



Council of the European Union  
General Secretariat

Brussels, 05 November 2025

---

---

**Interinstitutional files:**  
**2018/0225 (COD)**  
**2025/0544 (CNS)**

---

---

WK 14506/2025 INIT

LIMITE

RECH  
COMPET  
IND  
MI  
EDUC  
TELECOM  
ENER

ENV  
CLIMA  
AGRI  
TRANS  
SAN  
BIOTECH  
CADREFIN  
CODEC

*This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.*

## CONTRIBUTION

---

From: General Secretariat of the Council  
To: Working Party on Research

---

N° prev. doc.: 13653/1/25 REV 1  
N° Cion doc.: ST 11765 2025 REV 1; ST 11749 2025 INIT

---

Subject: Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL establishing Horizon Europe, the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, for the period 2028-2034 laying down its rules for participation and dissemination, and repealing Regulation (EU) 2021/695

Proposal for a COUNCIL DECISION on establishing the Specific Programme implementing Horizon Europe - the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation for the period 2028-2034, laying down the rules for participation and dissemination under that Programme, and repealing Decision (EU) 2021/764

- Member States comments on the Competitiveness and Society Pillar including European Partnerships (block 3)

---

Delegations will find attached a table with the Member States comments on the above-mentioned subject.

---

WK 14506/2025 INIT

**LIMITE**

**EN**

**Guidelines to be followed**

Please kindly provide your contributions in the table below.

**Drafting suggestions:** you may use 'track changes'\* or formatting (for example bold-underline for additions and ~~strike-through~~ for deletions, **where necessary, in a different colour**). \*Track changes can only be connected once the cursor is placed in editable areas (Drafting or Comments columns).

To make it feasible to consolidate all contributions, the structure of the table must not be changed, so **no rows can be added or deleted**.

New provisions may only be added in any of the '**existing cells**'.

**Name of document:** please add the **two initials** of your delegation's country followed by a space (to the MS Word document name), followed by any optional text, for example, for Austria: **AT comments on ... .docx**

Thank you for your cooperation!

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>General Comments</b></p>          | <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Ireland welcomes the first Presidency compromise text and the efforts to address the concerns raised by MS.</p> <p>We provide some initial drafting suggestions for consideration.</p> <p>Ireland maintains a general scrutiny reservation as the text evolves – in particular given the interlinkages between FP pillars and the ECF, nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.</p> <p>MT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Malta reiterates its call on the European Commission to publish the communication on the Competitiveness Coordination Tool (CCT) as soon as</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>possible, to better understand the interplay between Horizon Europe and the European Competitiveness Fund regulations.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SE has asked for a scrutiny reservation on the Horizon Europe regulation proposal.</p> |
| <p><b><u>PROPOSAL FOR A REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL ESTABLISHING HORIZON EUROPE, THE FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION, FOR THE PERIOD 2028-2034 LAYING DOWN ITS RULES FOR PARTICIPATION AND DISSEMINATION, AND REPEALING REGULATION (EU) 2021/695</u></b></p> |  |
|   |  |

*Article 11*  
*European Partnerships*

BE

**(Comments):**

The relation with the ECF still needs to be further clarified. If partnerships are set up in the ‘competitiveness’ part of Pillar II, how will the governance be done, priorities set, work programmes written, ... Art 12.11 of the ECF states that to attain objectives of the ECF it may implement activities in public-public or public private partnerships established in the FP. Does this mean that also partnerships could fall under the total remit of the ECF (see also art 12.3)?

LT

**(Comments):**

We agree with other delegations that it is important to ensure that a significant part of funds outside partnerships will be available to collaborative research projects. We would support any additional wording or new para that reflects this provision.

MT

**(Comments):**

Malta reiterates its stance that well-functioning European Partnerships under HE 2021-2027 like PRIMA, not directly tied to the ECF policy windows, should receive support to continue operating beyond 2027. In this regard, we are seeking the answer to the question what mechanism to decide which of the current Partnerships are going to continue their operations under the next Framework Programme will be used and who is going to take these decisions.

NL

**(Comments):**

NL supports the additions made to the text on this article, better reflecting future possibilities for cofunding partnerships, public-public partnerships, in kind contributions and less focus on central financial management. It is important for NL to that these additions are maintained, unless specified otherwise.

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>SK<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SK supports <b>introducing capping for partnerships</b> as it is in the current Horizon Europe programme.</p> <p>SK proposes to expand the criteria for establishing partnerships, recommending that more than 5 MS be required to form a partnership, with a <b>minimum of 10 MS or 40% of all MS</b> involved.</p> <p>Based on the experience so far, we would like to support the continuation of the European Partnerships in next Horizon Europe, based on the continuity when comes to the list of existing and second wave partnerships as well as their research goals. European Partnerships should be <b>open, transparent, and better connected with other programmes</b> to achieve EU goals and deliver real socio-economic impact, while reducing administrative burden and <b>ensuring geographical balance</b> within the partnerships.</p> |
| <p>1. Where necessary to achieve the objectives set out in Article 3, activities under this Regulation may be implemented through European Partnerships, <del>by default</del> <b>in particular</b> through the work programmes. <b><u>A strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships shall be ensured.</u></b></p> | <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>As partnerships can be very complex to establish and manage. In practice, it is difficult to achieve the objectives on financial sustainability and they are often closed clubs. To use resources most efficiently, the use of partnerships should be limited to where no other instrument fits the purpose.</p> <p>Further clarification on the selection of partnerships would be welcome, as it is officially the FP which selects the partnerships, but the money from P2 (competitiveness) is controlled by the ECF. Also the ECF (consideration 13) mentions setting up JUs. How will this work? Will there be room for</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>partnerships outside the four policy windows? Will partnerships also be set up in the Society part of P2?</p> <p>We are in favour of restating the cap of 49.9% of funding from P2 (Society &amp; Competitiveness separately) that can go to partnerships.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We support the new wording. It is important to reduce the number of partnerships.</p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>Where necessary to achieve the objectives set out in Article 3, activities under this Regulation may be implemented through European Partnerships, <del>by default</del> <b><u>in particular</u></b> through the work programmes. <b><u>A strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships shall be ensured.</u></b></p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We find that a reduced number of partnerships would work compared to the present landscape but a strategic and coherent portfolio is the appropriate goal instead of a number.</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>1. Where necessary to achieve the objectives set out in Article 3, activities under this Regulation may be implemented through European Partnerships, <del>by default</del> <b><u>in particular</u></b> through the work programmes. <b><u>A strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships shall be ensured. Transitional measures will be put in place to manage partnerships that are ending.</u></b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Consideration needs to be given to how the existing portfolio of European Partnerships will be managed. Will there be provision for the “sunsetting” of these and will this inform the development of the new portfolio of partnerships post 2027?</p> <p>In order for our R&amp;I stakeholders to engage with European partnerships, the existing and potential portfolios of partnerships need to be identified and agreed so that appropriate and timely planning can happen.</p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Malta supports the inclusion in the text of the reference to a strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships.</p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     1. Where necessary to achieve the objectives set out in Article 3, activities under this Regulation may be implemented through European Partnerships, by default <b><u>in particular</u></b> through the work programmes. <b><u>A strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships shall be ensured.</u></b></p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>In view of the efforts of the Commission to ensure flexibility we should not ensure a limited number of partnerships to find out at a later stage that we have reached the limit, but would prefer to pick up new initiatives. We should indeed strive for a strategic and coherent landscape. The present landscape might have some overlapping topics which are not needed.</u></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>PT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>1. Where necessary to achieve the objectives set out in Article 3, activities under this Regulation may be implemented through European Partnerships, by default <b>in particular</b> through the work programmes <b>set within the framework of Horizon Europe’s strategic plans. A strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships shall be ensured.</b></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We regard strategic plans as important tools to keep Horizon Europe work programmes, Union strategic priorities and national priorities aligned. It also provides a way to involve a wide range of stakeholders in a real co-design process. This is key to making sure that both European and national needs are taken into account, creating shared responsibility and better results.</p> <p>PT has consistently supported to rationalise the number of partnerships in HE. Throughout HE, we have assisted to an increase on the number of partnerships, namely co-programmed partnerships. It is important to ensure that EU partnerships in the future FP offer an added-value instead of adding a layer of complexity to the stakeholders.</p> <p>In addition, it is pivotal to define a budget ceiling to the European partnerships.</p> <p>PT would also require further clarification on how EU Partnerships and the mentioned 'Moonshoots' will be related.</p> <p>SE</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>(Comments):</p> <p>SE highlights that the selection of partnerships must be decided in a transparent process.</p>   |
| <p>2. European Partnerships shall be based on a Memorandum of Understanding, <b>or a grant agreement</b>, agreed and signed between the partners, stipulating:</p> | <p>ES</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>2. European Partnerships shall be based on a Memorandum of Understanding, <b>and/ or a contractual grant agreement</b>, agreed and signed between the partners, stipulating:</p> <p>ES</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>We support the change for clarification purposes. Although the Commission informed that MoU and GA are not incompatible, this new wording is clearer. Mybe adding “and” will give flexibility :</p> <p>However, we prefer ‘Contractual arrangements’ as in FP9. Sometimes there are entities that participate in a cofunded partnership, but they do not sign the GA, as they step in, in a running partnership</p> <p>FR</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>2. European Partnerships shall be based on a Memorandum of Understanding (<b>co-programmed Partnerships</b>), <b>or a grant agreement (co-funded Partnerships)</b>, agreed and signed between the partners, stipulating:</p> <p>FR</p> <p>(Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><u>We suggest differentiating co-programmed and co-funded Partnerships, since they have different functioning modalities (e.g. co-funding rates).</u></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>Please, clarify the typology of partnerships that are envisaged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cofund?</li> <li>- Coprogrammed?</li> <li>- Institutionalized?</li> </ul> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>European Partnerships shall be based on a Memorandum of Understanding <b><u>and/or contractual arrangements</u></b>, agreed and signed between the partners, stipulating:</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SE appreciates the proposed addition but would prefer a more general provision in order to promote stability/continuity with current practice.</p> |
|   | <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>The objectives to be achieved</u></b></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>It is necessary to define the objectives sought and the specific results to be achieved.</p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
| <p>(a) the results to be delivered, which shall be clear, measurable, time-bound;</p> | <p>BE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Suggestion to add: “Where relevant, specify if this EU partnership is a continuation of a EU partnership funded under FP9 (state of the art and perspectives of deployment should be also mentioned)”.</p>   |
| <p>(b) <b>single set of</b> reporting requirements;</p>                               | <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     AT welcomes this amendment. Especially when partnerships are managed by different executive agencies, the rules should still be the same.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We fully agree. It is necessary to set homogeneity in reporting. Monitoring and reporting requirements should be the same as for calls for proposals under direct management and for all partnerships, regardless the type or formal agreement used.</p> <p>FI<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     FI supports this addition.</p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation from NL. Does this imply we ensure reporting in the same way for every partnership?</u><br/> <u>We need to look into the applicability of a single set of requirements for different types of partnerships.</u></p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)        | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | single set of reporting requirements <b><u>and key performance and impact indicators</u></b> ;<br>SK<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br>(b) <b><u>single set of</u></b> reporting requirements <b><u>and key performance and impact indicators</u></b> ;   |
| (c) the related commitments from all partners; | DE<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br>(c) the related <b><u>financial and/ or in-kind</u></b> commitments from all partners;<br>DE<br>(Comments):<br>DE proposes a clarification on commitments as the word “commitment” may or may not refer to financial and/ or in-kind commitments.<br>FR<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br>(c) the related commitments from all partners <b><u>regarding their financial and/or in-kind contributions, in accordance with national provisions</u></b> ;<br>FR<br>(Comments):<br><b><u>Clearer wording.</u></b><br>SI<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br>the related commitments from all partners <b><u>particularly their financial and/or in-kind contribution</u></b> ; |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
| <p>(d) governance arrangements with a mechanism for <b>the</b> partners to discuss and agree on the partnerships’ programming and activities.</p> | <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (d) governance arrangements with a mechanism for <b>the all</b> partners <b>involved in the partnership</b> to discuss and agree on the partnerships’ programming and activities.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE proposes the insertion the para (d) to address governance arrangements with a mechanism for “all partners involved in the partnership”.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (d) <b>common</b> governance arrangements with a <b>standard</b> mechanism for <b>the</b> partners to discuss and agree on the partnerships’ programming and activities.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     So partnerships are closer in their procedures for a sake of simplification</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (d) governance arrangements with a mechanism for <b>the</b> partners to discuss and agree on the partnerships’ programming and activities. <u>- Such governance arrangements shall be based on common governance-related guidelines for all partnerships.</u></p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><u>To avoid having 50 different governance arrangements, there is a need to streamline the governance model. We call therefore for common guidelines – discussed between Member States and the Commission.</u></p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     governance arrangements with a mechanism for the partners to discuss and agree on the partnerships’ programming and activities, <b>such as Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA)</b></p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (d) governance arrangements with a mechanism for <b>the</b> partners to discuss and agree on the partnerships’ programming and activities <b>such as Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda.</b></p> |
|   | <p>AT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <b>(e) an adequate approach towards phasing out from Union funding, which shall be subject to regular review and adjustment in light of the evolution of Union policy priorities, technological progress and achieved results.</b></p> <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     AT: While the timing for transition/phasing-out strategies needs to be well-reflected, partnerships should consider the phasing-out from Union funding from the start.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><u>2.2 . European Partnerships shall be based on a Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA) agreed between the EU and partners other than the Union and implemented via their work programme, detailing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <u>The thematic priorities and desired scientific, economic and societal impacts</u></li> <li>(b) <u>A roadmap of planned activities during the duration of the programme</u></li> </ul> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE asks to stress the role of the SRIAs being at the core of the creation and implementation of Partnerships.</p>   |
| <p>3. <del>In duly justified cases</del> <b><u>Where appropriate for achieving their objectives,</u></b> European Partnerships will be implemented by entrusting budget implementation tasks from <b><u>one or</u></b> various Union funding programmes to bodies established pursuant to Articles 185 and 187 TFEU, in accordance with Article 62(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509.</p> | <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <b><u>In duly justified cases, where appropriate for achieving their objectives,</u></b> European Partnerships will be implemented by entrusting budget implementation tasks from <b><u>one or</u></b> various Union funding programmes to bodies established pursuant to Articles 185 and 187 TFEU, in accordance with Article 62(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Art. 185 or 187 TFUE partnerships should be limited and only to be considered in duly justified cases, when it is essential to archive the specific objectives of the partnership.</p> <p>It is important to open the possibilities for one or various Union programmes. We support the change.</p> <p>FR</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>3. <del>In duly justified cases</del> <b>Where appropriate for achieving their objectives</b>, European Partnerships will be implemented by entrusting budget implementation tasks from <b>one or</b> various Union funding programmes to bodies established pursuant to Articles 185 and 187 TFEU, in accordance with Article 62(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509. <u>Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.</u></p> <p>FR<br/>                 (Comments):<br/> <u>We have moved the last sentence of the next paragraph (para 4) here for consistency.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                 (Comments):<br/>                 What does ‘where appropriate for achieving their objectives’ mean?<br/><br/>                 How will this be determined? Who will decide?</p> <p>MT<br/>                 (Comments):<br/>                 Malta would like to inquire on how the overlaps between the Competitiveness Fund and Horizon Europe, particularly regarding partnerships, JUs, and strategic technologies will be avoided.</p> <p>SE<br/>                 (Comments):<br/>                 SE welcomes these modifications, and the focus on achieving the objectives of the partnership.</p> <p>SI</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>Where appropriate <b>and based on specific set of criteria</b> for achieving their objectives, European Partnerships will be implemented by entrusting budget implementation tasks from one or various Union funding programmes to bodies established pursuant to Articles 185 and 187 TFEU, in accordance with Article 62(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509.</p>  |
|   | <p>FR</p> <p><b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><u>3a. European Partnerships shall define a Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA), agreed between the Union and other partners, detailing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>(a) The thematic priorities and desired scientific and socio-economic results;</u></li> <li><u>(b) A roadmap of planned activities during the duration of the programme.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>SRIAs of Partnerships, in particular Joint Undertakings, shall be taken into account in the strategic programming of the policy windows under the ECF, where relevant.</u></p> <p>FR</p> <p><b>(Comments):</b></p> <p><u>SRIAs are at the core of the creation and implementation of Partnerships. The Regulation should mention it, and provides details on what is expected in such Agendas.</u></p> <p><u>It is also important to mention the connection to the ECF strategic programming. Most JUs are aligned with industrial policy objectives, and it is important to consider them in the strategic programming. We are also in favour of further alignment of their thematic priorities on ECF policy windows, as mentioned in recital 10. It should be reflected in the ECF-HE governance, also to ensure joint funding from ECF and HE.</u></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
| <p>4. For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article, support from the Programme shall be conditional upon efficient use of Union financing, a proportionate financial contribution from <b>the Union</b> <del>other partners at least</del> matching the <b>other partners' Union in cash or in-kind</b> contribution and voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> in the governing bodies <del>ensuring protection of the interests of the Union in the partnership</del>. For that purpose, Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.</p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     AT welcomes the amendments as they reflect the process of the financial “matchmaking” much better than the original text.</p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     We find it very important that “in-kind” contributions remain a possible form of co-financing.</p> <p>The current article raises the following questions: Which co-funding rate fork can be considered proportionate? Do harmonised rules also mean a similar structure for their financing? Does the term financial contribution also entail in-kind contributions, or is it limited?</p> <p>Can it be clarified when and where the 'single establishing act' defining the JU as a separate instrument will be made available?</p> <p>CZ<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article, support from the Programme shall be conditional upon efficient use of Union financing, a proportionate financial contribution from <b>the Union</b> <del>other partners at least</del> <b>matching commensurate to</b> the <b>other partners' Union in cash or in-kind</b> contribution and voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> in the governing bodies <del>ensuring protection of the interests of the Union in the partnership</del>. For that purpose, Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.</p> <p>CZ<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><u>CZ welcomes the proposed changes as going in the right directions. However, we would prefer to change the wording from “matching” to “commensurate” in order to achieve higher flexibility in the implementation of the partnerships.</u></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>4. For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article, support from the Programme shall be conditional upon efficient use of Union financing, <del>a proportionate financial contribution from the Union</del> <del>other partners at least matching the other partners’ Union</del> <del>in cash or in-kind</del> contribution and voting rights for the Union <del>and other partners</del> in the governing bodies ensuring protection of the interests of the Union in the partnership. <u>an adequate financial contribution from the Union complementing other partners in-cash and/or in-kind contributions. The co-funding rate shall depend on the overall strategic relevance of the candidate partnership for the EU.</u><br/> <u>The assessment of the overall strategic relevance shall be undertaken jointly by the EU and MS [and be part of the corresponding work programme].</u></p> <p><u>Governance structures and bodies of the partnerships should reflect the respective contributions from all partners.</u><br/>                     For that purpose, Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.<br/> <u>The SRIAS and activities of the partnerships of the JU need to be taken into consideration for the strategic programming of the policy windows under the ECF where relevant.</u></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>DE: According to the PKH opinion on partnerships, the co-funding from the Union for the implementation of partnerships should be more flexible – according to the strategic priorities of the programme and the related EU added value of the partnership. Consequently, the wording should be revised. DE proposes to have the basis for a clear link between the JUs and the planned industry policy actions,</p> <p>EE_comments<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>4. For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article, support from the Programme shall be conditional upon efficient use of Union financing, a proportionate financial contribution from <b>the Union</b> <del>other partners</del> at least matching the <b>other partners’ Union in cash or in-kind</b> contribution and voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> in the governing bodies <del>ensuring protection of the interests of the Union in the partnership</del> <b>taking into account the specific nature and strategic importance of the partnership, particularly in the context of dual-use research</b>. For that purpose, Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.</p> <p>EE_comments<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>To provide legislative leeway for differentiating co-funding rates where strategic or dual-use priorities require greater public sector investment, and where capacity constraints in smaller MS must be accommodated.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>4. For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs <del>2 and 3</del> of this Article, support from the Programme shall be conditional upon efficient use of Union financing. <del>A</del> <b>A</b> proportionate financial contribution from <b>the Union</b> <del>other partners</del> at least matching the <b>other partners’ Union in</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><del>cash or in-kind</del> contribution <b>will be provided</b> and voting rights <del>for the Union and other partners</del> in the governing bodies <b>shall be proportional to the partners' contribution</b> ensuring protection of the interests of the Union in the partnership. For that purpose, Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     We support the changes. It is important to define the different types of contributions and the voting rights that should be proportional to contributions.</p> <p>Regarding the elimination of para 2: Check if there is a misunderstanding as, if we speak about Jus, we refer to arts 185 and 187, that are the ones under the Basic Single Act.</p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     FI supports the new text regarding in cash or in-kind contributions and voting rights.</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     4. For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2 <del>(except for co-funded Partnerships)</del> and 3 of this Article, support from the Programme shall be conditional upon efficient use of Union financing, a proportionate financial contribution from <b>the Union</b> <del>other partners at least matching the other partners' Union in cash or in-kind</del> contribution and voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> in the governing bodies ensuring protection of the interests of the Union in the partnership. <b>In the case of co-funded Partnerships, the co-funding rate shall depend on the overall strategic relevance of the candidate partnership to Union's priorities,</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><u>and should be between 25% and 50%, except in duly justified cases. The assessment of the overall strategic relevance shall be jointly undertaken by the Union and Member States. For that purpose, Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.</u></p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><u>In the current regulation, co-fund actions receive between 30% and 70% of Union contribution. We are considering the appropriateness of maintaining this range and propose decreasing this ceiling, without being convinced that it is necessary to have 50% from the Union and 50% from other partners, as is the case for the other two types of partnership. A “one-size-fits-all” does not work the same way for JUs and co-programmed partnerships than for co-funded partnerships.</u></p> <p><u>Regarding the sentence “Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.”, does that mean that EuroHPC regulation will be merged with the SBA?</u></p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>General comment: PL supports those Member States who opt for introducing a budgetary cap from the Framework Programme Pillar II to the European Partnerships.</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><u><i>the Union</i></u> <del><i>other partners</i></del> <i>at least matching the <u>other partners’ Union in cash or in-kind</u> contribution</i></p> <p>PT would like to clarify if these two options will be implemented in all partnerships, or if this possibility will be defined per partnership.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Additionally, PT would like to confirm if the single establishing act is to be applied to all Joint Undertakings including euroHPC, or if euroHPC is expected to have a stand-alone regulation?</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article, support from the Programme shall be conditional upon efficient use of Union financing, a proportionate financial contribution from <b><u>the Union</u></b> <del>other partners at least</del> matching the <b><u>other partners' Union in cash or in-kind</u></b> contribution and voting rights for the Union <del>and other partners</del> in the governing bodies ensuring protection of the interests of the Union in the partnership. For that purpose, Joint Undertakings shall be established through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>This proposed new arrangement would significantly alter the dynamics of the partnerships and SE cautions against it.</p> <p>SE welcomes the explicit mentioning of in-kind contributions.</p> <p>SI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><b><u>4(a) For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2, namely partnerships based on grant agreement, Union support shall be provided on the condition that Union financing is used efficiently and that the participating Member States and other partners make financial or in-kind contributions corresponding to the commitments jointly defined within the partnership. The Union shall complement these partner contributions with a proportionate financial contribution from the</u></b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b><u>Programme, ensuring coherence with the agreed objectives and governance framework.</u></b></p> <p>SI<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>Separate financing contribution explanation from the Union – based on the current typology of partnerships - in cases partnerships based on GA <b>(4(a))</b>, partnerships based on MoU <b>(4(b))</b> and partnerships based on A.187 TFEU <b>(4(c))</b>.</p>   |
|   | <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><b><u>(4a) Horizon Europe budget should be used only for research and innovation activities under the Programme.</u></b></p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We propose to add a new point to ensure that HE funds are only to be used for R&amp;I activities. Including it here is more general. Another possibility is to add this sentence in paragraph 3 (art. 185 and 187 TFUE).</p> <p>SI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><b><u>4(b) For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraphs 2, namely partnerships base don Memorandum of Understanding, Union support shall take the form of contributions to actions implemented under the Horizon Europe work programmes. These contributions shall be proportionate to the Union’s strategic interest in the partnership and subject to conditions ensuring effective coordination, mutual commitments, and protection of the Union’s interest.</u></b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><b><u>4(c) For European Partnerships established pursuant to paragraph 3 of this Article, the Union shall provide a financial contribution from the Programme, which must be matched by contributions from the other partners at least equivalent in value, whether in cash or in-kind. Such partnerships shall be established as Joint Undertakings through a single establishing act ensuring harmonised rules, including provisions safeguarding the Union's interests and guaranteeing appropriate voting rights for the Union within the governing bodies.</u></b></p>                 |
| <p>5. European Partnerships shall:</p>   | <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     DE would like to ask, where in the regulation a clear reference to the priority areas for Partnerships is foreseen.<br/>                     DE asks to check the numerical order of entire paragraph 5.</p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     FI supports the presidency compromise text on partnerships and finds it important that the additions are maintained.</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Ireland supports the calls from other MS to make the links with the ECF clearer</p> |
| <p><b><u>(-a) be identified in close cooperation with Member States.</u></b></p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     AT welcomes this important addition.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/> <del>(-a) be identified in close cooperation with Member States.</del></p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE suggests to add a new para, see in next row. DE asks for clarification on co-decision and co-creation process.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><b>(-a) be identified and selected in close cooperation with Member States.</b></u></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We support this new point. It is of paramount importance that Member States participate in the identification but also in the selection of partnerships. We propose to include the participation of Member States in the selection here or in art. 11.5(d).</p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><b>(-a) be identified and agreed in close cooperation with Member States and be co-designed and co-implemented with them.</b></u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Ireland welcomes and supports this insertion. However, we need to ensure that MS are not just consulted and the decision made elsewhere.</p> <p>It is also critically important that MS have a central role in the design and implementation of the European partnerships.</p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Malta supports the addition highlighting the role of Member States in identifying and establishing European Partnerships.</p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><b>be identified in close cooperation with Member States. The Union and Member States will together identify new European Partnerships, if any.</b></u></p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Since Member States are an integral part of partnerships and have in-depth knowledge of which regional and national R&amp;I ecosystems would be suitable to connect through partnerships at the EU level, it would be good have a co-creative identification process from the very start for regarding new partnerships.</u></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><b>be identified and selected in close cooperation with Member States.</b></u></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     PT supports the new indent. An early involvement of Member States since the identification phase can contribute for a more active participation of the relevant stakeholders, including from private sector (industry, SMEs, ...). We would strengthen the text by emphasising the involvement as well in the selection procedure.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     SE welcomes this addition.</p> |
|   | DE  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><u>-a) be identified in a close co-creation process together with the Member States before being implemented in work programmes,</u></p> <p><u>-ab) contain a preparatory phase,</u></p> <p><u>-ac) safeguard capacities for steering and coordination at all levels respecting national rules.</u></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE suggests to add a new para and proposes to add more details on identifying, installing and coordinating the process on new partnerships.</p>   |
| <p>(a) — <del>be established only in cases where Union action alone or other forms of support under the Programme cannot achieve the desired objectives.</del></p>   |   |
| <p>(b) be established for the purpose of addressing challenges that require a critical mass of resources and a unified and coordinated approach, both in terms of programming and implementation, across actors.</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(b) be established for the purpose of addressing challenges that require a critical mass of resources and a unified and coordinated approach, both in terms of programming and implementation, across actors <b><u>and governance levels.</u></b></p> <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>AT: Partnerships not only support coordination across actors in terms of R&amp;I actors but also in terms of governance actors. EC-MS cooperation in PS allow different ways to mobilise and involve local/regional/national level.</p> <p>BG</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(b) be established for the purpose of addressing challenges that require a critical mass of resources and a unified and coordinated approach, both in terms of programming and implementation, across actors. <b><u>The majority of the budget in Pillar II components shall be allocated to actions outside European Partnerships:</u></b></p> <p>BG<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We insist on setting a budgetary ceiling for partnerships in Pillar II for each component, because we believe their focus should be on collaborative research.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(b) be established for the purpose of addressing <b>key European</b> challenges that require a critical mass of resources and a unified and coordinated approach, both in terms of programming and implementation, across actors.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>The European partnerships must be focus in key European challenges that are identified and selected within a co-design approach between the EC and the MS.</p> |
| <p><b><u>(ba) be established only in cases where Union action alone or other forms of support under the Programme cannot achieve the desired objectives.</u></b></p> | <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We support to move this point. Point (b) should be before this one.</p>  |
|  |   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
| <p>(c) align with <b>Union strategic priorities</b> and assist in the implementation of major Union policies and policy initiatives.</p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     AT agrees that partnerships should deliver added value to EU priorities.</p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     (c) align with <b>Union strategic priorities</b> and assist in the implementation of major Union policies and policy initiatives, <b>while remaining consistent with relevant national and regional strategies.</b></p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     What are the implications for partnerships that do not thematically align with current Union strategic priorities or no longer do when priorities change in the future? How fixed or dynamic are these priorities?<br/>                     To ensure coherence and foster implementation, alignment with EU policies must be paired with alignment with national and regional initiatives (in the same domain.)</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     (c) align with <b>Union strategic priorities</b> and assist in the implementation of major Union <b>and Member States'</b> policies and policy initiatives.</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     (c) align with <b>Union EU and national strategic priorities</b> and assist in the implementation of major Union policies and policy initiatives.</p> <p>IE</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(Comments):</p> <p>Given the focus in EU R&amp;I policy on ensuring greater alignment between EU and national policies, European partnerships must also be aligned with national policies as well as EU policies. This needs to be explicit in the text.</p> <p>LT</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>align with Union strategic priorities and assist in the implementation of major Union policies and policy initiatives, <b><u>that are complementary to those of the Member States.</u></b></p> <p>MT</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(c) align with <u>Union strategic priorities</u> and assist in the implementation of major Union policies and policy initiatives.</p> <p>MT</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>Malta argues that not all European Partnerships need to be aligned with the Union strategic priorities; hence why we ask to remove the corresponding part of the text.</p> <p>PL</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>PL supports SI remark (RWP 13/10) about the openness of the European Partnerships towards new partners from various disciplines, regions, Member States throughout the life-cycle of the European Partnership (openness by default).</p> <p>SI</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>align with Union strategic priorities and assist in the implementation of major Union policies and policy initiatives, <b><u>that are complementary to those of the Member States.</u></b></p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(c) align with <b><u>Union strategic priorities</u></b> and assist in the implementation of major Union policies and policy initiatives <b><u>that are complementary to those of the Member States.</u></b></p>  |
| <p>(d) be selected in a <b><u>transparent and</u></b> competitive manner based on a set of quantifiable lifecycle criteria and a strong portfolio approach, resulting in a coherent set of initiatives.</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>AT welcomes the addition of transparency.</p> <p>However, AT has a SCRUTINY RESERVATION regarding the processes towards the competitive selection of partnerships. It should be kept in mind that they are supposed to deliver on strategic priorities (as defined above). The guiding principle should be “best fit for purpose”. The role of public funding agencies still needs to be clarified.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(d) be selected <b><u>by the Commission services including decision-making by Member States</u></b> in a <b><u>transparent and</u></b> competitive manner based on a set of quantifiable lifecycle criteria and a strong portfolio approach, resulting in a coherent set of initiatives.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>d) be selected in a <b><u>transparent and</u></b> competitive manner <b><u>in close cooperation with Member States and</u></b> based on a set of quantifiable</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>lifecycle criteria and a strong portfolio approach, resulting in a coherent <b>and complementary</b> set of initiatives.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We propose to include the participation of Member States in the selection here or in art. 11.5(-a)).<br/>                     It is important that the initiatives are complementary.</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(d) be selected in a <b>transparent and</b> competitive manner <b>after a joint identification process with Member States</b> based on a set of quantifiable lifecycle criteria and a strong portfolio approach, resulting in a coherent set of initiatives.</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p><u>Important to recall here that Member States should not only be associated to the selection process, but also in the identification phase.</u></p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>d) be selected in a <b>transparent and</b> competitive manner <b>in close consultation with the Member States</b> based on a set of quantifiable lifecycle criteria and a strong portfolio approach, resulting in a coherent set of initiatives.</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>MS need to be centrally involved in the process.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>What does in a ‘competitive manner’ mean? It needs to be clarified in the text.</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(d) be <b>identified and</b> selected in a <b>transparent, open and</b> competitive manner <b>process</b> based on a set of quantifiable <b>and verifiable</b> lifecycle criteria, <b>complemented by clear impact indicators</b>, and a strong portfolio approach, resulting in a coherent set of initiatives.</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>To guarantee transparency and clarity of the process the European partnerships must be identified and selected in an open process based on verifiable criteria and clear impact indicators.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SE welcomes this emphasis on transparency.</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>be selected in a transparent and competitive <b>process using</b> manner based on a set of quantifiable lifecycle criteria and a strong portfolio approach, resulting in a coherent set of initiatives.</p> |
| <p>(e) be based on ex ante, long-term and formal commitments from all partners to contribute <del>financially</del> <b>in cash or where appropriate in-kind</b> to the resources of the European Partnership, <del>which shall be centrally managed, except in duly justified cases.</del></p> | <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(e) be based on ex ante, long-term and formal commitments from all partners <b>in accordance with national provisions</b> to contribute <del>financially</del> <b>in</b></p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><del>cash or where appropriate in-kind</del> to the resources of the European Partnership, <del>which shall be centrally managed, except in duly justified cases.</del></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>DE would like to add the insertion to para (e) to respect national provisions in the process.</p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(e) be based on ex ante, long-term and formal commitments from all partners to contribute <del>financially</del> <b><u>in cash or where appropriate in-kind</u></b> to the resources of the European Partnership, <del>which shall be centrally managed, except in duly justified cases.</del> <b><u>which may be centrally managed, provided this approach is justified by the implementation mode and shall respect national funding provisions.</u></b></p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We support maintaining the central management of partnerships to ensure proportionality and flexibility regarding financial management models (e.g., co-funded partnerships), aligning with the need to respect differing national funding schemes and minimise administrative burden for MS, especially smaller ones.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We support that contribution may be in cash or in kind.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>SE welcomes the deletion at the end of the sentence, as SE questions central management in case there is no contract, only MoU:s.</p> <p>Central management poses problems in national contexts. Once again, SE welcomes the explicit mentioning of in-kind contributions.</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We would like to keep the deleted ‘central management’ part</p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(e) be based on ex ante, long-term and formal commitments from all partners to contribute financially <b><u>in cash or where appropriate in-kind</u></b> to the resources of the European Partnership, <b><u>which shall be centrally managed, except in duly justified cases.</u></b></p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SK welcomes explicit reference regarding in-kind contributions.</p> <p>We would like to re-integrate deleted part with reference on central management.</p> |
|   | <p>BG<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>(ea) be continuously open for participation of new partners.</u></b></p> <p>BG<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We believe partnerships must adhere to the principle of openness and allow new partners/members (Member States) to join, participate and contribute</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>throughout the Partnerships lifecycle, not only in the very beginning of its setup.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u>(ea) implement joint additional activities of high Union added value, in particular related to market, regulatory or policy uptake, dissemination and knowledge transfer, or standardisation.</u></p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Joint Additional activities play a key role in delivering on Partnerships' objectives and missions. The PKH Opinion on FP10 advocates further integration of knowledge transfer and dissemination-related topics in Partnerships' activities.</u></p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u>(e1) ensure their continuous openness for partners of all sizes across the entire value chain and disciplines, including for participation in calls for proposals, and transparency in priority setting and governance</u></p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u>(e1) ensure their continuous openness for partners of all sizes across the entire value chain and disciplines, including for participation in calls for proposals, and transparency in priority setting and governance.</u></p> |
| <p>(f) require a clear lifecycle approach, including an upfront plan for the implementation of the initiative with a strategy for gradually or fully phasing out from Union funding.</p> | <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (f) require a clear lifecycle approach, including an upfront plan for the implementation of the initiative with a strategy for gradually or fully phasing</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>out from Union funding. <u>The phasing out strategy shall include stipulations that ensure an open and transparent data strategy.</u></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>DE proposes to add the link to the data strategy of the partnership, as introduced in the selection criteria in Art. 5 para (1 a via), and explicitly make the connection to the phasing out strategy.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(f) require a clear <b>and defined</b> lifecycle <b>approach</b>, including an upfront plan for the implementation of the initiative with a strategy for gradually or fully phasing out from Union funding.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We propose a change for clarification purposes. The use of “approach” is confusing.</p> <p>LT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>require a clear lifecycle approach, including an upfront plan for the implementation of the initiative with a strategy for gradually or fully phasing out from Union funding. <b><u>Non-compliance with this requirement may result in the reduction, suspension ore recovery of Union funding, or other appropriate measure.</u></b></p> <p>LT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We support the suggestion to stress the importance of having a phasing out strategy.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>PT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (f) require a clear <b>and effective</b> lifecycle approach, including an <del>an upfront</del> <b>a preliminary</b> plan for the implementation of the initiative with a <b>transition strategy and an action plan</b> for gradually or fully phasing out from Union funding, <b>while ensuring mechanisms for future evaluation to inform decisions on possible renewal or alternative forms of intervention.</b></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We believe the lifecycle approach should be well-defined but also effective. A preliminary implementation plan, which allows adjustments during implementation to address changing contexts and unforeseen challenges rather than a fixed upfront plan, better reflects the ambition and realism of European Partnerships at their early stage. In addition, a transition strategy, not exclusively focused on phasing out, offers a broader, evolutionary perspective for the lifecycle approach.</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     require a clear lifecycle approach, including an upfront plan for the implementation of the initiative with <b>an initial</b> strategy for gradually or fully phasing out from Union funding. <b><u>Non-compliance with this requirement may result in the redusction, suspension ore recovery of Union funding, or other appropriate measure.</u></b></p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (f) require a clear lifecycle approach, including an upfront plan for the implementation of the initiative with a strategy for gradually or fully phasing out from Union funding. <b>Non-compliance with this requirement may</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b><u>result in the reduction, suspension ore recovery of Union funding, or other appropriate measure.</u></b></p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SK proposes to include a reference clause for the phasing-out of partnerships if objectives or financial aspects are not met.</p>   |
|  | <p>AT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>g) should be aligned with other Union funding instruments, in order to avoid overlaps and duplications and instead ensure added value and maximise impact.</u></b></p> <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>AT: It is important to provide coherence with other instruments within Horizon Europe, e.g. the EU missions and the proposed “Moonshots”.</p> <p>Furthermore, since EU partnerships might also be supported with funding from the European Competitiveness Fund, thematic bridges need to be established in a coordinated way.</p> |
| <p>6. Contributions from Partners other than the Union shall take the following forms:</p> | <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><del>6. Contributions from Partners other than the Union shall take the following forms:</del></p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><del>The provisions mentioned in this para are already covered by article 11 § 4, § 5(e) and article 5 § 1 (ii) of the specific programme, ensuring that all partners provide funding to the individual partnerships. The manner in which the</del></p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><u>funding is distributed within each partnership is a matter to be set out in the corresponding MoU (article 11 § 2) and is not to be predetermined here.</u></p>  |
| <p>(a) <b>in cash</b> <del>financial</del> contributions to the operational budget of the initiative;</p> | <p>DE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                 (a) <del>in cash</del> financial contributions to the operational budget of the initiative; <u>commitments for financial and/ or in-kind contributions, from each partner in accordance with national provisions throughout the duration of the initiative .</u></p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                 DE suggests to be more specific on the details of the co-financing model: The value added by the partnerships (including their Additional Activities) must be maintained in FP10 and thus be reflected in the co-financing model.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                 Would this mean that in all the EP it would be required cash contribution to OPEX? This might be problematic even for art. 185 Jus, unless it is mandatory just to article 187</p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                 Could ‘operational’ budget be clarified for the sake of understanding? Would in-cash contribution for administrative costs be required to enter the partnership?</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(a) <del>in cash</del> financial contributions to the operational budget of the initiative;</p>  |
| <p>(b) <b>in-kind contributions through</b> co-financing by the Partners of their own participation, or that of their members, in projects funded through the initiative.</p> | <p>BE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <b>in-kind contributions through</b> co-financing by the Partners of their own participation, or that of their members, in projects funded through the initiative <b>or in the realisation of the plan of activities.</b></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (b) <b>in-kind contributions through</b> co-financing by the Partners of their own participation, or that of their members, <b>in joint calls, including</b> projects funded through the initiative.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     WE support to include in-kind contributions.<br/>                     It is necessary to include those costs related to call preparation, evaluation, follow up, etc</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <del>(b) in-kind contributions through</del> co-financing by the Partners of their own participation, or that of their members, in projects funded through the initiative.</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     PT would like to confirm that in-kind contributions foreseen include in-kind contribution against payment and in-kind contribution free of charge.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>Also, PT would like a clarification if the co-funding by the Partners described is only for the in-kind or also applied for the in cash.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     SE welcomes the explicit mentioning of in-kind contributions.</p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     SK welcomes explicit reference regarding in-kind contributions.</p>  |
|   | <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><b>c) implementation of joint additional activities of high Union added value in particular related to structuring an ecosystem, market, regulatory or policy uptake, dissemination and knowledge transfer, standardisation of up-skilling.</b></u></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE proposes to stress the importance of the additional activities, as they are often key for ensuring additional impact when compared to ‘classical’ collaborative research projects. The additional para is therefore proposed.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><b>b(bis) integration of their relevant activities using a Programme co-fund action</b></u></p> <p>SE</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(Comments):</p> <p>SE proposes to clearly spell out the possibility for maintaining co-funded partnerships</p> <p>SI</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>(6(1)) The majority of budget of each component under Article 4(1)(b) shall be allowed to actions outside European Partnerships.</u></b></p>  |
| <p>7. All Partners other than the Union shall <del>provide</del> <b>make public</b> information on the structure, membership and activities developed within the partnership. In cases where partnerships are concluded with representative organisations and associations, this shall include regular information on their membership.</p> | <p>NL</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p><u>The previous wording was unclear. This is clearer. Could the Commission provide information how this relates to diminishing administrative burden? Doesn't it make more sense if the partners provide this information to the secretariat and the partnerships publishes this? The way it is written now seems quite an administrative burden.</u></p> <p>PT</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>7. All Partners other than the Union shall <del>provide</del> <b>make public</b> information on the structure, membership and activities developed within the partnership. In cases where partnerships are concluded with representative organisations and associations, this shall include regular information on their membership. <b><u>The scope, frequency and format of the information to provide shall be proportionate and clearly defined in the Memorandum of Understanding or work programme.</u></b></p> <p>PT</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>Since the responsibility to make information public rests with the partners, it is essential that this does not result in disproportionate or inefficient effort.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>PT proposes to balance harmonised criteria and a reasonable level of effort from all partners.</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>All Partners other than the Union shall make publicly <b>available</b> information on the structure, membership and activities developed within the partnership. In cases where partnerships are concluded with representative organisations and associations, this shall include regular information on their membership.</p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>In relation to enhance EU competitiveness, SK believes that Partnerships have to be open, transparent and available for all entities across the Union.</p> |
|   | <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>8. The majority of the budget of the Programme shall be allocated to actions outside European Partnerships, in particular the budget for Pillar II</u></b></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>The majority of the budget shall be dedicated to ordinary calls for proposals. The budget for partnerships should be limited. It is not a problem to calculate the amounts if the participation of the partners is clear from the start of the partnerships and the monitoring is done properly using common guidelines.</p>   |
| <b>Recitals</b>   |   |
| <p>(9) It should be possible to implement parts of the budget through European Partnerships together with <del>other public</del> <b>private</b> and <del>or private</del> <b>public entities-partners</b>, where this is the most effective implementation</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
| <p>form to achieve the policy objectives. European Partnerships should be established where a close involvement of the Union is required and should ensure appropriate voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> as well as sufficient co-investment by other partners to leverage Union funding. In view of fostering synergies and efficiencies, it is necessary to ensure harmonised rules. Therefore, a strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships should be established.</p> | <p>Therefore, a strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships should be established <b><u>with a clear thematic focus</u></b>.</p> <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>AT: The goal to reduce the number of Partnerships should not lead to merging of several thematic topics, historically addressed by separate large initiatives, into a single overly broad partnership.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(9) It should be possible to implement parts of the budget through European Partnerships together with <del>other public</del> <b>private</b> and/or private <b>public entities-partners</b>, where this is the most effective implementation form to achieve the policy objectives. European Partnerships should be established where a close involvement of the Union is required and should ensure appropriate voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> as well as sufficient co-investment by other partners to leverage Union funding. In view of fostering synergies and efficiencies, it is necessary to ensure harmonised rules. Therefore, a strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships should be established <b><u>based on the co-creation process between the Union and Member States</u></b>.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We support the changes. It is important to open the possibilities to private and/or public partners.</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><del>(9) — It should be possible to implement parts of the budget through European Partnerships together with other public</del> <b>private</b> and/or private <b>public entities-partners</b>, where this is the most effective implementation</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><del>form to achieve the policy objectives. European Partnerships should be established where a close involvement of the Union is required and should ensure appropriate voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> as well as sufficient co-investment by other partners to leverage Union funding. In view of fostering synergies and efficiencies, it is necessary to ensure harmonised rules. Therefore, a strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships should be established.</del></p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>As previously mentioned, we do not see the added value of this recital, especially since the latest sentence has been integrated in article 9 § 1.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>9) <del>It should be possible to implement parts of the budget through</del> European Partnerships shall be implemented together with <del>other public</del> <b>private</b> and/or <del>private public entities</del> <b>partners</b>, where this is the most effective implementation form to achieve the policy objectives. European Partnerships should be established where a close involvement of the Union is required and should ensure appropriate voting rights for the Union <b>and other partners</b> as well as sufficient co-investment by other partners to leverage Union funding. In view of fostering synergies and efficiencies, it is necessary to ensure harmonised rules. Therefore, a strategic and coherent portfolio of a limited number of European Partnerships should be established.</p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     All references to ‘it should be possible to’ in the text should be deleted. It is vague and ambiguous language.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>SE welcomes the addition of “and other partners” as it creates a balanced representation.</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>...European Partnerships should be established where a close involvement of the Union is required and should ensure appropriate voting rights for the Union and other <b>public</b> partners as well as sufficient co-investment by other partners to leverage Union funding....</p>  |
| <p>(10) [The European Partnerships, including in the form of Joint Undertakings, as an essential tool to deliver on industrial involvement and investment in collaborative research and innovation, should contribute to the specific policy objectives of the policy windows of the European Competitiveness Fund, and be supported through it, where necessary, to complete these objectives.]</p> | <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>The European Partnerships, including in the form of Joint Undertakings, as an essential tool to deliver on industrial involvement and investment in collaborative research and innovation, should contribute to the specific policy objectives of the policy windows of the European Competitiveness Fund, and be supported through it, where necessary, to complete these objectives. <b><u>and, where appropriate, should also support collaborative research and innovation activities addressing societal challenges under the ‘Society’ part of Pillar II.</u></b></p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>The added text is needed in order to maintain the possibility to address important societal challenges and promote synergies between technical and societal development.</p> |
| <p>(34) [Where Union support under the Programme is to be provided in the form of a budgetary guarantee or a financial instrument, including where combined with non-repayable support in a blending operation, with the exception of financial instruments under the EIC, such support should be</p>  | <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
| provided exclusively through the ECF InvestEU Instrument in accordance with the applicable rules of the ECF InvestEU Instrument.]   | AT: Clarify if this concerns the partnerships. It would not make sense to support partnerships through InvestEU only.  |
|   |  |
| <b>Chapter III</b>  |  |
|   |  |
| <b>Competitiveness and Society</b>  |  |
|   |  |
| <p><i>Article 15</i><br/> <b><i>Collaborative research <u>and innovation</u></i></b></p>  | <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     We support to include innovation.</p> <p>MT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Malta reiterates its call for all collaborative research work programmes to be adopted in the examination procedure with a greater role of the Member States.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     PT welcomes the inclusion of innovation.</p>  |
|   |  |
| <p>1. Collaborative research <b><u>and innovation</u></b> shall support the creation of <b><u>excellent</u></b> transnational research and innovation <b><u>activities and</u></b> cooperation networks, bringing together entities of <b><u>across</u></b> different <b><u>sectors and</u></b> disciplines, <b><u>including SSH</u></b>, to support the <b><u>discovery, the</u></b> development and swift diffusion of high-quality results in favour of the Union's <b><u>strategic priorities</u></b>. <del>industrial competitiveness, space, security, clean transition, preparedness and resilience, and addressing societal challenges, including culture and creativity, and to strengthen the impact of research in developing and supporting Union policies.</del></p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     AT welcomes the amendments.</p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     Collaborative research <b><u>and innovation</u></b> shall support the creation of <b><u>excellent</u></b> transnational research and innovation <b><u>activities and</u></b> cooperation networks, bringing together entities of <b><u>across</u></b> different <b><u>sectors and</u></b> disciplines,</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><u>including SSAH</u>, to support the <u>discovery, the</u> development and swift diffusion of high-quality <u>knowledge and</u> results in favour of the Union’s <u>strategic priorities</u>.</p> <p>DE<br/> <u>(Comments):</u><br/>                     DE: Germany supported the references to “societal challenges, including culture and creativity” in Art. 15 of the COM proposal. We can accept the deletions suggested by the Presidency under the condition that “culture”/ “cultural heritage” will be added to Art. 11 of the Specific Programme.</p> <p>ES<br/> <u>(Comments):</u><br/>                     We support the new wording. It is simpler and clearer.<br/>                     It is important to add innovation and open to R&amp;I activities in general and not only the creation of cooperation networks, that are a consequence of the transnational R&amp;I activities.<br/>                     Strategic priorities are more general and avoids including incomplete lists.<br/>                     For these reasons the wording proposed is more appropriate.</p> <p>FI<br/> <u>(Comments):</u><br/>                     FI supports this streamlining.</p> <p>IE<br/> <u>(Comments):</u><br/>                     We welcome and support the explicit addition of innovation, excellence and SSH.</p> <p>We also support the deletion of specific thematic areas.</p> <p>MT</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>1. Collaborative research <b>and innovation</b> shall support the creation of <b>excellent</b> transnational research and innovation <b>activities and</b> cooperation networks, bringing together entities of <b>across</b> different <b>sectors and</b> disciplines, <b>including SSH</b>, to support the <b>discovery, the</b> development and swift diffusion of high-quality results in favour of the Union's <del>strategic priorities:</del> <b>industrial competitiveness, space, security, clean transition, preparedness and resilience, and addressing societal challenges, including culture and creativity, and to strengthen the impact of research in developing and supporting Union policies.</b></p> <p>MT<br/>                 (Comments):<br/>                 Malta argues that the term ‘Union’s strategic priorities’ is not tangible or constant; therefore, we are calling for reintroduction of the deleted text.</p> <p>PL<br/>                 (Comments):<br/>                 PL strongly supports the reference to SSH in Art. 15.1</p> <p>SE<br/>                 (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>1. Collaborative research and innovation shall support the creation of excellent transnational research and innovation activities and cooperation networks, bringing together entities across different sectors and disciplines, including <b>and SSH, and using a systems perspective</b>, to support the discovery, the development and swift diffusion of high-quality results in favour of the Union’s strategic priorities <del>industrial competitiveness, space, peace and security, clean transition, climate change and biodiversity, resilience, preparedness, health and wellbeing, bioeconomy, food systems, agriculture, urban transitions, heritage, culture and creativity; and to</del></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>strengthen the impact and socio-economic benefits of research and innovation in developing and supporting Union policies.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SE welcomes the additions. Suggests adding examples of strategic priorities to illustrate the breadth (not equalling the policy windows in ECF).</p> <p>OK with deleting the full list and replacing it with “strategic priorities”. But if changes are made here and MS start listing words again the “<b>preparedness and resilience</b>” – as a horizontal important strategic priority -must be included as well.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The notion of central areas of focus is replaced by a reference of strategic priorities. Which are the strategic priorities and where are they decided?</li> <li>2) Strategic priorities should not solely be decided by the ECF, as the HEU has a focus on excellent research and innovation. Furthermore, strategic priorities should not be limited to the focus areas of the policy windows of the ECF, since this would exclude several areas of strategic importance for the EU.</li> <li>3) Notes that by removing the examples of priorities from the text, several important areas such as resilience, clean transition etc. are no longer included in the presidency texts in this document.</li> <li>4) If the list of strategic priorities is not defined elsewhere in the texts, SE suggests including a list here again. Certain central strategic priorities are currently missing in the previously proposed list– see suggestions for additions.</li> </ol> <p>SI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>Collaborative research and innovation shall support the creation of excellent transnational research and innovation activities and cooperation networks, bringing together entities of across different sectors and disciplines, including</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>SSH, to support the discovery, the development and swift diffusion of high-quality results in favour of <b><u>prosperity of</u></b> the Union's <b><u>citizens, and its</u></b> strategic priorities.</p> <p>SK<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>Collaborative research <b><u>and innovation</u></b> shall support the creation of <b><u>excellent</u></b> transnational research and innovation <b><u>activities and</u></b> cooperation networks, bringing together entities of <b><u>across</u></b> different <b><u>sectors and</u></b> disciplines, <b><u>including SSH, and incorporating participatory approach and stakeholders engagement,</u></b> to support the <b><u>discovery, the</u></b> development and swift diffusion of high-quality results in favour of the Union's <b><u>strategic priorities.</u></b></p> <p>SK<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SK suggests explicit inclusion of participatory approaches and stakeholder engagement.</p> |
| <p>2. <b><u>Collaborative research and innovation</u></b> activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering <del>the whole</del> <b><u>all parts of the research and innovation</u></b> value chain <b><u>complementary to other activities under the ECF.</u></b></p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>Collaborative research and innovation activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels <b><u>or similar scales for non-technological areas,</u></b> thereby covering all parts of the research and innovation value chain complementary to other activities under the ECF.</p> <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>AT: Include the possibility to use Societal Readiness Levels.</p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>BE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>2. <b><u>Collaborative research and innovation</u></b> Activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering the whole <b><u>all parts of the research and innovation</u></b> value chain <b><u>complementary to other activities under the ECF</u></b>. <b><u>Grants should not be awarded for actions where activities go above TRL 8.</u></b></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>2. <b><u>Collaborative research and innovation</u></b> Activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels <b><u>up to and including TRL 8</u></b>, thereby covering the whole <b><u>all parts of the research and innovation</u></b> value chain <b><u>complementary to other activities under the ECF</u></b>.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>DE suggests to be consistent with Recital No 8.</p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>2. <b><u>Collaborative research and innovation</u></b> Activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering the whole <b><u>all parts of the research and innovation</u></b> value chain <b><u>up to TRL 8</u></b> <b><u>complementary to other activities under the ECF</u></b>.</p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>For us is important supporting the whole value chain and we prefer to keep reference to TRL8 in the text because there may be some collaborative</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>research projects on the higher TRL levels in the fields that are not covered by ECF policy fields.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We support the changes. We prefer all parts of the innovation value chain than the whole value chain. It is more illustrative.<br/>                     Regarding the last part of the sentence, complementary with ECF is a must and it is essential to include it here.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     2. <b><u>Collaborative research and innovation</u></b> Activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering the whole <b><u>all parts of the whole research and innovation</u></b> value chain <b><u>complementary to other activities under the ECF</u></b>.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Collaborative R&amp;I activities should be complementary to not only ECF actions, but also other programmes such as the Innovation Fund or Global Europe.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     It is not clear what in a ‘balanced manner’ means or how it will be done and by whom. This needs to be clarified explicitly in the text.</p> <p>What does <b><u>‘complementary to other activities under the ECF’</u></b> mean?</p> <p>LT</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>Collaborative research and innovation activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering all parts <u>relevant stages</u> of the research and innovation value chain complementary to other activities under the ECF.</p> <p>PT</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>2. <b><u>Collaborative research and innovation</u></b> Activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering <del>the whole</del> <b><u>all parts of the research and innovation</u></b> value chain, <b>and exploring, whenever adequate, complementary</b> <b><u>complementary to other activities under the ECF</u></b></p> <p>PT</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>Though we understand the purpose of connecting collaborative R&amp;I under ECF, PT suggests a nuanced writing, that does not reinforce a top-down vision of collaborative R&amp;I under FP10.</p> <p>It would also be important to clarify how complementarity will be ensured.</p> <p>SI</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>Collaborative research and innovation activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering all parts <u>relevant stages</u> of the research and innovation value chain complementary to other activities under the ECF, <b><u>where activities from TRL 7 and upwards shall be carried out and financed.</u></b></p> <p>SI</p> <p>(Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>We maintain that it should be clearly stated up to which TRL the HEU programme provides funding. Activities beyond that level — from TRL 7 onwards — should fall under the scope of the ECF.</p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>Collaborative research and innovation</u></b> Activities shall be carried out in a balanced manner between lower and higher Technology Readiness Levels, thereby covering the whole <b><u>all parts of the research and innovation</u></b> value chain <b><u>with a strong emphasis on basic research complementary to other activities under the ECF.</u></b></p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>The importance is to highlight the importance of basic research within the overall research and innovation cycle.</p> |
|  | <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>2a) Collaborative research might lead to security-relevant results that will benefit from specific follow-up actions in order to better explore security [and defence] related applications. For that purpose, the programme implementation shall provide for that option.</u></b></p>   |
| <p>3. <b><u>Under the ‘competitiveness’ component of pillar II, tThis</u></b> Programme shall <del>include</del> <b><u>support</u></b> the collaborative research and innovation activities in a specific dedicated part of the work programmes adopted under Chapters IV to VII of the Regulation (EU) XXX European Competitiveness Fund. Those work programmes shall be adopted in accordance with Article 15 of the Regulation (EU) XXX [European Competitiveness Fund Regulation].</p> | <p>BE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>3. <b><u>Under the ‘competitiveness’ component of pillar II, tThis</u></b> Programme shall <del>include</del> <b><u>support</u></b> the collaborative research and innovation activities in a specific dedicated part of the work programmes adopted under Chapters IV to VII of the Regulation (EU) XXX European Competitiveness Fund. Those work programmes shall be adopted in accordance with Article 15 of the Regulation (EU) XXX [European Competitiveness Fund</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Regulation] <b><u>and in accordance with the rules of this programme [Framework Programm].</u></b></p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     In line with art. 11(a).</p> <p>EE_comments<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>3. <b><u>Under the ‘competitiveness’ component of pillar II, t†his</u></b> Programme shall <del>include</del> <b>support</b> the collaborative research and innovation activities in a specific dedicated part of the work programmes adopted under Chapters IV to VII of the Regulation (EU) XXX European Competitiveness Fund. Those work programmes shall be adopted in accordance with <b>the examination procedure referred to in</b> Article <del>X15</del> of the Regulation (EU) XXX [<del>reference to the Horizon European Competitiveness Fund</del> Regulation].</p> <p>EE_comments<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     It is important for us that all work programs related to Horizon Europe are adopted through a examination procedure. Since we do not want to preempt the ECF negotiations we’d prefer to refer here to the Horizon Europe regulation.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>3. <b><u>Under the ‘competitiveness’ component of pillar II, t†his</u></b> Programme shall <del>include</del> <b>support</b> the collaborative research and innovation activities in <b>a specific dedicated part of the</b> work programmes adopted under Chapters IV to VII of the Regulation (EU) XXX European Competitiveness Fund. Those work programmes shall be adopted in</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>accordance with Article 15 of the Regulation (EU) XXX [European Competitiveness Fund Regulation].</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>This article is intimately related to the ECF policy windows, we suggest marking its character and put it in italics.</p> <p>We have our national position that we express through the ECF committee.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>3. <b><u>Under the ‘competitiveness’ component of pillar II, t†his</u></b> Programme shall <del>include support the</del> collaborative research and innovation activities <u>aligned on the objectives and specific activities of the ECF policy windows. The calls concerning these activities shall be integrated</u> in a specific dedicated part of the work programmes adopted under Chapters IV to VII of the Regulation (EU) XXX European Competitiveness Fund. Those work programmes shall be adopted in accordance with Article 15 of the Regulation (EU) XXX [European Competitiveness Fund Regulation].</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><u>The new wording is confusing.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>Can the Commission provide details of how the R&amp;I areas from the relevant six Cluster areas will translate across to the proposed four Policy Windows?</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>MT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>3. <b><u>Under the ‘competitiveness’ component of pillar II, tThis Programme shall include support the collaborative research and innovation activities in a specific dedicated part of the work programmes adopted under Chapters IV to VII of the Regulation (EU) XXX European Competitiveness Fund. Those work programmes shall be adopted in accordance with Article 15 of the Regulation (EU) XXX [European Competitiveness Fund Regulation]. The European Competitiveness Fund and the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation shall adopt separate work programmes. The work programmes of the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation shall exclusively address R&amp;I elements, while the European Competitiveness Fund work programmes shall focus on innovation deployment and market uptake.</u></b></p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>Malta argues that single work programmes of the policy windows under the European Competitiveness Fund will marginalise research activities and decrease excellence and effectiveness of Horizon Europe collaborative endeavours. We are calling for adoption of synergistic, but separate work programmes for both Horizon Europe and ECF.</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>- Several MS have voiced disagreement with this proposal to exclude dedicated FP10 Work Programmes for collaborative R&amp;I under the policy windows. The intent to implement single committees and Work Programmes for the ECF policy windows, thus enforcing a top-down approach to collaborative R&amp;I within Horizon Europe, raises concerns, particularly in</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>light of the existing multilevel governance framework of the ECF and the MS role. PT considers this aspect particularly important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In this sense, PT is still examining the text but we tend to support a solution that ensures specific Work Programmes for R&amp;I within the FEC, under each policy window.</li> <li>- This approach goes hand in hand with the comitology setting where dedicated ad hoc configurations should be set to discuss, with the MS, the R&amp;I component of the FEC policy windows work programmes</li> </ul> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><b><u>Under the ‘competitiveness’ component of pillar II, t[his Programme shall include support and benefit from</u></b> the collaborative research and innovation activities in a specific dedicated part of the work programmes adopted under Chapters IV to VII of the Regulation (EU) XXX European Competitiveness Fund. Those work programmes shall be adopted in accordance with Article 15 of the Regulation (EU) XXX [European Competitiveness Fund Regulation].</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SE asks whether the final sentence really is needed and if it can create confusion here. We support the HE to stand on its own, build collaborative research bottom up, and coordinate priorities with the ECF through addressing the same windows. The supportive role should be <b>mutual</b> between HE and ECF, hence the addition of “and benefit from”. In this context, SE reminds of the need for social sciences and humanities to be involved in supporting the objectives of the ECF policy windows.</p> |
|   |  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
| <p>4. <u>Under the ‘society’ component of pillar II,</u> This Programme shall support <u>collaborative research and innovation</u> activities:</p>   | <p>FR<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation, FR is still discussing internally.</u></p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Further discussion is required on what the focus of the society component should be – this also applies to the Specific Programme.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     PT expresses reservations on having a single committee for this component of Pillar II, due to thematic diversity. We are also concerned on budget allocation, as Missions need adequate funding to scale solutions by 2030. The indicative budget for Pillar II does not, in our opinion, respond to these needs and there is a risk to either underfund Missions, which may hinder their impact, or underfund NEB and EU response to complex societal challenges.</p> |
| <p><del>(a) to tackle global societal challenges and socio-economic transformations in the areas of strengthening democratic values and tackling disinformation, including rule of law and fundamental rights; promoting socio-economic transformations that contribute to inclusion and growth, addressing demographic and intergenerational challenges, including from a youth perspective and including migration management and integration of migrants.</del></p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/> <del>(a) to tackle societal challenges and socio-economic transformations aligned with the EU values, especially those enshrined in Art. 2 TEU.</del></p> <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     AT: “EU values” alone is vague; a reference to Art. 2 TEU would be useful and covers most of the text that has been deleted here.</p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(a) to tackle <b>global and</b> societal challenges <b>and socio-economic transformations</b> in the areas of strengthening <b>aligned with the EU values, as stated in article 2 of the Treaty of the European Union.</b></p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Could you confirm that these are not limited to EU values but should be aligned with EU values?<br/>                     A reference to article 2 TEU could make it more precise, while we would support broadening the scope of values considered.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     DE: Germany’s position is that the societal challenges, which shall be tackled in the research projects funded in the “Society” part of Horizon Europe, need to be laid out in the legal documents in a clear and transparent way, in order to define the scope of this funding area. Therefore, we supported the concrete examples for research topics in Art. 15 (a) of the COM proposal. We can accept the deletions suggested by the Presidency under the condition that Art. 11 of the Specific Programme will define the scope the “Society” part of the programme in a transparent manner.</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     What does ‘socio-economic transformations’ mean?</p> <p>NL<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>This scope seems incoherent with the SP reference, which now mentions a lot of added thematic priorities. If ‘socio-economic’ covers all these themes, how will we be able to make strategic programming decisions, within the scope of the available budget for this part? Also for the Society component, thematic prioritization should be based on strategic choices and priorities, and should not become a catch-all for everything that is not funded through the ECF.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><b>(a) to tackle global <u>complex</u> societal challenges <u>and address cultural, political and socio-economic transformations</u> in the areas of strengthening <u>aligned with the EU values.</u></b></p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>PT suggests such changes to make the regulation more coherent with what is described under Society under the Specific Programme.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>to tackle <del>global</del> societal challenges and <del>socio-economic</del> transformations aligned with the EU values, <b><u>such as democratic values and human rights, and global commitments where relevant.</u></b></p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>[SE can agree with deletions in this paragraph as long as the specific programme covers all relevant challenges and transformations. “EU values” may need to be spelled out or explained.]</p> <p>SK<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>(a)</b> to tackle global societal challenges <b><u>and socio-economic transformations</u></b> in the areas of strengthening <b><u>aligned with the EU values.</u></b> democratic values and tackling disinformation, including rule of law and fundamental rights; promoting socio-economic transformations that contribute to inclusion and growth, addressing demographic and intergenerational challenges, including from a youth perspective and including migration management and integration of migrants. <b><u>To support the delivery of these activities, the Programme shall promote co-creation and co-design through the engagement of citizens and civil society, including youth organisations.</u></b></p> <p>SK<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We would like to reintegrate the reference to co-creation and co-design with civil society from the 2021 regulation, and builds on the wording in the ECF regulation and reference to youth organisations - as referenced in the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security regulation as a key stakeholder.</p> |
| <p><b><i>5.(b) <del>The Programme shall contribute to support EU Missions notably through the identification of priority actions for R&amp;I funding for the development of new knowledge, technologies, services, and products in view of their goals. Funding for the EU Missions established under Article 8 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/695 shall be awarded on the basis of work programmes covering up to the budgetary year 2030.</del></i></b></p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><b><i>contribute to support EU Missions notably through the identification of priority actions for R&amp;I funding for the development of new knowledge, technologies, services, and products in view of their goals. Funding for the EU Missions established under Article 8 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/695 shall be awarded on the basis of work programmes covering <u>at least up to the budgetary year 2030.</u></i></b></p> <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>AT: The inclusion of the term “<i>at least</i>” opens the possibility for extending EU Missions beyond 2030, rather than imposing a fixed time limit at this stage. This approach provides the necessary flexibility in cases where certain Missions demonstrate strong performance in the upcoming evaluation but require a longer implementation period to achieve their R&amp;I objectives.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE: Could the Presidency clarify the intention of this paragraph?</p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <i>5.(b) — The Programme shall contribute to support EU Missions notably through the identification of priority actions for R&amp;I funding for the development of new knowledge, technologies, services, and products in view of their goals. Funding for the EU Missions established under Article 8 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/695 shall be awarded on the basis of work programmes covering up to the budgetary year 2030.</i></p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We find that missions should be carried out under ECF rather than under Horizon Europe</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We are currently analysing the interministerial position regarding missions. HE shall only fund R&amp;I activities. From 2028 onwards EU Mission activities will be deployment and uptake activities, therefore they should be included as part of the actions of the ECF policy windows.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>R&amp;I activities related to EU Mission (if needed) should be included in other parts of the Programme. There is no need to include Missions explicitly in the text.</p> <p>No other fund has included missions, no mention in the Performance regulation. This is a very clear indicator that the COM does not consider Missions and portfolio of actions in different policy dimensions.</p> <p>For the sake of simplification Missions should be removed from the text.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>LT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We would like to stress that Horizon Europe resources should be used to fund only the R&amp;I component as in the case of NEB.</p> <p>We are also not sure that this is legally correct to refer to a Regulation which is being repealed by this new Regulation.</p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>MT would like to know what is going to happen to the EU Missions and their goals beyond 2030 and whether the Moonshots will continue the Missions' objectives.</p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><i>5.(b) <del>The Programme shall contribute to</del> <u>support</u> EU Missions notably through the identification of priority actions for R&amp;I funding for the development of new knowledge, technologies, services, and products in view of their goals. Funding for the EU Missions established under Article</i></b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><i>8 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/695 shall be awarded on the basis of work programmes covering up to the budgetary year 2030. <b>The continuation of EU Missions shall be subject to a critical assessment of their outcomes and added value.</b></i></p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     PL suggests this addition which emphasizes the lack of clear distinction between mission projects and (current) Pillar II projects. Effective evaluation is required to check if missions still serve their purposes.</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><b>The EU Missions, as an essential tool to deliver technological and innovative solutions to our territories and citizens, should contribute to the specific policy objectives of the policy windows of the European Competitiveness Fund, and be supported through it, where necessary, to complete these objectives.</b></u></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Considering the resources needed for Missions to scale their solutions until 2023, PT considers that the possibility of having Missions supported by ECF, similarly to the EU partnerships, should be considered. This would require an articulation between the work programmes and the policy priorities under ECF policy windows.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <i>-(b) <del>The Programme shall contribute to</del> <u>support</u> EU Missions notably through the identification of priority actions for R&amp;I funding for the</i></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><i>development of new knowledge, technologies, services, and products <u>and practices</u> in view of their goals. Funding for the EU Missions established under Article 8 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/695 shall be awarded on the basis of work programmes covering <u>at least</u> up to the budgetary year 2030.</i></p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Ny version efter mötet.</p> <p>SE would like to add “practices” which opens up for social innovation where relevant.</p> <p>[SE would also like to add “at least” in order not to rule out continuation of missions that show good results but need to be prolonged in order to capitalise on the results.]</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <i>5.(b) — The Programme shall contribute to <u>support</u> EU Missions notably through the identification of priority actions for R&amp;I funding for the development of new knowledge, technologies, services, and products in view of their goals. Funding for the EU Missions established under Article 8 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/695 shall be awarded on the basis of work programmes covering up to the budgetary year 2030.</i></p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Missions should no longer belong to FP. They have achieved their research phase and it is time for their implementation, that shul dnot be funded from the Programme.</p> |
|   |   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
| <p><del>6.(c) The Programme shall <u>to</u> support the R&amp;I component of the New European Bauhaus Facility.</del></p> | <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <del><b><i>6.(c) — The Programme shall <u>to</u> support the R&amp;I component of the New European Bauhaus Facility.</i></b></del></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     HE shall only fund R&amp;I activities. R&amp;I activities related to the NEB Facility (if needed) should be included in other parts of the Programme for the sake of simplification. We propose to delete this point and for the same reasons the recital.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <del><b><i>6.(c) — The Programme shall <u>to</u> support the R&amp;I component of the New European Bauhaus Facility.</i></b></del></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     This should not be listed separately – particularly if the text on the society activities remains very high level.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <del><b><i>6.(c) The Programme shall <u>to</u> support the R&amp;I component of the New European Bauhaus Facility.</i></b></del></p> <p>SE</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SE would like to explore options for the NEB R&amp;I component (and perhaps the whole NEB facility) to be integrated in the ECF policy window 1.</p>  |
| <b>Recitals</b>   |  |
| <p><i>(11) EU Missions as set up in the Regulation 2021/695 should enable a transformative and systemic impact for society, by fostering cross-disciplinary, cross-sectoral, cross-policy and cross-border collaboration. They should rely on research and innovation to develop the breakthrough technologies, services, products, and social innovations needed to achieve their ambitious objectives. In turn, EU Missions should accelerate the development, scaling, and deployment of innovative solutions and help create lead markets for new products and services. The Framework Programme should finance the research and innovation activities of the Missions, while the deployment and scaling up should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</i></p> | <p>AT</p> <p><b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><i>The Framework Programme should finance the research and innovation activities of the Missions, while the deployment and scaling up should be delivered through other EU programmes <b>including the ECF, National and Regional Partnership Plans, Connecting Europe Facility</b> and national funding.</i></p> <p>AT</p> <p><b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>AT: The “other” EU programmes supposed to deliver deployment and scaling should be specified. The deployment and scaling component of the missions should also be embedded in the legal bases of those other EU programmes.</p> <p>BE</p> <p><b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><i>EU Missions as set up in the Regulation 2021/695 should enable a transformative and systemic impact for society, by fostering cross-disciplinary, cross-sectoral, cross-policy and cross-border collaboration. They should rely on research and innovation to develop the breakthrough technologies, services, products, and social innovations needed to achieve their ambitious objectives. In turn, EU Missions should accelerate the development, scaling, and deployment of innovative solutions and help</i></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><i>create lead markets for new products and services. The Framework Programme should finance the research and innovation activities (up to TRL 8) of the Missions, which may be partially done through European partnerships, while the deployment and scaling up should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</i></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE: Which programmes are meant by “<i>while the deployment and scaling up should be delivered through other EU programmes</i>”?</p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <del><i>(11) — EU Missions as set up in the Regulation 2021/695 should enable a transformative and systemic impact for society, by fostering cross-disciplinary, cross-sectoral, cross-policy and cross-border collaboration. They should rely on research and innovation to develop the breakthrough technologies, services, products, and social innovations needed to achieve their ambitious objectives. In turn, EU Missions should accelerate the development, scaling, and deployment of innovative solutions and help create lead markets for new products and services. The Framework Programme should finance the research and innovation activities of the Missions, while the deployment and scaling up should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</i></del></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We are currently analysing the interministerial position regarding missions. HE shall only fund R&amp;I activities. From 2028 onwards EU Mission activities will be deployment and uptake activities, therefore they should be included as part of the actions of the ECF policy windows.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>R&amp;I activities related to EU Mission (if needed) should be included in other parts of the Programme. There is no need to include Missions explicitly in the text.</p> <p>No other fund has included missions, no mention in the Performance regulation. This is a very clear indicator that the COM does not consider Missions and portfolio of actions in different policy dimensions.</p> <p>For the sake of simplification Missions should be removed from the text.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>LT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     See the comment above</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><i>(11) EU Missions as set up in the Regulation 2021/695 should enable a transformative and systemic impact for society, by fostering cross-disciplinary, cross-sectoral, cross-policy and cross-border collaboration. They should rely on research and innovation to develop the breakthrough technologies, services, products, and social innovations <u>and practices</u> needed to achieve their ambitious objectives. In turn, EU Missions should accelerate the development, scaling, and deployment of innovative solutions and help create lead markets for new products and services. The Framework Programme should finance the research and innovation activities of the Missions, while the deployment and scaling up should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</i></p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><del>(11) — EU Missions as set up in the Regulation 2021/695 should enable a transformative and systemic impact for society, by fostering cross-disciplinary, cross-sectoral, cross-policy and cross-border collaboration. They should rely on research and innovation to develop the breakthrough technologies, services, products, and social innovations needed to achieve their ambitious objectives. In turn, EU Missions should accelerate the development, scaling, and deployment of innovative solutions and help create lead markets for new products and services. The Framework Programme should finance the research and innovation activities of the Missions, while the deployment and scaling up should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</del></p> |
| <p><b>(12) Anchored in the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>1</sup>, the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility is a multi-annual funding tool designed to accelerate the transformation of neighbourhoods through sustainable and inclusive design. Its R&amp;I component should be funded by Horizon Europe while its roll-out component should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</b></p> | <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                 DE: Which programmes are meant by “other EU programmes”?</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/> <u><del>(12) — Anchored in the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>2</sup>, the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility is a multi-annual funding tool designed to accelerate the transformation of neighbourhoods through sustainable and inclusive design. Its R&amp;I component should be funded by Horizon Europe while its roll-out component should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</del></u></p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p>   |

<sup>1</sup> Commission Decision C(2024)1741 of 20.03.2024.

<sup>2</sup> Commission Decision C(2024)1741 of 20.03.2024.

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>HE shall only fund R&amp;I activities. R&amp;I activities related to the NEB Facility (if needed) should be included in other parts of the Programme for the sake of simplification.<br/>                     We propose to delete this recital.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <i>12) — Anchored in the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>3</sup>, the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility is a multi-annual funding tool designed to accelerate the transformation of neighbourhoods through sustainable and inclusive design. Its R&amp;I component should be funded by Horizon Europe while its roll-out component should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</i></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Such detail is unnecessary and out of line with the rest of the section.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (12) — Anchored in the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>4</sup>, the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility is a multi-annual funding tool designed to accelerate the transformation of neighbourhoods through sustainable and inclusive design. Its R&amp;I component should be funded by Horizon Europe while its roll-out component should be delivered through other EU programmes and national funding.</p> |

<sup>3</sup> Commission Decision C(2024)1741 of 20.03.2024.

<sup>4</sup> Commission Decision C(2024)1741 of 20.03.2024.

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | SE<br>(Comments):<br>SE would like to explore options for the NEB R&I component (and perhaps the whole NEB facility) to be integrated in the ECF policy window 1.  |
| <p><b><u>PROPOSAL FOR A COUNCIL DECISION ON ESTABLISHING THE SPECIFIC PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTING HORIZON EUROPE - THE FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION FOR THE PERIOD 2028-2034, LAYING DOWN THE RULES FOR PARTICIPATION AND DISSEMINATION UNDER THAT PROGRAMME, AND REPEALING DECISION (EU) 2021/764</u></b></p> |  |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 5</i><br/><i>European Partnerships</i></p>   | MT<br>(Comments):<br>Malta reiterates its stance that well-functioning European Partnerships under HE 2021-2027 like PRIMA, not directly tied to the ECF policy windows, should receive support to continue operating beyond 2027. In this regard, we are seeking the answer to the question what mechanism to decide which of the current Partnerships are going to continue their operations under the next Framework Programme will be used and who is going to take these decisions. |
| <p>1. European Partnerships shall follow a clear lifecycle approach, including their <b>identification in close cooperation with Member States</b>, selection, implementation and monitoring, and transitioning out of Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>] on the basis of the following:</p> | AT<br>(Comments):<br>AT welcomes this amendment.<br><br>DE<br>(Drafting suggestions):  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>1. European Partnerships shall follow a clear lifecycle approach, including their selection, implementation and monitoring, and transitioning out of Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>] on the basis of the following: <u>European Partnerships shall follow a clear lifecycle approach. They shall be identified in the co-creation process together with Member States and, where appropriate, with associated countries before being implemented in work programmes. They shall be selected following a competitive, open, non-discriminatory, and transparent procedure.</u></p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>DE suggests to reformulate the entire para (1) to underline that the participation of Member States and associated countries in the Strategic Coordinating Process for European Partnerships is essential to achieve true co-ownership of the partnerships. To this end, Member States and associated countries must jointly lead the processes of identifying and selecting partnerships with the Commission.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>1. European Partnerships shall follow a clear lifecycle approach, including their <b>identification and selection in close cooperation with Member States, selection</b>, implementation and monitoring, and transitioning out of Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>] on the basis of the following:</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>It is necessary to add selection.<br/>                 We strongly support to include the cooperation of Member States.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>1. European Partnerships shall follow a clear lifecycle approach, including their <u>identification-in-close-cooperation-with Member States</u>, selection, implementation and monitoring, <u>in close cooperation with Member States</u>, and transitioning out of Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>] on the basis of the following:</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><u>Strong support to this added mention, although Member States should be associated to all phases – not only the identification process.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>European Partnerships shall follow a clear lifecycle approach, including their <u>identification and agreement in close cooperation with Member States</u>, co-selection, co-design and co-implementation and monitoring, and transitioning out of Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>] on the basis of the following:</p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>As mentioned in Article 11 #5 (a), we need to ensure that MS are not just consulted and the decision made elsewhere. It is also critically important that MS have a central role in the design and implementation of the European partnerships.</p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>Malta supports the addition highlighting the role of Member States in identifying and establishing European Partnerships.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>NL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>1. European Partnerships shall follow a clear lifecycle approach, including their <u>identification in close cooperation with Member States</u>, selection, implementation and monitoring, and transitioning out of Regulation XXX [reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation] on the basis of the following:</p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><u>We support the role of member states in the identification and selection of partnerships. However, this sentence seems a bit odd. The close cooperation with Member States fits better under sub a where it is about selecting. We are open for other ways to make this more clear.</u></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>PT supports an early involvement of Member States since the identification phase can contribute for a more active and participation of the relevant stakeholders, including from private sector (industry, SMEs, ...)</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SE welcomes this addition.</p> |
| <p>(a) European Partnerships shall be selected following a competitive, open, non-discriminatory, and transparent procedure, <del>on the basis of areas proposed by the Commission</del>. In addition the requirements set out in Article 11 of Regulation (EU) Regulation XXX [reference to the Horizon</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><b>AT: SCRUTINY RESERVATION</b></p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Europe Regulation</i>], candidate partnerships shall comply with the following selection criteria:</p> | <p>The guiding principle should be “best fit for purpose” and EU added value. Selection processes and the role of public funding agencies need to be further clarified.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(a) <del>European Partnerships shall be selected following a competitive, open, non-discriminatory, and transparent procedure, on the basis of areas proposed by the Commission.</del> In addition the requirements set out in Article 11 of Regulation (EU) Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>], candidate partnerships shall comply with the following selection criteria:</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>DE suggests to shift part of the content to para 1. in order to bring together general aspects.</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(a) European Partnerships shall be selected following a competitive, open, non-discriminatory, and transparent procedure <b>in close consultation with Member States</b>, <del>on the basis of areas proposed by the Commission.</del> In addition the requirements set out in Article 11 of Regulation (EU) Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>], candidate partnerships shall comply with the following selection criteria:</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>MS must have a central role in the procedures put in place.</p> <p>NL<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(a) European Partnerships shall be selected following a competitive, open, non-discriminatory, and transparent procedure, <u>in close cooperation with Member States</u>, <del>on the basis of areas proposed by the Commission</del>. In addition the requirements set out in Article 11 of Regulation (EU) Regulation XXX [<i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i>], candidate partnerships shall comply with the following selection criteria:</p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>See above.</u></p>  |
| <p>i. portfolio relevance: overall consistency and coherence of the partnership portfolio shall be ensured, provided that candidates meet all selection criteria and demonstrate relevance as part of a strategic portfolio of actions;</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     ... demonstrate relevance as part of a strategic portfolio of actions. <b><u>The portfolio should be managed in a way that keeps challenges clearly defined while also addressing key system-wide needs to support the entire ecosystem;</u></b></p> <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     AT: The overall partnership portfolio requires effective management to ensure that the addressed challenges are clearly delineated, and that systemic RDI activities are comprehensively covered</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     i. portfolio relevance: overall consistency and coherence of the partnership portfolio shall be <del>ensured</del> <u>secured</u>, <del>provided</del> <u>ensuring</u> that candidates <u>partnerships</u> meet all selection criteria and demonstrate relevance as part of a strategic portfolio of actions;</p> <p>ES</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>i. portfolio relevance: overall consistency and coherence of the partnership portfolio shall be ensured, provided that candidates meet all selection criteria and demonstrate relevance as part of a strategic <b>and complementary</b> portfolio of actions;</p> <p>ES<br/>(Comments):<br/>Partnerships should be complementary. It is necessary to avoid overlapping.</p> <p>FR<br/>(Comments):<br/><u>How will be defined the strategic nature of portfolio of actions, and based on which criteria?</u></p> |
| <p>ii. critical mass: the partnerships' budget (Union and partners' contributions) shall match their duration, ensuring sufficient resources to fund at least one substantial call per year, <del>each comparable in size to an average Horizon Europe call in the relevant thematic area;</del></p>  | <p>ES<br/>(Comments):<br/>We support the removal of the last sentence. It is misleading.</p>  |
| <p>iii. partners' composition: unless duly justified, the participation of public entities from at least <del>five</del> <b>XX</b> Member States and, <b>where appropriate</b>, private entities representing substantial segments of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders;</p> | <p>BG<br/>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>iii. partners' composition: unless duly justified, the participation of public entities from at least <del>XX</del> <b>ten</b> Member States and, where appropriate, private entities representing substantial segments of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders;</p> <p>EE_comments<br/>(Drafting suggestions):</p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>iii. partners' composition: unless duly justified, the participation of public entities from at least five <del>XX</del> <b>half of the</b> Member States and, <b>where appropriate</b>, private entities representing substantial segments of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders;</p> <p>EE_comments<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>It is important to us, that all the Partnerships have EU added value and are strategically important to at least half of the MS'. We are open to <i>50% of MS', at least half of the MS'</i> or any other wording that suits best.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>iii. partners' composition: unless duly justified, the participation of public entities from at least five <del>XX</del> <b>13</b> Member States and, <b>where appropriate, by</b> private entities <b>with adequate and representative participation, reflecting representing</b> substantial segments <b>of their respective ecosystems substantial segments</b> of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders <b>that enable the achievement of the objectives of the partnership;</b></p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We support the change. The minimum number of partners should be 13-14 following the same criteria of the ERA policy actions: -half of the MS- We consider that "substantial segments" is vague and propose an alternative wording.</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>iii. partners' composition: <del>unless duly justified</del>, the participation of public entities from at least <del>five</del> XX Member States and/or, <del>where appropriate</del>, private entities representing substantial segments of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders;</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>In the current regulation, it mentions the participation of at least 40% of Member States for Institutionalised Partnerships. It represents c. 11 Member States, but 10 seems enough.</u></p> <p>HU<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>iii. partners' composition: unless duly justified, the participation of public entities from at least <del>XX</del> <b>40% of the</b> Member States and, where appropriate, private entities representing substantial segments of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders;</p> <p>HU<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     To ensure that Union funding delivers on shared priorities and achieves the greatest possible impact, initiatives of Union-wide importance should aim for a balanced and broad representation of Member States.</p> <p>LT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>iii. partners' composition: unless duly justified, the participation of public entities from at least <b>40%</b> <del>five</del> <del>XX</del> of Member States and, <u>where appropriate</u>, private entities representing substantial segments of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders;</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>LT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     If we aim for pan-European relevance partnerships, the involvement of MS should be way above 5 MS. We suggest setting the limit of at least 40% of MS.</p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     NL makes a scrutiny reservation. We wonder if it would be necessary to state a minimum amount, if all other requirements are met (relevance, critical mass, etc). Would decent participation not automatically follow if the right selection procedure was followed?</p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     PL opposes to the possibility of creating an European Partnership with public entities from 5 Member States, this number is considered too low to achieve a critical mass and to deliver on paneuropean cooperation. It may contribute to the creation of “closed clubs” which we want to avoid. PL would be in favor of partnerships involving at least half of the Member States.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     SE welcomes the addition of “where appropriate”.</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We propose 10.</p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>iii. partners' composition: unless duly justified, the participation of public entities from at least <del>five</del> <b>ten</b> Member States and, <b>where appropriate</b>, private entities representing substantial segments of their respective ecosystems is required, ensuring a broad and balanced involvement of key stakeholders;</p> <p>SK<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     SK proposes to expand the criteria for establishing partnerships, recommending that more than 5 MS be required to form a partnership, with a <b>minimum of 10 MS or 40% of all MS</b> involved.</p>               |
| <p>iv. pan-European relevance: partnerships shall have pan-European relevance, reflected in a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States;</p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/> <del>pan-European relevance: partnerships shall have pan-European relevance, reflected in a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States;</del></p> <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     AT is against the introduction of geographical criteria.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     iv. pan-European relevance: partnerships shall have pan-European relevance, <del>reflected in a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States;</del></p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>DE suggests to delete “reflected in a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States”.</p> <p>Pan-European relevance should not necessarily mean balanced distribution among Member States but can also be achieved by addressing pan-European challenges.</p> <p>EE_comments<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We support keeping the reference to balanced geographical distribution as it is now.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><b>iv. pan-European relevance: partnerships shall have pan-European relevance, reflected in their capacity to address common European challenges with European added value; <del>a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States;</del></b></p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>It is not necessary to include a reference to geographic distributions, pan European relevance is justified with the minimum number of countries and addressing common challenges.</p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><del>pan-European relevance: partnerships shall have pan-European relevance, reflected in a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States</del><u>by targeting strategic research priorities and technology areas and creating the needed critical mass;</u></p> <p>FI</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>(Comments):</p> <p>FI supports NL formulation. We also find the requirement ‘balanced geographic distribution of partners’ unclear.</p> <p>FR</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>iv. pan-European relevance: partnerships shall have pan-European relevance, reflected in <del>a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States</del>; <u>the contribution of the project to Union’s strategic priorities</u>;</p> <p>FR</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p><u>Pan-European relevance is first of all a question of generating genuine added-value at the EU level, producing results being beneficial for the Union as a whole. The involvement of at least XXX Member States is already mandatory (cf iii).</u></p> <p><u>The introduction of geographical criteria is not aligned with the excellence principle of the FP.</u></p> <p>IE</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>iv. pan-European relevance: partnerships shall have pan-European relevance, <del>reflected in a balanced geographic</del> and <b>ensure a critical mass distribution</b> of partners <b>across Europe among Member States</b>;</p> <p>IE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>It is not clear what a ‘balanced geographic distribution of partners’ means or how it would be determined.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>The aim should be to ensure a critical mass of partners – this needs to be reflected in the minimum number of countries in the previous paragraph (iii). It should also be open to associated countries.</p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Malta supports the “balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States”. We do not wish to see any changes in this point.</p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     iv. <del>pan</del>-European relevance: partnerships shall have <del>pan</del>-European relevance, <del>reflected in a balanced geographic distribution of partners among Member States</del> <u>by targeting strategic research priorities and technology areas and creating the needed critical mass;</u></p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     Relevance for Europe should be based on different grounds (critical mass, strategic priorities etc). Also, it is unclear what ‘balanced’ concretely means.</p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     PL strongly supports this provision and objects to possible deletion of the wording reg. “a balanced distribution of partners among Member States.”</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     New paragraph to be included in (a):<br/> <u><b>Demonstrated added value: a partnership must clearly demonstrate that it achieves the programme’s objectives more effectively than the Union</b></u></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><b><u>acting alone and more effectively than other instruments available under the Framework Programme;</u></b></p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>PT seeks to reaffirm one of the key criteria for the selection of European Partnerships under the Horizon Europe Regulation (2021–2027): the added value of partnerships compared to other instruments of the Framework Programme and its effectiveness to achieve policy goals.</p>   |
| <p>v. mission-orientation: partnerships shall formulate clear, measurable, time-bound objectives within <del>their</del> duration of Horizon Europe that will inform monitoring, assessment, and evaluation exercises;</p> | <p>LT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><del>mission-orientation</del> <b>challenge based approach</b>: partnerships shall formulate <b>specific</b>, clear, measurable, time-bound objectives within their duration that will inform monitoring, assessment, and evaluation exercises;</p> <p>LT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>“Mission-orientation” is a misleading term in the context of this Regulation.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SE welcomes this modification.</p> <p>SI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><del>mission-orientation</del> <b>challenge based approach</b>: partnerships shall formulate <b>specific</b> clear, measurable, time-bound objectives <b>aimed at tackling clearly identified societal or technological challenges</b> within their duration that will inform monitoring, assessment, and evaluation exercises;</p> |
|  |  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
| <p>vi. <b>implementation</b> business plan: partners shall develop an <b>implementation</b> business plan ex-ante, including a set of key performance indicators to track progress and a forward-looking transition strategy, including actions for phasing out from Horizon Europe funding;</p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                 ...and a forward-looking transition strategy, <b>that includes clear strategies for translating research results into practical deployment and</b> including actions for phasing out from Horizon Europe funding;</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                 vi. <b>implementation and sustainability</b> business plan: partners shall develop an <b>implementation</b> business plan ex-ante, including a set of key performance indicators to track progress and a forward-looking transition strategy, including actions for phasing out from Horizon Europe funding;</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                 We support the change. The implementation plan should take into account the lifecycle of the partnership and its sustainability.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                 vi. <b>implementation</b> business plan: partners shall develop an <b>implementation</b> business plan ex-ante, including <b>policy objectives, deliverables and</b> a set of key performance indicators to track progress and a forward-looking transition strategy, including actions for phasing out from Horizon Europe funding;</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                 PT supports that is important that the implementation plan includes the policy objectives for which each partnerships contributes and attainable deliverables.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | SE<br>(Comments):<br>SE welcomes this modification.  |
| <p><u>via. data strategy: a data strategy shall include stipulations to the use of data created during the partnership and ensure availability of data at least 10 years after its end, in line with the FAIR data principle;</u></p> | AT<br>(Comments):<br>AT welcomes this additional paragraph.<br>BE<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br><p><u>via. data strategy: a data strategy shall include stipulations to the use of data created during by the partnership and ensure availability of data at least 10 years after its end, in line with the FAIR data principles;</u></p> BE<br>(Comments):<br>To clarify who is being addressed here, and correct the typo regarding FAIR Principles (plural).<br>ES<br>(Comments):<br>The general principles of the Programme should apply also to partnerships. We would prefer not to include special conditions for partnerships in relation to availability and use of data.<br>SE<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br><p><u>via. data strategy: a data strategy shall include stipulations to the use of data created during the partnership and ensure availability of data at least 10 years after its end, in line with the FAIR data principle;</u></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     SE: is data strategy a new item in the draft regulation? How will different data strategies be aligned and harmonised to avoid different standards?<br/>                     Is the regulation the correct placement of requirements for data strategies?<br/>                     Previously such requirements are stipulated in the work programmes.</p>   |
| <p>vii. openness and transparency: partnerships shall demonstrate openness and transparency regarding the identification of priorities and objectives – including expected results and impacts – and the engagement of partners and stakeholders across the entire value chain and from diverse sectors, backgrounds, and disciplines, including relevant international ones <b>with due regard to</b> without affecting <b>economic and research security</b> European competitiveness;</p> | <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Clarification is needed on what "economic security" means in this context?</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     We welcome the explicit reference to economic and research security. However, the Regulation needs to clearly set out what we mean by ‘economic and research security’.</p> <p>As previously highlighted, Ireland favours the inclusion of a specific article on research security to ensure a consistent approach across the programme.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     vii. openness and transparency: partnerships shall demonstrate openness and transparency regarding the identification of priorities and objectives – including expected results and impacts <b>at national and Union’s level</b> – and the engagement of partners and stakeholders across the entire value chain and from diverse sectors, backgrounds, and disciplines, including relevant international ones <b>with due regard to</b> without affecting <b>economic and research security</b> European competitiveness;</p> <p>PT</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>(Comments):<br/>                     The interplay between national and European levels must be assured.<br/>                     SE</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     openness and transparency: partnerships shall demonstrate openness and transparency regarding the identification of priorities and objectives – including expected results and impacts – and the engagement of partners and stakeholders across the entire value chain and from diverse sectors, backgrounds, and disciplines, including relevant international ones <b>with due regard to</b> without affecting <b>economic and research security</b> European competitiveness;</p> <p>SE</p> <p>(Comments):<br/>                     SE believes research security considerations are enough in this context.<br/>                     SK</p> <p>(Comments):<br/>                     We welcome explicit reference on economic and research security.</p> |
| <p><b><u>vii.a. SME and scale-up integration: where relevant, partnerships shall formulate clear strategies to ensure the effective inclusion of SMEs and scale-ups in the innovation cycle, taking into account their specific needs and challenges;</u></b></p> | <p>AT</p> <p>(Comments):<br/>                     AT welcomes this additional paragraph.<br/>                     ES</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):<br/> <b><u>vii.a. SME and scale-up integration: where relevant, partnerships shall formulate clear strategies to ensure the effective inclusion of SMEs and</u></b></p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b><u>scale-ups in the innovation cycle and their role in the value chain, taking into account their specific needs and challenges;</u></b></p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We are currently analysing the interministerial position regarding missions. HE shall only fund R&amp;I activities. From 2028 onwards EU Mission activities will be deployment and uptake activities, therefore they should be included as part of the actions of the ECF policy windows. R&amp;I activities related to EU Mission (if needed) should be included in other parts of the Programme. No other fund has included missions, no mention in the Performance regulation. This is a very clear indicator that the COM does not consider Missions and portfolio of actions in different policy dimensions. For the sake of simplification Missions should be removed from the text.</p> <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We welcome and support the explicit reference to SMEs.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>PT welcomes this specific paragraph, bearing in mind the importance of SMEs and scale-ups in the innovation cycle and their potential to translate the knowledge generated by R&amp;I activities into new and more innovative products and services; on the other we have to take into account the specific needs and challenges they face comparing with large enterprises..</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>vii.a. SME and scale-up integration: where relevant, partnerships shall formulate clear strategies to ensure the effective <b>promote</b> inclusion of SMEs and scale-ups in the innovation cycle, taking into account their specific needs and challenges;</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>Inclusion of SMEs cannot be ensured, only promoted as they are independent entities.</p>  |
|   | <p>PT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>New paragraph to be included in (a):<br/> <u><b>Synergies: partnerships shall promote alignment and coordinate with other R&amp;I initiatives, aiming to create synergies that strengthen the coherence of action, streamline shared efforts, and ensure cost-effectiveness;</b></u></p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>PT aims to reaffirm another key criteria for selecting European Partnerships under the current Horizon Europe Regulation, namely the ability to establish synergies with other instruments and initiatives.</p> |
| <p>viii. legacy: in cases where candidate partnerships build on predecessor initiatives, the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of previous partnerships shall be demonstrated;</p> | <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>viii. legacy: in cases where candidate partnerships build on predecessor initiatives, the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of previous partnerships shall be demonstrated <u><b>and their objectives updated as needed;</b></u></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>It is important to highlight that a full revision of the objectives of the partnership is needed to align them with the objectives of this Programme.</p> <p>MT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>Malta would like to inquire on what criteria to measure “efficiency, effectiveness and impact of previous partnerships” will be used.</p> <p>SI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>legacy: in cases where candidate partnerships build on predecessor initiatives, the efficiency, effectiveness <u>and <b>scientific, technological, economic, societal, policy and capacity building</b></u> impact of previous partnerships shall be demonstrated;</p> <p>SK<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>viii. legacy: in cases where candidate partnerships build on predecessor initiatives, the efficiency, effectiveness and <u><b>scientific, technological, economic, societal, policy and capacity building</b></u> impact of previous partnerships shall be demonstrated;</p> <p>SK<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>Based on the experience so far, we would like to support the continuation of the European Partnerships in next Horizon Europe, based on the continuity when comes to the list of existing and second wave partnerships as well as their research goals. European Partnerships should be <b>open, transparent</b>, and <b>better connected with other programmes</b> to achieve EU goals and deliver real socio-economic impact, while reducing administrative burden and <b>ensuring geographical balance</b> within the partnerships.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | PL<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br><i>(a new sentence coming after the last of selection criteria): The selection criteria shall be published transparently. Partnerships failing to meet performance indicators may be suspended or terminated.</i><br>PL<br>(Comments):<br>PL suggests reinforcing the message about transparency in the selection of new partnerships and their suspension/termination. |
| <del>ix-(aa)</del> <del>¶</del> Throughout their implementation, European Partnerships shall ensure:   |  |
| x. <del>internal</del> transparent governance arrangements and <del>internal</del> rules, <b>based on common guidelines</b> , including codes of conduct, that ensure their functioning in an open and transparent manner; | ES<br>(Comments):<br>We support to have common guidelines.<br>SE<br>(Comments):<br>Are those guidelines common for all partnerships and which text describes them?   |
| xi. continuous openness of the initiative through clear and transparent accession and exit criteria, including through open calls to potential new partner organisations;  | DE<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br>xi. continuous openness of the initiative through clear and transparent accession and exit criteria, including <b>e.g.</b> through open calls to potential new partner organisations;<br>DE   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(Comments):</p> <p>DE: while openness is key for all partnerships it should be reflected in this article that not all partnerships have calls for potential new partners but different instruments for attracting new partners</p> <p>SE</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>xi. <b>where relevant</b>, continuous openness of the initiative through clear and transparent accession and exit criteria, including through open calls to potential new partner organisations;</p> <p>SE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>The present model, in which commitments from new partners are met with Union co financing, is functioning well. SE sees a risk that allowing new partners to enter without adding financial resources, may water down successful partnerships.</p> |
| <p>xii. flexibility through timely revisions of key documents such as the Strategic Research and Innovation Agendas (SRIAs) and transition strategies, adapted as necessary to ensure relevance and feasibility;</p>  |   |
| <p>xiii. continuous monitoring, <del>shall include</del> <b>include</b> tracking progress towards a set of partnership-specific common indicators, <b>such as</b> <del>including</del> partner contributions, cost efficiency, and openness to new partners. Partnership-specific common indicators shall build on the common indicators as defined under Regulation XXX [<i>reference to Performance Regulation</i>] and <del>set out in</del> <b>on</b> the biennial monitoring reports on the performance of European partnerships under Horizon Europe 2021-2027;</p> | <p>PT</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>xiii. continuous monitoring, <del>shall include</del> <b>include</b> tracking progress towards a set of partnership-specific common indicators, <b>such as</b> <del>including</del> partner contributions, cost efficiency, and openness to new partners. Partnership-specific common indicators shall build on the common <b>impact</b> indicators as defined under Regulation XXX [<i>reference to Performance Regulation</i>] and</p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>set out in <b>on</b> the biennial monitoring reports on the performance of European partnerships under Horizon Europe 2021-2027;</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>Important to guarantee common impact indicators that show the added-value of launching a specific partnership</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>xiii. continuous monitoring, shall <b>include</b> tracking progress towards a set of partnership-specific common indicators, <b>such as including desired effects</b>, partner contributions, cost efficiency, and openness to new partners. Partnership-specific common indicators shall build on the common indicators as defined under Regulation XXX [<i>reference to Performance Regulation</i>] and set out in <b>on</b> the biennial monitoring reports on the performance of European partnerships under Horizon Europe 2021-2027;</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SE believes the tracking of desired effects should be spelled out.</p> |
| <p><b><u>xiiia. detailed information on the evaluation process and results from all calls for proposals within European Partnerships, to be made available timely and accessible and in the same way as in general calls for proposals.</u></b></p> | <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We welcome this increase in transparency.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>DE: The paragraph needs to be further elaborated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which results (rejected proposals included)?</li> </ul>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Available for whom? Programme Committee, States Representative Groups, Public?</li> </ul> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><b><u>xiii.a. detailed information on the evaluation process and results from all calls for proposals within European Partnerships, to be made available to Member States timely and accessible and in the same way as in general calls for proposals.</u></b></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We strongly support this new point.<br/>                     A reference to Member States or programme committees is also needed.</p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>It is not clear what this means, particularly the phrase ‘<b><u>and in the same way as in general calls for proposals</u></b>’</p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>PL supports possible strengthening of this provision to include the duty of the Partnerships to regularly inform Member States about the effects of their implementation.</p> <p>PT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>PT considers this point very important and welcomes its introduction.</p> |
| <p>xiv. European Partnerships shall launch their final calls before 31 December 2034. European Partnerships shall determine and implement the</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
| <p>best mode of transition. Taking into account the transition strategies prepared ex-ante, partnerships shall undergo an independent assessment determining whether their objectives have been met, the suitability of the partnership approach, and their continued relevance for the Union’s policy priorities. This assessment should include a recommendation for the most effective policy intervention mode for any future actions.</p> | <p>AT: Expectations regarding <i>transition strategies prepared ex ante</i> should be clarified and the timing should be well-reflected. It should be kept in mind that ex-ante strategies do need to anticipate developments 10-12 years ahead. Related to this, clarification is needed when the proposed assessment is expected to take place so that meaningful conclusions regarding achieved objectives and relevance for Union’s policy priorities can be drawn.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>xiv. European Partnerships shall launch their final calls <b><u>co-funded with funds allocated from Horizon Europe (2028-2034)</u></b> before 31 December 2034. European Partnerships shall determine and implement the best mode of transition. Taking into account the transition strategies prepared ex-ante, partnerships shall undergo an independent assessment determining whether their objectives have been met, the suitability of the partnership approach, and their continued relevance for the Union’s policy priorities. This assessment should include a recommendation for the most effective policy intervention mode for any future actions.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>DE would like to point out the following:<br/>                 All indications from previous Partnership processes (FP9 and earlier) are that this is an unreasonably short timeframe to impose on a partnership. This stipulation effectively places a limit of 4 – max. 5 – calls on any FP10 Partnership. As a potential partner contemplating the set-up of a partnership, this short duration would render it difficult to justify the time and effort necessary for establishment and implementation. Any such time limitation must, therefore, stipulate that this applies only to calls that include EU co-funding. Applying this criterion it would have been impossible, for example, to justify participation in the FP9 partnerships</p> <p>FR</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>xiv. European Partnerships shall launch their final calls <u>before 31 December 2034 co-funded with funds allocated under the MFF 2028-2034</u>. European Partnerships shall determine and implement the best mode of transition. Taking into account the transition strategies prepared ex-ante, partnerships shall undergo an independent assessment determining whether their objectives have been met, the suitability of the partnership approach, and their continued relevance for the Union’s policy priorities. This assessment should include a recommendation for the most effective policy intervention mode for any future actions.</p> <p>SE</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>xiv. European Partnerships shall launch their final calls before 31 December [2034]. European Partnerships shall determine and implement the best mode of transition. Taking into account the transition strategies prepared ex-ante, partnerships shall undergo an independent assessment determining whether their objectives have been met, the suitability of the partnership approach, and their continued relevance for the Union’s policy priorities. This assessment should include a recommendation for the most effective policy intervention mode for any future actions.</p> <p>SE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>SE cautions against setting this date, as a number of partnerships started late in the current FP and there is a risk that the continuity of partnerships in some sensitive areas which require continuous public support will be challenged, including on antimicrobial resistance.</p> |
|   |  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
| <p>(<del>bxivb</del>) In the absence of renewal, European Partnerships shall implement appropriate measures based on their phasing-out actions identified in their transition strategies.</p> | <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (<del>bxivb</del>) In the absence of renewal, European Partnerships shall implement appropriate measures based on their phasing-out actions identified in their transition strategies. <u>The European Commission should provide beneficiaries with clear guidelines and expectations on such transition and phasing-out strategies.</u></p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>We need further information on the lifecycle approach and on the phasing out strategy. It seems important to define common guidelines to ensure clarity for applicants and to avoid differences in elaborating and implementing such strategies.</u></p> |
| <p><u>(ab) In case of non-compliance with the above requirements, the Commission may reduce, suspend, or terminate Union funding, or take other appropriate measures.</u></p>                 | <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We support this new point to avoid non-compliance.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u>(ab) In case of non-compliance with the above requirements, the Commission may reduce, suspend, or terminate Union funding, or take other appropriate measures. Member States shall be informed in due time of such measures.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u>(ab) In case of non-compliance with the above requirements, the Commission may reduce, suspend, or terminate Union funding, or take other appropriate measures.</u></p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | IE<br>(Comments):<br>The phrase ‘ <b>or take other appropriate measures</b> ’ is very vague. It should either be clarified or deleted.   |
| <b>Chapter III</b>  |  |
|   |  |
| <b>Competitiveness and Society</b>  | BE<br>(Comments):<br>Call for a clear overview of how thematic clusters of FP9 will flow into the policy windows.  |
| <i>Article 11</i><br><b><i>Collaborative research <u>and innovation</u></i></b>   | IE<br>(Comments):<br>How will “Society” and SSH initiatives interact?<br>MT<br>(Comments):<br>Malta calls for all collaborative research work programmes to be adopted in the examination procedure with a greater role of the Member States.<br>PT<br>(Comments):<br>PT welcomes the reference to innovation. |
|   |  |
| Collaborative research <b><u>and innovation</u></b> activities referred to in <b><u>Title I</u></b> Chapter <b><u>III</u></b> of Regulation XXX [ <i>reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation</i> ] shall cover, in particular, the following research and innovation activities: | SE<br>(Drafting suggestions):<br>Collaborative research <b><u>and innovation</u></b> activities referred to in <b><u>Title I</u></b> Chapter <b><u>III</u></b> of Regulation XXX [ <i>reference to the Horizon Europe</i>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><i>Regulation</i>] shall cover, in particular, the following research and innovation activities, <u>interdisciplinary as well as intersectorial wherever this is relevant</u>.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SE thinks that “<u>interdisciplinary as well as intersectorial</u>” is needed here as a reminder.</p>   |
| <p>(a) under ‘Competitiveness’, research and innovation activities of the policy windows described in Chapters IV to VII of the European Competitiveness Fund, <b><u>in accordance with the rules of this Programme</u></b>:</p> | <p>BE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(a) under ‘Competitiveness’, research and innovation activities of the policy windows described in Chapters IV to VII of the European Competitiveness Fund, <b><u>in accordance with the rules of this Programme [Framework Programm]</u></b>:</p> <p>BE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>Clarification needed whether the Presidency means the rules of the FP or the rules of ECF? FP rules should apply for R&amp;I aspects/parts.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>(a) under ‘Competitiveness’, research and innovation activities of the policy windows described in Chapters IV to VII of the European Competitiveness Fund, <b><u>in accordance with the rules of this Programme Regulation XXX [reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation]</u></b>:</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>DE: what is the meaning of the addition “..in accordance with the rules of this Programme.”? Does it not constitute a contradiction to Art. 4 para. 3 according to which work programmes shall be adopted in accordance with Articles 15 an 84 of the ECF proposal?<br/>                     The formulation “this regulation” is ambiguous. We would prefer mentioning of the HE regulation.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We support the change. It is important to include that the rules of this Programme shall apply.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (a) under ‘Competitiveness’, research and innovation activities <u>aligned with the objectives and specific activities of</u> the policy windows described in <u>article 3 and in</u> Chapters IV to VII of the European Competitiveness Fund <u>Regulation, in accordance with the rules of this Programme:</u></p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Clearer wording.</u></p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     (a) under ‘Competitiveness’, research and innovation activities of the policy windows described in Chapters IV to VII of the European Competitiveness Fund, <u>adopted in separate work programmes, in accordance with the rules of this Programme:</u></p> <p>MT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>Malta argues that single work programmes of the policy windows under the European Competitiveness Fund will marginalise research activities and decrease excellence and effectiveness of Horizon Europe collaborative endeavours. We are calling for adoption of synergistic, but separate work programmes for both Horizon Europe and ECF.</p> <p>NL<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>We support that it is now specified here that the rules of Horizon appl to the R&amp;I programmed through the ECF.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>under ‘Competitiveness’ <b>collaborative</b> research and innovation activities of the policy windows described in Chapters IV to VII of the European Competitiveness Fund, <del>in accordance with the rules of this Programme:</del></p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>ECF rulebook is to be applied to all FP10, so this specific reference to ECF rules is not justified.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(a) under ‘Competitiveness’, research and innovation activities of the policy windows described in Chapters IV to VII of the European Competitiveness Fund <b><u>and societal challenges, in accordance with the rules of this Programme:</u></b></p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SE believes that societal challenges need to be addressed also under (a).</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>SE asks for a clarification of what the addition “in accordance with the rules of this Programme” refers to (HE or ECF?).</p> <p>SE suggests that, for collaborative R&amp;I activities to be included in the dedicated part of work programmes adopted under the ECF, the EC should obtain a positive opinion from the HE Programme Committee before adoption.</p>   |
| <p>(b) under ‘Society’, research and innovation activities, such as:</p>   | <p>IE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>As referenced above, further discussion is required to ensure a shared understanding of the objectives and priorities for the society component.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>(b) under ‘Society’, research and innovation activities <b><u>addressing specific societal challenges not related to the activities under (a)</u></b>, such as:</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>SE would welcome a thorough discussion of the relation between (a) and (b), and whether they could be merged in order to clarify the need for integrating relevant social science and humanities in activities under all of pillar II.</p> |
| <p>(i) activities aimed at accomplishing priorities for <del>global</del> societal challenges <b><u>and transformations</u></b>:</p> | <p>BE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>activities aimed at <b>accomplishing supporting</b> priorities for <b><u>global and societal challenges and transformations</u></b>:</p> <p>BE</p>  |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>(Comments):<br/>                     Supporting priorities for global and societal challenges is what the goal of the FP should be. When using “accomplishing”, the reference to transformations should be omitted as this would be beyond the scope of the FP → or change to “supporting” or delete “and transformations.”</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We support this amendment</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     activities aimed at accomplishing priorities for <del>global</del> societal challenges <b><u>and transformations:</u></b></p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     SE suggest keeping the global perspective to not lose the broader perspectives.</p> |
| <p>– strengthening democratic values and foundations, <del>civic engagement</del>, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering <b><u>civic engagement</u></b>, resilient, pluralistic societies, <b><u>and upholding</u></b> the integrity of the information and media space and countering <b><u>foreign interference</u></b>, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, <b><u>and supporting peace and security</u></b> in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     - strengthening democratic values and foundations, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering civic engagement, resilient, pluralistic societies, and upholding the integrity of the information and media space and countering foreign interference, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, and supporting peace and security,</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b><u>especially conflict prevention, peacebuilding and peacekeeping</u></b>, in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>AT welcomes the amendments already integrated by the Presidency but would like to repeat that research on different dimensions of peace and security should be supported by the Programme.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p>strengthening democratic values and foundations, <del>civic engagement</del>, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering <b><u>civic engagement</u></b>, resilient, pluralistic societies, <b><u>and upholding</u></b> the integrity of the information and media space and countering <b><u>foreign interference</u></b>, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, <b><u>and supporting peace and security</u></b> in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>The reference to “foreign interference” and “supporting peace and security” shall be deleted to avoid misunderstanding and overlapping with ECF, in particular with Chapter VII.<br/>                     SSH disciplines should be also considered under the R&amp;I activities of the policy windows.</p> <p>-</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p><u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>HU</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>- strengthening democratic values and foundations, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering civic engagement, resilient, pluralistic societies, and upholding the integrity of the information and media space and countering foreign interference, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, and supporting peace and security, <b>especially conflict prevention, peacebuilding and peacekeeping</b>, in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> <p>HU</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>HU supports AT’s proposal.</p> <p>IE</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>strengthening democratic values and foundations, <del>civic engagement</del>, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering <b>civic engagement</b>, resilient, pluralistic societies, <b>and upholding</b> the integrity of the information and media space, <b>enhancing research security, and</b> countering <b>foreign interference</b>, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, <b>and supporting peace and security</b> in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> <p>IE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>We need to be consistent in the terminology we use on research security.</p> <p>PL</p> <p>(Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>- strengthening democratic values and foundations, <del>civic engagement</del>, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering <b>civic engagement</b>, resilient, pluralistic societies, <b>and upholding</b> the integrity of the information and</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>media space and countering <b>foreign interference</b>, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, <b>and supporting peace, security, and conflict prevention</b>, in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> <p>PL<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     PL supports AT remark.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     – strengthening democratic values and foundations, <del>eivic engagement</del>, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering <b>civic engagement</b>, resilient, pluralistic societies, <b>and upholding</b> the integrity of the information and media space and countering <b>foreign interference</b>, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, <b>and supporting civil preparedness, resilience, peace and security, social cohesion and democratic resilience</b> in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     SE suggests to add <b>civil preparedness, resilience, social cohesion and democratic resilience</b> which is central to overall objectives.</p> <p>SI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     strengthening democratic values and foundations; the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering civic engagement, resilient, pluralistic <b>and peaceful</b> societies, <b>the role of culture and creativity in strengthening such societies</b> and upholding the integrity of the information and media space and countering foreign interference, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, and supporting peace and security</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b><u>such as conflict preventions, peacebuilding and peacekeeping</u></b> in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts</p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>– strengthening democratic values and foundations, <del>eivic engagement</del>, the rule of law and fundamental rights, by fostering <b><u>civic engagement</u></b>, resilient, pluralistic societies, <b><u>the role of culture and creativity in strengthening such societies, and upholding</u></b> the integrity of the information and media space and countering <b><u>foreign interference</u></b>, polarisation, disinformation, hate speech, discrimination, and xenophobia, <b><u>and supporting peace and security, especially conflict prevention, peacebuilding and peacekeeping</u></b>, in a rapidly evolving world of geopolitical shifts;</p> <p>SK<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We highlight the importance of cultural and creative sectors (Article 167 TFEU) as drivers of innovation and cohesion.</p> <p>Additionally, SK supports AT proposal that research on different dimensions of peace and security should be supported by the Programme.</p> |
| <p>– promoting social inclusion, social and economic transformations, inclusive societies, <b><u>fair and just working conditions</u></b> and social cohesion and tackling inequalities to create opportunities for all, taking into consideration rural areas’ specificities, addressing demographic change and intergenerational fairness, including well-managed migration and mobility, supporting <del>mental health and societal well-being</del> <b><u>for all</u></b>, <del>including for young people</del>;</p> | <p>AT<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>promoting social inclusion, social and economic transformations <b><u>(incl. the green and digital transition) ...</u></b></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>– promoting social inclusion, social and economic transformations, inclusive societies, <b>fair and just working conditions</b> and social cohesion and tackling inequalities to create opportunities for all, taking into consideration rural areas’ specificities, addressing demographic change and intergenerational fairness, including well-managed migration and mobility, supporting <b>mental</b> mental health and <b>societal</b> societal well-being <b>for all</b>, including for young people;</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     DE: Germany emphasises that all the research topics, which are listed in Art. 11 in order to define the scope of the “society” part of the programme, must have a clear link to society and culture related research. We prefer keeping the references to “<b>mental</b> health” and to “<b>societal</b> well-being” in order to avoid overlaps with other health-related research already covered in the Competitiveness part via .the ECF</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     We support the changes.</p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     promoting social inclusion, social and economic transformations, inclusive societies, <del><b>fair and just working conditions</b></del> and social cohesion and tackling inequalities to create opportunities for all, taking into consideration rural areas’ specificities, addressing demographic change and intergenerational fairness, including well-managed migration and mobility, supporting <del>mental</del> health and <del>societal</del> well-being <b>for all</b>, including for young people;</p> <p>FI<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>We would like to restrain from listing all possible topics in the regulation and find this is already covered by the text.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– promoting social inclusion, social and economic transformations, inclusive societies, <del>fair and just working conditions</del> and social cohesion and tackling inequalities to create opportunities for all, taking into consideration rural areas’ specificities, addressing demographic change and intergenerational fairness, including well-managed migration and mobility, supporting <del>mental</del> health and <del>societal</del> well-being <b>for all</b>, <del>including for young people</del>;</li> </ul> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>See other comments on extending the scope of this part. Fair and just working conditions are important, but is if needed already covered by the existing text. We should avoid already deciding on possible calls and topics already within the regulation.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– promoting social inclusion, social and economic transformations, inclusive societies, <b>fair and just working conditions</b> and social cohesion and tackling inequalities to create <b>gender equality and equal</b> opportunities for all, taking into consideration <b>for example universal design as well as urban and</b> rural areas’ specificities, addressing demographic change and intergenerational fairness, including well-managed migration and mobility,</li> </ul> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>supporting mental health, <b>prevention</b> and societal well-being <b>for all</b>, including for young people;</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     The inclusion of universal design strengthens social inclusion and equity, aligning with the broader goals of creating inclusive societies and tackling inequalities.</p> <p>Gender equality should be added to the list.</p> <p>”Prevention” adds a societal dimension to health issues which enables research that promotes societal functions in times of crisis.<br/>                     May also cities/urban areas’ specificities be addressed ?</p>                           |
| <p>= <b><u>strengthening the knowledge base needed to support actionable solutions for driving the global transition towards a climate neutral and climate resilient society; fostering activities to combat biodiversity loss and degradation and the increasing frequency of natural disasters and extreme weather events;</u></b></p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     AT welcomes that this has been taken up.</p> <p>BE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     While a welcome addition, how will a coherent and coordinated approach be made to the relevant policy window of the ECF? Does this mean that all climate research (without direct effect on competitiveness) is put here? Presumably, this will take a large part of the budget?<br/>                     Would it make more sense to link these issues with education and skills?<br/>                     Educational research is currently lacking.</p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>- <b><u>strengthening the knowledge base needed to support actionable solutions for driving the global transition towards a climate neutral and climate resilient society; fostering activities to combat biodiversity loss and degradation and the increasing frequency of natural disasters and extreme weather events;</u></b></p> <p>DE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>DE: This is an unnecessary repetition of climate – especially given that our societies should be resilient in all sorts of ways not just ‘climate resilient’ We note that the suggested additions would extend the scope of the “Society” part to further research areas. It is important to avoid overlaps with fields already covered in the Competitiveness part via the ECF and to ensure that the focus of this funding area remains on culture and society- related research.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p> <p><del><b><u>strengthening the knowledge base needed to support actionable solutions for driving the global transition towards a climate neutral and climate resilient society; fostering activities to combat biodiversity loss and degradation and the increasing frequency of natural disasters and extreme weather events;</u></b></del></p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p> <p>This point shall be deleted to avoid overlapping. Climate change and Biodiversity are included in Chapter IV of the ECF and R&amp;I activities are part of “Competitiveness” under this same Pillar.</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>We believe that this is a high political priority and it should be included either under the policy windows and/or in a separate part of the Society programme with a dedicated budget</p> <p>Alternatively, the scope should be narrow down to the social aspects and consequences of climate change and biodiversity loss</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u>strengthening the knowledge base needed to support actionable solutions for driving the global transition towards a climate neutral and climate resilient society; fostering activities to combat biodiversity loss and degradation and the increasing frequency of natural disasters and extreme weather events;</u></p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <u><del>strengthening the knowledge base needed to support actionable solutions for driving the global transition towards a climate neutral and climate resilient society; fostering activities to combat biodiversity loss and degradation and the increasing frequency of natural disasters and extreme weather events;</del></u></p> <p>NL<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>This scope seems incoherent with the FP, which mentions ‘socio-economic’ challenges. Furthermore, it is unclear how these topics around climate overlap with the missions that are also funded within this part. NL is not all against funding R&amp;I on the themes mentioned, however also for the Society component, thematic prioritization should be based on strategic choices and priorities, overlap should be avoided, and it should not become a catch-all for everything that is not funded through the ECF.</p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/> <u>strengthening the knowledge base needed to support actionable and inclusive solutions for driving the global transition towards a climate neutral and climate resilient and inclusive society; fostering activities to boost ecosystems preservation, combat biodiversity loss and degradation and the increasing frequency of natural disasters and extreme weather events;</u></p> <p>PT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     Inclusive is an important aspect of the knowledge base.</p> <p>The EU is the leading economy regarding ecosystems preservation and this should be highlighted.</p> <p>SE<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     This addition is most welcome.</p> |
| <p>= <u>safeguarding the Union’s cultural heritage and exploring the potential of cultural and creative sectors for sustainable development;</u></p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b></p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>- <del>research on</del> safeguarding the Union’s cultural heritage and exploring the potential of cultural and creative sectors for sustainable development;</p> <p>AT<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>AT welcomes that cultural heritage and the cultural and creative sectors have been taken up, but the Programme should not only address the “safeguarding” of cultural heritage.</p> <p>BE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>- <b><u>safeguarding the Union’s cultural heritage and exploring leveraging the potential of cultural and creative sectors for sustainable development, including well-being, the clean transition and resilience;</u></b></p> <p>BE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>Welcome addition of cultural heritage and the CCIs in this section. Textual adjustment to replace “exploring” with “leveraging” as we know the potential is there. “Sustainable development” is ok (and a better choice than sustainable growth) but also a bit vague. Suggested text is more focused.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p>- <b><u>safeguarding the Union’s cultural heritage by analysing the societal role of cultural heritage and of cultural identity and exploring the innovative potential of cultural heritage as well as of the cultural and creative sectors for sustainable development;</u></b></p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>DE: We welcome the addition of cultural heritage as an important area of research, which was completely missing in Art. 11 in the COM proposal. Material as well as immaterial cultural heritage holds a great innovative potential for social transformations. Therefore, immaterial aspects of cultural heritage, such as cultural identity, should also be mentioned as subjects of research.</p> <p>ES<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/>                     We welcome this insertion<br/>                     t is necessary to avoid overlapping. Cultural and creative industries are mentioned as part of the objectives under the ECF Digital Leadership policy window (see article 3.2 (c) of the ECF Regulation. It is also important to avoid overlapping with AgoraEU.</p> <p>FR<br/> <b>(Comments):</b><br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation</u></p> |
| <p>– fostering a value-based and competitive Europe by advancing future-ready skills, and driving inclusive innovation that empowers people, facilitates societal acceptance of technologies <b>and digital transitions, promotes trust in science and participatory research to foster societal relevance and acceptance,</b> and supports sustainable growth that benefits all.</p> | <p>AT<br/> <b>(Drafting suggestions):</b><br/>                     fostering a value-based and competitive Europe by advancing future-ready skills, and driving inclusive innovation that empowers people, <b>facilitates the development of technologies in accordance with societal needs</b> and digital transitions, promotes trust in science and participatory research to foster societal relevance and acceptance, and supports sustainable growth that benefits all.</p> <p>AT<br/> <b>(Comments):</b></p>   |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>AT: Not the technology should drive societal acceptance, but the other way around, technological developments should be guided by societal needs.</p> <p>BE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     fostering a value-based and competitive Europe by advancing future-ready skills, and driving inclusive innovation that empowers people, facilitates societal acceptance of technologies <b><u>and digital transitions, promotes trust in science and where relevant participatory research to foster societal relevance and acceptance</u></b>, and supports sustainable growth that benefits all.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     – fostering a value-based and competitive Europe by advancing future-ready skills, and driving inclusive innovation that empowers people, facilitates societal acceptance of technologies <b><u>and digital transitions, promotes trust in science and participatory research paying regard to the societal effects of technological transformations, to foster societal relevance and acceptance</u></b>, and supports sustainable growth that benefits all.</p> <p>DE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     DE: we would like to add a reference to the role of research to critically support technological transformations. Research funded under the “Society” part should address the societal effects of technological innovations and digital transitions including their impact on social cohesion, cultural practices etc. Ethical or legal aspects could also be added.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     – fostering a value-based and competitive Europe by advancing future-ready skills, and driving inclusive innovation that empowers people, facilitates societal acceptance of technologies <b><u>and digital transitions,</u></b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b><u>promotes trust in science and participatory research to foster societal relevance and acceptance and act on science denial and pseudoscientific narratives,</u></b> and supports sustainable growth that benefits all.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     We welcome this insertion</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     fostering a value-based and competitive Europe by advancing future-ready skills, and driving inclusive innovation that empowers people, <b>economies and societies at large</b>, facilitates societal acceptance of <b>innovation, technologies and digital transitions, promotes trust in Science, science-based policy making and participatory research to foster societal relevance and acceptance,</b> and supports sustainable growth that benefits all.</p> <p>PL<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     PL stresses the need to create policies based on scientific evidence, for the benefit of the European societies and economies</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     fostering a value-based and competitive Europe by advancing future-ready skills, and driving inclusive innovation that empowers people, facilitates societal acceptance of technologies <b>and digital transitions, promotes trust</b></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)  | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b><u>in science and participatory research to foster societal relevance and acceptance</u></b>, and supports sustainable growth that benefits all</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>SE welcomes the added text and suggests enhancing the need for a well-educated population; we believe the skills dimension should be more explicitly addressed also in the HE FP and not only in the ECF.</p>   |
| <p><i>(ii) EU Missions: activities supporting EU Missions referred to in Article 15(5) of Regulation XXX [reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation].</i></p> | <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><del><i>(ii) — EU Missions: activities supporting EU Missions referred to in Article 15(5) of Regulation XXX [reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation].</i></del></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>We are currently analysing the interministerial position regarding missions. HE shall only fund R&amp;I activities. From 2028 onwards EU Mission activities will be deployment and uptake activities, therefore they should be included as part of the actions of the ECF policy windows. R&amp;I activities related to EU Mission (if needed) should be included in other parts of the Programme. No other fund has included missions, no mention in the Performance regulation. This is a very clear indicator that the COM does not consider Missions and portfolio of actions in different policy dimensions. For the sake of simplification Missions should be removed from the text.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p><u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> |

