



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 8 May 2013

9258/13

RECH 142

NOTE

From: Presidency
To : Permanent Representatives Committee/Council
Subject: *Preparation of the Council ("Competitiveness") of 29-30 May 2013*
Joint Programming
- Policy debate

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Since its start at end of 2008, the joint programming process and the Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs) have gained considerable momentum and have led to the development of strategic research agendas, visions ahead and first joint activities, which in general have taken the form of common calls. Today, after more than four years the joint programming process and the ten JPIs themselves have come to important crossroads. This is confirmed by both the European Commission's Communication on A Reinforced European Research Area Partnership for Excellence and Growth, of July 2012 and the Expert Group's Review of the Joint Programming Process of October 2012.

2. The Irish Presidency's Joint Programming Conference in Dublin on 28th of February - 1st of March 2013 was organized in the light of this to gather national policy makers, programme managers, European Commission representatives and delegates from research institutions to discuss the achievements so far and the steps for the future. A copy of the Report of the Presidency's Joint Programming Conference is appended to help inform this policy debate.
3. In its Communication on A Reinforced European Research Area Partnership for Excellence and Growth, the European Commission emphasised that the EU needs to act urgently and coherently to achieve the scale of effort and impact needed to address grand challenges with the limited public research funds available. Crucially, it stated that implementation to date falls short. The Commission identified the need to enable transnational research and innovation by exploiting synergies between national and international programmes, strategically aligning different sources of national and other funds at EU level. **The current low level of alignment was stated to be due in part to differences between national funding rules and selection processes, but also a question of political will.**
4. The overall conclusion reached by the Expert Group on Joint Programming is that the joint programming process has got off to a good start, although **the process can only reach its full potential if commitment and financial support from national level administrations continues.** In some cases participating public authorities are already working to orientate and align their programmes and their funding in order to contribute to the overall implementation of the Joint Programming Initiatives in a coherent manner. However, the full delivery of joint programming as originally envisaged, that is going beyond programme alignment and joint calls, remains uncertain. **The Expert Group expressed its concern that the necessary level of commitment to this ultimate objective at the national level is not yet evident.** The political challenge is for Member States to fully understand and appreciate the potential that the process offers. Member States need to move away from the idea that joint programming is about bringing new funds to address specific research ideas in single joint calls, to a realisation that it is about aligning existing national programmes to tackle major societal challenges and ultimately to engage in a full policy cycle together in order to arrive at true joint programming.

5. Despite the tremendous efforts having been invested in joint programming so far, the process has come to the stage where the concepts and strategies of JPIs have to turn into implementation. In its Biennial Report (2010-2012), the High-Level Group on Joint Programming (GPC) advocated that JPIs should step up efforts towards implementation and build upon national programmes. **The GPC Report also calls for adequate national resources to be committed and strategically aligned at European level in the areas being addressed by the JPIs.**

6. As the Report of the Presidency's Joint Programming Conference concludes, politically the message is clear: **Member States need to renew their commitment to joint programming and need to engage fully in the alignment of national research programmes in order to unlock the potential of joint programming and move from planning to implementation. Unless concrete steps are taken, the ultimate goal of joint programming – achieving societal impact through efficient use of resources in the fields of the grand societal challenges - will not be met.**

II. QUESTIONS FOR THE POLICY DEBATE

In the light of the overall context described above, the Presidency invites the Council ("Competitiveness – Research part") on 30 May 2013 to address the following questions:

- Q. 1 Successful implementation of Joint Programming requires a new mind-set at national level, involving, for example, greater alignment of national programmes, earmarking of funds or acceptance of jointly agreed standards and procedures. What are your plans to move in this direction?

- Q.2 What is needed to ensure that Joint Programming achieves maximum societal impact?

- Q. 3 Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs) now need to move swiftly to implementation of their Strategic Research Agendas. What level and types of commitment do you intend to give at national level to ensure that the JPIs are implemented effectively?



28th February - 1st March 2013
Dublin Castle • Dublin • Ireland



Uachtaránacht na hÉireann ar
Chomhairle an Aontais Eorpach
Irish Presidency of the Council
of the European Union
eu2013.ie

Co-funded
by the



REPORT on the Joint Programming Conference

“Agenda for the future & Achievements to date”

28th Feb – 1st March 2013, Dublin

Report by:

Evelina Santa-Kahle

With contributions from:

John Locke

Szonja Csuzdi

Virginia Enache

Stavros Katsanevas

Lisa Almesjö

Patries Boekholt

Pieter de Pauw

Angus Hunter

Executive Summary

In 2008, the joint programming concept was introduced during the French Presidency with the aim of tackling grand societal challenges through more efficient use of resources, by the alignment of funding on national level and through decreasing fragmentation in the European Research Area (ERA). Since then, ten Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs) focusing on societal challenges have been established along with the High Level Group on Joint Programming (GPC), whose task is to guide and provide political framing of the joint programming process.

Joint Programming has been set up as a Member State driven process with the European Commission acting as facilitator.

Today, after more than four years the joint programming process and the ten JPIs themselves have come to important crossroads. The Joint Programming Conference in Dublin on 28th of February – 1st of March 2013 was organized in light of this to gather national policy makers, programme managers, European Commission representatives and delegates from research institutions to discuss the achievements so far and the steps for the (near) future.

Topics included aspects relevant to implementation, such as the Strategic Research Agenda, Framework Conditions and Synergies with Horizon 2020 as well as aspects relating to the societal impact – from the question on how to involve and communicate with different stakeholders in the process, including Member States and regions to measuring the impact on society.

Politically, the message was clear: Member States need to renew their commitment to joint programming and need to engage fully in the alignment of national research programmes in order to unlock the potential of joint programming and move from planning to implementation.

ERA.

Taking Stock

The SRA and implementation plan

Implementation is pivotal if JPIs want to achieve their ultimate goal of tackling grand societal challenges through a more efficient use of research resources on national levels. There was common agreement that the Strategic Research Agenda is the foundation but that a dedicated implementation plan is the way to go when turning plans into reality in JPIs.

It became clear that joint calls may be an excellent testing ground for joint activities but only the alignment of research programmes will ultimately make a change in using research resources more efficiently and in building the ERA.

Framework Conditions

Although inspiring, the “Guidelines on Framework Conditions for Joint Programming” have proven to be insufficient for practical use by JPIs. There was a call for an update of the content and its practicality and applicability. Input could come from existing platforms of knowledge exchange, such as the ERALEARN and the JPIs To CoWork project.

Synergies between JPIs and Horizon 2020

It was generally agreed that there is a need for cooperation and strategic use of synergies between JPIs and Horizon 2020. Both are important building blocks of ERA. The European Commission presented different scenarios from coordination support through the CSA instrument to ERANET schemes and Art 185 as modes of cooperation. From the JPI perspective, there were calls to use the SRA far more strategically than it has been so far for the engagement with Horizon 2020.

Achieving Societal Impact

Achieving societal impact is the key delivery of the joint programming process and the JPIs. This is another example of how the gap between science and practice has to be crossed in order to justify the investment being made and to deliver tangible results for society at large. Equally, European added value has to be proven to demonstrate to society the difference that coordination via JPIs make in comparison to what is achieved solely on national level.

Clearly, national administrations face a challenge to ensure transnational cooperation as the norm in national research programming.

Involvement of and Communication with Stakeholders

As communication with and involvement of stakeholders is pivotal in all stages of a JPI, special attention has to be devoted to this. Crucial aspects are inclusiveness, good communication, transparency and trust building. Nevertheless, the matter is complex as stakeholders are not single, easily identifiable groups, and the level of involvement and time of stakeholder engagement may vary as well.

There is no one size fits all approach, and this is also true for the involvement of industry and cooperation with international partners. For the former, agreement existed that industry needs to be included in the joint programming process as societal challenges cannot be resolved by a certain group of stakeholders alone. However, industry will only engage if there are clearly demonstrated advantages for industry through, for example, access to cutting edge research and new networking opportunities. The advantages for JPIs are on the other hand, to increase their innovation potential and exploitation possibilities.

In the area of international cooperation, joint programming has the propensity to offer benefits for both sides – from increasing the science base and critical mass in particular research areas, through having a part to play in the global flow of knowledge, as well as politically through enhanced visibility and the identification of new opportunities. One of the main barriers here is the differences internationally in programme administration.

Participation of countries and regions in JPIs

Persuasion, positioning of JPIs and organisation – three key words that resulted from the discussions that can enable and support small and less research intensive (LRIs) countries participating in JPIs. JPIs need to be persuasive through proving the added value of what they do, through being transparent in the process and by considering LRIs concerns. Placing JPIs higher in the priorities of national administrations and national research programming was equally identified as important for motivating LRIs along with the need to offer easy-entry participation mechanisms to the JPIs. For the latter, the concept of the “knowledge hub” was proposed as a cross-cutting platform throughout all JPIs, offering overall information on each JPI’s stage of development, SRA, participation schemes (ongoing joint activities, calls etc.) as to enable LRIs to quickly and easily have access to information on the basis of which strategic decisions on participation can be taken. Last but not least, smart specialisation strategies allow LRIs to concentrate on their strengths and engage in JPIs based on that.

Measuring societal impact/benefits of JPIs

Added value and societal impact can only be tangible and verifiable if they are measured and demonstrated on the basis of clear criteria. However, blurred expectations, different levels of maturity in evaluation cultures and the complexity of the matter itself have so far hindered the process of measuring JPIs on their impact and benefits.

Agreement was reached on the relevance of a “logic framework analysis”, a model which helps clarify the goals and strategies of interventions such as joint programming. New indicators, which should explore the key features of “joint” and “programming” (Type A and B indicators), were proposed as a possible way forward. The clear message from the session was to develop a European evaluation culture.

The conference resulted in a set of very concrete recommendations (see table page 21) with specific stakeholders assigned responsibility for their implementation. The main underlying message in all sessions was that the JP process has to remain in the hands of Member States and it is the Member States which have to express a new political commitment to the process and to their JPIs.

Introduction

The joint programming process started more than four years ago with the establishment of the High Level Group on Joint Programming (GPC) to follow up and give political guidance to the process and ten Joint Programming Initiatives, which have since been set up.

Recently, the Biannual report of the GPC as well as the European Commission's Expert Group on Joint Programming acknowledged the considerable progress and commitment of all ten JPIs in terms of personnel resources and coordination efforts having been invested to push the process further. Nevertheless, they also conclude that the ultimate goal of joint programming to tackle societal challenges and defragment the European Research Area (ERA) will not be achieved unless the current phase of planning and implementation leads to tangible results.

On the basis of the outcomes of the two reports and of a general awareness that the JP process is on important crossroads, the conference focused on the achievements to date and the necessary steps that need to be taken to ensure the future progress of joint programming. It brought together programme managers, ministry representatives from Member States (MS), stakeholders in the joint programming process and the European Commission with the aim of engaging in open and critical discussions on where we stand now and how the JPIs should proceed. The conference's objective was to determine the structure for the next steps and have the participants address the challenges ahead.

This common understanding of the current state of play and the necessities for the future is pivotal, as the joint programming process will only be brought forward jointly, with a clear vision and common efforts from MS.

In this sense, the conference's agenda included plenary sessions, to facilitate scene setting and wrap up discussions and parallel sessions for closer exchange of ideas and opinions.

The context of the conference was set in the opening remarks of Minister Sherlock, Commissioner Geoghegan-Quinn and MEP Graca-Carvalho, who highlighted the crucial point of time in the joint programming process. Further, it was stressed that joint programming is not only about implementing calls but also about a more coherent and strategic way of using the existing resources and aligning national programmes.

Minister Sherlock spoke of how Joint Programming goes to the heart of the European project, where the whole can be much greater than the sum of its parts. Unlocking this potential needs a renewed commitment to the concept of joint programming and the renewed political will by national decision makers. Societal impact will be achieved, according to Minister Sherlock, if added value and the rationale for this approach are proven.

Similarly, Commissioner Geoghegan-Quinn regards joint programming as being at a critical juncture where agenda setting has to be moved forward to implementation, which she believes will be “achieved first and foremost through the alignment and coordination of national research programmes and activities”. The Commissioner also shared the view of Minister Sherlock that “with strong political support and commitment from Member States and from those involved in Joint Programming, we will be able to produce results that matter soon”. She also stressed that the way forward in JPIs has to take into account the developments in Horizon 2020. The European Commission and the JPI Member States need to work together, in partnership, and become better at coordinating and aligning research programmes to make sure that the best research and researchers are funded.

The structure of this report does not follow the structure of the conference but follows the two “frame setting” aspects of the joint programming process: implementation and achieving societal impact. The chapter on “Taking Stock” summarizes the main discussion points in the sessions; the chapter on “The Way Ahead” shows an overview of the main outcomes and recommendations for the future, brought together in a table allowing a clear overlook. The “Conclusions” chapter wraps up the main messages coming out of the conference.

Taking Stock

This chapter summarizes the main discussion points in the plenary session of day 1 and the consecutive parallel sessions 1-8 during the two-day conference.

Implementation

There was common agreement that the Joint Programming process is at a turning point – where the step from planning and strategic thinking to implementation has to be taken in order to prove the potential of Joint Programming, to make a change in the ERA landscape and to have a positive impact on societal challenges.

General aspects, crucial to implementation, are the accessibility of JPIs and the possibility of voluntary participation, as progress is best achieved by participating according to a Member States' individual needs and strengths.

The SRA and Implementation Plan

Developing an SRA is a milestone in the JPI process as well as in its consecutive implementation. Therefore, special attention has to be devoted to this process. Although there is no one-size-fits all approach, as the context and content of each JPI is different, there was common agreement that JPIs should learn from one another and build on existing experience¹.

Two of the JPIs, JPND and FACCE, which have already started to implement their SRAs, and the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) Art. 187 presented their experiences in parallel session 6 “SRA Development and joint activities: how can we build on success to date”.

Agreement exists on the necessity for the early identification of the conceptual outline and of the scope of the SRA, which is achieved through mapping exercises and thematic as well as strategic workshops, inclusive to all stakeholders. Equally, leadership from committed partners and sufficient resources are crucial. For the latter, participants stressed the importance of the Coordinated Support Action (CSA) in providing resources to support the development of a sustainable SRA.

Another aspect crucial to the development of an SRA is the need to accommodate the different perspectives of stakeholders by involving them in a continuous dialogue, which are prerequisites to building trust and transparency. Concrete suggestions on stakeholder involvement are summarised in the chapter “Involvement of and communication with stakeholders” below.

Nevertheless, an SRA is not sufficient as it is “only” ” a holistic roadmap. A tailor-made “implementation plan” including concrete measures, instruments and time plans is the basis for implementation².

¹ Ptries Boekholt, Summary Session Day 2

² Philippe Amouyel, Plenary Session, Day 1

Turning the plan into concrete implementation often means being confronted with the complexity of research funding (national, regional, EU, international) and with different budget cycles, administrative hurdles and different practices, for example, for data access and release, resource sharing and IPR management³. These points were identified as determinants for international cooperation in particular, but are equally relevant for transnational cooperation on European level. While not the only means of implementation, the advantage of common calls is that they can provide an excellent test environment and means of ironing out problems, for the variety of differences in the organisation of research.

Framework Conditions

In parallel session 7 on “How can the application of the Guidelines for Framework Conditions (FCs) be made more relevant?” discussion was structured in the “World Café” format, where direct engagement of participants was possible.

There was common agreement that, although inspiring, the FCs’ relevance should be improved for better uptake and usability by JPIs.

Therefore, FCs should be updated and optimised in content and form as the complexity of JPIs demand additional aspects to be reflected in the FCs. Consequently, guidelines for FCs should also include recommendations for strategy development rather than solely focussing on rules and pre-defined procedures for programme management.

The CSA project “JPIs to Co Work” as well as the project “ERALEARN” can offer guidance in this respect, as both are targeted towards synthesizing common experiences in ERA-Nets and JPIs. However, both projects have to “sell” themselves better as JPIs tend not to be aware of the services and help that is available through these projects.

The Nordic Joint Programming and the Urban Europe JPI presented examples of good practice on governance structures, incentives for joint programming, joint calls, common pots and peer-review, foresight and programme evaluation – features crucial for an update of the FCs.

Consensus was that the Framework Conditions will be more readily applied and of real help to JPIs when the guidelines are more flexible in their structure, content and application.

Detailed recommendations are summarised in Section 3.

³ Yves Joannette „Canada’s perspective as a 3rd country member of JPND“

Synergies between the JPIs and Horizon 2020

Session 5 looked at synergies between JPIs and Horizon 2020. Two speakers, involved in the JPI FACCE and ERALEARN project and one speaker from the European Commission examined the communalities and differences of Horizon 2020, where synergies are necessary, the way in which they can be maximized, how Horizon 2020 can support the JP process and finally, on what has worked so far.

JPIs and Horizon 2020 share common ground – both are important building blocks of ERA and both aim to tackle the societal challenges, either Member State (MS) driven or through one of the three pillars of Horizon 2020. Therefore, complementarity, coherence and alignment between the two are a necessary strategic move. However, participants of the session questioned whether it is clear how the JPIs and Horizon 2020 are positioned in respect of each other—in other words, are they complementary initiatives or completely separate?

This question could not be answered in a straightforward manner as the European Commission and JPI Members approach the question from different angles:

The European Commission sees the JPIs clearly in the driving seat in Joint Programming, and implementation is the responsibility of Member States involved. However, there is a need for cooperation as to make the best use of possible synergies.

Therefore, there is an absolute need for cooperation between JPIs and Horizon 2020, which was examined in more detail in Parallel Session 5. According to the European Commission representative, the ideal functioning mode for JPIs is when they implement their SRA on their own. The Commission can provide support for JPIs through a CSA to help them to establish their SRA.

Equally, it was suggested that the JPIs should use their SRA in a more strategic manner when it comes to positioning to Horizon 2020⁴. This could be achieved on one hand through close interaction with advisory boards and programme committees and on the other hand through strategic decisions on whether, when and which instrument, from CSAs to ERANETs, Art 185 and joint use of research infrastructures, should be applied and used.

The value of a CSA for the sustainability of JPIs was highlighted repeatedly at this point. Its role was also stressed in involving less research-intensive countries and regions in the JP process⁵.

⁴ Isabelle Albouy, FACCE, Parallel Session 5

⁵ Effie Amanatidou, Plenary Session 2

Achieving Societal Impact

In this section, findings and discussion points from the plenary session, parallel session 1 to 4 and parallel session 8 are summarised. The first part reflects on the need for a changing mindset, added value and societal challenges. Following section focuses on the involvement of and communication with stakeholders, comprising discussion points from plenary session 1 and parallel sessions 2 and 4. A specific section is dedicated to topics raised in session 3 - the participation of countries and regions in JPIs. In the last part, findings are summarised on measuring societal impact and the benefits of JPIs.

Societal challenges, Added Value and the Need for a Changing Mindset

Tackling grand challenges and achieving societal impact are the key deliverables of the JP process and each JPI. Plenary session 1 and parallel session 1 examined the issue of societal challenges.

According to the European Commission JPI expert group, the GPC, JPIs are regarded as a good approach to tackling societal challenges⁶ but to do so, JPIs need to bridge the gap between science and practice⁷. The Science Europe representative,⁸ in plenary session 1, highlighted how JPIs can be excellent tools where there is a genuinely “global” challenge to be met, however always in combination with less ambitious, bottom up approaches.

The question on the optimum size of JPIs –small and focused or ambitious and broad - was identified as relevant factor in addressing societal challenges, but a solution to this was not found. Agreement exists that joint programming will only deliver if European added value is proven; stakeholders, citizens and society need to know the difference that a JPI makes relative to what is achieved on a purely national scale. The question on how to prove this added value was discussed in parallel session 8 on evaluation. The outcomes are summarised under chapter “measuring societal impact/evaluation of JPIs”.

⁶ Helena Acheson, plenary session day 1

⁷ John Lock, rapporteur parallel session 1

⁸ Paul Boyle, plenary session day 1

A **changing mindset** was echoed as being immensely important to deliver on the ultimate goals of Joint Programming. Expectations are unlikely to be met unless national-level administrations act to match the vision set by their political leaders. There is an apparent discrepancy between high-level political commitment of MS Ministers (e.g. Lund Declaration) and sustainable national-level commitment⁹. Therefore, the JPIs should be elevated at national level ensuring that transnational collaboration in national programmes becomes the norm. International programmes need to be seen as an intrinsic part of national strategy setting¹⁰.

There was agreement among the discussants in parallel session 1 that if stakeholder interest is high, impact is very likely.

On the other hand, JPIs also have a role to play as the discussion in parallel session 5 highlighted that in some cases, they tend to neglect the national focus, by not involving national stakeholders enough in the whole process.

Finally, the point was raised that JPIs need be clearly positioned vis-à-vis ERA instruments as the JPIs are part of a very crowded and increasingly unclear landscape of different instruments and initiatives (e.g. EIPs, Technology Platforms etc.).

Involvement of and Communication to stakeholders

There was general agreement throughout all sessions that the engagement of stakeholders in JPIs is important, in the phase of SRA development as well as in meeting its goal of societal impact. Therefore, special attention must be devoted to stakeholder management.

Session 6 clearly identified characteristics such as inclusiveness, good communication, transparency and trust building as pivotal for successful and effective SRA development. However, these aspects can be seen as THE guiding principles in stakeholder engagement in general, having been raised also in discussions on industry engagement and international cooperation.

⁹ Helena Acheson, Plenary Session Day 1

¹⁰ Stavros Katsanevas, Parallel Session 4

Although the necessity of engaging stakeholder in the JPI process is clear, it is a complex matter as stakeholders are not single, easily identifiable groups and JPIs often cover a very broad area of policies, interests and research¹¹. Even in rather clear-cut areas such as the JPND initiative, a variety of stakeholders need to be engaged on different levels and at different points of time in the process¹². As an example, the JPND organizes workshops, questionnaires and public consultations in order to identify and relate to stakeholders.

The Innovative Medicine Initiative (IMI) uses another means: it has positioned itself as the “neutral broker”, offering large-scale industry collaboration and engagement with the scientific community, promoting active involvement of patients, regulators and payers and enabling innovation via joint effort where singular approach has failed so far.

Stakeholder Advisory Boards are the most “common” way of stakeholder inclusion – their role in giving regular advice on main strategic orientations and in proposing short-, medium- and long-term actions was highlighted repeatedly.

As JPIs are not merely “joint programmes” but intend to align and structure the research landscape in the given area, dialogue on the policy level with other (ERA) initiatives, other policy areas and developments needs to be considered, as highlighted by the FACCE representative¹³.

In summary, there is no single scheme to including stakeholders but JPIs need to find the approach tailored to their needs and characteristics.

Adding to the complexity of managing stakeholders are language barriers, which may also hinder the process, as English is the language at the JPI level but not necessarily at the stakeholder level, as was highlighted in Session 1¹⁴.

Nevertheless, JPIs have taken up this challenge of embedding stakeholders directly through appropriate JPI bodies, strategic advisory boards consisting of societal as well as industrial representatives¹⁵, existing initiatives on European level (e.g. EIPs, ERANETs¹⁶, JTIs, KICs) and through international cooperation activities.

¹¹ JPI MYBL, FACCE, Cultural Heritage – Session 1, Urban Europe – Session 7

¹² Philippe Amouyel, Plenary Session Day 1

¹³ Niels Gotke, Parallel Session 6

¹⁴ John Locke, Parallel Session 1

¹⁵ Parallel Session 2, the place of JPIs within the innovation cycle and the involvement of industry

¹⁶ Parallel Session 5, How to ensure effective synergies between JPIs and Horizon 2020

In parallel session 2 on “the place of JPIs in the innovation cycle and the involvement of industry”, emphasis was put on drivers for industry to cooperate with JPIs and on the questions on how and when to engage with industry. Generally, agreement was shared to take industry on board in the JPI process, as societal challenges cannot be resolved by a certain group of stakeholders on their own. Again, there is no “one size fits all” approach, as each JPI has to analyse its own relation to industry, which needs to be based on a mutual win-win situation and interest, in order to achieve real impact.

Understanding each other’s challenges was also raised as an important factor as it also helps to determine how and when to engage in a mutual endeavour. For industry, cooperation with JPIs is interesting due to networking opportunities and access to cutting edge research results and the possibility of identifying opportunities and limitations. JPIs, on the other hand, have to be aware that cooperation with industry means understanding that their research activities are not just about excellence but also about relevance in terms of innovation, competitiveness, users and exploitation¹⁷.

In answering the “how” it was suggested to use stakeholder platforms, setup industry advisory groups, manage properly and clearly IPR issues from the start and carefully identify representatives of industry associations.

The session discussants had controversial opinions on the “when”. Some argued that a continuous dialogue throughout the process and a phasing approach are the way to go. Others raised concerns that a very early involvement, right from the start, could open the door to a unilateral influence on the SRA development, strictly speaking “lobbying”.

On international cooperation, discussed in Parallel Session 4, some aspects have already been described in above sections on SRA development. In this session there was strong agreement that the successful engagement of international cooperation partners is a long-term endeavour and therefore sustainability of a JPI will be the main condition for success. Also, concerns were raised that the coordination of stakeholders in JPIs adds an extra political layer and that flexibility is needed to answer the question on “who is sitting around the JPI table”.

¹⁷ Serafin de la Concha, Chair Parallel Session 2

International speakers highlighted the benefits for their engagement in JPIs – scientifically, critical mass is increased, duplication avoided and global flow of innovation is shared. In terms of research management, costs and risks can be shared although mismatch in the alignment of research focus areas¹⁸, available funds and timing and differences in management of calls can be hurdles to international cooperation. Politically, enhanced visibility and new opportunities are drivers for international partners.

Overall, benefits seemed to outweigh the complex challenges.

Participation of countries and regions in JPIs

In Parallel Session 3 the question on how to enable small and less research-intensive countries (LRIs) participation in JPIs, was discussed. Even if, according to the outcomes of the European Commission's JPI expert group report, no indicator exists which conclusively demonstrates whether a more- or less-research intensive country is likely to participate¹⁹, the participation of countries and regions in JPIs is of special concern, and participation from EU 12 is still low in relation to EU 15.

The discussants in Parallel Session 3 identified three enablers for a possible LRI countries strategy: **Persuasion, Positioning of JPIs and Organisation.**

Often, LRI countries feel that they have little potential and prospect to influence decision-making in JPIs and hence abstain from participation. In order to counteract such developments, JPIs need to be persuasive through transparency all through the process, through the demonstration of added value and the consideration of the LRIs concerns.

Participants in the session also agreed that the aspect of **positioning JPIs** higher in the national strategy is relevant to LRI countries, as it is also for countries already in JPIs, as outlined in previous sections. Smart specialisation strategies were also addressed as being helpful for LRIs to identify areas of strengths and to engage in respective JPIs.

Mainstreaming trans- and international collaboration in national programmes and having a clear vision on the position of JPIs in the ERA landscape and vis-à-vis other ERA instruments is equally crucial for more LRI country participation.

¹⁸ Jane Silverthorne, Parallel Session 4

¹⁹ Helena Acheson, Plenary Session Day 1

On **organisation**, the session speakers highlighted the need to secure a good mix of representative institutions with decision-making power from LRI countries. JPIs could also be more attractive to LRI countries by offering easy-entry participation mechanisms. The session concluded with the proposal of creating a “knowledge hub” especially designed to meet needs of LRIs. The concept foresees a cross-cutting platform throughout all JPIs, holding information on the different JPIs (their stage of development, SRA, members etc.) and participation schemes (through pilot activities, in kind contributions, special conditions, access to benefits and more.) so as to enable LRIs to quickly and easily have access to information on which strategic decisions can be taken on where, when and how to engage in specific JPIs. The concept accommodates the LRIs’ lack of capacity to engage constantly in many different JPIs, and offers the possibility for tailor-made participation on the basis of variable geometry.

Measuring societal impact/benefits of JPIs

The ultimate success of JPIs will only be met if the benefits for citizens will be tangible and the desired societal impact attained. Hence, measuring societal impact is important in this respect. However, while it may sound linear, it is not, it sounds measurable but is not (easy). Too often quantitative criteria are used, such as financial value, rather than the intrinsic value, for example of culture²⁰.

Parallel Session 8 therefore intended to shed light on questions such as “what expectations do different stakeholders have towards JPIs?”, “what are the common measures of success for individual JPIs?” and ultimately whether there is scope for a harmonised monitoring and evaluation system.

The session discussants agreed on the increasing importance of evaluation due to the extreme competition for financial resources (evidence for research investment) and as a need exists to learn from successes and failures.

The expectations of the (different) stakeholders strongly condition evaluation. In the JPI context this means that national agencies and other stakeholders have a wide range of expectations, which makes the clarification of objectives problematic. In addition, different levels of maturity and capability in evaluation cultures add complexity and evaluations will be challenged to engage wide and non-traditional range of stakeholders.

²⁰ Parallel Session 1, the role of JPIs in meeting the needs of citizens and society in Europe

Measuring the European added brings along classic additionality questions of changes in expenditure, impact and behaviour²¹. Thus, can a change in for example, behaviour, be attributed to the cooperation in a JPI or would it also appear without? Questions like these need closer consideration.

Grand challenge research evaluation requires a system (holistic) view of the big picture. The experience gained within JPND and within an example of Canadian “joint programming”²² showed the relevance of a ‘logic framework analysis’, thus having a clear picture on the goal of an initiative/instrument or programme and on the strategies for achieving these within a broader context. Factors such as the challenge/rationale, objectives, inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impacts and multiple stakeholder perspectives (quantitative/qualitative) are key in developing a logic framework for evaluation. A similar approach is being used for ex-ante case for Article 185 in Horizon 2020.

Evaluation in the JP context should also explore the key features of “joint” and “programming”. Similarly, “Type A” and “Type B” impact indicators were proposed in the session. The JPND Type A are used to identify attitude towards goals and objectives, national research priorities based on the SRA, amount of commitment in research funding for neurodegenerative diseases as share of total EU research funding in this field, the number of publications in this area of research. Type B indicators relate to the number of collaborative research projects funded through JPND, the number of non-project funded activities, regular interactions between JPND and stakeholder groups etc.

The chairman of parallel session 8 concluded that “...clearly, we must work together towards a European evaluation culture...”

The way ahead

The concept of the conference foresaw room for intense discussions on the current state of play in joint programming but also put emphasis on outcomes and proposals for concrete actions.

These are summarised in the following chapter, recommendations for the way ahead in joint programming. Its structure follows part 2 of the report and is also written in a combined manner.

²¹ Luke Georghiou, Parallel Session 8

²² Parallel Session 8, Example of the Canadian Academy of Health Sciences Framework for Impacts of Health Research

Chapter	Actions	Addressee
Securing Commitment and Engagement in Joint Programming	<p>Build sustainability and trust in joint programming and the JPIs as it is a long-term process and sustainability of the created structures will be the main condition of success. No short-term solutions, but long-term support.</p> <p>Use the Smart Specialisation Strategy process (ERDF) to identify, prioritise and engage in JPI- related research and innovation activities</p>	Member States, European Commission
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a clearer explanation of the ERA landscape and the focus and interdependency of each instrument • Continue to provide CSA support in Horizon 2020 • Continue EFFLA work as a basis for future priority setting <p>Increasingly inform and align national strategies and research programmes with SRAs</p>	MS, in particular Less research intensive countries (LRIs) European Commission
SRA and implementation plan	<p>Share experiences in developing and implementing SRAs: mutual learning, sharing best practices, good communication for transparency and inclusiveness</p> <p>Develop mapping tools to support foresight in JPIs</p>	Ministries and agencies responsible for RTD programming JPIs
		JPIs in the lead with the European Commission as facilitator (e.g. through CSA)

Framework Conditions	<p>Consider including new topics into FC Guidelines, such as governance</p> <p>Provide templates, for example, on communication</p> <p>Develop the FC Guidelines so that they become a „living guidance“ instead of guideline document. The appropriate instrument could be an online helpdesk, structured in modules and providing tools. It should be interactive, centralised and allow brainstorming.</p>	<p>JPIs to CoWork and ERALEARN, through continued support from EC funding</p>
	<p>Enhance visibility and promotion of FC guidelines</p> <p>Support JPI to Co-Work to work for the benefit of JPIs</p>	<p>European Commission, GPC</p>
Synergies JPIs – H2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect experiences of hurdles and on what works (from bi, tri-lateral programs, ERA-Nets, existing and complementary JPIs) • Distil out the most important issues for common actions 	<p>JPIs to CoWork and ERALEARN, through continued support from EC funding</p>
	<p>Leverage level of resources at both national and EU level</p>	<p>JPIs, EC</p>
Societal challenges, added value and the need for a changing mindset	<p>Examine in which JPIs sustainable commitment can be maintained</p>	<p>Member States, Less research intensive countries</p>
	<p>Greater involve national stakeholders into the JPI process</p>	<p>JPIs</p>

	Avoid over-expectation on the side of stakeholders and be more realistic in what can be achieved. Danger of overstretching stakeholders' capacity exists. Thus, from the Stakeholder perspective smaller, more focussed JPIs would be better at meeting the needs of citizens and society in Europe.	General consideration
Involvement of and communication with stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay special attention to communication and be more creative in the way communication is undertaken • Ensure that there is a level of realism in a stakeholder's ability to engage with JPIs. 	JPIs
Industry involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage JPIs to set up their own strategy towards industry according to their own special requirements (to put it in a long-term perspective - further development after the pre-competitive phase; focusing on achieving real impact) • Organize awareness raising events for industry on JPIs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ At international level (Industry Forum in Brussels) ◦ At local level with the support of the national agencies • Undertake consultation via the involvement of ETPs, NTPs • Undertake more targeted actions, such as, matchmaking events for academy and industry, establishing database(s) to facilitate partnership building etc. • Consider new instruments, such as proof of concept, demonstrations, trials • Flexibility is needed as coordination on international level adds an extra political layer: questions on the type of stakeholders sitting around the table, on monitoring the process (intergovernmental groups?, global institutions ?), on difference of funding, policies and needs, need to be reflected. • More Flexibility necessary as there is no unique optimal scheme. Extended multidisciplinary imposes flexible platforms (e.g. JPI Climate) while other JPIs (genome or Alzheimer) might be ready to move to more integration. 	JPIs
International Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility is needed as coordination on international level adds an extra political layer: questions on the type of stakeholders sitting around the table, on monitoring the process (intergovernmental groups?, global institutions ?), on difference of funding, policies and needs, need to be reflected. • More Flexibility necessary as there is no unique optimal scheme. Extended multidisciplinary imposes flexible platforms (e.g. JPI Climate) while other JPIs (genome or Alzheimer) might be ready to move to more integration. 	JPIs

	Policy on big data and on access, relationships with Private sector (from implementation plan onwards) are also key but tractable challenges that need coordination.	JPIs, KT Group, GPC (topic for the update of Guidelines for Framework Conditions)
Participation of countries and regions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure good mix of representative institutions with decision-making power • Exploit other key instruments and sources (Horizon 2020, SF) but there are certain disadvantages to be tackled • Smart specialisation approach useful BUT several concerns (diverse rationales with JPI and GCs, niche areas (in)compatibility with JPIs, and changes over time) 	LRI
	<p>Continuous interplay between global and local level: regions should build on their assets such as specialisation, proximity to stakeholders, clusters, etc.</p> <p>Attract LRI countries with pilot activities, in kind contributions, special conditions, access to benefits, flexibility: the extended ‘Knowledge Hub’ concept</p> <p>The extended ‘knowledge hub’ concept links all JPIs under a framework allowing LRIs access to all types of knowledge produced, capacity building and mobility, and flexibility in their decision at which stage and to which extent to participate or when to step out of a JPI.</p>	Regions
		JPIs, European Commission through CSA

Measuring societal impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the relevance of the JPND methodology • Get some insights on indicators in Art185 ex-ante evaluation (example: IMI) • It is not necessary to 'reinvent the wheel' when implementing joint calls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collaborate with relevant ERA-NETs (marginal investment in process) as many are optimising their joint call processes ○ Create benefits for both parties 	JPIs
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate on developing common indicators • Harmonised indicators could enable peer benchmarking and learning 	JPIs to Co Work (continuation?)
	Strive for a European Evaluation Culture	General consideration

Conclusions

Since its start in 2008, the joint programming process and the joint programming initiatives have gained considerable momentum and have led to the development of strategic research agendas, visions ahead and first joint activities, which in general have taken the form of common calls. Even if these have been the major criteria to prove that the JPIs are functioning, it became evident during the Dublin conference that these steps do not suffice. The way ahead in joint programming has to lead to alignment of national research programmes and implementation. These are the two cornerstones of success.

Despite the tremendous efforts having been invested in Joint Programming so far, the process has come to crossroads: where the concepts and strategies of JPIs have to turn into implementation. Unless concrete steps are taken, the ultimate goal of joint programming – achieving societal impact through efficient use of resources in the fields of the grand societal challenges - will not be met.

Barriers need to be overcome at all levels: at the level of the JPIs, which have to prove their impact and added value, at the level of national policy makers, who will have to consider strategic research agendas as instruments to leverage national programmes and at the level of the European Commission, who is asked to clarify the whole “ERA picture” and to enable maximum synergies with Horizon 2020.

The time is now to move forward to real cross-border alignment of strategies and research programmes and their joint implementation. Single calls will not bring the process further, but real dedication and commitment to joint work and joint outputs through joint programming. Thus, everyone involved in Joint Programming is asked to step up efforts and to be open to new approaches and ways of working together.