

**Joint Programming Initiative Urban Europe
6th Meeting of the Governing Board
Summary Conclusions**

Date & time: Monday, 19 September, 2011, 14:00h – 18:30h;
Tuesday 20 September, 2011, 09:30h – 14:00h.
Venue: Malta Council for Science & Technology, Villa Bigghi, Kalkara

Agenda:

1. Opening and welcome [TBN]
2. Minutes of Helsinki meeting [TBA]
3. Appointment of one more Vice Chair of the Governing Board [TBA]
4. Short report by GB chair on state of play and roadmap until end of 2011 (decisions to be prepared, and made, etc.) [TBN]
5. Short progress report by MB [TBN]
6. Implementation of SRF in Pilot Phase (content, instruments)
 - (a) General presentation of triple-module approach and implementation roadmap [TBD]
 - (b) Module 1: Further development of stakeholder process in Pilot Phase (towards joint calls) [TBD]
 - (c) Module 2: Shared knowledge (stock taking) [TBD]
 - (d) Module 3: Expression of national interest and engagement (a la carte collaborations) [TBD]
 - report from workshop on 13 September
 - preparation of match-making event in November [TBD]
 - (e) labelling process (as part of the implementation) [TBD]
7. Design of future structure of Management Board
8. Report on UEF (presentation of concept for the future of the UEF) [TBD]
9. Report on SAB (MN) (proposal of new members, next steps) [TBD]
10. National presentations, e.g. on national programmes or clusters [TBN]
11. MB work plan for 2012-2013
 - (a) Legal procedures and legal position of JPI UE [TBD]
 - (b) Work Programme 2012-13 [TBA]
 - (c) Budget 2011-2012 and financial procedures [TBA]
 - (d) International cooperation [TBN]
12. Communication strategy [TBD]
13. New meeting format for observers and other interested countries [TBA]
14. EC related matters
 - (a) Status of assessment by European Commission [TBN]
 - (b) Development of CSA proposal for 2012 [TBD]
 - (c) INCO proposal [TBD]
 - (d) COST actions [TBN]
15. Next meetings: dates, times and venues [TBN]

Legend: TBN: to be noted; TBD: to be discussed; TBA: to be approved;

Day one, 19th of September 2011 (14.00 – 18.30):

- 1. Opening and welcome** by Ingolf Schädler, Chair of the Governing Board, and the Maltese hosts; Brief introduction of R&D policy and funding in Malta and Malta's role and commitment vs. the JPI UE by David Sutton (DS) and Dr. Jennifer Cassingena;
Apologies from: Belgium, the EC, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, and Turkey.
- 2. Minutes of Helsinki meeting and adoption of the agenda**
The minutes of the last GB meeting are adopted and the agenda of the present meeting is approved. Special congratulations go to the Vice Executive Director of the MB, Hester Menninga (currently on maternity leave), on the birth of her son on 15 August 2011.
- 3. Appointment of one more Vice Chair of the Governing Board**
Olaf Cornielje (NL) is appointed one of the Vice Chairs of the Governing Board in accordance with the ToR of the Governing Board.
- 4. Short report by GB Chair on state of play and roadmap until end of 2011**
State of play: The EC has made a favourable assessment, which will be officially communicated to the Council by November. The formal advice to the Council is expected to be positive as well.
Roadmap: As outlined in a document prepared by the Austrian and Dutch delegations prior to the meeting the current 6th GB meeting will prepare the ground for decisions to be taken at the upcoming GB meetings in October (Copenhagen) and December (Oslo) on the following items:
 - The Pilot Phase (themes, budgets, etc.) (TBD in Copenhagen, TBA in Oslo)
 - The structure of the future Management Board (TBD in Copenhagen, TBA in Oslo)
- 5. Short progress report by MB**
Peter Nijkamp, Executive Director of the MB, states that the MB has been working intensively, focusing on certain dedicated issues. One of these issues was a common concept document 'National Interests and Engagements' in which the so-called triple-module approach is explained. These three modules would essentially form the ingredients of the next 2-year Pilot Phase starting from 1 Jan 2012.

Mika Lautanala (FI) points to the fact that decisions need to urgently be made on how to improve the workflow communication.
- 6. Implementation of SRF in Pilot Phase (content, instruments)**
 - (a) General presentation of triple-module approach and implementation roadmap**
Presentation of the three modules of the Pilot Phase by Margit Noll (MN), Vice Executive Director of the Management Board, with reference to the brief discussion on this issue during the last GB meeting in Helsinki;
 - (b) Module 1: Further development of stakeholder process in Pilot Phase (moving towards joint calls)**
The Pilot Concept, which was approved by the GB in Helsinki, proposes joint calls on a number of topics for foresight and R&D activities. To ensure a refinement of the topics and a good uptake in the participating countries, all countries have been invited to initiate national stakeholder processes which focus on **consolidating the R&D topics**.

To further **refine the foresight topics** with interested parties from the UE countries a workshop will be organized on the 7th of November in Vienna. A final foresight concept for the pilot phase will then be presented at the 8th GB meeting in December (Oslo).

The discussion leads to the outline of a possible timeframe for setting up the Joint Call as described in the UE work programme 2012-13:

- Decision on the budget and for the go-ahead at the Oslo meeting in December 2011;
- Negotiations of the framework among national agencies to commence in January 2012;
- The earliest possible time to actually open the call would then be April 2010;
- Allowing three months for submitting proposals, the evaluation would have to happen over summer 2012;
- Negotiation of contracts in autumn 2012;
- Kick-off of the successful projects earliest at the end of 2012 or the beginning of 2013.

A second Call could follow in early 2013.

(c) Module 2: Shared knowledge (stock taking)

This module serves to identify and liaise with results relevant for Urban Europe, coming from national RD&I as well as from the EU FP, but also with good practice in cities and urbanised regions. Through screenings of the results of RD&I programmes, as well as via workshops and conferences this module will link to cities and the research community in order to define the point of departure of the JPI Urban Europe. A draft proposal for a platform on urban research and innovation, again based on national stakeholder processes, will be presented in Copenhagen with a view to the final proposal to be approved in Oslo.

(d) Module 3: Expression of national interests and engagement (a la carte collaborations)

A first step in this module was the mapping of national programmes for the Status Report to the European Commission, which will be further updated.

Report from workshop on 13 September: Thibault Prévost (FR) and Margit Noll present a brief summary of a workshop held by the MB in Brussels on the 13th of September, which targeted the owners of national RD&I programmes (agencies and ministries).

Although a detailed analysis is still in process, a number of common aspects are obvious: a focus on sustainability, the interdisciplinary nature of the programmes and an interest to link to the JPI UE. A number of restrictions regarding potential collaboration could be concluded as well: differences in objectives, legal approaches and budgets, as well as in the positioning of the programmes with regard to the innovation cycle, i.e. basic or applied research). The next steps will be to conduct an in-depth analysis, undertake thematic match-making event(s) and support the thematic cross-linkage of national programmes (thus paving the way for programme alignment).

Preparation of match-making event in November: (This item was not discussed any further and the planning of the related event might be postponed until the above-mentioned results are available.)

(e) Labelling process (as part of the implementation): (The discussion of this item was transferred to the presentation of the MB Work Programme 2012-13)

Following the presentation, the Chair initiates a tour de table on the ability and readiness of each of the countries present to engage in a Joint Call for proposals in 2012.

- **France** is very supportive of the general approach, sees a possible contribution in Module 2, is open to activities in other Modules, but possibilities on the short-term are very limited as national budgets and programmes have already been set for next year. Yet, if money would not have to flow before the end of 2012, there might be a window of opportunity to participate in Urban Europe calls. Negotiations on such participation would have to be finalised by April 2012.
Referring to former ERA-NET experiences, Thibault Prévost also points out, that there may not be enough international teams able to answer the JPI UE Joint Call in the first place. The JPI Urban Europe must therefore develop momentum on the demand side as well as on the supply side.
- **Norway:** Anne Beate Tangen states that the ambitions of the JPI UE are welcomed, especially regarding Modules 2 and 3. Regarding Module 1, a positive attitude is there, but budget issues would have to be solved.
- **Denmark:** Thomas Trøst Hansen explains that for Denmark it is easy to contribute in Module 1. However, a process is currently under way of prioritizing Denmark's input in its various JPIs. As this process will continue throughout Autumn 2011, decisions will be taken only later this year, but any amount of available money will start out small. Denmark finds the national stakeholder processes very important and is looking into starting its own.
- **Malta:** Stephen Camilleri states that Malta's funding agencies need clarification on how national funds might be coordinated within each of the three modules. If the framework conditions match, there might be funds available that can be used.
- **Sweden:** Inger Gustavsson states that they are very glad that the national stakeholder processes have been started. She stresses the importance to build on this to inform possibilities for participating in Module 1.
- **The Netherlands:** Olaf Cornielje points to the importance of paying equal attention to the process of coordinating activities and to possibilities of financing joint calls. Ad van Ommen adds that NL is very much interested in logistics, and he sees the same preference in Sweden, Ireland and Finland. He will take the potential timeframe for a possible Joint Call back to NL and get feedback from the agencies on whether they can agree to the common work programme and be ready for a joint call by April 2012.
- **Finland** will not make a decision on opting in/out of a certain module but will focus on where the added value lies of working together. Mika Lautanala points out that financing a Joint Call is not the only option, as is indicated by the three modules. He then shows some slides on how he sees the JPI UE approach. Coordination is key, and for this coordination to work, 'champions' are needed to lead in certain areas. This makes the process easier and creates action.

The Chair summarises the discussions in that Modules 2 and 3 seem to be generally seen in a positive light but that there are still question open regarding Module 1. What can be pointed out is that joint calls in Module 1 would most likely use a virtual common pot as this currently is the state-of-the-art tool to finance transnational activities. But the discussion shows that the main task presently is to manifest a common interest and a long-term strategy.

In rounding off the issue of the Pilot Phase, the Chair points out the need for a clear and attractive formulation of the topics for the first Joint Call. The first projects will have to deliver evidence on the megatrends and challenges, which will define the urban issue in the future.

- All members of the GB are asked to give input on the most important research questions and/or topics to be outlined in the triple module approach (especially Module 1 – joint call) and communicate this to the MB before the next meeting in Copenhagen.
- The MB is given the mandate to further develop the Pilot Phase topics and research questions, based on the input of the GB members to be discussed in Copenhagen.

7. Design of future structure of Management Board. (This item is shifted to day two)

Day two, 20th of September 2011 (9.30 – 14.00):

Given the timeframe, the agenda is slightly amended to start with those points on which decisions need to be taken in order for the MB to continue its work.

- 8. Report on UEF (presentation of concept for the future of the UEF):** (Upon request from the MB, this item is postponed until the GB meeting in October (Copenhagen))
- 9. Report on SAB (proposal of new members, next steps):** (Upon request from the MB, this item is postponed until the GB meeting in October (Copenhagen))
- 10. National presentations, e.g. on national programmes or clusters:** (This item is not taken up in order to make more time for discussions)

11. MB work plan for 2012-2013

(a) Legal procedures and legal position of JPI Urban Europe: The Chair of the MB elaborates on the legal procedures and position of the JPI UE and suggests that the legal and financial handling of JPI UE activities, such as joint calls, should eventually be outsourced to national funding agencies. As an example the funding network NORFACE¹ is mentioned.

- The MB is asked to make a proposal for a Consortium Agreement which could be used to mandate funding agencies for the management of calls and other joint activities.
- It is agreed upon that other discussions related to this item will be picked up in the context of the future MB structure.

(b) Work Programme 2012-13: Margit Noll, Vice Director of the MB, presents the Work Programme of the MB, explaining that it is divided in two parts:

- 1.** The implementation of the pilot modules and secondly, horizontal activities and strategy development. Besides a possible Joint Call (Module1), the stock-taking activities of Module 2, and the ‘a la carte collaborations’ of Module 3, a so-called Research Alliance could mobilise the institutional resources of all countries.

¹ NORFACE (New Opportunities for Research Funding Agency Co-operation in Europe) is a partnership between fifteen research councils to increase co-operation in research and research policy in Europe. Over five years between 2004 and 2009, the partners engaged in an ERA-NET, creating a range of initiatives designed to deliver new levels of co-operative research policy and practice. In 2009, NORFACE launched an ERA-NET Plus call resulting in 12 projects forming a new transnational programme on Migration in Europe, destined to run until 2014. Currently preparations are underway to form an ERA-NET NORFACE II.

2. In the second part of the Work Programme the governance activities come into play: SAB, Communication, liaison with the EC, etc.

The Chair states that the Work Programme is very ambitious and that the MB should not go beyond capacities and provisions that are currently available. He calls on the MB to concentrate on defining topics in order to generate concrete research proposals in Module 1, and only elaborate on the second and third Modules if it can manage.

- (c) **Budget 2011-2012 and financial procedures:** Margit Noll presents the budget related to the Work Programme, which can presently only be drawn up until the end of 2011. The reason is that, although the Work Programme covers all the steps until end of 2013, calculations for these activities cannot yet be made because the future structure of the MB is not yet known.

Estimated budget for the period Sep – Dec 2011: the workshop costs (not including the travel expenses of various external participants) could be covered by in-kind contributions. The communication item needs to be covered by cash.

Activity	Task	Estimated budget
UEF	1 meeting	7.000
Pilot phase – Module 3	2 workshops with national funding agencies	10.000
Communication	Details see table below	44.200
Total		61.200

The discussion focuses on the need to make sure that expenditures never exceed actual funds available from national contributions. This will require a prioritisation of spending items and a halt to expenditures, as soon as their sum is higher than the current level of the account. In order to remain within the limits of the € 60.000 of cash available from participation fees in 2011, the MB is asked to aim at finding extra in-kind contributions for the workshops mentioned in the first two budget lines and to limit the costs for these workshops to a combined amount of € 15.000.

Available budget

Countries committed to pay the fee	12
Budget 2011	EUR 60.000,-
Available budget per 12.9.2011	EUR 45.000,-

In addition, a procedure to approve expenditures in the Management Board is presented, which is based on the four-eye principle, and aims at insuring conformity with good accounting principles.

- (d) **International cooperation:** (this item is not taken up and might be addressed in a subsequent meeting)
- **The budget proposed by the MB for 2011 is approved with the restriction of reducing the first two budget lines to a combined amount of € 15.000, and the requirement to balance expenditures with the amount available in cash at any given time.**
 - **The members of the GB will give input to the MB on the Work Programme 2012-2013 so that further refinements can be discussed in Copenhagen, in order to prepare for a final decision in Oslo.**

12. Communication Strategy

Margit Noll presents the communication strategy and a detailed budget for its implementation. Based on suggestions made by the GB in Helsinki, the strategy is now geared towards specific target groups. According to the related Communication Action Plan, a first step will be to update a corporate design, develop templates for various communication purposes and start creating the new JPI UE website (Inter/Intra-net) as is reflected in the proposed communication budget.

- **The Communication strategy is adopted together within the frame of the foreseen expenditures, given the important note to look at how much of expected funding is actually available.**
- **In line with this, the GB gives the MB the mandate to continue with the development of the Communication Strategy and the development of the website, and, if asked by the MB, will give further input on the Strategy as a whole.**
- **Regarding internal communication the GB reiterates the need for all documents created in the JPI UE framework to be dated, signed and assigned a number according to their respective meeting agenda.**

13. New meeting format for observers and other interested countries: (this item is not taken up and might be addressed in a subsequent meeting)

14. Item 14a and 14b: Status of EC assessment and Coordination and Support Action (CSA)

Hans-Günther Schwarz (AT), liaison between GB and MB, briefly sketches the current situation, where a favourable Commission Recommendation for the JPI Urban Europe can be expected around end of October 2011. Detailed feedback from the Commission services will be presented in a Commission staff working paper accompanying the Recommendation and will be presented by the EC representatives and discussed during the GB meetings in October (Copenhagen) and December (Oslo).

- As reported during the GB meeting in Helsinki, the 2 million EUR to be made available for a CSA for JPI UE will come out of the Regions of Knowledge Work Programme by means of a budget amendment. GB members are asked to liaise with their national delegates in the Programme Committee on Regions of Knowledge and inform them of the priorities of the JPI Urban Europe. They should also inform them of signals from the Commission, that the budget for the CSA will be provided from FP funds additionally and not reduce the already agreed budget of the work programme. A list of national delegates to the programme committee has been sent around before the GB meeting.
 - Expected timeline: A specific CSA Call will be made available for JPI UE on the 12th of January with a closing date in March. In case of a positive evaluation of the Urban Europe proposal, contract negotiations could be completed (depending on how fast and effective negotiations take place) in the summer of 2012. This would mean that the earliest possible contract for a CSA for JPI UE would start in the autumn of 2012. However, costs could possibly be claimed beginning from the time of the closing of the call.
- **The MB is asked to produce a memo of two or three pages to be communicated to the national delegates with aims, objectives, the importance of JPI UE and how these can fit in with the overall aim of the Regions of Knowledge Work Programme.**
 - **GB members are asked to liaise with their respective national delegates in the programme committee on Regions of Knowledge and can use the memo to convey the approach of the JPI Urban Europe.**
 - **All GB members are asked to report back in Copenhagen on how their contact with the national delegates in the Programme Committee of the Regions of Knowledge went.**

Items 14c and 14d: INCO/COST

Margit Noll reports that after close consideration of current INCO-net areas, there is one high-potential for the JPI UE to perhaps engage in: a BILAT project with China. As the EC is very much interested in linking to China, this might be a very interesting and welcome opportunity for the JPI UE to engage with countries/regions outside of Europe. A project can, however, only come together, if a few interested JPI UE countries come together to further develop a proposal.

As for the relation with COST, PN explains that our EC contact Pia Laurila (PL) still thinks there is a good possibility of liaising with existing activities but she suggested not to engage this pro-actively for the time-being.

→ The MB is asked to send out an invitation to all the JPI UE participating countries to see if a Consortium can be established based on AIT lead.

Item 7: Design of future structure of Management Board (MB)

PN summarizes the state of the discussion until now on the future structure of the MB and discussions that have been going on in the MB in which a consensus was not reached. Basic elements for which the GB initially gave the MB the mandate to elaborate on was a 'lean and mean' MB as an instrument to realize the objectives set out by the GB, but also to distinguish the various functionalities and competences needed regarding future MB members. The link with the GB, by means of some sort of national liaison role, also needs to be discussed, as well as task forces within the MB structure, based on national input. Finally, the future role of the secretariat must also be considered. The MB asks for guidance from the GB on how to proceed.

→ The MB is asked to produce a clear document describing how the other JPIs have tackled this organizational set-up issue. Compare and contrast the different governance models the other JPIs are using. To be discussed in Copenhagen.

The Chair states that a few principles should be taken into account as a consensus of the Governing Board, when developing the new structure:

- The members of the future MB would have to be seconded by participating countries and devote at least 50% of their time for their role in the Management Board.
- The MB team will need to cover a set of specific functions, which will have to be reflected in the management structure.
- A support infrastructure in the form of a secretariat or service platform will be established and financed by the participating countries.

After a discussion on the different functions, new governance options to ensure better liaison with the national structures, and on the role of the secretariat, Mika Lautanala (FI) proposes to set up a task force in the GB to look into the MB structure and put a proposal on the table for Copenhagen.

→ The GB sets up a task force consisting of the representatives of Finland (Mika Lautanala), Netherlands (Olaf Cornielje) and France (Thibault Prévost), to be chaired by NL. This task force will come up with a proposal on the future structure and design of the MB including a supporting secretariat, to be presented in Copenhagen.

15. Next meetings - dates, times and venues

Earlier meeting dates decided upon during the previous GB meeting in Helsinki are slightly altered/extended as it is considered necessary that the GB members convene for at least 1 ½ days per meeting.

- The Copenhagen meeting is set for the 24th (to start at 14.00h), and an all-day meeting on the 25th of October.
- The meeting in Oslo will follow the same time schedule, which means starting in the afternoon on the 14th of December followed by a full-day meeting on the 15th of December.

The Chair thanks the Maltese hosts for their excellent hospitality and the meeting is closed.

Annex: Participants of the meeting

Attendance 6th Governing Board Meeting JPI Urban Europe, Malta

Members of the Governing Board

Ms.	Isabella Eiselt	Federal Ministry of Science and Research (BMWf)	Austria
Mr.	Ingolf Schädler	Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology	Austria
Mr.	Thomas Trøst Hansen	The Danish Council for Strategic Research	Denmark
Mr.	Mika Lautanala	TeKes	Finland
Mr.	Thibault Prévost	French Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development, Transp. and Housing, on behalf of Ms. Jaquot-Guimal (IFSTTAR)	France
Mr.	David Sutton	Transport Malta	Malta
Mr.	Stephen Camilleri	Transport Malta	Malta
Mr.	Olaf Cornielje	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment	The Netherlands
Mr.	Ad van Ommen	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment	The Netherlands
Ms.	Anne Beate Tangen	Norwegian Ministry of the Environment	Norway
Mr.	Jonas Enge	Research Council of Norway	Norway
Ms.	Inger Gustafsson	Vinnova; Vice Chair of the Governing Board	Sweden

National experts or participants from Management Board

Ms.	Margit Noll	Vice Executive Director; Austrian Institute of Technology	Austria
Mr.	Hans-Günther Schwarz	Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology / Liaison between GB and MB	Austria
Ms.	Maria Attard	Institute of Sustainable Development, University of Malta	Malta
Mr.	Peter Paul Barbara	Transport Malta	Malta
Ms.	Jennifer Cassingena Harper	Maltese Council of Science and Technology	Malta
Ms.	Alexandra Ellul	Transport Malta	Malta
Mr.	Eric Flask	Maltese Council of Science and Technology	Malta
Ms.	Christine Perici	Maltese Council of Science and Technology	Malta
Ms.	Anneloes van Iwaarden	European Metropolitan Network Institute	The Netherlands
Mr.	Peter Nijkamp	Executive Director; VU University Amsterdam	The Netherlands
Ms.	Ebba Lindgren	Vinnova	Sweden