

EUROPEAN UNION

Brussels, 9 December 2011

**EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA
COMMITTEE**

**– ERAC –
Secretariat**

ERAC 1215/11

NOTE

To: ERAC delegations

Subject: ERAC Opinion on the development of an ERA Framework

Delegations will find attached the ERAC Opinion on the development of an ERA Framework that has been approved by written procedure.

ERAC Opinion on the development of an ERA Framework

Prepared by an enlarged ERAC Steering Board (SB+) with input by Steering Group for Human Resources and Mobility (SGHRM), High Level Group for Joint Programming (GPC), Strategic Forum for International S&T Cooperation (SFIC), Working Group on Knowledge Transfer (KT) and European Strategic Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI)

Introduction

At its 6th meeting on 24 May 2011, ERAC decided that its opinion on the development of an ERA Framework, which the Commission announced would be tabled in 2012, would be prepared by the ERAC Steering Board in an *ad hoc* enlarged format (hereafter ERAC SB+)¹. The ERAC opinion should contribute to the preparatory work by the Commission in which it is exploring all possible barriers and problems which continue to hamper completion of the ERA and, in turn, all possible actions which could be taken to remove such barriers.

Via a combination of collective and individual work and four meetings, the SB+ is basing its draft opinion on a clear, comprehensive and substantiated overview of the current situation, against the background of the EU's legal and political commitments (ERA Vision 2020, Lisbon Treaty, Europe 2020, Innovation Union, European Council February 2011 etc.). The SB+ is also taking account of the input from the four ERA related groups and ESFRI, as requested by the Council on 31 May 2011² via working arrangements agreed with the Chairs of these groups.

¹ Terms of Reference in Annex.

² Council Conclusions on the development of the European Research Area (ERA) through ERA-related Groups of 31 May 2011, 11032/11.

Observations and recommendations

- **Much has already been achieved** by Member States (MS), Associated Countries (AC) and the European Commission (EC) since the Council endorsed the creation of the European Research Area (ERA) in 2000 and the start of the Ljubljana process³ in 2008 – increased research partnership across Europe, greater mobility of researchers, particularly under the Marie Curie Actions, enhanced cooperation on the creation of European research infrastructures, the establishment of the European Research Council and the European Institute of Innovation and Technology, for example. Substantial resources have been deployed through successive Framework Programme initiatives, complemented by the Open Method of Coordination and, since 2008, there has been increased political commitment via the ERA partnership approach. **There is much more that we can do together in building an ERA based on complementary and mutually reinforcing policies in the research and innovation landscape. The ERA is a long term goal based on our shared Vision 2020.** While ERA will be achieved in one form by 2014 it will continue to evolve in a dynamic process.

The ERA Framework in a global context

- The global competitive situation for Europe is rapidly changing, with dynamic challenges from other regions of the world, making the innovation gap growing against Europe. To emphasize the role of Research and Innovation is the only way for Europe to create further growth.
- The answer to the question “**What will make Europe stay relevant as a global player in a knowledge-based society?**” should be to build on what we already have achieved, to harness our creativity, to capitalise on our research and innovation, whilst using diversity between countries as a strength, and to improve the competitive strength of Europe by **radically enhancing quality and efficiency.**

³ http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/partnership/process/ljubljana_process_en.htm

- **Competition is needed at most levels of research activity to achieve excellence**, whether it is competition between individual researchers, at national level or at European level, to achieve excellence, as in the European Research Council, or competition in industry both within the EU and with its major global competitors.
- Among the prerequisites for realising a successful and competitive ERA, the free mobility of researchers, a critical mass of skilled researchers, gender balance and the attractiveness of the research profession rank very high.

