

European Commission

# Ideas for a European

## European Innovation Council

Overview of Responses to the Call for Ideas



#### EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Research and Innovation Directorate B – Open Innovation and Open Science Unit B.1 — Open Innovation

Contact: Petra Sarapatkova Koen de Pater

E-mail: EC-EIC-IDEAS@ec.europa.eu RTD-PUBLICATIONS@ec.europa.eu

European Commission B-1049 Brussels

### Ideas for a European Innovation Council

Overview of Responses to the Call for Ideas

#### Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union

Freephone number (\*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(\*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

#### LEGAL NOTICE

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

More information on the European Union is available on the internet (http://europa.eu).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2016

| Print | ISBN 978-92-79-59928-6 | doi:10.2777/06091  | KI-02-16-637-EN-C |
|-------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| PDF   | ISBN 978-92-79-59750-3 | doi:10.2777/068191 | KI-02-16-637-EN-N |

© European Union, 2016

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

#### Contents

| EXE | CUTIVE SUMMARY   | 5  |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.  | INTRODUCTION   | 6  |
| 2.  | RESPONDENTS' PROFILE   | 6  |
| 3.  | THE ROLE OF DISRUPTIVE MARKET CREATING INNOVATION I EUROPE'S ECONOMY |    |
| 4.  | GAPS AND SHORTCOMINGS IN CURRENT EU SUPPORT                          | 9  |
| 5.  | MAIN FUNCTIONS OF AN EIC   | 11 |
| 6.  | OTHER POSSIBLE FUNCTIONS OF AN EIC                                   | 15 |
| 7.  | CONCERNS   | 15 |
| 8.  | CONCLUSIONS  | 16 |
| ANN | NEX 1: LIST OF PUBLISHED POSITION PAPERS                             | 17 |
| ANN | NEX 2: POSSIBLE OTHER FUNCTIONS OF AN EIC                            | 19 |

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The European Commission ran a call for ideas between 16th February and 29th April 2016 to gather stakeholders' views on disruptive, market-creating innovation, on gaps in the current innovation support landscape and on the potential remit of a European Innovation Council (EIC). A total of 1022 replies and 183 supporting documents and position papers were received.
- 40% of the respondents were affiliated with research organisations, 35% with businesses (predominantly SMEs but also several large companies), 11% with public bodies (innovation agencies, regional representations and governmental departments), 4% with representative organisations, 2% were financiers and 2% were private citizens. Respondents came from over 46 countries, with the majority from southern and western EU Member States. There was at least one contribution from each of the 28 Member States.
- Over 80% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that a lack of disruptive market creating innovation is an obstacle to growth and job creation in Europe. There was no significant difference between stakeholder groups. Approximately 18% disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- Over 75% agreed or strongly agreed that there are gaps in current EU support for innovation, 20% strongly disagreed or disagreed. Typically respondents argued that it remains difficult for SMEs to take advantage of the support offered due to the complexity and length of the application process.
- Respondents were asked which issues a potential EIC could address. 'Filling in gaps' had the highest count, closely followed by 'simplification of access' and 'strategic advice'.
- A large number of respondents argued that there is a need for further simplification of application rules, reduction of administrative requirements and improvement in the navigation among the various support options. A number of respondents argued that call themes should not be pre-defined.
- In order to fill the gaps in EU support, many stakeholders called for dedicated calls for disruptive technologies and improved access to risk financing. A suggestion to establish an 'EU-wide venture capital fund' was mentioned several times, as well as the idea of combining grants and loans. Respondents also argued for the need to strengthen links between national and EU programmes.
- The opinions on what kind of strategic advice should be provided by the EIC were varied. A common view across all stakeholder categories was that a potential EIC could provide strategic advice to the EU and national governments in order to create an EU-wide innovation-friendly ecosystem.
- Frequent suggestions for other services an EIC could provide included: regulatory reform, mentoring and coaching, incubation of new ideas, formulation of a long-term innovation strategy, brokerage and networking, introduction of new financing instruments, promotion of an innovation culture including risk-taking, promotion of inclusion and diversity, marketing of EU innovation and international outreach and enhancing cooperation between the research and private sector community.

The European Commission will take this input into account in its upcoming policy development. First reforms could be implemented in the Horizon 2020 Work Programmes for 2018-2020, in order to maximise the impact of the innovation activities funded in this period. Other elements will be considered in the preparation of the next Framework Programme.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

A call for ideas was launched to gather stakeholders' views on disruptive, marketcreating innovation, on gaps in the current innovation support landscape and on the potential remit of a possible European Innovation Council (EIC). The consultation ran between 16th February and 29th April 2016. A total of 1022 replies and 183 supporting documents and position papers were received.

The discussions on a possible EIC are still at an early stage and the legal nature, structure, membership, competences and functions have not yet been defined. Any references to its "remit" only reflect the answers given by stakeholders who participated in this consultation exercise and will not necessarily translate into any specific policy actions taken by the European Commission.

#### 2. <u>RESPONDENTS' PROFILE</u>

The vast majority of the stakeholders who took part in the online survey come from the business and the research sectors – together these two stakeholder groups account for 75% of the total. 40% of the respondents represent, or are affiliated with, research organisations (i.e. universities, research institutes, foundations and thinks-tanks), 35% with businesses (predominantly SMEs but also several large companies), 11% with public bodies (innovation agencies, regional representations and governmental departments), 4% with representative organisations gathering either business or research stakeholders and 2% were financiers. Approximately 2% of respondents were private citizens.



Figure 1: What is your main field of activity? (total: 1022)

183 respondents uploaded a document in the survey or submitted a standalone position paper. 47% of these documents came from the research community (individual universities, research institutes and their groups), 15% from businesses, 14% from public national and EU bodies, 9% from representative organisations, 3% from public and private finance stakeholders and 11% from respondents who registered as 'other' or 'individual'.

These contributions are published at:

<u>https://ec.europa.eu/research/eic/index.cfm?pg=your-ideas</u>, with the exception of documents which were duplicates or deemed not to bear any relevance to the questions asked.



Figure 2: Submitted documents by stakeholder category (total: 183)

The geographical coverage was diverse<sup>1</sup>, with respondents coming from over 46 countries and at least one respondent from each EU Member State. The top 10 countries account for 74% of the respondents. Contributors were more likely to come from western and southern Europe than from eastern Europe.



Figure 3: Respondents to the EIC call for ideas per country (top 10 countries only)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Information about the respondent's country of origin was not requested in the call for ideas. It was estimated on the basis of email extensions and addresses of organisations.

#### 3. THE ROLE OF DISRUPTIVE MARKET CREATING INNOVATION IN EUROPE'S ECONOMY

### **3.1.** Vast majority of respondents believe that disruptive innovation is important for growth and job creation...

"Europe must get over its fear of disruption, fear of failure, avoidance of entrepreneurial risk-taking. It needs to support a lot more experiments..."

SME, Netherlands

Over 80% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that a lack of disruptive market creating innovation is an obstacle to growth and job creation in Europe. There is no significant difference between stakeholder groups on this particular issue – the research community appeared to be similarly concerned about this issue as the business community.

More than 35% of the respondents provided additional comments to substantiate their answer. A large number of those stakeholders who agreed that the lack of disruptive innovation is an issue have alluded to a 'risk-averse' culture in Europe and to weak links between academia and the private sector. The latter comment was particularly prominent among research stakeholders. Respondents frequently commented that there is a wealth of good ideas, skilled workforce and many hopeful start-ups but companies struggle to scale up.

"There are great innovative companies that have started up, but now need to scale up to actually be able to make a (disruptive) difference. Not just startups, but also the scale-ups need to be supported."

Financier, France

#### 3.2.... but many argue that it is not the whole story.

"We should, however, move cautiously and not compare or prefer disruptive innovation to incremental innovation. The latter can be a powerful source of differentiation for a business. In Europe, many traditional industries still hold large reservoirs of incremental innovation."

Business association, Belgium

A minority of respondents, approximately 18%, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the notion that a lack of disruptive innovation in Europe is an obstacle to job creation and economic growth.

Those who disagreed often argued in the comments section that other barriers are more important for economic growth and job creation – for instance, austerity, the economic crisis,

lack of collaboration, lack of bold leadership, language barriers or inadequate policy. A number of stakeholders pointed out that support for incremental innovation (improving existing technologies and business models) is equally important. Several respondents made the

"There is a lot of talk of disruptive innovation but very little follow through. There needs to be consideration how disruptive innovation can be encouraged and supported by the European Commission through financial incentives, risk sharing and other available mechanisms."

Public sector, UK

"Innovation as a solution to create jobs is not obvious at all. Basically innovation is dedicated to make our life better and therefore creates growth (and wealth) but creating jobs is another more complicated topic strongly depending on the competition context. Innovation can also destroy jobs by replacing persons by robots for instance."

Research organisation, Italy

point that certain innovative products and services can, in fact, have a negative impact on job creation even if they do generate economic value. A few respondents argued that the focus on innovation is too narrow, and that innovation is not the only source of economic growth and jobs. A small number of respondents said there should be more focus on sustainability.



**Figure 4:** Do you agree that a lack of disruptive, market-creating innovation is an obstacle to job creation and economic growth in Europe?

#### 4. GAPS AND SHORTCOMINGS IN CURRENT EU SUPPORT

Over 75% of all stakeholders who took part in the survey strongly agreed or agreed that there are gaps in current EU support for innovation, 20% strongly disagreed or disagreed and 5% said they do not know. The views were, again, relatively consistent across all stakeholder groups.



**Figure 5:** Do you agree that there are gaps in current EU support (e.g. Horizon 2020, European Structural and Investment Funds) for disruptive, market-creating innovation and for scaling up of new businesses?

"I don't see the H2020 support for the third phase which can be extremely critical - the scale up and market development once the idea became a product (it might be that my information is not sufficient). Supporting this phase might be also a zero-cost operation providing loan to companies for the scale up rather than funding."

Business, Hungary

(drug discovery, biomedical sciences, multidisciplinary disciplines, innovation infrastructures). A few respondents stated that the main gap is in the budgetary

resources available, which makes success rates, particularly for the SME and the FET Open instruments, very low. Limited availability of smaller grants for small companies was also mentioned several times.

However, most of the comments pointed to perceived deficiencies in the current EU level

" Horizon 2020 seems too fixated on scientific excellence. Would a Twitter/Facebook/LinkedIn have gotten Horizon 2020 support? Would Ryanair, now among the largest European airlines?

Private sector, UK

When asked to elaborate on their response, several stakeholders made general statements about the need to bridge the 'valleys of death' in the research and innovation process. few Α stakeholders pointed to a lack of venture capital to fuel the growth of scale-ups, gaps in geographical coverage or in particular sectors and fields

> "EU money is much too slow to get and needs too much experience for applying to be any help to disruptive breakthroughs."

Public sector, Finland

support rather than to actual gaps. Typically respondents argued that it remains difficult for SMEs to take advantage of the support offered due to the complexity and length of the application process. Despite recent improvements, respondents across all stakeholder categories continue to call for further simplification and acceleration of the application process, and improvements in the evaluation process.

"Share examples and best practices better; promote openness, foster bottom-up, citizen-oriented and -driven activities. Support only newcomers, not those who've been funded for years already."

Public body, Belgium

Respondents also called for more freedom and flexibility. Thematic calls were often perceived as too restrictive and leading to missed business opportunities; many respondents explicitly advocated 'bottomup' open calls. A number of respondents called for more flexible eligibility criteria that would allow individuals or sinale organisations to apply, arguing that EUadded value should be sought at the

programme rather than at the project level. Horizon 2020 was also perceived to be overly focused on academic excellence by a few stakeholders. Suggestions for improvements in the evaluation procedures included, for instance, appointing accomplished innovators as evaluators. Another suggestion that was mentioned was that all innovation support should be more joined up and awarded in a phased manner, with easy access to initial funding but further funding granted only if promising results were achieved.

A few respondents argued that Horizon 2020 is too heavily geared towards larger, more mature companies and established universities and research organisations. Several respondents noted that innovation instruments under Horizon 2020 do not sufficiently reflect the specificities of the innovation process, for instance that academic excellence is not essential. An overall lack of coordination and overlaps between individual innovation instruments were also a frequently voiced criticisms.

Very frequent were comments about the entire landscape of EU innovation support being too difficult to navigate. Several respondents explicitly stated that more important than the gaps in the funding offer is the difficulty of finding the right products.

"There could always be fewer gaps. But I think the main problem is accessing and knowing about the help that already exists."

University, UK

#### 5. MAIN FUNCTIONS OF A POTENTIAL EUROPEAN INNOVATION COUNCIL

Respondents were asked which issues a potential EIC could address in order to inform future discussions about the about its possible structure. Five options were given: 'bring together and simplify access to current EU innovation support', 'fill in gaps in current EU innovation support', 'provide strategic advice to improve the innovation environment', 'other' and 'do not know'. Respondents could select all that apply and also provide additional comments.

'Filling in gaps' had the highest count, closely followed by 'simplification of access' and 'strategic advice'.



Figure 6: What issues could a potential EIC address?

Looking further at the combinations respondents preferred, 43% indicated that the EIC should have all three functions, 17% that it should simplify access and fill gaps, 11% that it should fill gaps and 7% indicated that it should only provide advice. There are no significant differences among stakeholder groups in their views on this issue.

#### 5.1 How to simplify access

"Simplify rules and regulations, simplify documentation/paperwork. If we have to spend more time on paperwork than on projects/business then something is wrong with rules. USA or Asia don't have those obstacles that is why they have Amazon, Google, Facebook, Alibaba etc. and Europe doesn't."

Entrepreneur, Croatia

European value need not lie in each individual project, but in the programme as a whole. Several respondents pointed out that the overall offer of instruments it too complex and disjointed and that some instruments should be merged to avoid overlap. In this context the instruments that respondents referred to included the SME instrument, Fast Track to Innovation, FET Open, inducement

Respondents were also asked to comment on how such functions could be implemented. With regards to simplification of access to support, many respondents argued, in general terms, that support mechanisms must be adapted to the fast-moving market place. The majority of respondents stated that there is a need for further simplification of administrative application rules and requirements, and acceleration of the time to grant. Some argued that single applicants should be eligible that the

> ".. apply a more private sector approach to the way in which ideas are accessed, assessed, and evaluated. To achieve this means the Council should seek to attract more talent from the private sector that has experience with structuring and channelling such support."

> > Business association, UK

prizes, innovation procurement, EIT activities, ERC Proof of Concept, as well as Eurostars and the InnovFin financial schemes.

А large number of respondents suggested that improvements are particularly needed the in wav information about the support available is communicated and that the user interface must be substantially improved to enable innovators to navigate to the most appropriate option quickly and efficiently. Many suggested

"By bringing together the information on current instruments supporting innovation under a single platform, in first instance. Then to critically screen the success of the current instruments in promoting disruptive innovation."

Research institute, Romania

that there should be a single point of access, where information is presented in 'entrepreneurs' language' and visitors are sent directly to the appropriate instrument based on their needs and/or profile. A number of stakeholders called for more hands-on assistance including a helpdesk, webinars etc.

Several respondents argued that in order to simplify access, innovation support programmes should not have pre-defined themes and that applicants should be solely judged on the quality of their proposals. Permanently open calls with rolling deadlines were suggested by a number of respondents.

#### 5.2 How to fill in gaps

"[Provide] personalized grants for R&D regarding disruptive innovations or respective grants for single organizations (cf. ERCgrants).

Research institute, Germany

order fill the In to gaps, many stakeholders called for dedicated calls or earmarked budget for disruptive innovation and improved access to risk financing for scale-ups. A suggestion to establish an 'EU-wide venture capital fund' was mentioned several times. Some suggested that the European Research Council should cover projects with lower

Technology Readiness Levels (1-3) and the European Investment Bank and European Investment Fund the higher levels (7 and higher), with the EIC focusing on projects in between. Several contributors called for inducement prizes that can attract outside innovators and public procurement of innovative solutions.

Several contributors offered ideas for new instruments such as crowd-funding platforms where public and private funding are matched, special support for cross-border risk-capital investment, 'soft' loans', 'personalised grants', grants convertible to loans or grants with royalty, grants convertible to equity or an 'accelerator' programme. A significant number of stakeholders across all stakeholder categories emphasised that the offer of support should be more joined up,

"I think many startups are not aware of the support the EU provides. Just getting the word out there would bring huge value to many startups."

> Private company, Netherlands

allowing for companies to find suitable support as they progress through the innovation cycle. In the words of one respondent, there should be "a seamless path

"Having worked both on DARPAfunded projects in the US, and EUfunded projects in Belgium, I can attest that the former are much more conducive to real innovation and risk-taking. Some suggestions: more freedom upfront, funding based on track record, competitive evaluations."

Business, Belgium

from grants to loans and venture capital". A few stakeholders suggested that funded companies that were successful should be eligible for follow-up funding.

A number of respondents argued that to fill gaps, existing instruments should be amended in some The SME way. instrument was mentioned in several respondents' replies. It was noted that the fact that the European Investment Fund operates through intermediaries, is

problematic in some countries, where the commercial banking sector is weaker or more risk averse. Other suggestions were that funding should be allocated to individuals and that it should not be restricted by thematic calls. Other suggestions for filling in gaps included: enabling citizen-driven innovation, greater focus on nontechnological innovation, provision of data and monitoring, interviews as a means of evaluating projects, small grants for a larger number of players, dedicated support for SMEs to guide them through the application process, one-stop-shop or single point of access to information, best-practice exchange, mentoring, training and management support.

In this section respondents also frequently argued for the need to strengthen links across all relevant bodies: between national and EU programmes, between the industry and academia and between national innovation centres and infrastructures, and between innovative SMEs. Some argued that an EIC should support innovation or company incubation in universities and other research infrastructures. A number of respondents warned against establishing an initiative that would try to address everything and instead recommended narrowing the scope.

#### 5.3 What kind of strategic advice

The opinions on what kind of strategic advice should be provided by a possible EIC were varied. The majority view across all stakeholder categories was that an EIC could provide strategic advice to the EU and national governments in order to create an EUwide innovation-friendly regulatory

"[Policy-makers and innovators] still do not understand one another well; they speak different languages and inhabit different universe. The European Innovation Council could serve as translation."

Business, Netherlands

"EIC could have a policy development and advising role by formulating a Disruptive Innovation Action Plan. EIC could give a new definition of innovation for Europe, a new vision on where Europe expects to be in the next 20-30 years ..."

Research sector, Czech Republic

framework. Others argued that the advice function should have a wider scope and also be targeted at regional and local authorities or even financial institutions, industry clusters, young entrepreneurs, start-up incubators and trade unions. A common view was that an EIC could, in fact, have a dual focus – governments and institutions on the one hand and innovators on the other. Some argued that the strategic role of an EIC should also involve the formulation of a longterm innovation strategy for the EU, build alliances between relevant institutions and become the 'voice of innovators' in the EU, advocating for innovation and its importance for economic growth and highlighting best practices.

"The EIC could help to identify "best practices" in start-up and up-scale funding / support in the EU and promote or help coordinate/multiply these best practice approaches."

Business, Germany

A smaller number of respondents argued that this function should focus on distributing the funding available, and making sure that proposals for disruptive, market creating innovation are prioritised.

#### 6. OTHER POSSIBLE FUNCTIONS OF A EUROPEAN INNOVATION COUNCIL

Suggestions for other services a potential EIC could provide included: advice on regulatory reform, mentoring and coaching, incubation of new ideas, formulation of a long-term innovation strategy, brokerage and networking, introduction of new financing instruments, promotion of an innovation culture including risk-taking,

Networking. Create co-working spaces. Create a web/network for innovation and publication of ideas. Simplify the demand of patents.

Business, Italy

promotion of inclusion and diversity, marketing of EU innovation and international outreach and enhancing cooperation between the research and private sector community. A summary table of truncated suggestions grouped by category of stakeholder and theme is included in Annex 2.

#### 7. POTENTIAL CONCERNS

Overall the EIC idea was widely supported by respondents across all stakeholder groups. In addition, a number of concerns were raised, notably the possibility that an EIC could add another layer of complexity and bureaucracy to the funding application process. Many national innovation funding agencies stressed that the EIC should not overlap with but complement their work. Several organisations

"Any future European Innovation Council should work closely with current national innovation agencies to avoid duplicating existing activities by focusing on EU-wide socio-economic challenge."

Business, UK

argued that EIC should not be a new 'brick and mortar' institution. A second common concern related to the EIC budget, in particular research organisations and research representative bodies argued that the EIC should not be funded with resources allocated to research, in particular the budgets earmarked in the Excellent Science and Societal Challenges pillars under Horizon 2020. Lastly, several respondents highlighted that incremental innovation is just as important as radical innovation and therefore that the EIC should not only focus on the latter.

#### 8. CONCLUSIONS

The majority of respondents to the call for ideas across all stakeholder categories were concerned about the lack of disruptive, market creating innovation in Europe. Overall, the respondents were positive about the European Innovation Council idea although some voiced concerns, especially regarding the possibility of increased complexity and less resources being available for basic research. Respondents called for a European Innovation Council that would bring together the various elements of EU innovation support, provide clear signposting and make the entire process of applying for funding administratively leaner and more agile. Respondents also emphasised the need for strategic advice, for example to improve regulation, policy frameworks and practices, and to serve as the voice of innovators in Europe. Many suggested that a potential European Innovation Council could go beyond the suggested three main functions and also support other services for innovators such as brokerage, networking and mentoring.

The European Commission will use this input in its upcoming policy development work on innovation. The dialogue with stakeholders will continue in order to obtain deeper insight into some of the issues raised. Collectively, all these inputs will also be used to take forward improvements within the second half of the existing Horizon 2020 programme in order to further simplify and maximise the impact of the programme. Other elements will be considered in the preparation of the next Framework Programme.

#### ANNEX 1: LIST OF PUBLISHED POSITION PAPERS

- Aalborg University
- Aalto University
- Aarhus University
- ACARE Advisory Council for Aviation Research and Innovation in Europe
- ACI French Association of Innovation Consultancies
- AFPC French Competitiveness Clusters Alliance
- AHSNS Academic Health Science Networks
- AIRTO Association of Innovation, Research and Technology Organisations, UK
- Aix-Marseille University
- Alliance for Biomedical Research in Europe
- APRE, Italy
- Association of European Renewable Energy Research Centres
- ASTER Innovation Agency of Emilia-Romagna
- ATTRACT Innovation Consortium
- Bayer
- BDI Federation of German Industries
- Bpifrance (EN)
- Bpifrance (FR)
- Bruno Kessler Foundation, Trento
- Business Angels Europe
- Business Europe
- Catalan Government
- CDTI Center for Industrial and Technological Development, Spain
- Cefic European Chemical Industry Council
- CEN and CENELEC
- CERCA Research Centres Catalonia
- CESAER, Eurotech, Cluster, IDEA, Nordic Five, 50 Universities
- CNR National Research Council of Italy
- Coventry University
- Design Council UK
- DLR German Aeronautics and Space Research Centre
- Druid Collective Initiative of the Global Young Leaders
- EARTO European Association of Research and Technology Organisations

- East of England Europe and International Panel
- EBE European Biopharmaceutical Enterprises
- ECIU European Consortium of Innovative Universities
- eFIP European Forum for Innovation Policies
- EFPIA European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations
- EI Enterprise Ireland
- EIB
- EIDD Design for All
- EIROforum
- EIT
- EIT KIC InnoEnergy
- ENoLL European Network of Living Labs
- EPS European Physical Society
- EREA European Research Establishments in Aeronautics
- ERRIN European Regions
  Research and Innovation Network
- ESTEP European Technology
  Platform for Steel
- Estonia Ministry of Education and Research, Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, Estonian Research Council
- ETH Zurich
- EU-Life Research Centres
- EUA European University Association
- EUCAR
- Eupportunity Consultancy
- EUREKA
- Euroalliages European Association of Ferro-Alloys and Silicon Producers
- Eurocadres the Council of European Professional and Managerial Staff
- FFG Austrian Research Promotion Agency
- Five Finnish Universities
- Flemish Department of Economy, Science & Innovation and Partners
- Formas Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development
- Fraunhofer
- Fraunhofer Presentation
- Giuri Research Group, Italy
- Helmholtz Association

- I3s Institute for Research and Innovation in Health, Porto
- Ibec Irish Business Organisation
- Innovate UK
- Innovation Norway
- Ireland Dept of Jobs Enterprise and Innovation
- Irish Research Council
- KEPA Business and Cultural Development Centre, Greece
- KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
- KTN the Knowledge Transfer Network UK
- LDS Venture Capital
- Leibniz
- LERU League of European Research Universities
- Manuel Heitor Minister for Science, Technology and Higher Education, Government of Portugal
- Mov'Eo Mobility and Automotive R&D Competitiveness Cluster
- Nesta
- Norwegian University of Science and Technology
- NSAI Innovation Management Standard Committee of Ireland
- Patents Factory Poland
- Philips
- RCN Research Council Norway
- RCUK Research Councils UK
- Science Europe
- Sciencebusiness
- Silicon Europe
- Sisvel Technology
- Sonae Portugese Retail Company
- Sothic Bioscience Ltd
- Swiss Innovation Promotion Agency and the State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation
- Technology Agency of the Czech Republic
- Tekes Finnish Innovation Agency
- Tyndall Institute Ireland
- UAS4EUROPE Universities of Applied Sciences 4 Europe
- UK Royal Academy of Engineering
- ULB Université Libre de Bruxelles
- Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
- University of Copenhagen
- University of Strathclyde
- Vanguard Initiative

- VDMA German Industrial Association
- Vinnova the Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation Systems
- VRWI Flemish Council for Science and Innovation
- Wetsus European Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Water Technology
- White Rose Brussels Leeds, Sheffield and York Universities

| Stakeholder<br>group   | Number of contributions | Themes                           | Suggestions (frequency in brackets)   |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Private sector<br>(including<br>financiers and<br>trade<br>associations) | 55                      | Regulation                       | Remove regulatory barriers/harmonise law (6x), simplify patenting, simplify EU tax law, tax breaks for SMEs   |
|  |                         | Networking<br>and<br>mentoring   | Networking/brokerage<br>events/matchmaking/co-working spaces<br>(9x), mentoring (2x), assist business<br>development  |
|  |                         | Approach and culture             | Promote user/citizen/employee innovation<br>(3x), vision/strategy, promote creativity,<br>take into account differences among<br>countries, a less risk-averse funding<br>approach/enable funding without track<br>record (2x), foster innovation culture,<br>encourage diversity, focus on 'valley of<br>death', focus on 'man on the moon'<br>projects, focus on high-risk ventures,<br>invest in 'crazy' ideas |
|  |                         | Funding and<br>funding<br>reform | More funding (3x), better venture capital<br>strategy (2x), incentives for banks to take<br>on more risk (2x), improve evaluation<br>(4x), in-person presentations/pitching<br>(2x), remove thematic restrictions for<br>funding (2x), reform existing initiatives,<br>innovative funding, promote and monitor<br>crowdfunding and alternative finance  |
|  |                         | Miscellaneous                    | Promotion of innovation in education from<br>a young age, pan-European incubator,<br>better impact monitoring to convince<br>taxpayers, appoint EU advisors for<br>international companies, avoid premature<br>evaluation   |
| Research<br>sector   | 52                      | Regulation                       | Regulatory reform (6x), champion the innovation principle, IP law reform  |
|  |                         | Approach and culture             | Safeguard sustainability, gender equality,<br>diversity and fairness (3x), foster a risk-<br>taking culture (3x), foster quality and<br>entrepreneurial spirit in education and<br>research (2x), support social innovation<br>(2x), promote creativity including in  |

19

|               |     | Funding and<br>funding<br>reform<br>Miscellaneous | education, vision/strategy, global<br>outreach, support outcome-driven<br>research, reward excellence and impact on<br>market, foster innovation in education,<br>encourage holistic approach to innovation<br>More support for small companies and<br>projects, more investment, support<br>international consortia, strategic<br>planning/definition of calls, get rid of calls,<br>coordination and integration of existing<br>entities and instruments, integrate<br>innovation policy and funding, divert<br>funding towards high potential ventures<br>Act as a link between the Commission, EIB<br>and ECB, central innovation hub, bridge<br>between national funding programmes,<br>create innovation hub/parks across |
|---------------|-----|---|---|
|               |     |   | Europe, support hotspots, innovation<br>helpdesk, advise on innovation centres<br>across European Commission  |
| Public sector | 11  | Regulation  | Policy reform (2x)  |
|               |     | Funding   | Venture capital   |
|               |     | Miscellaneous                                     | Security issues, cultivating talent,<br>retraining of workforce, multi-actor<br>innovation projects, link innovation hubs,<br>bring together good examples, one-stop-<br>shop   |
| Other         | 12  | Funding and<br>funding<br>reform                  | Make grant mechanism more flexibile,<br>align all existing instruments and monitor<br>their performance   |
|               |     | Culture and approach                              | Promote diversity and inclusion, promote EU innovation internationally  |
|               |     | Miscellaneous                                     | Permanently open doors to hear new<br>ideas, reduce exodus of young<br>researchers, work closely with the ERC,<br>foster demand-driven innovation,<br>understand innovation in all EU member<br>states  |
| Total replies | 136 | 1   |   |
| L             | 1   |   |   |

#### HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

#### Free publications:

- one copy:
  - via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu);
- more than one copy or posters/maps: from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent\_en.htm); from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index\_en.htm); by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index\_en.htm) or calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (\*).
   (\*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

#### Priced publications:

• via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu).

The European Commission ran a call for ideas between 16 February and 29 April 2016 to gather stakeholders' views on disruptive, market-creating innovation, on gaps in the current innovation support landscape and on the potential remit of a European Innovation Council (EIC). A total of 1022 replies and 183 supporting documents and position papers were received. This report summarises the outcomes of the consultation exercise.

Research and Innovation policy

