

COMPETITIVENESS ADVISORY GROUP

ENHANCING
EUROPEAN COMPETITIVENESS

Second Report to the President of the Commission,
the Prime Ministers
and Heads of State

Blank pages not reproduced: 2, 4, 10, and 18.

December 1995

The information contained in this publication does not necessarily reflect either the position or views of the European Commission.

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1995

ISBN 92-827-5449-9

© ECSC-EC-EAEC, Brussels • Luxembourg, 1995

Reproduction is authorized, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Germany

Competitiveness Advisory Group members

C. A. Ciampi, Chairman, former Prime Minister of Italy, former Governor of the Bank of Italy

Professor F. Maljers, Vice-Chairman, former Chairman of Unilever, Chairman of Philips Supervisory Board

P. Barnevik, President and Chief Executive Officer of ABB

D. Simon, Chairman of British Petroleum Company plc

J. Gandois, President of CNPF, former Chairman of P echiney, Cockerill-Sambre

C. Solchaga, former Minister for Finance of Spain

P. Cassells, General Secretary of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions

J. Ollila, President and Chief Executive Officer of Nokia Telecom

B. Breuel, Commissioner General of the World Exposition EXPO 2000

G. Sapountzoglou, Vice President and General Manager of Ionian and Popular Bank of Greece

W. Peirens, President of ACV, Membre du Comit e de Direction de la CES

K. Zwickel, President of IG Metall

Commission Permanent Representative: Professor Alexis Jacquemin, Chief Advisor

Carlo Azeglio Ciampi

Rome, 1 December 1995

Mr. President,

I am honoured to present the second Report of the Competitiveness Advisory Group established by the Commission on the recommendation of the Essen European Council.

The Report represents the joint efforts of all the members of the Group, although, as you are aware, Mrs. M-J. Rodrigues was obliged to resign in October on her appointment as Portuguese Minister of Employment.

The Group has chosen to continue along the course set in the first Report, maintaining a pragmatic approach in addressing problems, based on the professional experience of its members. Continuity in the approach stems from the belief of the existence of a close link between completion of the single market, strengthening firms' structures, primarily through the spread of technological innovation, and the systematic valorization of human resources.

The objective of enhancing competitiveness, and thereby improving the employment prospects and ensuring better well-being of Europe's people, is the thread joining the issues addressed in the first two Reports.

Sincerely yours

Carlo Ciampi

Mr Jacques SANTER
President
European Commission
Brussels

I. INTRODUCTION

The European economy is at a crossroads. Re-establishment of the links with Eastern Europe which were artificially severed for many decades, deepening of the European integration process, progressive opening of markets in the newly industrializing countries and the rapid pace of the information revolution all provide major opportunities for the resumption of sustained non-inflationary growth in the European economy. In turn, sustained economic growth is essential to allow Europe to tackle its long-standing unemployment problem. Exploiting this set of opportunities will however require a great deal of flexibility to adjust to a rapidly changing economic environment. Inability or unwillingness to respond in a flexible way to the new challenges could push European economic policies into a defensive posture.

In this context, as made clear in our first report, competitiveness should be seen as a basic means to raise the standard of living, provide jobs to the unemployed and eradicate poverty.

Europe is well equipped to face the challenges. It is essential, however, that European policy-makers make a devoted effort to overcome the obstacles that still exist to the completion of a truly unified market, to strengthen the European enterprise so as to enable it to face stronger competition abroad, to enhance human resources so as to promote flexibility in economic adjustment and ensure that the benefits of growth are evenly distributed. The second CAG report again addresses this set of issues, adopting an empirical approach, with a view to identifying areas where actions by policy-makers and economic agents alike have become imperative to restore the competitiveness of the European economy.

Completion of the internal market represents an absolute priority to enhance European competitiveness in the world economy. The first CAG report focused on three major issues:

- (i) the adoption of a European company statute,
- (ii) the acceleration of the trans-European networks,
- (iii) the enlargement of the European Union to Central and East-European countries.

Now we focus on the role of the State in the provision and the regulation of basic infrastructural facilities. Without a stronger and competitive basis in the fields of energy, public transport and telecommunications, the European economy will be at a disadvantage.

We look at the various experiences of restructuring and at the introduction of competitive pressures into the public utilities. While no single model of deregulation and privatization applies throughout Europe, this range of actions can help us to draw some useful general lessons. What matters most is not so much that the ownership – and management – of public utilities moves from the State to the private sector, as that competition is introduced and extended wherever possible. Where government budget constraints limit investment in much-needed infrastructural investment, privatization can provide sizeable benefits. The decision whether to privatize or not should be the sole discretion of the Member State concerned. As in all cases of deregulation, it must take account of the social impact in terms of unemployment, availability of basic services and the structure of prices.

The creation of an efficient transnational infrastructural network in Europe goes, however, beyond efficient national systems. It requires that real interoperability of infrastructures across Member States be carefully monitored.

We take this opportunity to reiterate that further progress on the way to the completion of the internal market requires that *European Monetary Union* be fully implemented as scheduled. Many of the benefits bestowed by an integrated internal market can materialize only with the introduction of the European currency, which *inter alia* will no longer expose intra-European trade to sudden gyrations in nominal exchange rates. The benefits of EMU for all participating countries, irrespective of the present condition of their currency, will in turn be greater, the higher the number of participating Member States.

There are still many hurdles on the path to EMU, that require further efforts to achieve economic convergence. Yet, the obstacles ahead

should not discourage us from taking decisive action towards realization of a European Union economically and politically integrated under clearly set institutional arrangements.

These ambitious targets, embedded in the Maastricht Treaty, are now within reach. Any delay or postponement could drive them further away, with the risk of losing them, as well as jeopardizing the work of decades, with the resurgence of the danger of nationalistic attitudes and demands.

In our first report, we emphasized that *small and medium-sized enterprises* (SME) are central to the European economy. Here, we focus on those smaller enterprises that have the capacity to add value and employment through innovation and the application of technical advances. To support this, we argue for a European technology foresight programme. We also identify the lack of access to both suitable forms of finance and advice to investors regarding technology as significant constraints to the growth of this type of enterprise. Finally, we recommend that all efforts be made to ensure that the regulatory climate, especially in the areas of innovation and technological advance, supports rather than discourages the start-up and growth of smaller enterprises. The establishment of a common European corporate statute to minimize the cost of doing business in different Member States, which we have advocated in our first report, must embrace legal forms of company statutes most suitable for small enterprises.

Achieving sustained economic growth while *preserving the environment* is a basic objective of EU policy. While the two objectives may create pressures in the short run, in the long run they are not incompatible goals. Well-designed policies and regulations, coordinated at a global level, can make them mutually reinforcing. The desire to enhance the quality of the environment can indeed create opportunities for improved competitiveness, new products, employment and trade.

It is, however, essential that the regulatory system does not impose an excessive burden on the economy. The costs of achieving environmental targets should normally be made explicit. The means to achieve these targets should not, however, be prescribed. Enterprises must have an incentive to develop innovative and cost-effective ways of meeting environmental objectives. Market-based instruments should be

used whenever possible, rather than quantitative regulations. We should strive to establish a single clear set of objectives applicable to enterprises throughout the Union.

In a constantly changing economic scenario, initial training will not generally be enough to allow individuals to cope with constant changes in job content or the need for mobility between occupations. In this report, we focus on stages of *education and training* beyond initial vocational training. In a learning society, adaptation should not be limited to the unemployed or to the entry of young people, but should involve a much greater proportion of the adult population. The information society must not result only in a limited number of 'islands of excellence' and in a new source of inequality between firms, regions and individuals.

We survey a number of practical experiences throughout Europe as pointers to what is already being done by companies, the social partners, educational institutions, in association with government.

There are strong links between the CAG's recommendations of SME innovation and competitiveness and its recommendations on human resources. Through effective communication of the insights of a European technology foresight programme combined with the work of knowledge resource centres, SMEs would be more able to appreciate the alternative scenarios likely to affect their businesses and the human resource implications of them.

As stated in the presentation of the 'Priorities of the Spanish Presidency in the Council of the European Union': 'in the next months, the basis of a Europe of the future will have been established'.

After decades of developments and progress, the decision in favour of a united Europe is reaching a critical juncture. We are close to the point of no return with the attribution to European institutions of key functions in significant areas of government. Awareness of the importance of the events before us explains many of the tensions, the doubts, the uncertainties, the delaying tactics – even the revival of nationalistic attitudes – which we are now facing. We may be witnessing the onset of the birth pangs of a new Europe. It is important to keep in mind the permanent and fundamental reasons which gave rise after the Second World War to the

design of a united Europe. Clear and credible messages and commitments on the part of European leaders will greatly ease uncertainty and boost resolve.

It is in that spirit that the second report of the CAG has adopted a still more pragmatic methodology. Following on from the first report's messages on the urgency of achieving the basic objective – reinforcing competitiveness in Europe – our analysis has led us to identify important issues and priorities:

- the reform of infrastructure services and the utilities sector,
- support of innovative SMEs,
- the company and environmental policy,
- redesigning and reinforcing education and training beyond basic levels.

All these topics are strongly related to the central concern of European people today, namely unemployment. Labour issues, already tackled in the first two reports above all in the context of training, will be at the core of the next report.

II. THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN THE PROVISION AND REGULATION OF BASIC INFRASTRUCTURES

In line with the first report presented at Cannes in June 1995, stressing the need to accelerate the implementation of the internal market, the CAG now focuses on 'the role of the State in provision and regulation of basic infrastructures', with particular reference to important public-sector reforms.

The approach involved analysis of interesting cases around Europe drawn from the energy, telecommunications and transport sectors in which the European Union has regulatory initiatives. Other sectors are also affected by the process of reform to varying degrees including, for example, aviation. A selection of regulators and operators were approached in Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the UK. We also looked at experiences from outside the EU, taking Poland as an example.

We look in this report at the various experiences of restructuring and the introduction of competitive pressures into the public utilities. While no single model of deregulation and privatization applies throughout Europe, we nonetheless rely on a range of examples of successes and failures to draw some useful general lessons.

It is significant that global surveys of decision-makers investing in the manufacturing and high-technology sectors confirm that **infrastructure quality is the single most important factor influencing multinational investment**. Ignoring the needs of these sectors will in time impact across the entire economy and reduce competitiveness.

The degree of State ownership in key sectors is significantly greater in Europe than in Japan and the USA. With rapidly growing demand for efficient and cost-effective transportation, power and telecommunications infrastructure, but markedly insufficient public funds to provide the massive investment required to keep abreast of technological advances, Europe's ability to maintain high-quality infrastructure is in question.

Percentage of sector that is State-owned, by region/country

	Telecommunications	Electricity	Gas	Rail	Air
EUR 12	85	75	50	90	75
Japan	33	0	0	25	0
USA	0	25	0	25	0

Source: OECD, 1989 (no more recent data is currently available).

We are unable at this stage to compare differences in public-sector reform between Europe and elsewhere, but there are some clear trends emerging in US telecommunications and Japanese energy deregulation. The US Congress is considering sweeping changes in the way communications are regulated. The Bill, when approved, would eliminate all legal and regulatory barriers to market entry that prevent local phone companies, long-distance carriers, cable TV operators and other producers of information products and services from competing in one another's business. In the electric power industry in Japan, the 'deregulation action programme', to be implemented in 1996, provides easy entry for new licences for wholesale power operators by setting up a bidding system for electricity procurement and allows third-party access to transmission lines.

As most of the public infrastructure sectors around Europe are undergoing important reforms, driven by a combination of political, financial, regulatory and competitive pressures, there are opportunities for the Member States to redefine their role as regulators and coordinators in the new 'operator environment'.

II.1. Challenges and issues in some European public-sector reforms

Rail

Rail reform has been driven by continuing severe competition from air and road transport, traditionally large debt loads, public demands for the State to continue to provide basic services even if unprofitable, socially determined man-

ning levels and, in contrast, a growing recognition of rail's environmental advantages and technological advances in equipment and systems.

Over the past few years, three main trends have emerged in Europe:

- (i) the target is to improve economic performance in State-owned railway companies,
- (ii) separation or 'unbundling' of infrastructure from commercial operations, with a view to making profitability target-setting easier and to introduce greater competition,
- (iii) public/private partnerships to finance high-speed railway programmes.

In Germany, the integration of the Deutsche Bundesbahn and the former DDR Deutsche Reichsbahn will lead to a new structure called DB AG Holding. This will control four separate companies: short-distance passenger transportation, long-distance passenger transportation, freight operations and infrastructure.

Sweden began the unbundling of the Swedish State railway in 1993. By the end of 1995, the government plans to introduce a project to deregulate Swedish freight transport (to be approved by Parliament).

Spain introduced in 1995 a law in Parliament which would terminate the monopoly of the State railway RENFE. This would retain management of the infrastructure but open commercial operations to competition.

Italy has given a 50-year concession to TAV, a public/private company 40% owned by the State railways and 60% by banks, to design, build and operate a high-speed Italian network on a turn-key basis.

Poland's State railway is to be transformed by December 1996 into a State-owned public company controlling several independent profit centres (freight transport will be fully open to competition).

Energy

As with rail, there is no uniform model of energy reform around Europe. But several moves to liberalize the sector in certain countries may be summarized as follows:

- (i) opening up provision of new capacity to private independent power producers (IPPs),
- (ii) creation of independent energy sector regulatory bodies.

The UK 1989 Electricity Act pioneered electricity privatization in Europe. As a result of the reform, the two main players, National Power and Powergen, have seen their combined share of the power generation market fall from 78 to 55%. Electricity tariffs have dropped sharply. The utilities have improved their financial performance (stock market capitalization has more than doubled). Investment in more efficient, less polluting, generating capacity is strong with new entrants in the sector.

Italy approved a law in 1995 establishing the electricity regulatory authority. Government intention and Parliamentary resolution indicate that State-owned ENEL would accomplish a separation of the three functions (generation, transmission and distribution) in the future. Electricity production will be open to new entrants with a system of competitive bidding whose rules are still to be determined. ENEL should be partly privatized, possibly in 1996.

Sweden presented to Parliament a law in 1995 to deregulate the energy sector. The aim is to make electricity production more efficient and, through this, to increase the competitiveness of Swedish industry as a whole.

Spain approved a law in 1994 which allows both the award of provision of new generating capacity by competitive bidding and third-party access to the grid.

Telecommunications

This is a strategic area of considerable European Union interest, as the 1994/95 Green Papers testify. Timetables for sector reform are being agreed and progress continues, though the pace differs markedly between the Member States. In the EU, only the UK, Sweden and Finland have highly liberalized telecommunications sectors.

The following trends have been noted:

- (i) technology and deregulation are profoundly changing the telecommunications industry,
- (ii) privatization in the mobile phone sector is well under way,
- (iii) Europe-wide liberalization of voice telephony is scheduled for 1 January 1998.

Germany plans partially to privatize Deutsche Telekom, the world's third-largest operator, by an increase of capital to be placed in the stock market next year. In addition, four major commercial partnerships, plus smaller regional operators, are likely to enter the sector in the run-up to privatization.

The UK introduced a new competitor (Mercury) to British Telecom in 1982 and embarked on a

duopoly policy in which, however, BT has remained the dominant player. In 1990-91, the policy was revised to allow new competition and greater diversity of supply. Cable TV operators are already allowed to provide telecommunications services – an indication of the likely fusion of telecommunications and television.

Spain introduced a second operator, Airtel, in the mobile phone sector in 1995. After some initial resistance, deregulation has now gathered pace. The elimination of the Telefonica monopoly of basic telephone services by 1998 is well ahead of the European Commission's extended deadline for Spain of 2003.

More than some other key sectors, such as power and transport, the telecommunications industry is already driven by rapid technological, customer and regulatory changes that have forced competition onto State-owned enterprises. Member States and the European Commission are confronted with defining a new role for the State as regulator, while the positive effects of deregulation, such as increased demand in new telecommunications services and reduced pricing, are becoming ever more significant.

The rail, energy and telecommunications sectors are being reformed throughout Europe, albeit at various speeds, and under strong EU deregulatory pressures. The countries and sectors surveyed work with a broad range of reform models, from State monopoly restructuring and controlled deregulation, at the national level, to pan-European deregulation and full privatization. The importance of an emerging internal market in all sectors, though especially in telecommunications, is already evident.

The major challenges of such public-sector reforms can best be summarized as follows.

Before	After
monopoly	competition
State-owned	different types of share ownership
cost plus	price determined
engineering-led	market-led
centrally-planned	unbundling-decentralized
closed to new entrants	open to new entrants
national provision	international orientation

One common feature of public-sector reforms in most European countries and in all sectors examined so far is the attempt to introduce greater competition whenever possible. This is being achieved by unbundling infrastructures (where, typically, little competition is possible) from commercial operations (where competitive forces are more pervasive), and by opening

the markets to new operators. What matters most is not so much that the ownership – and management – of public utilities moves from the State to the private sector, as that competition is introduced and extended wherever possible. Where government budget constraints limit investment in much-needed infrastructural investment, privatization can provide sizeable benefits. However, the decision whether to privatize or not should be at the sole discretion of the Member State concerned and always depends on local provisions and environment. It must take account, as in all cases of deregulation, of the social impact in terms of unemployment, availability of basic services and the structure of prices.

In this context, the role of the State is that of a regulator as more competition is introduced into the sector.

II.2. Lessons from public-sector reforms

The public sector in Europe is facing a double challenge: budget cuts from cash-strapped governments and increasing competition in the enlarged European and global market-place. Public-sector reforms vary greatly from country to country in Europe as a reflection of diverse political, financial, economic and social requirements. No single deregulation or privatization model applies throughout Europe. Financial, legal and technical issues often shape or delay political decision-making. In particular, the strength and health of national financial markets can be crucial both for the success of privatization and for capital increases. Concern over security of supply aspects to justify continued national ownership remains in several countries, especially some smaller ones, though not in all.

Introducing competitive forces in the sector of public utilities has proved to be a win-win situation for the State (positive impact on the public borrowing requirement), for industry (utilities which are more responsive to its needs) and for the consumer (competitive pricing and service, greater choice). In some cases, problems have arisen, such as public shares being sold at too low a price, widening of earning distribution within the company, pricing differentials between large and small (industry versus private) customers, assuring universal service provision and underestimating the direct impact on employment. The CAG believes that these concerns, important though they may be in the short term, must not overshadow the medium to long-term structural advantages stemming

from increased efficiency, stimulation to investment, the boost to technological innovation, job gains in ancillary activities and greater responsiveness to customer needs.

The utilities sector has a social dimension, but concern in this area should centre on the provision of universal service – irrespective of geographical location or of a customer's attractiveness to the operator. Despite initial negative reactions, where there has been full consultation and involvement of social partners, some positive public-sector reforms have been achieved. There have been substantial layoffs in most sectors, but new jobs are being created for some operational and ancillary activities arising from deregulation, such as new servicing activities in the rail and telecommunications sectors.

The reforms have also led to substantial improvements in environmental performance.

This is especially true of the energy sector, with the influx of new investment in cleaner and more cost-efficient power plants. Rejuvenation of the rail industry may also have significant environmental benefits. Furthermore, competitively priced telecommunications services reduces the need for commuting and business travel and raises the quality of life of the disadvantaged and those living in decentralized locations.

II.3. The continuing process of change

The role of the State in the public sector that is now emerging looks radically different from what we have been used to. Member States should now optimize their role as regulator and coordinator to increase competition and the supply of cost-effective and high-quality public services becoming in a very real sense a 'regulator of deregulation', bringing an orderly process to the dynamic of the market. In their improved role as regulator, the Member States can also act as important facilitators to create new markets and services. These, in turn, will require both retrained and new labour skills.

Deregulation and privatization – adapted to the specific needs of public sectors – must be matched by a simpler, more transparent regulatory framework. Indeed, recent surveys confirm that the volume, complexity and cost of regulation (especially at the national level) still represents a major obstacle to competitiveness in key public sectors.

The degree of regulatory involvement and enforcement at national and pan-European level

must be carefully defined. Excessive proliferation of national regulatory agencies should be avoided. With the Commission clearly setting minimum levels of deregulation, there should be no major differences in regulatory enforcement at the national level which could prevent establishing a level playing-field in Europe. This embraces the whole area from technical standards to public procurement, from environmental regulation to the unbundling of infrastructure and operational activities, from the injection of competition and customer choice to the achievement of the internal market.

Deregulation at a national level may not be sufficient for the creation of a truly pan-European market. Operators in one Member State must be put in the condition to operate in another Member State. Without interoperability, European markets will remain segmented and the functioning of the internal market will be hampered. It is essential therefore that the regulatory framework and the choice of standards in the telecommunications, energy and transport sectors be designed to promote effective integration of national markets across Europe.

In order to stimulate this process of change, the CAG recommends the following policy actions:

1. While Member States have played an important role in their choices of public sector reform and privatization, the Commission should further enforce a common policy to introduce competitive pressures in public utilities services, taking into account effects on minimal universal service, prices and employment.
2. There is also a need to harmonize and, where appropriate, reduce regulatory barriers which prevent the completion of the internal market.
3. The Commission should stimulate the exchange of best practice by monitoring and publicizing on an annual basis a benchmark report on the best public-sector reform practices and competitiveness improvements achieved in the European Union as compared with the USA and Japan.
4. As stated in the White Paper on growth, competitiveness and employment, the enforcement of pan-European competition as the only way to global competitiveness is the joint responsibility of the Commission and Member States, who must act in close cooperation.

III. SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES, INNOVATION AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The June meeting of the European Council in Cannes emphasized that 'small and medium-sized enterprises play a decisive role in job creation and act as a factor of social stability and economic drive'. This importance is confirmed by the available data. Two thirds of all European employment is provided by companies with less than 250 employees. The proportion has grown by more than 10% over the last decade as employment in larger firms has declined.

Recent growth, however, does not imply that all is well. Many new small firms are the product of outsourcing of activity by larger enterprises rather than of innovation. Since the health and vitality of small enterprises are central to the European economy, policies to support their development should be at the heart of proposals to enhance European employment and competitiveness.

Smaller enterprises do not comprise a homogeneous group. Generalized policies will therefore be inappropriate. **Our focus has been on those enterprises which have the capacity to add value and employment through innovation and the application of technical advances in response to current or developing market requirements and social needs.** By innovation, we mean any improvement or invention – in products or processes – which is successfully introduced to the market. In our concept, whenever we discuss innovative SMEs, we envisage companies active in any sector of the economy, including distribution, tourism and the services. No less than industrial companies, through the introduction of technological innovation, these can make a strong contribution both to competitiveness and to employment.

Innovation, whether introduced by large or small companies, springs from research. The 1994 European Report on Science and Technology Indicators states 'The EU appears to benefit from a highly productive and internationally well-performing scientific base, with roughly comparable efficiency levels to those of the US:

Per capita public and private expenditure on research and development is generally lower in European countries than in its main competitors. The CAG cannot here discuss the critical role of research in the economic system. In Europe today, **the main challenge is the ability to ensure that the results of successful research are translated into marketable innovation.** Tracking the number of patents issued against R&D expenditure, the same report argues that Europe's 'technological output propensity, though only marginally below that of the US and Japan in 1981, appears to have decreased steadily over the 1980s and 1990s and is now only half the US and Japanese level!'

The CAG does not believe that government can create entrepreneurs. We do, however, believe that at both the national and the European level, public policy can be designed in ways which favour the commercial application of research and which support the creation and development of new and existing small enterprises. We thus identify three areas – research infrastructure, finance and regulation – in which developments in policy at the European level could be of material benefit. All three will have a positive impact across the whole productive system, but in particular on small enterprises.

III.1. Research infrastructure

The primary task is to establish and maintain the necessary networks linking research, entrepreneurs and the financial community.

A number of larger enterprises have demonstrated the ability to widen their own access to academic work and to the innovative activities of smaller companies by creating advisory boards comprising external specialists. Efforts to achieve greater linkage have taken place in every Member State, and at EU level. Throughout Europe, investment is being made to increase flows of information between the research community and entrepreneurs, including the

network of information centres (EICs) which have been established to disseminate information to SMEs on EU legislation, programmes and opportunities and to assist businesses on participation in EU and cross-border activities. Though there is not a single universally applicable model, the importance of the linkage merits thorough analysis by the European Commission to benchmark past experience in Europe and elsewhere in order to identify best practice.

The appropriate role for the State in this process is that of facilitator. Prime examples are the technology foresight programmes – developed initially in Japan, but recently introduced in Germany and the UK. Technology foresight programmes have been used successfully to identify research priorities reflecting the opportunities provided by technological progress and the needs of industry (and of society as a whole). They have also successfully demonstrated the considerable potential which exists for interdisciplinary research.

We recommend that this approach also be adopted at the Union level with the establishment of a European technology foresight programme which we believe would help to improve coordination between work at both national and EU levels, combining efforts and reducing the risk of duplication. A European technology foresight programme would build on the work already done by the Institute for Prospective Technological Studies.

III.2. Finance

Access to finance remains an obstacle to many actual and potential entrepreneurs who wish to establish or develop a business through innovation. In the first CAG report we endorsed proposals to create a European equivalent of the American Nasdaq stock market, which provides capital to new and expanding small businesses.

An independent study shows that 4 000 companies listed on the Nasdaq market, which represent only a tiny fraction of the 10 million American companies, had created almost 16%, or 500 000, of the new jobs generated in the American economy between January 1990 and June 1994. Over the same period, America's largest firms – as listed in the Fortune 500 – eliminated some 850 000 jobs.

But replication of the Nasdaq experience in Europe will not be enough. Many small enterprises require access to finance, including venture and seed capital, during the earliest phases

of an innovative development. Experience particularly from the United States suggests that one important factor in creating a climate conducive to investment and innovation is the availability of a reliable assessment process which can reduce the perceived risk of novel ideas and products to individual and corporate investors.

An initiative by Dutch and Flemish institutions has led to the creation of the Technology Rating Project Group. The idea is simple, namely to provide full assessment of an innovation project and report the findings to all parties involved (market, management, banks). The approach is being tested on 25 pilot projects. Initial experience with the scheme shows that it can overcome reluctance on the part of financial institutions to fund a project, particularly when such institutions are unable to evaluate on their own the technological and economic soundness of the project.

The Union has a key role to play in facilitating the efficient operation of the capital market by fostering the emergence of independent and objective sources of advice to help investors screen new projects which can also, through acting as mentor, strengthen the links between existing entrepreneurs and potential sources of finance.

There is also scope for better deployment of public funds to support innovative commercialization of European successes in research. The use of a larger proportion of the EU's Structural Funds to promote innovative small businesses, particularly in the less-developed areas of Europe, would be beneficial. We believe that involvement of industry – including representatives of existing, successful small businesses and of labour – should be the norm for all research funding with potential commercial application. A greater element of competition in the funding process would strengthen links between the business and research communities.

III.3. Regulation

In addition to issues of infrastructure and finance, government at all levels has a responsibility to ensure that the regulatory climate supports innovation and the establishment and development of smaller companies. Inappropriate regulation – particularly regulation involving complex and time-consuming administrative and legal procedures and especially at the national level – has been cited as a discouragement to the application of innovation. Equally, patchy enforcement of regulation across Europe can become an obstacle. Smaller enterprises in particular can be faced with high fixed costs.

undue complexity – particularly given the lack of coordination of regulatory requirements imposed by local, national and European authorities – and by delays which, in highly competitive sectors, can make the crucial difference between success and failure.

A recent study of the administrative cost burden facing enterprises of different sizes in The Netherlands has demonstrated the extent to which smaller enterprises are disadvantaged.

The average costs of the administrative burden in The Netherlands 1993 (in ECU)

Number of employees	Costs per enterprise	Costs per employee
1-9	12 100	3 500
10-19	20 500	1 500
20-49	47 100	1 400
50-99	62 000	900
100 or more	171 000	600

Source: EIM 1994.

A clear regulatory framework setting straightforward and enduring goals is an essential precondition for the development of an innovative and competitive European economy as well as for the achievement of high standards. Regulations which vary from one country to another impose costs and discourage intra-Union trade and investment.

In all cases, regulations should only be enacted once it is clear that the benefits – including the social and environmental benefits – exceed the costs on the basis of clearly under-

stood and widely-accepted definitions of the impacts being measured.

The EU and Member States have a responsibility to ensure that all procedures – particularly those which affect innovation – operate with the maximum possible efficiency while respecting the need for a soundly-based assessment of social and environmental impact. The need for simplicity and clarity extends to company law. In our first report, we stressed the value of establishing a common European corporate statute. **This approach should embrace legal forms of company statutes most suitable for small enterprises.** Commission initiatives, such as the statute for European association and the statute for a European cooperative society, go in this direction.

Appropriate and well-designed regulation can be a highly positive force, stimulating innovation and helping small enterprises to thrive and grow, opening sectors of the market closed by monopolies and by national barriers. Regulation can also assist small businesses by fulfilling past commitments to ensure that public procurement is fully open. Procurement at government level accounts for at least 15% of gross European product but, according to a recent study, no more than 2% of public-sector contracts are awarded internationally. **A concerted approach to the removal of all barriers to cross-border trade and investment within the Union should be central to the Commission's policy in support of smaller enterprises and their internationalization.**

IV. THE COMPANY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

In this chapter, the CAG limits itself to analysing environmental policy in the context of the company, competitiveness and the functioning of the internal market.

Innovation combined with effective regulation is also the main key to the simultaneous achievement of two of Europe's prime objectives – protecting the natural environment and improving the competitiveness of European business in order to secure living standards and employment. Although the two objectives create pressures and potential conflicts, we do not believe that they are incompatible goals.

Two examples demonstrate what can be achieved. In the first, a cooperative approach involving the regulatory authorities, the car industry and oil suppliers is achieving a progressive reduction in vehicle emissions with the goal of meeting air-quality targets based on guidelines set by the World Health Organization. In the second, cooperative action helped in the process of eliminating refrigerator cooling agents suspected of damaging the ozone layer. The encouragement through regulation of alternative technologies has given some European companies an advantage over US competitors who have faced a rigid regulatory framework which has not permitted the development of the most cost-effective solutions.

In some areas, however, inappropriate or ill-designed regulation has damaged competitiveness and employment, while achieving little or nothing in terms of environmental protection. In other areas, weak regulation can increase rather than decrease waste, and can raise the long-term costs of environmental protection. If regulation is focused too narrowly, it can fail to correct weakness in pricing structures which do not always reflect the cost of resource depletion and can impose undue costs relative to the benefit.

To achieve environmental protection in a least-cost way, the CAG believes that market-based instruments should be used whenever possible, rather than quantitative regulations. The latter can be most effective when well-proven health hazards are at issue, or when only a limited number of companies is involved. In general, however, quantitative regulation cannot guarantee that the marginal cost of pollution abatement will be equalized across uses and firms. A typical case is the relative cost of a further unit of reduction of pollution at a well-run plant

within the EU compared to the much smaller sum required to achieve the same improvement in an out-dated plant in the neighbouring Central or Eastern Europe. Quantitative regulation can therefore lead to wide disparities in the costs of emission reduction, depending on the starting point of improvement.

Compatibility of the objectives of competitiveness and a clean and secure environment rests on the quality of the regulatory process. To be successful, that process must be based on a high-quality dialogue, underpinned by sound expert advice and up-to-date scientific evidence that need not compromise the independence of environmental policy-making from the interests of industry and of labour.

We believe that the optimal regulatory process is one in which:

- (a) the development of the regulatory framework is open with full participation from all parties;
- (b) regulation is framed in terms of goals, which should be precise, scientifically valid and clearly understood by all parties;
- (c) the costs of achieving such goals – in terms of their impact on competitiveness and employment – is made clear before regulation is enacted, as is the way in which any such costs are to be met;
- (d) the goals are set, but the means of achieving those goals are normally not prescribed – creating the incentive for enterprises to develop innovative and cost effective ways of meeting the objectives, for instance through the application of technical advance;
- (e) whenever possible, pricing instruments (such as taxes or incentives, tradable permits, etc.), should be used, rather than quantitative regulations.

The presence of multiple regulatory systems operating within the EU imposes further costs. A simplification of the regulatory structure to establish a single clear set of objectives applicable to enterprises throughout the Union would be highly beneficial. Pan-European, rather

than national, regulations should play a greater role in the environmental field. In many cases, environmental protection cannot be tackled in an effective way at a national level. First, there are obvious externalities in pollution abatement across Member States. Reduction in trans-boundary pollution originating in one country would also benefit others. Second, the functioning of the Union's internal market must not be constrained by national environmental policies.

Given a sound regulatory system, the desire to enhance the quality of the environment can also create opportunities for improved competitiveness, new products, employment and trade. In the words of a recent study 'properly-designed environmental standards can trigger innovations that lower the total cost of a product or improve its value'.

A good example of the potential which exists is energy conservation. It has been estimated that a potential market worth some ECU 430 billion

exists within Europe for measures to reduce energy waste. The effective application of existing measures to improve all round energy efficiency in process plant and buildings could create up to 3.4 million man-years of work over the next decade. By cutting down waste and by using energy efficiently, additional wealth can be created while burning less fuel, with less damage to the environment.

Growing international concern about environmental issues can provide opportunities for European firms which have identified commercial ways of meeting those concerns. Incorporating environmental objectives into the design of products and processes is already a valid marketing strategy. The scope in this area is considerable, but it is as yet little understood across the European Union. The commercial potential arising from the need to manage environmental issues would be a legitimate focus for a European technology foresight programme designed to stimulate interest and the development of applicable research.

V. THE MEANING OF THE LEARNING SOCIETY

Basic training is essential in preparing individuals for life in a democratic society and to endow them with general skills and the capacity to adapt flexibly to a changing environment. It cannot be disassociated from the needs of the economy. Well-designed apprenticeship schemes can ease the integration of young people into the labour-market and provide a sizeable contribution to lowering youth unemployment. In its first report, the Group emphasized that early education is only one component in the accumulation of human resources, which should be seen as a continuing process throughout an individual's life.

The notion of what is in effect a 'learning society' has been debated in education, training and business circles for some time. The CAG is convinced that the creation of a learning society will be good for competitiveness. Therefore we have chosen to focus in this second report on stages of education and training beyond initial vocational transition, especially on the approach to continuing development of the individual.

Occupational structures are changing so rapidly as to demand more career flexibility, adjusting to transformation in job content in existing occupations or mobility between occupations. Restricting adaptation to the unemployed or to the entry of young people trained to modern requirements is not enough. Effective adaptation must increasingly involve much greater proportions of the adult population. This means that the learning process will need to:

- (i) continue further beyond the phase of education and training for entry to an occupation;
- (ii) involve a broader group of people.
- (iii) encompass a wider set of learning situations.

Undoubtedly, the rise in skill and knowledge intensity is most apparent in those areas of the market economy which are subject to the fiercest combination of technological change and international competition. But **successful economies cannot be built on these 'islands of excellence'**.

From both economic analysis and practical experience, we know that both companies and individuals investing in qualifications face several market insufficiencies. For example, there is a lack of information about the future demand for skills and qualifications. It is difficult for enterprises to determine what are the appropriate levels for their education and training programmes; for this reason, some companies opt for a minimum effort. Uncertainty in product markets strengthens this tendency. Companies can then be under pressure to compete for workers trained by other companies rather than organize training schemes themselves. This is also true for SMEs, which moreover have practical difficulties in releasing staff for training. Overall, therefore, if left to market forces, only a weak version of the learning society is likely to result. Learning organizations will not materialize in sufficient numbers.

To remedy this deficiency, the CAG believes that a combination of 'cluster-building' and coordination is required:

Cluster-building: groups of firms which are supplying goods and services to each other, or simply share the same regional economic base, can try to coordinate their efforts in education and training. Governments can stimulate such cooperative behaviour:

More coordination by government, with an assumption of responsibility on the part of the social partners: this can take the form of regulations which underpin the training efforts of those firms that are already highly active by requiring the same effort from other organizations; it can also involve installing follow-up mechanisms, for example, at a sectorial level, which seek to provide better information by which firms can aim for and attain appropriate levels and patterns of training.

V.1. Innovators in the learning society

In examining numerous examples of innovative behaviour, the CAG has been struck by the extent of new thinking, experimentation and the

gradual accumulation of real experience in Europe. It notes especially the national initiatives to empower individuals to develop the range of opportunities open to them and to pursue their independent career objectives, including distance-learning developments which encompass 'open universities' and 'open colleges'. This requires **qualification systems which facilitate flexibility while maintaining quality**; modularity, credit transfer and external transparency of assessment standards are needed in order to achieve these goals.

Key to the development of the learning society are the efforts of educational institutions, but also of corporate management and the social partners, working together. Just three examples of action are described here.

- (i) Educational institutions and companies collaborating to combine both technology transfer and professional training at a high level:

University-enterprise training partnerships (UETPs)

UETPs aim to promote technology transfer and training, sometimes on a regional basis, sometimes on a sectorial basis. In one region in Spain undergoing major industrial restructuring and experiencing mass unemployment, a UETP has been established between seven universities, 10 enterprises and 18 professional associations. By reaping the economies of scale through collaboration, this has helped to redeploy through training and retraining many of those lacking the skills which are essential for the new jobs being created. This approach contributes to both economic and social regeneration. It not only encourages existing producers to invest in modern production methods and organizational designs, but also attracts new producers to the region by making them more confident of finding the necessary skills.

- (ii) Companies which take very long-term views of the need to enhance the learning capacities of their employees and have reached agreements with employees, trade unions, colleges and universities over the contributions which all should make to the arrangements:

Employee development schemes

These schemes have emerged in a number of Member States and sectors with particular take-up in manufacturing. One example serves to emphasize the key features:

One UK company aimed to promote better relations with its workforce and the active involve-

ment of the trade unions was seen as a key element. The original intention was to provide opportunities for personal development and training for all employees. Later this was extended to include the pursuit of healthier lifestyles and career development. Each employee may receive a grant of ECU 250 per year towards the cost of courses which have to be undertaken voluntarily, outside working hours and treated separately from any job-related training in progress.

Initial predictions that about 5% of employees would apply were well exceeded by the third of employees who did so in the first six months of the scheme. Subsequently, this level of commitment has increased – virtually half of the workforce is now involved every year. Such a scheme extends the idea of continuing learning to a wider group of employees than might usually be involved regularly in it for vocational reasons. A capacity for learning cannot be turned on and off at the convenience of the organization. It must be developed and maintained.

- (iii) Government and/or social partners agreeing to fund special training efforts for the long-term unemployed, low-skilled and other groups which are vulnerable to social exclusion. These 'outsiders' will not otherwise benefit from improvements which are made for the 'insiders', i.e. those who are in employment. An example of this would be to devote a percentage of the wage bill to this end. Such schemes establish a direct sense of responsibility, an element of solidarity, between employees who are in strong positions in the labour-market, and those who are not:

Social cohesion and the learning society

In Belgium, by agreement between the social partners and the government, 0.25% of the wage bill of the private sector is devoted to the training and integration of risk groups. Collective agreements have to be concluded by sectors and enterprises which provide for training of:

- the long-term unemployed,
- young people studying half-time and working half-time,
- unemployed people with schooling limited to the lower secondary level, and
- older employees facing dismissal from the sectors and enterprises which are, themselves, running the initiatives.

These innovations will depend for their success on much more rigorous monitoring and evaluation than is currently the experience in Europe. Costs incurred by social partners and other groups involved in the development of the system need to be properly covered, recognizing their investment on behalf of the respective sectors and of society as a whole.

V.2. Knowledge resource centres

A much wider take-up of best practice must be encouraged. The CAG welcomes new EU programmes, centred on Leonardo covering vocational training. It supports the Commission's proposal to report regularly on the European vocational training situation. The CAG stresses the importance of the Commission developing its evaluation role so as to be able to disseminate both best practice and promising innovations on the basis of thorough analysis. In our first report, we proposed a pilot scheme of knowledge resource centres (KRCs). We now try to go further:

The function of the KRC is to ease access to professional judgment about the knowledge which it may become increasingly important to possess, the alternative ways of acquiring it, and the relative merits of the different routes to doing so. **The KRC is not just another advertising medium or a database: it will deal particularly with material which has been subjected also to qualitative analysis of some kind.**

KRCs need to acquire and update knowledge about developments in the labour-market, their impacts upon the industrial-occupational structure, the relationships between different occupations and the evolving job content associated with them. Contributions to this are already made both by the EU employment observatories and by independent research organizations.

KRCs must play a dual role: that of providing information about what learning technologies and opportunities are available and that of providing information about how good they are.

Moreover, it is here that the value of adopting a European-wide approach to ensure the diffusion of best practice can best be seen. To achieve real benefit, the special importance of strict monitoring of quality to pan-European standards must be recognized.

The KRC approach

The objective of the KRC is to be a 'facilitator between information supply and demand'. This means that it needs to take an evaluative approach to its role. As a broker in the market for information, it should help consumers judge the quality and relevance of a learning technology, a curriculum design, a mode of delivery (i.e. teaching/training). New qualification and training systems may introduce new barriers for disadvantaged groups; by promoting greater transparency, KRCs should help to avoid this. To play this important role, KRCs will themselves need to adopt the highest standards of operation and staff development.

The CAG proposes that the pilot schemes advocated in its first report be funded, in the first instance by the European Commission, and be focused on particular educational and vocational areas. The schemes should give special emphasis to achieving transparency and accessibility, so as to avoid turning the information society into a new source of inequality between firms, regions and individuals.

European Commission

Enhancing European competitiveness – Second Report to the President of the Commission, the Prime Ministers and Heads of State – December 1995

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

1995 – 23 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

ISBN 92-827-5449-9

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg: ECU 7