The international nature of science and its political environment

- **By its nature, science is an international enterprise.** Publicly funded activities are however largely funded at national level out of budgets ultimately responsive to the play of democratic debate within our countries.
- Successful coordination and pooling of research and innovation efforts in the EU is closely linked to the facilitation of cooperation between and operation of actors across national and regional borders, as well as between the public and private sector. **The emphasis should be on finding ways to enable transnational research and innovation and to facilitate synergies between national and international programmes**, rather than on transnational funding *per se*. Financial commitments are more likely to be forthcoming if the strategic agenda and projected resultant research and socio-economic outcomes are truly attractive and offer clear added value.
- In order to **enable synergies and complementarity between Horizon 2020 and the wider ERA**, there needs to be greater flexibility in the components and the implementation of Horizon 2020 than in previous Framework Programmes. The contributions by the ERA groups clearly highlight this need.

Definition and objectives of the ERA

- The definition of ERA contained in the Treaty has as a core element the free circulation of researchers, knowledge and technology⁴. In the European Council conclusions of 4 February 2011, the Heads of State and Government concluded that Europe "**needs a unified research area to attract talent and investment**" and that the objective of rapidly addressing remaining gaps and realising ERA is "**to create a genuine single market for knowledge, research and innovation**"⁵.
- Lack of clarity in the definition of the ERA is, however, an obstacle to setting our goals for the ERA and to measuring our progress towards meeting them. For clarity, ERAC recommends that any future detailed interpretation of the definition contained in the Treaty should promote the **realisation of an ERA which is achievable against identified goals and realistic timeframes**.
- **In the short-term, ERAC proposes that the ERA Framework focus on issues related to the five axes** (human resources, cross-border operation, knowledge circulation (including Open Access), research infrastructures, international dimension), with a considerably higher degree of mutual interaction and coherence and a higher emphasis on **strengthening the Knowledge Triangle and facilitating strategic agendas for MS, AC and EU research and innovation programmes** to ensure they are complementary and mutually reinforcing.
- **Obstacles to the completion of ERA should be identified taking into account in a balanced way the perspectives and interest of different research actors**, i.e. researchers, research institutions, business sectors, funding organisations, knowledge transfer agents and ministries. Prior to the implementation of policies aimed at the removal of identified barriers, a clear analysis of the potential costs and benefits of such policies and their modification for different user groups should be made.

⁴ Article 179 (1) states that "The Union shall have the objective of strengthening its scientific and technological bases by achieving a European Research Area in which researchers, scientific knowledge and technology circulate freely".

⁵ http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/119175.pdf

- Ensure that **the general principle of variable geometry is retained** i.e. that participation in research and innovation activities at EU level should always be open to all MS/AC either as partners or observers according to their needs and capabilities.
- There is an obstacle to the full use of the intellectual capability of Europe if some regions and countries are unable to engage fully in the ERA. **Cohesion Policy Funds, working in close interaction with Horizon 2020, should be used to develop the capacities of less RTD&I⁶ intensive regions and countries.**
- The Joint Programming process launched in 2008, with its focus on research addressing societal challenges, has the potential to contribute to the wider innovation agenda and, in that context, also to education measures. It also has potential for better anchoring cooperation with third countries. The process for Joint Programming could be broadened and deepened if **national, regional and EU programmes were formulated and designed to enable better interaction and articulation with other national, regional and EU programmes, potentially leading ultimately to coordination between such programmes.** The existing governance of Joint Programming should be strengthened accordingly.
- In parallel to the substantial work done in GPC on the issue of cooperation between research funding organisations, there is a **need for deeper analysis of the processes, incentives and framework conditions to facilitate cross-border cooperation between research performing organisations** in order to enable Europe to tap its major potential in this area.
- This can *inter alia* be undertaken by drawing on that existing work and by using the monitoring and evaluation tools already in place, with modifications if needed, with the aim of increasing transparent and well-founded cross-border cooperation based on clear research and socio-economic needs. This could be underpinned by exchange of best practice concerning legislation enabling international cooperation.

⁶ Research, technological development and innovation

- **The use of legislation to address obstacles to the ERA is not widely supported by MS and should be used only where clear and significant need is agreed**, i.e. only as a last resort. It may be useful in specific cases, one example being the introduction of the ERIC⁷ which has served as a facilitating option for some ESFRI⁸ projects.
- ERAC welcomes the current review of national legislation relevant to the achievement of the ERA, as being undertaken by the EC, and anticipates that it will provide insights into the situation across Europe.

Data gathering, evaluation and monitoring

- Lack of information is an obstacle to knowing how we are progressing with the ERA and whether we need to take action. Within the ERA there is clear room for improvement, **linking the information available within the ERA, and also with that of the other Knowledge Triangle pillars**, i.e. linkages between research-, innovation- and education-relevant information systems. Insufficient communication and dialogue between MS, AC and EU is an obstacle to achieving the most cost-effective, coherent and complementary system of MS, AC and EU research and innovation policies and initiatives. There is in particular a need for information on progress in achieving the ERA against agreed operational objectives to **increase the knowledge sharing and coordination between different types of transnational research** between MS and AC globally.
- **Monitoring and evaluation** of the ERA should not impose an excessive workload on the research or policy communities and should be **set at a manageable level suited to tracking progress, in a timely manner against identified targets and timings** using comparable datasets and, as much as possible, existing resources. Evaluation and impact metrics and criteria should be developed for each ERA themes (the five axes) at appropriate levels to facilitate an ongoing objective assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of European research and innovation systems and the ERA, taking particular account of impacts on the grand challenges of our society and the economic growth. The ERA Framework proposal

⁷ The legal framework for a European Research Infrastructure Consortium
http://ec.europa.eu/research/infrastructures/index_en.cfm?pg=eric

⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/research/infrastructures/index_en.cfm?pg=esfri

should clarify how monitoring and evaluation processes for the ERA (including Horizon 2020 programmes) will be developed.

- By setting long-term objectives (7-10 years) for the ERA as a whole, including the Framework Programme but also other financial and non-financial elements, it should be possible to **facilitate an appropriate degree of orientation of national research and innovation programmes relative to agreed EU objectives and higher overall consistency and impact.**
- A report should be prepared, every second year, on progress towards achieving the goals of the ERA. This would help to strengthen the dialogue and cooperation with European research organisations as, inter alia, called for by ESFRI. It would also help to **enhance the visibility of ERA initiatives and structures** as one of a number of methods which should be considered to showcase Europe as an effective and attractive cooperation partner in research and innovation globally.

Specific ERA initiatives and their inputs

- In the area of **human resources and mobility**, further work on obstacles in the areas of i) doctoral training; ii) recruitment in public research institutions including public-private staff exchanges; iii) research career structure and iv) social security may be necessary to address obstacles which hinder the implementation of the core pre-requisites of the ERA. Measures under the ERA Framework will need to fully acknowledge Member State and institutional competence (especially in the context of the EU agenda for modernisation of Europe's higher education system, as recently proposed by the European Commission⁹) and their linkages with actions under the forthcoming Horizon 2020 programme will need to be clearly defined.

⁹ Supporting Growth and Jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education system (COM (2011) 567/2, 20 September 2011).

- Any policy measures included in the ERA Framework should encourage and support effective cross-border operations of research funding agencies and transnational research. The ERA Framework should therefore **stimulate development of an effective EU research and innovation policy strategy for cross-border cooperation on the grand societal challenges**. This cooperation might involve structures and processes to design, implement and monitor policy actions, strengthening world class research in a coordinated manner at and between MS/AC and EU levels and with other policy areas.
- The ERA Framework should at the same time stimulate efforts to engage all MS/AC in a meaningful participation in these cross-border activities in a manner that is conducive to reaching the goal of excellence and relevance in research. In particular, **to encourage wider participation by small and by less RTD&I intensive MS/AC and regions, supporting measures aimed at effective coordination and implementation of their research and innovation programmes should be available** at the EU level.
- **There is need for tools, actions and a common strategy for knowledge transfer**, further building upon the major achievements in knowledge transfer and the management of IP (intellectual property) already attained in Europe during the last decade, while seeking to address areas where progress has been insufficient. Further, for efficient knowledge transfer a supportive framework that stimulates interaction and cooperation between key actors and stakeholders is fundamental.
- The IP Recommendation, and further guidelines to be developed for efficient knowledge transfer/ intellectual property management by and for MS/AC in the ERA, appears to be an effective tool to achieve progress and voluntary harmonisation by means of best practice examples rather than European legislation. It would however help to unblock the remaining obstacles if the understanding of the process of professionalising knowledge transfer and IP management were developed more fully at a political level. This could also enhance an increased uptake of research results, through the implementation of Open Access policies and provisions.

- From a governance point of view, there are two important aspects related to **international co-operation**.
 - Firstly, there is a need to articulate synergies more clearly by encouraging coherence between SFIC activities and international aspects of the activities of other groups with different focuses (such as GPC, ESFRI etc.). Thus, SFIC would provide strategic but general guidelines and methods relevant to international cooperation. To this extent, SFIC will work towards the development of a European level strategy and by this way will provide inspiration, guidelines, experiences, methods and tools relevant to international cooperation.
 - Secondly, there is a need to ensure that SFIC activities really add value to national and EU activities. International cooperation is a natural part of all ERA activities and SFIC's role is to support, ensure coherence, coordinate but also provide advice to other groups on how to integrate an international dimension in their respective activities. International activities should as much as possible be integrated into specific research and innovation activities and focus in particular on countries/regions where MS agree to join forces. One obstacle to the implementation of an EU international strategy is that some Member States or national agencies lack a strategy for the international dimension. There is a need for peer learning and exchange of experiences on developing national strategies for international cooperation.

- In the area of *research infrastructures*, ESFRI highlights the major bottlenecks for the implementation process of the roadmap for new Research Infrastructures as follows:
 1. **The lack of (sustainable) funding** appeared the single most important bottleneck for most ESFRI projects;
 2. Many projects struggle with and need **support and guidance in legal matters** and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues; and
 3. There is a **lack of coordination** between the various levels and actors.

- ERAC notes in particular the valuable contribution of ESFRI in describing in a systematic way all of the obstacles in the ERA relevant to infrastructure, including those in the other ERA axes (human resources, cross-border operation, knowledge circulation including a clear call for Open Access, international dimension) as well as in the managing and monitoring of ERA as a whole. ESFRI has identified the need to increase **regional and international cooperation** on research infrastructure as well as cooperation with **industry**. Another item to be dealt with is the setting of the timing for an **update of the ESFRI roadmap**.
 - The potential value of increased coordination between pan-European initiatives such as JPIs and pan-European research infrastructures is identified, as well as closer cooperation between ESFRI and European research organisations (such as EIROForum, EUROHORCS, TAFTIE, EARTO, ESF and others) and the Joint Research Centres.
-

Terms of Reference

Preparation of a draft ERAC Opinion on the development of an ERA Framework by an enlarged ERAC Steering Board

(With input by GPC, SFIC, KT, SGHRM and ESFRI)

1. INTRODUCTION

At its 6th meeting on 24 May 2011, ERAC decided that its opinion on the development of an ERA Framework, which the Commission announced would be tabled in 2012, would be prepared by the ERAC Steering Board in an *ad hoc* enlarged format (hereafter ERAC SB+). The ERAC opinion should contribute to the preparatory work by the Commission. Taking into account article 3, 4 and 10 of the Rules of Procedure of ERAC¹⁰, these terms of reference set out the relevant background, the proposed working modalities and composition of the SB+, the responsibilities of those involved, deliverables and timetable.

2. THE GENERAL CONTEXT

Based on the Innovation Union (IU) flagship¹¹ adopted by the Commission in October 2010 as part of the Europe 2020 Strategy¹², and considering the reinforced legal basis for research policy in the Lisbon Treaty (i.e. Art. 179 & 182(5) TFEU), the Commission is exploring all possible barriers and problems which continue to hamper completion of the ERA and, in turn, all possible actions which could be taken to remove such barriers. The IU Flagship announces for 2012 an ERA framework and supporting measures to remove obstacles to mobility and cross-border co-operation (see box), to be in force by the end of 2014, as formally endorsed by the European Council of 4 February 2011¹³.

Commitment 4 Innovation Union Flagship Initiative:

In 2012, the Commission will propose a **European Research Area framework and supporting measures to remove obstacles to mobility and cross-border co-operation**, aiming for them to be in force by end 2014. They will notably seek to ensure through a common approach:

- quality of doctoral training, attractive employment conditions and gender balance in research careers;
- mobility of researchers across countries and sectors, including through open recruitment in public research institutions and comparable research career structures and by facilitating the creation of European supplementary pension funds;
- cross-border operation of research performing organisations, funding agencies and foundations, including by ensuring simplicity and mutual coherence of funding rules and procedures, building on the work of stakeholders, funding agencies and their representative organisations;
- dissemination, transfer and use of research results, including through open access to publications and data from publicly funded research;
- opening of Member State operated research infrastructures to the full European user community; and
- consistency of EU and national strategies and actions for international cooperation in science and technology.

¹⁰ ERAC 1206/10 of 12 October 2010

¹¹ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, *Europe 2020 Flagship Initiative Innovation Union*, SEC(2010) 1161, Brussels, 6.10.2010, COM(2010) 546 final, http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/pdf/innovation-union-communication_en.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none

¹² http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm

¹³ European Council 4 February 2011 Conclusions, Brussels, 8 March 2011, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/119175.pdf

Based on detailed Impact Assessment work, the nature of the measures which the Commission could propose to increase the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of research in Europe can vary from funding to self regulation, coordination or legislation. At this stage, no type of measure is either favoured or discarded. All measures must respect subsidiarity and the shared competence nature of research policy, as well as proportionality between the measures and the costs involved - economic and others. Existing legislation and initiatives both at EU as well as national/regional level should be taken into account.

3. MANDATE, DELIVERABLES AND TIMETABLE

3.1. OVERALL MANDATE

Via a combination of collective and individual work and a (limited) number of meetings, the SB+ should base its draft opinion on a clear, comprehensive and substantiated overview of the current situation¹⁴, against the background of the EU's legal and political commitments (ERA Vision 2020, Lisbon Treaty, Europe 2020, Innovation Union, European Council Feb 2011, etc.). The SB+ shall take account of, and consolidate, the input from the four ERA related groups and ESFRI, as requested by Council on 31 May 2011¹⁵ via working arrangements to be agreed with the Chairs of these groups.

The Council noted on this occasion the considerable progress achieved in implementing ERA, notably since 2007 through the impact of inter alia ERANET, ERANET+, article 185, Joint Technology Initiatives and Joint Programming Initiatives, but stressed also that the ERA Framework should result in a continuation of the comprehensive and strategic approach to implement the Ljubljana process of realizing ERA in line with ERA 2020 vision and take full advantage of Europe's intellectual capital, that societal challenges should be addressed, while encouraging the competitiveness of Europe's industries and the excellence of its scientific and technological base.

The draft opinion should propose, against this background, elements of an approach to developing an ERA Framework which aims to address areas of underperformance of European research by eliminating remaining obstacles to the completion of ERA in particular continuing inefficiencies in the European research system, unexploited cross-border synergies and co-ordination failures.

Some of these potential obstacles are of a **theme-specific nature**, i.e.:

- **Researchers:** career prospects and employment conditions, cross-border & inter-sectoral mobility;
- **Cross-border operation of funding organisations and research performing organisations:** cross-border pooling of funding to tackle major challenges; cross-border research with national funds; cross-border operation of research performing organisations; impacts of differences in national systems, rules, definitions, priorities, etc;
- **Research infrastructures:** scientific, innovation and societal potential of existing research infrastructures (e.g. in terms of access); sustainability of competitive edge of Europe in developing new European RIs;

14 Preferably based on evidence collected from a wide range of Member States, be it at institutional, national or international level, with possibly some cross-country comparisons.

15 Council Conclusions on the development of the European Research Area (ERA) through ERA-related Groups of 31 May 2011, 11032/1.

- **Knowledge circulation:** knowledge transfer and IP strategies in public research institutions; national strategies on open access to scientific publications and data; access to and use of public research results by business;
- **International dimension:** exploitation of EU potential; relationship between EU & MS policies & programmes; coordinated / joint EU-MS initiatives and positions in global fora; information sharing and multi-lateral dialogue.

Others may be of a more **cross-cutting nature** relating to political will and governance at national level as it affects the ability of researchers to use existing instruments, to include the EU perspective in national policy or to communicate the benefits of the ERA to Member States, i.e. there is a need:

- to have a clear **definition and objectives** for ERA;
- to **ensure systematic links and coherence** in EU and MS policies and complementarity between them and to fully **leverage the research potential** within the EU and MS; **to promote inclusiveness** across Member States and EU research policies and fields as well as smart specialization¹⁶; and to foster interactions between research and innovation policies and (higher) education policies;
- To balance the **international nature of science** and the largely national political framework;
- To ensure that **ERA relevant information**¹⁷, across the many different levels and in many systems, is well-organised and easily accessible; and to have a structured, visible and well-accepted system of **monitoring of ERA and its objectives**;
- To **ensure openness and enable free movement** of ideas, knowledge and researchers & cross-border operation of research performing actors (taking into account the outcomes of the analysis of the theme-specific issues).

The work of the ERAC SB+ should focus on helping to fully **characterize and substantiate** the above problems, barriers and obstacles to the completion of ERA, supplementing the list with others where justified. It should take full and objective account of demonstrable benefits **and deficiencies of the voluntary approach** followed so far in the ERA partnership initiatives and other EU and national/regional actions which contribute to ERA, making explicit the degree of commitment and rate of progress in Member States it gives rise to, and possible divergences and unevenness therein, and suggesting ways that deficiencies should be overcome. In view of the broad scope of the exercise, the ERAC SB+ should identify and prioritise the issues which require immediate action.

The SB+ may also suggest tentative orientations for **how to deal with these obstacles via European policy measures** in order to meet the recent high demands of the European Council, including on the basis of examples of good practice where a particular issue has been successfully addressed by one or more countries, regions or institutions.

The SB+ shall take due consideration of the perspectives and associated costs and benefits of completing ERA for **different types of stakeholders** – individual researchers; research organisations; funders; and firms. Furthermore, the ERAC opinion should go over and above the positions and interests of Member States¹⁸ and give precedence to views which aim at maximizing the **win-win** situation for the **EU overall AND for individual Member States**.

¹⁶ Taking into account the Commission Communication on smart growth (COM(2010) 553).

¹⁷ Currently, ERA relevant information can be found on different levels, from policymaking to researchers, in many not combined or linked systems like ERA Portal, CORDIS, ERAWATCH, NETWATCH and national systems.

¹⁸ As concluded in earlier ERAC opinions, the advice should inspire national positions in an early stage, but will be without prejudice to the positions by individual Member States following the formal proposal by the Commission, nor will it infringe upon the right of initiative from the European Commission.

3.2. MEMBERSHIP, DELIVERABLES, TIMETABLE AND MEETINGS

Membership

The SB+ consists of the regular members of the ERAC Steering Board, including past, current and incoming Presidencies (after 1 July 2011 Hungary, Poland, Denmark and Cyprus) two elected members (United Kingdom and Spain), and four additional members (Czech Republic, Ireland, Netherlands and Switzerland) and it will be chaired by the Vice-Chair of ERAC.

Deliverables

The end result should be a draft ERAC opinion, with a core text not exceeding 20 pages, plus annexes and references.

Timetable

The group should prepare a first draft for discussion at the 7th ERAC meeting (12-14 October, Cracow, Poland). A final draft opinion should be prepared for discussion at the 8th ERAC meeting (16 November, Brussels). The final version should be approved before the end of the year via written procedure, in order to feed in a timely manner into the Commission's preparations of the ERA Framework (see timetable attached).

Meetings

The group will meet approximately 4-5 times up to November 2011. This includes the kick-off meeting on 21 June (fixing a work schedule taking into account relevant contributions by the Commission as planned in advance, agreeing a number of meetings and allocating tasks). Meetings could take place mid-September in the margin of the ERAC Seminar with stakeholders, early October to discuss the first draft, and a final meeting upon delivery of a final draft. A coordinator will assist the Chairperson. To reinforce the analytical and coordinating capacity of ERAC SB+, rapporteurs for specific areas may be identified among ERAC SB+ members, working together with the Chairperson.

Contributions by the Commission

The Commission will provide factual information and clarifications if needed e.g. on possible relations and synergies between other major initiatives such as the CSF proposal, Universities Communication and Scientific Information Communication and the ERA Framework. The Commission may propose orientations to the work when deemed necessary in order to guarantee a good connection with the Commission's internal work. The Commission will inform the SB+ of relevant outcomes of the broad consultation on the CSF and, in a timely and well scheduled manner, of the approach for the broad public consultation on the ERA Framework¹⁹ and of relevant other preparatory work launched by DG RTD, such as the study on how research and research systems in MS are regulated.

¹⁹ Given the timing of the on-line public consultation on the ERA Framework, any major inputs received of relevance to the ERAC SB+ work will be made available in real time.

Milestones for the preparation of the ERA Framework and the input by ERAC and SB+

2011

- **29 JUNE** FINALISATION TERMS OF REFERENCE, LETTER TO CHAIRS OF ERAC GROUPS, MINI-QUESTIONNAIRE TO ERAC DELEGATES ON CROSS-CUTTING AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES
- **JULY** FINE-TUNING CONSULTATION APPROACH BY COM WITH SB+ (BY WRITTEN PROCEDURE)
- **20-21 JULY** ERA MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE BACK-TO-BACK WITH INFORMAL COMPETITIVENESS COUNCIL MEETING
- **1 AUGUST** DEADLINE INPUT ERAC QUESTIONNAIRE
- **END OF AUGUST** REFLECTION PAPERS BY SB+ MEMBERS ON CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES
- **12 OR 14 SEPT** MEETING ERAC SB+ / ERAC VICE-CHAIR ALSO TO MEET WITH CHAIRS OF ERA GROUPS. COM TO PRESENT STATE OF PLAY PROBLEM ANALYSIS, UPDATE OF OVERALL ERA FRAMEWORK PREPARATIONS INCLUDING STUDY ON REGULATION RESEARCH SYSTEMS IN MS.
- **13 SEPTEMBER** LAUNCH OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE ERA FRAMEWORK, ERAC SEMINAR WITH STAKEHOLDERS
- **END OF SEPT/EARLY OCT** FIRST INPUT BY ERA RELATED GROUPS
- **3 OCTOBER** MEETING SB+ (WHOLE DAY), COM TO PRESENT MAIN OUTCOMES STUDY ON REGULATION RESEARCH SYSTEMS IN MS
- **12-14 OCTOBER** FIRST DISCUSSION ON ERAC OPINION (CRACOW), CHAIRS OF ERA GROUPS WILL BE INVITED
- **END OF OCTOBER** FINAL INPUT BY ERA GROUPS, CONSOLIDATION/SYNTHESIS BY SB+
- **END OF OCTOBER** MEETING SB+
- **16 NOVEMBER** SECOND DISCUSSION ON ERAC OPINION (BRUSSELS), SUBSEQUENTLY ADOPTION BY WRITTEN PROCEDURE
- **30 NOVEMBER** END OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE ERA FRAMEWORK
- **1 DECEMBER** ADOPTION OF ERAC OPINION BY ERAC
- **5-6 DECEMBER** INNOVATION CONVENTION: SESSION ON ERA, PRESENTATION, DISTRIBUTION ERAC OPINION

