

## Minutes of Meeting;

### ERTRAC meeting on CCAM JU; 24.1.2019

- Participants from MOVE
  - [REDACTED]
- Participants ERTRAC & supporters:
  - [REDACTED] of ERTRAC and EGVIA, [REDACTED]  
Cooperation of BMW Group
  - [REDACTED] of ERTRAC and EGVIA, [REDACTED]  
for Sustainability and External Affairs of Valeo Group
  - [REDACTED] of ERTICO ITS Europe
  - [REDACTED] of EPoSS (ETP for Smart Systems Integration), [REDACTED] of  
Bosch Sensortec
  - [REDACTED], EPoSS, [REDACTED] of EGVIA, [REDACTED]  
of Infineon Technologies
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED] POLIS
  - [REDACTED] EARPA, TNO
  - [REDACTED] of ERTRAC
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED] of ERTRAC
- [REDACTED] explains that Commission (MOVE, CNECT, GROW, RTD jointly) is setting up the informal Expert Group on CCAM to act quickly in the field. Expert Group will also discuss the scope of the JU. The JU should be in place in 2 years from now. [REDACTED] invites participants to apply for the Expert Group when the call is published. This will happen in these days.
- [REDACTED] questions the scope of the JU. He points out that all committed partners are already working on ERTRAC roadmap and STRIA. No duplication is needed. [REDACTED] explains that the JU should be the focal point to consolidate the work done. JU should have in focus also the connection to other modes of transport. Also current activities e.g. 5G corridors, will be connected to the JU. Everything on CCAM should be connected to this one place.
- [REDACTED] reports that industry has some issues to talk to MS, as the MS are not synchronised. What will be the role of MS in the JU? [REDACTED] explains that the rules still need to be defined but MS should be on board. Also SMEs should be able to participate.
- [REDACTED] states that Industry is not interested in paying the organisational structure of an JU. A certain flexibility is needed to be on the right track in CCAM. The aims of an initiative should be re-assessed every 2 years. It has to be assured that national and international financing go hand in hand
- [REDACTED] confirms that we will apply lessons learned from other JU. The overall strategy in this field is depicted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> mobility package.
- [REDACTED] states that we are committed to CAD, but we are in full competition; we need an easy to handle tool for financing. We are not certain what is needed in terms of R&D in 3,4 years from now, however in a JU industry would need to commit to budgetary lines – industry will not make available money for that if the scope is unclear

- [REDACTED] says that Commission is in the same situation. It is true that the challenges are different each year and we need to be flexible.
- "If you ask industry to put money in a JU, the industry would need to fire people as the budget is reserved for researchers in the companies" has been stated by one of the ERTRAC representatives.
- [REDACTED] is concerned why do we start from the beginning with a JU; shouldn't we define the aims beforehand. The big elephant will not solve everything. We should link the activities also to the deployment agenda. In a cPPP all MS/EC are discussing. The result is turned in efficient projects. In a JU discussion with MS will be very complicated. Best lobbied projects will be funded. So many work needs to be taken into account; we should not ruin all of the work

- [REDACTED]