



# Workshop on Phasing out Strategies - EC Feedback

11 February 2026

*European Commission  
DG RTD.G4*

# Welcome and introduction

Kathrin Kapfinger, Team leader European Partnerships, DG RTD, G4 - Common Missions & Partnerships Service

# Agenda

14:00 – 14:05 **Welcome and Introduction**

14:05 – 14:25 **Presentation on feedback + next steps**

14:25 – 14:45 **Q&A**

14:45 – 15:45 **Collaborative work:** thematic breakout sessions

- Sharing of good practices
- Opportunity for peer learning

15:45 – 16:00 **Highlights from breakout sessions, conclusions and next steps**

# Presentation on feedback

General feedback following review of all strategies

Lucas van Hattem, DG RTD, G4 - Common Missions & Partnerships Service

# Background: EC feedback process

- RTD G4: Coordination and consolidation of feedback
- Feedback round:
  - RTD G4: Horizontal policy guidance
  - Thematic EC colleagues: Context and thematic-specific insights

**Objective** → provide constructive feedback to align your draft strategy with the guidelines and/or in order to strengthen/finetune your current draft

# Rationale

- **Phasing out** = a (possibly gradual) discontinuation of funding from the Framework Programme
- **Legal obligations** set out in the Horizon Europe Regulation (Article 10.2(c) and Annex III.4(b))
- **Life-cycle**: remain impactful, relevant and efficient over time
- Forward-looking exercise: opportunity to articulate and communicate the partnership's **strategic vision** on its future role and evolution and **secure its legacy**
- Developing a phasing out strategy  $\neq$  Discontinuation of the partnership
- **Failure to comply** → **weakness** when assessing the partnership's performance and future prospects.

# Commission Guidelines

- **Concise and strategic**, several scenarios may be explored,  $\leq 3$  pages per scenario
- **Compulsory elements:**
  - At least one credible scenario **without EU Framework Programme funding**
  - Each scenario: alternative **implementation modality**, a realistic, **actionable pathway** and an indicative **timeline**
  - **indicators** for assessing progress towards the phasing out
  - **Consistency** with the overall strategic orientation and **coherence** with the policy context

**The “No FP funding” scenario(s) should be listed first**

# Don'ts (state of play in draft strategies)

- **Not a box ticking** exercise
- Not about listing **achievements** or past performance
- **The status quo** does not constitute a scenario
- The phasing-out strategy should **not** be presented as a **case for extending** the partnership's funding.
- Avoid scenarios that assume **complete loss of all funding and thereby assets  $\neq$**  meaningful phasing-out pathway

**Concise and strategic**, several scenarios may be explored,  $\leq 3$  pages per scenario



# 1. At least one credible scenario without FP funding

- This is the core of your phasing out strategy and of this exercise
- Not having (at least) one = non-compliance
- No FP funding scenario needs to be clearly indicated
- Stand-alone scenarios

**The “No FP funding” scenario(s) should be listed first**

## 2. Alternative **implementation modality**, a realistic, **actionable pathway** and an indicative **timeline**

- Be as clear as possible in your ‘roadmap’, more than conceptual
  - Avoid being too descriptive or too vague <-> actionable pathway; clear actionable steps
  - “e.g. set up a new legal entity”
    - ➔ what about it’s governance? Who will pay for setting this up?
  - “e.g. funding will come from membership fees”
    - ➔ How much are you aiming for? How will this be done in practice?
- “e.g. organise a survey/talks to discuss commitment/membership of the partners”
  - “e.g. agreement of the amount of funding/membership fees per committed partner by date x”
  - “e.g. formal adoption of a business and financial sustainability plan”

## 2.2 Indicative timeline

- This is **a requirement for each scenario** ≠ general timeline for the whole strategy
- It needs to be realistic and credible (e.g. setting up a structure in x time).
- Starting point of the indicative timeline on a reasonable point in time to ensure a “smooth transition”
- Balance between listing formal legal points in time and actual steps of transition (e.g setting up a legal structure: what about the preparation of that action in itself?)

### 3. Indicators for assessing progress towards the phasing out

- **≠ indicators to monitor your current partnership's activities**

e.g. x calls during the current partnership

- Quantitative/qualitative indicators that can “show” the progress towards the phasing out

e.g. x signed letters of intent by partners

e.g. formal adoption of the final “continuity plan”

- Can also be linked to the indicative timeline

e.g. x amount of money (pre)-committed by date x

## 4. **Consistency** with the overall strategic orientation and **coherence** with the policy context

- Overall taken well into account
- MFF and FP10

# Process and timeline



- I. 20 March 2026: Share the final strategy with the EC
- II. EC approval for adoption by 31 March 2026\*

\* Adoption by the relevant governance structure after receiving the EC's approval

# Q&A

# Collaborative work: thematic breakout sessions

- Peer learning opportunity
- Sharing of good practices and remaining challenges



# Room 1

## CLUSTER 1: Health

Innovative Health Initiative

Global Health Partnership

Transformation of health systems

Chemicals risk assessment

ERA for Health

Rare diseases\*

One-Health Anti Microbial Resistance\*

Personalised Medicine

Pandemic Preparedness\*

Brain Health

EIT Health

Innovative SMEs

# Room X

## CLUSTER 2: Culture, creative, inclusive societies

Resilient Cultural Heritage

Social Transformations and Resilience

EIT Cultural and Creative Industries\*

European Open Science Cloud

# Room 2

## Cluster 4: Digital, Industry & Space

Chips (formerly KDT)

Smart Networks & Services

High Performance Computing

European Metrology (Art. 185)

AI-Data-Robotics

Photonics

Made in Europe

Clean steel – low-carbon steelmaking

Processes4Planet

Global competitive space systems\*

Innovative Materials for EU (I AM for EU)

Virtual Worlds

Textiles of the Future

Raw Materials for the Green and Digital Transition

EIT Raw Materials

EIT Manufacturing

EIT Digital

# Room 3

## Cluster 5: Climate, Energy & Mobility

Clean Hydrogen

Clean Aviation

Single European Sky ATM Research 3

Europe's Rail

Connected and Automated Mobility (CCAM)

Batt4EU

Zero-emission waterborne transport

Zero-emission road transport

Built4People

Solar Photovoltaics

Clean Energy Transition

Driving Urban Transitions

EIT InnoEnergy

EIT Urban Mobility

EIT Climate

# Room 4

## Cluster 6: Food, Bio-economy, Agriculture, Env...

Circular Bio-based Europe

R&I in the Mediterranean Area (PRIMA, Art. 185)\*\*

Biodiversa+

Climate Neutral, Sustainable & Productive Blue Economy

Water4All

Animal Health & Welfare

Accelerating Farming Systems Transitions

Agriculture of Data\*

Safe & Sustainable Food System

Forests and Forestry for a sustainable Future

EIT Food

# Highlights of the breakout sessions

# Conclusion and next steps

1. Share final strategies with the European Commission by Friday 20 March 2026
2. Approval of the European Commission (RTD G4) by 31 March 2026
3. Immediate adoption the strategies within the relevant governance structure
4. Inform the European Commission (RTD G4) on the adoption

# Thank you