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Delegations will find attached the PowerPoint presentation "ERAC Ad-hoc WG on Partnerships" given under item 5.1 of the ERAC plenary agenda of 17/05/2018.
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Reports on ‘Criteria’ and ‘Strategic Coordinating Process’

Both documents have been revised on the basis of comments received by the delegations and adopted at the level of the Working Group

Report on criteria for selecting, implementing, monitoring and phasing out EU R&I partnership initiatives:

• Only minor changes (along the conclusions)
• Important: calls on COM to elaborate an objective and impact oriented, life-cycle based criteria framework, operational by May 2019

Report on strategic coordinating process for EU R&I partnerships:

• Most important change concerns the transition period: early and structured consultation of MS/AC on the basis of Inception Impact Assessment for Article 185 and 187 initiatives, after the programming process has led to the identification of priorities that require early preparation of these partnership initiatives
• Important: calls on COM to propose the operational design for the process in close consultation with MS/AC before the end of 2018
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Rationalising the EU R&I partnership landscape: main conclusions

• Rationalisation should lead to fewer and more strategic R&I partnerships with a clear position within the given thematic priorities

• Rationalisation can be pursued at 3 levels
  • the overall level of Europe's R&I policy framework;
  • the level of funding approaches; and
  • the level of thematic priority/intervention area.
Rationalising the EU R&I partnership landscape: main recommendations (I)

Rationalisation strategies at the level of Europe's R&I policy framework

• Ensure that partnerships are strictly **limited to cases** where other policy instruments would not be able to achieve similar results, and benefits clearly outweigh its complexities;

• Monitor and report on the **budget allocation** to partnerships;

• Ensure in the design and implementation of future partnerships **coherence and coordination with other related FP9 and national initiatives.**
Rationalising the EU R&I partnership landscape: main recommendations (II)

Rationalisation strategies at the level of funding approaches

• Ensure a simplified system of distinct funding approaches with clear intervention logics (co-programming, co-funding, institutional);
  ➔ Explore discontinuing some of the existing instruments

• Ensure bottom-up support for coordination between MS/AC/industry on topics of their choice (= Coordination and Support Actions)
Rationalising the EU R&I partnership landscape: main recommendations (III)

Rationalisation strategies at the level of thematic priority/intervention area

• **Starting point**: a mapping exercise (current landscape vs. thematic clusters of *Horizon Europe*);

• **Limit the number** and ensure **appropriate level of granularity** of R&I partnerships per FP intervention area;

• Use always the **easiest funding approach** to achieve the policy objectives (= *lowest possible level of administrative burden*)
Increasing the efficiency of implementation: main conclusions

• H2020 Interim Evaluation identified a number of key issues and opportunities;
• For PPPs the main issue to be addressed is strengthening interaction with MS/AC, inclusiveness in participation and access to project data;
• Limited synergies between partnerships and Structural Funds, continue to be an important barrier for participation (especially for low performing countries).
• P2Ps needed further investigation – survey results to the P2P community:
  • Impact of P2Ps depend highly on an increased political commitment at national level;
  • Many efficiency issues due to decentralised implementation via national funding bodies;
  • A centralised management of data on proposals and projects is considered important;
  • A ‘real common pot’ for the funding of transnational R&I projects is not supported;
Increasing the efficiency of implementation: main recommendations (I)

- Ensure the involvement of MS/AC in the set-up and implementation of Public-Private Partnerships
- Ensure wider use of good practices for removing participation barriers for new and smaller R&I players at project and programme level

Examples of concrete activities (more examples are identified in the Issue Paper):
- Broader use of non-binding forms (MoUs) to align partnership activities with national ones;
- Targeted use of communication campaigns for smaller and new R&I players;
- Ensure openness of partnerships at project level in their design and implementation;
- Monitor the performance of initiatives in engaging MS/AC, and small/new players;
- Allow the use of ESIF funding as the national contribution to co-funded calls of partnerships;
Increasing the efficiency of implementation: main recommendations (II)

Explore options for a more centralised and coordinated implementation of the activities of Public-Public Partnerships

Examples of concrete activities:
• Implementing a more centralised grant management, e.g. commonly agreed rules, procedures and single grant agreements for transnational R&I projects
• Implementing a more centralised data management of project data related to partnership initiatives
• Assess the potential use of COM legal entity validation and COM IT tools for proposal submission and evaluation

Follow-up Workshop on 21 June 2018: Efficient implementation of P2Ps – Quo Vadis?
Increasing the efficiency of implementation: main recommendations (III)

Ensure necessary measures at national level that participation in partnership initiatives is accompanied by appropriate commitment and resources for the life cycle of initiatives, and a governance establishing stronger links with national policy priorities and end-users;

Examples of concrete activities:
• This topic was the focus of MLE on Alignment and Interoperability of National Research Programmes
Next steps

• Written comments by 28 May 2018 to the ERAC Secretariat (copy: Maria.Reinfeldt@hm.ee)

• Next steps –
  • 21 June 2018: ERA-LEARN Workshop
  • 17-18 September 2018 ERAC Plenary: adoption of the final reports on ‘Rationalisation’ and ‘Efficiency of Implementation’
  • December 2018 ERAC Plenary: adoption of the final report
Questions for debate

1. **Do you agree with the draft recommendations** proposed for rationalising the partnership landscape and increasing the efficiency of implementation of partnerships?

2. **Is there a smart way to define an ‘appropriate’ budget share for R&I partnerships** within the different pillars of Horizon Europe?

3. **How far are MS /ACs willing to increase the efficiency of implementation** by harmonising their rules and procedures for designing and implementing joint calls for transnational projects as core activity of all R&I partnerships?
Thank you!
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