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1)   | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>LT<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     See the comment on missions above.</p> <p>SI<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/>                     ii) — EU Missions: activities supporting EU Missions referred to in Article 15(5) of Regulation XXX [reference to the Horizon Europe Regulation].</p>   |
| <p><i>(iii) activities in the context of the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility, established with the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>5</sup>, shall deliver on the objectives of the New European Bauhaus, in particular supporting activities to foster the development and scaling up of innovative research solutions for the transformation of neighbourhoods into sustainable, inclusive and beautiful places.</i></p> | <p>BE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <i>(iii) activities in the context of the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility, established with the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>6</sup>, shall deliver on the objectives of the New European Bauhaus, in particular supporting activities to foster the development and scaling up <b>(up to TRL 8)</b> of innovative research solutions for the transformation of neighbourhoods into sustainable, inclusive and beautiful places.</i></p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <i>(iii) activities in the context of the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility, established with the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>7</sup>, shall deliver on the objectives of the New European Bauhaus, in particular</i></p> |

<sup>5</sup> Commission Implementing Decision C(2024)1741 of 20 March 2024 on adopting the 2025-2027 strategic research and innovation plan under the Specific Programme implementing Horizon Europe – The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

<sup>6</sup> Commission Implementing Decision C(2024)1741 of 20 March 2024 on adopting the 2025-2027 strategic research and innovation plan under the Specific Programme implementing Horizon Europe – The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

<sup>7</sup> Commission Implementing Decision C(2024)1741 of 20 March 2024 on adopting the 2025-2027 strategic research and innovation plan under the Specific Programme implementing Horizon Europe – The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><i>supporting activities to foster the development and scaling up of innovative research solutions for the transformation of neighbourhoods <del>into sustainable, inclusive and beautiful places</del> <u>in line with the NEB criteria.</u></i></p> <p>EE_comments<br/>                     (Comments):</p> <p>The current wording refers explicitly to the transformation of neighbourhoods into “sustainable, inclusive and beautiful places.” While these terms reflect the core values of the New European Bauhaus (NEB), they are derived from the specific formulation of NEB objectives as defined in the Horizon Europe Work Programme 2025–2027, adopted by Commission Decision C(2025) 2779 of 14 May 2025. However, these descriptors — “sustainable,” “inclusive,” and “beautiful” — are not permanent legal definitions but rather expressions of the NEB criteria applicable during the current programming period. As such, they may evolve in or be reformulated in next programming period. To ensure legal precision and future-proofing of the text, it is more appropriate to refer to the <b>New European Bauhaus criteria</b> in general terms. This approach maintains alignment with the current objectives while allowing flexibility for any future updates to the NEB framework without requiring further amendments to the legal text.</p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):</p> <p><i><u>(iii) — activities in the context of the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility, established with the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025–2027<sup>8</sup>, shall deliver on the objectives of the New European Bauhaus, in particular supporting activities to foster the development and scaling up of innovative</u></i></p> |

<sup>8</sup> Commission Implementing Decision C(2024)1741 of 20 March 2024 on adopting the 2025-2027 strategic research and innovation plan under the Specific Programme implementing Horizon Europe – The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><del><i>research solutions for the transformation of neighbourhoods into sustainable, inclusive and beautiful places.</i></del></p> <p>ES<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     R&amp;I activities related to the NEB Facility (if needed) should be included in other parts of the Programme. We propose to delete this point.</p> <p>FR<br/>                     (Comments):<br/> <u>Scrutiny reservation.</u></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Drafting suggestions):<br/> <del><i>iii) — activities in the context of the New European Bauhaus (NEB) Facility, established with the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan 2025-2027<sup>9</sup>, shall deliver on the objectives of the New European Bauhaus, in particular supporting activities to foster the development and scaling up of innovative research solutions for the transformation of neighbourhoods into sustainable, inclusive and beautiful places.</i></del></p> <p>IE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     As previously mentioned, such detail is inconsistent with the rest of the Article.</p> <p>SE<br/>                     (Comments):<br/>                     SE would like to explore options for the NEB R&amp;I component (and perhaps the whole NEB facility) to be integrated in the ECF policy window 1.</p> |

<sup>9</sup> Commission Implementing Decision C(2024)1741 of 20 March 2024 on adopting the 2025-2027 strategic research and innovation plan under the Specific Programme implementing Horizon Europe – The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

| Presidency texts (doc 13653/1/25 REV 1) | Drafting suggestions and Comments |
|---|-----------------------------------|
|   |                                   |

