Contribution ID: ae2c92e6-d991-4fb6-a95f-8a0d684990e3

Date: 05/11/2019 21:00:32

# 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: <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/research-and-innovation-including-horizon-europe-iter-and-euratom-legal-texts-and-factsheets\_en">https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/research-and-innovation-including-horizon-europe-iter-and-euratom-legal-texts-and-factsheets\_en</a>
- [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

Hungarian
Italian
<ul><li>Latvian</li></ul>
Lithuanian
Maltese
Polish
Portuguese
Romanian
<ul><li>Slovak</li></ul>
Slovenian
Spanish Suradiala
Swedish
*I am giving my contribution as
Academic/research institution
Business association
Company/business organisation
<ul> <li>Consumer organisation</li> </ul>
© EU citizen
<ul><li>Environmental organisation</li></ul>
Non-EU citizen
<ul><li>Non-governmental organisation (NGO)</li></ul>
Public authority
Trade union
Other
*First name
*Surname
*Email (this won't be published)
*Scope
International
© Local
National
© Regional
*Organisation name
255 character(s) maximum

Greek

Ministerie van Buitenla	ndse Zaken Nederland		
<ul> <li>Large (250 or r</li> <li>Transparency registe</li> <li>255 character(s) maximum</li> </ul>	employees) 249 employees) nore) er number	voluntary database for organisations	s seekina to influence EU decision-
making.			
*Country of origin			
Please add your country of orig  Afghanistan	_	Libya	Saint Martin
Åland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	<ul><li>Saint Pierre and Miquelon</li></ul>
Albania	<ul><li>Dominican Republic</li></ul>	Lithuania	<ul><li>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</li></ul>
Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa

Macau

Malawi

Malaysia

Maldives

Malta

Marshall

Islands

Martinique

Mauritania

Mayotte

Mexico

Micronesia

Mauritius

Mali

Madagascar

American

Samoa
Andorra

Angola

Anguilla

Antarctica

Antigua and

Barbuda

ArgentinaArmenia

Aruba

Australia

Azerbaijan

Bahamas

Austria

Bahrain

**Egypt** 

El Salvador

Equatorial

Guinea

Eritrea

Eswatini

Ethiopia

Falkland Islands

Faroe Islands

French Guiana

Estonia

Fiji

Finland

France

French

Polynesia

San Marino

São Tomé and

Saudi Arabia

**Príncipe** 

Senegal

Seychelles

Singapore

Sint Maarten

Slovenia

Slovakia

Solomon

Islands

Sierra Leone

Serbia

Bangladesh	<ul><li>French Southern and Antarctic Lands</li></ul>	Moldova	<ul> <li>South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands</li> </ul>
<ul><li>Barbados</li><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li><li>Bermuda</li><li>Bhutan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Gabon</li><li>Georgia</li><li>Germany</li><li>Ghana</li><li>Gibraltar</li><li>Greece</li><li>Greenland</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Monaco</li> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> </ul>	South Korea South Sudan Spain Sri Lanka Sudan Sudan Suriname Svalbard and Jan Mayen
<ul><li>Bolivia</li><li>Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba</li></ul>	<ul><li>Grenada</li><li>Guadeloupe</li></ul>	<ul><li>Namibia</li><li>Nauru</li></ul>	<ul><li>Sweden</li><li>Switzerland</li></ul>
<ul><li>Bosnia and Herzegovina</li></ul>	Guam	Nepal	Syria
<ul><li>Botswana</li><li>Bouvet Island</li><li>Brazil</li><li>British Indian</li></ul>	<ul><li>Guatemala</li><li>Guernsey</li><li>Guinea</li><li>Guinea-Bissau</li></ul>	<ul><li>Netherlands</li><li>New Caledonia</li><li>New Zealand</li><li>Nicaragua</li></ul>	<ul><li>Taiwan</li><li>Tajikistan</li><li>Tanzania</li><li>Thailand</li></ul>
Ocean Territory  British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
<ul><li>Brunei</li></ul>	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	<ul><li>Heard Island and McDonald Islands</li></ul>	Niue	Togo
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	<ul><li>Northern</li><li>Mariana Islands</li></ul>	Tonga
<ul><li>Cambodia</li></ul>	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	<ul><li>North Macedonia</li></ul>	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
<ul><li>Cayman Islands</li></ul>	Iran	<ul><li>Pakistan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Turks and Caicos Islands</li></ul>
<ul><li>Central African Republic</li></ul>	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
<ul><li>Christmas Island</li></ul>	Italy	Guinea  Paraguay	Emirates United Kingdom

<ul><li>Clipperton</li><li>Cocos (Keeling)</li><li>Islands</li></ul>	<ul><li>Jamaica</li><li>Japan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Peru</li><li>Philippines</li></ul>	<ul><li>United States</li><li>United States</li><li>Minor Outlying</li><li>Islands</li></ul>
<ul><li>Colombia</li><li>Comoros</li></ul>	<ul><li>Jersey</li><li>Jordan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Pitcairn Islands</li><li>Poland</li></ul>	<ul><li>Uruguay</li><li>US Virgin</li></ul>
<ul><li>Congo</li><li>Cook Islands</li></ul>	<ul><li>Kazakhstan</li><li>Kenya</li></ul>	<ul><li>Portugal</li><li>Puerto Rico</li></ul>	Islands Uzbekistan Vanuatu
<ul><li>Costa Rica</li><li>Côte d'Ivoire</li></ul>	<ul><li>Kiribati</li><li>Kosovo</li></ul>	<ul><li>Qatar</li><li>Réunion</li></ul>	<ul><li>Vatican City</li><li>Venezuela</li></ul>
<ul><li>Croatia</li><li>Cuba</li></ul>	<ul><li>Kuwait</li><li>Kyrgyzstan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Romania</li><li>Russia</li></ul>	<ul><li>Vietnam</li><li>Wallis and</li></ul>
Curação	Laos	Rwanda	Futuna  Western Sahara
Cyprus	Latvia	<ul><li>Saint</li><li>Barthélemy</li></ul>	Yemen
Czechia	Lebanon	<ul> <li>Saint Helena         Ascension and         Tristan da         Cunha     </li> </ul>	Zambia
<ul><li>Democratic Republic of the Congo</li></ul>	Lesotho	<ul><li>Saint Kitts and Nevis</li></ul>	Zimbabwe
<ul><li>Denmark</li></ul>	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

programme Horizon 2020 or the preceeding Framework Programme 7?
Yes
O No
*Please identify in which capacity (multiple answers possible):
Applied for funding

\*1. Have you been involved in the on-going research and innovation framework

Received funding
 Expert (evaluator, reviewer, etc.)
 Participated in governance (programme committee, etc.)

<ul> <li>Are or were you directly involved in a partnership under predecessor Framework Programme 7?</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>No</li> </ul>	er Horizon 2020 or its
*Please identify your role in the partnership (select all to 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 Applied for funding under a partnership Provided national cofinancing to a partnership Other	ip
<ul> <li>Please identify the partnership (select all that apply):</li> <li>European and Developing Countries Clinical Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI2) Joint Undertaking</li> <li>Joint Undertaking</li> <li>5G (5G PPP)</li> </ul>	Jndertaking
<ul> <li>5G (5G PPP)</li> <li>European Metrology Programme for Innovation</li> <li>Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking</li> <li>Single European Sky Air Traffic Management Undertaking</li> </ul>	, ,
<ul> <li>Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking</li> <li>Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 (FCH2) Joint Undertaking</li> <li>Bio-Based Industries Joint Undertaking</li> <li>Eurostars-2 (supporting research-performing enterprises)</li> </ul>	·
<ul><li>Ambient Assisted Living (AAL 2)</li><li>Partnership for Research and Innovation i (PRIMA)</li></ul>	n the Mediterranean Area
European High-Performance Computing Join	t Undertaking (EuroHPC)
2 To what extent do you think that the future Furonea	n Partnershins under Horizo

Other

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	0	0	0	0	•	©
* Be more responsive towards societal needs	0	0	0	•	0	©

* Be more responsive towards priorities in national and regional research and innovation strategies, including smart specialisation strategies	0	0	•	0	•	0
* Make a significant contribution to achieving the UN's Sustainable Development Goals	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Make significant contribution to the EU efforts to achieve climate-related goals	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Focus more on the development and effective deployment of technology	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Focus more on bringing about transformative change towards sustainability in their respective area	0	0	•	0	0	0
* Make a significant contribution to EU global competitiveness in specific sectors/domains	0	0	0	0	•	0
* Other	0	0	0	0	•	0

### \*(Other) Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

In general, partnerships should look beyond their own discipline, incorporating (where possible) relevant social sciences and humanities, technical and medical sciences. The above mentioned statements are difficult to interpret when we speak about a broad range of partnerships which on itself apply to different goals of Horizon Europe. There is no one size fits all approach based on some of these statements, while question two does imply a one size fits all approach.

\*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 Netherlands is providing an in kind contribution to EDCTP through our Product Development Partnerships (Funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Managed by RVO). PDP's experience EDCTP as a complex structure, adding to their workload. In addition the objectives and result indicators of EDCPT are not fully aligned with the results framework of the Directorate for International Coorperation. A potential advantage is impact on strenthening health systems and research capacity in Africa.

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)?

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_			\ \ \	,	
ur vie	ws for more than one)?						
<b>V</b>	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	n					
	Integrated Air Traffic Managemer	nt					

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.

# EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious diseases (Global Health)

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised European Partnership on Global Health under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to accelerate the clinical development of effective, safe, accessible and affordable health technologies, as well as health system interventions for infectious diseases, together with African partners and international funders.

The proposed partnership would build on the existing European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership programme (EDCTP2), a public-public partnership between the EU, 14 European countries and 16 African countries, established under Horizon 2020 (on the basis of Article 185 TFEU), but would revise its scope, content and implementation and take account of the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe.

The <u>inception impact assessment</u> outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and likely impacts 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 global health?

### Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Insufficient understanding about infectious diseases	0	0	•	0	0	0

Insufficient capacity of the research community to anticipate and react to infectious diseases outbreaks	0	0	0	•	©	0
Limited capacity for evidence-based decision- making by the research community on infectious diseases	•	0	•	0	•	0
Limited capacity to rapidly scale up testing and production of candidate vaccines	0	0	0	0	•	0

## Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Lack of capacity of research institutions and health professionals in Africa to conduct clinical trials (human resources and skills)	0	0	•	0	0	0
Lack of diagnostic capacity in Africa to support the conducting of clinical trials (infrastructure)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Lack of capacity of African countries to oversee the conducting of clinical trials in accordance with national legislation and according to ethical standards	0	•	0	0	•	0
Fragmentation of research efforts and efficient collaboration to pool resources between national programmes with private funders	0	0	0	•	0	0

# Problems in uptake of health innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Market failures due to inadequate industry investment	0	0	0	0	•	0
Inability of health systems in Africa and in the EU to take up the research results of innovative health technologies (i.e. to procure and pay for health innovations, to deliver health innovations to areas where they are needed, to develop products suitable for local market conditions)	•	0	0	•	•	0

# 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

Institutionalized Partnerships guarantee a long-term collaboration, which is required for clinical research. However, we do acknowledge that they are also characterized by limited flexibility for adaptation (in case of changing national and international policies or priorities). Also, more insight is required into how art. 185 and 187 partnership can co-exist with member state legislation, in particular in relation to central financial management and accountability.

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	0	0	0	0	•	0
African countries	0	0	0	0	•	0
Industry	0	0	•	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	•	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	•	0	0
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. patients, healthcare providers, payers, regulators, civil society)	0	0	•	0	0	0

# 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	0	0	0	0	•	0
African countries	0	0	0	0	•	0

Industry	0	0	•	0	0	0
Academia	0	0	•	0	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	0	•	0	0
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. patients, healthcare providers, payers, regulators, civil society)	•	•	0	0	0	0

# Partnership composition:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t Know
Flexibility in the composition of partners over time	0	0	0	0	•	0
Involvement of a broad range of partners, including across disciplines and sectors	0	0	0	•	0	0

# Implementing the following activities:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t Know
Joint R&I programme	0	0	•	0	0	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	•	0	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	•	0	0	0
Input to regulatory aspects (i.e. to developers of medicines or health technologies on approvals and pre-qualifications)	0	0	0	0	•	0
Co-creation of solutions with end-users (e.g. national health systems)	0	0	0	0	•	0

# 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	0	•	0	0	0	0
Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs	•	0	0	0	0	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	•	0	0	0

Increase financial leverage	0	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure better links to regulators	0	0	•	0	0	0
Ensure better links to practitioners on the ground	0	•	0	0	0	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	0	•	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	©	0	•	0	0	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	0	0	•	0	0

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	0	•	0	0
Research areas covered	•	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	•	0	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	•	0	0
Range of activities covered	0	•	0	0
Sectoral coverage	0	•	0	0

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

500 character(s) maximum

Research areas not fully aligned with results framework of Directorate of International Cooperation, which focuses on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR). Middle East could also 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

(Yes) Please explain why? Which other comparable initiatives could it be linked with?

500 character(s) maximum

Although we fully understand that clinical research requires a long term focus, it would be good for a new partnership to effectively balance results at process and outcome level. There seems to be much emphasis on process (establishing platforms etc.). It is difficult to assess to what extent this contributes to results at outcome level.

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
Improved health promotion and disease prevention throughout the life course and accessible for a broader population	0	0	•	0	0	0
Better understanding of the environmental factors for health and well-being	0	0	•	0	0	0
Better fight against communicable diseases (including by helping to enable a faster response to epidemic threats) and reduction of the social and societal burden that they entail	0	0	0	•	0	0
More efficient and sustainable health systems providing accessible and person-centred high-quality health and care services	0	0	0	•	0	0
Stimulation of the development of effective, affordable and appropriate health products for use in developing countries	0	0	0	0	•	0
Increased ability of developing countries to participate in and conduct clinical research	0	0	0	•	0	0

## **Economic/technological impact:**

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Better, safe and affordable health technologies, tools and digital solutions for health, e.g. testing and demonstration of radically new platforms	0	0	0	•	0	0
More innovative, sustainable and globally competitive health industries (including SMEs)	0	0	•	0	0	0

# Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capabilities	0	©	0	•	0	0
Local capacity development to support and conduct clinical trials (human resources, skills, infrastructure)	0	0	0	•	0	0

#### Contact

RTD-A2-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu