Contribution ID: d4586a13-5a8e-4345-8abc-83c08e2737af

Date: 31/10/2019 11:49:12

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

- 7. Integrated Air Traffic Management
- 8. Clean Aviation
- 9. Clean Hydrogen
- 10. Safe and Automated Road Transport
- 11. Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from waste and biomass
- 12. Innovative SMEs

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

- [1] Legal texts for Horizon Europe to be found here: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/research-and-innovation-including-horizon-europe-iter-and-euratom-legal-texts-and-factsheets_en
- [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

GreekHungarian
Italian
Latvian
LithuanianMaltese
Polish
Portuguese
Romanian
Slovak
SlovenianSpanish
Swedish
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
*Surname
*Email (this won't be published)
Lines werre be published)
* Organisation name 255 character(s) maximum
Airbus
*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 <u>transparency register</u>. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

273216767476

	ntry of origin			
Pleas	e add your country of origin, or Afghanistan	that of your organisation. Djibouti	Libya	Saint Martin
0	Åland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
0	Albania	DominicanRepublic	Lithuania	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
	Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa
0	American Samoa	Egypt	Macau	San Marino
0	Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and Príncipe
0	Angola	EquatorialGuinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
	Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
	Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
0	Antigua and Barbuda	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
	Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
0	Armenia	Falkland Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore
	Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
	Australia	© Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
	Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
0	Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon Islands
	Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
0	Bahrain	FrenchPolynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
0	Bangladesh	FrenchSouthern andAntarctic Lands	Moldova	South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
	Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
	Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
	Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain

 Belize Benin Bermuda Bhutan Bolivia Bonaire Saint Eustatius and 	GhanaGibraltarGreeceGreenlandGrenadaGuadeloupe	 Montserrat Morocco Mozambique Myanmar /Burma Namibia Nauru 	Sri LankaSudanSurinameSvalbard and Jan MayenSwedenSwitzerland
Saba Bosnia and	Guam	Nepal	Syria
Herzegovina Botswana Bouvet Island Brazil British Indian Ocean Territory	GuatemalaGuernseyGuineaGuinea-Bissau	NetherlandsNew CaledoniaNew ZealandNicaragua	TaiwanTajikistanTanzaniaThailand
British VirginIslands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
BruneiBulgaria	HaitiHeard Island and McDonald Islands	NigeriaNiue	Timor-LesteTogo
Burkina FasoBurundi	HondurasHong Kong	Norfolk IslandNorthernMariana Islands	TokelauTonga
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	NorthMacedonia	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman Oman	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and Caicos Islands
Central African Republic	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
- Omina	101001	Guinea	Emirates
Christmas	Italy	Paraguay	United
Island	·		Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling) Islands	Japan	Philippines	United StatesMinor OutlyingIslands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin
			Islands

CongoCook Islands	KazakhstanKenya	PortugalPuerto Rico	UzbekistanVanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	VaridateVatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and Futuna
Curação	Laos	Rwanda	WesternSahara
Cyprus	Latvia	SaintBarthélemy	Yemen
Czechia	Lebanon	 Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha 	Zambia
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Zimbabwe
Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	

Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

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] Article 8 of COM(2018)435

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

0

Yes

No

- * Please identify in which capacity (multiple answers possible):
 - Applied for funding
 - Received funding
 - Expert (evaluator, reviewer, etc.)
 - Participated in governance (programme committee, etc.)
 - Other
- * Are or were you directly involved in a partnership under Horizon 2020 or its predecessor Framework Programme 7?
 - Yes
 - No

Please i	dentify your role in the partnership (select all that apply):
Pa	rtner/Member/Beneficiary in a partnership
Re	presentative in the governance of a partnership
	ember of a committee for a partnership
Ex	pert (evaluator, reviewer) in calls for proposals in partnership
🗹 Ар	plied for funding under a partnership
Propried	ovided national cofinancing to a partnership
Ot	ner
*Please i	dentify the partnership (select all that apply):
	European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP2)
	Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI2) Joint Undertaking
V	Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership (ECSEL) Joint Undertaking
✓	5G (5G PPP)
	European Metrology Programme for Innovation and Research (EMPIR)
	Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking
V	Single European Sky Air Traffic Management Research (SESAR) Joint Undertaking
V	Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking
	Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 (FCH2) Joint Undertaking
	Bio-Based Industries Joint Undertaking
	Eurostars-2 (supporting research-performing small and medium-sized enterprises)
	Ambient Assisted Living (AAL 2)
	Partnership for Research and Innovation in the Mediterranean Area (PRIMA)
	European High-Performance Computing Joint Undertaking (EuroHPC)

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

	1 (Not needed at all)	2	3	4	5 (Fully needed)	Don't Know
* Be more responsive towards EU policy objectives	0	0	0	•	0	0
* Be more responsive towards societal needs	0	0	0	•	0	0
* Be more responsive towards priorities in national and regional research and innovation strategies, including smart specialisation strategies	0	•	0	0	0	0
* Make a significant contribution to achieving the UN's Sustainable Development Goals	0	0	0	•	0	0

* Make significant contribution to the EU efforts to achieve climate-related goals	0	0	0	•	0	0
* Focus more on the development and effective deployment of technology	0	0	0	0	•	0
* Focus more on bringing about transformative change towards sustainability in their respective area	0	0	0	•	0	0
* Make a significant contribution to EU global competitiveness in specific sectors/domains	0	0	0	0	•	0
* Other	0	0	0	•	0	0

*(Other) Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

- Ensure the involvement of all relevant stakeholders, at the right levels
- Implement mechanisms allowing to build bridges between partnerships
- PPP need to answer both a Policy objective/priority (climate neutrality, digitalisation, etc) and private sector interests.
- Contribute to the implementation of European Research and Innovation Strategies (like ACARE SRIA)
- Need for mechanisms to facilitate the link between research and deployment (transitional tools)
- *3. What would you see as main advantages and disadvantages of participation in an Institutionalised European Partnership (as a partner) under Horizon Europe?

We can only report on H	2020 experience as modalities for HEU are unknown.	
PROS		
Long-term visibility and s	stability for R&T activities	
Efficiency of long-term fi	nancial commitment & leverage effect	
Inclusive instrument (hig	h participation of primes, SMEs, academia, RTOs)	
Equal treatment & transp	parency	
Complementarity with El	J, national, regional initiatives	
Strong & innovative ecos	systems, access to excellent partners	
CONS		
Slow processes		
System complexity requi	res subsequent resources	

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

ur viev	ws 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

V	Integrated Air Traffic Management
V	Clean Aviation
	Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from waste and biomass
	Clean Hydrogen
	Safe and Automated Road Transport
	Innovative SMEs

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.

Integrated Air Traffic Management

Air Traffic Management (ATM) ensures the safe separation of aircraft and the efficient flow of air traffic. The efficiency of Air Traffic Management systems is measured by how well they manage air traffic and ensure a seamless and safe flow of traffic in any situation. Current systems are reaching the limits of their ability to manage an ever increasing volume and complexity of air traffic.

The Commission is assessing whether to set up an Institutionalised European Partnership under Article 187 TFEU building on the experience of the SESAR Joint Undertaking (established on the basis of Article 187 TFEU and which; functioning is currently planned until 31 December 2024), but would revise its scope, content and implementation and take account of the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

The priorities, composition and governance of any new partnership would need to be reviewed to ensure that it addresses the new Air Traffic Management challenges for the EU in the coming decades, such as an increase in air traffic volume and the consequent increased environmental footprint of air transport, and the increasing complexity, digitalisation and automation of Air Traffic Management services.

The <u>inception impact assessment</u> 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 air traffic management?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know	
--	-------------------------------	---	---	---	-------------------	---------------	--

Misalignment between basic/exploratory research and industrial research	0	•	0	0	0	0
Misalignment between R&I and the needs of operational stakeholders	0	•	0	0	0	0
Fragmentation of EU airspace	0	0	0	0	•	0
Local issues (compared to network issues)	0	•	0	0	0	0

Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Need to bring together the Air Traffic Management research community, the manufacturing industry, and operational stakeholders, to ensure aligned development and deployment of innovation	•	0	0	0	•	0
Need to coordinate public funding with private research and innovation funding	0	0	0		•	0
Need to synchronise research and innovation activities with EU policy objectives	0	0	0	©	•	0
Appropriate budget	0	0	0	0	•	0
Need of specific Infrastructure (e.g. simulators, more test sites closer to real operational environment)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Skills required for researchers in this area	0	•	0	0	0	0

Problems in uptake of air traffic management innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Investments featuring a negative cost- benefit analysis	©	0	0	•	0	©
Regulation impeding the uptake of innovation	0	•	0	0	0	©
Absence of standards	0	•	0	0	0	0
Absence of a clear vision for future system	0	•	0	0	0	0
Slow pace of Air Traffic Management modernisation	0	0	0	0	•	0

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

Huge challenges ahead (traffic growth, increased complexity, GHG targets, digitalization). EU partnership is most effective approach:

- -long-term framework for innovation driven by EU policy priorities&oversight
- -technological pillar to Single European Sky => SESAR ensures consistency in R&D and later deployment, which must be synchronized across the network. ATM is per essence a matter of interoperability.
- -help develop strategic value chains
- -pool&align resources &investment

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:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	0	0	•	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	•	0
Academia	0	•	0	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	•	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	•	0	0	0	0

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

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	0	0	•	0

Industry	0	0	0		•	0
Academia	0	0	0	•	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	•	0	©	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	©	•	0	0	0	0

Partnership composition:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t Know
Flexibility in the composition of partners over time	•	0	0	0	0	©
Involvement of a broad range of partners, including across disciplines and sectors	0	•	0	0	0	0

Implementing the following activities:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Joint R&I programme	0	0	0	0	•	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	•	0	0	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	•	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	•	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	0	0	0	•	0

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?

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Implement its activities more effectively	0	0	0	0	•	0
Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs	0	0	0	0	•	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	•	0
Increase financial leverage	0	0	0	0	•	0
Ensure better links to regulators	0	0	0	0	•	0
Ensure better links to practitioners on the ground	0	0	0	0	•	0

Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0		0	•	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	•	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	•	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	0	0	0	•	0

5. What is your view on the scope and coverage proposed for this candidate institutionalised European Partnership, based on its inception impact assessment?

	Too narrow	Right scope & coverage	Too broad	Don't know
Technologies covered	0	•	0	0
Research areas covered	0	•	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	•	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	•	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	•	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	•	0	0

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

500 character(s) maximum

Complement to question 2:

Instutionalised partnership is the relevant instrument:

- brings economies of scale
- -brings together stakeholders around a single&integrated joint roadmap
- -EU action is more economically efficient than fragmented local initiatives, which may not be possible in many cases.

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

Indirect links with Clean Aviation: while distinct partnerships are needed (as stakeholders & processes are different, and because both tackle very different questions), there should be mechanisms for synergies and

cross-fertilization in place as they share some objectives - notably lowering emissions - and solutions need to be developed in a consistent way. Demonstrators interactions could be envisaged.

7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership to deliver on the following impacts?

Societal impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased aviation safety levels for all types of flying vehicles	0	0	0	•	0	0
Education of the next generation of aviation professionals and encouragement of diversity and inclusion	0	0	•	0	•	0
Improved passenger experience by reducing travel time, delays and costs	0	0	0	•	0	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Creation of additional jobs in the air transport industries and the EU economy at large	0	0	0	•	0	0
Increased EU aviation industry competitiveness with efficient airspace organisation and optimised traffic flows	0	0	0	•	0	0
Boosted EU industry globally through international agreements and the setting of global standards	0	0	0	•	0	0
Improved customer experience and business opportunities by reducing travel time, improving predictability and reducing the cost of Air Traffic Management services per flight	0	0	0	•	0	0
No significant disruption caused by cyber-security vulnerabilities	0	0	•	0	0	0

Scientific impact:

1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know

Contribution to the advancement of science by stimulating innovation along the entire Air Traffic Management services supply chain	•	0	0	0	•	0	
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	0	0	©	•	0	

Clean Aviation

The Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Clean Aviation under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be bringing together the European aviation supply chain - including on the transition to low carbon aviation - and accelerating the market uptake of technologies with significantly reduced environmental impact. The primary objective is a path towards deep decarbonisation, therefore contributing to the EU's climate and energy goals.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience of the existing Horizon 2020 Clean Sky 2 (CS2) Joint Undertaking (established under Article 187 TFEU), but would revise its scope, content and implementation and take into account the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

CS2 is a public-private partnership between the EU and the aviation sector, established under Horizon 2020 and which functioning is currently planned until 31 December 2024. It focuses on the finalisation of research activities initiated under Clean Sky 1 and contributes to improving the environmental impact of aeronautical technologies, including those relating to small aviation.

The <u>inception impact assessment</u> outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and impact that the partnership is likely to have.

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 clean aviation?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Too long development and innovation cycles to innovative products and services	©	0	0	0	•	0

Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know

Limited collaboration and pooling of resources between public actors and private actors	0		0	©	•	0
Lack of alignment and coordination between EU research, national research and private innovation efforts	0	0	•	0	0	0
Regulatory barriers in the field of disruptive and digital aviation technology	0	•	0	©	0	0
Barriers to exploitation due to the financial risk for early movers, especially in areas like urban air mobility	0	0	•	0	0	0
High costs of demonstration of innovative solutions that hinder commercialisation	0	0	0	0	•	0
Lack of acceptance, security and safety related to new aircraft configurations	0	0	0	•	0	0

Problems in uptake of clean aviation innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market failures due to inadequate industry investment	0	•	0	0	©	0
Lack of adequate business models	0	•	0	0	0	0
Regulatory framework lagging behind technology developments	0	•	0	0	0	0
Barriers to exploit due to potential lack of global standards	0	•	0	0	0	0
Lack of consideration of societal and user needs	0	•	0	0	0	0

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

Timescales, risks, interdependencies between technologies, integration challenge at aircraft design level require strong coordination.

JU ensures critical mass & strengthens EU aero-industry ecosystem, global leadership and competitiveness. Stable, long-term commitment & collaboration from the full innovation chain provides visibility, triggers increased investment in disruptive R&I & market failure risks.

R&I roadmap aligned with public policy & synergies with national programs.

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:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	0	•	0	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	•	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	•	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	•	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	•	0	0	0	0

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

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	•	0	0	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	•	0
Academia	0	0	0	0	•	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	•	0	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	•	0	0	0	0

Partnership composition:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t Know
Flexibility in the composition of partners over time	0	0	0	•	0	©

Involvement of a broad range of partners,	0	0	0	0	0	0
including across disciplines and sectors						

Implementing the following activities:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Joint R&I programme	0	0	0	0	•	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	•	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	•	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	•	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	0	•	0	0	0

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?

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Implement its activities more effectively	0	0	0	0	•	0
Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs	0	0	0	•	0	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	•	0	0
Increase financial leverage	0	0	•	0	0	0
Ensure better links to regulators	0	0	0	0	•	0
Ensure better links to practitioners on the ground	0	0	0	0	0	•
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	0	•	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	•	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	•	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	0	0	0	•	0

5. What is your view on the scope and coverage proposed for this candidate institutionalised European Partnership, based on its inception impact assessment?

_			
Too narrow	Right scope & coverage	Too broad	Don't know

Technologies covered	0	•	0	0
Research areas covered	0	•	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	•	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	•	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	•	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	•	0	0

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

500 character(s) maximum

The Clean Aviation shall serve the green deal policy objectives and contribute to carbon neutrality. Research areas: the Partnership in itself covers the right research areas, but other issues must be tackled in other partnerships: e.g. batteries for aviation in the Battery partnership.

Geographical coverage: excellence shall remain the only criterion for the selection of partners.

- 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

No rationalisation but build bridges with other initiatives.

Air transport decarbonisation is too complex for solutions to be developed in CA alone. Upstream cooperation is needed for solutions developed in different sectors to be integrated into aircraft/to ensure new fleets & transport modes can be integrated into ATM.

EC should coordinate & support implementation of synergies with ATM, Key Digital Technologies, Batteries, Clean Hydrogen, cybersecurity, AI, 5G, Made in Europe...

7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership to deliver on the following impacts?

Societal impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Improved public health on the basis of reduction of pollutants, particulates and noise emissions compared to current aircraft technologies	0	0	0	0	•	0

Reduced CO2 emissions	0	0	0	0	•	0
Novel competitive cross-sectoral solutions for decarbonisation	0	0	0	0	•	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased industrial leadership in aviation technologies and uptake of new technologies	0	0	0	0	•	0
Creation of jobs in the low-carbon economy by strengthening the European aeronautics sector	0	0	0	0	•	0
New demand side solutions to decarbonise the transport systems	0	0	0	0	•	0
Better cross-fertilisation of innovative ideas from SMEs to large companies that can bring them to mass market	0	0	0	0	•	0
Highly skilled jobs in industry	0	0	0	0	•	0
Low-carbon and competitive transport solutions across all modes	0	0	0	0	•	0
Acceleration of key technologies through selected integrated demonstrators	0	0	0	0	•	0

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Advancement of science by stimulating innovation along the entire aviation sector	0	0	0	0	•	0
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	0	0	0	•	0

Contact

RTD-A2-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu