Contribution ID: 50fa9b0b-ef3c-44a3-b388-e3feadb6e9cb

Date: 05/11/2019 16:39:03

## Public Consultation on 12 proposed Institutionalised European Partnerships under the future Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme

	Fields	marked	with *	are	mandator	٧.
--	--------	--------	--------	-----	----------	----

#### Introduction

With a proposed budget of nearly 100 billion euro from 2021 to 2027, the Horizon Europe framework programme represents the largest collaborative multinational research and innovation investment in Europe and is open to participants worldwide.

The European Parliament and the Council have provisionally agreed on the Horizon Europe legislative package (COM(2018)435)[1]. Based on the agreement, Horizon Europe promotes a more strategic, ambitious and impact-oriented approach to public-public and public-private partnerships (European Partnerships), ensuring that they can effectively contribute to the Union's policies and priorities.

European Partnerships allow to bring together a broad range of actors to work towards a common goal, develop synergies with EU, national and regional programmes and strategies, and accelerate societal and market uptake. Different forms of European Partnerships can be implemented depending on specific needs, type of activities and criteria: Co-funded, Co-programmed or Institutionalised European Partnerships.

Institutionalised Partnerships are implemented only when other parts of the Horizon Europe programme, including other forms of European Partnerships (Co-funded or Co-programmed), cannot achieve the objectives or generate the necessary expected impacts. The preparation of such Institutionalised Partnerships requires new EU legislation and the setting up of specific legal structures (funding bodies) based on Article 185 and 187 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU)[2]. As such all Institutionalised Partnerships must be justified with an impact assessment prior to the preparation of the legislative proposals.

The European Commission is currently running the impact assessment of 12 candidate Institutionalised European Partnerships in the following priorities:

- 1. EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious diseases (Global Health)
- 2. Innovative Health Initiative
- 3. Key Digital Technologies
- 4. Smart Networks and Services
- 5. European Metrology
- 6. Transforming Europe's rail system

- 7. Integrated Air Traffic Management
- 8. Clean Aviation
- 9. Clean Hydrogen
- 10. Safe and Automated Road Transport
- 11. Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from waste and biomass
- 12. Innovative SMEs

This public consultation aims to collect the views of stakeholders and citizens on the need for such Institutionalised European Partnerships and will feed into the impact assessment process. This consultation is structured in two parts: Part 1 covering all candidate Institutionalised European Partnerships and Part 2 specific to each candidate. We invite you to provide feedback on any of the candidate Institutionalised European Partnership.

The questionnaire is available in English, French and German and you can reply in any EU language. You can pause any time and continue later. Your contribution is downloadable once you have submitted your answers.

Responses received after the closing date will not be considered. Questionnaires sent by e-mail or on paper will not be analysed except those due to accessibility needs of people with visual disabilities and their representative organisations.

A summary on the outcome of the public consultation will be published by the Commission services on the 'Have your say' portal.

We thank you for your participation.

### Protection of personal data

Privacy statement on the protection of personal data in EU Survey

- [1] Legal texts for Horizon Europe to be found here: <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/research-and-innovation-including-horizon-europe-iter-and-euratom-legal-texts-and-factsheets\_en">https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/research-and-innovation-including-horizon-europe-iter-and-euratom-legal-texts-and-factsheets\_en</a>
- [2] Following Article 8(1)(c) of the proposed Regulation for Horizon Europe

### About you

- \*Language of my contribution
  - Bulgarian
  - Croatian
  - Czech
  - Danish
  - Dutch
  - English
  - Estonian
  - Finnish
  - French
  - Gaelic
  - German

<ul> <li>Greek</li> <li>Hungarian</li> <li>Italian</li> <li>Latvian</li> <li>Maltese</li> <li>Polish</li> <li>Portuguese</li> <li>Romanian</li> <li>Slovak</li> <li>Slovenian</li> <li>Spanish</li> <li>Swedish</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>I am giving my contribution as</li> <li>Academic/research institution</li> <li>Business association</li> <li>Company/business organisation</li> <li>Consumer organisation</li> <li>EU citizen</li> <li>Environmental organisation</li> <li>Non-EU citizen</li> <li>Non-governmental organisation (NGO)</li> <li>Public authority</li> <li>Trade union</li> <li>Other</li> </ul>
* First name
Frans
*Surname
Verkaart
*Email (this won't be published)
f.t.m.verkaart@minez.nl
*Scope
* Organisation name  255 character(s) maximum

	Ministry of Economic Affai	rs and Climate Policy				
	anisation size  Micro (1 to 9 emp  Small (10 to 49 e  Medium (50 to 24  Large (250 or mo	mployees) 19 employees) re)				
255		transparency register. It's a volur	itary	database for organisations	s seekir	ng to influence EU decision-
* Cou	ıntry of origin					
Plea	ase add your country of origin, o	or that of your organisation.				
0	Afghanistan	Djibouti		Libya		Saint Martin
0	Åland Islands	Dominica		Liechtenstein	0	Saint Pierre
						and Miquelon
0	Albania	Dominican		Lithuania	0	Saint Vincent
		Republic				and the
		•				Grenadines
0	Algeria	Ecuador		Luxembourg	0	Samoa
0	American	Egypt		Macau	0	San Marino
	Samoa					
0	Andorra	El Salvador		Madagascar	0	São Tomé and
						Príncipe
0	Angola	<ul><li>Equatorial Guinea</li></ul>	0	Malawi	0	Saudi Arabia
0	Anguilla	Eritrea		Malaysia		Senegal
0	Antarctica	Estonia		Maldives	0	Serbia
0	Antigua and	Eswatini		Mali		Seychelles
	Barbuda					•
0	Argentina	Ethiopia		Malta	0	Sierra Leone
0	Armenia	Falkland Islands		Marshall	0	Singapore
		<b></b>		Islands		<b>5</b> 1
0	Aruba	Faroe Islands		Martinique	0	Sint Maarten
0	Australia	© Fiji		Mauritania	0	Slovakia
0	Austria	Finland	0	Mauritius	0	Slovenia
0	Azerbaijan	<ul><li>France</li></ul>		Mayotte	0	Solomon
	o.o.a.jan			a, one		Islands

French Guiana

French Polynesia Mexico

Micronesia

Bahamas

Bahrain

Somalia

South Africa

Bangladesh	<ul><li>French Southern and Antarctic Lands</li></ul>	Moldova	<ul> <li>South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands</li> </ul>
<ul><li>Barbados</li><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li><li>Bermuda</li><li>Bhutan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Gabon</li><li>Georgia</li><li>Germany</li><li>Ghana</li><li>Gibraltar</li><li>Greece</li><li>Greenland</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Monaco</li> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> </ul>	South Korea South Sudan Spain Sri Lanka Sudan Sudan Suriname Svalbard and Jan Mayen
<ul><li>Bolivia</li><li>Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba</li></ul>	<ul><li>Grenada</li><li>Guadeloupe</li></ul>	<ul><li>Namibia</li><li>Nauru</li></ul>	<ul><li>Sweden</li><li>Switzerland</li></ul>
<ul><li>Bosnia and Herzegovina</li></ul>	Guam	Nepal	Syria
<ul><li>Botswana</li><li>Bouvet Island</li><li>Brazil</li><li>British Indian</li></ul>	<ul><li>Guatemala</li><li>Guernsey</li><li>Guinea</li><li>Guinea-Bissau</li></ul>	<ul><li>Netherlands</li><li>New Caledonia</li><li>New Zealand</li><li>Nicaragua</li></ul>	<ul><li>Taiwan</li><li>Tajikistan</li><li>Tanzania</li><li>Thailand</li></ul>
Ocean Territory  British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
<ul><li>Brunei</li></ul>	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	<ul><li>Heard Island and McDonald Islands</li></ul>	Niue	Togo
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	<ul><li>Northern</li><li>Mariana Islands</li></ul>	Tonga
<ul><li>Cambodia</li></ul>	Hungary	North Korea	<ul><li>Trinidad and Tobago</li></ul>
Cameroon	Iceland	<ul><li>North Macedonia</li></ul>	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
<ul><li>Cayman Islands</li></ul>	Iran	<ul><li>Pakistan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Turks and Caicos Islands</li></ul>
<ul><li>Central African Republic</li></ul>	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
<ul><li>Christmas Island</li></ul>	Italy	Guinea  Paraguay	Emirates United Kingdom

<ul><li>Clipperton</li><li>Cocos (Keeling)</li><li>Islands</li></ul>	<ul><li>Jamaica</li><li>Japan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Peru</li><li>Philippines</li></ul>	<ul><li>United States</li><li>United States</li><li>Minor Outlying</li><li>Islands</li></ul>
<ul><li>Colombia</li><li>Comoros</li></ul>	<ul><li>Jersey</li><li>Jordan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Pitcairn Islands</li><li>Poland</li></ul>	<ul><li>Uruguay</li><li>US Virgin</li></ul>
<ul><li>Congo</li><li>Cook Islands</li></ul>	<ul><li>Kazakhstan</li><li>Kenya</li></ul>	<ul><li>Portugal</li><li>Puerto Rico</li></ul>	Islands Uzbekistan Vanuatu
<ul><li>Costa Rica</li><li>Côte d'Ivoire</li></ul>	<ul><li>Kiribati</li><li>Kosovo</li></ul>	<ul><li>Qatar</li><li>Réunion</li></ul>	<ul><li>Vatican City</li><li>Venezuela</li></ul>
<ul><li>Croatia</li><li>Cuba</li></ul>	<ul><li>Kuwait</li><li>Kyrgyzstan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Romania</li><li>Russia</li></ul>	<ul><li>Vietnam</li><li>Wallis and</li></ul>
Curação	Laos	Rwanda	Futuna  Western Sahara
Cyprus	Latvia	<ul><li>Saint</li><li>Barthélemy</li></ul>	Yemen
Czechia	Lebanon	<ul> <li>Saint Helena         Ascension and         Tristan da         Cunha     </li> </ul>	Zambia
<ul><li>Democratic Republic of the Congo</li></ul>	Lesotho	<ul><li>Saint Kitts and Nevis</li></ul>	Zimbabwe
<ul><li>Denmark</li></ul>	Liberia	Saint Lucia	

### \*Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

### Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

### Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

### Part 1: General questions on European Partnerships

As per the political agreement on Horizon Europe, an Institutionalised European Partnership shall be implemented only where other parts of the Horizon Europe programme, including other forms of

European Partnerships (co-programmed, co-funded), would not achieve the objectives or would not generate the necessary expected impacts; they should be justified by a long-term perspective and high degree of integration.

There will be three types of European Partnerships under Horizon Europe [1].

**Co-programmed European Partnerships** are based on memoranda of understanding and/or contractual arrangements between the Commission and private and/or public partners. They are expected to be best suited to partnerships involving industry, but also Member States, foundations, international partners etc. They are jointly implemented by the Commission (Union contribution via Horizon Europe work programmes) and partners (contributions under their responsibility), with full application of Horizon Europe rules for the Union contribution, whereas partners rules apply to their contributions. They allow for more flexibility over time as regards the composition of partners, objectives and activities and require the relatively lowest effort for set-up and implementation compared to the other forms of European Partnerships.

**Co-funded European Partnerships** are implemented under the responsibility of the partners, that receive a substantial budget contribution from Horizon Europe (Grant Agreement) to cofound their joint programme of activities. They are expected to be best suited to partnerships involving Member States, with research funders and other public authorities at the core of the consortium, and possibility to include foundations and international partners etc. By default national rules apply to calls launched by the consortium. They require a relatively moderate effort for their set-up and implementation compared to other forms of European Partnerships.

Institutionalised European Partnerships are based on the Union participation in and financial contribution to research and innovation programmes undertaken by several Member States (under Article 185 TFEU) or by bodies established under Article 187 TFEU, for partnerships involving typically industry, research organisations but also Member States, foundations and international partners. They are expected to be best suited for long-term collaborations with stable partners and provide only limited flexibility for adaptation during their implementation. Compared to other forms of European Partnerships, they require a relatively high and long-term effort for their preparation and set-up, including the establishment of dedicated entities (funding bodies) for their implementation. By default the rules for participation of Horizon Europe apply for the calls launched under Institutionalised European Partnerships.

[1] Article 8 of COM(2018)435

programme Horizon 2020 or the preceeding Framework Programme 7?
Yes
O No
*Please identify in which capacity (multiple answers possible):
Applied for funding

\*1. Have you been involved in the on-going research and innovation framework

Received funding
 Expert (evaluator, reviewer, etc.)
 Participated in governance (programme committee, etc.)

	ere you directly involved in a partnership under Horizon 2020 or its sor Framework Programme 7?
□ Part □ Rep □ Men □ Exp □ App	lentify your role in the partnership (select all that apply): tner/Member/Beneficiary in a partnership presentative in the governance of a partnership mber of a committee for a partnership pert (evaluator, reviewer) in calls for proposals in partnership polied for funding under a partnership poided national cofinancing to a partnership er
	lentify the partnership (select all that apply): European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP2) nnovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI2) Joint Undertaking Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership (ECSEL) Joint Undertaking EG (5G PPP) European Metrology Programme for Innovation and Research (EMPIR) Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking Eingle European Sky Air Traffic Management Research (SESAR) Joint Undertaking Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 (FCH2) Joint Undertaking Bio-Based Industries Joint Undertaking Eurostars-2 (supporting research-performing small and medium-sized enterprises) Ambient Assisted Living (AAL 2)
□ F	Partnership for Research and Innovation in the Mediterranean Area (PRIMA)
	European High-Performance Computing Joint Undertaking (EuroHPC)

Other

2. To what extent do you think that the future European Partnerships under Horizon Europe need to:

	1 (Not needed at all)	2	3	4	5 (Fully needed)	Don't Know
* Be more responsive towards EU policy objectives	0	0	0	0	•	©
* Be more responsive towards societal needs	0	0	0	•	0	0

* Be more responsive towards priorities in national and regional research and innovation strategies, including smart specialisation strategies	0	0	•	0	•	0
* Make a significant contribution to achieving the UN's Sustainable Development Goals	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Make significant contribution to the EU efforts to achieve climate-related goals	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Focus more on the development and effective deployment of technology	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Focus more on bringing about transformative change towards sustainability in their respective area	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Make a significant contribution to EU global competitiveness in specific sectors/domains	0	0	0	•	0	0
* Other	0	0	0	•	0	0

### \*(Other) Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

In general, partnerships should look beyond their own discipline, incorporating (where possible) relevant social sciences and humanities, technical and medical sciences. The above mentioned statements are difficult to interpret when we speak about a broad range of partnerships which on itself apply to different goals of Horizon Europe. There is no one size fits all approach based on some of these statements, while question two does imply a one size fits all approach.

\*3. What would you see as main advantages and disadvantages of participation in an Institutionalised European Partnership (as a partner) under Horizon Europe?

500 character(s) maximum

The Netherlands strongly supports public-private partnerships, in specific for Eurostars. An Institutional Partnership is an important basis to aquire long term political and financial commitment from Member States. The multi-year international strategic cooperation of National Funding Agencies has resulted in a European wide ecosystem which made it possible to connect and assist SMEs faster, more intensively and more successfully.

4. For which of the candidate Institutionalised European Partnership(s) would you like to specifically provide your views through this consultation (you may provide your views for more than one)?

ws for more than one)?
EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious diseases - Global Health
Innovative Health Initiative
Key Digital Technologies
Smart Networks and Services
European Metrology
Transforming Europe's rail system
Integrated Air Traffic Management

	Clean Aviation
	Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from waste and biomass
	Clean Hydrogen
	Safe and Automated Road Transport
<b>V</b>	Innovative SMFs

# Part 2 - Questions on problems, objectives, policy options and impact tailored to each candidate European Partnership

The following questions allow to assess the necessity of a partnership approach, as well as the need for an Institutionalised Partnership for each candidate partnership.

### Innovative Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on innovative small and medium-sized enterprises. The overall objective of the proposed initiative is to support fast-growing and innovative SMEs to develop new products, processes and services that help to improve the daily lives of people and boost European competitiveness. It will do so by funding market-led, cross-border, collaborative research and innovation as well as accompanying measures supporting market uptake.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing Eurostars2 Programme but would significantly revise its scope and expand its partners and take into account the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

The Eurostars2 Programme, established in 2014 under Horizon 2020 (as an Article 185 TFEU initiative), supports international cooperation between SMEs, with 36 participating countries from Europe and worldwide. This was preceded by Eurostars Joint Programme (2008-2013) under FP7.

The <u>inception impact assessment</u> outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and likely impact of a candidate European Partnership in this field.

1. To what extent do you think this is relevant for research and innovation efforts at EU level to address the following problems in relation to innovative small and medium-sized enterprises?

### Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know	
--	-------------------------------	---	---	---	-------------------	---------------	--

Lack of understanding of or knowledge about scaling small and medium sized enterprises	0	0	•	0	0	0
Innovation gap in the EU in scaling small and medium-sized enterprises	0	0	0	•	0	0

### Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Limited collaboration and pooling of resources between public actors and private actors i.e. businesses, private investors	©	0	0	0	•	0

# Problems in uptake of innovative solutions from small and medium sized enterprises due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market size (national markets)	0	0	0	0	•	0
Regulatory barriers in the field of investments	0	0	0	0	•	0
Barriers to exploitation due to lack of access to national and international markets	0	0	0	0	•	0
Lack of consideration of societal or user needs when supporting small and medium-sized enterprises	©	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient digitalisation (data access and analysis, interoperability)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Concerns with use of digital tools for privacy or security reasons	0	0	0	•	0	0

## 2. In your view, how should the specific challenges described above be addressed through Horizon Europe intervention?

European Partnerships may take any of the following forms:

- a) Co-programmed European Partnerships: based on memoranda of understanding and/or contractual arrangements between the Commission and private and/or public partners;
- b) Co-funded European Partnerships: based on participation in and financial contribution to a programme of R&I activities, using a Programme co-fund action; or
- c) Institutionalised European Partnerships: based on participation in and financial contribution to R&I programmes undertaken by several Member States (under Article 185 TFEU) or by bodies established under Article 187 TFEU (Institutionalised European Partnerships)
  - Traditional calls under Horizon Europe work programmes
  - Co-Funded partnership
  - Co-Programmed partnership

### Institutionalised Partnership

### \* Please explain briefly your choice:

500 character(s) maximum

The described challenges are very different from each other and would require different policy interventions. The Netherlands wants to continue with Eurostars-3 in the form of an Institutional Partnership for reasons of political visibility and legal certainty.

3. In your view, how relevant are the following elements and activities to ensure that the proposed European Partnership would meet its objectives?

### Setting joint long-term agenda with strong involvement of:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	0	0	•	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	•
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	•
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other societal stakeholders	0	0	0	0	0	•

# Pooling and leveraging resources (financial, infrastructure, in-kind expertise etc.) through coordination, alignment or integration with:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	0	0	•	0
Industry	0	0	0	•	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	•	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	•	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	0	0	0	0	•

### Partnership composition:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t Know
Flexibility in the composition of partners over time	0	0	0	0	•	0

Involvement of a broad range of partners, including across disciplines and sectors (such as			•	
academia, research performing organisations, Member States representatives)				

### Implementing the following activities:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Joint R&I programme	•	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	•	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	•	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	•	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	0	•	0	0	0

# 4. In your view, how relevant is to set up a specific legal structure (funding body) for the candidate European Partnership to achieve the following?

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Implement its activities more effectively	0	0	0	0	0	0
Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs	•	0	0	0	0	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	•	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	0	•	0	0	0
Ensure better links to regulators	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure better links to practitioners on the ground	•	0	0	0	0	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	•	0	0	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	•	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	0	0	0	•	0

5. What is your view on the scope and coverage proposed for this candidate
institutionalised European Partnership, based on its inception impact assessment?

	Too narrow	Right scope & coverage	Too broad	Don't know
Technologies covered	0	•	0	0
Research areas covered	0	•	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	•	0	0
Types of partners covered	•	0	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	•	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	•	0	0

Please provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope and coverage for this candidate Institutionalised Partnership:

A dedicated implementation structure is needed to coordinate the national policies and activities to implement Eurostars-3. It is however of great value to Eurostars that the National Funding Agencies are the primary relation to SMEs. That means that diversity and decentral implementation is of great importance as well. To Ensure the maximum financial commitment from Member states, countries should maintain the possibility to deploy national instruments and budgets to fund their Eurostars-3 participants. This means that national (funding) rules should continue to be applicable. Central financial management with joint and several liability is not an option for the Netherlands.

- 6. In your view, would it be possible to rationalise the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership and its activities, and/or to better link it with other comparable initiatives?
  - Yes
  - No
- (No) Please explain why other comparable initiatives are not suitable to be linked with?

500 character(s) maximum

It is not clear what it means to 'rationalise' an IP. The Netherlands supports linking Eurostars-3 with other initiatives in the European Research and Innovation landscape through a joint Eureka-EC investment readiness programme.

7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership to deliver on the following impacts?

### Societal impact:

1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know

New products, processes and services that	0	0	0	0	•	0
help to improve the daily lives of people						

## **Economic/technological impact:**

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Scale-up of innovative small and medium sized companies in the EU boosting European competitiveness	•	0	0	•	•	0
More appealing and creative jobs in Europe, requiring high-skills	0	0	0	0	•	0
Increased coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of national research and innovation ecosystems in support of innovative SMEs	•	0	0	0	•	0

## Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Widened participation in EU research and innovation funding to SMEs based in countries with lower research, development and innovation intensity	0	0	•	•	0	0
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	0	0	•	0	0

### Contact

RTD-A2-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu