



Brussels, 05 June 2014
H1/FS

**DRAFT SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS OF THE
THIRD MEETING OF HORIZON 2020 TRANSPORT ADVISORY GROUP
13 MAY 2014**

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

- The chair of the meeting, Mr Alan McKinnon, welcomed the members of the Advisory Group for Horizon 2020 societal challenge “Smart, Green and Integrated Transport”.
- Since there were several new faces, the chair proposed to have a ‘tour-de-table’ allowing everyone to introduce him/herself to the rest of the group.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

- The members of the TAG received an official invitation for the second meeting on 6 May 2014 via e-mail, with the agenda attached.
- The chair proposed the following modifications to the agenda:
 - To add a presentation on the ‘Background and agenda for the meeting of May 13, 2014’ to the agenda point ‘Scope and focus of future advice’;
 - To replace the ‘Working Groups Session (1)’ (from 11:45-13:00) by a plenary discussion on key question 1 of the ‘Consultation’ paper: ‘What is the biggest challenge in the field of transport?’;
 - To start the working groups discussion only after lunch. This would coincide with ‘Working Groups Session (2)’ of the submitted agenda (from 14:00-15:45).
- All modifications were approved by the members.

3. ADOPTION OF THE ‘SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS’ OF THE SECOND MEETING

- Attached to the official invitation for the third meeting, sent via e-mail on 6 May 2014, there were also the summary conclusions of the second meeting.

- The sentence “*The members of the TAG confirmed that a radical change towards socio-economic and policy oriented research, away from technology, is essential. Therefore a paradigm shift may be needed (post-carbon transport)*” was largely discussed, mainly with respect to the 'post carbon transport' point. The main statement was accepted, but it was agreed to make clear that the 'post carbon transport' is only an example of a 'paradigm shift'. As a consequence this point had to be modified accordingly in the final version of the second meeting's summary.

4. TRANSPORT 'FORWARD LOOKING' ACTIVITIES: AN OVERVIEW OF RELEVANT PROJECTS FINDINGS

- The European Commission presented an inventory of still ongoing (FUTRE and RACE 2050) or recently finalised (GHG-TransporD, ORIGAMI, OPTIMISM, TOSCA) foresight-related research projects in the transport programme of FP7. The aim of the paper was to provide the members of the TAG with an overview of relevant findings and scenarios developed in forward looking projects.
- First, the most relevant findings were presented under the 7 different themes: 1. Transport demand and supply; 2. Industry developments; 3. Society and economics; 4. Technological developments; 5. Transport infrastructure, safety and security; 6. Services and organisational innovations; 7. Environmental and energy concerns.
- Then, the scenarios elaborated for each of the projects were proposed. Most scenarios proposed 2030 as time horizon; some projections however covered a time span until 2050.
- The findings and scenarios were intensively commented by the TAG. What follows is an overview of the main remarks:
 - The scenarios don't reflect all needs. Many environmental issues at stake are not mentioned (e.g. noise). To cover them all, different research is needed, even a paradigm shift;
 - FP7 develops a mechanistic point of view, assuming that supply generates demand. It doesn't look at users' demands and how they can steer/influence the technology and innovation;
 - The focus on 'Europe' as a whole, offers a false picture. There's not one homogenous Europe, rather different 'Europe's';
 - In addition, the scenarios are not open for conflicting ambitions. Europe should be compared to the rest of the world, but this doesn't happen, since the ambitions of Europe and the rest of the world are not compatible;
 - Foresight has the tendency to focus on the recent developments and to present them as trends. Most trends are already broken off at the moment they are presented. Foresight should therefore better focus on breaking trends.
- The Commission recognised the relevance of the comments made and clarified that the scope of the presentation was not to give a complete overview of forward looking activities, but rather to offer a sample of transport related FP7 projects to trigger the discussion. Since foresight is always a work in progress, the TAG members will be invited to regularly take stock of forward looking activities and

discuss their evolution. An inventory of publications will therefore be placed and regularly updated on CIRCABC, including the relevant deliverables of the projects referred to in the presentation.

- To conclude, it should be kept in mind that the main objective of forward looking scenarios is not to predict the future, but to change the way we look at the future.

5. PROVIDING ADVICE ON POTENTIAL PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION IN THE WORK PROGRAMME 2016-2017

- The core of the meeting was dedicated to discussing potential priorities for research and innovation in the Work Programme 2016-2017.

5.1. Key questions, process and timing

- First the Commission presented the ‘Key questions, process and timing’, to be considered as a guidance throughout the process of providing advice.
 - The main Commission guidelines, exposed in the document “Consultation of the Horizon 2020 Advisory Groups – Providing advice on potential priorities for research and innovation in the Work Programme 2016-2017” were recalled, including the 7 key questions (see ‘5.2. Scope and focus of future advice’);
 - Reference was also made to a series of documents which could be used as a basis for the consultation;
 - A few slides evoked the timing for the consultation process: by the summer of 2014 (end June), each Advisory Group has to produce a report summarising the discussions and including responses to the 7 questions. The TAG report will be used as an important input - among the input of other stakeholders – towards the drafting of the Work Programme 2016-2017.
- In the “Questions and answers” session after the presentation, the following clarifications were added:
 - The Commission confirmed that the TAG would get the necessary feedback on what happened with their advice;
 - Although the input of the TAG is part of a global stakeholder consultation, there’s no need to align the TAG advice with the advice given by other stakeholders;
 - While formulating its advice, the TAG has to analyse the evolution in other fields of technology, e.g. energy and ITC, and especially the way they influence evolutions in the transport sector;
 - The TAG advice focuses on defining priorities in view of future work programmes, with a volume of resources corresponding to approximately half of the transport research budget under Horizon 2020. The research financed through JTI’s is not included: they will define their own research agendas, without input from the TAG.

5.2. Scope and focus of future advice

- The Commission presentation was followed by a proposal by the chair, the vice-chair and the rapporteur on the ‘Scope and focus of future advice’. Based on the

outcome of the previous meeting on 6 February, the document intended to set the scene for the remaining discussions. A summary, ‘Background and agenda for the meeting of May 13, 2014’, was presented by the vice-chair and discussed by the group.

- It was agreed that there would be first a plenary discussion on ‘what is the biggest challenge in the field which requires immediate action under the next Work Programme?’ (Question 1 of the Commission ‘Consultation document’).
- Then the six remaining questions of the ‘Consultation document’ would be addressed in 2 different working groups. In case there wouldn’t be sufficient time to answer all questions, the missing responses would be prepared by the trio and presented to the TAG for comments and vetting at the next meeting on 11-12 June.

6. PLENARY DISCUSSION ON THE ‘BIGGEST CHALLENGE IN THE FIELD OF TRANSPORT’

- Before splitting into working groups, the plenary discussion on question 1 of the ‘Consultation paper’: ‘What is the biggest challenge in the field of transport?’ took place.
- The TAG discussion of 6 February 2014 did not identify a single ‘biggest challenge’, yet pointed to a variety of subjects: e.g. climate change, ageing population or resilient infrastructure.
- Although the proposed TAG challenges should cover societal issues, they should be transport-specific. The chair, vice-chair and rapporteur, therefore proposed in the ‘Background and agenda for the meeting of May 13, 2014’ (see ‘5.2. Scope and focus of future advice’) the following combination of objectives as a starting point:
 - 1) Developing and effectively harnessing new transport and ICT technologies to make the transport system (i) more resilient to extreme events and climate change, (ii) more supportive of economic competitiveness, (iii) more innovative for world commercial leadership, (iv) more sustainable to achieve pollution and noise abatement and decarbonization, (v) safer, to cut transport-related injuries and deaths to a low level and (vi) more inclusive in view of deepening EU economic integration and population ageing.
 - 2) Focus research on developing effective tools and procedures to address the significant and long-standing inefficiency and ineffectiveness of many intermodal interfaces; to integrate dispersed databases, reporting systems, payment procedures, client service standards; to standardize equipment and technologies to permit greater network inter-operability, and to make transportation more responsive to the needs of non-transport sectors, for example in catering for the growing demands of online retailing. In a few words, to make everyday multi-modal transport more seamless efficient, effective, innovative and competitive.
- The proposal generated a lot of reactions on what could be identified as the main challenge in transport:
 - A first comment referred to the fact that transport is not a goal on itself, as is health or food. Transport is at the service of other activities. As a

consequence, ‘avoidance’ of transport is not an option, at most we can talk about ‘decoupling’;

- Other comments pointed to the ‘inside thinking’ or ‘silo thinking’ of the background document. It focuses on what we know, rather than on transferring our knowledge to the rest of the world (industry, end-users and policy). Isn’t the real challenge in order to mitigate the negative effects of transport the failure of knowledge take-up?
 - The ambiguity of the term ‘challenge’ (cf. ‘societal challenge’) was questioned. It may refer to transversality’ (all modes and aspects of transport integrated), to new ‘focus areas’ or to global competition in a globalised world (does Europe accept to be one of the global competitors or does it want to regain its leadership position?);
 - It was again recalled that transport is not only driven by supply (service), but also by demand;
 - Transport should also be defined in terms of ‘inclusion’, e.g. the inclusion of apparent opposite objectives like competition and sustainability. In addition, transport operates within a financial (e.g. funding schemes) or political (e.g. liberalisation) context. Do they have to be taken into account?
 - Several interventions addressed the relation of Europe with the rest of the world. Some members stated that the European level is the appropriate level to collect ‘local’ knowledge and capacity to compete with Asian or American competitors. Others emphasised the need to focus on Europe in order to exploit its leading role in the field of transport. Europe is still the reference, perhaps not at industrial level, but certainly at the level of transport systems and infrastructures. But Europe has to be careful not to lose ground, as is demonstrated in the field logistics;
 - Rather than copying new global competitors (e.g. China), Europe has to do something completely new. Here the development of new technologies or services at a local level might offer opportunities (‘Size doesn’t matter anymore’).
- At this point, the Commission reminded the context in which the TAG has to operate:
 - The main objective of the TAG is not to design the future research programme, but to implement the current one;
 - The transport challenge of Horizon 2020 encompasses both research on mobility (the transport modes and the system) and on the industrial production of the means of transport (e.g. automotive, rail, ship or air sectors);
 - The TAG doesn’t work on a tabula rasa base, but builds further on the Specific Programme and the first Work Programme 2014-2015.
 - As a conclusion, it was agreed to maintain the two main lines of the discussion as ‘biggest challenge(s)’ for transport research in the next few years:
 1. Transport system integration for sustainability, competitiveness, inclusion/accessibility and (industrial) leadership;

2. Transfer of research outputs and knowledge to public policy making, economic actors and international partners.

7. WORKING GROUPS SESSION

- After having answered question 1 in plenary, the discussion was carried on in 2 working groups. Each group would primarily focus on the key questions 3-7. (Question 2 and any other unanswered question would be addressed by the ‘trio’ after the meeting).
- The members of the TAG were allocated to 2 different working groups as follows:
 - Group A: Ruben Alblas, Muriel Brunet, George Giannopoulos (rapporteur), Robert Haligowski, Merja Hoppe, Christopher Irwin, Astrid Linder, Francesca La Torre, Vytautas Paulauskas, Pietro Perlo and Maryvonne Plessis-Fraissard;
 - Group B: Laetitia Dablanc, Delia-Gabriela Dumitriu, Axel Friedrich, Theresia Hacksteiner, Mirko Hornung, Libor Lochman, Rosario Macario (rapporteur), Alassane Balle Ndiaye, Andrea Ricci and Stephen Perkins.
- The aim of group A was to answer the key questions 3-7 from the perspective of the ‘transport system integration’, while group B tried to do the same from the ‘transfer of research and knowledge’ perspective. In addition, group B also finalised the discussion related to question 1.

8. PRESENTATION OF THE OUTCOME OF THE WORKING GROUPS SESSION AND DISCUSSION

- After the discussion, the two working groups met again in a plenary configuration. There the rapporteurs presented the (provisional) answers collected during their specific working group debate (see attached summaries of the working groups in Annex 3).
- In a first, quick reaction, the following considerations were expressed:
 - The focus should be both on the modal and the inter(cross)modal level;
 - Urban transport is important, particularly in the context of transferability. For instance, the example of urban freight demonstrates that optimising the data collection at city level can generate a lot of impact. However it should be kept in mind that a lot of transport activities take place out of the urban context.

9. AOB, INCLUDING POINTS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

- Based on the conclusions in the working groups, the trio will draft a first version of the ‘TAG report’ with a proposed final format and the (partial) information already elaborated and present it to the TAG for comments and vetting at the June 11-12 meeting.

- At the next meeting on 11-12 June 2014, the TAG will review and approve the report format and structure and address all open issues.
- Before the end of June, the draft 'TAG report' will be circulated for members' comments.
- By Monday 30 June, the 'TAG report' will be submitted to the Commission.
- The next meetings in 2014 will take place on:
 - Wednesday 11 and Thursday 12 June (a one and a half day meeting, starting on Wednesday 11/06 at 14:00);
 - Thursday 20 November.

ANNEX 1: AGENDA



H2020 TAG_Third
meeting_13.05.2014

10. ANNEX 2: PRESENTATIONS

- Transport ‘forward looking’ activities: an overview of relevant FP7 project findings



Forward looking
activities_CC.pdf

- Providing advice on potential priorities for research and innovation in the Work Programme 2016-2017: Key questions, process and timing



Key questions,
process and timing_F:

- Providing advice on potential priorities for research and innovation in the Work Programme 2016-2017: Scope and focus of future advice



Scope and focus of
future advice_MPF.p

11. ANNEX 3: SUMMARIES WORKING GROUPS SESSION

- Summary ‘Working group session A’



Working Group
A_Summary.pdf



Working Group
A_Additional commen

- Summary ‘Working group session B’



Working Group
B_Summary.pdf

12. ANNEX 3: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

12.1. Members

- Ruben Alblas
- Muriel Brunet
- Laetitia Dablanc

- Delia-Gabriela Dumitriu
- Axel Friedrich
- George Giannopoulos
- Theresia Hacksteiner
- Robert Haligowski
- Merja Hoppe
- Mirko Hornung
- Christopher Irwin
- Francesca La Torre
- Astrid Linder
- Libor Lochman
- Rosário Macário
- Alan McKinnon
- Alassane Bale Ndiaye
- Vytautas Paulauskas
- Pietro Perlo
- Maryvonne Plessis-Fraissard
- Andrea Ricci

12.2. Apologies for members

- Jacob Bangsgaard
- Liana Giorgi
- Valérie Guenon
- Niels Buus Kristensen
- Margaret O'Mahony
- Jana Pierigud
- Maria Luisa Soria
- Dušan Teodorović

12.3. Invited guest

- Stephen Perkins (OECD)

12.4. European Commission

- Manuela Soares (Director DG RTD/H)
- Liam Breslin (Head of Unit DG RTD/H.2)
- Alessandro Damiani (Head of Unit DG RTD/H.1)
- Keir Fitch (Head of Unit DG MOVE/C.2)
- Tiit Jurimae (Head of Unit DG RTD/H.3)

- Daniel Bengtsson (JRC/A.1)
- Salvador Cervera (DG RTD/H.1)
- Natascia Lai (DG RTD/H.2)
- Cristina Marolda (DG MOVE/C.2)
- Frédéric Sgarbi (DG RTD/H.2)
- Frank Smit (DG RTD/H.1)