Joint Programming Initiative Urban Europe
11th Meeting of the Governing Board
Summary Conclusions

Date & time: Wednesday, 19 September 2012, 9:00h - 18:00h

Venue: Vienna University of Technology

Agenda: (all agenda items will be followed by discussion)

1. Opening and welcome [TBN]
2. Procedures [TBA]
3. GB update [TBN]
4. Status Work Programme and budget outlook – including Pilot Call(s) [TBD]
5. Action Plan towards SRA [TBA]
6. CSA [TBD]
7. Policy-related issues [TBD]
8. Cooperation and international outreach [TBD]
9. Management information [TBN]
10. Next meetings [TBD/TBN]

Legend: TBN: to be noted; TBD: to be discussed; TBA: to be approved.

1. Opening and welcome [TBN]

The meeting is officially opened. GB Members from 11 countries are present, with apologies from Ireland, Malta and Turkey, as well as from Portugal and Spain. Belgium just recently sent their letter of accession to the JPI and is welcomed as full member of the JPI Urban Europe.

2. Procedures [TBA]

a. Adoption of the Agenda

The draft Agenda is adopted.

b. Verification of the action points from last meeting

All action points have been implemented, a few points are connected to reports by GB Members but will be addressed during the meeting.

c. Adoption of the minutes of last meeting

The summary conclusions of the last meeting are adopted with the following amendment of the report on Agenda Item 6 (Pilot Call): 'The Norwegian participation in a second Pilot Call is likely if sufficient countries join with a meaningful budget.'

3. GB update [TBN]

This item is shifted to be discussed as part of the next item 'Status Work Programme'.

4. Status Work Programme and budget outlook [TBD]

a. Management Summary of latest activities

- The first joint call of the JPI UE is now closed since 18 September 2012; A brief recap of the process leading to the call:
  - GB approves a draft of the thematic framework prepared by the MB in December 2011;
  - Thematic framework for the joint calls of the pilot phase made available to the general public in January 2012, and handed over to the participating funding agencies;
  - Work on the the thematic focus and scope, and the administrative frame of the call between January and June 2012;
  - The MB's role in the creation of the call text was limited to assisting the agencies in the process of their collaboration. In this way the autonomy of the funding agencies could be respected. So far this is considered to have been a very successful process by all involved.
- The JPI UE budget is currently based on the annual fees (€ 5000) of all participating countries. Until a proposal for the CSA has been successful in the evaluation and a contract signed with the EC, there won't be any costs commited beyond this cash budget.

- The MB proposes to create a format called "inter-conference workshops" with the purpose of ensuring that all workshops or conferences done in the name of, or with financial support from the JPI UE fit in the JPI UE concept. If money is put aside for hosting a JPI UE-related workshop, the pre-condition would be that specific added exposure, influence on the agenda and 'back-learning' would be guaranteed in order to ensure valuable outputs for the JPI UE.

The MB presents a proposal dubbed a 'Panel of Cities' (see document accompanying the Agenda Item 4a). The idea is based on the supposition that if one defines a very strict and specific geographic scope, it will be easy to collect or generate high-level/meta knowledge. In the JPI Urban Europe case, 5 to 10 European cities could be recruited as subjects for committed research over a longer period of time. JPI UE could use this as a specific USP because as it would be very attractive for researchers to be able to access a pool of committed cities open to interviews and with open databases, etc. ;

In the discussion, concerns are expressed relating to potential negative publicity for the recruited panel cities, e.g. if research raises 'problematic' topics. The restricted geographical scope (only 5 to 10 cities) is another concern for some GB members, who fear that not all JPI UE members might want to spend money on research conducted on just a few cities. Some delegates advise to work with existing panels and networks such as the C40 Cities (Climate Leadership Group), and explore links to other initiatives such as the EII on Smart Cities and Communities of the SET-Plan, etc., before implementing new ones. Notwithstanding the question of the size of the panel, the overall idea of having a set of committed cities attached to JPI UE is considered attractive. It is felt that cities (and citizens) could act as important sounding boards for JPI UE, given the 'human-centred' approach chosen by the JPI. Also, in view of a systemic approach to the urban innovation cycle (testing technology, living labs concept as specific interest /link to industry), working with a dedicated sample of cities seems attractive.

→ **The MB is asked to further develop the 'Panel of Cities' idea, given the above discussion.**

b. Status of Call I (report by FFG)

The call closed on the 18th (the day before the Governing Board meeting) and proposals are still being processed as the meeting is proceeding. 59 proposals have been submitted, asking for a funding budget of more than 52 M€. After an eligibility check by the call secretariat, the evaluation of the proposals will take place on 6th November, with a meeting of the involved funding agencies to follow on the 13th of November. Any allocation will be strictly based on the quality of the proposals, reflected in the ranking provided by the evaluation panel, and the availability of national budgets. JPI UE countries may of course decide to increase their respective budget for this first call.

c. Status of setting up Call II (timeline, topics, budgets)

The great interest in Call I is a good omen for a second call. Wim Hafkamp (MB) emphasises that current discussions among the funding agencies and countries show that it might be too early for issuing a second Call already in 2012. Besides still having to evaluate and analyse the process and content of Pilot Call I, the participation of several JPI UE members is still uncertain. It is considered important that a realistic timeframe is adopted for setting up a second call.

Wim Hafkamp goes on to propose that the aim for a budget for the second call should be set high (10 – 15 million). This depends on finding matches among participating countries and funding agencies. The budget is also crucial for the credibility of any call for proposals.

→ **The MB shall produce a realistic and attractive timetable for advancing the second joint call, including ideas for the necessary lobbying and budget, etc.**

d. Update on the Megatrends project (see accompanying ppt.)

A first workshop involving experts from several participating contries has been held on the day before the GB meeting. In the discussion following the presentation, delegates share that they would like to see more programmes/intitiatives, such as ESPON, involved in this project.

→ **The MB is asked to make a proposal on how ESPON, as well as links with FP7 (SSH,) and the EU-China collaboration, can be involved in the megatrends project.**

e. UERA (Urban Europe Research Alliance)

The current French proposal for the structure and contents of the UERA is based on the assumption that potential participants should be research operators (RTOs and Universities) and cover the supply-side of knowledge. Gérard Hégron (IFSTTAR / FR) shares that the UERA could function as an incubator for European projects in reponse to UE joint calls, as well as for foresight studies. It could also contribute to the SRA. This is where innovation and valorisation could be established, as well as the creation of transnational joint research infrastructures following the example of the EERA (European Energy Research Alliance of the SET-Plan), and, if appropriate, international cooperation beyond Europe. In the discussion, concerns are being expressed, that the presented organizational structure is a little on the heavy side, and that, like for the EERA, incentives should be created for the RTOs to come up with a research plan based on their own in-kind contributions. The question which remains is, whether the urban research area has enough strong actors, and a critical mass of a 'specialised RTO community', which could gather enough momentum for such a joint effort.

In the end, agreement is reached that there is a strong added value of a UERA, especially since, unlike in the EERA case, urban Europe is a very transversal theme. Various competencies related to urban

development must be bridged; there are no technological competencies geared specifically to cities. Compared to EERA, which is focused on energy RTD, urban development addresses a different set of policy and research phases in the innovation cycle, so bringing researchers together is of utmost importance.

As regards the budget for the UERA, Gérard Hégron proposes to use funds from a future CSA for the set-up phase. The operational phase could potentially be (co-) financed with support from a COST Action. A first meeting could already take place at the end of this year, or at the beginning of 2013. The idea is to invite members and representatives from RTOs and universities, and do the first workshop with input from a few GB members.

→ **The MB shall provide a clear structure and proposal for the UERA looking specifically into incentives and expectations.**
→ **GB members/NCPs are asked to provide by the end of November a list of potential members from their countries which should be part of the UERA.**

f. Cooperation with COST

There have been negotiations with the COST Office in 2011 on a potential collaboration, where COST would offer their expertise and services, and potentially travel money for researchers in order to manage the exchange of the JPI Urban Europe with individual stakeholders (i.e. the workshops of the Urban Europe Forum and/or the UERA). COST facilitates its Actions, which are thematic groups of scientists, by organising their meetings, together with a very efficient management of the reimbursement of their travels. In their nature, the COST Actions could be compared with the stakeholder activities planned within the JPI Urban Europe.

Unfortunately no final conclusion could be reached with COST, because they were, and still are, in their own negotiations with the European Commission and the European Council on how to secure their future financing in the new period after the end of 2013.

g. Upcoming SAB meeting

Carl Hamilton (Chair of the MB) presents the Agenda for the upcoming inaugural SAB meeting (see presentation accompanying the Agenda), which is planned for 21 September 2012 with 7 out of 11 current members present. It includes the plans of getting the feedback of the SAB members on the themes of the second joint call and inter-conference workshop scheme proposed under agenda point 4. As the SAB members are all very generous with time and effort, it is crucial that JPI UE respectfully treat their advice and input and make proper use of them. The advisory role of the SAB is particularly seen in the megatrend debate (within and beyond Europe), future Joint Calls and a long-term vision. Ingof Schädler proposes a joint meeting on content between the GB and the SAB sometime in Spring 2013.

→ **The Management Board is asked to facilitate the planning of a joint meeting between GB and SAB in the context of one of the next Governing Board meetings before summer 2013.**

5. Action Plan towards SRA [TBA]

Carl Hamilton explains that the SRA is the core document of JPI UE and should describe 'who we are, why we are doing this and where we are going'. In short, the SRA is the high-level document used to illustrate the essence and profile of JPI UE, and will need to specify WHAT will be done in the JPI UE, as well as HOW it will be done. The 10min JPI UE presentation presented last time (and again today in an updated version, see item 5b. below) should include the 'light-version' of the SRA.

a. Updated action plan

First of all, a proposal for the SRA process is outlined by Carl Hamilton looking into how JPI UE will relate to academic research (EURA, etc), policy-oriented associations (EUKN, EUROCITIES) and mission-oriented programmes (Smart Cities, URBACT, etc). The discussion highlights the importance of having the national funding agencies and ministries represented in the JPI involved in the SRA process. The proposal is to develop the SRA in parallel with all other JPI UE activities. The establishment of a core SRA team is proposed (5 – 10 persons) tasked with drafting several 'generations' of SRA drafts. Besides this team, national dialogues must be initiated by the NCPs in order to capture national priorities.

→ **GB members are asked to propose persons/organisations to be involved in the drafting of the SRA as well as in the national dialogues which will feed into the SRA.**

The timeframe for the development of the SRA is proposed to be from late 2012 until halfway into 2014. Concerns are raised, however, that this timeframe might be too long. A roadmap, and implementation strategy is seen as urgent. Another point is about the relationship between the contents of the SRA and the themes addressed in Horizon 2020 (H2020). Some arguments focus on a need for complementarity between JPIs and H2020, which would position the JPIs as 'content-givers' for H2020. Others emphasise the crosscutting nature of the urban themes, which address aspects of many challenges mentioned in H2020, and the need to clearly reach out to cities and industry (e.g. by means of the living lab concept). In addition, the importance of optimising RDI collaboration and harmonization among the Member States is highlighted. Finally everyone agrees that, anyway, the main themes of the JPI Urban Europe will have to be clearly stated and argued in the CSA proposal in a transparent way.

→ **The MB, with the NCPs as sounding board will propose an indicative summary of the SRA with more focus for the first GB meeting in 2013. Content should also cover how to reach out to industry and cities.**

b. Essence and profile

Carl Hamilton (Chair of the MB) briefly outlines the 10min JPI UE presentation which he had already presented during the last GB meeting, and explains the changes which he made based on the comments received. The new document contains a specific mention of the institutions (ministries and funding agencies) representing their respective countries in the JPI UE. Two issues are seen as especially important to be discussed further: (1) What is the scope of the JPI UE? and (2) What is the scale of JPI UE? Terminology and instruments should be defined as clearly as possible.

→ **The GB members are asked for additional comments and feedback on the 10min presentation.**

6. CSA [TBD]

Dimitri Corpakis (EC) explains that the Regions of Knowledge Work Programme 2013 is currently being modified to include a call for JPI UE, which is expected to be openend by the end of December 2012.

There are a number of issues to be considered for drafting a second CSA proposal:
- Desired participation: All members of the JPI UE should feel responsible for the CSA. Organisations participating on behalf the JPI UE countries should be well recognised organisations (such as RTOs, or funding agencies) with a high degree of expertise, and/or scientific record in their field. It is important to consider and argue why a particular organisation should be picked for a specific task, as well as why a particular consortium of organisations is deemed the most suitable/excellent for the CSA. Also, as the work of several organisations within the JPI UE is being contributed as in-kind contribution by the participating countries, the question arises, whether organisations can be included in the CSA without actually being funded out of it. In the end, given the administrative burdens, Denmark opts out of participating in the proposal.

→ **The MB will find out whether it is a possibility (and whether it is effective) for participants to be included in the CSA proposal without actually being funded out of it.**

- How to present/describe JPI UE in the proposal: The level of detail is up for discussion. In any case the proposal text should be further developed using the 10min presentation as a starting point, and taking into account that the CSA proposal will be the only source of information available for the assessment by external evaluators who are often working on a tight schedule. It will therefore need to be extremely clear and well-argued from beginning to end. To address the evaluation criteria will be paramount: Scientific & Technological Excellence (state-of-the-art, concepts and objectives), Implementation (management and financial plans) and Impact (contributions to European policy goals, specifically referring to the wording of the call text).

→ **The MB will schedule a first meeting on the CSA for late October/early November. In the meantime GB members will give input and offer their views regarding the process and necessary content of the CSA proposal.**
→ **First ideas on the actual contents of the CSA proposal will be made available to the GB as the basis of a first discussion at the next GB meeting (Note: the actual Call Text will be officially published at the end of December, and be open until March 2013).**

7. Policy-related issues [TBD]

a. UE and EIP

Hans-Günther Schwarz gives an update on the new European Innovation Partnership on Smart Cities and Communities (EIP SCC). The European Commission proposal on EIP mentions JPI UE as an actor to be involved. The concrete role/contribution of the JPI UE will be decided in the next several months, as well as its role in the EU-China Urbanisation Partnership started in early 2012.

→ **The GB will be kept informed the progress of the EIP and the EU-China Urbanisation Partnership.**

b. Structural funds

Dimitri Corpakis (EC) gives a presentation on the Structural Funds of the EU, highlighting that these are being managed subsidiarily by the European regions, and controlled by the EC via a closely monitored audit scheme. Cohesion policy aims to alleviate significant regional disparities in Europe. The new Cohesion policy package is geared specifically towards delivering on the goals of the Europe2020 strategy. The most important objectives are the strengthening of innovation, SMEs, and the reduction of CO_2, with 5% of each national budget explicitly being earmarked for cities. The bulk of funding will go to less-developed regions, and provisions have been made by the EC to enable such regions or countries to contribute to joint call budgets out of these funds.

The national goals and instruments used for the next funding period should be discussed in a stakeholder dialogue and reflect the above-mentioned, general requirements. They will be laid down in Partnership contract, which every country will sign with the EC. Dimitri Corpakis advises GB members to get involved in their respective national processes responsible for the Structural Funds, in order to make sure that contrete steps are taken to ensure the 5% reserved for cities.

→ **The MB will further look into Structural Funds and how they can be used within the JPI UE framework.**

c. Expansion

Wim Hafkamp further elaborates on efforts to get especially Central and Eastern European countries on board as JPI UE members. Based on conversations he had with Jan Olbrycht (Polish Chair of the URBAN Intergroup of the European Parliament), Wim Hafkamp proposes to get in touch with a Polish DG. He goes on to observe that many programmes such as Horizon2020 aren't very accessible to research groups from middle and eastern Europe. How to build capacity and strengthen UE as representative for cities in the whole of Europe? How to use the Structural Funds?

As much time and effort has already gone into getting countries from Central and Eastern Europe on board, it is felt that it is crucial to first respond to key JPI UE issues on essence, profile and vision. This will be important for approaching and informing potential new members of JPI UE.

8. Cooperation and international outreach [TBD]

Oliver Diehl stresses that outreach to countries like China and India is crucial. He offers to be part of a team looking into this.

Reports by the MB are delivered on the following upcoming activities:

   a. EURA 2012 Conference, Vienna
   b. EU-China Mayors Forum, Brussels
   c. REGIO Open Days, Brussels (already fully booked)
   d. EU-China Innovation Conference/Seminar, Beijing
   e. Workshops organized by SAB members
   f. Workshop on the 22nd of October at the University of Amsterdam, related to the relevant activites of the European Investment Bank (EIB) geared towards cities

9. Management information [TBN]
a. New e-mail addresses for the MB and Programme Office:

- wim.hafkamp@jpi-urbaneurope.eu
- carl.hamilton@jpi-urbaneurope.eu
- margit.noll@jpi-urbaneurope.eu
- hans-gunther.schwarz@jpi-urbaneurope.eu
- hester.menninga@jpi-urbaneurope.eu
  anneloes.vaniwaarden@jpi-urbaneurope.eu

10. Next meetings [TBD/TBN]

Belgium will be the next country hosting a 1 ½ day GB meeting. Proposed dates are end of November and between 5 and 7 December 2012.

→ **Hans-Günther Schwarz (liaison GB-MB) will send out a reminder with the the chosen dates after consulting with the members of the GB.**

AOB:
- Dutch Governing Board delegates Olaf Cornielje and Ad van Ommen (both from the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment) will no longer be representing the Netherlands in the Governing Board. They are thanked for their their important contribution to setting up the JPI UE in the initial phase. and, both Two colleagues from the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, will take over JPI UE-related responsibilities, with Henk Snoeken serving as the delegate and Henk Meeldijk as his alternate.
- Anssi Salonen (RYM Oy) announces ideas for pooling private and public funds in a common pot. He will present this during the next meeting.
- Yves de Weerdt states that JPI UE is now officially launched on Twitter: #urbaneurope is claimed.
- Final update of the day on Call I: 60 project proposals have been submitted, with a total proposed budget of 66 million EUR. The budget requested in these 60 projects is 52.5 million EUR. The third call topic has proved to be the most popular. Netherlands, Austria and Swedish participants submitted the most proposals. The eligibility check will be completed next week.

Annex: Participants of the meeting

Attendance 11th Governing Board Meeting JPI Urban Europe, Vienna (by name of country)

Members of the Governing Board

Ms	Isabella Eiselt	Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Research	Austria
Mr	Ingolf Schädler	Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology	Austria
Mr	Yves de Weerdt	VITO	Belgium
Ms	Katerina Kari	Research Promotion Foundation	Cyprus
Ms	Anne Munk Christiansen	The Danish Council for Strategic Research	Denmark
Mr	Ilmari Absetz	Tekes	Finland
Ms	Angelica Roschier	Tekes	Finland
Mr	Anssi Salonen	RYM Oy	Finland
Mr	Gérard Hégron	Ifsttar	France
Mr	Oliver Diehl	Federal Ministry of Education and Research	Germany
Ms	Paola Clerici Maestosi	Ministry for Education, Universities and Research	Italy
Ms	Valentina Stefanini	Ministry for Education, Universities and Research	Italy
Mr	Olaf Cornielje	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment	Netherlands
Mr	Henk Meeldijk	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment	Netherlands
Mr	Henk Snoeken	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment	Netherlands
Ms	Anne Beate Tangen	Ministry of Environment	Norway
Ms	Stine Madland Kaasa	The Research Council of Norway	Norway
Mr	Jonas Enge	The Research Council of Norway	Norway
Ms	Rebecka Engström	VINNOVA – Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation	Sweden

National experts, observers or participants from the Management Board

Mr	Johannes Riegler	Austrian Institute of Technology	Austria
Mr	Hans-Günther Schwarz	Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology	Austria
Mr	Wim Hafkamp	NWO	Netherlands
Ms	Anneloes van Iwaarden	European Metropolitan network Institute (EMI)	Netherlands
Mr	Carl Hamilton	VINNOVA	Sweden