



## Implementing Mission-Oriented / Challenge-Driven innovation policies

### Call for Special Themed Track and Plenary Panel (*Deadline 4<sup>th</sup> March*)

Grand challenges, be they *Sustainable Development Goals* or *Grand Societal Challenges*, capture societal needs that are currently unmet and require often international and multisector solutions. Research and innovation policies targeted at societal grand challenges rather than purely economic growth has been argued to be a new type of policy for transformative change (Gassler et al. 2008, Weber and Rohracher 2012) where policies contribute to facilitating innovation and socio-economic impact in a particular *direction* towards desirable transformative change (Mazzucato 2013, Kallerud, 2013, Schot and Steinmueller, 2016, Lindner et al. 2016).

There have been calls for a return to mission-oriented policies as a way to facilitate this, for example the recent “Mazzucato Report” to inform European Commission policies, particularly around future funding programmes such as FP9 (Mazzucato 2018). However, with the increasing interest in mission oriented **policies** around challenge-based **objectives** it is becoming recognised that **“implementation”** of missions is becoming a key issue for STI policy and for organisations wishing to apply mission-oriented approaches (Robinson and Mazzucato *forthcoming*).

Implementation requires taking into consideration the existing sectors, regions, nations and socio-technical systems along with the various forms of innovation. What forms of implementation strategies and Implementation structures are needed? Can we learn from previous instances of targeted STI policies? What can be said about the variety of loci of innovation<sup>1</sup> and the relation to mission implementation strategies and structures? Will they vary for different sectors of activity? Mission-oriented policies will not be implemented in a vacuum, how do they link up with existing policy mixes with their own implementation structures (Rip and Nederhof) and how will they be tailored for different sectors and landscapes (Geels 2004) which have their own existing regimes of behaviour, and incumbent infrastructures.

This special themed paper presentation track invites papers that address (and expand on) these questions relating to implementation of mission-oriented / challenge driven policies. Contributions that explore implementation structures and strategies, and contributions that draw on historical cases of applying “targeted policies” in existing policy mixes would be very welcome.

#### **SUBMISSION INFO**

Deadline for abstracts minimum 500 to a maximum of 3000 words should be uploaded to the EU-SPRI easychair website, adding IMPLEMENTING MISSIONS at the end of the title. Abstracts can be submitted are the following link: <https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=euspri2018>

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, innovation in hospitals, on farms, user-driven innovation, innovation within firms, in public-private partnerships and other forms of “creative corporatism” (Kuhlmann and Rip *forthcoming*)

For any questions or comments regarding the Thematic Track or dedicated Panel, or those who have already submitted abstracts and wish to be considered for this track, do not hesitate to contact Douglas Robinson at [contact@douglas-robinson.com](mailto:contact@douglas-robinson.com).

## CONVENORS

Douglas K. R. Robinson, Senior Research for CNRS at LISIS, IFRIS, Université Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (France) and the Institute for innovation and Public Purpose, UCL (UK)

Philippe Larédo, LISIS, IFRIS, Université Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (France) and Manchester Business School (UK).

Rigas Arvantis, Director of IFRIS and director of research at the Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD).

## REFERENCES

Gassler H., W. Polt, C. Rammer (2008) Priority Setting in Technology Policy: Historical Developments and Recent Trends, in: Claire Nauwelaers, Rene Wintjes (eds): Innovation Policy In Europe. Measurement and Strategy, London: Elgar

Geels, F. W. (2004). From sectoral systems of innovation to socio-technical systems: Insights about dynamics and change from sociology and institutional theory. *Research policy*, 33(6-7), 897-920.

Kallerud, E., Amanatidou, E., Upham, P., Nieminen, M., Klitkou, A., Olsen, D. S., ... & Scordato, L. (2013). Dimensions of research and innovation policies to address grand and global challenges. EU-SPRI Exploratory Initiative Paper. [http://www.euspri-forum.eu/key\\_missions/exploratory\\_initiatives/](http://www.euspri-forum.eu/key_missions/exploratory_initiatives/)

Kuhlmann, S. and Rip, A. (forthcoming) Next Generation Innovation Policy and Grand Challenges. Accepted for publication in *Science and Public Policy*.

Lindner, R. et al. (2016). Addressing directionality: Orientation failure and the systems of innovation heuristic. Towards reflexive governance. Karlsruhe (Fraunhofer ISI Discussion Papers Innovation Systems and Policy Analysis No. 52) ISSN 1612-1430.

Mazzucato, M. (2013). *The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking the Public vs. Private Myth in Risk and Innovation*. London: Anthem.

Mazzucato, M. (2018). *Mission-Oriented Research & Innovation in the European Union - A problem-solving approach to fuel innovation-led growth*. European Commission. ISBN 978-92-79-79832-0 doi:10.2777/360325

Robinson, D.K.R. and Mazzucato, M. (forthcoming) Evolving frames of market creating innovation policy: US and European mission-oriented space agencies in an era of Industry 4.0. Accepted for *Research Policy*.

Rip, A., & Nederhof, A. J. (1986). Between dirigism and laissez-faire: Effects of implementing the science policy priority for biotechnology in the Netherlands. *Research Policy*, 15(5), 253-268.

Schot, J and Steinmueller, W. E. (2016) Framing innovation policy for transformative change: innovation policy 3.0. Working Paper - Draft Version 2. 18 October 2016.

Weber, K. M., & Rohracher, H. (2012). Legitimizing research, technology and innovation policies for transformative change: Combining insights from innovation systems and multi-level perspective in a comprehensive 'failures' framework. *Research Policy*, 41(6), 1037-1047.