

ERAC-GPC 1312/16

NOTE

Subject: Summary conclusions of the GPC plenary meeting of 26 September 2016

Chair: Leonidas Antoniou

Vice-Chair: Emmanuel Pasco-Viel

Secretariat: General Secretariat of the Council

Present: AT, BE, CH, COM, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, IL, IT, LU, MT, N, NL, NT, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, UK; JPI representatives (JPI Connecting Climate Knowledge for Europe, JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change: A New Challenge for Europe, JPI Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change, JPI Alzheimer and other Neurodegenerative Diseases, JPI Healthy and Productive Seas and Oceans, JPI Water Challenges for a Changing World, JPI Urban Europe - Global Urban Challenges, Joint European Solutions Urban Europe, JPI More Years, Better Lives - The Potential and Challenges of Demographic Change; JPI Antimicrobial Resistance - The Microbial Challenge - An Emerging Threat to Human Health was represented by other JPI representatives)

Absent: ALB, BG, BiH, CY, EE, EL, Feroe, FL, FYROM, HR, ISL, LT, LV, MD, ME, PL, RS.

1. Approval of the provisional agenda

The agenda was adopted.

2. State of play of the Mutual Learning Exercise

The AT delegation present the state of affairs of the Mutual Learning Exercise.

COM stated 10 MS/AC participated in the Mutual Learning Exercise (MLE).

In reply to a question by the Chair, COM stated there was no need for a deadline for the expression of interest for the "second sequence" (in which other MS and AC can participate) at present, as the results of the "first sequence" would have to be discussed first and the National Coordination Report would only be ready by February 2017.

3. State of play of the Working Group "GPC Working Group on the Long Term Strategy of Joint Programming"

The Vice-Chair presented the work of the GPC Working Group on the Long Term Strategy of Joint Programming, in particular the three "work packages" (i.e., Framework for the Long-Term Strategy of JPIs, a Proposal for Joint Programming in the Work Plan 2018-2020, and a Proposal for Joint Programming in the next Framework Programme).

Two options were presented for the time planning of the work and asked delegations for ideas and suggestions regarding the future of JP (cf. the Excel sheet sent to delegations).

AT (member of the next Trio Presidency (EE, BG, AT)) and DK (which thought the Committee's opinion might also feed into the planned ERAC opinion on the next FP) preferred the second planning process resulting in Council conclusions (CC) in December 2017 rather than March 2018 (first option). The former would come in time for the Committee to give timely input for the next FP. Under provisional planning, EE (which was not present to comment) may present CC to Council on the mid-term review of H2020 by the end of its term. These might also include the Committee's recommendations on long-term planning. COM stated the communication on the mid-term review was indeed planned for October 2017.

The Chair informed delegations he had presented the Hernani's Report and the Committee's response to its recommendations to the latest ERAC plenary, emphasising the work of the GPC Working Group on the Long Term Strategy of Joint Programming.

The Committee decided that both GPC's opinion and recommendations for the future of JP should be given in time to influence the preparations of the next FP.

The Committee also decided that delegations should send their suggestions regarding the future of JP ahead of the next plenary meeting on 24 November to the Secretariat.

Suggestions on other issues were also welcome.

The Vice-chair was asked to come up with more concrete suggestions to get JP on the agenda of the next FP and it was suggested to the WG to involve not only JPI representatives but also other interested parties.

4. National ERA roadmaps: Commission analysis

COM presented a first breakdown of the national ERA Action Plans (NAPs) it had received so far. In line with the CC and the ERA Roadmap, the NAPs revealed commitment to ERA although they were poor on objectives, baselines, timelines and milestones, which were included in only 10 out of 24 NAPs. Priority 2a (Optimal Transnational Cooperation, i.e., JP) came out lowest in the ERA Priorities. The next ERA Progress Report will include more details, although no in-depth analysis of the NAPs (due to lack of time).

The Chair suggested setting up a task force for Priority 2a which could work on the indicators, among other issues.

5. State of play of the Migration / Integration Challenge Task Force

The Chair informed the Committee that the Task Force on Migration / Integration Challenge had finished its report in September 2016. Six countries (France, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Turkey and Greece) had asked the Chair to "take the necessary steps to speed up the process towards a decision by the GPC on the JPI-MMI" and asked him "to open the procedure aiming at the launch of a new JPI".

The IT delegation presented the Task Force's "Report on the feasibility of a JPI on Migrants, Migration and Integration".

Some delegations commented that policy-makers would look for ready-made solutions from such a topical JPI. Delegations also called on the Task Force to look at existing JPIs as there were cross-cutting issues, such as demographic change, urban cities and climate change.

COM observed that Challenge 6 of the H2020 Work Programme covered many migration aspects and asked the Task Force to have a look at the broader context and how a migration JPI would fit in existing initiatives. Also, the PRIMA proposal on the development and application of innovative solutions for food systems and water resources in the Mediterranean basin (an Article 185 initiative under Horizon 2020) is under preparation and this also had a link with the migration issue. There was also a Coordination and Support Action (CSA) under H2020 called "Current European and cross-national comparative research and research actions on Migration" in the 2017 Work Programme of Challenge 6. Finally, COM pointed out that results of the migration JPI might come too late for the issue which is burning right now, and suggested to focus on existing and on-going actions in 2017 instead.

While delegations agreed migration was an issue for joint European research, many thought a JPI was not necessarily the only option for this and any duplication of efforts with other ongoing initiatives had to be avoided. This position was supported by a large number of delegations who took the floor, as well as by some JPI representatives.

IT replied that the proposed JPI would cover the research gaps in this field and *coordinate* the numerous existing bottom-up research efforts that were going on; such coordination was said to be very difficult without the centralising influence a JPI could have.

The Chair concluded that it was not possible for the Committee to take a decision on the Task Force's proposal at the present meeting, since many delegations had reservations and wanted the Task Force to examine further (i) the potential opportunities and possibilities of a CSA on migration and (ii) the possible duplication with other initiatives.

This item would be up for further discussion at the next plenary.

6. JPI Oceans towards an AISBL

Joachim Harms, chair of the Working Group on sustainability and business plan for the JPI Oceans, presented the Working Group's proposal to turn the JPI's administration into an international non-profit organisation under Belgian law (AISBL).

The proposal received mixed comments from delegations. Some were positive about the idea while others voiced misgivings over a possible recommendation to other JPIs to follow the example of the JPI Oceans. Discussions focussed on the administrative structure for a JPI, including, as it would, a separate office and staff, rather than relying on in-kind contributions from members.

On the question of the eligibility of such a structure for ERA-NET Cofunding, COM replied that an AISBL cannot qualify a priori as a "programme owner" or a "programme manager".

7. Procedure and criteria for possible new JPIs, following the adoption of IG3 report (doc. 1310/16)

The BE delegation (rapporteur of the IG3) presented the GPC assessment process for new JPIs, including the procedure and criteria for selecting new JPIs.

Delegations asked for clarifications of some of the selection criteria, such as "commitment".

Following the approval by written procedure of the IG3 report last June, the procedure and criteria for possible new JPIs will now be usable. The process can be adjusted if this will be necessary following a first concrete implementation.

8. Draft GPC Work Programme (2016-2018)

The Vice-Chair presented the first draft of the new GPC Work Programme (2016-2018).

The RO delegation presented the proposal for a new GPC Inclusiveness Task Force, which would look into promoting the inclusion and participation of low-performing countries in JPIs. Delegations were asked to express their interest in joining the Task Force.

The draft work programme contains seven themes on which the Committee could focus its work. The AT delegation observed this would stretch delegations' resources to the limit. GPC should focus on Theme 1, i.e., the long-term strategy of the Joint Programming Process (JPP) and Initiatives, and on taking forward the achievements of JPIs.

The Chair, supported by the AT delegation, stated that promoting the image of JPIs should also be included in the draft work programme.

According to the NL delegation, a correspondent or rapporteur would suffice as far as the issue of the legal structure was concerned (No 6).

The Vice-Chair concluded by suggesting the Committee should perhaps focus on the long-term process of JPP and JPS (No 1) and Inclusiveness (No 5) and called for volunteers to run these parts of the work programme. The Sustainability JPI (No 6) could be taken up at a later stage.

9. General information concerning recent developments within ERAC and the ERA-related groups

The Chair informed the Committee about the ERAC Steering Board (SB) meeting in June. He had also received an invitation for the ERAC SB meeting on 18 October, when SB would discuss ERAC's contribution to the mid-term review of H2020 and preparations for the new FP.

10. Any other business

The next GPC plenary would be on 24 November.

On 22-23 November, the ERA-LEARN 2020 and the Commission will organise the Annual Joint Programming Conference 2016, which this time will focus on Impacts of Public-Public Partnerships — expectations and experiences. Details are available on <https://www.era-learn.eu/news>.