NOTE

Subject: GPC Contribution to the ERAC Annual Report

Delegations will find in the annex GPC (the High Level Group on Joint Programming) Contribution to the ERAC Annual Report, as adopted by the GPC at its meeting on 12 February 2016.
GPC Contribution to the ERAC Annual Report

After having completed the first task of its mission, with the identification and launch of the 10 Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs), the GPC explored how to best contribute to foster the Joint Programming Process (JPP).

This was done first with the establishment of ad hoc working groups on key issues of the JPP, i.e. promoting alignment among national strategies and programmes, maintaining commitment to joint programming, improving relationship among JPIs and GPC, monitoring implementation of common framework conditions, measuring JPIs progress and impact.

On the basis of the output of the working groups, the GPC established 3 Implementation Groups, to take action on

1) Fostering Relationships among the JPIs and the GPC,
2) Promoting Alignment and Interoperability,
3) Monitoring and Evaluating JPIs and JPP Impact.

Also, the results of the work of the working groups formed the basis for the revision of the GPC mandate. The revision of the mandate was accomplished according to the main concept that “the focus of the GPC activity should shift from the JPIs to the JPP”.

After extensive discussions, the opinion on a renewed mandate\(^1\) was approved by the GPC on 11 March 2015 and transmitted to the ERAC.

Due to the ongoing debate on the ERA advisory structure, the proposal for adoption of the new mandate was postponed in view of the decision on ‘common clauses’ to be included in the mandates of all the ‘ERA-related Groups’.

---

\(^1\) Doc. 1302/15.
Finally, the new draft mandate\(^2\) was approved by the GPC on 12 February 2016 and it is attached to this document (Annex I).

The Implementation Groups (IG) completed their tasks and delivered\(^3\)/are delivering their final reports (Annex II).

The IG on “Fostering Relationships among the JPIs and the GPC” provided the essential elements for the production of a document on “Keeping the GPC up to the job – Tasks and Profile of the GPC Delegates”\(^4\) (Annex III), which has been adopted by the GPC, and led to the decision of inviting, wherever possible, the JPIs’ Representatives to the works of the GPC, which revealed to be a very useful initiative.

The IG on “Improving Alignment and Interoperability” performed an alignment mapping exercise which highlighted the importance of a high level national commitment, of an overarching inclusive national strategy, and of using the national budget as an instrument for promoting alignment. Interestingly, also the national governance (where it exists!) of the JPP was explored, which led to a set of recommendations which is expected to be discussed and approved by the GPC.

After the establishment by the EC of the Expert Group on “Evaluation of Joint Programming to Address Grand Societal Challenges”, the activity of the IG on “Monitoring and Evaluation” which initially was meant to measure the impact each JPI, the GPC and the JPP as a whole have on the relevant societal challenges, was mainly concentrated on the establishment of minimum conditions for JPIs to be used both for possible new JPIs, as well as for the assessment of the existing ones. The IG has presented its proposal on ‘minimum conditions for JPIs’ at the GPC plenary meeting in February 2016 and is planning to deliver its final report early in 2016.

\(^2\) Doc. 1302/16.
\(^3\) Doc. 1303/16 (Final report of the GPC Implementation Group 1 "Fostering and mentoring JPIs").
\(^4\) Doc. 1305/15.
An excellent synthesis of the GPC view of the state of art and vision for the near future can be found in a presentation given by the GPC Vice Chair at the P2P Conference (Brussels, 14-15 January 2016, Annex IV).

Briefly,

- a genuine joint programming of research strategies, programmes and activities is at the core of the full implementation of the ERA in the priority area of the societal challenges;
- joint funding activities are not per se making a genuine joint programming process to develop and grow;
- a stronger effort of the national scientific communities and an effective political will of the decision makers are required for aligning strategies, programmes and activities on major societal challenges, at the Members States, Associated Countries and EC level;
- most likely, a more visible role of the JPIs within the H2020 (as it started happening) could contribute to effectively developing JPIs as strategic hubs for the European research on major societal challenges;
- a MLE conducted within the PSF (started in February 2016) is expected to find solutions for increasing MS/AC and EC commitment to the joint programming process and to the JPIs, for enhancing alignment of strategies and programmes, and for improving interoperability among MS/AC instruments and with the EC instruments.
NOTE

Subject: Proposal for a revised mandate for GPC

Delegations will find in the annex a proposal for a revised mandate for GPC (the High Level Group on Joint Programming), as adopted by the GPC at its meeting on 12 February 2016.
Objective

The High Level Group on Joint Programming (GPC) is a dedicated configuration of ERAC. Its mission, as the ERA-related Group responsible for the European Research Area (ERA) Priority 2a “Optimal transnational cooperation and competition: jointly tackling grand challenges”, is to address issues related to the Joint Programming Process (JPP) of European research.

Main activities

1. The GPC will focus its activities on:

   (a) delivering strategic and timely advice on the ERA Priority area 2a and on the whole progress towards the implementation of the ERA and its Roadmap.

   (b) with the aim of contributing to the consolidation and advancement of the ERA, being responsible for

      - promoting alignment\(^5\) of national, regional and European strategies, programmes and activities for research and innovation with the strategic research and innovation agendas developed as the results of the JPP,

---

\(^5\) Alignment is defined here as “The strategic approach taken by Member States to modify their national programmes, priorities or activities as a consequence of the adoption of joint research priorities in the context of Joint Programming, with a view to implement changes to improve efficiency of investment in research at the level of Member States and ERA”, according to the report of the GPC Working Group on Alignment.
- improving the interoperability among European, national and regional research and innovation programmes/activities, thus facilitating transnational cooperation and also the sharing of information about activities in priority areas for societal challenges;

(c) contributing to the preparation of the debates and decisions of the Competitiveness Council on the JPP;

(d) monitoring and assessing whether the initiatives resulting from the JPP (hereafter „the initiatives“) maintain coherence with their mission and perform adequately, within the frame of their rights and obligations, including the adoption and implementation of the Framework Conditions (FC) and Voluntary Guidelines mentioned under (g) below;

(e) without prejudice to the responsibilities of the European Commission, promoting access to funding instruments for the initiatives aimed at enhancing integration and EU added value, such as those currently known as „Coordination and Support Actions“ for the set-up phase of the initiatives, „ERA-NET Cofund“ for conducting the research and innovation projects foreseen in the strategic research agendas of the initiatives and, when an adequate level of integration is achieved at scientific, managerial and financial level, the “European Joint Programmes” and the public-public or public-private partnerships, as per articles 185 or 187 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, respectively, monitoring the impact of the JPP on addressing the relevant societal challenges;

(f) representing the forum where the initiatives are invited to present on their plans and progress in relation to the funding instruments indicated under (e) above;

(g) updating, whenever needed, the FC outlined in paragraph 8 of the Council Conclusions of 2 December 2008 and the set of Voluntary Guidelines aimed at implementing the FC and at establishing an enabling environment for the JPP, in the light of new developments in the fields of the challenges covered by the ongoing and possible future initiatives;

(h) developing and promoting governance guidelines for the initiatives, complementary to and coherent with the above-mentioned FC;
(i) further, when considered appropriate with respect to the progress of the ongoing JPP and identified societal challenges, identifying, upon proposal of its members and following broad consultation of the different regional, national and European scientific communities as well as, where appropriate, other public and private stakeholders, potential new themes for initiatives where joint programming of research and innovation activities appears beneficial for the solution of new or (re-)emerging major challenges facing Europe and beyond;

(j) within this framework, evaluating each proposal submitted to it, on the basis of the criteria outlined in paragraph 9 of the Council Conclusions of 2 December 2008;

Organisation

2. The GPC shall meet regularly, as a rule 4 times per year. The meetings will normally be held in Brussels.

3. The GPC shall be attended by high-level representatives of the Member States, and of the Commission.

4. The GPC shall be open, as appropriate, to the Countries Associated to the EU's Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

5. Delegates of Member States and Associated Countries are present in the Group as formal representatives of their country, not as individual experts, and should ensure appropriate co-ordination with national representatives in other ERA-related groups.

6. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the GPC shall be elected from among the representatives of Member States in the Group by a majority of its component Members for a period of three years, which is renewable once. In so doing, they shall have due regard to gender balance and other aspects of diversity.

7. The Secretariat for the GPC is provided by the General Secretariat of the Council. The primary role of the Secretariat is to assist the Group in its operation. In particular, it assists the Chair in the preparation, conduct and follow-up of meetings, including the circulation of provisional agendas and of related documents, and the drafting of summary conclusions of meetings.
8. The Commission shall support the work of this Group within the remit of its competence, acting as a facilitator and promoting proactively the JPP and the initiatives.

9. The GPC may set up sub-groups to deal with questions relevant to its mandate. These must have a clear purpose and mandate and be of limited duration.

Streamlining the ERA advisory structure

10. In agreement with the ERAC Steering Board, the GPC shall draw up rules of procedure that are coherent with those of the other ERA-related Groups. The requirement for coherence in rules of procedure does not include any voting rules, which are solely a matter for the GPC.

11. The GPC and the other ERA-related Groups shall develop their own work programmes, draw up their own agendas, carry out their activities and produce their deliverables according to their mandates and the ERA Roadmap. The relevant aspects of the draft work programmes, including the timing of work, the scheduling of meetings and the planning of communication with the Council, shall be discussed within the ERAC Steering Board and comments by the ERAC Steering Board shall be taken into account. The Chairs of the ERA-related Groups shall ensure the substance of these discussions is systematically reported back to their Groups.

12. To ensure overall coherence among the ERA-related Groups and to avoid gaps or duplication in the coverage of ERA priorities, the work programmes shall be discussed within the ERAC Steering Board and a report of these discussions presented to ERAC before the adoption of the work programmes by each Group. Within this framework, the GPC and the other ERA-related Groups take sole responsibility for the content of the advice they provide.
13. The GPC regularly (and at least once a year) updates its work programme, to keep flexibility in dealing with issues of concern to the actors in the field.

14. The Chair of the GPC will serve on the ERAC Steering Board along with the Chairs of the other ERA-related Groups.

15. The GPC shall submit a concise annual report to ERAC, providing a timely strategic and operational overview of research and innovation issues that are relevant to the development of the specific ERA Priority for which it is responsible and on the impact of its activities on the achievement of that Priority. This shall be provided in good time for ERAC to prepare its own annual report to the Council. It shall also ensure more generally, through the Steering Board or otherwise, that other ERA-related groups are aware of developments in its area that are relevant to the wider work of ERA.

16. The GPC’s mandate shall be assessed when necessary, but at least every three years, by ERAC in line ERAC’s agreed procedure for this exercise, and recommendations shall be made to the Council on whether the mandate needs to be revised or repealed in order to reflect progress in the implementation or updates of ERA Priorities.
Delegations will find in the annex the Final report of the GPC Implementation Group 1 "Fostering and mentoring JPIs", as adopted by the GPC at its meeting on 12 February 2016.
GPC Implementation Group 1, “Fostering and mentoring JPIs”

Final report

February 2016
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Summary

Tasks

GPC Implementation Group 1 (IG1, “Fostering and mentoring JPIs”) was created to:

1. Implement the recommendations of the GPC Working Groups 1 “Fostering the relationships between GPC and the JPIs” and 2 “Framework Conditions”
2. To establish a forum for exchange of information and coordination between JPIs and between JPIs/GPC/European stakeholders
3. To work towards the advancement of implementation of the Framework Conditions

Implementation and outcome

The reports of the before mentioned GPC working groups form an excellent starting point for recommendations of the further development of the JPP. The report of WG1 “GPC and JPIs” was based on a survey under the actors of the JPP. It points to a number of shortcomings of the JPP as experienced by the respondents from JPIs, GPC and the Commission. The report of WG2 “Framework Conditions” proposes a distinction between the partly revised “Framework Conditions”, renaming them “Joint Programming Functions” and an “Enabling environment for Joint Programming”.

The work of IG1 focused on the role of the actors of the JPP and how the JPP could be implemented better with an improved interaction between JPIs, GPC and the Commission. Main focus was on the GPC and its delegates as member state representatives and on their specific function in implementing the JPP. Representing the member states, being in the driving seat to implement Joint Programming, GPC and its delegates are recommended to play a more active role, building up on the tasks defined by the Competitiveness Council, when Joint programming was started.

A paper with recommendations for the actors in the JPP was drafted by IG1 and used as the background for the document “Tasks and profile of GPC delegates”. This document was adopted by the GPC and it specifies the role of the GPC-delegates in the JPP. IG1 promoted interaction of the GPC with ERA-learn and the JPIs. This interaction is crucial to foster the JPP.

Conclusions

A much stronger interplay between the actors of the JPP is needed to further advance Joint Programming and the JPIs. The analysis undertaken by IG1 shows that, while JPIs have made remarkable progress, there appears to be significant room for further action regarding GPC. According to its new mandate, GPC shall have a more active role in the future. Ideally, GPC acts as a platform of MS and AS with the aim of facilitating the JPP being an intermediate between politics, policies and practice. Taking into account that Joint Programming is a voluntary process, IG1 recommends GPC members to play an active role in strengthening the commitment by member states and associated countries in order to help it to reach its full potential. GPC shall be supportive in creating a favourable environment for the implementation of JPIs

---

6 RECH 441, COMPET 551, Conclusions concerning joint programming of research in Europe in response to the major societal challenges (2891st Competitiveness Council meeting, 2 December 2008)
7 ERAC-GPC 1305/15 "Keeping GPC up to the job - Task and profile of GPC delegates"
8 ERAC-GPC 1352/16, adopted by GPC in the meeting on the 12th of February 2016.
and shall support the implementation of the Framework Conditions for Joint programming by the JPIs, as well as the further development of the Joint Programming Process as a whole. In this context, JPIs must be recognised as a key actor for the respective societal challenge by member states and by the Commission and must be given the resources needed.

**Mandate and composition of IG1**

**Mandate and role of IG1 in the context of the JPP**

The mandate of IG1 “Fostering and Mentoring JPIs” was to advise the GPC on the practical implementation of the recommendations provided for by the GPC ad hoc Working Groups on GPC and JPIs and on Framework Conditions. Furthermore its task was, on request of the GPC, take effective action in implementing those recommendations. The tasks of IG1 formed part of a process of exploring new ways of working for GPC, and were complemented by two more implementation groups:

IG2 “Alignment and Improving Interoperability” had to build up on the key recommendations of the WGs’ “Alignment” and “Framework Conditions”. Its tasks were to focus on the advancement of Alignment in the context of Joint Programming as defined by the Alignment WG as well as on improving the interoperability of national and European programs and activities.

IG3 “Monitoring JPIs” had to design and implement a monitoring process to ‘measure’ the impact that each JPI, that the GPC, and that the JPP as a whole had on the selected challenges JPIs are dealing with. Background of the work of IG3 was that the concept of Joint Programming was developed with the aim of impacting on major challenges which cannot be realistically and successfully tackled at single-country level. Together, the three IGs were mandated to contribute to a further development of the JPP after several years since the process has been launched and the 10 JPIs are operational since 4 to 6 years.

**Tasks of IG1**

According to its mandate, the tasks of IG1 were to build on the key recommendations of the WG on “Framework Conditions” and “GPC and JPIs” and oversee their implementation. Its focus was on the cooperation between the different stakeholders (JPI, Member States (MS)/Associated Countries (AC), GPC and EC and on the implementation of Framework Conditions. This had to include supporting the JPIs in implementing the full Joint Programming cycle, including those issues that have not received sufficient attention so far, such as use of knowledge, knowledge transfer or innovation. While respecting the specificities of the different challenges and different methods of implementation, the guiding principle was that JPIs are part of an overall Joint Programming Process (JPP) and have been tasked by the Council with a well-defined mission.

Due to its crosscutting nature IG1 had to liaise with the other IGs to ensure consistency in relation to identified steps to be taken and avoid duplication.

The work of IG1 was broken down into three work packages.

**Work Package 1: Implementation of WG Recommendations**

Milestone 1: The IG had to consider the WG Reports on “Framework Conditions” and “GPC and JPIs” and identify for the GPC the practical steps to be taken and by whom, in order to implement as much as possible their recommendations;

---

9 ERAC-GPC 1301/15 Mandates for the GPC Implementation groups
Milestone 2: The IG had to advise the GPC the order and timing by which the recommendations should be implemented, taking into account any necessary sequencing of implementation steps (including in relation to other IGs to ensure a coherent choreography;

**Work Package 2: Establishing a forum for exchange of information/and coordination between JPIs and between JPIs/GPC/European stakeholders**

IG1 was tasked to improve communication between the JPIs, implementing an institutionalised forum that shall help to communicate problems, possible solutions/best practices, need for support, and in general make the JPP more transparent.

Milestone 1: The IG shall ensure that such a forum will be established together with the JPIs and the EC, involving the ERA Learn 2020 project.

Milestone 2: The IG shall represent the GPC in the forum and make the necessary initiatives on behalf of the GPC plenary.

**Work Package 3: Advancement of implementation of Framework Conditions**

While JPIs should in principle be free with choosing the methods for implementation the WG shall focus on areas which did not get sufficient attention so far and areas where JPIs could work together in finding solutions to common problems/challenges. Work had to be done in close collaboration with the JPIs and using i.e. the ERA-Learn 2020 project to deliver support to the JPIs.

Milestone 1: The IG shall identify, together with the JPIs, which areas need increased attention and in which areas collaboration/common approaches are useful and where support can be given through the ERA-Learn 2020 Project or other means.

Milestone 2: On the basis of Milestone 1 the IG shall work on concrete steps to advance the Implementation of Framework Conditions

According to its mandate IG1 was set up for a maximum of 1 year starting in February 2015.

**Composition of IG1**

IG1 was composed of voluntary members of GPC working on the tasks of the group and of observers advising IG1 and establishing links to the relevant elements in the JPP.

The following individuals were involved in the work of IG1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Organisation, country</th>
<th>Role in IG1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonfim</td>
<td>José</td>
<td>FCT, PT</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinges</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>AIT, AT</td>
<td>observer, representative of ERA-Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enache</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>ANCS, RO</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Siobhán</td>
<td>Dept. of Jobs, Enterprise &amp; Innovation, IE</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayraud</td>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keet</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>MINEZ, NL</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monfray</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Agence Recherche, FR</td>
<td>observer, JPI representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihail</td>
<td>Iulia</td>
<td>ANCS, RO</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šándor</td>
<td>Dušan</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmid</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>BMWF, AT</td>
<td>member, Vice-Chair of GPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Brigitte</td>
<td>BMVIT, AT</td>
<td>chair, rapporteur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Background**

As defined in its mandate IG1 builds up on the work of two working groups GPC had established to explore new ways of working within GPC and to find new ways for the advancement of the JPP. Both Working Groups presented final reports. The reports by GPC Working Group “GPC and JPIs” ¹⁰ and by GPC Working Group on Framework Conditions for Joint Programming¹¹ were both adopted by the GPC on 9 September 2014 by written procedure. IG1 has been created to implement the recommendations in these reports.

**GPC Working Group on GPC and JPIs (WG1)**

The WG undertook a consultation using a questionnaire among the actors of the JPP: (1) JPIs (JPI Chairs), (2) GPC delegates and (3) European Commission to establish an inventory of needs, expectations and recommendations and to have a basis for evaluation what support would be needed for the JPP. The results of the questionnaire, subsequent work and discussions in the working group and in GPC led to a set of key messages, which shall now be repeated as they are still relevant.

### Stronger political support at Member States level is needed

The survey emphasised that the JPP should continue to be a Member States driven initiative and pointed out the role of GPC, as the political and strategic forum for Joint Programming, to have a clear vision and determined and sustained political commitment. A common response from all key stakeholders consulted was that there is a need for such a determined and sustained political commitment to ensure that:

- the political environment within the MS is supportive of the work of the JPIs,
- it facilitates the required activities within the MS research programming policies and activities, and
- adequate resources (human and financial) are in place to support the MS actively participating in JPIs.

Therefore the WG concluded that the 2008 commitment of the MS towards Joint Programming should be renewed and strengthened as soon as possible.

### Active participation by Member States and Associated Countries is needed

The Working Group considered that active participation by all EU Member States (not only active participation at GPC level) who join JPIs is vital in order to promote cohesion, to maintain a high level of interest in Joint Programming and to maximise resources utilisation. The principles of Open Access and Variable Geometry are valuable features of Joint Programming and should be enshrined in future Joint Programming mandates.

### GPC should be the key actor to help promote the implementation of JPIs

JPIs should consider the GPC as the political forum for not only their achievements and successes but also for addressing their difficulties. JPIs should work closely with the GPC to address barriers to the implementation of their SRAs and alignment of national research and innovation agendas.

The GPC should have a strategic vision on JPI goals / objectives and implementation timeframe and ensure the definition of clear national positions regarding alignment of National Research and Innovation agendas (SRAs, EU research and innovation programmes, Structural Funds ...) where possible and justified.

---

¹⁰ ERAC-GPC 1306/14, Report of the GPC Working Group on GPC and JPIs
GPC members should, according to the results of the survey, be key actors in securing support to JPIs at a national level (financial and human resources). Equally, GPC shall support JPIs to enhance their visibility.

It was stated that for this, GPC would, as the political and strategic forum for Joint Programming, require an explicit mandate to oversee the implementation by the Member States of the Council’s commitment to act rapidly and coherently to achieve the scale of impact needed to effectively address societal challenges with available research funds.

This recommendation had been followed up with the drafting of a new mandate for GPC, taking into account many of the recommendations coming from that survey.

A properly structured relationship between the actors involved in Joint Programming is needed

The consultations undertaken by the Working Group “GPC and JPIs” with the GPC, JPIs and Commission indicated that relations and communications between the three partners in the Joint Programming process are currently suboptimal to the attainment of their respective mandates. The GPC Working Group “GPC and JPIs” did not find evidence of properly structured relationships between the GPC, JPIs and Commission, nor evidence of a reliable and consistent communications structure between the parties involved in Joint Programming.

Some GPC members felt not sufficiently recognised by the JPIs, while JPIs seem to lack knowledge about the work of the GPC (some do not even know their Member State’s representative). The flow of communication (on issues like CSA, Horizon 2020, Work Programmes, Innovation Plan, relations between H2020 and Innovation Plan etc.) was not considered to be optimal and there was no real timely communication between the Commission services and GPC/JPIs.

Following to these observations GPC has started inviting JPI Chairs to its meetings and since then each GPC plenary is attended by representatives from at least half of the JPIs. There are attempts within GPC to increase awareness and knowledge on the JPIs, like identifying one GPC delegate as correspondent for each JPI, being the first contact person for this specific JPI. However, this has not been achieved yet.

The role of the Commission in supporting the Joint programming process can be further improved

WG1 identified the Commission as a key player which has both the resources and ability to bring all parties together. Results from the survey suggested the Commission should streamline its internal coordination and information process and communication channels relating to JP, harmonise the official status of the EC in the different JPIs and proactively promote the JPP and the JPIs. The Working group proposed as a key mechanism to achieve this, the establishment of a Task Force on Joint Programming, composed of the responsible Commission officials.

JPIs play a key role in the completion of ERA

The contribution of the JPIs to the completion of the ERA has been noted by the Council. In its conclusions of 20 and 21 February 2014\(^1\) the Council considered that the development of the ERA Roadmap should take into account alignment, where possible, of national strategies and research programmes with the Strategic Research Agendas of the JPIs.

\(^1\) 6945/14; Rech 90, COMPET 138; Council conclusions on the progress report from the Commission on European Research Area (ERA) 2013
GPC Working Group on Framework Conditions for Joint Programming

The Working group used the Voluntary Guidelines of 2010\textsuperscript{13} as a starting point and further developed them to more clearly address the environment in which JPIs operate. The support in implementation was in the mandate of IG1 (for topics that are not addressed elsewhere).

The guiding principle of the report was that the term “Framework Conditions” has two aspects, both of which are already covered by the Voluntary Guidelines to varying degrees. The Working group has named these two aspects “Joint Programming Functions” and “Enabling Environment”. Whereas the former addressed the aspects of the “joint programming cycle” which have to be implemented by the JPIs, the latter addressed the conditions for this implementation which exist in the ERA. Both aspects are naturally closely interdependent.

The Joint programming Functions

The Working Group has defined six Joint Programming Functions:

\textbf{Governance}

The Joint Programming Function Governance involves governance systems, the involvement of stakeholders, of the scientific community and of industry as appropriate and with issues of openness and transparency. This aspect also stresses the integration of countries with less developed STI capacities or resources as being indispensable to achieve the fundamental goal of Joint Programming which is to find and implement solutions to challenges that affect all nations in the world, regardless of their STI capacities. Bering in mind that JPIs are focussing on societal challenges the involvement of stakeholders is another important aspect. Experience shows that choosing the appropriate governance model is crucial for effective implementation.

\textbf{The Strategic Process (Foresight)}

Forward looking activities and stock-taking of ongoing and planned research are crucial for defining the right priorities and for elaborating an SRA. This has to be seen as a continuous process and is among the core functions of a JPI. JPIs have proven to have a strategic role in Europe with regard to their challenge area.

\textbf{Alignment}

Alignment has been defined as the strategic approach taken by Member States’ to modify their national programmes, priorities or activities as a consequence of the adoption of joint research priorities in the context of Joint Programming with a view to implement changes to improve efficiency of investment in research at the level of Member States and ERA.\textsuperscript{14} Alignment has come up as a main issue for the implementation of the SRA of a JPI. A focus on Alignment has frequently been called for, e.g. by the Expert Group Report and the Dublin Conference.

\textsuperscript{13} European Union 2011, Voluntary Guidelines on Framework Conditions for Joint Programming in Research 2010

\textsuperscript{14} ERAC-GPC 1305/1/14, Report of the GPC Working Group on Alignment, adopted by the GPC on 28 October 2014 by written procedure
**Joint Activities**

The Joint Programming Initiatives have developed a number of activities in order to ensure the implementation of their Strategic Research Agendas. In addition to these Strategic Research Agendas, several JPIs have set up Implementation Plans to ensure a follow-up of the Agendas. Though varied in conception, design and follow-up, the activities developed by the different JPIs to implement their Strategic Research Agendas, including through Implementation Plans, generally fall into the following categories:

- Mapping of research capacity and capability in order to identify opportunities for Joint activities
- Identification of areas of national research for alignment at European level (co-investment with the European Commission)
- Enhanced coordination, linking and alignment of national research funding, research programmes, national infrastructure and national strategies
- Implementation of calls for proposals (funding)
- Networking, cooperation and partnership activities – with researchers, industry, policy-makers and others
- Capacity building initiatives with researchers
- Outreach and communication activities
- International collaboration with non-EU partners where justified

**Dissemination and Use of Research Findings, Innovation and IPR issues**

This Joint Programming Function groups together the issues of “Dissemination and Use of Research Findings”, “IPR Issues” and “Innovation”. Open access should be applied to the research output of JPIs as much as possible. This claim is even more valid since open access to publications has been made obligatory in Horizon 2020. Furthermore open access to research data needs to be dealt with by JPIs as well. Innovation as a key factor in JPIs for tackling societal challenges should address concrete and realistic issues. If appropriate, the involvement of industry should also be considered in a wide range of areas from an early stage. As another important issue closely related to innovation, JPIs shall develop IPR strategies.

**Evaluation of JPIs (and of the JPP as a whole)**

The Assessment of the functioning, outcome and Impact of a JPI according to their (expected) results, impacts and needs they aim to satisfy. With regard to Joint Programming, it is useful to distinguish between separate levels of evaluation: the first related to assessing the validity of the general policy concept; the second its implementation within individual Joint Programming Initiatives; the third in connection to individual projects conducted within a particular JPI.

Beyond JPIs it would be relevant to assess the dynamics and impacts of the overall process of Joint Programming considering the variety of its instruments at stake.

**Enabling Environment for Joint Programming**

The second aspect of the “Framework Conditions” has been identifies as “Improving the environment for Joint Programming and the JPIs throughout the ERA”. The main issues are: (1) national strategic approaches and their alignment, (2) full commitment by all stakeholders (3) the problem of divergent national rules and procedures, and (4) the willingness to engage in joint and coordinated activities. Implementation

As pointed out in the mandate, IG1 was tasked with three work packages, each with two milestones.
Work Package 1: Implementation of WG Recommendations

Following an analysis of the report of the Working group “GPC and JPIs” GPC Implementation Group 1 defined a clear set of recommendations to the actors in the Joint programming process that could foster the implementation of JPIs and improve the Joint Programming Process as a whole. The sources of these recommendations are the results of the survey among the actors of the JPP. The recommendations are directed to:

- GPC and its members
- JPIs
- the European Commission
- GPC meetings
- ERA-Learn (how to best support the Joint programming Process)

Recommendations to GPC and its members

The “recommendations to GPC and its members” drafted by IG1 were used as a basis for the document “Keeping the GPC up to the job – Tasks and Profile of GPC delegates”15. This document defined the profile and role of GPC delegates as actively contributing to the advancement of the JPP. According to this document approved by GPC delegates should...

- ... have a significant influence on their countries participation in the JPP
- ... be well informed about their countries participation in JPIs and the relating policy processes and programs
- ... be in regular contact with their countries individuals involved in JPIs and manage a national network involving their countries participants to the JPP to ensure the flow of information from the political/administrative system (GPC, government) to the JPIs in their respective countries.
- ... be well informed about national programs and R&D-activities in the fields of the JPIs

With this, GPC would be enabled to play a strong political role in the advancement of the JPP in the interplay of the actors of the process. Additionally, this would ensure a much closer interaction between GPC and the JPIs and would help ensuring stronger political commitment to the JPIs, including an increase of resources that has been asked for so many times, including by the expert group” Analysis on the Joint Programming Process”, chaired by Juan Tomas Hernari.16

The abovementioned recommendations to GPC relate to shortcomings that have been identified in the survey undertaken by the Working Group “GPC and JPIs”. A more active role of GPC, overcoming these has in principle been supported by GPC. Its further implementation by the member states and associated countries is an ongoing task. This new role of the GPC is reflected in the updated mandate for GPC17. The future relevance of GPC appears to strongly depend on the implementation of these recommendations.

Recommendations to JPIs

Provided that GPC and its delegates are ready to assume a more active role JPIs were advised to approach GPC as the forum to support their implementation and regularly report key issues, e.g. implementation problems, success stories, etc. to GPC.

15 ERA-GPC 1305/15, “Keeping the GPC up to the job – Tasks and Profile of GPC delegates”
16 Presentation at the Annual Joint programming Conference by ERA-Learn Conference, Brussels, 14th January 2015
17 ERAC-GPC 1352/16, adopted by GPC in the meeting on the 12th of February 2016.
Additionally JPIs were recommended to further exchange among them, including continuing to organise their annual JPI-Chairs meetings and intensify communication among JPIs in general, to develop and update appropriate SRAs and to develop roadmaps with timelines and measurable goals. JPIs were recommended to communicate more actively on the way they focus on their societal challenges and to involve EC-members and GPC delegates, e.g. by inviting them to their meetings.

**Recommendations to the Commission**

Since the start of the JPP the Commission has been implementing highly regarded supportive measures to the JPP, like CSAs for individual JPIs, dedicated ERA-Net and ERA-net COFUND projects for joint calls of JPIs, supporting actions like the project ERA-Learn 2020. However, currently this support is not centrally organised, but is integrated in several of the work programs of H2020. In the survey JPIs expressed the need for a more streamlined support to JPIs in the view of building the ERA and supporting the sustainability of the JPIs. JPIs also expressed their wish to be involved in the programming-cycle of H2020 and to be contacted timely to give their input (alignment shall function in two ways and take place also between national programs and H2020, not only between Member States programs).

**Recommendations for GPC Meetings**

The replies to the survey suggested that GPC meetings should be more focused on concrete issues brought up by JPIs and that JPI chairs should actively be involved in GPC meetings. Additionally GPC should be active to put the JPP high on the political agenda, e.g. by defining issues for Council discussions around the JPP.

This recommendation has been followed already by Inviting JPI chairs to the GPC meetings. However, the JPIs would deserve a more active role at the GPC meetings.

ERA-Learn provides a web-space for P2P initiatives, also to be used by GPC, e.g. to inform about the most important issues from GPC-meetings.

**Recommendations to the project ERA-Learn 2020**

The survey also indicated how ERA-learn could best support the JPIs and the JPP. All these measures are already implemented or are in the work-plan of ERA-learn 2020:

- Provide an (on-line) communication platform for JPIs and GPC (containing regularly updated key information on JPIs, on H2020 and on the GPC)
- Organize seminars on strategic and implementation issues such as implementation of Framework Conditions and exchange of best practises
- Collect evidence to inform policy, success stories to gain support and inform the public
- Support GPC and JPIs in identifying good-practise examples for JPI-implementation

**Work package 2: Establishing a forum for exchange of information/and coordination between JPIs and between JPIs/GPC/European stakeholders**

This task is undertaken by the EU-Project ERA-learn. On the web-portal of ERA-Learn 2020 information on issues related to the work of JPIs is compiled. ERA-Learn hosts an annual event on Joint Programming, e.g. from 14.-15. Jan 2016 the Annual Joint Programming Conference 2015 with the focus on “Building and Sustaining Commitment to Public-Public Partnerships”.

IG1 and GPC shall closely follow this work to be informed about actual developments in the JPP and to support the process within its function as the forum of high level member states representatives.
Work Package 3: Advancement of implementation of Framework Conditions

Many of the tasks falling under this work-package have been sufficiently worked on or are already dealt with by other actors. The creation of an enabling environment for Joint programming is among the tasks of GPC that have been defined under Work Package 1: it is the role of member stated policy actors to create an environment supporting the JPP and therefore among the core activities of GPC in its future role.

A major open issue not having been sufficiently worked on is the Framework Condition “Optimum Dissemination and Use of Research Findings”, together with the Framework Condition “Protection, Management and Sharing of Intellectual Property Rights”. These issues could be further worked on by ERA-learn, supported by GPC.

---

Glossary

AIT
Austrian Institute for Technology

ANCS
Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research

AS
Associated Country

AT
Austria

BMVIT
Austrian Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology

BMWFW
Austrian Ministry of Science, Research and Economy

ERA
European Research Area

Expert Group
Group of experts who analysed the Joint Programming Process in 2012

FCT
Portuguese national funding agency for science, research and technology.

FP
Framework Programme, e.g. Horizon 2020

IG
Implementation Group

JP
Joint Programming

JPI
Joint Programming Initiative

JPP
Joint Programming Process

MINEZ
Ministry of Economic Affairs (Government of the Netherlands)

MS
Member State

SK
Slovakia

RO
Romania

WG
Working group
NOTE
Subject: Keeping the GPC up to the job – Tasks and Profile of GPC delegates

Delegations will find in the annex “Keeping the GPC up to the job – Tasks and Profile of GPC delegates“, as adopted by GPC at its meeting on 30 September 2015.
Keeping the GPC up to the job – Tasks and Profile of GPC delegates

In order for the GPC to fulfil its task to facilitate the JPP in general and the process of Alignment in particular, in accordance with the GPC mandate, it is recommended that the GPC delegates (individually or the national delegations collectively) meet the following profile and carry out the following tasks:

1. They represent an institution which has significant influence on the policy for participation of the MS/AC in the JPP.

2. GPC delegates are informed about the current status, joint activities and actual/important governance issues of the JPIs in which their respective country participates.

3. They are informed about the participation of their respective country in the JPIs, including the budgetary planning and legal issues or other issues/difficulties with regard to the national system.

4. They keep in regular contact with the individuals in their respective country who are involved in a JPI (as members of boards or other structures within a JPI or as national contact points).

5. They are informed about national programmes or other significant actions in their respective countries in the fields corresponding to the JPIs.

6. They organize and manage a national network of the individuals working in JPIs and those working with corresponding national programmes, as well as of the delegates of the corresponding H2020 Programme Committees. GPC delegates also ensure the flow of information from the political/administrative system (GPC, government) to the JPIs in their respective countries.

7. They participate in at least one of the GPC implementation groups or take over another specific task in the GPC.
8. They are in a position to devote an adequate amount of time to work within the GPC, which includes the tasks mentioned above.
Building and Sustaining Commitment to Public-Public Partnerships

Session 1 – Looking to the future

What do JPIs need to become really big players in the ERA

Bruxelles, 14/15 January 2016
in collaboration with

Martin Schmid
GPC Vice-Chair
1. We need to create a common understanding of what JPIs are

- JPIs are strategic hubs for Joint Programming on Grand Societal Challenges in Europe
- They are far from being an instrument, they use instruments to implement their strategies
- Their main role is to run the JP cycle – develop SRAs, implement the SRAs, deliver results, update the strategies and so on...
2. Everybody should believe in the strategic importance of JPIs as core elements of the ERA

- The JPIs must believe in themselves
- MS/AC and the EC must recognise the JPIs as first address for the respective societal challenge
- The visibility and significance of JPIs to other stakeholders and the public must be increased
3. JPIs must be given the necessary resources to fulfil their ambitious task

• Functioning as a strategic hub requires more substantial resources
• If we want it we have to fund it, otherwise...
4. MS/AC and the EC must give full commitment to the JPP and the JPIs

- This means for MS/AC to recognise the strategic role of JPIs also when defining national strategies or programmes
- This means for the EC to give JPIs the appropriate role within the Framework Programmes
5. JPIs must focus on delivering solutions

• Funding research is not a goal in itself
• Mission oriented research requires delivering solutions
• We need to demonstrate that JPIs are actually contributing to meet the Grand Societal Challenges
6. We must make Alignment happen

- Joint funding activities will not be sufficient to make the JPP big
- We need to bring together the activities of the MS/AC and the FP including the science/research institutions in the MS/AC
Talking about the future...

- ERA Learn 2020 is doing important work to support JPIs to get to the next step of the JPP
- Building on the work of ERA Learn, MS/AC and the EC will launch in February 2016 a Mutual Learning Exercise which will focus on the role of MS/AC and the EC in the JPP
- The MLE is supposed to find solutions for increased commitment, enhancing Alignment and improving interoperability between MS/AC