



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 15 October 2012

14999/12

**PE 457
ENER 411
IND 163
CADREFIN 426
RECH 374
FIN 758
DRS 116
TELECOM 183
PI 124
COMPET 629**

NOTE

from: General Secretariat of the Council
to: Delegations

Subject: Summary of the meeting of the **Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE)**, held in Brussels on 8 - 9 October 2012

The meeting was chaired by Ms Sartori (Chair) (EPP, IT), Ms Toia (Vice-Chair) (S&D, IT) and Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP, ES).

Joint debate on HORIZON 2020 (second consideration of amendments)

1. Establishment of Horizon 2020 - The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020)

ITRE/7/08101, 2011/0401(COD), COM(2011)0809

Rapporteur : Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D, ES)

Opinions: AFET, DEVE, BUDG, EMPL, ENVI, TRAN, REGI, AGRI, PECH,

CULT, JURI, FEMM

2. Specific Programme Implementing Horizon 2020 - The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020)

ITRE/7/08080, 2011/0402(CNS), COM(2011)0811

Rapporteur : Maria Da Graça Carvalho (EPP, PT)

Opinions: AFET, BUDG, EMPL, ENVI, TRAN, AGRI, CULT, JURI

3. Rules for the participation and dissemination in 'Horizon 2020 – the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020)'

ITRE/7/08098, 2011/0399(COD), COM(2011)0810

Rapporteur: Christian Ehler (EPP, DE)

Opinions: AFET, DEVE, BUDG

4. Amendment of Regulation (EC) No 294/2008 establishing the European Institute of Innovation and Technology

ITRE/7/08123, 2011/0384(COD), COM(2011)0817

Rapporteur: Philippe Lamberts (Greens/EFA, BE)

Opinions: BUDG, EMPL, CULT, JURI

5. Strategic Innovation Agenda of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT): the contribution of the EIT to a more innovative Europe

TRE/7/08116, 2011/0387(COD), COM(2011)0822

Rapporteur: Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL, PT)

Opinions: BUDG, EMPL, ENVI, AGRI, CULT, JURI

6. Research and Training Programme of the European Atomic Energy Community (2014-2018) complementing Horizon 2020 – The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation

ITRE/7/08087, 2011/0400(NLE), COM(2011)0812

Rapporteur: Peter Skinner (S&D, UK)

Opinions: BUDG, ENVI, JURI

The debate on the Horizon 2020 package was divided into four parts.

Part I

The rapporteur, Ms Riera Madurell, focused mainly on the outstanding issues, such as Article 16, Article 19 and open access, as well as the internal budget, where she advocated more funds for Marie Curie actions and e-infrastructures. Related issues were an increased budget for energy, disagreements on the budget for societal challenges 6 and 7, and better representation of SMEs. She also underlined that science and innovation were crucial for competitiveness, growth and jobs, therefore an adequate budget was required. The rapporteur, Ms Carvalho, supported this call for an appropriate budget. She also mentioned open access, widening participation, earmarking, SMEs, and stem cells.

In particular, Members discussed the budget (Ms Matias (GUE/NGL, PT), Mr Hénin (GUE/NGL, FR), Mr Ehler (EPP, DE)), and advocated prioritising in the event of cuts (Mr Lamberts (Greens/EFA, BE), Ms del Castillo Vera (EPP, ES), Ms Merkies (S&D, NL)). In this context, some members raised the issue of security and defence funding (Mr Lamberts, Ms Hall (on behalf of Mr Johansson (ALDE, SE), Mr Ehler), ITER, GMES and Galileo (Mr Prodi (S&D, IT), Mr Audy (EPP, FR)). The separate budget for widening participation (Mr Ehler) and more equal distribution of funds under FP7 (Ms Jordan (EPP, SI)) were also mentioned. Mr Kelly (EPP, IE) thought that the programme as such should be prioritised within the MFF as a generator of growth and jobs. Some Members highlighted innovation and underlined that it should not be considered a secondary priority (Ms Hall, Mr Lamberts, Ms Merkies). Members also mentioned the widening of participation, including the criteria of excellence (Mr Ehler, Ms Hall (ALDE, UK)) and improving industry participation (Mr Ehler), close-to market activities (Ms Hall), and the direct link between research and industrialisation (Mr Lamberts, Ms Țicău (S&D, RO)). They also saw a need to find the right balance with regard to open access (Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP, ES), Mr Tsoukalas (EPP, EL), Ms Matias). Other issues raised were the simplification of procedures, PPPs, eligibility of costs and the flat rate, equal conditions for researchers, health research and nanotechnologies, and SMEs.

Concerning open access, the Commission representative informed Members about the intention to launch a pilot project to assess the consequences. With regard to widening participation, the Commission was eager to bridge the innovation divide. The achievements of PPPs had to be carefully assessed and their renewal would be subject to an impact assessment. As for stem cells, the Commission representative was grateful that the proposal supported the status quo.

The rapporteurs, Ms Riera Madurell and Ms Carvalho, stressed that the programme was balanced and covered the complete cycle of innovation. With regard the budget, they reiterated the need to prioritise in order not to jeopardise excellence.

Part II

The rapporteur noted a high level of agreement on most of the issues (reduced time to grant, acceptance of accounting methods, simplified auditing, two-step evaluation). Open access needed clear rules to avoid legal uncertainty, but there was consent for differentiating between free access to publications and free access to data. He also mentioned reimbursement of indirect costs, cost calculation methods, the flat rate, efficiency in the use of funds, and private co-funding.

Members discussed the MFF budget and the relative position of Horizon 2020, the funding model, including the differentiation between participants, and open access and access rights related to patented results.

Concerning the acceptance of usual accounting practices, the Commission representative pointed out huge existing differences within the EU. With regard to the time to grant, he said changes should not be made to the detriment of the evaluation system. Given the IPRs and a competitive edge, a careful approach was needed to open access. On the differentiation between participants, he underlined that the programme aimed to support projects, not participants, and that the principle of equitable treatment of participants was enshrined in the financial regulation. Furthermore, as a creator of jobs, industry should not be penalised. Concerning the indirect costs, he recalled that under FP7 there was a 30 % error rate. The flat rate would eradicate these errors and the audit would no longer be necessary.

The rapporteur considered that there should be differentiation between the participants to take account of differing needs. Concerning the budget, prioritisation would be needed if budget cuts occurred, both for content and for rates.

Part III

The rapporteur, Mr Lamberts, informed Members about three outstanding issues (aside from the budget): the selection process for Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs), criticism of the fact that some enterprises had apparently already claimed to have been chosen, and the issue of leverage and Regional Innovation Consortia (RICs). The rapporteur, Ms Matias, also referred to the selection process (pre-selected participants as a result of lobbying) and saw the closed list as problematic. As in the previous debates, she raised the issue of the seat of the EIT, proposing Strasbourg.

Concerning the selection process for KICs, intervening Members highlighted the need for some predictability for industry, while ensuring flexibility and genuine competition (Ms Hall (ALDE, UK), Ms Carvalho (EPP, PT)). As for the RICs, Mr Tsoukalas (EPP, EL) thought they should work on a regional basis under the KICs. Mr Ehler (EPP, DE) was sceptical about the budget increase for the EIT. Mr Audy called for greater EP influence over all management boards of agencies. He also said that Strasbourg issue should be dealt at the level of the French government and the city itself.

With regard to the selection of KICs, the Commission representative recalled that predictable financing, budget and sustainability were necessary. There should not be a multitude of KICs, and that was the reason for proposing the themes. In future these could be changed by the legislator if they did not prove successful. He stressed that no applicant had been chosen. As for the RICs, he was not in favour of creating new forms of cooperation. On leverage, he considered that the EIT 25-75 leverage should remain, because if different constraints were added, it could damage the KICs.

Rapporteurs reiterated that some consortia had claimed they had been selected. Ms Matias called for a balanced model with some level of predictability and open options and equal conditions for all participants, meeting Horizon 2020 requirements. On the EIT, she considered that good results had already been achieved in terms of the multiplier capacity and creation of European added value. Concerning the duration of KICs, Mr Lamberts thought that monitoring without financial consequences did not create discipline.

Part IV

The rapporteur, Mr Skinner, was pleased with the high level of agreement on this file, giving a strong voice to the EP in subsequent negotiations. Regarding the financing of ITER, he informed Members about two compromises being prepared, which follow the lines of the BUDG Committee. He hoped that these would be acceptable. He also recalled that the report emphasised the special need for training and safety in the nuclear field (e.g. decommissioning).

Members had divergent positions on the financing of ITER. Ms Rivasi considered nuclear research to be obsolete and preferred to invest in decommissioning (as a potential economic sector), radiation measurement and evaluation, partly due to the lack of training in these areas. Mr Prodi (S&D) agreed that decommissioning had to be taken seriously and suggested refocusing the research to find suitable sites and the most appropriate technologies for the final disposal of waste. Mr Ehler, on the other hand, thought that nuclear was an important bridging technology and was needed to deal with electricity costs during the transition to renewable sources. Mr Audy (EPP, FR) was against the removal of ITER financing from the budget. Together with Ms Rivasi, he was unhappy that the file was not a co-decision file.

Regarding the EP's association, the Commission representative referred to the Treaty, but ensured Members that the EP would continue to be involved in Euratom issues. Concerning decommissioning, he noted that R&D was already ongoing, but the industrial activity was beyond R&D. Nevertheless, he welcomed the idea of focusing on training activities in this field.

He concluded that ITER financing should remain outside the budget.

7. Amendment of Directive 2006/43/EC on statutory audits of annual accounts and consolidated accounts

ITRE/7/08048, 2011/0389(COD), COM(2011)0778

Rapporteur for the opinion: Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE, DE)

Responsible: JURI

8. Specific requirements regarding statutory auditing of public-interest entities

ITRE/7/08136, 2011/0359(COD), COM(2011)0779

Rapporteur for the opinion: Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE, DE)

Responsible: JURI

The rapporteur, Mr Creutzmann, focused on strengthening the position of investors, ensuring the independence of audit companies (including mandatory rotation), and protecting investors and shareholders (related to representation on the boards of audit companies, transparency, etc).

He supported only two categories of audit services, as this would involve less red tape and bring greater clarity.

With regard to independence, Mr Audy supported the Commission's intention to examine whether the auditing market was working properly. He advocated the separation of non-audit services and inquired about the supranational monitoring of audit companies.

The Commission representative recalled the main objectives of the proposal. She said that the principle of mandatory rotation was the cornerstone of the proposal and could constitute a possible element for compromise, but she could not yet take a position. In this context, she also emphasised the incentivisation of joint audits and extension of their duration to a maximum of 9 years.

Regarding non-audit services, she considered that some of these (such as tax advice and certification of compliance), which went beyond national legal requirements, should be looked at very carefully so as not to harm the independence of the audit. As for audit communication, she advocated external audit reporting.

The rapporteur was willing to support the joint audit. On supervision, he clarified that there was a national supervision of audit companies which was responsible for companies having their headquarters in the Member State. Concerning communication, he was sceptical about the full circulation of information to the public.

Timetable: Deadline for amendments: 16 October 2012, 12:00

*** *Electronic vote* ***

9. Safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities

ITRE/7/07802, 2011/0309(COD), COM(2011)0688

Rapporteur: Ivo Belet (EPP, BE)

Opinions: BUDG, EMPL, ENVI, JURI

The negotiation mandate was adopted (50 for, 1 against, 0 abstentions).

10. Instrument for Nuclear Safety Cooperation

ITRE/7/08198, 2011/0414(CNS), COM(2011)0841

Rapporteur: Holger Kraemer (ALDE, DE)

Opinions: BUDG, ENVI

The draft report was adopted as amended (47 for, 6 against, 0 abstentions).

*** *End of electronic vote****

11. Trans-European telecommunications networks, and repeal of Decision No 1336/97/EC

ITRE/7/07678, 2011/0299(COD), COM(2011)0657

Rapporteur: Evžen Tošenovský (ECR, CZ)

Opinion: ECON, ENVI, IMCO, REGI, CULT, LIBE

The rapporteur informed Members that 37 compromise amendments were being prepared. The main changes concerned the objectives of the Digital Agenda, as these needed to be adapted in order for the EU to remain a competitive player. He highlighted the access of all households to high speed internet (100Mbps), an objective which needed to be backed with the necessary funding, flexibility (due to the diversity of projects and different regulations existing in the Member States), technology neutrality and focus on the supply side (which should respond to the real demand for high speed connections).

During the following discussion, Mr Hökmark (EPP, SE) was concerned that the most dynamic developments in the internet and broadband were not taking place in Europe, in particular those in the rapidly-developing services sector. He warned against setting targets that would soon be outdated, and advocated (together with Ms Andersdotter (Greens/EFA, SE)) targets addressing future needs. In his view, criteria which are too low could result in an uncompetitive infrastructure for broadband and the internet. Mr Creutzmann (ALDE, DE) supported ambitious aims, but said these should be realistic so as not to drive away private investment. However, Ms Trautmann (S&D, FR) considered that the Digital Agenda was already too ambitious, and even more ambitious objectives could create a digital divide. Members highlighted the importance of connecting rural and remote areas. In this context, Mr Hökmark called for greater flexibility.

Mr Creutzmann considered that there should be differentiation between rural and urban areas in terms of demand, not to replace the private funds. Ms Trautmann agreed that the actions could not be fund solely by public money. Mr Audy (EPP, FR) would involve public funds only when the market could not cover the needs (e.g. in remote areas). Members also expressed their concerns about the programme's existence and its budget (Ms Trautmann, Mr Creutzmann, Ms Andersdotter, Ms Del Castillo Vera (EPP, ES)). The latter called for respect of the telecommunications allocations in the event of budget cuts. Other issues raised were market analysis before product launch, the preservation of technological neutrality and the use of the existing definition of open access, separation between infrastructure provision and service and the child protection projects falling within the scope of the programme.

The Commission representative underlined the importance of the CEF and its multiplier capacity, and of cloud computing, for the industry and SMEs. He welcomed the debate on involving local partners, as access to infrastructure had a local dimension. On the other hand, the services had a clear EU dimension (e-commerce, etc.) that could generate substantial savings for the Member States. He believed that this should be recognised when debating the MFF and CEF budget.

The rapporteur reiterated the need to find a balance between ensuring the highest technological level and fastest speed, and preventing rural and remote areas from becoming isolated from access to technologies. He concluded that no new definition of open access should be created.

Timetable: ITRE vote: 5 November 2012
Plenary vote: January 2013

12. Amendment of Directive 2003/98/EC on re-use of public sector information

ITRE/7/08211, 2011/0430(COD) COM(2011)0877
Rapporteur: Ivailo Kalfin (S&D, BG)
Opinions: IMCO, CULT, JURI, LIBE

The rapporteur, Mr Kalfin, informed Members that most of the amendments were in line with the proposed Directive. As for the outstanding issues, he outlined the model for charging for the re-use of public information, procedures for price justification and efforts made by public entities to provide or make available this information. He also announced that the Cyprus Presidency was willing to go as far as possible with the file, which might be concluded by the end of the year.

In the short discussion, Members raised the issues of charging and what could be charged for marginal costs, and in which cases this cost could be increased, independent bodies, exclusive rights of PPPs, the definition and use of an open format, and the inclusion of public broadcasters in the scope of the proposal.

The Commission representative welcomed the EP's support, in particular in light of the reticence of some Member States to open up their data.

The rapporteur concluded that the issue of public broadcasters should be taken seriously.

Timetable: ITRE vote: 5 November 2012
First trilogue: 15 November 2012

13. Visit of Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science, to present the Communication on "Enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: A strategic approach"

The Commissioner congratulated the Nobel Prize winners in physics and delivered the speech set out in the Annex.

In the following discussion, Members welcomed the Communication. For the EU to remain competitive, international cooperation played a crucial role in the strategic approach to research. Besides their concerns about budget cuts, the various issues mentioned included targeted cooperation actions, financing the cooperation with third countries, compatibility with Horizon 2020, intellectual property rights (IPRs), SMEs and red tape, the need for further research in space, nuclear energy and safety, patents, stairways to excellence and the brain drain in Europe.

Concerning the budget, the Commissioner recognised the danger of cuts and called for vigilance and a fight for the "policy for the future". On targeted actions, she reiterated that the areas and partners for cooperation would be decided up front. As for FP7 and Horizon 2020, these were open for participation for all, but there were no specific calls for international participation. With regard to automatic funding, a GDP threshold was added to the requirements under Horizon 2020. She acknowledged that IPRs were an issue of a huge concern and wanted to ensure a system protecting and supporting IPRs generated in the EU, allowing R&D from the EU to be commercialised in the EU.

14. Current Challenges and Opportunities for Renewable Energy in the European Internal Energy Market

Rapporteur: Herbert Reul (EPP, DE)

The rapporteur welcomed the Commission's communication as a good overview of renewables. As the sector was growing faster than anticipated, some issues needed to be addressed before increasing its share in the energy mix. These issues include sustainability, costs, infrastructure (renewables as a fluctuant source), storage (which is costly) and the existing toolbox (ETS). He also addressed the issue of subsidies for renewables, which were creating inequalities and did not promote the single energy market, and suggested that these should be established at European level. He also thought that there were too many parallel aims in the energy sector and considered that more focus was required.

Members agreed on the need to address the issue of subsidies (Mr Pieper (EPP, DE), Mr Mészáros (EPP, SK)). Mr Lange (S&D, DE) considered that different systems with different outcomes created significant distortion of prices, and supported the Europeanisation of subsidies to end the distortion of competition. Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP, ES) thought that renewables should be competitive, integrated into the market and stand on their own feet, in order to reduce subsidies that were weighing heavily on state budgets. To allow the full integration of renewables, subsidies for fossil fuels should be abolished. Mr Creutzmann (ALDE, DE) said that renewables should be produced where the natural advantages existed, instead of being dependent on state money. Mr Cochet (Greens/EFA, FR) also thought that specific regional features should be considered. Mr Turmes (Greens/EFA, LU) and Ms Hall (ALDE, UK) were not in favour of harmonisation. Mr Hibner (EPP, PL) found it unacceptable that only one sort of energy was subsidised and called for support for innovation in fossil fuels (e.g. shale gas). Mr Lange and Ms Hall also called for renewables targets for 2030 as drivers for decarbonisation, energy efficiency and lower dependency on fossil fuels. In this context, the former saw the need for greater communitarisation of policies on renewables, to provide stable conditions for investment. As far as the energy mix was concerned, Mr Mészáros acknowledged that renewables were an important part, but underlined the primary objective of competitiveness and access to energy. Mr Pieper believed that conventional sources and nuclear power needed to remain in the energy mix to secure the supply, at least during the transition stage. Mr Mészáros pointed out that besides photovoltaic (raised by Mr Turmes) and wind power, other renewables were not cutting the impact of climate change. Members agreed on the need to adapt the grids (Mr Lange, Mr Mészáros, Mr Cochet) and achieve better interconnection between countries (Ms Hall) and better storage (Mr Creutzmann), and had divergent views on the cost of renewables.

The Commission representative underlined the need to ensure that changes were driving the transformation of the energy market forward, with the objectives to be met in a cost-effective way. Regarding subsidies, he informed the meeting about the Commission's ongoing guidance on reforming support schemes to achieve convergence (but not necessarily harmonisation). He agreed that distribution networks and grids were crucial in the context of infrastructure.

The rapporteur concluded that the focus should be given to renewables with a future, to keep prices down and make supplies reliable. The EU should become more responsible in this context.

Timetable: workshop: 18 November 2012
 further discussion: 28-29 November 2012

15. Presentation by the Commission on the implementing acts for the ROAMING III Regulation

The Commission representative informed Members about the implementing acts in the area of the separate sale of regulated retail roaming services. The Commission assessed technical solutions, but none of them met all the required criteria. Subsequently, the Commission chose the Single IMSI for home-market unbundling and the LBO was chosen for access to roaming in visited countries. The BEREC (Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications) was consulted and gave its opinion last week, approving this combination as the most appropriate at this time. However, given the technological and market development, the Commission was invited to monitor and assess whether these solutions should be adapted in the future. He also said that the Commission did not want to go into too much detail on the implementation as such and limited itself to entailing and outlining the basic requirements to be met by the technological solution. BEREC would work on guidelines in more detail and the industry itself should agree on certain issues, such as interfaces, etc. He concluded that the separate sale should be implemented by 1 July 2014.

The issues raised by Members were network resilience and the complaints about compliance with the new ceilings in place since 1 July 2012.

The Commission representative said that the implementing acts did not address network resilience in particular, but that it was one of the requirements for the technical solution. As for the complaints about compliance, there were fewer than there had been in the past.

16. The December 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT-12) in the context of the Digital Agenda

This item would be covered in writing.

17. Any other business

In the context of the Climate Change Conference in Doha, a letter from the Chair to the Chair of the ENVI Committee was adopted, concerning ITRE input in preparing the joint resolution.

Dates of the next meeting:

- 5 November 2012, 15.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)
-

Commissioner Geoghegan-Quinn**Address to the ITRE Committee on the communication "Enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: a strategic approach"****9 October 2012, European Parliament**

Honourable Members,

I would like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to present the Communication adopted by the European Commission on the 14th of September last on a strategic approach to enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation.

This Communication proposes a new strategy for international cooperation in research and innovation.

Scientists have always crossed frontiers to pursue their discoveries and they have collaborated with their colleagues in other parts of the world to achieve new opportunities. While that has been valid for many centuries, it is even more the case in our age of global communication and interdependence.

What we have witnessed, in particular, over the past decade, is the emergence of a global research and innovation landscape in which scientific publications are increasingly co-authored by researchers from different countries. We can also see this internationalisation happening in the private sector as well.

Europe is a world leader in research and innovation. While the Union accounts for just 7% of the world population, it is responsible for 24% of world expenditure on research, 32% of high impact publications, and 32% of patent applications.

But we now also see that, as part of this globalised research landscape, many more countries, especially the BRIC nations – Brazil, Russia, India and China – are investing heavily and developing major research and innovation programmes.

These trends pose both challenges and opportunities to the European Union.

Knowledge is increasingly generated outside Europe and we need to ensure that our researchers and businesses get access to it. Globalisation and mobility have also resulted in a fierce world-wide competition for talent and for the best scientific brains.

The scale of the challenges we face today, such as climate change, the spread of infectious diseases or ensuring a steady supply of clean energy, is such that we need the world's best scientists working together on finding solutions to these global problems.

By working in cooperation with our partners, we can find the answers and generate major opportunities for innovation and for boosting our competitiveness.

It is no surprise, then, that international cooperation continues to be a crucial aspect of our research and innovation policy and it is an integral part of the new Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020.

This new strategy builds on the achievements of the Seventh Framework Programme. There are many good examples, so let me name just a few.

FP7 has funded the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership, in which 14 EU Member States and Norway and Switzerland cooperated with sub-Saharan countries on making progress in the battle against HIV/Aids, malaria and tuberculosis.

Researchers from 80 different countries have participated in the immensely successful Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions, while the European Research Council enables top scientists from anywhere in the world to conduct their research in Europe.

The world-wide interconnection of research and education institutions through the GEANT network has been largely funded by the European Union, through both FP7 and its development cooperation instruments.

The ITER project, where together with China, Japan, the USA, Russia, India and South-Korea, we are attempting to demonstrate the viability of nuclear fusion as an energy source, has also been one of our flagship international cooperation projects.

While we have taken great strides in international cooperation, it is clear that there is still much more to do. To this end, our new strategy has three key objectives:

- First: Strengthening the Union's excellence and attractiveness as a research partner. For the Union to maintain its position and fully benefit from research and innovation, we need access to knowledge, people and markets across the globe. But this is not a one way street. In order to cooperate effectively, we must make sure that we also remain an attractive research partner internationally.
- Second: Tackling global challenges. We need to cooperate internationally to tackle the major societal challenges that I referred to earlier.
- Third: Supporting the Union's external policies. Many of the international commitments that we have signed up to as the European Union are also underpinned by research and innovation. This concerns, for example, our commitments in the Mediterranean region, but also other international obligations such as achieving the Millennium Development Goals or our commitments to assist developing countries to develop their economies and societies.

Horizon 2020 is due to start in 2014 and it will be the main tool for implementing our international cooperation strategy. There will be a two-pronged approach: first of all, Horizon 2020 will be open to participation from all countries, allowing European consortia to cooperate with partners from around the globe on the research topics of their own choice.

In addition, there will be targeted cooperation actions, where we, as policy makers, will decide up front both the area and the partner for cooperation.

These targeted actions will be selected on the basis of common interest and mutual benefit. They will be developed from the ongoing dialogues with our global partners.

Horizon 2020 will make a real improvement by ensuring a more strategic approach to the selection of these targeted actions, driven by clear selection criteria that are applied in a coherent manner across the whole programme.

We will also continue our efforts to develop actions with sufficient scale and scope to generate the impact that is needed.

All of this will be clearly laid out in a set of multi-annual roadmaps that will specify for each of our partner countries and regions the topics on which we wish to cooperate.

So that our researchers can collaborate in full confidence with their counterparts across the world, we need to create a level playing field for global research and innovation. The strategy therefore promotes the development of common principles at the international level on issues such as research integrity, gender, reciprocity and open access.

The protection of intellectual property will be of particular importance as we move to Horizon 2020 and its increased support for innovation activities.

The strategy links action at EU level more closely with the international cooperation policies and funding programmes of the Member States, exploiting in particular the work of the Strategic Forum for International Science and Technology Cooperation. This body brings together the Member States, the countries associated to the Framework Programme, and the European Commission.

In recent years, the Forum has been developing strategic agendas for research and innovation cooperation with key countries such as India, Brazil, the USA and China. We need to keep this momentum going.

The ERA Communication launched this year seeks to exploit better synergies between national and international programmes by enabling more transnational research and innovation programmes.

Launching this strategy is only the first step. Making it work it will require the full and visible integration of international cooperation into Horizon 2020.

To ensure that we stay on track, the Commission will produce a report every two years to measure progress and assess impact.

Honourable Members, international cooperation is vital for the Union to truly reap the benefits from our research and innovation and to deliver the smart, sustainable and inclusive growth championed by Europe 2020.

This Strategy is a major step forward in achieving our objectives.