Contribution ID: e74ef572-408b-4b11-a7b2-ec5e993efbd8

Date: 05/11/2019 08:59:19

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: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/research-and-innovation-including-horizon-europe-iter-and-euratom-legal-texts-and-factsheets_en
- [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

 Greek Hungarian Italian Latvian Lithuanian Maltese Polish Portuguese Romanian
SlovakSlovenianSpanishSwedish
 I am giving my contribution as Academic/research institution Business association Company/business organisation Consumer organisation EU citizen Environmental organisation Non-EU citizen Non-governmental organisation (NGO) Public authority Trade union Other
* First name
Wilfried
*Surname
DE WAAL
*Email (this won't be published)
w.a.j.dewaal@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	Equatorial Guinea	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
				Islands		5 1
0	Aruba	Faroe Islands		Martinique	0	Sint Maarten
0	Australia	© Fiji		Mauritania	0	Slovakia
0	Austria	Finland	0	Mauritius	0	Slovenia
0	Azerbaijan	France		Mayotte	0	Solomon
	o.o.a.jan			a, one		Islands

French Guiana

French Polynesia Mexico

Micronesia

Bahamas

Bahrain

Somalia

South Africa

Bangladesh	French Southern and Antarctic Lands	Moldova	 South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
BarbadosBelarusBelgiumBelizeBeninBermudaBhutan	GabonGeorgiaGermanyGhanaGibraltarGreeceGreenland	 Monaco Mongolia Montenegro Montserrat Morocco Mozambique Myanmar /Burma 	South Korea South Sudan Spain Sri Lanka Sudan Sudan Suriname Svalbard and Jan Mayen
BoliviaBonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	GrenadaGuadeloupe	NamibiaNauru	SwedenSwitzerland
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guam	Nepal	Syria
BotswanaBouvet IslandBrazilBritish Indian	GuatemalaGuernseyGuineaGuinea-Bissau	NetherlandsNew CaledoniaNew ZealandNicaragua	TaiwanTajikistanTanzaniaThailand
Ocean Territory British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	Heard Island and McDonald Islands	Niue	Togo
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	NorthernMariana Islands	Tonga
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	North Macedonia	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and Caicos Islands
Central African Republic	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
Christmas Island	Italy	Guinea Paraguay	Emirates United Kingdom

ClippertonCocos (Keeling)Islands	JamaicaJapan	PeruPhilippines	United StatesUnited StatesMinor OutlyingIslands
ColombiaComoros	JerseyJordan	Pitcairn IslandsPoland	UruguayUS Virgin
CongoCook Islands	KazakhstanKenya	PortugalPuerto Rico	Islands Uzbekistan Vanuatu
Costa RicaCôte d'Ivoire	KiribatiKosovo	QatarRéunion	Vatican CityVenezuela
CroatiaCuba	KuwaitKyrgyzstan	RomaniaRussia	VietnamWallis and
Curação	Laos	Rwanda	Futuna Western Sahara
Cyprus	Latvia	SaintBarthélemy	Yemen
Czechia	Lebanon	 Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha 	Zambia
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Zimbabwe
Denmark	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

Expert (evaluator, reviewer, etc.)

 Have you been involved in the on-going research and innovation framew programme Horizon 2020 or the preceeding Framework Programme 7? 	<i>i</i> ork
Yes	
No	
Please identify in which capacity (multiple answers possible):	
Applied for funding	
Received funding	

Participated in governance (programme committee, etc.)

Pa Re Me Ex Ap	identify your role in the partnership (select all that apply): artner/Member/Beneficiary in a partnership epresentative in the governance of a partnership ember of a committee for a partnership epert (evaluator, reviewer) in calls for proposals in partnership epplied for funding under a partnership eovided national cofinancing to a partnership ether
* Please	identify the partnership (select all that apply): European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP2) Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI2) Joint Undertaking Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership (ECSEL) Joint Undertaking 5G (5G PPP) European Metrology Programme for Innovation and Research (EMPIR) Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking Single 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)
	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	©

* 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 main advantage of participation in said partnership is that it supports the creation of a European network structure for developments and corresponding metrological services. New developments can be handled in a coordinated and efficient way, without unnecessary doubling of efforts as is already illustrated with the new kilogram. For maximum effect the cooperation should be extended to the provision of metrological services to industry. A disadvantage can be some loss of sovereignty.

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)?

0 .0 Or	beamean provide year views and agreeme consumation (year may provide
ur vie	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
V	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
Innovative SMEs

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.

European Metrology

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Metrology under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to create sustainable European metrology networks for strategic application areas and for support of emerging technologies. An additional specific objective relates to the need to maintain and further claim the global lead in state-of-the-art metrology solutions.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing European Metrology Programme for Innovation and Research (EMPIR) but would revise its scope, content and implementation and take account of the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

The EMPIR initiative, established under Article 185 TFEU, is co-funded by the EU's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme and the EMPIR Participating States and its functioning is currently planned until 31 December 2024.

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 metrology?

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 Metrology	0	©	0	©	•	0

Innovation gap in the EU in ensuring a European- wide metrology system applicable to emerging technologies and able to support their industrial deployment	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, such as national metrology institutes, and private actors, such as measurement service providers, device manufacturers and industry at large	•	0	0	•	•	0
Increasing costs of complex and specialist metrology infrastructure to meet the increasing scope of metrology requirements i.e. to meet needs of emerging and existing technologies	•	0	0	0	•	0

Problems in uptake of metrology innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Lack of understanding of the benefits metrology brings to emerging technologies	0	0	0	©	•	0
Insufficient consideration of industrial and regulatory user needs when building metrology capacity and the quality infrastructure for emerging technologies	•	0	0	•	•	0
Insufficient digitalisation (data access and analysis, interoperability, and accessibility issues) to access and use metrology infrastructure and services	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

Access to metrological standards and metrological services on the basis of these standards should in any case and under all circumstances be guaranteed. When it comes to international specialization, this guarantee can only be delivered by an institutionalized partnership. Any other form can help in gaining efficiency by cooperation (e.g. the new kilogram), but cannot provide any certainty in the long run. Not having a partnership would be a setback compared to the current situation.

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	0	0	0	0	•	0

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
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
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
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 assessmen	nt?

	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 cover	erage
for this candidate Institutionalised Partnership:	_

50	00 character(s) maximum
	Coverage should be as wide as possible.

- 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

(Yes) Please explain why? Which other comparable initiatives could it be linked with?

500 character(s) maximum

This partnership underpins developments in other clusters 1, 3, 5 and 6. It should be linked to activities and partnership under these clusters as much as possible.

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
Reliable and trusted data exchange and in the fields of health, environment, social protection and cultural heritage	•	©	0	0	•	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased employment in sectors developing and deploying new technologies	0	0	0	0	•	0
Accelerated adoption of, and trade in, new technologies through trusted validation and product performance	0	0	0	0	•	0
More innovative and competitive technology- based businesses	0	0	0	0	•	0
Improved quality assurance for innovative commercial products	0	0	0	0	•	0
Higher added-value for innovative commercial products	0	0	0	0	•	0

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	©	0	0	•	0
New measurement techniques and protocols for emerging technologies	0	©	0	0	•	0
More accurate and precise calibration services for any scientific discipline	0	0	0	0	•	0

Contact

RTD-A2-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu