

# **Euro-CASE Policy Paper on “EU Public-Private Partnerships in Research and Innovation”**

About Euro-CASE:

The European Council of Academies of Applied Sciences, Technologies and Engineering is an independent non-profit organisation of national Academies of engineering, applied sciences and technologies from 21 European countries. Euro-CASE acts as a permanent forum for exchange and consultation between European Institutions, Industry and Research. Through its Member Academies, Euro-CASE has access to top expertise (around 6,000 experts) and provides impartial, independent and balanced policy advice on technological and innovation issues with a clear European dimension to European Institutions and national Governments. In 2012 Euro-CASE has launched an Innovation Platform which consists of members of Euro-CASE Academies from science, engineering and business. The platform develops policy recommendations relevant for member states and EU Innovation Policy.

## **Executive summary**

- As they provide structures and incentives for the collaboration of researchers and the industry, public-private partnerships can be a highly effective instrument for turning research findings into innovative and marketable products. Providing appropriate surrounding conditions for this collaborative process should be a central issue for European research politics.
- Euro-CASE recommends that under *Horizon 2020*, the European Union establishes a unified, comprehensive, open, and competitive framework for the development of new public-private partnerships at European level complemented by a corresponding legal regulatory structure. In the next Framework Programme after *Horizon 2020*, this framework should result in a dedicated Research Public-Private Partnership Funding Programme for establishing new research public-private partnerships.
- This Research Public-Private Partnership Funding Programme should focus on a dedicated bottom-up strategy and on a competitive selection process aimed at achieving scientific excellence. This programme should help foster the strategic development of public-private partnerships with respect to independent and autonomous actions which go beyond mere research funding.
- Under the terms of the proposed new focus on innovation, regulations and conditions for the investment of public funds by the European Union should be explicated in such a way that industry research policy and competition policy are kept in a pragmatic and sensible balance.
- Political bodies should concentrate on providing the best possible surrounding conditions and incentives for the development of public-private partnerships and should make use of more modern mechanisms of governmental control, such as

target and performance agreements, supplemented by a streamlined and effective auditing process. Participation of the European Commission in the governing structures of existing public-private partnerships in research should be reconsidered in this light.

- Euro-CASE asks its member academies for support in bringing together national public-private partnerships at the European level, in integrating researchers coming from countries with a comparatively low level of innovative activities and in using potential synergies among national funding programmes for the development of partnerships and innovations.

## **The importance of public-private partnerships in research**

Euro-CASE supports the new focus on innovation expressed in the *Europe 2020* Flagship Initiative *Innovation Union* and the new Framework Programme *Horizon 2020*. Euro-CASE believes that measures for research funding have to be complemented with appropriate measures to foster the translation of research results into innovations. Politics should engage actively in bringing together researchers and industry, providing structures for their collaboration and helping them to tap the potential for innovations inherent in scientific findings.

Euro-CASE believes that public-private partnerships in research are strong instruments for fostering innovation at large, to bring together academia, research institutions and industry, to leverage private funds for research and innovation and to increase industry participation in the European Union's research programmes. Public-private partnerships are also tools for keeping Europe's strong competitive position in relation to other economies such as the USA or the BRICS states and, last but not least, to enable Europe to respond effectively to the Grand Challenges such as ageing populations, climate change, scarcity of resources (energy, water, food), security, migration and public health.

In addition, public-private partnerships foster integration processes at various levels such as pre-commercial cooperation, capitalising on common strengths, transnational and interdisciplinary cooperation, joint research between industry and academia and the collaboration of Europe's Member States. Public-private partnerships, Euro-CASE believes, are an excellent instrument for developing new innovations covering the full innovation process and taking advantage of the successful interaction between research discoveries, (technological) applications, economic strategies, as well as social development, preferences and acceptance. This may also lead towards more welfare, employment and prosperity within the European Union.

It is, thus, very advisable that Europe develops a strong focus on partnerships between higher education institutes, research centres, industry – larger companies as well as Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) – at the regional, national, European and international level.

In order to foster innovation, politics should design the best possible surrounding conditions and should provide incentives to stimulate innovations.

This policy paper addresses the issue of public-private partnerships *in research*.<sup>1</sup> At European level, there are two main types of research public-private partnerships which may be seen as separate research programmes within the context of the *Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7)*: the *Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs)* for five different industrial sectors which are legally recognised as *Joint Undertakings (JU)* according to Article 187 of the *Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)*<sup>2</sup>, and the three *Public-Private Partnerships* which have been established as part of the European Economic Recovery Plan as of November 2008 for three industrial sectors which have been identified to be particularly affected by the crisis.<sup>3</sup> JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs are public-private partnerships in two senses: (1) They are partnerships between industry and the European Union, either as Joint Undertakings or as contractual partnerships, executing a joint research strategy and (2) they are public-private partnerships at the project level because the projects funded according to this joint research strategy are collaborative projects between public partners such as universities or research organisations and private partners such as large corporations, start-ups or SMEs.

Apart from these larger public-private partnerships in research there are, in addition, joint European industry-academia research projects which are funded by the FP7 programme *Cooperation*.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the first three *Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs)* may also be seen as structured public-private partnerships in innovation integrating higher education, research and technology, and business actors.<sup>5</sup> They are the operational arms of the *European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT)*.

## **Analysis, problems and recommendations**

### **Towards a unified framework for research public-private partnerships**

#### *Analysis, Problems*

To date there is no unified, comprehensive and transparent framework which guides steps towards new public-private partnerships, the ways of establishing and formally recognising

---

<sup>1</sup> It is important to distinguish between public-private partnerships for large infrastructure projects involving private companies and capital as well as various Member States (e. g. for building bridges) and public-private partnerships *in research* which are to be seen in the area of European research policy such as *Joint Technology Initiatives* and *Recovery Programme Public-Private Partnerships*. This paper only deals with *research* public-private partnerships.

<sup>2</sup> These are: *ARTEMIS* for embedded computing systems, *CleanSky* for aviation, *ENIAC* for Nanoelectronics, *FCH* for fuel cell and hydrogen industry and *IMI* for the pharmaceutical sector.

<sup>3</sup> These are: *Green Cars (GC)* for the automotive sector, *Energy-efficient Buildings (EeB)* for construction and *Factories of the Future (FoF)* for manufacturing. In the following they are labelled as Recovery Programme PPPs.

<sup>4</sup> Programmes such as EUREKA and COST should also be mentioned here.

<sup>5</sup> As the European Commission in "Partnering in Research and Innovation", COM(2011) 572 final, p. 3, Euro-CASE sees the KICs as "structured partnerships".

the JTI and Recovery Programme PPPs have been heterogeneous. Based on preliminary *European Technology Platforms* (ETPs) some negotiations between stakeholders and interest groups with the European Commission have resulted in joint actions establishing public-private partnerships, others not. In this process, the status and role of JTIs has been the subject of critical dispute which has interfered with some plans for setting up new partnerships. Between partners and stakeholders there often has been no common understanding of what a public-private partnership should be and how they should best be established. The processes have been time-consuming and extensive, binding many resources. A unified framework providing a transparent realm for negotiations in favour of new public-private partnerships providing equal opportunities for all interest groups is still a desideratum. For some stakeholders the process towards new partnerships is frustrating. Patience is waning and some stakeholders are considering ending negotiations. Possible synergies between various interest groups during the application process can be used more efficiently.

### *Recommendations*

#### **1. Unified Framework**

Euro-CASE supports the general tendency towards unification and simplification pushed forward with *Horizon 2020*. Thus, Euro-CASE suggests the establishment of an open, unified and comprehensive framework designed to initiate larger public-private partnerships as part of *Horizon 2020*. Also in accordance with the Commission's recommendations for a reinforced European Research Area<sup>6</sup> this framework should set up common funding standards and principles. Furthermore, it should be equally accessible to larger industry, SMEs, universities as well as research and technology institutions and should provide equal opportunities to all interest groups. It should give direction to the development of research public-private partnerships and help new interest groups to find a common denominator and to improve management, organisational capacity and governing structures. A key intention of this framework is to help bringing together potential partners and fostering their cooperation.

#### **2. Legal Regulation**

Euro-CASE suggests that a legal regulation for public-private partnerships in research should be implemented following the example of the Council Regulation for a European Research Infrastructure Consortium<sup>7</sup> but adapted to the legal situation of research public-private partnerships. This regulation should contain a clear and modular definition of public-private partnerships allowing for the adaptation of the concept to the needs of various and different academic or industrial settings. It

---

<sup>6</sup> See: A Reinforced European Research Area Partnership for Excellence and Growth, COM(2012) 392 final, pp. 8-9.

<sup>7</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 723/2009 of 25 June 2009 on the Community legal framework for a European Research Infrastructure Consortium (ERIC), Official Journal of the European Union, L 206, 8. 8. 2009.

should also provide a clear set of participation rules facilitating access for all interest groups.

### **3. New Research Public-Private Partnership Funding Programme**

As a vision for an upcoming “FP9” following *Horizon 2020*, Euro-CASE proposes the implementation of a separate funding programme dedicated to the development of new public-private partnerships. This programme should have a strong competitive focus in order to push forward collaboration and new innovations. It should not be confined to certain industrial sectors. It should implement a bottom-up application process with regular application deadlines inviting new applications for public-private partnerships which are assessed in comparison to each other. It should be confined to a transparent time frame and applicants should get feedback on a regular basis. In *Horizon 2020*, already, the path towards such a programme should be paved. For example, the new programme could gather and develop further the existing JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs but also initiatives leading towards new partnerships such as the European Technology Platforms (ETPs), European Innovation Partnerships (EIPs) and, possibly, KICs as well.

These general recommendations are complemented by the following individual recommendations which for the most part can best be followed within the unified framework suggested but may also be considered on their own.

#### **Recommendation 1: Balancing industrial research policy and competition policy in public-private partnerships**

##### *Analysis, Problems*

The new European focus on innovation comes along with the problem that public money is invested closer to the market. This problem is most acute at the both sensitive and critical transition zone connecting basic research to product development (“Valley of Death Problem”). This raises the issues of government intervention, state aids and subsidies to certain industries. Industrial research policy, on the one hand, and competition policy, on the other hand, have to be balanced. In case of public-private partnerships this problem is particularly complex, because JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs consist of public and private partners and aim at funding research projects involving public institutions such as universities and research organisations. Whereas funding for research at public institutions should be granted according to excellence criteria only, government interventions in certain industrial sectors are only justified if there is a good reason such as a market failure. As far as public-private partnerships are concerned, both aspects have to be combined in a sensible way without losing competitiveness.

## *Recommendations*

- Euro-CASE embraces the aims of *Horizon 2020* to close the gap from research and development to innovation and to the market by providing funding not only for basic research but also for prototyping, testing, demonstrating, experimental development, piloting and market replication.
- The European Union should avoid the investment of public money becoming a subsidy for certain industrial sectors and their innovations. However, the European Union should also allow for pragmatic, targeted and adjusted support or experimental product development where applied research is involved. Industrial research policy and competition policy have to be kept in a sensible and pragmatic balance.
- In order to achieve this, Euro-CASE suggests that the European Union concentrates on the central motives that can justify investment of public money in close-to-market research. These motives, e. g., can be market failures such as knowledge externalities, financial market imperfections, cooperation failures, competition with non-European economies or other reasons such as an evident European added value or the strategic importance of the topic with respect to the challenges Europe is faced with.
- Euro-CASE draws attention to the point that standards for justifying investments of public money in close-to-market research vary across industrial sectors. There can be no “one-size-fits-all” rule. Individual solutions have to be found and developing them should be part of a competitive creation process.
- Special attention should be paid to competitiveness. As long as public money is invested for close-to-market research, there has to be a group of competitors striving for the best impact from this investment. This also dovetails with the research funding criteria dedicated to scientific excellence. Euro-CASE believes that this is the key for balancing industrial and competition policy.

### **Recommendation 2: Towards a strong focus on competition in dealing with initiatives towards new public-private partnerships**

#### *Analysis, Problems*

JTIs have been selected by the European Commission as a result of a long dialogue with industry interest groups where strong interest groups have finally succeeded. Especially the Recovery Programme PPPs have been selected for political reasons. There has been no competitive framework for their selection and inviting further potential interest groups to participate. It is unclear whether this process provides equal opportunities to all interest groups, makes the most effective use of all possible synergies and ensures the degree of competitiveness which is necessary for justifying government interventions in favour of industrial sectors.

### *Recommendations*

- Euro-CASE recommends that the new Research Public-Private Partnership Funding Programme proposed here will be based on competitive selection processes. The funding programme needs to be dedicated to excellent research and to the most convincing and impactful strategies for dealing with challenges Europe is faced with.
- This new programme should not be confined to certain technologies, companies or industrial sectors. Politicians should refrain from picking winners beforehand. Instead, the initiative should promote inter-sectoral competition and should not favour only a few particular firms or companies within one sector or promote a particular technology if there are alternatives from other competitors. Support should be provided on equal terms to any firm or company in the sector.
- All applications should be evaluated and assessed simultaneously in comparison to each other by an independent peer-review jury.
- In *Horizon 2020*, already, this focus on competitiveness should be implemented as far as possible, e. g., in streamlining and synchronising application processes for new public-private partnerships and defining more clearcut criteria for scientific excellence differentiated for basic research, applied research and experimental development.
- All existing and future partnerships should be funded only for a limited period of time (e. g., until the next call). This period of time is divided in terms which are subject of regular evaluations and assessments. Positive evaluation of precedent terms is a prerequisite for funding for further terms. Non-performing partnerships should not receive further public funding from the European Union. Entries and exits should be stimulated to uphold competitiveness.
- The partnerships get constant assistance for the development and adaption of their strategic orientations. If their strategic aims are accomplished or cannot be accomplished there is no reason for further funding also.
- The competitive focus also includes competition for cooperation. This means that possible synergies for merging new or other partnerships are explored constantly.

### **Recommendation 3: Reconsidering political involvement of Member States and the European Institutions in the governing structures of JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs**

#### *Analysis, Problems*

The focus on competition emphasised above also means that the degree of involvement of political entities (European Commission, Member States) in JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs has to be reconsidered. Under the terms of a competitive orientation of the framework and the new Research Public-Private Partnership Funding Programme, political bodies cannot appear as a partner in a joint undertaking or a contractual partnership. One cannot design the surrounding conditions for a competition and take part in this competition at the same time.

In addition, there are already problems with governmental involvement in the current situation: In some cases, Member States and political interests interfere with the overall strategies of JTI and Recovery Programme PPPs which are crucial for their functionality. This is the case especially with tripartite JTIs involving Member States. Furthermore, it is evident that the different Directorates Generals all act according to their own strategies. With respect to their involvement in the governing structures of the existing JTIs but also in the contractual partnerships of Recovery Programme PPPs, this leads to coordination problems, in particular as far as the attribution of the partnerships to respective strategies followed by the Directorates Generals is concerned. Even the European Parliament asks for more parliamentary control.

### *Recommendations*

- Euro-CASE suggests that new ways of political control of the public-private partnerships are explored. Within the framework suggested this control can alternatively be executed with methods such as target and performance agreements. With respect to the new Research Public-Private Partnership Funding Programme, the relation of the EIT to the KICs might be a model.<sup>8</sup>
- This also means that a streamlined, comprehensive and effective auditing process for the use of public money within public-private partnerships according to the general rules of the framework should be implemented.
- Euro-CASE suggests a rethink on whether a *Joint Undertaking* means that the European Commission has to be represented directly in the governing boards or if other governing structures are possible too, for example a political supervising committee.
- It is crucial that new ways of involving, integrating and committing Member States are explored. For example, by allowing for the combination of structural funds with funding provided by the partnership, providing incentives for additional Member State commitment, e. g., by granting top ups for their contributions and implementing a more flexible model for Member State participation which reflects the need for Member States to see the benefit of their commitment.
- Euro-CASE recommends the organisation of a conference on the degree of political involvement of Member States and the European Commission in European public-private partnerships and on the question of how political participation could be replaced by a more streamlined and target-oriented auditing process.

### **Recommendation 4: Relying on a bottom-up strategy for new public-private partnerships**

#### *Analysis, Problems*

Public-private partnerships develop gradually and reflect the different phases of their integration in their internal structures. These processes are very often crucial for the

---

<sup>8</sup> This, of course, depends on the outcome of further evaluations of the EIT and the KICs.



development of an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding which is the basis for their collaboration. Especially the Recovery Programme PPPs have rather been selected in a top-down process. By contrast, the decisive bottom-up strategy pursued for the establishment of the KICs has been particularly conducive.

### *Recommendations*

- Euro-CASE recommends that the new Research Public-Private Partnership Funding Programme is dedicated to a bottom-up strategy. Such a strategy helps fostering the development of new public-private partnerships and facilitates discovering synergies between different consortia of applicants that can be merged within the process of establishment. This also encourages the taking advantage of knowledge spillovers.
- The initiative should be undertaken as a multi-level programme accounting for different levels of development and integration of public-private partnerships and also for different industrial or research cultures. The fixed and multi-level time frame of the initiative should be used to inform all stakeholders and interest groups about the degree of development and the future potential of their undertaking.
- Instruments to recognise and fund public-private partnerships should be variable and modular in such a way that they facilitate the integration process of new partnerships. Thus, Euro-CASE embraces the fact that two different models for public-private partnerships (*Joint Undertaking* and contractual partnership) will be provided in *Horizon 2020*.<sup>9</sup> It is vital that potential interest groups make the choice for the appropriate model themselves.
- In addition, Euro-CASE suggests considering the provision of seed money as a small funding for promising interest groups facilitating their initial administrative and coordinating steps necessary for establishing a new public-private partnership.

### **Recommendation 5: Advancing executive management with respect to the strategic orientation of public-private partnerships**

#### *Analysis, Problems*

The strongest asset of JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs is their capacity to develop a strategic orientation for their actions. Especially in JTIs, there is some potential that the executive management as a neutral mediator between European Commission's and Member States' interests, on the one hand, and other stakeholders' interests, on the other hand, secures the partnership's focus on its research agenda. The European Commission, by its very nature, has to be impartial, especially with respect to Member State interests, and industry as well as academic partners have to be gathered on a common denominator which is not only a weak compromise but an effective strategy, too. The potential for a partnership's decisive focus on its strategic orientation can be used more effectively.

---

<sup>9</sup> See COM(2011) 809 final, Article 19. Euro-CASE also supports the plans of broadening the scope of collaborative projects expressed in Article 18a allowing for the inclusion of public-private partnerships under the terms of collaborative projects.

### *Recommendations*

- It is important that strong emphasis is put on the strategic orientation of public-private partnerships. Individual and partial stakeholders' interests as well as detailed political considerations, by contrast, should not come to the forefront.
- Euro-CASE suggests that the executive management structures are reconsidered in the light of the considerations above with the aim of finding ways to strengthen the role of the executive management as a strong advocate in favour of the partnership's strategic orientation and against all partial interests or lobbying.
- Euro-CASE believes that a strong, autonomous and strategy-orientated executive management is best unfolded in the competitive framework programme suggested above. This means that the executive management's central task is to ensure the success of the partnership with respect to its strategic aims.

### **Recommendation 6: Broadening the scope for autonomous and independent actions which go beyond research funding**

#### *Analysis, Problems*

JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs are more or less seen as instruments for allocating research funding from FP7 or *Horizon 2020*. Only some JTIs try to use their legal status for independent and autonomous actions. The potential for strategic action in favour of the respective community and the general development of the public-private partnerships is underdeveloped. In theory, JTIs, for example, can make own contracts which put them in a position to pursue aims which go beyond providing research funding only. The potential for direct actions in favour of the partnerships' joint interests could be used more effectively.

#### *Recommendations*

- Euro-CASE recommends that public-private partnerships are provided with more independence and autonomy. It goes without saying that autonomous actions which go beyond research funding measures have to be financed with private money. If this is successful this will be a strong incentive for more industrial leadership and more investment of private money.
- It is of vital importance that the five currently existing JTIs which have already developed a certain degree of independence and autonomy due to their legal recognition as Joint Undertakings advance this independence and autonomy in the future. It is crucial that the Joint Undertakings make use of these opportunities which would allow them making own contracts pursuing further aims which go beyond research funding and implement direct actions in fields which are relevant for their development. Potentials to strengthen autonomy and independence for contractual partnerships should be explored and developed further.

### **Recommendation 7: Balancing academia and industry participation**

## *Analysis, Problems*

Within the FP7 programme *Cooperation* industry participation has constantly decreased from 39% in FP4 to 25% in FP7.<sup>10</sup> Very often, projects are initiated and administrated by the academic partners. In the field of basic research the European Research Council (ERC) has become a new strong pillar of research funding within Europe. Within JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs, by contrast, industry participation is comparatively high because these partnerships are industry-driven. Industry plays a predominant role and, on the other hand, research organisations would like to participate more and ask for easier access. This situation will be intensified with the new focus on innovation. This means that public-private partnerships at the European level are unlikely to be balanced with respect to equal representation of academic and industry players in the partnerships, they do not commit equally and do not participate at an equal level.

## *Recommendations*

- Euro-CASE believes that the aim of more industry participation can be much better achieved if the conditions for industry and academia participation are balanced in all branches and programmes of *Horizon 2020*.
- This means that within *Cooperation* more emphasis should be put on genuine industry-academia partnerships in research: e. g., partners are equipped with equal rights at an equal level, the object of research and the research itself are equally valuable for the different partners involved.
- Euro-CASE embraces the plans for simplifying participation rules and removing administrative hurdles for the industry within the FP7 programme *Cooperation*.
- Collecting and publishing best practice examples of successful public-private partnerships established with the help of the *Cooperation* programme will attract more public-private partnerships in this programme.
- Euro-CASE embraces the orientation towards innovation of the ERC which is implied in the *Proof of Concept* programme line.
- In case of JTIs and Recovery Programme PPPs, Euro-CASE recommends the expansion of academia participation within these partnerships. Academic partners such as research institutions should be integrated in the governing structures.
- The process towards more close-to-market research should not leave basic research behind. This can be prevented by using public-private partnerships as platforms for developing Smart Specialisation strategies exploring new application possibilities of findings from basic research.<sup>11</sup> Basic research institutions should be integrated in such a way that they contribute to finding new possibilities for applications which can be used to foster innovation and development.

---

<sup>10</sup> According to the Interim Evaluation of the Seventh Framework Programme (2010).

<sup>11</sup> See Dominique Foray, Paul A. David and Bronwyn Hall: „Smart Specialisation – The Concept“, Knowledge Economists Policy Brief no. 9, June 2009.

## **Recommendations particularly addressed to the Euro-CASE member academies**

Up to now, promising public-private partnerships in research and innovation have been launched at Member State level such as those in the “Leading-Edge Cluster Competition” in Germany, the “Leading Technological Institutes” in The Netherlands, , the “Competence Centers for Excellent Technologies (COMET)” in Austria, the Partnership Programmes VINNVÄXT in Sweden, the “Strategic Centres for Science, Technology and Innovation (SHOKs)” in Finland and the UK Catapult Centres. On the other hand, there are European countries with a lower degree of innovation activities. Measures have to be found to integrate these countries into the overall European innovation and development process. This is even more crucial as the competitive strategy suggested above might run the risk of excluding European partners which do not have strong research, development and innovation structures.

- As a European umbrella organisation, Euro-CASE is an ideal platform for bringing together experts from all European countries to share ideas, establish international partnerships and find joint pooling strategies to help to integrate partners with weaker innovation backgrounds.
- Member academies are asked to help to disseminate the advantages of public-private partnerships in their home countries.
- In addition, they should help to interconnect clusters and industry-academia partnerships with similar activities in other countries and at the European Union level.
- Member academies should help to collect best practice examples for successful research public-private partnerships in their respective countries and serve as an advisor for the development of new ones.
- Member academies should help to identify European Structural Funds in their countries for generating new research public-private partnerships – even in regions with a relatively low level of industry, research and development. This can be done by exploring Smart Specialisation strategies<sup>12</sup> aimed at finding applications that can be used even in regions with comparatively low development.

Euro-CASE believes that only joint action of research organisations, industry and European political bodies at the regional, national and the European level will foster research public-private partnerships in Europe successfully. Therefore, it is of crucial importance that the national academies, European Institutions, companies, SMEs and all other stakeholders contribute to this process.

---

<sup>12</sup> See Dominique Foray, Paul A. David and Bronwyn Hall: „Smart Specialisation – The Concept“, Knowledge Economists Policy Brief no. 9, June 2009.

## References

### Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

- Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Official Journal of the European Union, C 155, 9. 5. 2008

### Strategy 2020

- Europe 2020 Flagship Initiative Innovation Union, COM(2010) 546 final
- COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT A RATIONALE FOR ACTION Accompanying document to the COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS Europe 2020 Flagship Initiative Innovation Union, SEC(2010) 1161 final

### Horizon 2020

- Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and Council establishing Horizon 2020, COM(2011) 809 final
- Proposal for a Council Decision establishing the Specific Programme implementing Horizon 2020, COM(2011) 811 final
- Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and Council laying down the rules for the participation and dissemination in Horizon 2020, COM(2011) 810 final
- Proposal for a Council Regulation on the research and training programme of the European Atomic Energy Community complementing Horizon 2020, COM(2011) 812 final

### Establishing and Defining Public-Private Partnerships

- COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Report on European Technology Platforms and Joint Technology Initiatives: Fostering Public-Private R&D Partnerships to Boost Europe's Industrial Competitiveness, Brussels, 10.6.2005, SEC(2005)800
- COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL A European Economic Recovery Plan, COM(2008) 800 final
- COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS Partnering in Research and Innovation, Brussels 21.9.2011, COM(2011) 572 final

### Evaluations

- JTI Sherpas' Group Report, Designing together the 'ideal house' for public-private partnerships in European research. Final report, January 2010
- Directorate-General for Research and Innovation Unit G.2 – 'New forms of production', Interim Assessment of the Research PPPs in the European Economic Recovery Plan. Energy-efficient Buildings, Factories of the Future, European Green Cars Initiative, European Union, 2012
- European Commission (2010): Interim Evaluation of the Seventh Framework Programme. Report of the Expert Group, November 2010

### **Information about the Euro-CASE Innovation Platform:**

Launched in 2012, the Euro-CASE Innovation Platform brings together the expertise of representatives of its member Academies from science, engineering and business. The purpose of the Innovation Platform project is to help put in place the necessary conditions for Europe to increase its innovative power.

If Europe is to succeed we need to create the best possible conditions for individual innovators, entrepreneurs, education systems, research organisations and enterprises. We need to develop a culture that stimulates renewal, innovation and calculated risk-taking.

The Euro-CASE Innovation Platform works on policy papers for Euro-CASE in order to give science based policy advice to relevant EU-Institutions and national governments.

In line with Europe 2020 and the flagship Innovation Union and Horizon 2020, the Euro-CASE Innovation Platform contributes proactively to making Europe the most successful innovation region in the world.

Euro-CASE strives to support and advise the EU and national governments on relevant topics where Euro-CASE, as a pan-European organization with broad links to both academia and industry, are in a unique position to contribute.

### **Members of the Euro-CASE Innovation Platform:**

Magnus Breidne, Vice President, IVA, Sweden

Timothy Brick, Executive Director, IAE, Ireland

Thomas Brunotte for acatech, Germany

Sir Mike Gregory, Fellow, RAEng, United Kingdom

Ainomaija Haarla, President TAF, Finland

Rudolf Hielscher, Head of Brussels Office, acatech, Germany

Karl Klingsheim, CEO, NTNU, NTVA, Norway

Karel Klusacek, Director, TC ASCR, EACR, Czech Republic

Vojteh Leskovšek, Vice President, IAS, Slovenia

Shane McHugh, Head of International Activities, RAEng, United Kingdom

Bjorn Nilsson, President, IVA, Sweden

Richard Parker, Fellow, RAEng, United Kingdom

Ian Ritchie, Hon Treasurer, RAEng, United Kingdom

José Manuel Sanjurjo, Fellow, RAI, Spain

Germain Sanz, Fellow, NATF, France

Holly Wright, International Policy Advisor, RAEng, United Kingdom

**Guest speakers who gave an input to the policy paper:**

Jürgen Creutzmann, MEP, Member of ITRE Committee

Marion Dewar, Member of Cabinet of the Commissioner for Research and Innovation Máire Geoghegan-Quinn

Iain Gray, RAEng, Chief Executive of the Technology Strategy Board

Thorsten Hülsmann, Managing Director [www.effizienzcluster.de](http://www.effizienzcluster.de)

Mariana Mazzucato, R.M. Phillips Professor of Science and Technology at the University of Sussex

Ernst Rietschel, acatech European Affairs Representative, former President of Leibniz Association

Approved by the Euro-CASE board in November 2012

This paper complies with the “Euro-CASE Guidelines on advising policy makers and society”

**Contact address of Euro-CASE:**

Euro-CASE

Grand Palais des Champs-Élysées | Porte C

Avenue Franklin D. Roosevelt

75008 Paris, France

T. +33 1 53 59 53 40

mail@euro-case.org

www.euro-case.org