

Intelligence, segmentation, overlapping: in search of solidarity and a certain European industrial and economic autonomy united in diversity

The European Union and its members are economically strong on the paper, but should they continue to only remain so? The Covid crisis should not be the only alibi for the reaction. In the elaboration of its four pillars of evolutionary general policy which are its strategy, its identity, its structure and its decision-making process, and especially at the time of the recovery plans, it is advisable to go with intelligence and courage, to in a disruptive way, and optimized towards notions of segmentation, overlapping and dependence in the interdependence of our internal economic and industrial capacities as well as with the rest of the world in order to achieve a certain identity hoped for in particular by action of solidarity.

François CHARLES

Economist, strategy consultant, management, President of the I.R.C.E. former head of European industrial affairs at the DGA

In the 1990s, the United States and Japan identified target sectors in Europe to market equipment from dual sources or investments in niches or strategic sectors while protecting themselves. Now the same exercise is being carried out by China with a strategy adapted to developments, without strong reactions from the EU, with nevertheless some a posteriori bursts following certain robotic takeovers or certain attempts in the railway, undoubtedly too accustomed to liberalism, individualism and piecemeal, leaving each state to do both in external bilateralism and in a simulacrum of

internal multilateralism, making the continent the playing field of outside powers.

Preserving competition is a key element, even the founder of the Union in protecting the consumer to guarantee them choices, particularly of quality, reasonable prices and a certain ethics. But the EU can also be protected in what it can imagine, design, develop, manufacture and sell by taking advantage of the needs of its internal market, as well as external opportunities, like Russia in the face of mutual sanctions and not only by focusing on green growth, as when it was not necessary to speak of defense or security in the creation of the EEC, leading to a crystallization of a particular governance. It can react with intelligence by saving time, by exploiting certain findings for its own benefit and in particular by taking advantage of the way others see Europe to get to know each other better with its assets and driving forces identified in each country, united in diversity, beyond just regulations.

The meaningful EU can above all act for informed consultation before each country first freezes its strategic vision by defining a certain framework in a cross-industry and institutional approach so as not to be blamed. The involvement of regions and territorial actors, who generally work with identity but without the notion of individual sovereignty, can be decisive in raising collective awareness. As much research can save time and money by capitalizing on the history, as much the announced recovery plans can also do it by

intelligence of solidarity by distributing the efforts in and beyond a common base of interoperability to strengthen, by distributing strategic funding, aid or leverage, not by opportunity and sprinkling and without either weakening businesses and regions in forced financial partnerships.

There is no shortage of tools ranging from strategy to psychology to help achieve this, in particular that of the process of defining objectives through the necessary filter of current or maturing realities and possible options before any specific, measurable, realistic action (GROW), achievable and determined over time (SMART). European choices can be both defensive with maintenance of the current situation, stagnation, concentration or release, but also offensive by expansion, controlled development with domination, differentiation and concentration. A global approach work considering the political, socio-cultural, ecological, economic, technological and legal aspects (PESTEL) must be done with identification of suppliers, potential entrants, substitutes and customers or distributors (PORTER) by integrating in addition the role regulator of institutions, countries, even regions, like the free states that are the Länders in Germany.

The segmentation exercise, with which Airbus and Ariane could have been carried out, is delicate. It is appropriate for each country to be part of a planned European industrial policy and to recognize, as France has already done,

without however disclosing it as it is with its vital interests, its area (s) of strategic activity in as relevant and realistic as possible in relation to the choices to be made and the competitive struggles identified, with a proven combination of key success factors, with confidence in abilities and without the objective of individual fulfillment at all levels, as we see too often in armaments and high technology.

This segmentation can be achieved by dividing the activity into homogeneous groups of the same criteria such as technology, clientele, market, competitors but also in knowledge, know-how and know how to be common and specific with degree of vertical integration and specialization. It can also be done by grouping according to substitution criteria or resource sharing. While being aware of the potential additional cost of a certain autonomy sought and the acceptable risks or not of external dependence passed in the filter of a Reasoned Buy European Act, the mapping found will make it possible to fill the gaps and be able to integrate certain external interdependencies with responsibility and permanent control over common and added value chains.

These areas will have to be consolidated at institutional level in a concept of industrial heritage and in a long-term and evolving plan, in particular to respond to new capital investment policy initiatives in future unicorns on risky and strategic projects as well as on new loans in his name. It will have to go well beyond the Franco-German engine which must set an example with

its hot and cold parts distributed knowingly about the realities of manufacturing and maintenance.

Based on broad realities, fair win-win work, not necessarily 50-50 is realistic and achievable if the large industrial countries agree to cut certain branches, certainly sometimes with mourning but with an alternative solution, why not with cross-purchasing, from the driving forces of each for the benefit of the others, in consideration of rapprochements, possible fillings, decompartmentalization of experiences, in confidence of capacities for the benefit of the community within alliances, partnerships and cooperation, in particular on R&D and in particular in the industry of the future, of labels between complementary solutions on the same subject.

Beyond developing a necessary concurrent engineering of projects, public contracts, international organizations, agencies and large groups can include clauses of incentive, even obligation of subcontracting in other countries than that of the contracting authority and the project manager. With regard to funds specifically dedicated to SMEs, they may include the concepts of open book, objective cost, risk sharing in terms of cost, deadlines and performance as well as bonuses and penalties.

This can also be the case in defense and security and as it is done in European research and innovation. The identification of champions and skills by country or group of countries is also all

the more acceptable if they know how to make their ecosystem work and of the sectors of partners and subcontractors in a transversal way by implying, accompanying, protecting in particular the export with a squadron hunting system more than a pack and why with the support and the support of a European Economic Intelligence agency.

Why not take inspiration from brooding models of companies and projects without necessarily taking capital but with strong links then on licenses. There is no question of reviewing the free movement of goods and capital like the euro area, but why not also imagine a circle of industrial solidarity for countries and their companies that want it? Why not repatriate certain products to Germany, where costs are 30% lower for SMEs, rather than to France but with the search for common interests? Why not create truly European Centers of Excellence funded in whole or in part by the institutions? The EU can also develop its treaties with the notion of enhanced economic solidarity, as is the case in article 2 of NATO, before article 5 which is more military.