 2010 were introduced by keynote presentations. This was followed by a plenary discussion on the EU SDS and its interface with the Lisbon Strategy process. In the second part, scenarios of the future strategic development in the EU were outlined and afterwards discussed in two parallel working groups. The results of the working group discussions were then presented and discussed by the workshop participants. In the third part, a concluding plenary discussion reflected on the necessities and options of including SD in the post-2010 debate and on the arenas of exchange regarding the future EU development trajectory on the EU and national level (i.e. cooperation between ‘Lisbon community’ and ‘SD community’).

Working group discussions

The parallel working groups discussed two scenarios of the future strategic development in the EU: On the one hand, the opportunities and threats of one over-arching EU development strategy post-2010. On the other hand, the opportunities and threats of two separate strategies post-2010 (i.e. post-Lisbon Strategy and future EU SDS). Each working group was moderated by a member of the ESDS Office team and the discussions were guided by questions on the content of the strategies as well as on institutional and governance arrangements.

Welcome addresses

The co-chair of the ESDN, **Elisabeth Freytag** (Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Austria) welcomed the workshop participants. She underlined the importance and timeliness of reflecting upon the future strategic development in the EU post-2010, particularly on the topics that need to be included in future strategies. She then briefly outlined the main objectives of the workshop: (1) To raise awareness among ESDN members about the current discussions and upcoming decisions on the future of the two main European strategies post-2010; (2) to clarify which topics and themes of SD should be considered in the EU's future strategic development; and (3) to discuss governance issues, i.e. institutional requirements, governance processes and coordination between the 'Lisbon community' and 'SD community' on the different political levels.

Stéphane Buffetaut (President of the Sustainable Development Observatory) welcomed the workshop participants on behalf of the co-hosting organisation. He pointed out that the EU SDS is characterised by long time frames and broad topics that are addressed in an integrated manner. The Lisbon Strategy is distinct from the EU SDS regarding three aspects: (a) it mainly focuses on economic growth and economic reforms; (b) it has a shorter time frame; and (c) it has a purely European focus. Mr Buffetaut argued that both strategies should be made more consistent in the future. On the one hand, sustainable development (SD) is not only about environmental objectives, but comprises issues like inter-generational justice, social issues, etc, which are important but currently not covered in the Lisbon Strategy. On the other hand, the Lisbon Strategy addresses several issues which are important in order to achieve SD in the long-term, e.g. knowledge, innovation, etc. He finally argued that the major challenge in the future is to achieve a balance between environmental issues, economic growth and social cohesion. However, it would be also important to openly address trade-offs and conflicts that emerge among objectives.

Keynote presentation I

Martin Ahbe (Secretariat-General, European Commission): “Current discourse, review mechanisms and planned initiatives on EU strategies post-2010 – Lisbon Strategy and EU SDS”¹

Introduction

Mr Ahbe argued at the beginning of his presentation that the need for **policy coordination** has a long tradition within the EU. It has been an important issue since the establishment of the Common Internal Market and the need to coordinate different sectoral policies. Therefore, cross-sectoral policy coordination is not solely associated with the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS. However, the most far-reaching need for policy coordination must be seen **in the context of SD**, i.e. the coordination of long- and short-term issues, coordination of different political levels, etc. In this context, Article 2 of the EU

¹ The full version of the presentation can be downloaded from the [‘ESDN workshops’ section](#) on the ESDN website.

Treaty (“to promote economic and social progress and a high level of employment and to achieve balanced and sustainable development”) renders the need for policy coordination as obvious.

The two major development strategies of the EU, the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS, were developed in the early 2000s and have both been reformed recently (Lisbon Strategy in 2005; EU SDS in 2006). Mr Ahbe argued that, generally, SD seems firmly rooted in the EU agenda: For instance, the Commission's first Progress Report on the EU SDS (October 2007) confirmed that the EU must take a more decisive stance to turn around the persistent unsustainable trends addressed by the strategy's seven core challenges. Furthermore, in 2008 the Commission has adopted new and far reaching proposals on selected SD subjects such as emissions trading, alternative energy and climate change. And finally, the three pillars of SD remain an important objective within the EU. However, he pointed out that there is widespread **unease about progress** regarding the EU SDS as well as regarding the coordination between both strategies. At the same time, core elements of the EU SDS, such as climate change and sustainable energy policies, have become top-priorities on the EU and global political agendas (however, outside the EU SDS framework).

Mr Ahbe mentioned that a number of critics argued that the pursuit of two different, very comprehensive policy platforms, more or less in parallel, is delivering results which are less satisfactory. Therefore, he pointed out that reconsidering the **link between the two strategies** is timely, particularly in view of the mandate given by the March 2008 European Council to start reflecting on the review of the Lisbon Strategy for the post-2010 period. Mr Ahbe also mentioned that it is crucial in this debate to take into account the **political context** in which decisions about future EU development strategies will take place, i.e. new Commission in 2009, new European Parliament in 2009, new US President, etc.

In his presentation, Mr Ahbe focussed on three questions for which he presented some reflections which do not, however, present an official position of the European Commission:

1. Which **experiences** have been made so far with the current approach in pursuing a wide variety of economic/social/environmental objectives?
2. What has changed in terms of **political context** since the formulation/re-formulation of both strategies?
3. Which **institutional arrangements** can be developed to enable a coordinated pursuit of a wide range of policy objectives that are usually associated with SD policies?

Experiences made in pursuing the strategies' objectives

After outlining the main objectives of the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS as well as the respective changes in the objectives after the re-launch of the strategies, Mr Ahbe focused on some strengths and weaknesses in the experiences made with both strategies:

Lisbon Strategy	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Re-focusing on growth and employment in 2005 allowed for better visibility and communication of Lisbon goals (3 % of GDP investment in R&D, 70 % employment rate, 20 % GHG emission reduction).	Difficult to measure success due to change in key objectives and orientations.
Governance structure (Open Method of Coordination – OMC) allowed for structured implementation from the beginning.	Intended integration into EU SDS only partly achieved: SD and/or environmental issues remain an add-on.

Annual reporting process is the basis for monitoring and reviewing progress in the implementation.	OMC as 'soft governance' approach does not allow for uniform implementation in all Member States.
High political visibility of strategy and its objectives in wider policy context in Europe: Post-2010 debate has already begun.	The relation between economic growth and SD is not openly addressed.

EU SDS	
<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>
Renewed EU SDS (2006) constitutes a more comprehensive approach with clearer governance and implementation provisions.	Strategic approach of EU SDS remains incomplete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only general description of link between EU SDS and Lisbon Strategy; • Horizontal integration is identified as major challenge, but no framework provided to address this challenge; and • Link between EU SDS and NSDSs is rather weak
Improved system of reporting: Commission progress report and national progress reports established bi-annually.	General follow-up remains limited: Only small number of voluntary peer reviews and external evaluations, limited number of meetings of SDS Coordinators Group.
EU SDS is important paradigm for civil society and a policy driver at the national and regional level, but has a low profile on the European level.	Quantified targets only for some key challenges; no quantified goals for cross-cutting policies.
EU SDS aims to balance sectoral policy objectives (horizontal integration) and addresses policy coherence on different political levels (vertical integration).	

Political context

Mr Ahbe argued that it would be important to consider the political context in which the **decisions on the future strategic development** in the EU will be taken, particularly in comparison to the time when the strategies were designed:

In 2000, the main objective of the Lisbon Strategy was to catch up with the US with regards to the knowledge society. Mr Ahbe argued that in 2010, the knowledge society will be largely established in Europe and it seems that globalisation is now the key driver in policy-making. In this context, Commission President Barroso argued that the EU should 'lead from the front as a world player'. Moreover, in 2000, a strategic policy approach was being developed with over-arching EU strategies for the first time. In 2010, the EU will have several years of experience with over-arching strategies (Lisbon, EU SDS) and their implementation. Mr Ahbe argued that a follow-up approach can thus be based on previous experiences. Finally, discussions of a possible re-orientation of the growth concept (e.g. 'beyond GDP') are currently ongoing.

The political context for the period 2009-10 onwards will also change: On the one hand, until 2010 there will be a new Commission and a newly elected European Parliament which will certainly influence the development and objectives of major new EU strategies. On the other hand, the inauguration of a new US President will also alter political and policy perspectives in the coming years.

Therefore, Mr Ahbe pointed out repeatedly that the changing political context and possible re-orientations in policy objectives make predictions for the period post-2010 very difficult.

Alternatives to current approach

Mr Ahbe outlined several *considerations for the new strategic approach* in the EU: Firstly, structural reforms will need to continue despite of the financial crisis and the institutional uncertainty due to the current state of ratification of the Lisbon Treaty. Secondly, the time horizon for the new strategies is currently unclear. Towards which politically significant date should the new strategies be oriented? Thirdly, in 2000, the comparison of strategic development in the EU was largely with the US. After 2010, which parts of the world should be considered for comparison? Fourthly, the focus for the future strategic development in the EU seems as yet unclear. Could 'mastering globalisation' be the overarching objective? And finally, new forms of cooperation between the EU and the Member States and new forms of dialogue with stakeholders may be necessary.

He then presented *several options for the future of the EU SDS* in light of possible Lisbon Strategy developments for the period post-2010:

- Future EU SDS would remain the framework strategy and post-Lisbon Strategy would focus on economic instruments and financial issues;
- Future EU SDS would remain the framework strategy and post-Lisbon Strategy would try to improve current weak aspects, e.g. mobilisation of businesses and civil society, inclusion of trade dimension, focus on financial markets, etc.
- Newly designed single strategy, with future EU SDS as preparatory forum for long-term decision-making and post-Lisbon Strategy as final decision-making stage.

Conclusion:

Mr Ahbe presented in his conclusion some remarks on the *decision-making process for the future strategic development* in the EU:

- New approach for future strategic development in the EU will be decided by the European Council, based on the proposal by the European Commission in cooperation with the new European Parliament, also taking into account high-level external expertise, e.g. from the independent Reflection Group on the future of the EU that was established by the European Council in December 2007. The decision will be made in a complex political context and will strongly depend on the assessment of the achievements of both, the Lisbon Strategy and EU SDS. Whilst a continuation of the existing approach with significant changes is certainly a possibility, a new Commission may attempt to raise its political profile with a new approach.
- All new approaches will have to address a number of basic questions, such as (i) the need for coordination between sectoral policy fields, (ii) the balance between short- and long-term orientation, and (iii) the stronger involvement of stakeholders, including the civil society, etc.
- The discussion about a new strategic approach for the coordination of economic/social/environmental policies will not only address the advantages and disadvantages of individual strategies, but will probably also highlight some of the more general strengths and weaknesses of the short-term orientation of our political systems.
- The decision process on the future of the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS will most likely not start before the spring 2009 European Council. Decision-making will be supported by the work of the Reflection Group which will present its results by June 2010.

Plenary discussion: The EU SDS and its Interface with the Lisbon Strategy Process

The keynote presentation of Mr Ahbe was followed by an intensive discussion in the plenary. Several topics were discussed by the workshop participants and Mr Ahbe which are summarised below:

Road map for discussion on future strategies

The participants asked Mr Ahbe about the time line for discussing the post-Lisbon Strategy and future EU SDS within the EU. Mr Ahbe answered that the internal preparations for the future strategic development are currently moving ahead slowly. The national Lisbon coordinators will discuss the link between the two strategies in December 2008. Generally, the European Council has the formal mandate to deal with this issue. Due to the political situation (i.e. European elections in 2009, new European Commission, etc) and the general socio-economic situation (e.g. financial crisis), it would be difficult to predict how the strategic development of the EU will be approached. Mr Ahbe pointed out that for the Member States, it would be important to clarify their position on the topic and discuss it with the current and future EU Presidencies.

Two strategies or one over-arching strategy, coordination aspects, strategy objectives

Several participants raised the issue of either having two strategies (post-Lisbon Strategy and future EU SDS) or one over-arching strategy. In this context, they addressed the different time horizons of the strategies (Lisbon – short-term, EU SDS – long-term), their different strategic orientation (Lisbon – European focus, EU SDS – linked to global debate, but also to NSDSs), their different objectives, etc. Mr Ahbe replied that one over-arching EU development strategy may not be realistic. One of the most crucial issues would be to improve the coordination between the two future strategies. It is not only important to begin with defining the major objectives of both strategies, but also to address integrated policy-making from the beginning.

Synergies of both strategies and experiences made

One participant asked about the possible synergies between the two strategies and the achievements/experiences made with the current Lisbon Strategy and EU SDS. Mr Ahbe replied that synergies between the strategies are difficult to achieve, mainly because of the compartmentalised structure of the Commission. Therefore, the Commission launched an exercise in 2003 with the aim to have informed decisions “in full knowledge of the matter concerned”. Regarding experiences with the two strategies, Mr Ahbe pointed out that the Commission has not yet fostered the discussion on outcomes of the strategies in the post-2010 debate out of two reasons: On the one hand, several analyses have already been made and, on the other hand, it was felt that this would have opened a new discussion and political decisions would potentially have been postponed. However, external expertise will be taken into account when developing the future strategic development of the EU.

Reflection Group on the future of the EU

Marko Hren (Government Office for Growth, Slovenia) pointed out that this Reflection Group in the Council would be an important body for debating the future strategic development of the EU. It was constituted in October 2008 and consists of 9 members from various fields. Its secretary-general will be Ziga Turk, former Minister of Growth of Slovenia. The first report of the Reflection Group will be issued

in June 2010. Mr Hren argued that the ESDN may be able to influence organisational issues of the Reflection Group as the organisation of the group is as yet open for discussion. For instance, the ESDN could propose how it will contribute to the Reflection Group or indicate which experts should be consulted by this group. Mr. Ahbe mentioned that the Reflection Group will provide important inputs in the discussions on the future of the EU in the European Council (which will take the final decisions). Generally, the Reflection Group can be approached and provided with information. For instance, when the 'Kok Group' prepared the mid-term review of the Lisbon Strategy, there was a lot of effort by stakeholders to inform the group's members about specific issues, problems, challenges, etc. And overall, Mr Ahbe argued, the stakeholder contributions and external expertise has increased the credibility of this group's results and report.

Impact of financial crisis

Several workshop participants referred to the current financial crisis and how it will impact on the future strategic development of the EU. On the one hand, there was concern that the financial crisis would foster short-term political thinking and measures and thus SD issues, characterised by long-term objectives, may become less important. On the other hand, it was argued that the financial crisis would show that more emphasis and discussion on transformation issues is necessary. Regarding the first issue, Mr Ahbe replied that addressing long-term political and societal challenges when faced with a severe financial crisis is a matter of political leadership. Generally, though, it would be short-sighted to neglect future challenges when the focus is on solving immediate problems. Regarding the second issue, Mr Ahbe mentioned that although a discussion on transformation is regarded as necessary, the current decision-making processes and institutions would not be properly set up for addressing such issues. Therefore, there would be a need for establishing space to debate transformation issues.

Research and sustainable development

A workshop participant pointed out that it is also crucial to link the future strategic development of the EU with its research policy. The current Lisbon Strategy is focused on the 'Barcelona goal' of investing 3 % of the GDP on R & D as well as on growth and employment issues. However, the current Research Framework Programme (FP7) also needs to contribute to meet SD objectives. Thus, SD is also a challenge for European research and has implications on the EU research policy in general. In order to address this issue, a conference will be organised in Brussels in May 2009. Mr Ahbe replied that linking research and SD is necessary and will potentially result in a new focus of European research in general.

Progress report on the EU SDS

Several participants asked about the Member States' reports on implementing the EU SDS as part of the Commission' progress report (also based the Monitoring Report on SD indicators by Eurostat) that is due in June 2009. The SD coordinators agreed that a template for the Member States' reports would be needed in order to have some consistency and that the Member States know what they should report on. Moreover, a meeting of the SDS Coordinators Group would be helpful in the preparation phase of the Member States' reports. One participant pointed out that a reflection on the relationship between the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS as well as on the future strategic development in the EU could be included in each Member State report. Mr Ahbe confirmed that the Commission will present its bi-annual report on the EU SDS in June 2009. Currently, no deadline has yet been set for submitting the Member States' reports, but the Commission would prefer a submission approx. 2-3 months before the Commission progress report is issued. Mr Ahbe acknowledged the need for a template for the Member States' reports. Currently, no date for a meeting of the SDS Coordinators group has yet been

fixed. A representative of Eurostat informed the workshop participants that the SD indicator set has been updated in a meeting that took place in October 2008. The Monitoring Report by Eurostat will be available in July 2009 and officially published in September/October 2009.

Keynote presentation II

R. Andreas Kraemer (Ecologic): “Sustainable development in the future strategic development of the EU: Scenarios for the post-2010 period and the role of sustainable development”

In his presentation, Mr Kraemer referred to the *different scenarios* of strategic development in the EU post-2010 which were presented in the Workshop Background and Discussion Paper. Figure 1 below shows the different scenarios. He argued that one can interpret the figure as outlining two main trajectories: One the one hand, a ‘merger’ of the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS, i.e. two equals are joined and none of the two strategies is predominant. On the other hand, an ‘acquisition’ would mean that one strategy is acquired by the other, e.g. Lisbon merged into EU SDS (not very likely) or vice versa. In the latter case, a culture of winners and losers would emerge. Moreover, an acquisition would also imply that one community would lose its ability to deliver the objectives and actions it is supposed to deliver.




Figure 1: Different scenarios for strategic development in the EU post-2010

Mr Kraemer referred to the **opportunities and threats** of either having one over-arching EU development strategy (workshop scenario 1) or two parallel strategies (workshop scenario 2) that were presented in the Workshop Discussion Paper. He added some important 'governance concerns' in relation to the Lisbon Strategy that were identified by [Iain Begg of EPSD](#)²:

- Procedures generally work well, but...
 - evident risk of 'reporting fatigue'
 - may be distant from real policy-making
- Negative effects of missed targets
- Limited engagement of actors, limited transparency
 - leading to dubious 'ownership' & visibility
- Lack of budgetary resources
- Confusion from other 'mega-strategies'

Mr Kraemer also pointed out that one of the major challenges of the main EU strategies is that they must be able to deal with **critical emerging issues**, like the current financial crisis. He argued that the EU SDS is more likely to be able to deal with complexities as it is based on integrated policy-making and the complex SD concept; the Lisbon Strategy is generally more focussed and thus may have limitations in taking up new and emerging issues.

He concluded by arguing that the most likely scenario is to have still two separate strategies **post-2010**. While it would be crucial to have some specific focus in the individual strategies, the room for coordination and cooperation between the strategies should be expanded. As both, the Lisbon and SD community, share in many ways the same concerns, Mr Kraemer argued that enhanced cooperation could be possible. He furthermore argued that the future EU SDS should be understood as an envelope containing a number of different cards. However, it should be possible to draw single cards and put them on the table with clear objectives and time frames. This would enable more visibility, a clearer focus and better communication of the future EU SDS.

Working group results

For the **two parallel working groups**, the two most likely scenarios (see Figure 1 above) were selected for discussion. The participants could choose to discuss either Scenario 1 (one over-arching EU development strategy) or Scenario 2 (two parallel strategies). Both working groups were moderated by members of the ESDN Office. The discussions in both working groups were guided by three questions respectively. Below we present the results of the two working groups according to the three questions:

² [European Panel on Sustainable Development](#) (EPSD) is a network of universities and researchers focusing on the implementation of the EU SDS with the Centre for Environment and Sustainability (GMV) in Gothenburg as host organisation and administrative centre.

Working group 1: Over-arching EU development strategy

This Working Group discussed the scenario of having one over-arching EU development strategy. Below we list the issues raised by the working group participants on the three questions that guided the discussion.

Q 1: What do you consider as the most important opportunities and threats of having one over-arching EU development strategy?

Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SD is taken out of the 'environmental corner' and will potentially gain a more strategic position in the EU development trajectory; • SD will become an issue that is addressed at the centre of the political dialogue; • SD issues could be discussed at high-level political structures; • Defining a clear purpose/vision for an over-arching EU development strategy; • Making sure that people who will be responsible for the over-arching EU development strategy are competent on SD issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 'friendly' merger of Lisbon Strategy and EU SDS – who will represent each community when discussing the merger? • SDS is 'weaker brother/sister' in Secretariat-General – Lisbon Strategy is put on a higher level (ministers). • Only selected Lisbon/SD issues will be included in the over-arching EU development strategy – selection process has to ensure that SD is treated equally with Lisbon; • Persons responsible for SD in Member States will lose competences.

Q 2: Which themes and topics must be considered in an over-arching EU development strategy? How to address potential trade-offs between economic growth and SD?

- Strategic goal is most important: What kind of growth is acceptable from an SD point of view? Current approach leads to wrong kind of growth;
- Growth should not be replacement activity for things that have been lost but the production of new things – therefore, the current perception of growth should be replaced by a new concept and content;
- Discussion about trade-offs between growth and SD = discussion about merging the two strategies;
- Synergies between the topics are more important than simply adding further topics.

Q 3: Which institutions, procedural provisions and governance structures are necessary for an over-arching EU development strategy?

- Modest governance structures are needed that are able to overcome the lack of integration and capable of building links between 'fragmented cells';
- Legitimate means of bringing stakeholder views into the over-arching strategy process are required;
- 'Contestable space' is needed in order to filter new issues that are brought into the process.

Working group 2: Two parallel strategies

This Working Group discussed the scenario of having two parallel strategies, a post-Lisbon Strategy and a future EU SDS. Below we list the issues raised by the working group participants on the three questions that guided the discussion.

Q 1: What do you consider as the most important opportunities and threats of having two parallel strategies?

<i>Opportunities</i>	<i>Threats</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good mix of addressing short-term issues (immediate issued) & long-term issues (persistent issues); • Both strategies need to reflect on long-term issues (e.g. global issues) and provide meaningful answers; • Establishing a clear framework for dialogue and cooperation between the two strategy processes – conflicting objective should not be seen as obstacle but as fruitful for the dialogue; • Explaining and addressing SD issues through Lisbon (better communication of SD issues); • More quantified targets necessary in EU SDS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danger that long-term issues, which are mainly addressed by the EU SDS, become less important: short-term political thinking will prevail, especially in situations of crisis (e.g. financial crisis); • Economic issue remain in Lisbon Strategy only – economic and financial issues will not be included in EU SDS; • Important global issues will be pushed into long-term perspective and EU SDS (e.g. biodiversity); • Conflicting objectives in both strategies – decision what to address and when will be guided by day-to-day political aspects rather than forward-looking strategic thinking.

Q 2: Which themes and topics should be in the focus of the post-Lisbon Strategy and the future EU SDS respectively? How to address potential trade-offs between economic growth and SD?

<i>Post-Lisbon Strategy</i>	<i>Post-EU SDS</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One strategic objective helps to sell/communicate the strategy; • Strategic investments into technologies, particularly energy technologies: R & D employment ('green jobs'); • Sustainable economy; • Low-carbon economy; • Growth connected to quality of life; • Sustainable energy use; • Based on EU SDS (as 'resource pool' for important development issues) – 'friendly take-over' of issue into future Lisbon Strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, a limited number of topics would be preferable – e.g. topics which are based on objectives formulated in EU Treaty; • One strategic objective helps to sell/communicate the strategy; • Optimistic messages – defining opportunities rather than challenges; • Inclusion of more macro-economic issues, e.g. financial issues; • Inclusion of sustainable economy; • Defining link to sustainable business; • Strategic investments into technologies, particularly energy technologies, life-

	cycle issues, recycling; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of life; • Clear steering & management tools for the implementation and monitoring processes.
--	---

Q 3: Which institutions, procedural provisions and governance structures are necessary for a good coordination between the post-Lisbon Strategy and future EU SDS processes?

- Provisions for policy coordination are crucial;
- A clear formulation about SD in the EU Treaty would help to foster uptake of SD issues in each sectoral policy;
- EU Council: Lisbon Strategy and EU SDS should be discussed in separate Council meetings;
- SDS Coordinators Group should review Lisbon process (as part of the Lisbon progress report) and Lisbon coordinators should review EU SDS process (as part of the EU SDS progress report);
- It is important to establish a committee on the Council level which deals with SD/environmental issues; currently, there are committees for economic and social policy; the chairs of the committees could meet regularly in order to improve the coordination between the post-Lisbon Strategy and future EU SDS;
- Organising foresight and/or scenario events to address emerging issues;
- Better coordination between EU-level strategies and national strategies (How to design a better coordination process? Are benchmarks useful?)

Plenary discussion on the working group results

After the working groups results were presented by the moderators from the ESDN Office, the participants discussed various issues which are summarised below:

At the beginning, the **over-arching EU development strategy** was discussed. One participant argued that such a comprehensive strategy would be too difficult to communicate to the civil society. Another participant pointed out that it would be necessary for the SD community to develop quality criteria or preconditions for SD which should be integrated in an over-arching EU development strategy; this should ensure that SD issues are on an 'equal footing' with the Lisbon issues. Again another participant remarked that an over-arching strategy would offer the possibility to address the relationship between SD and growth: What kind of growth should be envisaged for the EU that is in line with SD objectives?

Afterwards, the participants discussed the **relationship between two separate strategies** in the future. One participant pointed out that regardless of the scenario, the main objective of the SD community should be that SD is properly represented – either in an over-arching EU development strategy or when there will be two parallel strategies. In case there will be one over-arching strategy, it would be important to ensure that SD is properly represented in this strategy and that the people involved know about SD issues. In case there will be two parallel strategies, it would be important to make sure that the future EU SDS does not get sidelined compared to the post-Lisbon Strategy. Another participant argued that the EU SDS has currently a weaker position because it is too broad and thus very difficult to communicate; the Lisbon Strategy is more specific with clearer targets and time-frames. Based on

his experience as national Lisbon and EU SDS coordinator, he argued that it is less important whether there will be one or two parallel strategies, but it is crucial to have clear objectives that can be communicated to all stakeholders. Moreover, it is important to establish a good visibility of a strategy and its objectives and organise inter-ministerial coordination at the national level. Several other participants mentioned that they believe efforts for enhanced policy integration as well as a better coordination of both strategies would improve implementation in the future. In this context, SD could be a helpful concept (or even tool) to address policy coordination on all political levels.


At the end of the plenary discussion, ***possible next steps and the involvement of the SD community*** in the debate of the future strategic development in the EU were discussed. Several workshop participants remarked that the Workshop Background and Discussion Paper could be further developed as an input for the further discussions on the future strategic development in the EU, e.g. focus on 3-4 aspects (or opportunities/threats) and how they should be addressed in the future. One participant argued that it is crucial for the SD community to outline what they have to offer and which answers the SD concept can provide to the current crisis. A closer cooperation between the SD community and the Lisbon community was regarded as beneficial for the future by the workshop participants.

Concluding discussion


At the beginning of the concluding discussion, Gerald Berger (ESDN Office) presented the ***first results of a questionnaire survey*** that was conducted by the ESDN Office in October/November 2008 about the national coordination process between the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS³. The questionnaire was sent out via email to SD coordinators of all 27 EU Member States. Until mid-November 2008, 14 filled in questionnaires, plus one email reply, were returned to the ESDN Office (54 % response rate). The results of the survey are shown in the graphs below:

³ A more elaborated presentation of the survey results can be found in the ESDN Quarterly Report of December 2008.

1) Responsibility for the EU SDS and its national implementation process in your country?⁴




2) Responsibility for the national Lisbon Strategy process (National Reform Programme) in your country?⁵




⁴ The numbers in brackets are the absolute figures; in some Member States, more than one ministry is responsible for the EU SDS and its national implementation.


⁵ Again, more than one ministry is responsible for the Lisbon Strategy process in some EU Member States.

3) Frequency of exchange between SD coordinator(s) and the national Lisbon Strategy/National Reform Programme coordinator(s) on issues related to the two strategies?




4) SD coordinators' degree of satisfaction of with...







5) Degree of inclusion of SD issues in the national Lisbon Strategy process/National Reform Programme?



6) Rating of issues listed below regarding their intensity in the national debate (rate from 1-5; 1 indicates 'very intensive', 2 'intensive', etc.):



7) Importance of the following issues for the post-2010 debate:



At the end of the workshop, several participants argued that a closer **cooperation between the Lisbon coordinators and the EU SDS coordinators**, both at the EU and Member States level, would be beneficial. One participant, who is also a national Lisbon coordinator, mentioned that the Member States' Lisbon coordinators are currently discussing the post-2010 strategy; they have not, however, discussed so far the issue of having one over-arching EU development strategy.

Elisabeth Freytag informed the participants that the ESDN plans to organise a small workshop after the next SDS Coordinators Group meeting in Brussels in order to provide a platform for informal exchange. She closed the workshop by announcing that the next ESDN Conference will take place in Prague on 17-19 June 2009. The Conference will also focus on the interface between the Lisbon Strategy and the EU SDS.

Annex I: List of participants

ESDN Workshop, "Post-2010: The Future of the EU SDS and its Interface with the Lisbon Process", Brussels, 19 November 2008

No	Name	Institution	Country
1	Ahbe, Martin	Secretariat-General, European Commission	Belgium
2	Berger, Gerald	ESDN Office	Austria
3	Bernaudeau, Stéphane	Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and Spatial Planning	France
4	Buffetaut, Stéphane	SD Observatory, EESC	France
5	Dewandre, Nicole	DG Research	Belgium
6	Freytag, Elisabeth	ESDN Co-chair, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management	Austria
7	Gouzée, Nadine	Federal Planning Bureau	Belgium
8	Hametner, Markus	ESDN Office	Austria
9	Hren, Marko	Government Office for Growth	Slovenia
10	Jansons, Martins	DG Environment	Belgium
11	Jensen, Nicole	Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and Spatial Planning	France
12	Kasemets, Keit	State Chancellery	Estonia
13	Kaukewitsch, Robert	SD Observatory, EESC	Belgium
14	Kavran, Viktoria	National Council for Sustainable Development	Hungary
15	Klidonas, Yorgos	Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Public Works	Greece
16	Klitgaard, Karin	Ministry of the Environment, Environmental Protection Agency	Denmark
17	Kohnen, Marguy	Ministry of Environment	Luxemburg
18	Korzinek, Annika	SD Observatory, EESC	Belgium
19	Kraemer, R. Andreas	Ecologic	Germany
20	Lessaer, Bartek	DG Employment, Social Policy and Equal Opportunities	Belgium
21	Lock, Graham	Eurostat	Luxemburg
22	Mayer-Ries, Jörg	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	Germany
23	Moerman, Koen	Federal Council for Sustainable Development	Belgium
24	Nedeljković, Ana	Project Manager of "Sustainable Development Strategy of the Republic of Serbia" project	Serbia
25	Nicotra, Antonella	Interministerial Committee for European Affairs	Italy
26	Niestroy, Ingeborg	European Environment and Sustainable Development Advisory Councils (EEAC)	Belgium
27	Nilsson, Anne-Cerise	Ministry of Environment	Sweden
28	Osborn, Derek	SD Observatory, EESC	UK
29	Pienkowski, Jerzy	DG Environment	Belgium
30	Scheller, Andrea	Eurostat	Luxemburg
31	Schneider, Patrick	Federal Foreign Office	Germany
32	Szczepińska, Agnieszka	Ministry of the Environment	Poland
33	Trattinig, Rita	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management	Austria
34	Vander Beke, Dieter	Federal Public Planning Service for Sustainable Development	Belgium
35	van Sandick, Onno	Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment	Netherlands
36	von Homeyer, Ingmar	Ecologic (Brussels Office)	Belgium
37	Zissopoulou, Smaro	Ministry of Economy and Finance	Greece