UNU-CRIS Working Papers

Requirements for Effective European Union Leadership in Science and Cultural Diplomacy on (Inter) Regionalism in the South

Authors:

Stephen Kingah
Ana B. Amaya
Luk Van Langenhove

UNU-CRIS Working Papers

The authors

Stephen Kingah is Research Fellow at UNU-CRIS.
Contact: skingah (@) cris.unu.edu

Ana B. Amaya is Research Fellow at UNU-CRIS.
Contact: aamaya (@) cris.unu.edu

Luk Van Langenhove is Director at UNU-CRIS and Scientific Coordinator of the EL-CSID Project.
Contact: lvanlangenhove (@) cris.unu.edu and lvlangen (@) vub.ac.be

Abstract

This inception paper expatiates on the conditions that are necessary in determining the effectiveness of the European Union's (the EU's) leadership in science and cultural diplomacy (SCD) on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. These conditions include willingness, capacity and acceptance. Willingness delineates the scope of the ambition of the EU in SCD. Capacity covers elements that pertain to breadth and depth/ quality and quantity of resources mobilized and available to lead SCD that delivers results. Acceptance refers to the nature of the credibility that the EU is able to command both within and outside the Union respecting its influence to attract followers both amongst Member States of the Union as well as third states, regional and international organizations. The emphasis of the paper is on effectiveness in terms of impact on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. Focus is placed on regional and inter-regional processes/ initiatives in Africa, Southeast Asia and Latin America.

1. Introduction

Measuring the effectiveness of the leadership of the European Union (the EU) in the realm of science and cultural diplomacy (SCD) can be an exacting exercise. Even more daunting is an adventure in gauging the fallout of such leadership on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. Yet useful are such indicators in validating or negating the assumed impact that EU's leadership in SCD has on novel dynamics in the political economy of regional and inter-regional processes of the South. Setting parameters for determining effectiveness (realization of set goals) is quintessential in policy implementation.[1] Information is critical for evidence informed policy making that reflects best practices, which can lead to changes in policies, allowing them to remain as such if successful or redirecting resources if not.[2,3] As such, policy effectiveness or impact is frequently measured through performance. Yang and Holzer address six important drivers of performance data use: measurement system maturity; stakeholder involvement; leadership support; support capacity; an innovation culture; and goal clarity.[4] When made public such parameters or indicators on performance can motivate practitioners and those who deliver services to excel, either through a process of self-reflection or due to external pressures holding them accountable for their decisions.[5] In a policy-making context when there are numerous variables to consider, data is often chaotic and disjointed.[6] This is even more amplified in a regional or international context. Hence it is key to have clear tools to set priorities and measure progress especially in a context where policy makers are receiving data and information from a myriad of sources.[7] This is not to say that policy-making is a linear process. Policy-making frequently is not only informed by data but decisions may be influenced by short-term political interests or personal agendas[8].

---

[1] Joseph Stiglitz, Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi, *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress* (2009), at paragraph 1.

[2] Laurie M. Anderson, Ross Brownson, Mindy T. Fullilove, Steven M. Teutsch, Lloyd F. Novick, Jonathan Fielding and Garland H. Land, 'Evidence-Based public health policy and practice: promises and limits,' 28(5S*)* American *Journal of Preventive Medicine* (2005), 226-230, at 228.

[3] Ties Boerma, Patrick Eozenou, David Evans, Tim Evans, Marie-Paule Kieny and Adam Wagstaff, 'Monitoring progress towards universal health coverage at country and global levels,' 11(9) *PLoS Medicine* (September 2014), 1-8, at 4.

[4] Kaifeng Yang and Marc Holzer, 'Plowing ahead: Introduction to symposium on frontiers of performance management,' 38 *Public Performance & Management Review* (2015), 359-364, at 361.

[5] Judith H. Hibbard, 'Editorial: What can we say about the impact of public reporting? Inconsistent execution yields variable results,' 148(2) *Annals of Internal Medicine* (January 2008), 160-161, at 160.

[6] Ross C. Brownson, Rachel Seiler and Amy A. Eyler, 'Measuring the impact of public health policy,' 7(4) *Preventing Chronic Disease Public Health Research, Practice, and Policy* (2010), 1-6.

[7] Peter Byass, 'The imperfect world of global estimates,' 7(11) *PLoS Medicine* (November 2010), 1-3.

[8] Andrew Green, Nancy Gerein, Tolib Mirzoev, Philippa Bird, Stephen Pearson, Le Vu Anh, Tim Martineau, Maitrayee Mukhopadhyay, Xu Qian, K.V. Ramani and Werner Soors, 'Health policy processes in maternal health: A comparison of Vietnam, India and China,' 100(2) *Health Policy* (May 2011) 167-173.

In the field of regionalism numerous efforts have been made in gauging performance. There is a rich literature on monitoring regional integration and regionalism as such. De Lombaerde and colleagues note that such monitoring ensures that policies are more transparent, effective and legitimate.[9] For Girvan, measuring and monitoring are about inclusive interactions between the organization's structures and other stakeholders such as non-governmental (NGOs) and that the potential value of monitoring mechanisms 'lies in shortening the time-frame of the learning cycle and improving the accuracy of problem identification and interventions.'[10] Van Langenhove and colleagues have used the criteria of willingness, capacity and acceptance as qualitative indicators to gauge the performance of regional organizations in a variety of policy fields. By focusing on these three determinants (further disaggregated into a number of sub-determinants), which are: 1) the willingness of a regional organization to act, expressed in the existence of policy tools such as treaties and agreements and the existence of visionary leaders; 2) the acceptance of its actions by the national actors, as well as the citizens; and 3) its capacity or the resources to develop, promote and invest in the specific policy area and thus have an influence; the framework has been used in comparative analysis between regions.[11]

While the study of the interactions between international regions, or 'interrregionalism', as a tool for external relations is not new, it is still a relatively underdeveloped field[12]. Furthermore, while interregionalism has been propelled by globalization there is a close association between interregionalism and regional integration of the involved regions

[9] Philippe de Lombaerde, Julia Pietrangeli and Chatrini Weeratunge, 'Systems of Indicators for Monitoring Regional Integration Processes: Where do we Stand?' 8(2) *The Integrated Assessment Journal: Bridging Science and Policy* (2008), 39-67, at 41.

[10] Norman Girvan, 'Learning to Integrate': The Experience of Monitoring the CARICOM Single Market and Economy, in: *Governing Regional Integration for Development: Monitoring Experiences, Methods and Prospects* (Philippe De Lombaerde, Antoni Estevadeoral and Kati Suominen eds., Ashgate, Aldershot, 2008), pp. 31-56, at 51.

[11] Stephen Kingah and Luk Van Langenhove, 'Determinants of a regional organization's role in peace and security: Comparing the African Union and the European Union,' 19(2) *South African Journal of International Affairs* (August 2012) 197-218; Marieke Zwartjes, Luk Van Langenhove, Léonie Maes and Stephen Kingah, 'Determinants of regional leadership: Is the European Union a leading regional actor in peace and security,' 12(3) *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* (September 2012), 393-405; Luk Vangenhove and Stephen Kingah, 'Conditions for effective regional social (health) policies: The EU and Unasur compared,' in: Bianculli, Andrea C and Andrea Ribeiro Hoffmann eds., *Regional Organizations and Social Policy in Europe and Latin America: A Space for Social Citizenship?* (London: Palgrave 2016), 231-250.

[12] See for example: Francis Baert, Tiziana Scaramagli and Frederik Soderbaum (Eds.), *Intersecting Interregionalism: regions, global governance and the EU.* (Houten: Springer, 2014); Heiner Hanggi, 'Interregionalism: empirical and theoretical perspectives' at < http://www.cap.lmu.de/transatlantic/download/Haenggi.PDF>; Fredrik Soderbaum, Patrik Stalgren and Luk van Langenhove, 'The EU as a global actor and the dynamics of interregionalism: a comparative analysis', *European Integration (2005),* 27(3), 365-80.

themselves[13]. The majority of the literature addresses EU's interactions with other regions in economic terms but the area of SCD, which is increasingly becoming a palpable interest for the EU, and the understanding of the potential of it as a tool to promote regionalization and inter-regionalism with the 'South' is innovative. The European Leadership in Cultural, Science and Innovation Diplomacy (EL-CSID) project, funded through Horizon 2020 scheme of the European Commission seeks to further understand these issues with a focus on how the European Union operates in the areas of cultural and science diplomacy with other states, regions and institutions and how this can enhance the interests of the EU and awareness around the importance of CSD to improve the regions' external relations. Work package 5 of the EL-CSID project, led by the United Nations Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS), specifically looks at the how the EU and its member states foster regional and inter-regional processes in Asia, Africa and Latin America through science, cultural and economic diplomacy.

Understanding leadership, used in this context as primacy in a field rather than at the organizational level, can be challenging. In this paper the determinants of willingness, capacity and acceptance are used for the first time, in mapping the conditions for successful SCD. The downside of using such a conceptual model is that these determinants may require long periods of time to be internalized and institutionalized to ensure the desired empirical results.[14] Yet this should not obviate its important strength for coherent systemic analysis. The objective of this paper is to provide a first step towards addressing this challenge by providing qualitative determinants that can ease ascertainment of the impact of EU's leadership on SCD on regionalism and inter-regionalism in Africa, Southeast Asia and Latin America. These regions are selected because within them, one can find regional entities that themselves have a mandate (in varied degrees) in SCD. For the most part they have regional entities that explicitly or implicitly engage in SCD. The paper is both a conceptual canvass as well as an empirical effort to determine the manner in which the EU's leadership on SCD has effects on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. The ambition of the paper is not to rehearse the definitions of SCD which have been amply covered in the debate on SCD[15]

---

[13] Fredrik Soderbaum and Luk van Langenhove, 'Introduction: The EU as a global actor and the role of interregionalism', 27(3), *European Integration (2005),* 249-262.

[14] Thomas R. Oliver, Population health rankings as policy indicators and performance measures, 7(5) *Preventing Chronic Disease Public Health Research, Practice, and Policy* (September 2010), 1-7, at 5.

[15] See Luk Van Langenhove, 'Toward an EU Strategy for Cultural and Science Diplomacy that is Integrated in the Wider Foreign and Security Policy,' ELCSID, 1 March 2016, at <http://www.el-csid.eu/#!Towards-an-EU-Strategy-for-Cultural-and-Science-Diplomacy-that-is-integrated-in-the-wider-Foreign-and-Security-Policy/w6qcj/56c31b400cf2fe0269b27ecb> accessed on 29 April 2016; Luk Van Langenhove, 'Science Diplomacy: New Global Challenges, New Trend,' RSIS Commentary, 12 April 2016, at <http://www.rsis.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/CO16082.pdf> accessed on 29 April 2016, at 2; Luk Van

but to provide analytical tools to make a determination on the effectiveness of EU's leadership through SCD on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. It is arguable that while this paper places emphasis on the EU, there are no convincing reasons for not applying the conceptual and analytical framework for SCD of other regional organizations nurturing similar SCD ambitions.

A word on words is worthwhile. Effectiveness of EU interventions in SCD on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South begs the question on what these terms mean. Emphasis here is on formal regional and inter-regional processes and entities or pure regionalism and pure inter-regionalism.[16] But this does not foreclose allusion to regional and inter-regional informal or networked initiatives fostered by the EU that impinge on the formal processes.[17] In so doing, it is useful to identify deficits in cooperation that hamstring desirable enhanced co-relation as between the EU's SCD efforts and regional/ inter-regional initiatives of the South. In terms of regionalism, focus is placed on those EU actions and policies that impact traditional or formal regional bodies. However, some of the formal regional bodies have continental and sub-continental remits including the African Union, ASEAN and even UNASUR. Within these entities and processes there are sub-regional and regional dynamics that may inter-relate.

A number of salient aspects are worth considering upfront. First, what is critical here is a determination as to whether the EU's efforts in SCD is used or can be better used as a device to foster regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. Such is an instrumentalist ambition. Second, the context cannot be ignored. The current global context is marked by a fierce competition for scarce skills and resources in a highly volatile geopolitical environment[18] exacerbated by critical security threats, energy price gyrations and climate change concerns. It is a context in which faced with the myriad of

---

Langenhove and Richard Higgott, 'Cultural and Science Diplomacy in the Early 21 Century: Can we Talk of a "Practice Turn" in European Policy ?' Paper prepared for the EU in International Affairs Conference, May 2016 (highlighting the need for emphasis to now be placed as well on practice as much as on structure in the understanding and shaping of diplomacy); Madaleine Albright, 'Good Science is Vital to Good Diplomacy,' *Presidents & Prime Ministers* (May/ June 2000), at 20; Elizabeth L. Chalecki, 'Knowledge in Sheep's Clothing: How Science Informs American Diplomacy,' 19(1) *Diplomacy & Statecraft* (2008) 1-19; Peter D. Gluckman, Stephen L. Goldson and Alan S. Beedle, 'How a Small Country can use Science Diplomacy: A View of New Zealand,' 1(2) *Science & Diplomacy* (June 2012); John Robert Kelley, 'The New Diplomacy: Evolution of a Revolution,' 21(2) *Diplomacy & Statecraft* (2010), 286-305; The Economist, 'Cultural Diplomacy: Soft Power and Rapturous Ovation,' (*The Economist* 28 February 2008); The Economist, 'Pop Drivel, Politics or Cultural Diplomacy,' (*The Economist* 22 May 2008);

[16] Francis Baert, Tiziana Scaramagli and Fredrik Söderbaum, 'Introduction: Intersecting Interregionalism,' in: *Intersecting Interregionalism: Regions, Global Governance and the EU* (Francis Baert, Tiziana Scaramagli and Fredrik Söderbaum eds., Springer, Dordrecht, 2014), 1-12, at 5.

[17] See Stephen Kingah, Vivian Schmidt and Wang Yong, 'Setting the Scene: the European Union's Engagement with Transnational Policy Networks,' in: *The European Union's Engagement with Transnational Policy Networks* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 1-15.

[18] Henry Kissinger, *World Order* (New York: Penguin, 2014), at 2.

hurdles, world leaders agreed to adopt important sustainable development goals (SDGs) with the objective of achieving these by 2030.[19] The EU has been engaged in efforts to provide solutions to some of the challenges while staying competitive. To do this it has coalesced and channeled resources through important policy fields such as research and innovation, which has had an impact on free trade agreements (FTAs) with other regions. Third, the EU's relationship with other regions of the global South does not take place in a void. These are also impacted by relationships nurtured by other actors or 'global powers' such as the USA, China, Japan, Russia and South Korea who, in varying ways, are also fostering regionalization processes in the South. These contending relationships should therefore be compared with a view of understanding what other actors outside of the EU are doing better and what they are not[20]. Through this we can determine whether the engagement of the EU through SCD and its impact on regionalism/ inter-regionalism in the South is progressing the Union's standing as an international actor. It is posited that one of the (non-exclusive) areas through which the Union could add value would be in enhancing the provision of tertiary higher education to bolster public-private partnerships that foster useful research and innovation.

Following the conceptual framework, the second part of this paper elaborates on the element of aspiration or willingness. The third part then discusses the various components of the capability or capacity with specific emphasis on resources. Part four considers the aspect of legitimacy that deals with questions around acceptance or power of influence/ attraction that the EU may command in SCD that in turn has an impact on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. Conclusions and policy implications follow in parts five and six.

2. Willingness

The desire for EU's effective leadership in SCD and the effects that this may have on regional and inter-regional processes in the South is a function of the ambitions that are nurtured by the EU itself. Such aspirations and ambitions to be a leader in SCD are captured by three critical sub-elements. The sub-elements of willingness include: inclusion of such ambitions in the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, in secondary legislation and also in critical policy documents of the Union; the presence of visionary and committed leaders especially in some of the EU Member States who promote the leadership of the EU in SCD; and finally the desire of EU institution principals and organs to take the lead in the area of SCD.

---

[19] See UN General Assembly Resolution 70-01, *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, A/RES/70/1, Adopted by the UNGA on 25 September 2015.
[20] This will be addressed in subsequent papers.

2.1 Inclusion of SCD goals in black letter law and policy

The nature of the desire of political masters to elaborate their ambitions in a particular policy area is the deliberate effort to include these set policy objectives in black letter law and also in influential policy statements. In the case of the EU, Title XIX and specifically Articles 180 and 186 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)[21] make clear that the EU is keen to forge a role for itself in the area of science cooperation although the words science diplomacy are not mentioned verbatim. Article 180 of the TFEU states that in meeting the research goals of the Union[22] cooperation with third countries and international organization shall be promoted. Article 186 stipulates specifically that 'the Union may make provision for cooperation in Union research, technological development and demonstration with third countries or international organizations.' One may interpret the inclusion of 'international organizations' in this provision to also cover regional organizations including those of the South. Title XIII of the TFEU which has a single article (Article 167) deals with culture and states, *inter alia*, that 'The Union and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organizations in the sphere of culture, in particular the Council of Europe.'[23] The wording of this article indicates that reference to the Council of Europe, itself a regional body, is non-exclusive.

Besides these provisions in black letter law, the Union has also adopted a number of important policy statements that corroborate its desire to be an effective leader in the realm of SCD.[24] The need for including such provisions/ statements in founding legal texts and also in secondary legislation and policies of the EU is that there is now a strong realization from the part of the Union that all the possible tools in the Union's arsenal have to be used in a highly competitive world to confront current challenges. For instance there is a realization that security problems such as international terrorism cannot be addressed unilaterally with the traditional hard foreign policy tools. Rather SCD efforts are a possible tool to comprehensively deal with the root causes of terrorism. In the

---

[21] Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, C 83/47 Official Journal of the European Union, 30.03.2010.

[22] The goal is mentioned in Article 179(1), TFEU: 'The Union shall have the objective of strengthening its scientific and technological bases by achieving a European research area in which researchers, scientific knowledge and technology circulate freely, and encouraging it to become more competitive, including in its industry, while promoting all the research activities deemed necessary by virtue of other Chapters of the Treaties.'

[23] Article 167(3), TFEU.

[24] See European Commission, The Future of Europe is Science: A Report of the President's Science and Technology Advisory Council (STAC) (October 2014); 'Resolution of the Council of 16 November 2007 on a European Agenda for Culture', Official Journal of the European Union (2007/C 287/01); European Commission, *Preparatory Action. Culture in EU External Relations: Engaging the World: Towards Global Cultural Citizenship* (2014).

same vein, a silo approach cannot be used to address challenges that relate to diseases and climate change.

2.2.1 Regionalism

At the same time, evidence of the importance that the EU places on SCD is their incursion in these types of diplomacy for some time now to promote regionalism with the regions of the 'South'. For example, the EU-Africa High Level Policy Dialogue on Science, Technology and Innovation (HLPD-STI) within the framework of the Joint Africa EU Strategy (JEAS) between the EU and the African Union (AU) has targeted key challenges such as climate change, nutrition and health. Within the strategy priority is placed on the development of knowledge-based societies as well as on cultural cooperation.[25] Other examples of EU SCD related actions with an impact on regionalism in Africa include: ERAfrica or the European Research Area Network for Africa - Developing African-European joint collaboration for Science and Technology; ECOWREX II which is dedicated toward the Promotion of Sustainable Energy Access through the use of Geospatial Technologies in West Africa; and RINEA which stands for Research and Innovation Network for Europe and Africa (see annex 1).

In Southeast Asia the EU's SCD actions have also had fallout on ASEAN. Some of the important initiatives worth mentioning include: ASEAN-EU Cooperation in Science, Technology and Innovation II; the Enhanced Regional EU-ASEAN Dialogue Instrument; and EU's direct Support for Higher Education in the ASEAN Region (see annex 2).

In Latin America the EU has provided assistance for initiatives that further regionalism in the region. These include CESCAN II that entails supporting economic and social cohesion in the Andean Region ('*Proyecto apoyo a la cohesion economica y social en la comunidad Andina*'). The Union has equally backed the Network in Advanced Materials and Nanomaterials of industrial interest between Europe and Latin American Countries of MERCOSUR (Argentina-Brazil-Uruguay). Also vital have been the Framework Agreement on Cooperation between the EU and the Cartagena Agreement member countries as well as the Network of digital cinema theaters of MERCOSUR (see annex 3).

2.1.2 Inter-regionalism

Making a distinction between regional and inter-regional relations within the context of understanding the effects of EU SCD actions in the South can be convoluted. This is because within given regional organizations of the South such as the African Union and CELAC, smaller regional bodies co-exist and interact. The issue of overlapping regions, a situation where several regional organizations exist within one geographical space and

---

[25] The Africa-EU Strategic Partnership: A Joint Africa-EU Strategy (2007) at <http://www.africa-eu-partnership.org/sites/default/files/documents/eas2007_joint_strategy_en.pdf.>

countries have multiple memberships is widely understood[26]. Therefore, in some instances where the EU is engaging these larger regional outfits it may advertently or otherwise provoke inter-regional dynamics.

In Africa, the EU has been engaged in supporting research in science capacities of Africans in ways that have inter-regional implications within the continent itself. Some of the initiatives include the Mwalimu Nyerere African Union Scholarship Scheme which is an initiative to support scientific collaboration between researchers and staff of higher education institutes from Africa, Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP) countries and regions. Other useful science initiatives the EU is supporting that benefit the interaction of people across African regional entities include AFRIGEOSS or the African dimension of the Group on Earth Observations; the Square Kilometer Array in South Africa and the European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development. It is also vital to highlight the important work that the EU and some of its Member States (Sweden for instance) have been engaged in, to progress efforts made in establishing and operating the Pan African University based in five institutes across five African countries: Algeria, Cameroon, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa. While the center in Kenya deals with science and innovation the one in Cameroon focuses on humanities and social sciences with a particular emphasis on African history and culture (see annex 1).

In the case of Asia, there has been a committed effort to foster ties in the areas of science and technology since 1996 namely within the process of the Asia Europe Meetings (ASEM). Following a proposal from China in 1998 during the biennial and second ASEM meeting in London, the parties agreed to forge ministerial level engagement on science and technology (S&T). However, they agreed that they would abstain from establishing formal institutions in this regard and that they would rather rely on more flexible networked structures[27]. They exposed their desire to amongst others, promote public awareness of their S&T activities and also enhance trans-boundary linkages for S&T and knowledge oriented business ventures[28]. Even in the absence of further ministerial meetings in ASEM on S&T efforts have moved forward especially through the engagement and activities that are promoted through the Asia Europe Foundation (ASEF) including the ASEF Young Leaders Summit and the ASEF Cultural Policy Dialogue Series. More discursive initiatives through seminars and

---

[26] Philippe De Lombaerde, 'Comparing regionalisms: Methodological aspects and considerations' (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011).

[27] The Asia-Europe Cooperation Framework (AECF) (2000) at
<http://eeas.europa.eu/asem/docs/aecf_2000_en.pdf>.

[28] UNESCO (May 2007). *Review of Science and Technology Meetings at Ministerial level 1996-2006. Report prepared for the Ministerial Round table on: Science, Technology and Innovation for Sustainable Development: The Role of UNESCO* at
<http://www.unesco.org/science/document/Rewiew%20ST%20Ministerial%20%20Meetings_EN.pdf>

workshops have continued in specific areas or instances such as cooperation on life sciences, pharmaceuticals and bio-medical equipment; cooperation on food safety and bioethics (covering the ASEM Food Safety Platform); cooperation on water resources management (including backing for ASEMWATERNET); cooperation on aquaculture for instance the creation of an ASEM research-driven and multi-sector Aquaculture Platform; an Asia-Europe Environment Forum and the ASEM Trans-Eurasian Information Network[29]. Some of the challenges in the cooperation within ASEM highlighted by senior officials in a meeting held in Brussels in 2011 underscored setbacks such as asymmetric capacities, weak standard setting devices, problems surrounding mobility of scientists and above all the lack of mechanisms to ensure fluid technology transfer. It is important to note that the demands for greater S&T engagement have been led mainly from the 'South'. For instance, China has been pushing for the creation of an ASEM Cooperation Centre for Science, Technology and Innovation. Overall there are many ongoing initiatives but they all suffer from a lack of strategic direction and guidance[30]. This can be partly explained by the fact that relevant ministers last met in 1998 (see annex 2).

In Latin America, the EU has also been involved in processes with an inter-regional dimension through SCD. Biennial meetings are now organized at the very highest level between the EU and LAC countries and this has been accelerated with the creation of CELAC. The EU finds CELAC as an easy mechanism to promote inter-regionalism. Although it should be clear that promoting inter-regionalism is not the only objective for EU-CELAC projects, there are also some EU-CELAC projects that do not seek to promote inter-regionalism but simply encompass activities with countries in the entire region. Initial formal engagements between the parties started at the level of senior officials in 1999 but in 2002 the first summit was held which is now convened on a rolling basis biennially. The parties have resolved to target specific areas for engagement. These include promotion of healthy societies and information society.[31] In March 2002 both sides agreed to create an Action Plan on S&T Cooperation building on a shared vision that had been elaborated in Bruges a year earlier[32]. During the third EU-LAC Summit that was convened in Mexico in May 2004 the parties agreed to establish an EU –LAC Knowledge

[29] Jacques Pelkmans and Weinian Hu (14 October 2014). *Does ASEM work?* Centre for European Policy Studies. Policy brief, p. 10; European Commission (2008) *The ASEM Aquaculture Platform: Sustained Supply, Finding Solutions, Bridging the Divide. ASEM Science and Technology*, Vol. 3. Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, p. 9.

[30] Oreste Spinelli (14 January 2014) *A new agenda for EU-Asia relations*. Friends of Europe at <http://www.friendsofeurope.org/global-europe/new-agenda-eu-asia-relations/>

[31] Walter B. Wriston, 'Bits, Bytes and Diplomacy,' 76(5) *Foreign Affairs* (September/ October 1997), 172-182, at 172.

[32] EU-LAC Senior Officials Meeting on Science and Technology (22 March 2002) *ALCUE's Brasília Action Plan for S&T Cooperation*. Brasília, Brazil.

Area[33]. While the EU-LAC Vienna Summit of February 2006 endorsed an EU-LAC Common Area of Higher Education[34], the Lima meeting of May 2008 was marked by the adoption of a decision by the EU to encourage efforts on Scientific and Technical Cooperation on Socio-economic and Environmental challenges between both sides. This was followed by the Madrid Summit of May 2010 in which the parties adopted the EU-LAC Joint Initiative for Research and Innovation (JIRI) which is now operationalized through five working groups on bio-economy, renewable energies, biodiversity, ICT and cross-cutting issues. In 2012 they agreed on an Action Plan that referred to many priorities amongst which was innovation and technology for sustainable development and social inclusion as a key plank in the inter-regional relations[35]. Some of the examples or instances of manifestation of EU-LAC engagement with inter-regional effects in the LAC regions have included EULARINET, ALCUE Net, ERANet-LAC, the EU-LAC Foundation, ENSOCIO LA, the EU-LAC Innovation Platform, EU-LAC Health, LEADERSHIP, ENLACE, and EUCARINET (see annex 3).

2.2 Presence of committed leaders

The importance of 'champions' and effective leaders in generating political commitment among decision-making is well documented[36]. When the leadership takes advantage of the merging of the identified problems with proposals and politics, what Kingdon termed 'policy windows' or opportunities frequently arise allowing for policy to move forward[37]. Visionary leadership is essential in effective SCD. It entails the presence of political leaders and even captains of industry and the arts who are keen to use SCD to further the interests and international standing of the European Union. The role of leaders such as Angela Merkel and Tom Enders of EADS have been clear in mobilizing the technological strengths of the EU to position it as an indispensable international player

---

[33] Third EU-LAC Summit. 2004. Declaration. Guadalajara, Mexico. Paragraph 93.

[34] Council of the European Union. 12 May 2006.Declaration of Vienna. EU-LAC Summit. Press release. C/06/137 9335/06 (Presse 137) IV. Brussels, 52.

[35] Council of the European Union. 15 November 2010. Towards a new stage in the bi-regional partnership: innovation and technology for sustainable development and social inclusion. Madrid Action Plan 2010-2012. Press release. 10449/1/10 REV 1 PRESSE 150. Brussels.

[36] Andrew Green, Nancy Gerein, Tolib Mirzoev, Philippa Bird, Stephen Pearson, Le Vu Anh, Tim Martineau, Maitrayee Mukhopadhyay, Xu Qian, K.V. Ramani and Werner Soors, 'Health policy processes in maternal health: A comparison of Vietnam, India and China,' 100(2) *Health Policy* (May 2011) 167-173; Ruth Levine, What Works Working Group and Molly Kinder (eds) (2004) 'Millons Saved: proven success in global health'. Washington, D.C.: Center for Global Development.

[37] John W. Kingdon, *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1995).

especially in the realm of aerospace technology[38]. So for there to be effective SCD it is not enough to encode such desires in black letter law. It takes visionary and committed leaders to ensure that the provisions included in primary and secondary legislation are not only conceived but also implemented.

2.3 Fostering SCD through the EU institutions and organs

Having political masters who can 'sell' the SCD agenda at the national level is one thing, yet having champions within the EU institutions themselves (the Commission, the Council, Parliament and various agencies) who can make a case for a more active engagement of the EU through SCD is another matter. The current President of the European Commission Jean Claude Junker has made it clear that one of his key priorities is to position the Union as a foremost and leading competitor in research and innovation and fostering that position outside of Europe.[39] This is critical and also partly explains why there has been an important shift in the research agenda of the EU Commission toward greater emphasis on the predominance of STEM or SET sciences.

3. Capacity

The willingness for desirable outcomes will remain superfluous if it is not backed by the needed capability to get the job done. The wherewithal in the realm of SCD is important in determining the nature of effective EU leadership in the area of SCD. Aspects of capacity can be further collapsed into three further sub-determinants. They are the presence and engagement of skilled professionals (scientists, artists, inventors); availability of financial resources to be channeled toward various research and cultural initiatives; and finally the establishment of institutions and agencies that are dedicated to fostering the goals of SCD.

3.1 Engaged and skilled professionals

A number of people participate in SCD but it is clear that the main actors involved are those directly related to the arts and sciences. Therefore, the nature of the people who are operationalizing relevant know-how is critical. As countries and regions need

---

[38] See for example: Aviation Week Network (2013) 'Person of the year 2012: How Angela Merkel quashed a mega-merger' at <http://aviationweek.com/commercial-aviation/person-year-2012-how-angela-merkel-quashed-mega-merger>

[39] See Jean-Claude Juncker, *A New Start for Europe: My Agenda for Jobs, Growth, Fairness and Democratic Change: Political Guidelines for the Next European Commission*, 15 July 2014, at <https://ec.europa.eu/priorities/sites/beta-political/files/juncker-political-guidelines_en.pdf> at 5.

battalions for hard power when the need arises so too do they need contingents of trained scientists and artists who are imbued with the requisite skills to engage other countries and regions of the world in a manner that has impact. As such a committed and dedicated cohort of scientists and artists is needed to make SCD work directly or indirectly as a result of their activities.[40] Even when the political masters provide the strategic direction of policy and what is needed, those who are technically strong are needed to make SCD have impact where it matters most. For these groups of skilled and committed professionals to deliver they must also be working in supportive environments that facilitate the free movement and exchange of ideas. They must equally be able to engage in professional associations and networks that guarantee minimum standards for them to thrive in their disciplines. Without a strong cohort of engaged professionals who are experts in their respective fields, SCD may only remain a fanciful idea that cannot be actualized or followed through with concrete actions.

3.2 Investing financial resources on SCD

Having a thriving SCD often means that leaders have recognized that others may have what their countries and regions have to offer. Skilled professionals and facilities require reliable and sustained resources. Important financial resources have to be committed by states to hope for successful SCD that is recognized and respected. This entails dedicating scarce resources in relevant and meaningful educational programs at all levels. It also means that higher and tertiary education is deliberately directed toward the feeding of priced industries that are critical for competition in a knowledge economy. In many instances this also requires that states as well as the private sector channel ample resources in research and development. Niche industries such as aerospace, bio-medical sciences, bio informatics, nanotechnology and new climate technologies are some of the sectors where critical investments in R&D are essential and for other states and regions to pay attention, there must have been proven achievements in these areas. When analyzing interactions between the EU and the regions of the South, it is clear that some imbalances exist in terms of access to resources and technologies. However, the regions of the South have made important strides in certain innovations. By exchanging access to technologies and promoting regional integration processes with other regions of the South, these countries could be in a position to gradually improve their economies,

---

[40] See Micah Lowenthal, 'Science Diplomacy for Nuclear Security,' 288 United States Institute for Pease Special Report (October 2011); Yale Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain* (PA: Penn State University Press, 2004).

which in turn would level out the playing field with the EU and other major powers. Therefore, investing in R&D and also in the crucial sectors of the arts and humanities are necessary for a successful SCD that would have an impact on other regions of the South and at the same time will have important benefits for the EU itself.

3.3 Establishment of institutions and agencies dedicated to promoting SCD goals

Institutions and agencies that are created to foster SCD are critical in ensuring that there is continuity in the activities conceived for SCD. Within the Commission Vice President and High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR FASP) can also draw from the institutional wealth provided by the directorate general for research and innovation and the directorate general for education and culture in efforts to move SCD for impact in terms of shaping regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. The HR FASP can also draw on the work of the various agencies that deal with applied sciences as well as the arts to ensure the realization of broad foreign policy goals that impinge on SCD. So the EU Commission, the Council as well as the Parliament and thematic agencies play an important role in ensuring a successful SCD.

4. Acceptance

Even when there is the willingness and the capacity to engage in SCD, these may fall short because of the absence of credibility of the EU in the area of SCD. Aspects of acceptance pertain more to legitimacy. Acceptance is an important manifestation of the diffusion of technology, policies, ideas, services, values, institutions, power, people, emotions, and much more[41] from stimuli or change agents[42] (in this case the EU) to other regions of the South. Indeed policy diffusion can also occur externally and not only internally and geographically so. Shipman and Volden note that: 'In today's world, with low barriers to communication and travel, the classic view of policy diffusion as geographic clustering is growing increasingly outdated.'[43] Evidence of acceptance include: the existence of a committed citizenry (including individuals, NGOs, the media, various professional and epistemic groups); buy-in from politicians such as local, national and regional parliamentarians; and the desire of other regional and international organizations to recognize and accept the leadership in SCD of the EU.

---

[41] Etel Solingen and Tanja A. Börzel, 'Introduction to Presidential Issue: The Politics of international diffusion – A Symposium,' 16 *International Studies Review* (2014), 173-187, at 173.
[42] Everett Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovation* (The Free Press, New York, 1983), at 4.
[43] Charles R. Shipman and Craig Volden, 'Policy Diffusion: Seven lessons for scholars and practitioners,' *Public Administration Review* (2012), 1-9, at 2.

4.1 Committed citizenry

Important technological advances in recent years including the advancement of social media tools now have empowered citizens in a unique way to have greater and even instant influence on how public policy and diplomacy is shaped. A committed citizenry is critical in voicing dissent or support for specific initiatives on SCD. In the European Union the inclusion of the citizens' initiative in the Lisbon Treaty is an important milestone allowing for direct impact on policy and even diplomacy from citizens. An informed and committed citizenry that is well served by an open and critical media as well as a vibrant civil society all matter in questioning the need for and direction of SCD at the EU level. Tools such as the Eurobarometer are important in gauging how EU citizens feel about policy choices adopted by policy makers in Brussels and other EU agencies. Such a high level of transparency is useful in ensuring accountability for public choices including on SCD that impact other regional entities.

4.2 Buy-in from national and regional politicians including parliamentarians

In representative democracies local, national and regional politicians including parliamentarians have an important role to play in the direction of SCD. Politicians who are more outward looking can make the case for SCD as a useful tool in a more inter-connected world. However, in times of economic challenges and also when identity politics has grown especially in the context of high levels of refugees movements and accelerated migrant mobility many politicians tend to question the rationale of engaging with other countries. They put up what Solingen calls (in diffusion literature) 'firewalls'[44] that deter the conductivity of ideas. In such conditions, the utility of forward thinking politicians including parliamentarians is vital in shaping public debate and sentiment. Indeed SCD could be regarded as one of the tools to dilute or mitigate the sharp edges of anti-immigrant sentiments in such sensitive times.

4.3 Acceptance beyond the EU: other regional and international organizations

For SCD to be successful, non-EU based partners in other regional organizations and also international organizations such as the United Nations (through agencies such as: UNIDO, WIPO, UNESCO, WHO) have to also accept the important role of the EU in the realm of SCD. In other regional organizations acceptance is not only manifested by the

---

[44] Etel Solingen, 'Of dominoes and firewalls: The domestic, regional and global politics of international diffusion,' 56 *International Studies Quarterly* (2012), 631-644, at 632.

fact that these external organizations can benefit from EU SCD initiatives but also by the fact that the EU serves as a stimulant for diffused ideas and insights[45] on how regional entities can also lead a successful SCD. Nonetheless, such diffusion (which is more of a process than an outcome)[46] to other regions for example ASEAN[47] is not linear and can also be bi-directional.[48] In any event it is direct diffusion whereby one entity models its actions following those of another.[49] The inter-regional diffusion mechanisms may include competition, coercion, emulation and learning.[50] For many international organizations, the EU has been an important voice and it is recognized as such.

5. Conclusions

Mapping the contours of effective leadership of the EU in SCD and the incidence that this has on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South is not an easy task. It is a topic with many convoluted facets that are all significant given the current context of varied global challenges including attainment of SDGs. The context is also one in which the EU is competing with other international actors. Yet the goal of the paper has been to look at ways in which one can better make a determination as to whether the actions of the EU in SCD have an impact on regionalism and inter-regionalism in the South. On willingness, there is a case to make that there are strong bases in the EU both in black letter law and through committed leaders that are keen to ensure that the EU is engaged in this regard.

Yet elements of capacity and acceptance reveal that even if there is the will, there can be capacity and credibility concerns which can also determine how regions of the South respond to the EU as stimuli. These concerns manifest themselves in various ways including the manner in which third states and regions are or are not receptive to SCD-related proposals that are made by the EU but channeled for instance through trade agreements that are still resisted in many places.

---

[45] Anja Jetschke and Tobias Lenz, 'Does regionalism diffuse? A new research agenda for the study of regional organization,' *Journal of European Public Policy* (2013), 1-12, at 2; Tanja A. Borzel and Thomas Risse, 'The Transformative Power of Europe: The European Union and the Diffusion of Ideas' 1 *KFG Working Paper* (May 2009), at 5; Anu Bradford, "The Brussels effect," 107(1) *Northwestern University Law Review* (2012), 1-67, at 10-19.

[46] Erika Forsberg, 'Diffusion in the study of civil wars: A cautionary tale,' 16 *International Studies Review* (2014), 188-198, at 189.

[47] Anja Jetschke and Philomena Murray, 'Diffusing regional integration: The EU and Southeast Asia,' 35(1) *West European Politics* (January 2012), 174-191, at 176.

[48] Amitav Acharya, 'How ideas spread: Whose norms matter? Norm localization and institutional change in Asian regionalism,' 58 *International Organization* (Spring 2004), 239-275, at 241; Tanja Börzel and Thomas Risse, 'From Europeanization to diffusion: Introduction,' 35(1) *West European Politics* (January 2012), 1-19, at 2.

[49] Michael C. Horowitz, 'Nonstate actors and the diffusion of innovations: The case of suicide terrorism,' 64 *International Organization* (Winter 2010), 33-64, at 37.

[50] Robyn Klingler-Vidra and Philip Schleifer, 'Convergence more or less: Why do practices vary as they diffuse?' 16 *International Studies Review* (2014), 264-274, at 270.

The conceptual framework applied composed by the requirements willingness, capacity and acceptance was a useful tool towards the first step of analyzing the effectiveness of the EU's use of SCD to promote regionalism and inter-regionalism in and with the regions of the South. However, this also raises questions on how can SCD serve as a tool for other inter-regional processes such as free trade agreements (FTAs)? How can aspects of SCD support the development of capacities in regions of the South? What works and does not work in SCD incursions between regions? And how can SCD improve the EU's standing as a global leader? These are all issues that will be further explored in the course of the EL-CSID project by work package 5.

6. Policy Implications

With respect to willingness, the SCD goals and agenda need to come out strongly in specific trade deals and also in the EU's overall security, climate change and trade strategies in as much as foreign and security policies are concerned. In terms of capacity, there is a case to be made for greater coordination of the research and cultural bodies of the various member states so that efforts do not mutually run at cross-purposes. There are a multitude of projects in which the EU is involved with other regions of the South but it is not always clear how all these initiatives can be channeled and mobilized to serve strategic foreign policy goals of the EU. The efforts often look dispersed and not sustained in time. Finally, with regard to acceptance, this is an area where there is a major gap and where greater efforts are needed not only in sensitizing EU citizens about the importance of SCD in the attainment of EU goals but also exposing some leaders to the benefits of SCD.

Annexes

Annex 1: Examples of EU-sub-Saharan African SCD interactions

Project name	Specific countries involved (if not all EU countries)	Type of interaction	Type of diplomacy	Brief description	Website
ERAfrica: European Research Area Network for Africa - Developing African-European joint collaboration for Science and Technology	France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Finland, Austria, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, South Africa, Kenya, Egypt, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire	EU-sub-Saharan Africa	Science in diplomacy	This project seeks to: "Establish a long-term framework for communication, collaboration and coordination of programme owners/ managers related to S&T co-operation from Europe and Africa. Reinforce EU-Africa S&T collaboration by promoting joint learning by African and European research programme owners and managers and identifying relevant instruments to address more effectively the global challenges of sustainable development. Develop joint funding schemes and procedures between European and African programme owners aiming at supporting joint activities. Strengthen African research capacities and improve the impact of research for development in Africa. Strengthening the impact and the influence of S&T research implies enhancing the transfer of new knowledge to the benefit of the society. It also implies the achievement of greater coherence between research outputs and policies and funding instruments in other areas than research."	http://www.erafrica.eu/en/251.php
ECOWREX 2: Promoting Sustainable Energy Access through the use of Geospatial Technologies in West Africa	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia,	EU-ECOWAS	Diplomacy for science	"The ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) Observatory for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECOWREX), a web-based information platform, was developed in response to the existing knowledge and information barriers that are hindering development in the energy sector in Western Africa. Its	http://acp-st.eu/content/promoting-sustainable-energy-access-through-use-geospatial-

	Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo			aim is to provide decision makers, project developers, investors, researchers and the general public with tailored information on the energy sector in the ECOWAS region. This platform also employs a Geographic Information System (GIS) to help visually assess the energy resources in combination with other human activities and plan where and when specific energy technologies can be deployed. To keep up with the demand for data sharing and knowledge transfer, it has become crucial to restructure the ECOWREX map framework."	technologies-west-africa
ACP-SRP: ACP Sugar Research Programme	Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Spain, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Latvia, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Slovenia, Slovakia, UK, ACP countries	EU-ACP	Science in diplomacy	"The ACP sugar research Programme provides solutions to the sugar industry in ACP countries, by responding to a selected number of clearly identified technological challenges that hamper the sugarcane sector's performance. A total of thirteen research and innovation projects are implemented under the Programme, covering three distinctive areas of research: (cane varieties, costs and losses cuttings)."	http://www.acp-srp.eu/

RINEA: Research and Innovation Network for Europe and Africa	Germany, UK, France, Portugal, Algeria, Burkina Faso, Namibia, South Africa, Burundi, Nigeria, Greece, Finland	EU-sub-Sahran countries	Diplomacy for Science	RINEA is a partnership between African and European partners to strengthen the bi-regional science, technology and innovation (STI) cooperation	http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/index.cfm?pg=south_africa
Examples of inter-regionalism					
European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD)	EU Member States, Norway, Switzerland, according to the projects Central African, West African, East African and Southern African countries	EU-SROs in Sub-Saharan Africa	Science for diplomacy	"This initiative seeks to promote coordination among its 28 European partners (EU Member States, Norway, Switzerland, European Commission). Activities encompass: (i) at the policy level: developing common European approaches towards the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agriculture Research) and its restructuring process, and towards other partners in the Global Forum for Agricultural Research, such as the Sub-Regional Organisations (SROs) in Sub-Saharan Africa, CORAF, ASARECA and SACCAR (for Central Africa, West Africa, East Africa and Southern Africa) and the North Africa SRO-now all coordinated by FARA (Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa); and (ii) at the institutional level EIARD initiated the European Forum for Agricultural Research for Development in order to strengthen institutional and thematic networks of European universities and research organisations."	http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/index.cfm?lg=en&pg=africa

Annex 2: Examples of EU-Southeast Asian SCD interactions

Project name	Countries involved	Type of interaction	Type of diplomacy	Brief description	Website
EU Support to Higher Education in ASEAN Region	Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam	EU-ASEAN	Diplomacy for Science	The global objective of this programme is to strengthen regional co-operation, enhance the quality, regional competitiveness and internationalisation of ASEAN higher education institutions and students, contributing to an ASEAN Community in 2015 and beyond.	https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/projects/eu-support-higher-education-asean-region-eu-share_en
Enhanced Regional EU-ASEAN Dialogue Instrument	ASEAN member states	EU-ASEAN	Cultural diplomacy	The ASEAN Socio-Cultural pillar, including but not limited to, climate change, disaster management, environment, education, working toward achieving sustainable development goals; and also support the reflection on how to narrow the development gaps between ASEAN most developed countries and its newer members (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam - CLMV)	https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/annex1-eu-asean-dialogue-instrument-e-readi-20141126_en.pdf
ASEAN-EU Cooperation in Science, Technology and Innovation	EU and ASEAN member states	EU-ASEAN	Science for diplomacy	International science cooperation network expanding scientific collaboration between Europe and Southeast Asia (SEA) in a more strategic and coherent manner. The four-year long project was launched in October 2012, involves 21 institutions from the two regions and is coordinated by the Project Management Agency at the German Aerospace Center (DLR). Core projects: ASEAN-EU Science, Technology and Innovation Days; Cooperation in Health, Food Security and Safety, Metrology as well as Water Management, Knowledge transfer and supporting participation in Horizon 2020; fact finding missions on in innovation systems in SEA	https://sea-eu.net/
ASEAN-EU Cooperation in Science, Technology and Innovation II	EU and ASEAN member states	EU-ASEAN	Science for diplomacy	Successor of SEA-EU-NET: cooperation framework for researchers from Europe and SEA; launched by 21 national institutions, thus no intergovernmental agreement/cooperation but transnational	http://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/105423_de.html

Examples of inter-regionalism					
ASEF Young Leaders Summit	ASEM Member Countries	ASEM	Cultural diplomacy	The ASEF Young Leaders Summit (#ASEFYLS) is for young thinkers and doers to question and explore how the entrepreneurial vein can trigger and nourish job-creation, mobility and social cohesion in Asia and Europe. ASEFYLS is also an experiential space where fresh minds and influential leaders from both regions meet. Constructive dialogue, hands-on skills development and a Call for Action addressed to the ASEM Foreign Ministers are the core elements of the programme. ASEFYLS emerged from the request by young citizens and ASEM Head of States and Governments for a closer interaction and exchange of perspectives on pressing societal issues in both regions. Now is your moment to shape this connection!	http://www.asef.org/projects/programmes
ASEF Cultural Policy Dialogue Series	ASEM Member Countries	ASEM	Cultural diplomacy	Engages at high lelvels of offical contacts, i.e. Track I and Track II level. Potential for socialisation, knowledge transfer and „sharing of good practices". Not a forum to assign the EU as a „sender" but possible toway-street, furhter research on output required.	http://www.asef.org/projects/programmes/524-cultural-dialogue
Asia-Europe Museum Network	ASEM Member Countries	ASEM	Cultural Diplomacy	ASEMUS (Asia-Europe Museum Network) is a cross-cultural network of museums with Asian Collections which promotes mutual understanding through collaborative activities and works towards facilitating the sharing and use of museum collections. ASEMUS now has over 100 members and the membership is continually growing. As of November 2014, the network included 116 members, from 39 countries (64 from Asia, 41 from Europe) and 11 affiliate members.	http://www.asef.org/projects/programmes/543-asemus

Annex 3: Examples of EU-Latin American SCD interactions

Project name	Countries involved	Type of interaction	Type of diplomacy	Brief description	Website
CESCAN II: Supporting economic and social cohesion in the Andean Region ("Proyecto apoyo a la cohesion economica y social en la comunidad Andina)	Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru	EU-Andean Community	Science in diplomacy	This Project sought to support the Member States of the Andean Community (CAN) and the General Secretariat of the CAN in developing regional policies for economic and social cohesion and territorial development (particularly border and regional cooperation).	http://www.comunidadandina.org/cescanII/cescanII.html
Network in Advanced Materials and Nanomaterials of industrial interest between Europe and Latin American Countries of MERCOSUR (Argentina-Brazil-Uruguay)	Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay	EU-MERCOSUR	Diplomacy for Science	"The main objective of this Coordination Action is to create a cooperation platform for forming strategic partnerships between scientists, scientific managers, policy makers, technology transfer and industrial experts in the European Community and three Latin-American (LA) countries belonging to MERCOSUR: Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina (BRAU)."	http://projects.icmab.es/eulasur/about
Framework Agreement on Cooperation between the European Community and the Cartagena Agreement member countries	Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela	EU-Cartagena Member Countries	Science for diplomacy	"The agreement is based on respect for democratic principles and human rights and aims to develop and encourage relations between the two regions. In order to achieve this objective, the Parties have resolved to promote, in particular, the development of cooperation relating to trade, investment, finance and technology, taking into account the special status of the Cartagena member countries as developing countries. Other aims include the promotion, intensification and consolidation of the process of integration in the Andean sub-region."	http://cordis.europa.eu/news/rcn/10238_en.html
Network of digital cinema theaters of MERCOSUR	Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay	EU-MERCOSUR	Cultural diplomacy	The MERCOSUR Audiovisual Programme is a cooperation agreement with the European Union and MERCOSUR developed in the field of Specialized Cinema and Audiovisual Authorities of MERCOSUR Meeting (RECAM),	http://www.mercosur.int/innovaportal/v/7082/2/innova.front/un-hito-para-la-

				the advisory body of MERCOSUR in the area of film and audiovisuals. This project was jointly funded by the EU and MERCOSUR.	integracion-regional-del-sector-audiovisual
ALFA III (Latin America Academic Training)	EU: 28 member states LAC: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	EU-LAC	Cultural diplomacy	"The ALFA III Programme represents the only existing programme aiming at the modernisation of Higher Education in Latin America as a platform to promote sustainable and equitable development in the region. The ALFA III programme comprises 51 projects managed and implemented through networks of higher education institutions in both regions."	http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/latin-america/regional-cooperation/alfa/index_en.htm
Examples of inter-regionalism					
ERANet-LAC - Network of the European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean Countries on Joint Innovation and Research Activities	EU: Finland, France, Germany, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey LAC: Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile,	EU-CELAC	Diplomacy for Science	"ERANet-LAC is a Network of the European Union (EU) and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) on Joint Innovation and Research Activities. It strengthens the bi-regional partnership in Science, Technology and Innovation by planning and implementing concrete joint activities and by creating a sustainable framework for future bi-regional joint activities."	http://eranet-lac.eu/index.php

	Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay				
ALCUE NET: Latin America, Caribbean and European Union Network on Research and Innovation	EU: Finland, Austria, France, Germany, Norway, Portugal, Spain, LAC: Argentina, Colombia, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Panama, Uruguay	EU-CELAC	Science for diplomacy	"The ALCUE NET objective is to establish a bi-regional European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean (EU-CELAC) platform bringing together actors involved in R&I orientation, funding and implementation, as well as other relevant stakeholders from the public and private sector and the civil society, in an effort to support the international Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) dimension of the Europe 2020 Strategy and Innovation Union Flagship Initiative. It will do so by promoting bi-regional and bilateral partnerships for jointly societal challenges, working to develop the attractiveness of Europe in the world, and by promoting the establishment of a level-playing field in Research and Innovation."	http://alcuenet.eu/about-alcue-net.php