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

 Lithuanian Maltese Polish Portuguese Romanian Slovak Slovenian
SpanishSwedish
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
Curnomo
*Surname
*Email (this won't be published)
Scope International Local National Regional
*Organisation name 255 character(s) maximum

Latvian

- *Organisation size
 - Micro (1 to 9 employees)
 - Small (10 to 49 employees)
 - Medium (50 to 249 employees)
 - Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the <u>transparency register</u>. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

*Country of origin			
Please add your country of origin			
Afghanistan	Djibouti	Libya	Saint Martin
Åland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
Albania	DominicanRepublic	Lithuania	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa
AmericanSamoa	Egypt	Macau	San Marino
	■ El Cobrodor	Madagaaar	Cão Tomá and
Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola	EquatorialGuinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands		Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
ArubaAustralia	Fiji	MartinqueMauritania	Slovakia
AustriaAustria	Finland	Mauritius	SlovaniaSlovenia
AustriaAzerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon
O Delegen	♠ F	♠ №	Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	FrenchPolynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern and Antarctic Lands	Moldova	 South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea

 Belarus Belgium Belize Benin Bermuda Bhutan Bolivia Bonaire Saint 	 Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland Grenada Guadeloupe 	 Mongolia Montenegro Montserrat Morocco Mozambique Myanmar /Burma Namibia Nauru 	 South Sudan Spain Sri Lanka Sudan Suriname Svalbard and Jan Mayen Sweden Switzerland
Eustatius and Saba Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guam	Nepal	Syria
BotswanaBouvet IslandBrazilBritish Indian	GuatemalaGuernseyGuineaGuinea-Bissau	NetherlandsNew CaledoniaNew ZealandNicaragua	TaiwanTajikistanTanzaniaThailand
Ocean Territory British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
BruneiBulgaria	HaitiHeard Island and McDonald Islands	NigeriaNiue	Timor-LesteTogo
Burkina FasoBurundi	HondurasHong Kong	Norfolk IslandNorthernMariana Islands	TokelauTonga
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	NorthMacedonia	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman 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	Italy	Guinea Paraguay	Emirates United Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United StatesUnited StatesMinor OutlyingIslands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay

Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan
Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and Futuna
Curação	Laos	Rwanda	WesternSahara
Cyprus	Latvia	Saint Barthélemy	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

* 1. Have you been involved in the on-going research and innovation f programme Horizon 2020 or the preceeding Framework Programme	
Yes	
O No	
* Please identify in which capacity (multiple answers possible):	
Applied for funding	
Received funding	
Expert (evaluator, reviewer, etc.)	
Participated in governance (programme committee, etc.)	
Other	

Are or were you directly involved in a partner predecessor Framework Programme 7? Yes No	ership un	der H	lorizo	n 202	20 or its	
* Please identify your role in the partnership Partner/Member/Beneficiary in a part Representative in the governance of Member of a committee for a partners Expert (evaluator, reviewer) in calls for Applied for funding under a partnersh Provided national cofinancing to a partnersh Other	nership a partners ship or proposa ip	hip			p	
* Please identify the partnership (select all the European and Developing Countried Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (Independent of Electronic Components and System Joint Undertaking 5G (5G PPP) European Metrology Programme of Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking Single European Sky Air Traffic Mundertaking Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 (FCH2) Bio-Based Industries Joint Undertaking Eurostars-2 (supporting research enterprises) Ambient Assisted Living (AAL 2)	es Clinica MI2) Joint ems for En or Innovat anagemen) Joint Unaking	I Tria Undurope ion a nt Re	ertaki ean L and Re searc	ng eade eseai ch (SE	rship (EC rch (EMP ESAR) Jo	IR)
Partnership for Research and In (PRIMA)	nnovation	in t	he M	edite	rranean	Area
European High-Performance Com	puting Joi	nt Ur	nderta	king	(EuroHP	C)
* (Other) Please specify: 500 character(s) maximum						
2. To what extent do you think that the futu Europe need to:	re Europe	an P	artne	rship	s under F	lorizon
	1 (Not needed at all)	2	3	4	5 (Fully needed)	Don't Know
I .					1	1

* Be mo							
	re responsive towards societal needs	©	0	0	0	0	0
	re responsive towards priorities in national gional research and innovation strategies, ng smart specialisation strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a significant contribution to achieving the UN' ainable Development Goals	0	0	0	0	0	(
	significant contribution to the EU efforts to e climate-related goals	0	0	0	0	0	(
	more on the development and effective ment of technology	0	0	0	0	0	(
	more on bringing about transformative e towards sustainability in their respective	0	0	0	0	0	(
	a significant contribution to EU global stitiveness in specific sectors/domains	0	0	0	0	0	(
* Other		0	0	0	0	0	(
0 charac	lease specify: ster(s) maximum						
O charac What v	• •						_
O charac What v	vould you see as main advantages tionalised European Partnership (a						_
What was a character of the special property of the sp	vould you see as main advantages tionalised European Partnership (a	ed Europgh this co	pean Fonsult	Partne ation urity t	ership (you	con Europ (s) would may prov	d yo

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.

EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious diseases (Global Health)

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Global Health under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to accelerate the clinical development of effective, safe, accessible and affordable health technologies, as well as health system interventions for infectious diseases, together with African partners and international funders.

The proposed partnership would build on the existing European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership programme (EDCTP2), a public-public partnership between the EU, 14 European countries and 16 African countries, established under Horizon 2020 (on the basis of Article 185 TFEU), 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 <u>inception impact assessment</u> outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and likely impacts 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 global health?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Insufficient understanding about infectious diseases	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient capacity of the research community to anticipate and react to infectious diseases outbreaks	0	0	0	0	•	0

Limited capacity for evidence-based decision- making by the research community on infectious diseases	©	0	0	0	©	©	
Limited capacity to rapidly scale up testing and production of candidate vaccines	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Lack of capacity of research institutions and health professionals in Africa to conduct clinical trials (human resources and skills)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of diagnostic capacity in Africa to support the conducting of clinical trials (infrastructure)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of capacity of African countries to oversee the conducting of clinical trials in accordance with national legislation and according to ethical standards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation of research efforts and efficient collaboration to pool resources between national programmes with private funders	0	0	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of health innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market failures due to inadequate industry investment	0	©	©	©	0	0
Inability of health systems in Africa and in the EU to take up the research results of innovative health technologies (i.e. to procure and pay for health innovations, to deliver health innovations to areas where they are needed, to develop products suitable for local market conditions)	•	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	n character(s) maximum			

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	0
African countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. patients, healthcare providers, payers, regulators, civil society)	0	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
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
	relevant)	relevant) 2	relevant) 2 3	relevant) 2 3 4	relevant) 2 3 4 relevant)

Other societal stakeholders (e.g. patients,		0	
healthcare providers, payers, regulators, civil			
society)			

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	0
Involvement of a broad range of partners, including across disciplines and sectors	0	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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects (i.e. to developers of medicines or health technologies on approvals and pre-qualifications)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end-users (e.g. national health systems)	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0

	Obtain more buy-in and long- commitment from other partne			0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches			0	0	0	0	0	0
	Facilitate synergies with other national programmes	r EU and		0	0	0	0	0	0
	Facilitate collaboration with of European Partnerships	ther relevant		0	0	0	0	0	0
	What is your view on th	•							_
ins	titutionalised European	Partnership	p, I	based on its	incep	tion i	mpac	t assessn	nent?
		Too narrow	F	Right scope & cove	erage	Тоо	broad	Don't knov	N
	Technologies covered	0		0				0	
	Research areas covered	0		0			0	0	
	Geographical coverage	0		0			0	0	
	Types of partners covered	0		0			0	0	
	Range of activities covered	0		0		0		0	
	Sectoral coverage	0		0		0		0	
for	ease provide any comm this candidate Institution Of Character(s) maximum				ropo	sed s	scope	and cove	rage
Ins	n your view, would it be titutionalised Partnersh nparable initiatives? Yes No	ip and its a	ctiv	vities, and/or	to be	tter I	ink it v	with other	
wit	es) Please explain why' h? O character(s) maximum	? Which oth	er	comparable	ınıtıat	ives	could	it be linke	ed
wit		other compa	ara	ble initiatives	are	not s	uitable	e to be lin	ked
50	00 character(s) maximum								

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
Improved health promotion and disease prevention throughout the life course and accessible for a broader population	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better understanding of the environmental factors for health and well-being	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better fight against communicable diseases (including by helping to enable a faster response to epidemic threats) and reduction of the social and societal burden that they entail	0	0	0	0	0	0
More efficient and sustainable health systems providing accessible and person-centred high-quality health and care services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stimulation of the development of effective, affordable and appropriate health products for use in developing countries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increased ability of developing countries to participate in and conduct clinical research	0	0	0	0	0	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Better, safe and affordable health technologies, tools and digital solutions for health, e.g. testing and demonstration of radically new platforms	0	0	0	0	0	0
More innovative, sustainable and globally competitive health industries (including SMEs)	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	0	0

Local capacity development to support and	0	0	0	0	0
conduct clinical trials (human resources, skills,					
infrastructure)					

Innovative Health Initiative

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Innovative Health under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to facilitate technology convergence and understanding of diseases in order to accelerate the development of safe, effective, patient-centred and cost-effective healthcare innovations that would directly respond to unmet public health needs, and that can be taken up by healthcare systems.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI2), but would revise its scope, content and implementation and take account of the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

IMI2 is a public-private partnership between the EU and the European pharmaceutical industry, established under Horizon 2020 (on the basis of Article 187 TFEU) and operating until 31 December 2024. It focuses largely on drug development.

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 health and health care innovation?

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 diseases	0	0	0	0	0	0
Innovation gap in the EU in translating the results of health research into the development of innovative health products and services	0	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 industry sectors (i.e. pharmaceuticals,						

diagnostics, medical devices, imaging, biotech and digital industries)	0				©	0	
Limited collaboration and pooling of resources across public, private and charity sectors	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Problems in uptake of health innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market failures	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of adequate business models	0	0	0	0	0	0
Regulatory issues in healthcare and medicinal product development	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ethics issues in healthcare	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restrictive intellectual property rights of innovations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient consideration of societal or user needs when translating the results of health research into better health products and services for its citizens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient evidence generated about cost- effectiveness at scale	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient digitalisation (data access and analysis, interoperability and accessibility issues)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology and vendor lock-in preventing scale- up	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concerns with use of digital tools for ethical, privacy or security reasons	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limited numbers of citizens managing their own health	0	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:

Co-Funded partnership

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

		1 (No relevar		2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	
Member States and Associated Countries		0		0	0	0	0	T
Industry		0		0	0	0	0	T
Academia		0		0	0	0	0	T
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations		0		0	0	0	0	
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. patients, healthcare providers, payers, regulators)		0		0	0	0	0	Ī
ling and leveraging resources through coordination, alignm	ent or	integ			vith:		5 (Very	
	ent or	or integ Not Vant)	rati	on v	vith:		-	
through coordination, alignm	ent or	Not vant)	rati 2	on w	vith:)	5 (Very relevant)	
Member States and Associated Countries	1 (l'	Not vant)	rati 2	3	vith:)	5 (Very relevant)	
Member States and Associated Countries Industry	1 (l'	Not vant)	rati 2	3	/ith:		5 (Very relevant)	
Member States and Associated Countries Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental	1 (N relev	Not vant)	2	3 (C)	/ith:		5 (Very relevant)	
Member States and Associated Countries Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	1 (N relev	Not vant)	2	3 ©	/ith:		5 (Very relevant)	
Member States and Associated Countries Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations Other societal stakeholders	1 (N relev	Not vant)	rati	3 ©	/ith:		5 (Very relevant)	

Co-Programmed partnershipInstitutionalised Partnership

*Please explain briefly your choice:

500 character(s) maximum

Involvement of a broad range of partners,						
including across disciplines and sectors (e.g.	0	0	0	0	0	0
academia, research performing organisations,						
patients, payers, healthcare professionals, etc.)						

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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	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	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	0	0	0	0	0

	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	0
Types of partners covered	0	0	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	0	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	0	0	0
Yes				
No s) Please explain why ?	? Which oth	er comparable initiat	ives could	it be linke
No s) Please explain why	? Which oth	er comparable initiat	ives could	it be linke
No s) Please explain why ?		·		

1 (Not

relevant

at all)

Healthy citizens in a rapidly changing society

2

3

4

20)

Don'

t

know

5 (Very

relevant)

Effective health services to tackle diseases and reduce the burden of disease	0	0			©	0	
Improved access to innovative, sustainable and high-quality health care	0	0	0	©	0	0	
Improved patient experience	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Safer drug disposal, green manufacturing processes and reduction in use of animals for research	•	0	0	0	0	0	

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Better, safe and affordable health technologies, tools and digital solutions for health, e.g. testing and demonstration of radically new platforms	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced duplication and waste in R&I activities and thus reduced development cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
More and de-risked innovations available for healthcare investors	0	0	0	0	0	0
More innovative, sustainable and globally competitive health industries (including SMEs)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highly skilled jobs in industry, healthcare and the public sector	0	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	0	0
New scientific collaboration networks	0	0	0	0	0	0

Key Digital Technologies

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Key Digital Technologies under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to reinforce Europe's capacity to innovate through robust electronics value chains in the EU and its ability to provide the rest of EU industry and society with sustainable and secure solutions.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing Electronic Components and Systems European Leadership (ECSEL) Joint Undertaking, but would also satisfy the more demanding scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

ECSEL JU s a public-private partnership, established under Horizon 2020, on the basis of Article 187 TFEU and which 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 key digital technologies?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Rapid change including big data and the emergence of new computing paradigms	0	0	0		0	0
Lack of sufficient expertise in specific key digital technologies	©	0	0	©	0	0
Innovation gap in the EU in translating research results into innovative digital solutions	0	0	0	0	0	0

Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Limited availability of testbeds for novel computing components and systems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sky-rocketing costs of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limited collaboration and pooling of resources between Member States, European Commission, Industry and Research organisations (Universities, RTOs)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of digital innovations due to:

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

Insufficient market size or inappropriate business models	©	0	0	0	0	0
Regulatory framework lagging behind technology developments	©	0	0	0	0	0
Barriers to exploitation due to limited access to capital, data or Intellectual Property	©	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of consideration of societal or user needs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concerns with the use of digital tools for ethical, privacy or security reasons	0	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 expla 	ain briefly	your c	hoice
----------------------------------	-------------	--------	-------

500 C	character(s) maximum			

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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0

Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Research areas covered	0	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	0	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	0	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	0	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	0	0	0

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

500 character(s) maximum		

- 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		

(No) Please explain why other comparatwith?	ole initiatives	are	not s	uitabl	e to be lin	ked
500 character(s) maximum						
7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate E ollowing impacts?	European Institu	ıtionalis	sed Pa	ırtnersl	nip to deliver	on the
Societal impact:					1	
	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Provision of trusted electronics components and systems to the public and businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enabled safety (automotive, avionics) and security (transactions, communications)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution to more functional, efficient and economical electronics systems accessible to a larger part of the population	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic/technological impact:						
	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
More innovative, sustainable and globally competitive electronics and systems industries (including SMEs)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Development and exploitation of innovative technology paradigms	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scientific impact:						
	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know

0

New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of

EU research and innovation capabilities in Key

Digital Technologies

Smart Networks and Services

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Innovative Smart Networks and Services under Horizon Europe. The objective is for Europe to maintain and further reinforce its role in the global scene for advanced smart digital connectivity platforms. Europe has to stay at the leading edge of innovation by leveraging its know-how and industrial strengths.

Building on the EU's strong position in 5G and Internet of Things (IoT) technology, the proposed partnership would enable Europe to master and lead the technology evolution of smart networks and services towards beyond 5G and later 6G networks and stay competitive and autonomous in relation to our main competitors in the field (i.e. China, USA) who are already launching similar initiatives.

The initiative also aims at coordinating deployment of Smart Networks and Services in areas of public interest.

The initiative would build on the experience gained in the existing 5G PPP H2020 partnership but would revise its scope, content and implementation to take into account important developments in the field of devices (IoT) and cloud computing (edge cloud infrastructures) and the strengthened scientific, societal, economicand technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

It hence proposes a comprehensive value chain approach, leveraging European connectivity strong assets and world class research capabilities to create industrial opportunities in related devices and computing domains.

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 smart networks and services?

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 next generation converged Digital Infrastructures with a comprehensive European system approach covering connectivity, devices and cloud services	•	0	0	0	•	•
Innovation gap in the EU in translating the results of connectivity, cloud and Internet of Things devices research into the development of innovative networks and services platforms	•	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, private actors i.e. network and internet service providers, connectivity vendors, computing and device actors, vertical industries and users, leading research centres and public authorities	©	0	0	0	©	0

Problems in uptake of smart networks and services innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market fragmentation due to lack of industrial policy favouring harmonised national take up and implementation strategies for new generation of smart connectivity systems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Regulation in the field of radio spectrum allocation including identification of new innovative spectrum management and sharing technologies	•	0	0	0	•	0
Barriers to exploitation due to critical mass of investment or time to market, notably for trans- European networks and corridors for connected and automated mobility	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barriers to exploitation due to potential lack of global standards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of consideration of societal or user needs driving networks and services research into human centric next generation Internet services for its citizens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient digitalisation (data access and analysis, interoperability) especially for what concerns vertical user sectors	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concerns with use of smart networks and services platforms for ethical, privacy, security, or EMF reasons	0	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 choi
--

<i>500</i>	character(s) maximum			

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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. Connectivity vendors, Telecom operators, regulators, user groups)	0	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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Too narrow	Right scope & coverage	Too broad	Don't know
Technologies covered	0	0	0	0
Research areas covered	0	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	0	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	0	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	0	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	0	0	0
titutionalised Partnersh nparable initiatives?				
In your view, would it be stitutionalised Partnersh emparable initiatives? Yes No Yes) Please explain why th?	ip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	tter link it v	vith other
stitutionalised Partnersh imparable initiatives? Yes No (es) Please explain why	ip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	tter link it v	vith other
stitutionalised Partnershomparable initiatives? Yes No Yes) Please explain why	ip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	tter link it v	vith other
stitutionalised Partnershomparable initiatives? Yes No Yes) Please explain why th? Soo character(s) maximum Io) Please explain why th?	ip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	tter link it v	vith other
stitutionalised Partnershomparable initiatives? Yes No Yes) Please explain why th? Soo character(s) maximum Io) Please explain why th?	ip and its a ? Which oth	ctivities, and/or to be	ives could	it be linked

Facilitate collaboration with other relevant

European Partnerships

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Developing and deploying connectivity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Providing consumers faster and smarter mobile communications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Providing citizens trusted next generation Internet networks	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bringing about the digital transformation of industries such as health, education, media, transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drastically reducing energy consumption of future smart network and service platforms	0	0	0	0	0	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Achieving the strategic objectives of the partnership by involving the Member States directly	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faster, energy efficient and affordable advanced communication systems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Developing the digital economy of networks, Internet of Things and cloud computing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Creating new industrial value chains across different sectors such as network equipment and service providers, big data, cloud, software- defined infrastructures and Internet of things technologies and services	©	0	0	0	©	©
Highly skilled jobs in industry	0	0	0	0	0	0

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Developing the scientific knowledge preparing for the 6th Generation of mobile communication networks	•	0	0	0	0	0

Creating synergies between networks, cloud and Internet of Things to achieve intelligent connectivity as a basis for the next generation Internet services and applications	0	0	0	©	•	0
Maintaining and reinforcing European world-class research and innovation capabilities in networks and related domains	0	0	0	0	©	0

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	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	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, 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	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	0	0
Insufficient consideration of industrial and regulatory user needs when building metrology capacity and the quality infrastructure for emerging technologies	0	0	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	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	chai	racter	1(c) r	naximı	ım

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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	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	0

Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	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	0
Research areas covered	0	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	0	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	0	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	0	0	0

Please provide any comment you may have for this candidate Institutionalised Partners		ropo	sed s	cope	and cove	rage
500 character(s) maximum						
6. In your view, would it be possible to rationstitutionalised Partnership and its activiticomparable initiatives?YesNo						
(Yes) Please explain why? Which other cowith?	mparable	initiat	tives	could	l it be linke	ed
500 character(s) maximum						
(No) Please explain why other comparable with? 500 character(s) maximum 7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate Eur 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	0	0	0
Economic/technological impact:						
	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know

Sectoral coverage

Increased employment in sectors developing

Accelerated adoption of, and trade in, new

technologies through trusted validation and

and deploying new technologies

product performance

More innovative and competitive technology- based businesses	0		0		0	0
Improved quality assurance for innovative commercial products	0		0		0	0
Higher added-value for innovative commercial products	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	0	0
New measurement techniques and protocols for emerging technologies	0	0	0	0	0	0
More accurate and precise calibration services for any scientific discipline	0	0	0	0	0	0

Transforming Europe's rail system

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Transforming Europe's rail system under Horizon Europe. Its overall objectives would be to strengthen the role of rail in the transport system (as a particularly sustainable mode) by increasing the cost-efficiency and reliability of EU rail services and to reinforce the global technological leadership of the European rail industry.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing Shift2Rail (S2R), but would focus its scope on a limited number of priorities and address emerging challenges and opportunities, such as automation, digitalisation, decarbonisation and the need to increase the attractiveness of rail freight and its integration into digital multimodal mobility and logistics chains. S2R is a public-private partnership between EU and the railway industry established in 2014 under Horizon 2020 (on the basis of Article 185 TFEU) to coordinate and manage Union research and investments in the rail sector and which 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 rail systems?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Need to strengthen the role of rail in the transport system	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of alignment between basic research in rail sector and market needs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of appropriate integration of freight	0	0	0	0	0	0
Need for common action to significantly advance key technologies and radically transform rail	0	0	0	0	0	0

Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Need to bring together rail research community, supply industry and operators/infrastructure managers, to ensure aligned development and deployment of innovation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deep coordination and alignment of public and private R&I funding	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of competitiveness (cost efficiency) and attractiveness (reliability) of rail services in comparison with other modes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation among railway ecosystems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation among rail subsystems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation along the innovation life cycle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uncoordinated programming approach and poor alignment with EU policy goals	0	0	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of rail system innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Slow deployment and limited market uptake of innovative solutions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Regulatory framework that is not conducive to innovation	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 exp	lain	briefly	your	choice:
--------------	------	---------	------	---------

500 character(s) m	aximum			

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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

©	
	0
0	0
0	0
0	0

Other societal stakeholders	0	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	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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes		0	0	0	0	0	0				
	Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships		0	0	0	©	0	0				
	What is your view on thatitutionalised European	•						nent?				
		Too narrow	Right scope & cove	erage	Тоо	broad	Don't knov	v				
	Technologies covered	0	0		0	0						
	Research areas covered	0	0			0	0					
	Geographical coverage	0	0			0	0					
	Types of partners covered	0	0			0	0					
	Range of activities covered	0	0			0	0					
	Sectoral coverage	©	0			0	©					
Inst cor (Ye with	n your view, would it be titutionalised Partnersh nparable initiatives? Yes No Please explain why n? O character(s) maximum	ip and its ac	tivities, and/or	to be	etter li	nk it v	vith other	ed				
with	(No) Please explain why other comparable initiatives are not suitable to be linked with? 500 character(s) maximum											
follo	7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership to deliver on the following impacts?											
50	cietal impact:						I					

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Contribution to a cleaner mobility at lower costs, reduction in noise, energy consumption and emissions, including carbon dioxide	0	0	0	0	0	0
Safer and more reliable infrastructure and rolling stock, further optimisation of signalling systems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better quality of services for passengers and freight	0	0	0	0	0	0
Secure handling and management of transported goods, and cybersecurity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduction in the use of fossil fuels	0	0	0	0	0	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Creation of high-quality jobs in the rail sector and in other related sectors	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increased competitiveness of the European rail industry on global markets	©	0	0	0	0	0
Increased economic efficiency of the sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increased vehicle capacity to support enhanced freight and passenger volumes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accelerated market uptake of the sector's scientific and technological developments	©	0	0	0	©	0
Impact of improved rail services on European economy generally	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accelerated transition to digitalisation and enhanced multimodal interfaces	0	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	0	0

Integrated Air Traffic Management

Air Traffic Management (ATM) ensures the safe separation of aircraft and the efficient flow of air traffic. The efficiency of Air Traffic Management systems is measured by how well they manage air traffic and ensure a seamless and safe flow of traffic in any situation. Current systems are reaching the limits of their ability to manage an ever increasing volume and complexity of air traffic.

The Commission is assessing whether to set up an Institutionalised European Partnership under Article 187 TFEU building on the experience of the SESAR Joint Undertaking (established on the basis of Article 187 TFEU and which; functioning is currently planned until 31 December 2024), 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 priorities, composition and governance of any new partnership would need to be reviewed to ensure that it addresses the new Air Traffic Management challenges for the EU in the coming decades, such as an increase in air traffic volume and the consequent increased environmental footprint of air transport, and the increasing complexity, digitalisation and automation of Air Traffic Management services.

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 air traffic management?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Misalignment between basic/exploratory research and industrial research	0	©	©	0	0	0
Misalignment between R&I and the needs of operational stakeholders	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation of EU airspace	0	0	0	0	0	0
Local issues (compared to network issues)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Structural and resource problems:

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

Need to bring together the Air Traffic Management research community, the manufacturing industry, and operational stakeholders, to ensure aligned development and deployment of innovation	©	0	0	0	•	0
Need to coordinate public funding with private research and innovation funding	©	0	©	©	0	0
Need to synchronise research and innovation activities with EU policy objectives	0	0	©	©	0	0
Appropriate budget	0	0	0	0	0	©
Need of specific Infrastructure (e.g. simulators, more test sites closer to real operational environment)	0	0	0	0	•	0
Skills required for researchers in this area	0	0	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of air traffic management innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Investments featuring a negative cost- benefit analysis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Regulation impeding the uptake of innovation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Absence of standards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Absence of a clear vision for future system	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slow pace of Air Traffic Management modernisation	0	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

ase explain briefly your choice: O character(s) maximum							
your view, how relevant are the following epean Partnership would meet its objectives ting joint long-term agenda with	s?					ne propose	d
	1 (Not relevant) 2	3	4		5 (Very relevant)	Don'
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	0	0		0	0
Industry	0	0	0	0		0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0		0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0		0	0
	0	0	0	0		0	0
Other societal stakeholders Dling and leveraging resources) through coordination, alignm	(financia	al, infra		cture			pertis
oling and leveraging resources	(financia	al, infra tegrati		cture	e, in-		Don'
oling and leveraging resources	(financia ent or in	al, infra tegrati	on w	cture	e, in-	-kind exp	Don'
oling and leveraging resources .) through coordination, alignm	(financia ent or in	al, infrategrati	on w	cture	e, in-	-kind exp	Don'
oling and leveraging resources .) through coordination, alignm Member States and Associated Countries	(financia ent or in	al, infrategrati	3	cture	e, in-	-kind exp	Don'
Dling and leveraging resources I) through coordination, alignm Member States and Associated Countries Industry	(financia ent or in	al, infrategrati	3 O	cture vith:	e, in-	-kind exp	Don'
Dling and leveraging resources Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental	(financia ent or in	al, infrategrati	3 O	cture vith:	e, in-	-kind exp	Don' Know
Dling and leveraging resources Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	(financia ent or in 1 (Not relevant	al, infrategrati	3	cture vith:	e, in-	5 (Very relevant)	Don' Knov
Dling and leveraging resources Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations Other societal stakeholders	(financia ent or in 1 (Not relevant)	al, infrategrati	3	cture vith:	e, in-	5 (Very relevant)	Don' Know
Dling and leveraging resources Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations Other societal stakeholders	(financia ent or in 1 (Not relevant)	al, infrategrati	3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	cture vith:	e, in-	-kind exp	Don' Know

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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	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	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	0
Research areas covered	0	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	0	0	0

	0				©	0	
Range of activities covered	0	0				0	
Sectoral coverage	0	0			0	0	
this candidate Institution							
In your view, would it be stitutionalised Partnership mparable initiatives? Yes No Please explain why?	and its activ	vities, and/or	to be	etter li	nk it	with other	
h?							
00 character(s) maximum							
	-						
o) Please explain why ot th? 00 character(s) maximum In your view, how relevant is it for the pwing impacts? In pocietal impact:		European Institu 1 (Not relevant					on the
ch? On character(s) maximum In your view, how relevant is it for pwing impacts? Ocietal impact:	or the candidate	European Institu	ıtionalis	sed Pa	rtnersh	nip to deliver	on the
th? On character(s) maximum In your view, how relevant is it for owing impacts?	or the candidate	European Institu 1 (Not relevant	ıtionalis	sed Pa	rtnersh	nip to deliver	on the
ch? On character(s) maximum In your view, how relevant is it for owing impacts? Increased aviation safety levels	or the candidate	European Institu 1 (Not relevant at all)	ationalis 2	sed Pa	rtnersh	nip to deliver 5 (Very relevant)	on the

Economic/technological impact:

Improved passenger experience by reducing

travel time, delays and costs

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Creation of additional jobs in the air transport industries and the EU economy at large	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increased EU aviation industry competitiveness with efficient airspace organisation and optimised traffic flows	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boosted EU industry globally through international agreements and the setting of global standards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improved customer experience and business opportunities by reducing travel time, improving predictability and reducing the cost of Air Traffic Management services per flight	0	0	0	0	0	0
No significant disruption caused by cyber-security vulnerabilities	0	0	0	0	0	0

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Contribution to the advancement of science by stimulating innovation along the entire Air Traffic Management services supply chain	0	0	0	0	0	0
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	0	0	0	0	0

Clean Aviation

The Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Clean Aviation under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be bringing together the European aviation supply chain - including on the transition to low carbon aviation - and accelerating the market uptake of technologies with significantly reduced environmental impact. The primary objective is a path towards deep decarbonisation, therefore contributing to the EU's climate and energy goals.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience of the existing Horizon 2020 Clean Sky 2 (CS2) Joint Undertaking (established under Article 187 TFEU), but would revise its scope, content and implementation and take into account the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

CS2 is a public-private partnership between the EU and the aviation sector, established under Horizon

2020 and which functioning is currently planned until 31 December 2024. It focuses on the finalisation of research activities initiated under Clean Sky 1 and contributes to improving the environmental impact of aeronautical technologies, including those relating to small aviation.

The <u>inception impact assessment</u> outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and impact that the partnership is likely to have.

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 clean aviation?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Too long development and innovation cycles to innovative products and services	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	0	©	©	0	0	0
Lack of alignment and coordination between EU research, national research and private innovation efforts	0	0	0	0	0	•
Regulatory barriers in the field of disruptive and digital aviation technology	0	0	©	0	0	0
Barriers to exploitation due to the financial risk for early movers, especially in areas like urban air mobility	0	0	0	0	0	0
High costs of demonstration of innovative solutions that hinder commercialisation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of acceptance, security and safety related to new aircraft configurations	0	0	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of clean aviation innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market failures due to inadequate industry investment	0		0	0	0	0

Lack of adequate business models	0	0	0	0		0
Regulatory framework lagging behind technology developments	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barriers to exploit due to potential lack of global standards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of consideration of societal and user needs	0	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	

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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	0	0	0	0	0
What is your view on the scope and o	coverage pro	pose	d for t	his c	andidate	-

5. institutionalised European Partnership, based on its inception impact assessment?

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

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

50	500 character(s) maximum		

- 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?

50	00 character(s) maximum

(No) Please explain why other comparable initiatives are not suitable to be linked with?

500	O character(s) maximum			

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
Improved public health on the basis of reduction of pollutants, particulates and noise emissions compared to current aircraft technologies	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced CO2 emissions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Novel competitive cross-sectoral solutions for decarbonisation	0	0	0	0	0	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased industrial leadership in aviation technologies and uptake of new technologies	0	0	0	0	0	0
Creation of jobs in the low-carbon economy by strengthening the European aeronautics sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
New demand side solutions to decarbonise the transport systems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better cross-fertilisation of innovative ideas from SMEs to large companies that can bring them to mass market	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highly skilled jobs in industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low-carbon and competitive transport solutions across all modes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acceleration of key technologies through selected integrated demonstrators	0	0	0	0	0	0

Scientific impact:

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

Advancement of science by stimulating innovation along the entire aviation sector	0	0			©	0	
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Clean Hydrogen

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised; European Partnership on Clean Hydrogen under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to create a strong, innovative and competitive European Clean Hydrogen sector, fully capable of underpinning the European energy transition by accelerating the market entry of nearly-zero carbon hydrogen-based technologies and delivering a wide range of socio-economic benefits to the European society.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 Joint Undertaking (FCH 2 JU), but could significantly revise its scope, expand partners and take account of the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe. FCH 2 JU is a public-private partnership between the EU and the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells industry, established under Horizon 2020 (on the basis of Article 187 TFEU) and which 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 hydrogen and fuel cells?

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 hydrogen and fuel cells	0	0	0	0	0	0
Innovation gap in the EU in translating the results of hydrogen and fuel cells research into new products	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of interest of major market players to engage in hydrogen and fuel cells research	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limited role of the current industrial policy in framing the market perspectives related to hydrogen and fuel cells innovation	•	0	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of hydrogen and fuel cells innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Small current market size	0	0	0	0	0	0
Market failures due to inadequate industry investment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of refuelling infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of funding or de-risking financial instruments for large-scale hydrogen/fuel cell projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overly restrictive regulation in the field of hydrogen and fuel cells	0	0	©	0	0	0
Overly restrictive regulation in energy markets and in particular for energy carriers that enable sector coupling across different areas (power, gas, fuels for transport networks)	0	0	0	0	0	0
High financial risk for early movers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation among players and lack of critical mass	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation among Member States and lack of EU binding targets and bonding networks	0	0	0	0	0	0
High costs of clean hydrogen and fuel cells solutions that hinder mass commercialisation until serial production is achieved, factoring-in economies of scale	0	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

ase explain briefly your choice: O character(s) maximum								
your view, how relevant are the following pean Partnership would meet its objective		s and act	ivities	s to e	ensure	that t	he proposed	
ting joint long-term agenda wi		ng inv 1 (Not relevant)		eme	nt o	f:	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Knov
Member States and Associated Countries		0	(0	0	0	0
Industry		0	0		0	0	0	0
Academia		0	0		0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations		0	(0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. end users		_	-					0
regulators, etc.)		© 			0	© 	0	
· -	finar	ncial, ir	nfras	stru	ctur	e, in		
regulators, etc.) Dling and leveraging resources	finar nent or	ncial, ir r integi	nfras	stru on w	ctur vith:	e, in	-kind exp	ertise
regulators, etc.) oling and leveraging resources .) through coordination, alignn	finar nent of	ncial, ir r integi Not vant)	nfras ratio	stru on w	ctur	e, in	-kind exp	Don't
regulators, etc.) Dling and leveraging resources Through coordination, alignn Member States and Associated Countries	finar nent or	ncial, ir r integr Not vant)	onfras ratio	stru on w	ictur	e, in	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
regulators, etc.) Dling and leveraging resources Through coordination, alignn Member States and Associated Countries Industry	finar nent or 1 (rele	ncial, in r integr Not vant)	atio	stru on w	ictur	e, in	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
regulators, etc.) Dling and leveraging resources Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental	finar nent or 1 (rele	ncial, in r integrial inte	anfras	stru on w	ictur	e, in	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
regulators, etc.) Dling and leveraging resources Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations Other societal stakeholders	finar nent or 1 (rele	ncial, ir r integr Not vant)	anfras	stru on w	ictur	e, in	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
regulators, etc.) Dling and leveraging resources Through coordination, alignn Member States and Associated Countries Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	finar nent or 1 (rele	ncial, ir r integr Not vant)	afras	stru on w	ictur	e, in	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know

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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	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					

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

	Types of partners covered	0		0			0	0		
	Range of activities covered	0		0			©	0	\exists	
	Sectoral coverage	0		0			0	0		
for	ease provide any comm this candidate Institution of the community of the c				oropo	sed s	scope	and cove	erag	je
Ins co (Ye wit		ip and its a	ctivitie	es, and/or	to be	etter li	ink it	with other		
50	00 character(s) maximum									
wit	o) Please explain why o h? 00 character(s) maximum	other compa	arable	initiatives	are	not sı	uitabl	e to be lin	ikec	k
	n your view, how relevant is it owing impacts?	for the candida	ate Euro	pean Institu	tionalis	sed Pa	rtnersh	nip to deliver	on t	he
So	cietal impact:							ı		
				1 (Not				5 (Very	D	on'

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

Improved public health: reduction of pollutants, particulates and noise emissions compared to direct fossil fuel combustion	©	0		0	©	0
Improved working conditions (e.g. for transport professionals, or on construction sites) by eliminating toxic and harmful local emissions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Novel competitive cross-sectoral solutions for decarbonisation	0	0	0	0	0	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased industrial leadership in hydrogen technologies and uptake of new technologies	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preparation of re-skilling of human resources towards high value-added markets with increasing weight in the economy (adaptation to phase-out /replacement of old technologies)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Providision of a solution for storing renewable energy for later use	0	0	0	0	0	0
Creation of jobs in the low-carbon economy by strengthening the European hydrogen sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
New demand-side solutions to decarbonise the energy and transport systems (also in remote /isolated areas)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better cross-fertilisation of innovative ideas from SMEs to large companies that can bring them to mass market	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highly skilled jobs in industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low-carbon and competitive solutions for heavy duty and long-distance transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low-carbon and competitive solutions for all modes of transport	0	0	0	0	0	0

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Contribution to the advancement of science by stimulating innovation along the entire hydrogen value chain	0	0	0	0	0	0

New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of			
EU scientific capability			

Safe and Automated Road Transport

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose a new Institutionalised European Partnership on Safe and Automated Road Transport under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to provide a clear long-term framework for the strategic planning of research and pre-deployment programmes for Safe and Automated Road Transport making sure that investments at local, regional and national level, both of public and private nature, are complementing each other more effectively.

The proposed partnership would take as a starting point the work developed by the Strategic Transport Research and Innovation Agenda (STRIA) and in particular the proposed R&I initiatives in the STRIA Roadmap report to jointly develop a research and innovation roadmap for Connected and Automated Transport.

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 road transport?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Insufficient understanding of technical and non- technical requirements for cooperative, connected and automated mobility (CCAM) services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of a shared strategic planning of research and pre-deployment programmes for cooperative, connected and automated mobility (CCAM)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limited capacity to develop a common testing framework	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient sharing of expertise in specific solutions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gap between research and the development of innovative products and services in road mobility and also between developers and validators /certifiers	0	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 and private actors such as vehicle manufacturers, road operators, digital service providers, research centres and public organisations	•	0	0	0	•	•
High cost and high risk of developing and testing new infrastructure and equipment	0	©	0	©	0	0

Problems in uptake of automated road transport innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market fragmentation due to R&I efforts not being sufficiently targeted towards systemic and interoperable solutions across the EU	0	0	0	0	0	0
R&I efforts targeting relatively low technology levels rather than demonstration projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of synergies and synchronized innovation in related segments and value chains (e.g. telecommunications, digital maps, mobility as a service, automation)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of consideration of societal or user needs; concerns with the uses of cooperative, connected and automated mobility and their interaction with road safety, ethics and data privacy issues	0	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

		1 (Not		2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t Know
Member States and Associated Countries		0		0	0	0	0	0
Industry		0		0	0	0	0	0
Academia		0		0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations		0		0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. representation of cities, vulnerable road users, research institutes and universities)	ives	0		0	0	0	0	0
ling and leveraging resources (through coordination, alignment	ent oi	r integ					5 (Very	Don't
ling and leveraging resources (through coordination, alignme	ent oi 1 (l rele	r integ	ratio	n w	ith:	į r		Don't
ling and leveraging resources (through coordination, alignments) Member States and Associated Countries	ent or	r integr Not vant)	ratio	on w	ith:	r	5 (Very elevant)	Don't Know
ling and leveraging resources (through coordination, alignme	1 (I rele	Not vant)	2	3 (0)	4 ©	r	5 (Very elevant)	Don't Know
ling and leveraging resources (through coordination, alignment of the states and Associated Countries Industry	1 (I rele	Not vant)	2	3 0	4	ŗ	5 (Very elevant)	Don't Know
Iing and leveraging resources (through coordination, alignme Member States and Associated Countries Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental	ent oi 1 (l rele	Not vant)	2	3 0	4	r	5 (Very elevant)	Don't Know
Iing and leveraging resources (through coordination, alignme Member States and Associated Countries Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	ent oi 1 (l rele	Not vant)	2	3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	r	5 (Very elevant)	Don't Know
Ing and leveraging resources of through coordination, alignment of the states and Associated Countries Industry Academia Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations Other societal stakeholders	ent oi 1 (l rele	Not vant)	2	3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	r	5 (Very elevant)	Don't Know

* Please explain briefly your choice:

500 character(s) maximum

operators, automotive suppliers, fleet operators,						
maps and navigation systems and services						
suppliers, user organisations, emergency/police	0	0	0	0	0	0
services, digital infrastructure, artificial						
intelligence, data management and platform						
providers, and service providers, companies of						
different sizes including SMEs, academia and						
research organisations)						
						l .

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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Too narrow	Right scope & coverage	Too broad	Don't know
Technologies covered	0	0	0	0
Research areas covered	©	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	0	0	0
Types of partners covered	©	0	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	0	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	0	0	0
itutionalised Partnersh parable initiatives?				
titutionalised Partnersh mparable initiatives? Yes No No Please explain why	nip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	tter link it	with other
stitutionalised Partnersh mparable initiatives? Yes No	nip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	tter link it	with other
stitutionalised Partnersh mparable initiatives? Yes No es) Please explain why th? Oo character(s) maximum o) Please explain why oth?	pes of partners covered per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: paracter(s) maximum per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope of candidate Institutionalised Partnership: per pro		with other	
stitutionalised Partnersh mparable initiatives? Yes No No es) Please explain why th? O character(s) maximum o) Please explain why th? oo character(s) maximum n your view, how relevant is it owing impacts?	nip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	ives could	with other
stitutionalised Partnersh mparable initiatives? Yes No es) Please explain why th? o) Please explain why th? o) Please explain why th? oo character(s) maximum n your view, how relevant is it	nip and its a	ctivities, and/or to be	ives could	with other

Facilitate collaboration with other relevant

European Partnerships

Improved traffic efficiency and less time spent in traffic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improved road safety	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better quality road infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	0
More inclusive mobility	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced environmental externalities of road transport: air pollutants	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced environmental externalities of road transport: CO2 emissions / Fuel consumption	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improved trust and awareness of innovative solutions	0	0	0	0	0	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
More innovative, sustainable and globally competitive cooperative, connected and automated mobility industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
New jobs and business opportunities in the sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
Need for reskilling current workers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less expenditure required in road infrastructure expansion and maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced administrative burden for applicants and beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced risk of investment in innovative solutions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increased number of patents in Europe in this sector	0	0	0	0	0	0

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased scientific cooperation in the field	0	0	0	0	0	©
New scientific knowledge created and reinforcement of EU scientific capability	0	0	0	0	0	0

Circular bio-based Europe

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Circular Bio-based Europe under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to seek new ways of producing and consuming by respecting the ecological boundaries of our planet in a world of limited resources, with pressing global challenges like climate change, land and ecosystem degradation and growing population.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing "Bio-based Industries Joint Technology Initiative" (BBI Initiative), established under Horizon 2020 (on the basis of Article 187 TFEU) with the last call being launched in 2020, but would revise its scope and partners and take into account the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

The <u>inception impact assessment</u> outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and likely impacts 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 circular bio-based field?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Lack of understanding of the circular and bio- based economy	0	©	0	0	0	0
Innovation gap in the EU in translating the results of research into the development of innovative circular and bio-based products	0	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 such as biomass producers, bio-refineries and biotechnology companies	0	0	0	0	•	0
Lack of consideration of user needs when translating the results of research and innovation into more sustainable products for the citizens	0	0	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of circular bio-based innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Barriers to exploitation due to for example difficulty in licensing of intellectual property rights	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of competitiveness with the traditional products/materials (e.g fossil based, due to higher production cost)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of economic and regulatory incentives for biobased products/ producers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of consumer acceptance or understanding (both business and individual)	0	0	©	0	0	0
High cost of transition to use of biobased materials (e.g. retrofitting of vehicle parts)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of private investment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of public investment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commonly used product specifications are not addressing favourable bio-based properties	0	©	©	0	0	0
Favourable biobased products do not fullfil some commonly used product specifications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Market failures and lack of adequate business models	0	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 ex	cplain	briefly	your	choice:
-------------	--------	---------	------	---------

5	00 character(s) maximum

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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	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	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	0	0

Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	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	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	0
Research areas covered	0	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	0	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	0	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	0	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	0	0	0

for this candidate Institutionalised Partnership: 500 character(s) maximum
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
(No) Please explain why other comparable initiatives are not suitable to be linked with? 500 character(s) maximum
7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership to deliver on the following impacts?

Please provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope and coverage

Societal impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased adaptation of production systems	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reinforced supply of sustainable biomaterials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced greenhouse gas emissions	0	0	0	0	0	0
More sustainable management of natural resources, prevention of pollution	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensurance of sustainable biomass and nutrients sourcing as well as reducing air, water and soil pollution	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximised valorisation of organic waste, and agriculture and forestry residues	0	0	0	0	0	0
Replacement of oil-based chemicals and materials with bio-based and biodegradable ones	0	0	0	0	0	0
Increased sustainability of agriculture & forestry	0	0	0	0	0	0

Addressing the trade-off between stable supply of biomaterials/biomass for use in the bio-economy and the need for biomass for food production and ecosystem services	•	0	0	©	©	0	
Increased knowledge of the biomass sourcing for the circular bio-based economy	0	©	0	0	©	0	

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Creation of jobs in rural and underdeveloped areas	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delivery of bio-based products that are comparable and/or superior to fossil-based products in terms of price, performance, availability and environmental benefits	0	•	0	0	0	•
Increased number of patents in Europe in this sector	0	0	0	0	0	0

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased scientific cooperation	0	0	0	0	0	©
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Innovation gap in the EU in scaling small and medium-sized enterprises	0	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	0
Regulatory barriers in the field of investments	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barriers to exploitation due to lack of access to national and international markets	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of consideration of societal or user needs when supporting small and medium-sized enterprises	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient digitalisation (data access and analysis, interoperability)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Concerns with use of digital tools for privacy or security reasons	0	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:

5	500 character(s) maximum		

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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	0	0

Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	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	0
Involvement of a broad range of partners, including across disciplines and sectors (such as academia, research performing organisations, Member States representatives)	•	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	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	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	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	0	©
Increase financial leverage	0	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	0

	Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners			©	0	0	0	0	0
	Ensure harmonisation of stan approaches	dards and		0	0	0	0	0	0
	Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes			©	0	0	0	0	0
	Facilitate collaboration with of European Partnerships	ther relevant		©	0	0	0	0	0
5. \	What is your view on th	e scope and	d covera	age pro	pose	d for	this ca	andidate	
ins	titutionalised European	Partnership	o, based	d on its	incep	tion i	mpac	t assessr	nent?
		Too narrow	Right sc	ope & cov	/erage	Тоо	broad	Don't kno	w
	Technologies covered	0		0			0	©	
	Research areas covered	0		0			0	0	
	Geographical coverage	0		0		0		0	
	Types of partners covered	0		0			0	0	
	Range of activities covered	0		©			0	0	
	Sectoral coverage	0		0		0		0	
	ease provide any comm this candidate Institutio				propo	sed s	scope	and cove	erage
Ins	n your view, would it be titutionalised Partnersh mparable initiatives? Yes No	•						•	
wit	es) Please explain why h? O character(s) maximum	? Which oth	er comp	oarable	initia	tives	could	it be linke	ed
wit	o) Please explain why o h? O character(s) maximum	other compa	ırable in	itiative	s are	not si	uitable	e to be lin	ked

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 help to improve the daily lives of people	0	0	0	©	0	0

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	0	0	0
More appealing and creative jobs in Europe, requiring high-skills	0	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	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	0