Public Consultation on 12 proposed Institutionalised European Partnerships under the future Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

With a proposed budget of nearly 100 billion euro from 2021 to 2027, the Horizon Europe framework programme represents the largest collaborative multinational research and innovation investment in Europe and is open to participants worldwide.

The European Parliament and the Council have provisionally agreed on the Horizon Europe legislative package (COM(2018)435)[1]. Based on the agreement, Horizon Europe promotes a more strategic, ambitious and impact-oriented approach to public-public and public-private partnerships (European Partnerships), ensuring that they can effectively contribute to the Union’s policies and priorities.

European Partnerships allow to bring together a broad range of actors to work towards a common goal, develop synergies with EU, national and regional programmes and strategies, and accelerate societal and market uptake. Different forms of European Partnerships can be implemented depending on specific needs, type of activities and criteria: Co-funded, Co-programmed or Institutionalised European Partnerships.

Institutionalised Partnerships are implemented only when other parts of the Horizon Europe programme, including other forms of European Partnerships (Co-funded or Co-programmed), cannot achieve the objectives or generate the necessary expected impacts. The preparation of such Institutionalised Partnerships requires new EU legislation and the setting up of specific legal structures (funding bodies) based on Article 185 and 187 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU)[2]. As such all Institutionalised Partnerships must be justified with an impact assessment prior to the preparation of the legislative proposals.

The European Commission is currently running the impact assessment of 12 candidate Institutionalised European Partnerships in the following priorities:

1. EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious diseases (Global Health)
2. Innovative Health Initiative
3. Key Digital Technologies
4. Smart Networks and Services
5. European Metrology
6. Transforming Europe’s rail system
This public consultation aims to collect the views of stakeholders and citizens on the need for such Institutionalised European Partnerships and will feed into the impact assessment process. This consultation is structured in two parts: Part 1 covering all candidate Institutionalised European Partnerships and Part 2 specific to each candidate. We invite you to provide feedback on any of the candidate Institutionalised European Partnership.

The questionnaire is available in English, French and German and you can reply in any EU language. You can pause any time and continue later. Your contribution is downloadable once you have submitted your answers.

Responses received after the closing date will not be considered. Questionnaires sent by e-mail or on paper will not be analysed except those due to accessibility needs of people with visual disabilities and their representative organisations.

A summary on the outcome of the public consultation will be published by the Commission services on the 'Have your say' portal.

We thank you for your participation.

Protection of personal data
Privacy statement on the protection of personal data in EU Survey

[2] Following Article 8(1)(c) of the proposed Regulation for Horizon Europe

About you

• Language of my contribution
  - Bulgarian
  - Croatian
  - Czech
  - Danish
  - Dutch
  - English
  - Estonian
  - Finnish
  - French
  - Gaelic
  - German
• I am giving my contribution as
  ○ Academic/research institution
  ○ Business association
  ○ Company/business organisation
  ○ Consumer organisation
  ○ EU citizen
  ○ Environmental organisation
  ○ Non-EU citizen
  ○ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
  ○ Public authority
  ○ Trade union
  ○ Other

• First name
  Belma

• Surname
  YASHAROVA

• Email (this won't be published)
  belma.yasharova@amice-eu.org

• Organisation name
  AMICE - Association of Mutual Insurers and Insurance Cooperatives in Europe

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

Transparency register number
255 character(s) maximum
Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It’s a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

62503501759-81

*Country of origin*
Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

○ Afghanistan
○ Åland Islands
○ Albania
○ Algeria
○ American Samoa
○ Andorra
○ Angola
○ Anguilla
○ Antarctica
○ Antigua and Barbuda
○ Argentina
○ Armenia
○ Aruba
○ Australia
○ Austria
○ Azerbaijan
○ Bahamas
○ Bahrain
○ Bangladesh
○ Barbados
○ Belarus
○ Belgium

○ Djibouti
○ Dominica
○ Dominican Republic
○ Ecuador
○ Egypt
○ El Salvador
○ Equatorial Guinea
○ Eritrea
○ Estonia
○ Eswatini
○ Ethiopia
○ Falkland Islands
○ Faroe Islands
○ Fiji
○ Finland
○ France
○ French Guiana
○ French Polynesia
○ French Southern and Antarctic Lands
○ Gabon
○ Georgia
○ Germany
○ Georgia
○ Germany

○ Libya
○ Liechtenstein
○ Lithuania
○ Luxembourg
○ Macau
○ Madagascar
○ Malawi
○ Malaysia
○ Maldives
○ Mali
○ Malta
○ Marshall Islands
○ Martinique
○ Mauritania
○ Mauritius
○ Mayotte
○ Mexico
○ Micronesia
○ Moldova
○ Monaco
○ Mongolia
○ Montenegro

○ Saint Martin
○ Saint Pierre and Miquelon
○ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
○ Samoa
○ San Marino
○ São Tomé and Príncipe
○ Saudi Arabia
○ Senegal
○ Serbia
○ Seychelles
○ Sierra Leone
○ Singapore
○ Sint Maarten
○ Slovakia
○ Slovenia
○ Solomon Islands
○ Somalia
○ South Africa
○ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
○ South Korea
○ South Sudan
○ Spain
Part 1: General questions on European Partnerships

As per the political agreement on Horizon Europe, an Institutionalised European Partnership shall be implemented only where other parts of the Horizon Europe programme, including other forms of European Partnerships (co-programmed, co-funded), would not achieve the objectives or would not generate the necessary expected impacts; they should be justified by a long-term perspective and high degree of integration.

There will be three types of European Partnerships under Horizon Europe [1].
**Co-programmed European Partnerships** are based on memoranda of understanding and/or contractual arrangements between the Commission and private and/or public partners. They are expected to be best suited to partnerships involving industry, but also Member States, foundations, international partners etc. They are jointly implemented by the Commission (Union contribution via Horizon Europe work programmes) and partners (contributions under their responsibility), with full application of Horizon Europe rules for the Union contribution, whereas partners rules apply to their contributions. They allow for more flexibility over time as regards the composition of partners, objectives and activities and require the relatively lowest effort for set-up and implementation compared to the other forms of European Partnerships.

**Co-funded European Partnerships** are implemented under the responsibility of the partners, that receive a substantial budget contribution from Horizon Europe (Grant Agreement) to cofound their joint programme of activities. They are expected to be best suited to partnerships involving Member States, with research funders and other public authorities at the core of the consortium, and possibility to include foundations and international partners etc. By default national rules apply to calls launched by the consortium. They require a relatively moderate effort for their set-up and implementation compared to other forms of European Partnerships.

**Institutionalised European Partnerships** are based on the Union participation in and financial contribution to research and innovation programmes undertaken by several Member States (under Article 185 TFEU) or by bodies established under Article 187 TFEU, for partnerships involving typically industry, research organisations but also Member States, foundations and international partners. They are expected to be best suited for long-term collaborations with stable partners and provide only limited flexibility for adaptation during their implementation. Compared to other forms of European Partnerships, they require a relatively high and long-term effort for their preparation and set-up, including the establishment of dedicated entities (funding bodies) for their implementation. By default the rules for participation of Horizon Europe apply for the calls launched under Institutionalised European Partnerships.


1. Have you been involved in the on-going research and innovation framework programme Horizon 2020 or the preceeding Framework Programme 7?

   - Yes
   - No

2. To what extent do you think that the future European Partnerships under Horizon Europe need to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not needed at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Fully needed)</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Be more responsive towards EU policy objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Be more responsive towards societal needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3. What would you see as main advantages and disadvantages of participation in an Institutionalised European Partnership (as a partner) under Horizon Europe?

500 character(s) maximum

The main advantages will be an in-depth and coordinated reflection and experimentations with largest spectrum of stakeholders - industry, institutional partners and third parties, avoiding redundancy and improving efficiency. This will foster the long-term commitment of all the actors involved. As per the main disadvantages, there needs to be a preliminary consensus on details, and possible delays not compatible with societal expectations and international competition.

4. For which of the candidate Institutionalised European Partnership(s) would you like to specifically provide your views through this consultation (you may provide your views for more than one)?

- EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious diseases - Global Health
- Innovative Health Initiative
- Key Digital Technologies
- Smart Networks and Services
- European Metrology
- Transforming Europe's rail system
- Integrated Air Traffic Management
- Clean Aviation
- Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from waste and biomass
Part 2 - Questions on problems, objectives, policy options and impact tailored to each candidate European Partnership

The following questions allow to assess the necessity of a partnership approach, as well as the need for an Institutionalised Partnership for each candidate partnership.

Safe and Automated Road Transport

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

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

The inception impact assessment outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and likely impact of a candidate European Partnership in this field.

1. To what extent do you think this is relevant for research and innovation efforts at EU level to address the following problems in relation to road transport?

Research and innovation problems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not relevant at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient understanding of technical and non-technical requirements for cooperative, connected and automated mobility (CCAM) services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a shared strategic planning of research and pre-deployment programmes for cooperative, connected and automated mobility (CCAM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limited capacity to develop a common testing framework |  |  |  |  |  |  |
Insufficient sharing of expertise in specific solutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
Gap between research and the development of innovative products and services in road mobility and also between developers and validators/certifiers |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Structural and resource problems:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not relevant at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited collaboration and pooling of resources between public and private actors such as vehicle manufacturers, road operators, digital service providers, research centres and public organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost and high risk of developing and testing new infrastructure and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Problems in uptake of automated road transport innovations due to:**

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

2. In your view, how should the specific challenges described above be addressed through Horizon Europe intervention?

European Partnerships may take any of the following forms:

a) Co-programmed European Partnerships: based on memoranda of understanding and/or contractual arrangements between the
Commission and private and/or public partners;
b) Co-funded European Partnerships: based on participation in and financial contribution to a programme of R&I activities, using a
Programme co-fund action; or
c) Institutionalised European Partnerships: based on participation in and financial contribution to R&I programmes undertaken by
several Member States (under Article 185 TFEU) or by bodies established under Article 187 TFEU (Institutionalised European
Partnerships)
- Traditional calls under Horizon Europe work programmes
- Co-Funded partnership
- Co-Programmed partnership
- Institutionalised Partnership

*Please explain briefly your choice:*

500 character(s) maximum

AMICE believes that Institutionalised European Partnership is the most suitable option because of the financial scope and the coordinated approach. The Institutionalised Partnership should enable the participation of the largest spectrum of stakeholders, such as car manufacturers, equipment manufacturers, infrastructure, institutions, telecoms, service providers interested in data in order to increase R&I efficiency and improve road safety.

3. In your view, how relevant are the following elements and activities to ensure that the proposed European Partnership would meet its objectives?

**Setting joint long-term agenda with strong involvement of:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not relevant)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member States and Associated Countries</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other societal stakeholders (e.g. representatives of cities, vulnerable road users, research institutes and universities)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not relevant)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member States and Associated Countries</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partnership composition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility in the composition of partners over time</th>
<th>1 (Not relevant)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring a broad range of partners, including across disciplines and sectors (e.g. Member States, EU, public as well as private transport operators, automotive suppliers, fleet operators, maps and navigation systems and services suppliers, user organisations, emergency/police services, digital infrastructure, artificial intelligence, data management and platform providers, and service providers, companies of different sizes including SMEs, academia and research organisations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementing the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint R&amp;I programme</th>
<th>1 (Not relevant)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative R&amp;I projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment and piloting activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input to regulatory aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creation of solutions with end-users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In your view, how relevant is to set up a specific legal structure (funding body) for the candidate European Partnership to achieve the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implement its activities more effectively</th>
<th>1 (Not relevant at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implements activities more transparently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. What is your view on the scope and coverage proposed for this candidate institutionalised European Partnership, based on its inception impact assessment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too narrow</th>
<th>Right scope &amp; coverage</th>
<th>Too broad</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technologies covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research areas covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of partners covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of activities covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

500 character(s) maximum

n/a

6. In your view, would it be possible to rationalise the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership and its activities, and/or to better link it with other comparable initiatives?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

(Yes) Please explain why? Which other comparable initiatives could it be linked with?

500 character(s) maximum

We believe that the European Institutionalised Partnership should build upon the work carried out by STRIA, the EU CCAM Single Platform, the C-ITS platform, as well as the GEAR2030 platform.
7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership to deliver on the following impacts?

**Societal impact:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>1 (Not relevant at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved traffic efficiency and less time spent in traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved road safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better quality road infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More inclusive mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced environmental externalities of road transport: air pollutants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced environmental externalities of road transport: CO2 emissions / Fuel consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved trust and awareness of innovative solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic/technological impact:**

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

**Scientific impact:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not relevant at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very relevant)</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased scientific cooperation in the field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New scientific knowledge created and reinforcement of EU scientific capability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact**

RTD-A2-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu