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

- ◎ Greek
- ◎ Hungarian
- ◎ Italian
- ◎ Latvian
- ◎ Lithuanian
- ◎ Maltese
- ◎ Polish
- ◎ Portuguese
- ◎ Romanian
- ◎ Slovak
- ◎ Slovenian
- ◎ Spanish
- ◎ 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

Alessandro

* Surname

BEDESCHI

* Email (this won't be published)

alessandro.bedeschi@5g-ppp.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

The 5G Infrastructure Association (5G IA)

* 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 [transparency register](). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

> 944198631623-17

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

◉ Afghanistan	◉ Djibouti	◉ Libya	◉ Saint Martin
◉ Åland Islands	◉ Dominica	◉ Liechtenstein	◉ Saint Pierre and Miquelon
◉ Albania	◉ Dominican Republic	◉ Lithuania	◉ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
◉ Algeria	◉ Ecuador	◉ Luxembourg	◉ Samoa
◉ American Samoa	◉ Egypt	◉ Macau	◉ San Marino
◉ Andorra	◉ El Salvador	◉ Madagascar	◉ São Tomé and Príncipe
◉ Angola	◉ Equatorial Guinea	◉ Malawi	◉ Saudi Arabia
◉ Anguilla	◉ Eritrea	◉ Malaysia	◉ Senegal
◉ Antarctica	◉ Estonia	◉ Maldives	◉ Serbia
◉ Antigua and Barbuda	◉ Eswatini	◉ Mali	◉ Seychelles
◉ Argentina	◉ Ethiopia	◉ Malta	◉ Sierra Leone
◉ Armenia	◉ Falkland Islands	◉ Marshall Islands	◉ Singapore
◉ Aruba	◉ Faroe Islands	◉ Martinique	◉ Sint Maarten
◉ Australia	◉ Fiji	◉ Mauritania	◉ Slovakia
◉ Austria	◉ Finland	◉ Mauritius	◉ Slovenia
◉ Azerbaijan	◉ France	◉ Mayotte	◉ Solomon Islands
◉ Bahamas	◉ French Guiana	◉ Mexico	◉ Somalia
◉ Bahrain	◉ French Polynesia	◉ Micronesia	◉ South Africa
◉ Bangladesh	◉ French Southern and Antarctic Lands	◉ Moldova	◉ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
◉ Barbados	◉ Gabon	◉ Monaco	◉ South Korea
◉ Belarus	◉ Georgia	◉ Mongolia	◉ South Sudan
◉ Belgium	◉ Germany	◉ Montenegro	◉ Spain

○ Belize	○ Ghana	○ Montserrat	○ Sri Lanka
○ Benin	○ Gibraltar	○ Morocco	○ Sudan
○ Bermuda	○ Greece	○ Mozambique	○ Suriname
○ Bhutan	○ Greenland	○ Myanmar /Burma	○ Svalbard and Jan Mayen
○ Bolivia	○ Grenada	○ Namibia	○ Sweden
○ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	○ Guadeloupe	○ Nauru	○ Switzerland
○ Bosnia and Herzegovina	○ Guam	○ Nepal	○ Syria
○ Botswana	○ Guatemala	○ Netherlands	○ Taiwan
○ Bouvet Island	○ Guernsey	○ New Caledonia	○ Tajikistan
○ Brazil	○ Guinea	○ New Zealand	○ Tanzania
○ British Indian Ocean Territory	○ Guinea-Bissau	○ Nicaragua	○ Thailand
○ British Virgin Islands	○ Guyana	○ Niger	○ The Gambia
○ Brunei	○ Haiti	○ Nigeria	○ Timor-Leste
○ Bulgaria	○ Heard Island and McDonald Islands	○ Niue	○ Togo
○ Burkina Faso	○ Honduras	○ Norfolk Island	○ Tokelau
○ Burundi	○ Hong Kong	○ Northern Mariana Islands	○ Tonga
○ Cambodia	○ Hungary	○ North Korea	○ Trinidad and Tobago
○ Cameroon	○ Iceland	○ North Macedonia	○ Tunisia
○ Canada	○ India	○ Norway	○ Turkey
○ Cape Verde	○ Indonesia	○ 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 Guinea	○ United Arab Emirates
○ Christmas Island	○ Italy	○ Paraguay	○ United Kingdom
○ Clipperton	○ Jamaica	○ Peru	○ United States
○ Cocos (Keeling) Islands	○ Japan	○ Philippines	○ United States Minor Outlying Islands
○ Colombia	○ Jersey	○ Pitcairn Islands	○ Uruguay
○ Comoros	○ Jordan	○ Poland	○ US Virgin Islands

⊙ Congo	⊙ Kazakhstan	⊙ Portugal	⊙ Uzbekistan
⊙ Cook Islands	⊙ Kenya	⊙ Puerto Rico	⊙ Vanuatu
⊙ Costa Rica	⊙ Kiribati	⊙ Qatar	⊙ Vatican City
⊙ Côte d'Ivoire	⊙ Kosovo	⊙ Réunion	⊙ Venezuela
⊙ Croatia	⊙ Kuwait	⊙ Romania	⊙ Vietnam
⊙ Cuba	⊙ Kyrgyzstan	⊙ Russia	⊙ Wallis and Futuna
⊙ Curaçao	⊙ Laos	⊙ Rwanda	⊙ Western Sahara
⊙ Cyprus	⊙ Latvia	⊙ Saint Barthélemy	⊙ 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?

   ◉
     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 identify your role in the partnership (select all that apply):
- ☐ Partner/Member/Beneficiary in a partnership
- ☑ Representative in the governance of a partnership
- ☐ Member of a committee for a partnership
- ☐ Expert (evaluator, reviewer) in calls for proposals in partnership
- ☐ Applied for funding under a partnership
- ☐ Provided national cofinancing to a partnership
- ☐ Other

* Please identify the partnership (select all that apply):
- ☐ European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP2)
- ☐ Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI2) Joint Undertaking
- ☐ Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership (ECSEL) Joint Undertaking
- ☑ 5G (5G PPP)
- ☐ European Metrology Programme for Innovation and Research (EMPIR)
- ☐ Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking
- ☐ Single European Sky Air Traffic Management Research (SESAR) Joint Undertaking
- ☐ 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	○	○	○	○	●	○
* Be more responsive towards societal needs	○	○	○	○	●	○
* Be more responsive towards priorities in national and regional research and innovation strategies, including smart specialisation strategies	○	○	○	●	○	○
* Make a significant contribution to achieving the UN's Sustainable Development Goals	○	○	○	●	○	○

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

* 3. What would you see as main advantages and disadvantages of participation in an Institutionalised European Partnership (as a partner) under Horizon Europe?

500 character(s) maximum

> The key advantage of participating in a an Institutionalized Partnership is the ability to bring together key stakeholders enabling through coordinated activities the ability to address larger problems and have a greater impact. The ability of such a Partnership to create consolidated results increases the chance of economic exploitation increasing the impact for Europe. Another key advantage in bringing together the key stakeholders is the ability to build consensus before standardization.

4. For which of the candidate Institutionalised European Partnership(s) would you like to specifically provide your views through this consultation (you may provide your views 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
- ☐ Integrated Air Traffic Management
- ☐ 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.

Key Digital Technologies

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Key Digital Technologies under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to reinforce Europe's capacity to innovate through robust electronics value chains in the EU and its ability to provide the rest of EU industry and society with sustainable and secure solutions.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing Electronic Components and Systems European Leadership (ECSEL) Joint Undertaking, but would also satisfy the more demanding scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

ECSEL JU s a public-private partnership, established under Horizon 2020, on the basis of Article 187 TFEU and which functioning is currently planned until 31 December 2024.

The inception impact assessment 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 key digital technologies?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Rapid change including big data and the emergence of new computing paradigms	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Lack of sufficient expertise in specific key digital technologies	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Innovation gap in the EU in translating research results into innovative digital solutions	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Limited availability of testbeds for novel computing components and systems	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Sky-rocketing costs of equipment	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Limited collaboration and pooling of resources between Member States, European Commission, Industry and Research organisations (Universities, RTOs)	○	○	○	●	○	○

Problems in uptake of digital innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Insufficient market size or inappropriate business models	○	○	○	●	○	○
Regulatory framework lagging behind technology developments	○	○	○	○	●	○
Barriers to exploitation due to limited access to capital, data or Intellectual Property	○	○	○	●	○	○
Lack of consideration of societal or user needs	○	○	○	●	○	○
Concerns with the use of digital tools for ethical, privacy or security reasons	○	○	○	○	●	○

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

> Looking at the broad impact and wide range of stakeholders this seems to be the most appropriate form of Partnership for this area.

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	○	○	○	○	○	○
Industry	○	○	○	○	○	○
Academia	○	○	○	○	○	○
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	○	○	○	○	○	○
Other societal stakeholders	○	○	○	○	○	○

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	○	○	○	○	○	○
Industry	○	○	○	○	○	○
Academia	○	○	○	○	○	○
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	○	○	○	○	○	○
Other societal stakeholders	○	○	○	○	○	○

Partnership composition:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Flexibility in the composition of partners over time	○	○	○	○	○	○
Involvement of a broad range of partners, 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	○	○	○	○	○	○
Collaborative R&I projects	○	○	○	○	○	○
Deployment and piloting activities	○	○	○	○	○	○
Input to regulatory aspects	○	○	○	○	○	○

Co-creation of solutions with end-users	○	○	○	○	○	○

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	○	○	○	○	○	○
Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs	○	○	○	○	○	○
Implements activities more transparently	○	○	○	○	○	○
Increase financial leverage	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ensure better links to regulators	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ensure better links to practitioners on the ground	○	○	○	○	○	○
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	○	○	○	○	○	○
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	○	○	○	○	○	○
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	○	○	○	○	○	○

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	○	○	○	○
Research areas covered	○	○	○	○
Geographical coverage	○	○	○	○
Types of partners covered	○	○	○	○
Range of activities covered	○	○	○	○
Sectoral coverage	○	○	○	○

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

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
Provision of trusted electronics components and systems to the public and businesses	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉
Enabled safety (automotive, avionics) and security (transactions, communications)	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉
Contribution to more functional, efficient and economical electronics systems accessible to a larger part of the population	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't know
More innovative, sustainable and globally competitive electronics and systems industries (including SMEs)	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉
Development and exploitation of innovative technology paradigms	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't know
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU research and innovation capabilities in Key Digital Technologies	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉	◉

Smart Networks and Services

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Innovative Smart Networks and Services under Horizon Europe. The objective is for Europe to maintain and further reinforce its role in the global scene for advanced smart digital connectivity platforms. Europe has to stay at the leading edge of innovation by leveraging its know-how and industrial strengths.

Building on the EU's strong position in 5G and Internet of Things (IoT) technology, the proposed partnership would enable Europe to master and lead the technology evolution of smart networks and services towards beyond 5G and later 6G networks and stay competitive and autonomous in relation to our main competitors in the field (i.e. China, USA) who are already launching similar initiatives.

The initiative also aims at coordinating deployment of Smart Networks and Services in areas of public interest.

The initiative would build on the experience gained in the existing 5G PPP H2020 partnership but would revise its scope, content and implementation to take into account important developments in the field of devices (IoT) and cloud computing (edge cloud infrastructures) and the strengthened scientific, societal, economicand technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

It hence proposes a comprehensive value chain approach, leveraging European connectivity strong assets and world class research capabilities to create industrial opportunities in related devices and computing domains.

The inception impact assessment 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 smart networks and services?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Lack of understanding of or knowledge about next generation converged Digital Infrastructures with a comprehensive European system approach covering connectivity, devices and cloud services	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Innovation gap in the EU in translating the results of connectivity, cloud and Internet of Things devices research into the development of innovative networks and services platforms	○	○	○	○	◉	○

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, private actors i.e. network and internet service providers, connectivity vendors, computing and device actors, vertical industries and users, leading research centres and public authorities	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Problems in uptake of smart networks and services innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market fragmentation due to lack of industrial policy favouring harmonised national take up and implementation strategies for new generation of smart connectivity systems	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Regulation in the field of radio spectrum allocation including identification of new innovative spectrum management and sharing technologies	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Barriers to exploitation due to critical mass of investment or time to market, notably for trans-European networks and corridors for connected and automated mobility	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Barriers to exploitation due to potential lack of global standards	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Lack of consideration of societal or user needs driving networks and services research into human centric next generation Internet services for its citizens	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Insufficient digitalisation (data access and analysis, interoperability) especially for what concerns vertical user sectors	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Concerns with use of smart networks and services platforms for ethical, privacy, security, or EMF reasons	○	○	○	○	◉	○

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

> In our view this Partnership could be implemented equally as an Institutionalised Partnership. The choice between Co-Programmed or Institutionalized Partnership is difficult to make today as the details of how such Programs will be implemented have not been published. In our view the area of SNS has the breadth, multiple stakeholders and ambitious goals to justify an Institutionalised Partnership however we also believe that this could be achieved by an extended form of a current cPPP.

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	○	○	○	●	○	○
Industry	○	○	○	○	●	○
Academia	○	○	○	●	○	○
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	○	○	○	●	○	○
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. Connectivity vendors, Telecom operators, regulators, user groups)	○	○	○	○	●	○

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	○	○	●	○	○	○
Industry	○	○	○	○	●	○
Academia	○	○	○	○	●	○
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	○	○	○	●	○	○
Other societal stakeholders	○	○	○	●	○	○

Partnership composition:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Flexibility in the composition of partners over time	○	○	○	●	○	○
Involvement of a broad range of partners, 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	○	○	○	○	●	○
Collaborative R&I projects	○	○	○	○	●	○
Deployment and piloting activities	○	○	○	●	○	○
Input to regulatory aspects	○	○	○	●	○	○
Co-creation of solutions with end-users	○	○	○	○	●	○

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	○	○	○	○	●	○
Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs	○	○	○	●	○	○
Implements activities more transparently	○	○	○	○	●	○
Increase financial leverage	○	○	○	○	●	○
Ensure better links to regulators	○	○	○	○	●	○
Ensure better links to practitioners on the ground	○	○	○	○	●	○
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	○	○	○	○	●	○
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	○	○	○	○	●	○
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	○	○	○	○	●	○

Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	○	○	○	○	●	○

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	○	●	○	○
Research areas covered	○	●	○	○
Geographical coverage	○	●	○	○
Types of partners covered	○	●	○	○
Range of activities covered	○	●	○	○
Sectoral coverage	○	●	○	○

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

500 character(s) maximum

> It is important to get a scope right. This Partnership cannot cover all digital aspects and needs a clear central focus to underly and give a clear structure to the proposal. Our view aligned with the attached proposal is that a central focus needs to be mobile communications networks. However, it is vital that we include the end to end view and this means related aspects of IoT, Cloud, AI and Components and Devices must be included.

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

(No) Please explain why other comparable initiatives are not suitable to be linked with?

500 character(s) maximum

> In our view SNS will produce one of the fundamentals technology building blocks for the future digital society. As such we feel it appropriate to have a distinct Partnership Programme for this area. This does not mean that there will not be common areas of interest with other Partnership proposals, e.g. AI and KDT. However, it is our view these common areas would be best handled by close collaboration between the Partnerships on agreed common goals rather than combining the Partnerships.

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
Developing and deploying connectivity	○	○	○	○	●	○
Providing consumers faster and smarter mobile communications	○	○	○	○	●	○
Providing citizens trusted next generation Internet networks	○	○	○	○	●	○
Bringing about the digital transformation of industries such as health, education, media, transport	○	○	○	○	●	○
Drastically reducing energy consumption of future smart network and service platforms	○	○	○	○	●	○

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't know
Achieving the strategic objectives of the partnership by involving the Member States directly	○	○	○	●	○	○
Faster, energy efficient and affordable advanced communication systems	○	○	○	○	●	○
Developing the digital economy of networks, Internet of Things and cloud computing	○	○	○	○	●	○
Creating new industrial value chains across different sectors such as network equipment and service providers, big data, cloud, software-defined infrastructures and Internet of things technologies and services	○	○	○	●	○	○
Highly skilled jobs in industry	○	○	○	●	○	○

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't know
Developing the scientific knowledge preparing for the 6th Generation of mobile communication networks	○	○	○	○	●	○

Creating synergies between networks, cloud and Internet of Things to achieve intelligent connectivity as a basis for the next generation Internet services and applications	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Maintaining and reinforcing European world-class research and innovation capabilities in networks and related domains	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Contact

RTD-A2-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu