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Beweging vzw, Belgium: Michel Debruyne, Sofie Put, Patrick Feltesse
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CNCA, Italy: Cinzia Brentari, Mauro Giacosa
European Commission: Petri Backman, Yuri Borgmann-Prebil
Humboldt University, Germany: Francesco Laruffa

Agenda

Monday, March 16th 2015

09.30 – 10.00 | Introduction based on life narratives
Michel Debruyne

10.00 – 11.00 | Getting to know each other: from life narratives to work narratives
Participative workshop moderated by Ortrud Lessmann

11.30 – 12.30 | General Assembly of RE-InVEST

14.00 – 15.00 | Information session by the European Commission
Yuri Borgmann-Prebil: the policy context for RE-InVEST
Petri Backman: project implementation in H2020
Questions and Answers by the RE-InVEST partners

15.00 – 15.45 | Investing in a common language for RE-InVEST
Equality, capability and human rights - Introduction by Tania Burchardt

16.00 – 17.00 | 3 brainstorm workshops on the meaning and development of Human Rights

17.00 – 18.00 | Constructing a common CA-language
3 workshops moderated by a CA-expert

Tuesday, March 17th 2015

09.00 – 10.00 | Investing in a common language. Bridging the CA and macro-economics
Robert Salais

10.00 – 11.00 | Socialise our knowledge on WP7
Collective reading session

11.15 – 12.30 | Debate: The issue of privatization and deregulation - linking WP6 with WP7
Mahmood Messkoub and Jeremy Leaman

13.30 – 15.30 | Parallel sessions on:
- WP2 and 3 (Ides Nicaise and Mary Murphy): NUIM, KU Leuven, EAPN Portugal, Poverty Alliance, TU Delft, SOFI, IFZ, Liverpool Hope, RSU, TON, Beweging, IRD, OSE
- WP7 (Robert Salais and Jeremy Leaman): CNRS, Loughborough University, UCL, Beweging, EUR
- WP4 (Jean-Michel Bonvin): UNIGE, KU Leuven, IFZ, IRD, UCL, Beweging

15.30 – 16.00 | Plenary reporting on the different parallel sessions

16.30 – 18.00 | Dissemination, communication and impact- introduction to WP8 and the first policy paper
Exercise on the Juncker investment plan

Wednesday, March 18th 2015

09.00 – 09.40 | ‘ALMP’s and capabilities’. Introduction of the CAPRIGHT results on labour market
Jean-Michel Bonvin

09.40 – 10.15 | Capability as a yardstick for ALMP’s – reflections on WP5
René Lehwess-Litzmann

10.15 – 11.00 | Investing in a common language on ALMP’s and capabilities
Reactions of Ides Nicaise and discussion

11.30 – 12.15 | Conclusions of the kick-off: the roadmap till the September Maynooth workshop
Minutes

Day 1 - Monday, March 16th 2015

Introduction based on life narratives

Speaker: Ortrud Lessmann

Ortrud Lessmann leads an ice-breaker activity by identifying foreign languages spoken by the participants.

Speaker: Michel Debruyne – Beweging vzw

Michel Debruyne welcomes the participants and describes the agenda for the first day. He then introduces a short video project “Life Narratives” by a Greek photographer and artist, Nikos Markou. The project combines portraits and short interviews of people in present-day Greece and their reflections on hardships encountered in their lives, such as hunger, poverty, war, homelessness, unemployment, age discrimination, and xenophobia. The film finishes with the sense of hope brought by a new day.

Getting to know each other: from life narratives to work narratives - participative workshop

Moderator: Ortrud Lessmann

Participants are divided into five groups with each group containing a representative of an organization experienced working with vulnerable people. The objective of the activity is to share work narratives and experiences from different countries. Group 4 discusses organizational history and activities of the EAPN Portugal. The EAPN started in 2008 in different regions with the goal of capacity building. The mandate of EAPN is multidimensional serving heterogeneous groups of populations, including low qualified workers, single mothers, and homeless. In addition, group 4 discusses the issue of stigma, youth unemployment, and migration in Portugal.

Cinzia Brentari leads the conversation in Group 5 and shares her experience as part of the CNCA. The CNCA is a national coalition of care centres with the main seat in Rome. It is comprised of about 250 different charities and organizations. These centres deal with a variety of problems including housing, family issues, alcoholism, prisons, migration drug abuse. One of the key objectives includes political interaction with the government to “give voice” to people and contribute to social policy development. Group 5 focuses on the issue of homelessness in Italy and its connection with migration, stigma, prisons, drug abuse, and negative experiences living on the streets (no public toilets, constant noise, lack of security).

Ortrud Lessmann concludes the activity by reflecting on work narratives from different countries discussed in all five groups.

General Assembly of RE-InVEST

Speaker: Ides Nicaise – KU Leuven

Presentation:

Ides Nicaise, HIVA-KU Leuven, summarises the agenda and objectives for this meeting. On the agenda: final consortium agreement, composition of the Management Board, Advisory Board, AOB.

Consortium agreement

Ides goes more deeply into the last changes that have been made to the CA since the preparatory workshop:
- section 4: addition of deontological code RESPECT (Annex 6) + ethical principles for participatory action research;
- section 6:
  - further clarification of the responsibilities of the general co-ordinator and network co-ordinator;
- voting rules (unanimity + consultation with Advisory Board + authorisation EC required for changes in strategic orientation or network composition);
- details amended by partners’ legal services.

In attachment 1, each partner needs to choose between 2 options regarding the treatment of so-called background information. Option 2 will be used as ‘default’ option, unless partners have some very precious input. Partners who opt for option 1 are requested to inform HIVA-KU Leuven before the end of the month.

The final CA will be circulated to the partners for signature in the beginning of April.

**Feedback/comments of the partners:**
- The relationship with the Alliances is not clear.
  
  Reply: The Alliances is the broader network which is the ‘father/mother’ of the project. All the RE-InVEST teams/partners are part of the Alliances. The project is one of the initiatives of the Alliances; the property of the project belongs to the Alliances.
  
  As discussed at the preparatory meeting the Alliances will be consulted in case of changes re. strategic issues.
- Are the meetings of the Alliances part of the project? Do we need to attend all the Alliances meetings?
  
  Reply: No. However, some RE-InVEST meetings will be combined with Alliances meetings.
  
  Partners can use their RE-InVEST travel budget for RE-InVEST meetings; travel costs made for specific Alliances meetings will be reimbursed by the Alliances.

**Green bible**

HIVA-KU Leuven has compiled and distributed a bounded copy with the Description of Action (DoA), several relevant documents, as well as an overview of the project structure, Gantt diagram, budget breakdown/partner, budget clarifications, ...

Delivery dates, due dates, start and end dates of WPs are indicated as calendar dates instead of month numbers.

The bounded copy is our ‘bible’ of the project/main guide for the project and most of the documents are an essential part of the contract (= binding).

The final grant agreement and final consortium agreement will be made available on Basecamp, as well as the digital version of the green bible.

**Management Board**

As decided at the preparatory workshop, we need:

- to ensure the representation of WPs when the lead partner is excused;
- to foster involvement of NGOs in particular, including one NGO of a New Member State.

With the agreement of the GA a representative of Fundatia TON and EAPN Portugal, as well as Ortrud Lessmann (IFZ) will be included in the Management Board.

**Advisory Board**

During the preparatory workshop, a lot of valuable names for the Advisory Board were mentioned.

General criteria for selection: gender, different countries (+ countries in budgetary endowment), diversity, representation of related research projects, NGO-sector, specialities related to the different WPs, a law specialist, …

A 3-circle Advisory Board based on the different objectives we have in mind for this Advisory Board is proposed. The main objectives for our Advisory Board are: accompanying the WPs, policy enriching, content enriching when needed during the project.

**Core circle**
Objective/task: accompany the WPs.
Proposal: 6 core members. Are present at mid-term conferences and speed-up meetings if content-related.
Members: Xavier Godinot, Tania Burchardt, Martin Kronauer, Peter Lelie, Dora Dimitra-Teloni, Sian Jones.

Policy working group

Objective/task: policy enriching.
Proposal: Dynamic composition depending on topics. Are present at policy workshops when topic-related, Alliances to Fight Poverty meetings when topic-related.
Members (= core group + all members of the Alliances): Patrick Feltesse, Mike Allen, Peter Lelie, Dora Dimitra Teloni, Xavier Godinot, Maria Jespen, Robert Walker, Ana M. Guillén, Laurence Fontaine, Sarah Banks, …

Others

Objective/task: content enriching when necessary during the project
Proposal: Dynamic composition depending on topics. Are present at speed up meetings, mid-term conferences, Alliances to Fight Poverty meetings when content related and needed.
Members: Jamie Burton, Kenneth Nelson, Istvan Gyorgy Toth, Maria Petmesidou, Emmanuel Pavolini, Peter Beresford, Allyson Pollock, Duncan Gallie, …

Feedback of the partners
- we should have back-ups for all members of the core group if one of the suggested names doesn’t accept the invitation;
- we need to keep an eye on the gender balance.

AOB
- The pre-financing payment has been processed by the EC (to the coordinator). KU Leuven will transfer the corresponding amounts to the partners ‘without undue delay’.
- Communication/dissemination:
  - Dissemination guidelines of Horizon 2020 projects: any dissemination of results (in any form, including electronic) must:
    - display the EU emblem: When displayed together with another logo, the EU emblem must have appropriate prominence;
    - include a disclaimer ‘excluding Commission responsibility’: Any dissemination of results must indicate that it reflects only the author’s view and that the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains;
    - include the following text: ‘This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 649447’.
  - Templates for reports, PowerPoints, Policy briefs, minutes of meetings, … will be made available on the Basecamp site.
  - Partners are requested to contribute/collaborate to the promotion and dissemination of the project (results):
    - HIVA-KU Leuven/Beweging vzw welcomes addresses of persons/institutes for the project (master) mailing list. This mailing list will be used to distribute project results, events, …;
    - partners are invited to forward project results, project communication to their national contacts/relevant email groups.
  - Communications will mainly be sent:
    - through Facebook and Twitter;
    - after the end of each WP; when Policy briefs are launched, in the frame of the national seminars.
    - The communication process will be coordinated by Beweging vzw.
    - internal dissemination/communication via Basecamp: keep a good balance between putting too much/too less documents on Basecamp.
  - Calendar of activities:
    - please stick to the calendar/Gantt (neither anticipate nor postpone);
    - in case of problems, the Management Board will be consulted;
    - take into account intermediate deadlines + time for WP leaders to carry out peer reviewing (= 5 weeks before deadline!). The partners are requested to supply the deliverables (in case of a report/note/…) in draft form to the coordinator and WP leader 5 weeks before the delivery date for
the peer review. The peer review is only required for deliverables (not for milestones). Partners are encouraged to submit to peer review as soon as they finish a deliverable.

Simultaneous Session during the General Assembly

*Moderator: Ortrud Lessmann*

During the General Assembly meeting, the participants who do not take part in GA reflect on their experiences with the theoretical framework of capability approach and participative research. Ortrud Lessmann highlights the richness and diversity of expertise among the participants. The group identifies a challenge of comparative work in different national contexts. Maria José Domingos from the EAPN notes the change in distribution of the poor resulting from youth unemployment. The EAPN presents a short film on social minimum income (RSI) in Portugal and on the difficulties that everyday people experience when trying to survive on RSI assistance.

Information Session by the European Commission

*Speakers: Petri Backman and Yuri Borgmann-Prebil*

Petri Backman presents on the key activities of the Research Executive Agency (REA). Since 2007, REA is tasked with managing programs (550-750 staff (17,5bn)). In addition to project management, REA provides horizontal services such as website, contracts etc. Societal Challenge Six: Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies / Eur after the crisis: Solidarity; European identity and public sphere; Social investment.

In regard to the RE-InVEST project implementation, project reviews are expected. In addition:
- After 12m + 60 days => submit report => reviewing: meeting 3w later = May 2016 (with MB): Yuri and ‘monitors’
- Training will be given to project co-ordination team
- Reference documentation

IT environment will be through the ‘Participant Portal’ (currently under development). Communicating – guide. Project website and deliverables (abstract if information is confidential). Project should allow for an open data access. REA is looking for experts, it is a good opportunity to get involved. Success 6/127. Links within Euro and probably also from Young / Reflec.

Yuri Borgmann-Prebil from the EC policy division states that in total 44 proposals were considered. Collaboration with REA needs to be fine-tuned. It is important to also collaborate with sister-projects to RE-InVEST (INNOSI, TRANSSOL, SOLIDUS, RE-CRIRE), for example by partnering in joint conferences. He refers to the book project “Assessing social investment synergies” by Hemerijck, which should be available in September/October 2015. Legacy from FP5-7: social innovation research in the EU (Jane Jenson and Denis Harrisson) and IMPROVE / LIPSE.

The work program 2016-17 should be available by the summer. Yuri Borgmann-Prebil introduces three calls:
- Call ‘co-creation for growth and inclusion’ / participative policy making
- Call ‘Reversing inequalities and promoting fairness’
  - Understanding forms / sources / impact of inequalities
  - (European conceptual framework for social justice / radicalization…
  - Free movement of capital and people
  - tax evasion
  - middle class
  - education
  - spatial justice – regional cohesion)
- Policies aimed at reversing various kinds of inequalities
- Mechanisms of inclusive innovation
Call ‘Understanding Europe – public and cultural space’

In conclusion, Yuri Borgmann-Prebil highlights that while scientific impact and excellence is expected the policy impact of the RE-InVEST is key.

Discussion

During the discussion, Ides Nicaise states that he has already contacted the two sister projects, however, he did not receive a response. It may be helpful to invite representatives of sister projects at major RE-InVest meetings. Anna Shamaeva asks to elaborate on how the policy impact will be measured. Potentially seminars with the Commission will be arranged. Project can result in policy proposals to affect the long term policymaking.

Investing in a common language for RE-InVEST

Speaker: Tania Burchardt

Tania Burchardt (London School of Economics) presents on the topic of “Equality, Capability and Human Rights”. She opens by giving examples of various discriminatory practices (based on income, age, sexual orientation). Substantive freedom (non-interference) is the real opportunity to lead a life you value and have reason to value. Capability is an interaction between individuals and their environment. It includes equality of outcome, equality of autonomy, and equality of process. Capability approach (CA) is relevant as it provides a solid theoretical basis, it values objective and subjective outcomes, it allows for variation in need, and it integrates equality and human rights concerns.

Capability approach is closely linked with human rights. In particular, fairness, respect, dignity, autonomy, and equality are five principles that underlie human rights. In her academic work, Martha Nussbaum has identified ten central/basic capabilities. In addition, UN Covenants on civil and political rights include references to economic, social, and cultural rights. It is also possible to disaggregate by key characteristics of individuals in order to focus on most vulnerable groups. It is possible to identify ten domains: life, physical security, health, education, standard of living, productive valued activities, participation, family/social life, identity, legal security. For example, the EQLS radar chart provides multidimensional comparison between target group and mainstream population.

There is a number of various critiques of CA. The first is that it is too individualistic and does not account for interdependence between individuals. Secondly, the capability approach provides insufficient focus on inequality in its consideration of outcomes rather than material resources. It is also criticized for being “hopelessly idealistic”. Some consider CA an apology for capitalism.

In regard to strengths and weaknesses of CA, the approach is multidimensional and that makes it informationally demanding. CA is not legally enforceable. On the other hand, it allows integrating human rights and equality concerns. In addition, its sociological theoretical foundations are insufficient, in particular, no prescriptions for policy framework to strengthen capabilities are given. It is important to have a ‘situated’ concept relative to social context and not only a list of basic capabilities, as pointed out by Robert Salais (CNRS).

2 Brainstorm workshops on the meaning and development of human rights and capabilities

During brainstorming workshops on human rights and capabilities the participants are divided into three groups for a more in depth discussion. Human rights and capabilities are interlinked. Poverty is a violation of HR. The distinction between formal and effective rights is important. B. Hobson argues that norms sometimes matter more than laws. The language of rights is evoked in the political dimension and tends to be selective. For example, in housing there are different thresholds of overcrowdedness, that can be determined by the relative norms (customs) or culturally.

Capability is a political concept. Rights provide a minimum floor. A capability is a dynamic component. The relationship between material resources and rights – conversion factors transform formal rights into real
rights. It is important to note that sometimes freedom leads to acceptance of consequences of bad choices. The participants also question if there is a ‘list’ of absolute minima of capabilities. And is it possible to develop indicators to assess this list of capabilities?

Plenary reporting on brainstorm workshops

*Moderator: Ortrud Lessmann*

The plenary session opens with a summary of the discussions in all three workshop groups presented by group leaders. Ortrud Lessmann points out that in her group it was noted that vulnerable groups were often unconscious about their rights. Her group also discussed substantive rights and the possible links between state and individuals in regard to capabilities. The group led by Mary Murphy discussed three generation for rights (economic, social, political), the issue of openness when defining a list of rights, and the importance of inputs from grassroots. Capabilities are viewed as the ability to implement rights. The members of the group led by Jean De Munck identified the difference between negative and positive freedom in terms of power and the difference between capabilities and resources in terms of agency. Capability is linked to free choice. The alternative is the Asset-Based Community Development.

**Conclusion of Day 1**

Michel Debruyne thanks all the participants for the informative day 1 of the conference and reminds everyone about the intensive program for day 2.

**DAY 2 - Tuesday, March 17th 2015**

**Investing in a common language. Bridging the CA and macro-economics**

*Speaker: Robert Salais (CNRS)*

Robert Salais presents on the link between capability approach (CA) and macroeconomics (the text of the paper was disseminated to the participants in advance of the session). Purpose of WP7 includes the aspects of funding, governance, and subsidiarity. Robert Salais introduces the idea of a “situated government”, which takes into account the different situational context of each individual. To ‘situate’ means to identify features of each person’s situation, it provides the relation between different levels of action plus a participative relation. Division of labour between state and individuals. There exist differences between countries and, thus, plurality of governance structures. Keynesianism and neoliberalism are both disqualified by history and are, at best, indifferent, and often hostile towards CA. In particular, they are concerned with an idea of “external state” while CA requires a ‘situated state’. It is important to link macro-micro levels, the ECB interventions are useless or even harmful because the link between macro-micro is missing. According to Robert Salais, Keynes was not Keynesian. The idea is that the investments cannot be steered from above as it is risky. Instead, there is a need for deliberation (for example, about sustainability and inclusiveness), which provides the capability to participate in fostering the common good.

**Discussion**

The discussion of the presentation begins with the consideration of the example of renewable energy sector, where the state should not directly intervene but create spaces for deliberation at the local level. Which structures of civil society can enable this participation? How to deal with the conflict of interest? There is an assumption that agenda has already been set and that civil society acts as ‘bounded agent’. How does such deliberation work? Striving for common goal involves bargaining and finding compromise between conflicting interests. How to deal with social conflict? Include excluded people in local deliberation. Jeremy Leaman advocates for strong public regulations (ex. rising inequalities) to combat the ‘public bad’. At all levels, there should be *a priori* acceptance of key principles relating to distribution, basic rights, etc. Complex interdependence requires complex measures. Fiscal federalism, example: Germany. Marja Elsinga argues that civil society is supposed to achieve common good efficiently, NL: CSO criticized for being inefficient ‘by definition’ so how to evaluate efficiency? There may be different indicators at different levels and thus may involve an autonomous decision.
Mary Murphy points out similarities between ‘situated state’ and ‘enabling state’. In some Latin American countries, there is an active experimentation with the relationship between state society and market (post-liberal state). Enabling state is a naïve approach, as it assumes a direct relationship between state and individual, with individual being able to solve global issues.

Jean-Luc Dubois discusses the notion of economics of convention. Ex. conflict DE-FR regarding milk industry. It is important to consider the social and solidary economy and appreciate the idea of the common good. The main issue is a taxation policy. In particular, where would the money for redistribution is raised from, at what level etc. not households, not enterprises, but banks / financial speculators. Keynes already had in mind a global co-operative solution between states with deficits / surpluses in external balances (for example, by transforming debt in shares). It may be also helpful in the future to devote a special session to the link between macro-economy and local level (NGOs), in the context of efficiency.

Jean De Munck addresses the issues of democratic design, in particular, the democratic deficit in Europe. For example, there is no consultation on TTIP. The gaps are inherent in representative democracy. There is a very long chain between principals and agents, which may result in perversion of the original message. EP is fine but is insufficient. It is important that institutional design gives voice to people on multiple levels of governance. Currently there is only lobbying. EESC is not effective as NGOs are not represented there. If we want to have macro-economic decisions then we should realize the idea of participation.

Ides Nicaise thanks Robert Salais for the stimulating text and suggest a number of possible extensions. First, the concept of ‘solidarity’ needs to be included. Also ‘deliberative democracy’ and the link with the ‘collective capability’, which is, in itself, a controversial idea. The third extension can be achieved by providing examples of social inclusion to highlight the key aspect of the project. Finally, the concept of subsidiarity can be interpreted from the point of the individual as a moral obligation at the local level to intervene where state fails (for example, redistribution in the context of poverty).

Ortrud Lessmann responds that there is a lot of literature on deliberation and capability approach. In addition, it may be helpful to consult Sen’s writing on commitment and agency. Marietta Haffner suggests consulting the economic literature about the role of non-profit organizations, accepting the role of the provider of the common good where state fails (see Ostrom). ‘Big society’ – complete retrenchment of the state. The key question is what the best lower level to achieve the economic good is (Robert Salais). Mahmood Messkoub points out that the rich regions are often the forefighters of subsidiarity as they have more resources and tend to do better. Jeremy Leaman says that there is a need to reconceptualize the role of the state by taking into account the distinct legacies from the past (eg. legacy of Stalinism, communism, Keynesianism). The session concludes with the identification of the need for new synthesis.

**Debate: The issue of privatization and deregulation- linking WP6 with WP7**

**Speakers:** Mahmood Messkoub and Jeremy Leaman

Mahmood Messkoub presents on the EU Social Investment Package – repacking social policy. Social policy has been used for nation-building: universal services (for example, education), residual services, regulation (eg. LMP). There exists a big difference between economic & social competences of EU. The process of decommodification, i.e. taking goods/services out of market or setting standards. Basic features of European social model include rights, social minima and social solidarity. Roles of social policy are in regard to social investment, social protection, and stabilization of economy. The shift from social insurance to SI, decreasing uncertainty, economic crisis. Areas affected are early childhood, health, housing, among others.

In discussing modernization of social policy it is important to consider more conditionality, temporary support, individualization, non-state actors. How do we evaluate the effectiveness? Perhaps by considering lessons from pioneering countries, such as the UK. Our research focuses on the impact on capabilities. It is highlighted that the change is driven not only by the economizing motive but it is also indicative of the ideological shift in the role of the state vs private sector. It may also necessary to include ‘de/refamilialisation’ concept

Jeremy Leaman presents on “Deformation of Europe’s political economy: the role of privatisation”. Market improvement is the first priority, otherwise there will never be enough resources to meet the need. The EU is a co-architect of radical market paradigm: abandonment of exchange controls, deregulation of factor markets, privatization of public services, monetarist policy, single market etc. Fiscal policy is subordinated to
monetary policy, eg. austerity. Permissive transition policy (re. Copenhagen criteria and reliance on private FDI); tax competition, toleration of increased inequality, constitutional brakes on state borrowing.

Policy failure is indicated by a very low growth; the reduced EU GDP as proportion of global output; a falling investment ratio. The strategic issues with privatization include physical infrastructure (basic utilities), social infrastructure, and the security of national assets. There is also a risk of market abuse by private monopolies. Judith Clifton / Aharone: diversion of investment, i.e. from productive to speculative investment. A metaphor of ‘all the family silver has been sold.’ Citizens as victims of this process: a new atomized commodified relationship with service providers.

Discussion

During the discussion, Rita Baeten identifies the paradox between privatization and austerity, the tendency to re-regulate, specifically, to provide the universal package at lower level with the higher prices for rest. In the NL 1/3 of housing market is social housing, but it is increasingly operating according to market mechanism. The EU insisted on greater state control and participation of tenants. NL relies on the asset-based welfare ideology: assets to be used as private protection against social risks. The example of Germany, where liberalization of electricity sector imposed as a condition for development of renewable energy provided the benefit of a smooth exit and entry for the customers. What is the impact on vulnerable groups coupled with the issue of minimum social standards?

Jean-Luc Dubois responds that not all countries are following this path, for example, in France de-privatization of motorways, increased taxes, although, as pointed out by Michel Debruyne, there is also some privatization in France (water), plus it is important to consider Trojka’s interventions in PIIGS. Jean De Munck notes that private oligopolies act as ‘new political governments’, not just as the enterprises. The definition of SI by EC is rather narrow and limited to the ‘public investment’ of human capital which overlooks of social and cultural work of civil society organizations. Measurement indicators in six sectors should be considered. Mahmood Messkoub suggests a use of ‘social cost-benefit analysis’ as criterion for efficiency measurement.

Parallel sessions on:

WP 2 and 3: NUIM, KUL, EAPN Portugal, Poverty Alliance, TU Delft, SOFI, IFZ, Liverpool Hope, RSU, TON, Beweging, IRD, OSE

Moderators: Mary Murphy and Ides Nicaise

Mary Murphy begins the session with the slide depicting the “Ladder of Participation” which includes the following eight steps: manipulation / therapy / information / consultation / placation /partnership / delegation of power / citizen control. The discussion of the ladder is followed by the group exercise in which the participants are paired up and are asked to share two examples from their research experiences. Afterwards, the group collectively discusses these experiences (Ex. Equal project (disabled people use research to lobby in EP); covert ethnography in elderly care home to (Joe Greener)); research on perception of the EU, which was much more easy in the NGO than within university). EAPN-PT points out that it is hardly can get beyond stage 7 of the ladder. It is important to be very clear about purpose of study; avoid that people feel they need to justify themselves (through vignettes). Expectations are also very important and should be communicated to the participants. In Romania, strong association of 53 groups – train-the-trainer for community development.

Criteria for selecting target groups

Flexibility, exposure to crisis, already in contact with the NGOs, containing at least 15 people (to account for participant attrition), and, if possible, continuity between WPs.

Topic/target groups will possibly include:
- PT: ECEC / LMP / crisis: same or different groups?
- Cinzia: who is responsible for the partnership?
- Children in LT care
- SOFI: working poor, urban setting
- IFZ: unemployed / disabled (no impression that crisis has changed their situation)
- IRD: African migrants (possibly 2nd gen.) in suburban Paris
- LV: disabled persons (around Riga)
- RO: Romanians returning from cities
- NL: evictions (from public housing)

Method of data collection: least text-based possible

Preparing for Maynooth (plus post-docs Rory & Ania)
- readings: merging of knowledge / human rights
- draft of the handbook for participatory methodology.
- 2 people from each country – identify researcher by Madrid beginning of May
- Inputs from PPR & ATD
- Resources to be shared on Basecamp
- The participants welcome suggestions on good resources.

Criteria for selection of topics for national case studies:
1. Impact of crisis and/or crisis-related policies on (the most) vulnerable people in your country / region
2. Illustration of social disinvestment: emphasis on long-term (possibly intergenerational) effects
3. Impact on basic human rights (not just income loss or unemployment, but impact on homelessness, morbidity/mortality, mental illness, family breakdown, suicide, overindebtedness…
4. Link with individual / collective capabilities:
   - Micro-level: individual / intergenerational effects
   - Meso-level: social fragmentation, weakening of civil society, of social dialogue…
5. Connect individual stories with the meso- and macro-context
   - Structural: privatization, disinvestment in public services, austerity measures / exclusion from social protection, erosion of labour conditions…
   - Political / cultural: neo-conservatism, loss of democracy, loss of trust, blame-the-victim culture, stigma, discrimination…

Secondary criteria:
6. Multidimensionality: loss of one basic right affects all other rights
7. Diversity of themes and target groups: we want to leave partners much flexibility in selecting groups and topics that suit you best. We will ‘co-ordinate the diversity’ through negotiation by email / during next workshops.
8. distinction with WP5-6:
   - WP3 is about disinvestment ◦ WP5-6 about investment.
   - Other topics than those of WP5-6 (not all topics are covered there)

WP 4: Unige, KUL, IFZ, IRD, UCL, Beweging

Moderator: Jean-Michel Bonvin

The following decisions and steps are identified at the WP 4 session:

1. Before Madrid (7-8 May 2015) and then until Maynooth (7-9 September 2015), collect relevant pieces of literature on the following three topics:
a) Human rights and capabilities, including:
   - Legal, social and moral aspects
   - Issue of fragmented rights and citizenship (cf. Sassen’s works)
   - And of course all writings bearing on CA and human rights (cf. Sen, 2004 already on basecamp)

b) Collective dimensions of capabilities, including:
   - The review paper by Ortrud, with a hint at the most relevant literature among the cited works.
   - Works related to the sociological debate “Agency within structure” (Giddens, Archer, etc.)
   - Papers related to the construction of preferences or aspirations.

c) Social investment, including:
   - the ESPAnet literature (Palier, Bonoli, Jenson, Morel, Palme, book edited by Hemerijk, Nolan, Cantillon, etc.)
   - It will be helpful if Francesco Laruffa could integrate a recent version of his work.
   - works related to “quality of society” and “third sector” (cf. Jean-Luc Dubois’ suggestions)
• official documents (Social Investment Package, European Semester, etc.) - Michel will create a specific file on basecamp with all relevant official documents.

NB. Integrate all relevant references on basecamp, either full texts or full references, so that everyone has a precise idea of the state of the art. Do not be selective at this stage. We will select the most relevant references in Madrid and Maynooth.

2. On this basis, first discussion in Madrid with all present people. Those who cannot join are asked to put their suggestions on basecamp, so that we may take them into account in Madrid.

3. The final objective is to be able to decide on a quite precise roadmap in Maynooth. Who will do what? Who will take the responsibility for what topic?

NB. We should not forget that we also have to integrate the results of WP3, e.g. with regard to the definition of a target group for possible case studies within WP4.

**WP 7: CNRS, Loughborough University, UCL, Beweging, EUR**

*Moderators: Robert Salais and Jeremy Leaman*

Core objective: Establish a strong linkage between the macro-level issues of political economy in the broad sense and the micro-level issues of citizens as members of social formations, with particular reference to the empowerment of marginalized individuals and groups; the approach remains strongly inter-disciplinary; the results of our inter-disciplinary deliberations will feed into a set of policy recommendations.

*Towards an alternative model of social investment.*

Against the background of a shared perception of social investment requiring not just a (passive) dimension of well-being, but also of (active) agency and participation, it was suggested that we begin our programme of analysis by pursuing some of the following:

- The deconstruction of the concept of investment as a feature of micro-, meso- and macro-policy as a means of a) critiquing orthodox understandings of investment in the diverse cultures of the EU28 and b) establishing an inclusive, holistic and sustainable approach to democratic social development.
- The close analysis of current EU initiatives, notably the Social Investment Plan and the Juncker-Plan in the context of an austerity paradigm which arguably relegates human welfare to a second-order issue behind debt-consolidation.
- The examination of the appropriateness of the ‘investment’ metaphor to social policy, with its traditional association with a rate-of-return (ROR) on capital, of beneficiaries (cui bono), risk-avoidance, project-choice, timescale, funding conditions.
- The examination of the current policy-architecture and its apparent inability to halt the decline in the investment ratio in general and the particular marginalisation of large sections of society in many European states (separation of monetary and fiscal policy; bank regulation)
- The identification of best practice of participation at both macro- and micro-level (stakeholders in central, regional and local government; workforce involvement in enterprises).
- The distinction between human capital formation as investment and the capability approach.
- Focus on the transgenerational dimension of (social) investment.

**Dissemination, communication and impact - introduction to WP8**

*Speaker: Michel Debruyne*

Michel Debruyne provides a brief discussion of the online dissemination tools such as the RE-InVEST website, Facebook, and twitter. The website is now available and will contain general information, reports, and policy briefs. RE-InVEST facebook page maintenance may require a rotation between members to maintain it. Twitter messages can be retweeted from others to encourage online activity.
Other ways to distribute information are policy briefings, Alliances meetings, policy workshops, and national seminars (April – October, 2018).

The discussion of the first policy brief on Juncker’s investment plan

Michel Debruyne introduces the first policy brief on Juncker’s investment plan. The participants familiarize themselves with the policy brief in preparation for the general discussion. During the discussion, Mary Murphy suggests to provide more context on Juncker’s plan and better graphs, reflecting the EU data. Ides Nicaise applauds the policy brief initiative but suggests limiting policy briefs to 2-3 pages, removing some weaker arguments and highlighting the pro-investment position. RE-InVEST has a mission of improving social investment strategy and this should be clearly communicated. In addition, the causal relationship between wage deflation and investment is unclear. The participants agree that the brief has to be more focused and should reflect a more positive tone. Michel Debruyne thanks everyone for the feedback. He will rewrite the policy brief incorporating the feedback from the participants and will upload the latest version of the brief on Basecamp. The participants can comment on the brief before the final version is published.

Day 3 - Wednesday, March 18th 2015

“ALMP's and capabilities.” Introduction of the CAPRIGHT results on labour market

Speaker: Jean-Michel Bonvin

Jean-Michel Bonvin presents on the results of the CAPRIGHT project completed four year ago. Theoretical framework of the project is the ambivalence of ALMPs and the relevance of the CA. Investing in vulnerable people's capabilities provides an alternative perspective on ALMPs. Formal freedom vs. real freedom: resources, individual and social conversion factors. Freedom to choose and reason to value: exit/voice/loyalty and public reasoning. It is important to consider balance between individual and collective responsibilities.

Ambivalence of social policies: enabling and constraining. The CA allows capturing this ambivalence (to what extent do social policies empower/enable AND to what extent do they emancipate/promote autonomy. Two sides of the approach: the capacity to act (empowerment) AND the freedom to choose.

Issue of ‘passive empowerment’: unconditional access and its effect – various interpretations. Incompatibility: negative incentives, moral hazards and dependency traps. Passive empowerment as a prerequisite for the enhancement of capabilities.

In relation to RE-InVEST, it is important to remember that the contractual relationship includes content and prescription, as well as the relationships between beneficiary and institutions / street-level bureaucrats: degree of ‘reflexivity’ (room for bottom-up participation. Project has to be realistic and achievable. What is meant by the concept of autonomy – independence from welfare and how does this relate to capability?

Jean-Michel Bonvin identifies challenges of participatory research – it is important that participants’ views of reality are taken aboard when designing public policy. The issue of incompleteness: agreements, performance indicators (managerial tools) are incomplete as a toolkit for evaluation. The researcher as a promoter of a more ‘democratic’ view of social policies to give more weight to the voice of the voiceless.

Discussion

During the discussion, Mahmood Messkoub reflects on the concept of ‘passive empowerment’. In particular, if we focus on HR, there should be a minimum threshold of passive empowerment. Mary Murphy asks to elaborate on the role of researcher in empowerment process. Jean De Munck asks to focus on collective processes.
Capability as a yardstick for ALMP’s – starting knowledge for WP 5

Speaker: René Lehwess-Litzmann

René Lehwess-Litzmann presents on the capability as a yardstick for flexicurity based on his dissertation. His book (2014) published by Goettingen University Press is available online. He begins by outlining labour-market (LM) segmentation and ALMP. Shape of LM results from an interaction between households and rims, under conditions set by the state. LM is not homogeneous, but subdivided (internal/external and primary/secondary). Labor market relations between households and firms need regulation both fiscal and legal. It is also important to remember that the welfare can be also produced outside the labor market. Households, as well as firms, have internal division of work. Focus in RE-InVEST is on secondary external labor market, in particular, how to enhance capabilities of this target group (how to affect conversion factors).

René Lehwess-Litzmann explains the Capability Model that identifies ‘capability set’ containing achievable functioning-bundles. He also presents the table of ideal types of ALMP based on Bonoli including incentive reinforcement/employment assistance/occupation/human capital investment. Incentive reinforcement (often negative incentives) frequently reduces capabilities. Employment assistance (even 1€ jobs may enhance social inclusion). Transitional labour-markets (TLM) (Schmid) as a complementary framework: importance of flexible combinations between work in LM and life.

In conclusion, René Lehwess-Litzmann outlines possible challenges/limitations of empirical research when using CA. In particular, unobserability of capability. How do you measure freedom to do/be or not do/be? Lack of information for individuals about alternatives. Interrelatedness between LM position and private choices (family…). Researcher is left in the dark about the yardstick to use to validate public discussion. His suggestion is to use dimensions and thresholds established by research, and let concerned persons comment on these and possibly to change them.

Discussion

Ides Nicaise suggests that 1€ jobs may enhance individual capabilities but reduce collective capabilities. Is there a trade-off? Ortrud Lessmann responds that there is a conflict between individual capabilities and there is no need to introduce collective capabilities. She also suggests measurement of freedom via psychological scales (see also T. Burchardt). In regard to the presented typology of ALMPs, Rüdiger Mautz points out that most programs are actually mixed. Some people are better off in informal labour market. Joe Greener comments on political economy of ALMPs.

Limitations of ALMP is a supply-side policy plus burden on labour, which results in many negative outcomes (in-work poverty) => rather focus on ‘active welfare policies’ than just ALMP. Graça Costa notes that in Portugal there are no jobs – especially problematic for older unemployed (too old to work, too young to retire) and social protection is very restrictive.

There is some room for case studies on ‘social activation’ and active welfare policies rather than labour activation. It is also important to consider the quality of work.

Investing in a common language on ALMP’s and capabilities

Speaker: Ides Nicaise

Ides Nicaise presents on the topic of “ALMP, social protection and capabilities”, in the context of discussion of WP 5. Sen’s capability approach is juxtaposed with the neoclassical approach. The implicit neoclassical paradigm of Social Security (SS) economics is “making work pay” but the empirical evidence in support of its theoretical foundations is limited. Instead, the reality seems to favour the CA in that more generous systems foster mobility out of poverty and unemployment. CA needs to be further developed on social security. The mobility conceptual framework built on a ‘ladder’ of five states of protection and the resulting mobility outcomes, i.e. social exclusion, social inclusion, or status quo. In the discussion, Mahmood Messkoub thanks Ides Nicaise for clear presentation and suggests breaking down the data from the regression analysis
by gender, age, household characteristics for a more nuanced picture. It may also be useful to use EU-SILC data for successful waves.

Conclusions of the kick off: the roadmap till the September Maynooth workshop

Moderator: Michel Debruyne

Michel Debruyne invites the work package leaders to discuss the “to do” items for September, 2015.

WP8
- Facebook page to set up in March
- Policy briefs
- Madrid
- To do: mail lists

WP2
- By 7/5: training needs, draft program.
- By Maynooth: toolkit for WP 2 and WP 3

WP3
- Updated criteria for selection of case studies will be circulated to partners.
- By end May, partners to submit their provisional outline (1p. + justification + partners to be involved)
- Feedback in June
- Final roadmap by Maynooth

WP4
- Review of literature on basic conceptual framework of social investment

WP6
- Privatization

WP7
- Review of literature followed up by the discussion of what is important

Michel Debruyne thanks everyone for their participation in the kick off meeting. The work package leaders are expected to attend the management board meeting.

Management board meeting

- Evaluation of the kick-off meeting
  - Did everybody feel connected? There was freedom of speech but discussions were dominated by lead partners
  - Academic language can be an obstacle for other partners
  - Reality of new MS needs to be highlighted more => ask those members for input
  - Long meetings: try to restrict to 2 days? (not Madrid / Maynooth + enough time for jr researchers

- Basecamp
  - How to structure documents? ‘social investment’ = general folder + WPs
  - Documents can be tagged, archived
  - Search function?
  - Presentation in Madrid

- Maynooth
  - Will focus on participative methodologies but also include meetings with wider network
• Split up: 2 days for others / 3 days for FG conductors
• Relationship WP4-WP7: coordination (over time) will be discussed
  ▪ Similar issue between WP6-7: privatization
  ▪ Let WP7 start with taxation?
  ▪ Jeremy L should be involved more closely
• Francesco: does not need any financial support – we are happy to include him; a specific agreement will be concluded with him to guarantee confidentiality
• Advisory Board
  ▪ Dora, Tania, Martin, Peter, Sian, Xavier… will be contacted by Sofie & Ides
• COST proposal
  ▪ We will re-apply in November
  ▪ 10 persons need to sign the application (balance by gender, seniority, background…)
  ▪ Mary is not keen on co-ordinating
  ▪ Check whether rules have changed
  ▪ Will be discussed in Madrid (we will ask partners beforehand to consider leadership / co-signature of application)