

Single Basic Act for Joint Undertakings and thematic priorities for the European Partnership portfolio in Horizon Europe 28-34

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Single Basic Act for Joint Undertakings and thematic priorities for the European Partnerships portfolio in Horizon Europe 28-34

Public Consultation Questionnaire

This open public consultation focuses on the preparation of the **European Partnerships under the new Horizon Europe programme 28-34 (HE 28-34)**. These include Treaty-based partnerships, i.e. Art. 187 TFEU Joint Undertakings (JUs) and Art. 185 TFEU initiatives, and Work Programme-based partnerships (encompassing the existing co-programmed and co-funded partnerships). **For reasons of efficiency, the consultation will cover two complementary strands:** the development of a Single Basic Act for the Joint Undertakings, and the definition of the thematic areas to be addressed within the overall set of European Partnerships, defined as “partnership portfolio”.

Treaty-based partnerships, i.e. Art. 187 TFEU Joint Undertakings (JUs) and Art. 185 TFEU initiatives, are unique instruments in the EU R&I funding landscape that bring together different actors around shared strategic priorities. Industry, Research Performing Organisations, Member States/Associated Countries and the EU pool resources and efforts to foster research, development and deployment of breakthrough technologies and push for system change. By combining and jointly deploying public and private resources, they enable the mobilisation of investments and expertise that go beyond what individual actors could achieve on their own.

Similarly to the situation under the current Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) the Commission is preparing a single establishing legislative act for Joint Undertakings (hereinafter referred to as the Single Basic Act (SBA)), in the context of the next MFF, notably Article 11(4) of the Commission proposal for a Regulation establishing Horizon Europe 28-34 (HE 28-34). **This public consultation is part of the**

preparation of this future SBA for JUs and of any potential basic act(s), e.g. to establish Article 185 TFEU initiative(s), under HE 28-34.

Together with the Work Programme based partnerships, the Art. 187 TFEU JUs and Art. 185 TFEU initiatives will be part of the partnership portfolio, chosen to match the EU's strategic priorities and to avoid gaps or overlap between initiatives. **Therefore, to ensure a coherent approach, the consultation includes a set of questions on the portfolio of partnerships in HE 28-34, beyond Art. 187 TFEU JUs and Art. 185 initiatives.**

Reflecting the work strands outlined above, **the questions in this consultation are structured in three distinct sections:**

The first section refers to Treaty-based partnerships and starts with questions focused on the functioning of current Treaty-based partnerships and potential areas for improvement under the next MFF. It continues with questions on the specific objectives and on the possible policy measures to achieve them.

The second section aims to collect ideas and suggestions on the characteristics of the portfolio of European Partnerships and possible thematic areas to be addressed by partnerships under HE 28-34, irrespective of their implementation type.

The last section of the survey contains a number of questions about the respondents and their relation to European Partnerships, if any.

This public consultation will inform the Impact Assessment of the proposal for the future SBA for JUs and of any potential separate legal act (one or several), for instance, to establish Art.185 TFEU initiatives, as well as also support the ongoing process of building the new portfolio of partnership areas under HE 28-34.

About you

* Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ Danish
- ☐ Dutch
- ☒ English
- ☐ Estonian
- ☐ Finnish

- ☐ French
- ☐ German
- ☐ Greek
- ☐ Hungarian
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Latvian
- ☐ Lithuanian
- ☐ Maltese
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Portuguese
- ☐ Romanian
- ☐ Slovak
- ☐ Slovenian
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☐ Company/business
- ☐ Consumer organisation
- ☐ EU citizen
- ☐ Environmental organisation
- ☐ Non-EU citizen
- ☐ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ☐ Public authority
- ☐ Trade union
- ☒ Other

* First name

Salman

* Surname

Muhammad

* Email (this won't be published)

salman.muhammad@cmeurope.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Carbon Management Europe

* Organisation size

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ☒ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☐ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☐ Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

793300922868-60

* Country of origin

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

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ 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	☐ Türkiye
☐ 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 | |

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution 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 organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

☒ I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Table of contents

Following the "Introduction" and "About you" the consultation consists out of three distinct sections:

1. Questions about Treaty-based partnerships in Horizon Europe 28-34

2. Questions on European Partnership portfolio in Horizon Europe 28-34

3. Questions about the respondent linked with European Partnerships

Estimated time for completion: 30–40 minutes.

1. Questions about Treaty-based partnerships in Horizon Europe 28-34

Many questions below, which refer to Treaty-based partnerships, are relevant both to JUs and Art.185 TFEU initiatives, unless specified otherwise. As mentioned in the introduction, the SBA initiative addresses JUs, while Art.185 TFEU initiatives will potentially be established by a separate legal act (one or several).

If a question mainly relates to a type of partnership (e.g., JU or Article 185 TFEU initiative) that you are not familiar with, you may select 'Cannot say'.

Questions group 1: Views on the areas of improvement

Changed geopolitical conditions and new EU strategic priorities call for increasing efficiency, effectiveness and maximising the impact of Treaty-based partnerships at system level on R&I, competitiveness performance, technological development and industrial deployment. This requires a strategic revision of the partnership landscape and the related enabling conditions, particularly in view of the whole innovation-to-investment journey. This will also account for the link with the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF), which is

aimed at boosting the market uptake of innovative technologies, and may support the partnerships set up under HE 28-34, where necessary to achieve its objectives.

The current MFF has demonstrated the key value of partnerships in aligning strategic agendas, leveraging public and private investment, and building ecosystems around key EU priorities. Therefore, partnerships have been an instrument of strategic importance for boosting Europe's global competitiveness. To ensure that they continue to have a significant impact in a rapidly evolving environment the Commission has identified five potential areas for improvement*– described below -, which will have to be addressed by the future Treaty-based partnerships. As the SBA for JUs under HE 28-34 will aim to define measures to tackle such areas for improvement, the Commission intends to identify the most appropriate and impactful ways to do so:

- Area 1: Treaty-based partnerships do not sufficiently support the development, uptake and/or deployment of new technologies and solutions by EU industry and society
- Area 2: Private co-funding in some Treaty-based partnerships is insufficient to create significant impact
- Area 3: Treaty-based partnerships are not fully aligned with the current EU strategic vision
- Area 4: Cross-fertilisation and knowledge dissemination is low among Treaty-based partnerships, and between Treaty-based partnerships and other publicly funded R&I initiatives
- Area 5: The requirements for membership, participation, and funding access in Treaty-based partnerships are hard to understand and navigate.

**These areas for improvement have been identified in various evaluations and do not necessarily pertain to all existing JUs, but are relevant to some JUs to varying extent.*

1.1 To what extent do you agree or disagree on the following areas for improvement to be addressed in future Treaty-based partnerships?

- *Treaty-based partnerships do not sufficiently support the development, uptake and/or deployment of new technologies and solutions by EU industry and society

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

- *Private co-funding in Treaty-based partnerships is insufficient to create significant impact

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Treaty-based partnerships are not fully aligned with the current EU strategic vision

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Cross-fertilisation and knowledge dissemination is low among Treaty-based partnerships, as well as between Treaty-based partnerships and other publicly funded R&I initiatives

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* The requirements for membership, participation, and funding access in JUs are hard to understand and navigate

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree

- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☒ Cannot say

Are there other problems to be considered in relation to Treaty-based partnerships that are not included above? (optional, open field)

Fragmentation across research, demonstration, infrastructure and deployment remains an important challenge. For systemic areas such as Industrial Carbon Management, different components may be addressed through different sectoral or technology-focused Partnership areas, but this should not create gaps across the complete CO2 value chain. The future portfolio should ensure coherent coordination across interdependent activities and clear interfaces with complementary instruments such as the Innovation Fund, the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF).

Questions group 2: Views on the drivers

To address potential areas for improvement, the Commission needs to understand what is driving them. In the following part, we are interested in your views on potential factors which support or hamper Treaty-based partnerships to reach their objectives.

2.1 To what extent do you agree/ disagree that the following factors are obstacles for Treaty-based partnerships to support the uptake and deployment of new technologies and solutions by industry and society?

- * Treaty-based partnerships primarily support research and development with limited funding to pre-commercial activities

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

- * A risk-averse attitude from partners, with limited appetite to invest in high-risk projects

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral

- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Limited interest in working jointly with commercial competitors on projects closer to the deployment stage

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☒ Cannot say

2.2 To what extent do you agree/ disagree that the following factors prevent the Treaty-based partnerships to raise sufficient private co-funding to create and maximise their impact?

* The Union's contribution does not trigger sufficient private co-funding that would jointly create significant change in a sector (disruptive technology, scale-up)

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* The Member States/Associated Countries' contributions do not trigger sufficient private co-funding that would jointly create significant change in a sector (disruptive technology, scale-up)

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree

- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* The current design of 'in-kind contributions to additional activities' — contributions provided outside the funded projects — risks diverting meaningful contributions from Treaty-based partnerships' projects

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☒ Cannot say

2.3 To what extent do you agree/ disagree that the following factors limit the alignment of Treaty-based partnerships with the current EU strategic vision?

* The topics of the existing set of Treaty-based partnerships no longer sufficiently address the most important and emerging challenges of the EU, including strategic sectors and technologies

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* There is lack of funding flexibility in Treaty-based partnerships, with funding allocated to fixed areas with little room to adapt when new technologies emerge or political priorities change

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral

- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* The size of individual calls (individual call budgets) is too small to introduce disruptive changes in a dedicated area

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

2.4 To what extent do you agree/ disagree that the following factor limits cross-fertilisation and knowledge dissemination in Treaty-based partnerships?

* Programming of Treaty-based partnerships is not flexible enough to accommodate cross-sectoral cooperation with other sectors and/or among Treaty-based partnerships

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* The time required for set up and the administrative burden of managing joint calls hinders collaboration across sectors and JUs

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree

- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Concerns on confidentiality and intellectual property rights from private partners create unfavourable conditions for cross-sectoral cooperation among Treaty-based partnerships

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☒ Cannot say

2.5 To what extent do you agree/ disagree that the following factors make the requirements for membership, participation, and funding access in JUs hard to understand and navigate?

* The level of financial commitment to join a JU is an entrance hurdle for new members, particularly for SMEs

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Treaty-based partnerships rely on complex organisational structures and governance, including different rules, work streams, and guidelines.

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree

☐ Cannot say

*Members and participants of Treaty-based partnerships face high administrative burden (e.g. reporting complexity)

Maximum 1 selection(s)

☐ Fully agree

☒ Somewhat agree

☐ Neutral

☐ Somewhat disagree

☐ Fully disagree

☐ Cannot say

2.6 Are there any other key factors, not mentioned in points 2.1 to 2.5, which you think should be addressed in the design of Treaty-based partnerships under HE 28-34? If yes, please explain (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Future Treaty-based Partnerships should ensure stronger continuity between R&I, demonstration and industrial deployment, with clear interfaces to complementary instruments such as the Innovation Fund, the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF). Where cross-cutting strategic thematic such as Industrial Carbon Management span several Partnership areas, programming and governance should explicitly coordinate interdependencies across the complete value chain rather than addressing individual technologies or sectors in isolation.

2.7 Are there any examples of current Treaty-based partnerships addressing the issues identified above, which you think could be considered as a best practice in the design of Treaty-based partnerships under HE 28-34? If yes, please explain which issues and how (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Questions group 3: Views on objectives

To address the problems, the Commission needs to set an overall direction for the future SBA and come up with several practical steps to take in that direction. These steps will guide the policy choices for the Treaty-based partnerships under HE 28-34. In this section, we are interested in your views on the relevance of five possible objectives.

3.1 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the following objectives are relevant for Treaty-based partnerships?

* Delivering and deploying innovative solutions and technologies

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Using the EU and Member States/Associated Countries' budget in Treaty-based partnerships to raise R&I private investment

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Increasing JUs' critical mass and scientific and technological capabilities to scale and target efforts at EU strategic industrial priorities

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Ensure cross-fertilisation through synergies, collaboration and coherence between Treaty-based partnerships, for example through more agile programming

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Make Treaty-based partnerships more accessible and open to new members, in particular for start-ups and scale ups

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

* Make Treaty-based partnerships focused on increasing competitiveness of EU strategic industrial sectors

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ Cannot say

3.2 Should any other objectives guide policy choices when designing Treaty-based partnerships under HE 28-34? If yes, please explain (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Future Partnerships should explicitly support continuity across the full innovation-to-deployment cycle while maintaining complementarity with dedicated deployment and infrastructure instruments.

They should also ensure coherent coverage of strategic European value chains across the Partnership portfolio. This is particularly important for cross-cutting thematic such as Industrial Carbon Management, where successful deployment requires synchronised progress across capture, CO2 conditioning and transport, geological storage, utilisation, carbon removals, monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV), standards, interoperability and enabling infrastructure. Clear coordination is needed particularly at the interfaces between industrial emitters, transport networks and storage providers.

Another objective should be to translate European scientific and technological excellence into industrial leadership, manufacturing and engineering capabilities, deployment within Europe, and international competitiveness.

Questions group 4: Views on possible policy measures

4.1 How effective do you consider the following mechanisms to support the uptake and deployment of new technologies and solutions by EU industry and society?

Measure	Extremely effective	Very effective	Moderately effective	Slightly effective	Not effective	Don't know
* Requirement for Treaty-based partnerships to fund activities and solutions at all technology readiness levels, from basic research to close-to-market (TRL 1-9)						
* Requirement for a minimum share of each Treaty-based partnership budget allocated to close-to-market activities (TRL 7-9)						
* Treaty-based partnerships to support the implementation of the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF)						

Should any other measures be considered, also based on current Treaty-based partnerships examples, to support the uptake and deployment of new

technologies and solutions by EU industry and society? If yes, please explain (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Establish clearer pathways from R&I to industrial deployment through flagship demonstrators, large-scale testing and mechanisms that feed operational learning from first-of-a-kind projects back into future R&I priorities. For systemic value chains, this learning should also inform coordination between interdependent technologies and infrastructure. Partnerships should provide clear transition pathways towards complementary deployment instruments such as the Innovation Fund, the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF).

4.2 How effective do you consider the following mechanisms to raise R&I private investment in Treaty-based partnerships?

Measure	Extremely effective	Very effective	Moderately effective	Slightly effective	Not effective	Don't know
* Limit the EU share of funding for projects (Lower funding rate)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Higher minimum contributions from private sector members	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Redesign rules for non-cash contributions from private sector members of Treaty-based partnerships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Design clearer “return-on-investment” pathways for industry, e.g. deployment-linked calls, flagship demonstrators	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Should other measures be considered, also based on current Treaty-based partnerships examples, to raise R&I private investment in Treaty-based partnerships? If yes, please explain (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Use risk-sharing mechanisms and clear follow-on pathways from Partnership-funded demonstrators to deployment finance such as the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF) and the Innovation Fund. Private investment should be mobilised through credible deployment pathways and risk reduction rather than primarily through higher mandatory contribution requirements. Funding intensity should reflect technology maturity and project risk, to mobilise genuinely additional private investment.

4.3 How effective do you consider the following mechanisms to increase JUs' critical mass and scientific and technological capabilities to scale and target efforts at EU strategic priorities?

Measure	Extremely effective	Very effective	Moderately effective	Slightly effective	Not effective	Don't know
* Minimum size (budget) of call for proposals in Treaty-based partnerships						
* Replace multiple smaller calls by one substantial call per year per Treaty-based partnerships, where applicable						
* Minimum share of call budget dedicated to activities related to high-tech content, for each Treaty-based partnerships call						

* Alignment of Treaty-based partnerships thematics with those proposed in the ECF /HE 28-34 policy windows* <i>*1) Clean transition and industrial decarbonisation, 2) digital leadership, 3) health, biotech, agriculture and bioeconomy, and 4) resilience, security, defence and space</i>	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
---	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Should any other measures be considered, also based on current Treaty-based partnerships examples, for increasing and focusing efforts in line with EU strategic priorities via JUs? If yes, please explain (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Critical mass should be built around strategic challenges and complete value chains rather than call size alone. Where a strategic theme spans several Partnership areas, aligned strategic research and innovation agendas (SRIAs), coordinated programming and access to shared research and testing infrastructures should ensure coherent coverage and avoid gaps between interdependent parts of the value chain.

4.4 How effective do you consider the following mechanisms for cross-fertilisation through synergies, collaboration and coherence among Treaty-based partnerships, in your opinion?

Measure	Extremely effective	Very effective	Moderately effective	Slightly effective	Not effective	Don't know
* Introducing larger JUs covering broader thematics to improve flexibility in programming	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Introducing one single JU covering all thematics to improve flexibility in programming	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Other measures to improve flexibility in programming	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

* Minimum number of joint calls between sectoral Treaty-based partnerships and with other partnerships						
* Promote inter-JU (or, where relevant, inter – Treaty-based partnerships) activities, such as access to research infrastructures						
* Simplify administrative functions by centralising them						
* Identify synergies in SRIAs (Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda, potentially including 'Deployment' as an additional element) of JUs in related sectors						

Should any other measures be considered, also based on current Treaty-based partnerships examples, for cross-fertilization through synergies, collaboration and coherence among Treaty-based partnerships? If yes, please explain (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Strengthen coordination between related Partnerships through aligned strategic research and innovation agendas (SRIAs) and multiannual roadmaps, targeted joint programming and shared research and testing infrastructures. For cross-cutting themes such as Industrial Carbon Management, coordination should explicitly cover the complete CO₂ value chain, including capture, transport, geological storage, utilisation, removals, monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV), standards and infrastructure integration, while maintaining clear thematic ownership, identifiable objectives and sufficient resources.

4.5 How effective do you consider the following mechanisms to make Treaty-based partnerships more accessible and open to new members, in particular for startups and scale ups?

Measure	Extremely effective	Very effective	Moderately effective	Slightly effective	Not effective	Don't know
* New competitive selection of Treaty-based partnerships private partners (<i>European Partnerships, including JUs, should be selected through a competitive, open, non-discriminatory and transparent procedure (Article 5(1a) of the proposal for establishing the Specific Programme implementing HE 28-34). Since the composition of the partnership itself is one of the criteria for selecting a European Partnership, the competitive selection process must also encompass the identification and selection of the participating partners themselves.</i>)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Minimum share of Treaty-based partnerships membership for SMEs/startups/scale up	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Minimum call budget for SMEs/ startups/scale ups, for each Treaty-based partnerships call	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Dedicated calls targeting SMEs/start-ups, with more agile processes	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Simplification of governance of Art 185 TFEU initiatives and JUs (art. 187 TFEU)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Simplification of procedures to submit proposals and implement projects (work programme, administrative and financial procedures, etc.)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Should any other measures be considered, also based on current Treaty-based partnerships examples, for making Treaty-based partnerships more accessible and open to new members, in particular for SMEs, start ups and scale ups? If yes, please explain (optional)

3000 character(s) maximum

Participation requirements should be transparent and proportionate, with simpler procedures and clear routes for new entrants to participate in Partnership activities.

2. Questions on the Horizon Europe 28-34 partnerships portfolio

While this consultation forms part of the process for defining potential future Treaty-based Partnerships, they are expected to remain one implementation modality within a coherent package of partnerships, defined as the European Partnerships portfolio. Their thematic scope, strategic rationale and complementarity therefore need to be assessed alongside Work Programme-based Partnerships to avoid duplication, gaps and inconsistencies across the overall landscape.

The following questions on the broader portfolio are therefore intended to provide context on strategic priorities and portfolio needs, relevant for all types of partnerships.

*** 1 - In your opinion, what is fundamentally needed in the portfolio building process and resulting portfolio of European partnerships?**

- ☒ A clear strategic rationale behind the design of the portfolio
- ☒ Coherent structuring of the thematic areas to be addressed by partnerships, avoiding overlaps and fragmentation
- ☒ A value chain approach exploring synergies and interdependencies within specific industrial ecosystems
- ☒ A balanced mix of stability (long-term structuring) and agility (ability to evolve)
- ☒ Improved efficiency compared to the current landscape
- ☐ A selection of fewer sectorial and synergetic partnerships selected competitively
- ☐ None of the above, satisfied with the status quo
- ☒ Other (specify below)

Please specify here:

The portfolio should reduce fragmentation while ensuring that strategically important cross-cutting thematic areas retain clear objectives, visibility, sufficient resources and identifiable coordination, including where they are implemented across broader Partnership areas. Portfolio streamlining should not create gaps between interdependent parts of strategic European value chains.

***2 - What are thematics* for which intervention through a European Partnership is essential, where the European Union's current and potential standing in the thematic area can be consolidated where strong relative to global competitors, including research excellence, industrial competitiveness, strategic autonomy, and ability to influence international standards and norms.**

**Thematics are policy-relevant themes or domains to be addressed through partnerships under Horizon Europe 28-34. Thematics reflect strategic R&I priorities, but do not necessarily require a stand-alone partnership. A thematic may be addressed by one or more partnerships. If a thematic area is not considered suitable for a partnership, either because it does not meet the criteria or is not prioritised, it may still be addressed through other Horizon Europe 28-34 instruments, including regular Work Programme calls. The absence of a partnership therefore does not imply a lack of funding opportunities.*

Please justify:

Proposed thematic: Industrial Carbon Management

Justification: Europe has established major scientific, technological and industrial strengths across Industrial Carbon Management (ICM), including CO₂ capture, transport, geological storage, utilisation, carbon removals and MRV. A distinguishing feature of ICM is the strong interdependence between these elements. Advances in individual technologies translate into deployment only when infrastructure, storage, standards and regulatory interfaces develop in parallel. Recognising ICM as a strategic thematic would help consolidate Europe's strengths while ensuring coherent coordination across the complete CO₂ value chain.

2.1 - Which of these should be addressed by Treaty-based partnerships and why?

**As work programme-based partnerships are the default implementation mode, all identified thematic areas are implicitly considered candidates for this mode. This*

question seeks to identify which thematic areas, if any, would instead warrant implementation through a Joint Undertaking, as this requires an additional justification.

Industrial Carbon Management (ICM) represents a strong candidate for implementation through a European Partnership. Where coherent and identifiable coverage of the complete CO₂ value chain cannot be achieved effectively through coordinated Work Programme-based Partnerships, a dedicated Partnership for ICM should be considered. Treaty-based implementation could be justified where dedicated long-term governance is necessary to coordinate industrial emitters, technology providers, transport infrastructure operators, storage developers, research organisations and public authorities across Member States. A Joint Undertaking should therefore remain an option where this would provide clear additional value compared with a Work Programme-based Partnership.

*** 3 - What are thematics for which intervention through a European Partnership is essential, where the European Union's current and potential standing in the thematic area can be strengthened where weak relative to global competitors, including research excellence, industrial competitiveness, strategic autonomy, and ability to influence international standards and norms.**

Please justify:

Industrial Carbon Management - industrial scale-up and integrated value-chain deployment

Justification: Europe has strong scientific, technological and regulatory capabilities in Industrial Carbon Management, while further strengthening is needed in investment, industrial scale-up, commercialisation and integration of the complete CO₂ value chain. The challenge is increasingly not only to advance individual technologies, but to ensure that capture projects, transport infrastructure, storage capacity and enabling systems can develop on compatible timescales. A European Partnership can help translate Europe's existing strengths into deployment, industrial leadership and commercial replication across sectors.

*** 3.1 - Which of these should be addressed by Treaty-based partnerships and why?**

Industrial Carbon Management should be considered for dedicated Partnership implementation where long-term coordination would materially accelerate industrial scale-up, private investment and integration across the CO₂ value chain. Treaty-based implementation could be justified where the scale and duration of coordination between technology development, infrastructure and industrial deployment require a dedicated governance structure and provide clear additional value compared with a Work Programme-based Partnership.

*** 4 - What are thematics for which intervention through a European Partnership is essential in order to address major societal, environmental, or**

systemic challenges of European relevance, where coordinated action at EU level is necessary to achieve sufficient scale, long-term structuring effects or cross-sectoral integration that could not be achieved effectively through fragmented national approaches alone?

Please justify:

Industrial Carbon Management (ICM) presents systemic challenges requiring coordination at European level. CO₂ sources, transport infrastructure, geological storage resources and industrial clusters are unevenly distributed across Europe, making cross-border value chains essential. While individual components of ICM may be addressed within sectoral or technology-focused programmes, no single component can deliver an operational CO₂ value chain on its own. EU-level coordination is therefore needed across capture, conditioning, transport, geological storage, utilisation, carbon removals, MRV, standards, interoperability and infrastructure planning, including the interfaces between emitters, transport operators and storage providers. The key issue is therefore not only recognition of ICM as a strategic thematic, but how that thematic is translated into the future Partnership portfolio while preserving coherent coverage of the complete CO₂ value chain. Where this cannot be achieved effectively through coordination across broader Partnership areas, a dedicated European Partnership for ICM should be considered.

*** 4.1 - Which of these should be addressed by Treaty-based partnerships and why?**

Industrial Carbon Management should be considered a strong candidate for dedicated Partnership implementation where this is necessary to provide long-term governance, sufficient scale and cross-border integration across the complete CO₂ value chain. Treaty-based implementation, including a Joint Undertaking, should be considered where coordination between industrial emitters, transport infrastructure, storage providers, technology developers, research organisations and public authorities requires a dedicated institutional structure that would provide clear additional value compared with a Work Programme-based Partnership.

3. Questions about the respondent's involvement in European Partnerships

*** 1 - What is the type of your organisation?**

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Academia
- ☐ Research and Technology Organisation
- ☐ Industry - large enterprise
- ☐ Industry - SME, including startup and scale up company
- ☐ Government body (Regulatory Authority, Ministry, Funding Agency, etc.)
- ☐ Other public entity

- ☐ Non-governmental organisation
- ☐ Individual EU citizen (no organisation)
- ☒ Other (please specify)

Please specify here:

Non-profit organisation - Official advisor to the EU on industrial carbon management

*** 2 - Has your organisation participated in a European Partnership?**

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes, as a partnership member
- ☐ Yes, as a beneficiary participating in a project funded by the partnership
- ☐ Yes, all of the above
- ☐ No, I have applied with no success
- ☒ No, I have not participated nor applied
- ☐ Don't know/ no answer
- ☐ Other (please specify)

Please specify here:

Contact

RTD-EUROPEAN-PARTNERSHIPS@ec.europa.eu

