



# Atlantic Social Lab

Cooperation for the Promotion of Social Innovation

---

## SOCIAL INNOVATION AND THE ROLE OF STATE WORKSHOP REPORT

---

*WP6 Atlantic Social Innovation Observatory*

*Final report*

*Document prepared by:*

*Carla Nogueira, Hugo Pinto, Ana Filipa Sá & Fábio Sampaio*

The project Atlantic Social Lab is co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) through the INTERREG Atlantic Area Cooperation Program (EAPA\_246/2016).



**Interreg**

**Atlantic Area**

European Regional Development Fund



EUROPEAN UNION

## Overview

Contemporary societies are facing new economic problems and societal challenges. This demands to rethink and restructure the hegemonic neoliberalist development paradigm and readapt the capitalist discourse to embody the increasing awareness of the need for change. Market-oriented innovation no longer can be perceived as a long-term solution and therefore other approaches to innovation, such as social innovation, emerge. Social innovation is a complex process that seeks to solve social problems, generating new ideas, products or processes that meet social needs and challenges.

The Atlantic Social Lab (ASL) project is an example of the need to discuss issues related to social innovation. With 9 partners and involving 10 associated partners from Spain, Portugal, France, United Kingdom and Ireland, its main goal is to develop and promote social innovation approaches and methods to resolve growing social issues of the Atlantic Area, involving citizens, third sector, social enterprises and the public sector.

The ASL project is now entering its final stage. Many of the main activities were already developed or are close to conclusion. Considering the tasks that the Centre for Social Studies from the University of Coimbra (CES) has developed, a multi-level needs evaluation was concluded and a web resource centre – the Atlantic Social Innovation Observatory – is close to be online. Several social innovation pilot actions are being implemented by the project partners within their regions. A preliminary suggestion of evaluation based in the Theory of Change is being implemented to assess the potential results and impacts of such initiatives.

The current report seeks to synthesize the main issues addressed in the international workshop *Social Innovation and the Role of the State*, implemented in the context of ASL work package 6, regarding the Atlantic Social Innovation Observatory. This workshop took aimed the comprehension of social innovation in the development of public management mechanism as well as exploring challenges of public policies. The target groups were local, regional and national policymakers, associations, non-governmental organisations, practitioners of social innovation, social entrepreneurs, among others. The workshop had 31 participants.

The workshop was held in the afternoon of May 9, in room 1 of CES Alta in Coimbra. It was attended by about 50 people, including keynote speakers, who represented organizations of the quadruple helix, such as, governance bodies, universities, companies or third sector organisations.

The main objectives of the workshop were sharing knowledge about social innovation; exploring the impact of social innovation initiatives in Europe; discussing the link between social innovation, State and public management; promoting social innovation as a driving force for a new and improved public management; presenting the ASL project main results and promote networking and cooperation for future projects of social innovation.

The programme had three key moments: an opening session with representatives from the project partnership, CES, the secretariat of the Atlantic Area Program, and the local organizing chair. Subsequently, a plenary session was held with two internationally renowned keynote speakers, and finally a moment of participatory debate at a roundtable. The next sections outline the main ideas presented by the keynote speakers and summarize main dimensions that emerged from the roundtable discussion.

The full Programme is detailed below.

## **Programme**

14:00 Reception and registration of participants

14:15 Opening session

*Social innovation: A response to market and State failures*

João Paulo Dias, Executive Director of CES (Centre for Social Studies)

Carlos Garea, Joint Secretariat Atlantic Area Programme

Geoff Whittam, Glasgow School for Business & Society, Glasgow Caledonian University, representing the ASL partnership

Hugo Pinto, Local Organizer and PI of the Atlantic-Social-Lab at CES

14:30 Plenary session: Keynote Speakers

*Surveillance as predator and State as prey*

Phil Cooke, Mohn Centre for Innovation & Regional Development Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Bergen, Norway

*The quest for public value: Regional innovation and the role of the State*

Elvira Uyarra, University of Manchester

Moderator: José Reis, CES & Tiago Santos Pereira, CES

16:00 - 16:30 Coffee Break

16:30 Roundtable

*Dynamics of Social Innovation and the Role of the State*

Carlota Quintão, Director of the Association A3S

Filipe Almeida, President of the Executive Committee of the Portuguese Social Innovation Initiative

Jorge Brandão, Representative of the Regional Coordination and Development Committee of the Centro

Liliana Simões, Coordinator and Founder of Microninho\_Incubadora Social

Maria Ferreira, Representative of the Ave Intermunicipal Community

Moderator: Sílvia Ferreira, CES | Rapporteur: Carla Nogueira, University of Algarve

18:00 End of the workshop.

## Plenary Session

The first intervention in the plenary session was carried out by Phil Cooke, currently Professor at the Mohn Centre for Innovation & Regional Development Western Norway University of Applied Sciences. Between 1991-2014 Professor Cooke was University Research Professor of Regional Development, Director of the Centre for Advanced Studies at University of Wales and Professor of the Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development. Formerly, he was an Adjunct Professor of the School of Development Studies in Aalborg University, Denmark, and of LEREPS (Studies and Research Laboratory in Economics, Policies and Social Systems) at the University of Toulouse. He is the Editor of the international renowned journal *European Planning Studies*.

Professor Cooke intervention was entitled “*Surveillance as predator and State as prey*”. He aimed to discuss surveillance in capitalism and its links to the weaknesses of the State and its role, or absence, in combating surveillance of large IT companies. This is the starting point, explicitly assumed in the title. His speech begins with a reflection on the issue of surveillance in capitalism, particularly given the dimension of the digital age, which according to the keynote, is facing a digital devastation. This devastation is reflected in the perception of personal data as ‘*behavioural surplus*’ and in the lack of regulation of digital processes. His intervention continued by making an interesting connection between the existence of monopolies and the consequent limitation to competition and innovation. This presence of monopolies runs against to what the current economic models of relatively free markets take for granted. However, Phil Cooke claims that there is a masked monopolization of large IT companies, which he calls ‘FAGAMI’ - Facebook (WhatsApp; Instagram), Amazon (Spark), Google (YouTube), Apple (AppStore Twitter site) and even Microsoft (Linked-In) - as quasi-monopolies. The point here is that the UK State has experienced a massive amount of “hollowing-out” by the outsourcing of previously public management expertise to various Big Tech and Big Outsourcing firms. This de-democratizes State functions to a dangerous degree. It further leaves them open to propagandising a neoliberal, market-favouring political agenda.

This ends up promoting outsourcing and false markets, contributing to a weakening of the role of the State. For him, the big problem of this weakening is that companies performed badly. He gave some examples to strengthen the argument: low

“absorptive capacity” of State know-how for outsourcing; then “learning backlash” to “squeeze” sub-contractors by cost-cutting of contracts and reducing their number to “increase competition”; caused risky tendering and wins for “lowest bidder” (even online auctions) in difficult, costly areas (like care and prisons); frequently forgot or downplayed pension costs; poor risk assessment by boards - governments did not insist on firm risk “hedging”. Phil Cooke concluded this reflection by stating that the public sector ought to “protect” firms to act in their own best interests.

Following, he gave some examples, namely articulating this reflection with artificial intelligence, identifying some of the major malfunctions of the emergence of artificial intelligence, articulating them into three major dimensions of threats: digital, physical and political. The present report highlight the political dimension that Phil Cooke defines as new forms of surveillance or use of fake media as propaganda to manipulate public opinion on a massive scale. In order to overcome these threats, it is necessary to promote a social (rather than technological) process to increase critical capacity and even scepticism, improve counter-surveillance and improve terrorist-intention learning, assessment and implementation. Altogether these moves have weakened and rendered fallible a State-mechanism that has been – as stated earlier – “hollowed-out” by privatization of public services, competences and legitimacy.

Phil Cooke finished his intervention with some conclusive lines highlighting the possibility of the State will soon facilitate full artificial intelligence enhanced privatisation of the profitable public sector, with further, future profit opportunities arising from outsourcing “malware” cyber-protection (even in healthcare which he considers to be the last frontier). Healthcare is one of the last relatively un-privatized State services in the UK but FAGAMI has plans for the world’s biggest service organization – the National Health Service (NHS) - employing some 1.2 million people. The Trump administration has its eyes on privatizing the NHS, even though it is a State public entity, once Brexit opens the UK to US competition in any future, resulting US-UK trade deal (in which the UK is inevitably the weaker “partner”).

The second intervention in the plenary session was held by Elvira Uyarra, who presented work co-authored with Jon Mikel Zabala-Iturriagoitia (University of Deusto), Edurne Magro (Orkestra/University of Deusto) and Kieron Flanagan (University

of Manchester). Elvira Uyarra is Reader in Innovation Policy and Strategy at Alliance Manchester Business School (University of Manchester) where she is also director of the Manchester Institute of Innovation Research and programme director of the MSc in Innovation Management and Entrepreneurship. Elvira is also Adjunct Professor at the Mohn Center of Innovation and Regional Development at the University of Western Norway and visiting fellow at the Centre for Innovation Management Research (CIMR) of Birkbeck, University of London. Elvira has a degree in Economics from The University of the Basque Country (Spain), an MSc in 'Technical Change and Regional Development' from Cardiff University and a PhD in Science and Technology Policy from the University of Manchester.

Elvira Uyarra began her speech by highlighting that much of the regional innovation policy literature has been seen as too focused on technological innovation and biased towards successful agglomerations, implicitly assuming that innovation and diversification are positive per se. Elvira's main argument is that we are facing a recent normative turn towards issues of green restructuring, transformation of socio-technical systems and responsible regional research and innovation. This means an increasing attention by innovation policy analysts to strategic or deliberate State actions to shape conditions for path creation and development, including the influence that the public sector purchasing decisions have in shaping regional economies.

According to this speaker, there is a rapidly growing interest in how innovation policy can be more selectively used to pursue 'transformative change'. Innovation policy debates increasingly recognize societal challenges as drivers for innovation policy. Thus making a link between innovation more comprehensively and the objectives of social innovation. These connections continue to be braided by moving the discussion to a more territorialized dimension. Policy implementation is local and depends on actors 'on the ground' with knowledge about place-specific problems and the context in which their solution will be implemented.

Increasing within-country inequalities and growing discontent amongst places left behind by globalization have forced a debate around balancing economic gains from innovation with greater territorial and social equity. These questions reflect a renewed interest in more inclusive and sustainable forms of regional innovation policy. Such an approach requires more active government intervention, more attention to distributive aspects and for innovation to be a means of achieving societal goals rather than an end in

itself. However, this normative turn has still only a timid presence in regional innovation policy frameworks.

This invited speaker, emphasized the importance of collective action, namely, arguing that large scale adjustment is rare and normally associated with external shocks, does not consider the ability of regions to successfully restructure is from within through for instance policy activism and institutional work. Subsequently, she focused the discussion on the importance of public procurement and how it has been suggested as a suitable tool to both fight societal challenges and enable structural change. One reason is that there are many ‘missing markets’ related to societal challenges. This argument strengthens the importance of demand because demand articulation increases the likelihood of innovation being accepted and adopted, shaping and legitimating the innovation process. In this sense, fighting societal challenges can, in turn, expose firms to knowledge from domains they would otherwise never look and therefore encourage unrelated diversification.

This recent turn requires some changes. Public procurement places significant demands on governance and implementation, in terms of the range of actors involved to effectively orchestrate demand and align priorities, the need for coordinating innovating policy and domain-specific policies to adequately embed and negotiate societal challenges, and multi-level coordination. This means that organizational and institutional changes are needed to support the management, monitoring and evaluation of the practice as well as creating intermediation structures to support links across the public sector.

Through the presentation of the case study of Galicia, Dr Uyarra ends her intervention highlighting that collective action is needed to shift demand in a particular direction and create markets. This is particularly important in a context of growing interest in how innovation policy can be more selectively used to pursue transformative change. In order to achieve this, policy-makers have a role in steering economic transformation towards socially desirable directions. This is particularly important in peripheral regions, where path creation is less likely to happen endogenously.





**Figure 1:** José Reis presented a final comment in the plenary session [from left to right: Phil Cooke, Elvira Uyarra, Tiago Santos Pereira, José Reis] Photo: HPinto

The two keynote interventions were followed by a final comment from José Reis, Full Professor of the University of Coimbra and Researcher at CES. José Reis underlined some essential ideas. That in fact we are facing waves of privatisation, in particular of public action; the dominance of market logics, that is pressuring the ‘*artificialisation*’ of society’ based in private interests, and the understanding of communities as externally defined; but that State and society are not different nor opposite entities. He argued that we should question several aspects. Is there any room to create articulated public policies considering the material conditions of society? Does the differentiation policy, namely regional innovation policies, considers the territories and diverse policy formulation options? What is the role of the State as a rule of sovereignty?

## Roundtable

The roundtable discussion was centred on the *Dynamics of Social Innovation and the Role of the State*. It was moderated by Sílvia Ferreira, Professor at University of Coimbra and Researcher at CES. The actors participating in the roundtable are presented below.

- Liliana Simões, Coordinator and Founder of [Microninho](#): it is a social innovation project with a multidisciplinary team that promotes the creation of alternative and sustainable life projects for families in situations of vulnerability, potential or effective, through the path of inclusive micro-entrepreneurship, with a validated and unique methodology, anchored in social innovation, territory and governance, with physical and distance incubation, aiming at sustainable local development.
- Jorge Brandão, representing the Commission for Coordination and Regional Development of Centro ([CCDR-Centro](#)): a decentralized agency of the Ministry of Planning, with joint responsibility with the Ministry of the Environment, endowed with financial and administrative autonomy, has the mission of executing environmental, territorial planning and cities policies and regional development at NUTS II Centro, promoting the coordinated action of regional decentralized services and technically support local authorities and their associations.
- Filipe Almeida, President of the Board of Directors of the [Portugal Social Innovation Initiative](#): is a national public initiative created within the framework of Portugal 2020, which aims to contribute to the promotion of Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives (IIES) in Portugal, as well as to create practices of investment that bring new actors (public and private) and greater scale to the financing of social innovation, stimulating impact philanthropy.
- Maria Ferreira, Representative of the Ave Inter-municipal Community ([CIM AVE](#)) (also partners in the Atlantic Social Lab project): is an association of public law municipalities whose purpose is to promote the management of inter-municipal projects. It has a fundamental historical role in the formation of Portuguese identity and covers territories of three hydrographic basins (Douro, Ave and Cávado) and two districts (Braga and Vila Real).

- Carlota Quintão, Director of the [Association A3S](#): is a non-profit association of Research and Development (R&D), the result of a collective project of individuals. Its mission is to promote social entrepreneurship and the development of the social and solidarity economy, seeking to contribute to the consolidation of sustainable, fairer, equitable, participative and inclusive development alternatives.



**Figure 2:** The RoundTable debate was intense [from left to right: Liliana Simões, Jorge Brandão, Filipe Almeida, Maria Ferreira, Carlota Quintão and Sílvia Ferreira] Photo: HPinto

The roundtable took on a flexible character; the participants were previously aware of all the questions but the only one formally posed by the moderator was the first. Therefore, the considerations herein are the summary of the participatory discussion that took place during the session.

This debate started from the central argument that one of the advantages of the notion of social innovation is its ability to stimulate reflection on new ways to shape and reorder State-society-market relations. However, this reorganization is embedded in a set of problems deeper than they appear. The roundtable was a participatory moment and it served as a space for debate where the idea was that the discussion focused on three main points, particularly relevant to reflect the role of the State in the dynamics of social innovation: sustainability, territory and networks. Initially, this moment was conceived on the basis of three guiding questions of the debate (reflecting these dimensions).

One of the main dimensions is the very sustainability of practices, dynamics and activities of social innovation. Social innovation is often associated with economic models based on the social economy. However, today it is possible to perceive that the social economy project tends to fail, failing to fulfil its initial purpose of being an economic alternative demarcated from the market and autonomous logics vis-à-vis the State. Third-sector organizations tend, on the one hand, to have overly welfare-dependent contours, largely dependent on the State, or to get closer to market dynamics, as in the case of some mutual societies and cooperatives, and now a growing wave of enterprises social rights. In this sense:

*How can governance actors help social innovation move away from this logic and function as a form of empowerment and sustainability?*

*How, and to what extent, should governments, at different territorial levels, internalize the responsibility for promoting social innovation?*

Social innovation advocates coordination and cooperation between actors to achieve their ultimate goal: the creation of social and economic value and the introduction of systemic changes. Thus:

*What is the role of the State beyond funding, in particular in promoting the introduction of systemic change or scalability of social innovation practices?*

*Social innovators pose challenges to economic, social and political models. Are we facing the transition from a welfare State to a facilitator State of social processes? Is this passage possible? It is desirable?*

The practices of social innovation are generally territorialized, of local and community origin, operating in a micro logic of responding to needs. This means that there is a high diversity, which is not systematic, of social innovation practices, which are often not transversal.

*How can different levels of governance account for this diversity? Does it require more decentralization of public policies or a new way of looking at the territory, building bridges between 'local' and 'universal'?*

Although these were the issues initially proposed to the roundtable participants for discussion due to time constraints and some delay in the workshop agenda, it was necessary to shorten the issues being discussed. We do not consider that this has

compromised the quality of the roundtable. On the contrary, the moderation of the debate through a more flexible structure allowed for more time for discussion, both between the members of the table and the audience. We believe that this discussion is a reflection of the real concerns of the organizations present in the workshop and, therefore, brings closer insights closer to the field rather than the questions theoretically constructed.

Basically, the discussion was divided between two main perspectives: those of actors in the organizations that intervene in the field (such as the Microninho and the A3S) and the actors who take on more formal positions of orientation, coordination or even financing of social innovation projects (as is the case of Portugal Social Innovation and CCDD Centro). CIM Ave took a more intermediate position, much due to the characteristics of the entity itself, also serving as moderating actor and bridging between the two perspectives.

Therefore, on the one hand, we have the vision of the associations that intervene in the field and that focused a lot on the main challenges that they encounter. Of these, the difficulty of challenging more crystallized actors to innovate along with these associations stands out. Also debated is what is reported as a 'push' of financial sustainability of institutions. This means that often institutions are required to develop social innovation projects to ensure their own financial sustainability. This has risks and distorts the missions of organizations that, on the one hand, must respond to the challenges of their territories and let innovation emerge from the bottom-up actors, but on the other hand, feel pressure to ensure their sustainability which prevents this process from occurring in the natural and articulated manner that should occur.

Another of the themes debated was the growing wave of social enterprises and the way this is often perverse to non-profit associations. While recognizing the importance of these companies, the participants representing the associations also underline some risks:

(1) The confusion of mixing associations with social enterprises. In fact, they argue that, they are different things that are not at the same level, since, although both work in a logic of satisfying social needs, social enterprises work on the logic of profit and associations do not. According to Liliana Simões: "*When these mixtures are generated, when all this is shuffled becomes a very complicated climate very difficult to manage*". With these

pressures, all true social innovation does not develop. The mercantile logics compromised true social innovation;

(2) The gap between the ‘time’ of public policies and the ‘time’ of social innovation. Social innovation is dynamic and it is therefore untenable to expect public policy to make social innovation. While this is the perception, Liliana affirms that "*true financial sustainability does not exist. This argument starts from this uncertainty, from the dynamism of social innovation and from the gap in the involvement of various actors. Social innovation can only be done in a quadruple helix logic*" (Liliana Simões);

(3) Another central aspect, mainly emphasized by Carlota Quintão, is the lack of knowledge of Social Innovation. Much has been debated on this subject but in reality "*nobody has yet realized what social innovation really is*". This lack of collective understanding owes much to their own needs. Although the emergence of new needs, increasingly territorialized, is recognized, when we talk about problems such as poverty, it becomes more explicit some overlaps and confusions. Carlota states that "*in the different European frameworks, similar things have had different names, from fight against poverty to social and inclusive cohesion, until now more recently, to social innovation.*";

(4) Social Innovation as a process of ‘financialization’ of public policy. This argument is based on the idea that innovation passes more and more by specialists and by metrics and less and less by citizens and people. This question of metrics is fundamental in the discussion and intersects with the dimension of the gap between the ‘time’ of public policy and the ‘time’ of social innovation. This is because there is pressure, notably on funded programs and governance bodies, for measuring the impact of interventions. According to Carlota Quintão: "*measuring impacts is fallacious and from the methodological point of view there is no consensus on the part of the scientific community on how to measure social impacts*". Stakeholders argue that indicators of achievement are often confused with impact indicators. Public policy is responsible for giving time to include criteria such as co-responsibility and participation, because, "*what we see on the ground are hybrid and plural things and Public Policy has to go look for them.*" (Carlota Quintão).

On the other hand, we have the positions of representatives of governance bodies and the formal instruments of support for social innovation. The major argument common

to these participants is the difficulties inherent in supporting and promoting social innovation. These difficulties are mainly reflected in the fact that we are facing a new framework, a concept and a process that implies a new way of looking at the territories, the problems and the way we solve them. Jorge Brandão illustrates this difficulty in stating that *"social innovation issues coincide with this programming period and even then there are things we do not know how to operate. We are more accustomed to working with municipalities in a traditional logic of supporting infrastructure, economy, exportations, companies and this conditions all the dimensions"*.

Among the various challenges and perspectives addressed, we will highlight those that are particularly relevant to counter the arguments of the organizations identified previously. The following stand out:

(1) The involvement of private partners and the importance of articulation. To this end, they argue that the key to social innovation is to boost the social investment market and to bring about intersectoral partnerships between public and private partners. Partners such as the State, the social economy and the private sector cannot be seen only as funders but as partners in mobilizing resources that allow a more structured bet on these initiatives.

(2) The dichotomy of sustainability. Sustainability is discussed here in two perspectives. On the one hand, the sustainability of the State itself is evoked. The challenge of economic sustainability, by the State, is transversal to all areas. The State has short budgets and that is the panorama of any agent working in and with the State. This challenge is directly associated with the perverse question of metrics. As Jorge Brandão says *"On the side of those who are managing funds there are 2 ways: gaining scale, gaining size, relevance and involving different agents to work on common projects."* And often, this articulation is neither agile nor possible. For Filipe Almeida, this issue of sustainability is immersed in a set of misunderstandings. Thinking only of sustainability as a financial need corrupts the very purpose of social innovation: *"what is important to be sustainable is the result of the innovation that has taken place, not the organizations that have developed it."*

However, both acknowledge that while there are such misconceptions, sustainability is important so that organizations can organize themselves in a future perspective and continue to develop their work because, as already mentioned, innovation and public policy work to 'times'. It is in this sense that the importance of partnerships between the

third sector and private companies is strengthened. This is because *"it is so wrong to think that the State has money and skills for all problems, as it is wrong to think that all social problems are solved with lucrative projects."* Sometimes this is possible and there are others that are not possible to solve with solutions So not all answers have to be self-sustaining" (Filipe Almeida);

(3) The risk of innovation. This issue of what is new and innovative has always associated risk is something that has also been debated as an embarrassing element of the more articulated relationship between governance bodies and social innovation initiatives. This is because Portuguese funding structures tend to be conservative and bureaucratic, and despite these characteristics they have to finance innovation that involves both risk and error. And this represents a great paradox because often it is not possible that the financial flows respect the time of the organizations.

(4) The municipality as a privileged place. In fact, it is noticeable in the debate that there is a tension between the top-down and the bottom-up. According to the participants, a formal way of reducing this tension is to view the municipality as a space that could (and should) function as a bridge. This is because it is more effective to work locally than centrally because the needs of the territories are individual and localized. In this sense, for municipalities, more important than to act as funders is to promote networking, to align partners. *"Internalizing the role of a paradigm shift, compelling the community to reflect on what is social innovation, forms of financing are functions that CIMs have to assume"* (Maria Ferreira). This, however, presents two main challenges: to work the innovative capacity of the people who manage the municipalities and to respond to the heterogeneity of the territories themselves.



## **Some Conclusions**

Social innovation is a concept and a process that implies thinking and acting in a way different from what traditional structures, such as governance bodies, and associations are used to. It is increasingly important to facilitate the link between agents and stakeholders and make this a truly collaborative, multi-actor and contextual process. This workshop portrayed these dynamics. More than solutions the workshop was debating challenges. Knowing these challenges is the first step so that we can solve them collectively.

Phil Cooke's wakeup call addressed some of the main challenges of contemporary societies with the emergence of IT monopolisation and its consequences for the State and public services. Elvira Uyarra's intervention was more optimistic but also focused on the need for a transformation in the way we look at innovation and the need to increasingly take innovative processes as localized and embedded in the regions. These interventions, although moving away from the framework of social innovation, ended up articulating this process here in a larger framework and showed that there are themes and challenges that are transversal to the role of the State considering a broad understanding of innovation. The roundtable revealed that social innovation in policy and practice also brings more and new challenges. The tension resulting from the "lag of the time" between the process itself and the organizations and governance bodies and public policies is crucial to address. The great challenge that has remained latent in this discussion is the inexistence of public mechanisms that allow the transfer of social innovation projects and outputs to public policies. The discussions showed a high level of awareness of this issue and that even actors with distinctive views are moving in this same direction.

There is a pathway – for Social Innovation - that is at the beginning and also needs some understanding of its own 'time'. This is a time that must be respected and internalized by all actors, in particular, to achieve the great purpose of achieving a real systemic transformative social change.



[www.atlanticsociallab.eu](http://www.atlanticsociallab.eu)

## ATLANTIC-SOCIAL-LAB

Atlantic Cooperation for the Promotion of Social Innovation



# Social Innovation and the Role of the State

9 May 2019

CES | Alta, Room 1 – 14h00

### *Surveillance as predator and State as prey*

Phil Cooke, Mohn Center for Innovation & Regional Development Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Bergen, Norway

### *The quest for public value: Regional innovation and the role of the State*

Elvira Uyarra, University of Manchester, UK

Filipe Almeida, Jorge Brandão, João Paulo Dias, Sílvia Ferreira, Carlos Gareia, Carla Nogueira, Tiago Santos Pereira, Hugo Pinto, Carlota Quintão, José Reis, Vera Soares, Liliã Simões, Geoff Whittam, among other participants.



Centro de Estudos Sociais / Centre for Social Studies  
Universidade de Coimbra / University of Coimbra



Project funded by the Interreg Atlantic Area Programme through the European Regional Development Fund

[www.atlanticarea.eu](http://www.atlanticarea.eu)