

EUROPEAN UNION
EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA
AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE
High Level Group for
Joint Programming

Secretariat

Brussels, 1 December 2017
(OR. en)

ERAC-GPC 1306/17

NOTE

Subject: Summary conclusions of the GPC plenary meeting of 15 September 2017

Delegations will find annexed to this Note the summary conclusions of the GPC plenary meeting on 15 September 2017, as adopted by written procedure.

The meeting was chaired by the GPC Chair, Mr Leonidas ANTONIOU and the GPC Vice-Chair, Mr Emmanuel PASCO-VIEL. The High Level Group for Joint Programming (GPC) drew the following conclusions:

1. Welcome by the Chair and approval of the provisional agenda

The agenda was approved as set out in doc. CM 3886/17.

2. Future of Joint Programming Process

a) Future of P2Ps - state of play

Mr Joerg NIEHOFF (Commission) provided a presentation on the public-public partnerships (P2P) in the context of the Interim Evaluation of Horizon 2020. He provided an overview of P2P toolbox and landscape in Horizon 2020, a specific overview of the framework programmes' (FP) support for the JPIs, national annual investments in P2P over the last years, preliminary conclusions on P2P included in the Commission Staff Working Document on Interim Evaluation of H2020, in the Lamy Report, in the ERAC Opinion on Interim Evaluation on future FP and also the conclusions from workshops with Member States on the future of P2Ps.

In the exchange of views the delegations mentioned the following main points:

- current uncertainty for the next MFF – duration, overall budget and allocation to R&I
- uncertainty for the process of preparation of next FP, including programme structure and possible new elements (like missions-orientation)
- interfaces with other relevant spending programmes (in particular ESIF)
- role of the JPIs in the future FP
- reducing the complexity of instruments and not increasing the number of instruments.

The Chair recalled that the GPC in its opinion on the "Future of Joint Programming to address societal challenges" in the context of the mid-term review of Horizon 2020 and the preparation of the 9th EU Framework Programme for research and innovation (doc. 1304/17) considered the idea of a "JP Roadmap-model with regular evaluations in order to get predictability and sustainability for the JPIs and the overall JPP ". Many delegations reiterated their support for the idea of the JP Roadmap-model.

b) ERAC opinion

The Chair recalled that the ERAC Opinion on the Interim Evaluation of H2020 and preparations for the next FP was adopted by ERAC in written procedure on 7 July and it was submitted to the Presidency with a view to the Informal meeting of the research ministers on 25 July.

The Vice-Chair presented the context of the ERAC opinion. He also outlined the contents of the document as well as the identified areas of success and the areas where improvements can still be done.

As a result of the exchange of views that followed the presentation, the Chair was mandated to propose to ERAC the GPC's willingness to become a part of the process of overseeing the European partnerships' landscape.

3. Working Group on Long Term Strategy of Joint Programming - next steps

The Vice-Chair provided the information on the latest developments within the Working Group on Long Term Strategy of Joint Programming. On behalf of the Group the following next steps were suggested:

- Analysis of the Long Term Strategies of the JPIs by the GPC
- Promotion of the Long Term Strategies of the JPIs at the annual P2P conference
- Elaborating on the GPC opinion / JP-Roadmap model

AT, ES, FR, PT, SE delegations volunteered to conduct the analysis of the Long Term Strategies of the JPIs.

It was agreed that a dedicated workshop in the morning before the P2P conference (7 November 2017) will be organised. As part of this workshop, there will be thematic sessions bringing together the JPIs and other initiatives tackling similar challenges. The Vice-Chair agreed to take the lead in the preparations of the workshop.

4. Mutual Learning Exercise – main outcomes and follow-up

Ms Jana KOLAR, Chair of the Mutual Learning Exercise, presented the background, the modus operandi, the transferable lessons as well as the planned follow-up steps of the exercise. She advocated to take the time to implement the lessons learnt from the exercise and she informed the GPC that within 1 year's time a report will be published on the results of the implementation.

5. Review of ERA governance

Mr Christian NACZINSKY recalled that the Council had decided that ERA advisory structure should be reviewed every three years and outlined the process of the review of ERA advisory structure undertaken by ERAC:

- The review process will be launched at the ERAC meeting at the level of Directors-General which will take place on 5 December 2017. In this context delegations were appealed to encourage their respective Directors-General to be part of the process.
- Following this meeting, the ERAC Steering Board will draft the Terms of Reference for the review and present them to ERAC.
- The results of the review should be ready by September next year.
- The Competitiveness Council at its meeting in December 2018 is foreseen to adopt the results as Council Conclusions.

6. Future of Joint Programming - Feedback from the Informal Meeting of Ministers responsible for Competitiveness (Research), 24-25 July 2017, Tallinn

Ms Maia-Liisa ANTON (the Chair of the Research Working Party) provided the following information:

- Estonian Presidency priority and topic of the discussion during the informal meeting of research ministers in Tallinn in July: Increased coherence and openness of European research and innovation partnerships.
- To prepare for this topic, the Presidency commissioned a study from Technopolis that provided input to the discussion.
- The Presidency also got a budget overview: partnerships represent about 25% of the total Horizon 2020 budget.
- The scope of partnerships is P2Ps, PPPs (including cPPPs), FETs, EIT-KICs.
- The ministers were asked to reply to two sets of questions:
 - o Question 1: Are partnerships the most effective and efficient way to reach the foreseen objectives? What should be the role and added value of partnerships compared to collaborative projects?
 - o Question 2: How should partnerships be identified and coordinated to better tackle issues of coherence, transparency during the formation process and openness to newcomers? What should be the distribution of roles between national authorities and the Commission?
- Main results of the discussions:
 - Partnerships have a distinctive and important role in EU R&I landscape (in delivering ERA and IU).
 - Many acknowledged that the partnerships landscape is complicated and confusing (both instruments and initiatives), resulting in high transaction costs and limited accessibility for participants. The FPs, including H2020, have been much developed as instrument-led programmes. There were calls to reduce complexity and increase coherence.
 - A more systematic and transparent approach is needed to identify new partnerships. The idea of a roadmap approach for partnerships was introduced as a possible way forward to have clarity in prioritization, implementation, and commitment of new partnership initiatives.
 - There is a need to clarify the vision on partnerships. Many saw the opportunity to link the idea of partnerships with missions in FP9 (each mission would involve a use of different instruments, incl. partnerships).

- There is a need to have a sunset clause or exit strategy or option to fail or review mechanisms: partnerships that do not deliver objectives should not be renewed to make more room for new initiatives. There should also be a possibility to stop initiatives that have already fulfilled their objectives.
- Main principle of partnerships should be openness.
- Wider involvement of Member States, inclusion in the agenda-setting and selection of topics should be envisaged.

Ms Jana KOLAR, guest speaker in the Informal Meeting of Ministers:

- advocated the idea of having a roadmap (or a strategic process) to define priorities at the European level.
- recalled that the Council conclusions dealing with the partnerships' landscape [From the Interim Evaluation of Horizon 2020 towards the ninth Framework Programme] are foreseen to be adopted by the Council at its meeting in December.
- appealed for the GPC to be strongly involved in the process of defining priorities / overseeing the initiatives.

7. Update on the GPC Task Forces

a) Widening Task Force

In the context of setting up a MLE on Widening it was concluded that the GPC will decide in its December meeting whether there is a need to continue the work of the Widening Task Force.

b) Priority 2a - Final report of the Task Force

The Chair recalled that the draft Final Report of the GPC Task Force “ERA NAPs and Strategies Analysis for Priority 2a” as well as a form for monitoring the progress of each action under Priority 2a, foreseen as Annex 1 to the Final Report, were circulated to delegations on 4 September.

The Chair recalled as well that the delegations are requested to send their written comments to Ms Zagar by 15 October 2017. The final version of the report is foreseen to be presented by Ms Zagar during the GPC meeting in December 2017.

8. General information concerning the recent developments within the ERA-related groups

The Chair provided the following information:

- There is an ongoing procedure for the election of the ERAC Member State co-Chair following the resignation of David Wilson. Mr Christian Naczinsky was the only ERAC Member who submitted his candidacy for the position.
- One of the two Member States representatives in the ERAC Steering Board has resigned and a new one will have to be elected. The procedure has not been launched yet.
- ERAC Annual Report was adopted in written procedure and will be submitted to the Presidency.
- ERAC co-Chairs have proposed to expand item 5.1 of the ERAC plenary in Tartu (concerning follow-up to ERAC Opinion on Interim Evaluation of H2020 and preparations for the FP9, especially regarding public-public partnerships) to have a first discussion of how ERAC might respond to the Council's request to analyse the coherence of partnerships more generally, including looking at the evidence emerging from Interim Evaluation of H2020. ERAC should also consider what else it needs to do to take stock of the different reviews and lessons learnt from the various partnering activities and to come up with recommendations for the future. Given the timescale for FP9, the co-Chairs consider that ERAC needs to produce recommendations reasonably quickly. It might therefore need to set up a dedicated ERAC ad-hoc working group or to organise an extraordinary ERAC meeting in October expressly to discuss this matter.

9. Any other business

Ms Ulle NAPA (EE Presidency) provided information on the Estonian Presidency conference „Nature-based solutions: From innovation to common use“ to be held on 24 – 26 October 2017. More information about the conference could be found on: <https://nbs2017.eu/>

The Chair recalled that the next GPC meeting will be held on 4 December 2017.