

**Joint Programming Initiative Urban Europe
10th Meeting of the Governing Board
Summary Conclusions**

Date & time: Tuesday, 29 May 2012, 14:00h - 18:00h
Wednesday, 30 May 2012, 9:00h - 15:00h

Venue: "Haagse Lobby", The Hague, the Netherlands

Agenda: (all agenda items will be followed by discussion)

1. Opening and welcome [TBN]
2. Presentation by the Dutch hosts [TBN]
3. Procedures [TBA]
4. Status [TBN]
5. UE Work Plan for Pilot Phase [TBD]
6. Pilot Call [TBA]
7. Forward looking Activities/Research Alliance [TBN/TBD/TBA]
8. Scientific Advisory Board and Urban Europe Forum [TBN]
9. Nomination of the National Contact Persons [TBD]
10. Adjustment of Terms of Reference [TBA]
11. Standard 10 minutes presentation on JPI UE [TBD]
12. Presentation on Conference of European Urban Research Association [TBN]
13. Communication [TBN]
14. Next meetings [TBD]

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

1. Opening and welcome

Ingolf Schädler, Chair of the Governing Board, opens the meeting and thanks the City of The Hague for hosting the meeting. Apologies from: Spain, Ireland, Malta and the European Commission. A special welcome to Mr. Oliver Diehl, head of the German FONA office in Brussels, who participates for the first time, since his country formally committed to full membership in the JPI Urban Europe in April. The delegates nominated by Germany are Florian Frank (German Federal Ministry of Science and Education - BMBF), Oliver Diehl (alternate), and Christian Bodensteiner (PTJ, alternate).

2. Presentation by the Dutch hosts

Theo Strijers, Programme Manager Metropolitan Development The Hague – Rotterdam, gives a presentation on the development and challenges of the metropolitan area of The Hague and Rotterdam.

3. Procedures

The agenda is adopted. The minutes of last GB meeting are adopted. Hans-Günther Schwarz confirms that all of the action points from the last GB meeting in Dublin have been answered.

4. Status

Information from GB

Hans-Günther Schwarz reports back on the most recent meeting of the Council High Level Group on Joint Programming (GPC) where all ten current JPIs had been invited to present their status. This was to provide input for a new expert panel set up by the Commission with the mission of evaluating the progress of the JPI process. In comparison to other JPIs, JPI UE proved unique in terms of its pilot phase and can claim to have made good progress (organisation/action lines). It is, however, the only JPI which was not successful with its proposal for a Coordination and Support Action (CSA). Referring to the themes discussed at the meeting, Leonidas Antoniou adds that the European Commission presented the option for member states to fund their budget share in the Joint Calls of JPIs out of their allowance of Structural Funds money. On another note, in the new period from 2014 to 2020, a minimum of 5% of the Structural Funds will have to be spent for urban topics.

- **The MB shall contact the European Commission to get more details on how member states can use Structural Funds to finance their share in joint call budgets**
- **Each GB-member is asked to look into options of using Structural Funds in relation to the JPI UE on their own national level, and report back at the next meeting.**
- **The presentation on the current status of the EIP on Smart Cities and Communities of the European Commission will be distributed with the minutes of this GB-meeting**
- **The MB is requested to prepare an agenda-item on the smart cities and communities initiative (innovation partnership) for the next GB-meeting in Vienna**

In the beginning of July, Ingolf Schädler will have a meeting with the Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) where JPI UE will be presented. The outcome of this meeting will be reported at the next GB-meeting.

Management Board: review first months in office

Carl Hamilton reflects on the in-phasing of the new management board and CSA writing process. The key learnings from the first months (i.e. expectations) are presented as well as future challenges on the focus of JPI UE (added value/definition of JPI UE). The new management team came into office in the middle of the CSA writing process, in a phase, where the thematic focus of the JPI had not yet clearly been formulated and agreed upon among the participating countries. Hence, for the new Management Board it was a challenging task to embrace the vision and outlook of the JPI, provide a new wording, and get agreement from everyone on such a focus in the short time available. This had an effect on thematic description of the JPI UE in the CSA proposal, which was somewhat vague under the given circumstances. Several delegates agree on the need for (more) focus in JPI UE.

Regarding the current team spirit in the MB, Carl Hamilton states that the design of the management structure is new, and untried, but it works due to the ambition and good will to work together. The work processes have been structured anew, reflecting the limited time-capacity of the management board (three members working half-time for the JPI), and the availability of the new Programme Office (secretariat).

The Management Board stresses that the involvement of GB-members and National Contact Persons (in-kind resources and contributions) will be crucial for the success of the different action-lines of the Pilot Phase.

5. UE Work Plan for Pilot Phase

CSA

Carl Hamilton summarises the evaluation report on the CSA proposal including the view of the MB on the different points made by the evaluation panel.

- Some of the thematic critique of the evaluation report is well founded, as hinted under the previous agenda point, but should not have been the main issue for the evaluation of a CSA proposal.
- A number of points are factually wrong, e.g. on the perceived inadequateness of the qualification of the proponents, or on the perceived lack of involvement of funding agencies (just to mention a few).
- The proposal was evidently judged according to its thematic contents, and the respective qualification of its proponents, as if it was about a standard R&D project. For a CSA, however, which is mainly about the structures and processes leading to such thematic projects, and about involving people with the right qualification (e.g. the SAB), this is the wrong measuring stick.
- The proposed structure of the CSA project, which would not have involved all of the activities of the Pilot Phase (e.g. the organisation of the joint calls was not included, as its funding had already been secured from in-kind contributions), and would not have covered all of the time needed to see its outcome, was seen as detrimental. This is completely against the given nature of JPIs, which should make sure to not rely on Commission funding only.

Hans-Günther Schwarz adds that, already before the CSA call, claims had been made from within the European Commission as well as from the research community, which labelled the thematic focus of the JPI as “too fuzzy”, and “lacking technological relevance”. More agreement and understanding had come from the desk officers at the RTD unit of Regional dimension of Innovation, as well as from actors at DG Regio.

Discussion on how to proceed

The MB suggests to very clearly bring this to the attention of the Commission. This could be done either by filing for redress, or by writing a letter to the Director General of DG RTD. It will be important, however, to ensure the continuation of the action lines of the Pilot Phase, and keep an emphasis on a strategic discussion within the JPI, which should address some of the thematic critique. The main argument of the JPI should, in any case, be the delivery of results.

The discussion reveals a preference of most delegates for the strategy of delivering results, rather than investing too much energy into procedural action. They agree that the JPI Urban Europe needs to keep its human-centred approach and to take a stance versus opinions which claim that the focus of the JPI is going into the wrong direction. Some argue that a redress will send the wrong message of an orientation at complaint rather than results. This is mainly backed by delegates from Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, and Turkey. Delegates from Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden agree, but state that they could live with a redress, together with the opening of strategic talks with the Commission on a way forward. Gürcan Ozan explains that even with a successful redress procedure the question remains whether the current proposal will be successful in the eyes of a new panel of evaluators.

At the moment of the GB meeting the European Commission has not yet communicated anything regarding a potential way forward, which could open the way for a new proposal. Hans-Günther Schwarz states that the European Commission seems open to (further) bilateral talks.

Ingolf Schädler sums up the discussion, stating that the JPI Urban Europe needs to take a clear stance regarding the points communicated via the evaluation results. Yet the redress procedure should only be started, if there was an indication that other strategic approaches were bound to fail. He indicates that a letter to the Commission stating the concerns about the evaluation might be more effective, if a strategic option for a new call can be found. He concludes that a high level discussion on the best way forward should be approached with the European Commission, while a formal redress procedure should be prepared in parallel, in order to keep all options open.¹

The first draft of the MB on the factual evaluation errors will serve as the basis for the redress document and/or a letter to the European Commission.

→ Ingolf Schädler will approach the European Commission regarding a strategic discussion of the way forward.

→ MB will prepare for a factual redress document and an optional letter to the EC.

Work plan

Carl Hamilton presents the work plan for the pilot phase. He emphasises that, without additional funding from a CSA project, immediate priority will be given to those action lines, which have a strong national backup through in-kind contributions from the participating countries.

- AL 1 forward looking activity (FLA): the results of the FLA will serve as input for the strategy development process.
- AL 2 pilot calls: the work of the funding agencies (FA) is considered an in-kind contribution by the participating countries and does not need any additional funding.
- AL 3 research alliance: will be created by involving the (existing) RTO's and universities.
- AL 4 alignment of national programmes: the group of FA has made a start in discussing the benefits of the alignment of national programmes.
- AL 5 knowledge sharing: this AL will be focussing on keeping the discussion on the focus of our JPI flowing; other activities will be added as soon as first convincing results are available.
- AL 6 strategy development process: will be fuelled by the results of the FLA;

Budget

Carl Hamilton presents the proposed budget for the pilot phase. The bulk of the costs are outreach, communication events, and the travel costs of invited speakers for those events, and the SAB. The budget is tight where additional capacity, workshops, some support for the programme office and other meetings are concerned. In-kind contributions from the member countries can do much to alleviate this situation. Hans-Günther Schwarz reports on recent contacts with COST in follow-up of talks held in 2011, where there is still an option of collaboration in the form of a dedicated COST Action.

The GB approves the budget including the EURO 5000 fee per GB-member state.

→ MB will contact COST for potential cooperation as regards to additional funding for activities

¹ In the meantime, at the Programme Committee meeting of the Regions of Knowledge Programme on 12 June 2012, the Commission announced that a new call for proposals will be opened at the end of 2012; this call will be dedicated to a CSA project of the JPI Urban Europe.

6. Pilot Call

Wim Hafkamp presents the status of the pilot call which will be launched on 11 June 2012. The application procedure foresees that at least 2 countries and 3 organisations need to be involved for a project to be eligible, as requested by the Governing Board. Researchers from countries which are not part of the consortium of funding agencies of the first call can participate, provided that they bring their own national funding. The involved funding agencies (FA) will sign a memorandum of understanding. On 12 June 2012 a next meeting of the FA will take place where the second call (2013) will be discussed as well as their involvement in the action line on the alignment of national programmes.

France, Norway and (most likely) Belgium will participate in the 2nd call. For Germany participation might be considered as their involvement and ambition takes shape later this year.

Ingolf Schädler congratulates the Management Board on the accomplishment of the launch of the pilot call. The Governing Board adopts the pilot call including all related documents and procedures.

→ The GB-members will promote the first pilot call of the JPI UE in their respective countries

→ The MB will contact the German delegation regarding their potential participation in the 2nd call

7. Forward Looking Activities/Research Alliance

Forward Looking Activities

Margit Noll presents the plan to set up the forward looking activities as agreed upon at the last GB meeting in Dublin. Other than originally planned, a financial commitment only exists from the part of Austria (€ 100.000) while other countries (Denmark, The Netherlands) have announced their participation via in-kind contributions (for NL this contribution will mainly be available in 2013).

However, the participation of organisations from all countries is invited and a request for nominations of national experts and organisations has been sent around by the MB. As the response has so far been low, the Chair opens a discussion on the best way forward. He proposes to use this action line to create a common ground on what the decisive megatrends are according to JPI UE on the basis of existing studies, and research. The Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) should be requested to reflect. As a result of the discussion, the delegates of, Belgium, Finland, Italy, and France agree to (look into the possibilities to) participate (e.g. through active participation of national R&D institutions).

The JPI UE workshop during the Open Days conference, organised by DG Regio in Brussels (where the JPI will contribute via a high level workshop on 9 October 2012), as well as a JPI UE session at the EURA 2012 conference (20-22 September in Vienna) will be dedicated to this action line.

→ the GB-members of BE, FI, IT and FR are invited to nominate organisations to participate in the foresight study

Research Alliance

Gérard Hégron presents the status on the action line on the Urban Europe Research Alliance (name proposed by France: ERAUD - European Research Alliance on Urban Development). ERAUD will be built by RTOs and universities of the JPI member countries (plus interested partners from countries beyond the JPI UE) and will have its own governance structure. One of the first activities will be the incubation of European projects in response to the JPI joint calls. The future of ERAUD could, however, be autonomous. France will take the development of ERAUD a step further by i.e. hosting the first workshop(s).

ERAUD should create a critical research mass in the future. The outcome of the discussion is that existing RTO's/ERANET will be invited, as well as multi-actor networks and projects and different universities. For nominations of national research organisations, the GB members are asked to keep in mind to focus not only on RTOs (technology focus) but include also institutes with social/socio-economic focus.

Ingolf Schädler concludes that France (Gérard Hégron) will organise a first meeting – foreseen in fall 2012 - to discuss the strategic research alliance for JPI UE.

- **the GB-members are invited to scan and nominate which organisations/universities in their countries should become a member of ERAUD**
- **the MB is asked to explore a possible involvement of COST in the set-up of ERAUD in their communication with COST**

8. Scientific Advisory Board and Urban Europe Forum

Carl Hamilton reports that the first meeting of the SAB (5 members) will take place on the first of June; the complete SAB (11 members) will meet en marge of the EURA-conference. Several SAB members will also be invited to give presentations at a EURA-session.

9. Nomination of the National Contact Persons (NCPs)

Carl Hamilton emphasises the need for active involvement of the GB-members. As already decided by the GB they should be able to be involved in the day-to-day work of the JPI, or nominate a person to be the NCP on their behalf. Unless a specific NCP is nominated, the GB-members will be seen as NCP, until further notice.

10. Adjustment of Terms of Reference

Hans-Günther Schwarz gives a short explanation on the proposed adjustments of the Terms of Reference. The Governing Board accepts all proposed adjustments of Terms of Reference with the exception of the last sentence in Article 7 of the ToR of the GB, which is set to have the following wording: "Working documents shall be provided as early as possible, preferably 14 days, but no later than 10 days before the meeting."

11. Standard 10 minutes presentation on JPI UE

Carl Hamilton presents the standard presentation on JPI UE via structure and content. The GB agrees on the need and approach of a common presentation. Potential additional elements which are mentioned in the discussion, are about innovation (living labs), participation from the private sector, future cities (visual) and participants, and some amendments.

- **The MB is invited to share the standard presentation for comments as soon as the first amendments have been included.**

12. Presentation on Conference of European Urban Research Association (EURA)

Margit Noll explains the engagement of the JPI UE at the EURA 2012 Conference, which will take place in Vienna on 20-22 September, and should allow very high visibility among stakeholders. The MB will organise six sessions at the EURA conference, which will be arranged along the Action Lines of the pilot phase. A great variety of stakeholders of JPI UE will be invited and the Management Board is currently inviting speakers for the sessions. Margit Noll invites all GB-members to attend the EURA conference after the next meeting of the Governing Board (foreseen for 19 September 2012) and to promote the conference in their communities.

→ The MB will send a draft programme for distribution as soon as possible to all GB-members

13. Communication

Carl Hamilton informs the GB on the update of the JPI UE website (www.jpi-urbaneurope.eu) including an event calendar and monthly newsletter. GB-members are invited to use and promote the website as well as the newsletter.

14. Next Meetings

→ The delegates of Cyprus, Germany and Belgium are asked to look into the possibility of hosting a GB-meeting in the near future.

→ The next GB meeting will be held on the 19th of September 2012 and will be hosted by Austria.

Annex: Participants of the meeting
Attendance 10th Governing Board Meeting JPI Urban Europe, The Hague (by name of country)
Members of the Governing Board

Mr	Ingolf Schädler	Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology	Austria
Mr	Yves de Weerd	VITO	Belgium
Mr	Leonidas Antoniou	Research Promotion Foundation	Cyprus
Ms	Anne Munk Christiansen	The Danish Council for Strategic Research	Denmark
Mr	Ilmari Absetz	Tekes	Finland
Mr	Anssi Salonen	RYM Oy	Finland
Mr	Gérard Hégron	Ifsttar	France
Mr	Oliver Diehl	Federal Ministry of Education and Research	Germany
Ms	Paola Clerici Maestosi	Ministry for Education, Universities and Research	Italy
Mr	Olaf Cornielje	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment	Netherlands
Ms	Anne Beate Tangen	Ministry of Environment	Norway
Ms	Stine Madland Kaasa	The Research Council of Norway	Norway
Ms	Rebecka Engström	VINNOVA – Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation	Sweden
Mr	Gurcan Ozan	TUBITAK	Turkey

National experts, observers or participants from the Management Board

Ms	Margit Noll	Austrian Institute of Technology	Austria
Mr	Hans-Günther Schwarz	Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology	Austria
Mr	Wim Hafkamp	NICIS/EMI	Netherlands
Ms	Hester Menninga	European Metropolitan network Institute (EMI)	Netherlands
Mr	Carl Hamilton	VINNOVA	Sweden