

Reunión para la preparación de la
Reunión del Mirror Group de la HFP el 12-05-06 en Bruselas
Código: REU_PTE HPC_060512

Fecha: 12/05/06

Lugar de reunión: CDTI

C/ Cid, 4 – 28001 - Madrid

Hora: 10:00 h.

Asistentes: por orden alfabético

Entidad	Contacto	Cargo	Teléfono	E-mail
ACCIONA Biocombustibles	Eugenio Guelbenzu		948 229422	eguelbenzu@ehn.es
Asociación Española del Hidrógeno (AeH)	Antonio González García-Conde	Presidente	91.520.14.78	glezgca@inta.es
CDTI	Joaquín Serrano Agejas	Programa Internacional	91.581.55.00	jasa@cdti.es
EMPRESARIOS AGRUPADOS	Luis Cacho		913098000 (Ext 8175)	lrc@empre.es
IDAE	Santiago González Herraiz	Resp. Proyecto	91.456.49.62	sgonzalez@idae.es
IDAE	Luis Alberto Vivaracho			
INTA	Esther Chacón		91.520.14.46	chaconce@inta.es
Generalitat Valenciana. Conselleria de Empresa, Universidad y Ciencia	Carlos Martínez- Riera	Asesor	679.20.90.34	martinez_mac@gva.es
HYNERGREEN	Javier Brey Sánchez		954.93.71.11	jbrey@hynergreen.abengoa.com
Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia	Manuel Montes Ponce de León	Subdirector Gral de Programas de Fomento de la Investigación Técnica Sectorial	91.349.45.11	manuel.montes@mec.es
AeH – Secretaría Técnica de la PTE HPC	María Jaén	Secretaría Técnica	91.804.53.72	maria.jaen@aeh2.org

Han enviado sus comentarios por correo electrónico y disculpan su asistencia a la reunión:

- D. Agustín Escardino (de NTDA Energía)
- D. Herminio Sastre (de la Consejería de Educación y Ciencia de Asturias)
- D. Germán López (de la Agencia Andaluza de la Energía)
- Dña. Ana Elizalbe (CEIT)
- Dirección Gral de I+D+i de la Xunta de Galicia
- D. Francisco García (ELCOGAS)
- D. Luis Correas (Fundación de H2 de Aragón)
- D. Juan Luis Pla (IDAE)
- D. J.R. Morante (Instituto de Investigación de Energía de Cataluña)

Reunión para la preparación de la
Reunión del Mirror Group de la HFP el 12-05-06 en Bruselas
Código: REU_PTE HPC_060512

Antecedentes:

El 12 de Mayo de 2006, se celebra una reunión en Bruselas del Mirror Group de la HFP (Plataforma Europea del Hidrógeno) en relación al tema de las JTIs (Joint Technology Initiatives). En esta reunión los representantes de los países miembros de la HFP, deberán exponer su opinión respecto a las JTIs.

El objetivo de la reunión es recopilar la opinión acerca de la JTIs, de las empresas y administraciones representadas en la reunión, para transmitirla a la HFP.

Como agenda de la reunión se establecen los principales temas que se tratarán en la reunión del 12 de Mayo en Bruselas y que son los siguientes:

**THE HYDROGEN AND FUEL CELL JOINT TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE
KEY ISSUES FOR THE HFP MEMBER STATES MIRROR GROUP**

The members of the HFP MS Mirror Group are requested to address the following important issues from their own national perspective.

1) The setting up of the hydrogen and fuel cell JTI

a) Membership and bodies of the JTI

The EC broadly supports the views expressed by industry in the HFP JTI Working Group paper (sent to MG members on 20 April 2006), although some issues still require further elaboration. Key areas of agreement are:

- Founding members of the JTI legal structure should be the Community (represented by the Commission) and a single industry grouping.
- A lean management structure is needed. The JTI should have a Governing Board and a Director managing a Programme Office. The Board would take strategic decisions and the Director would be responsible for implementing the programme according to the Board's instructions.
- The public-private partnership should be established on a 50:50 basis – i.e. financing of the Programme Office, representation on the Board and voting rights would be split 50% for the EC and 50% for the industry grouping (EC casting vote in the case of deadlock). The overall financing of the JTI programme would also be 50:50 public-private, but on a competitive basis (i.e. open to all to compete, whether members of the JTI or not).
- One of the industry representatives on the Board should represent SMEs. The EC may allocate one or more of its seats on the Board on the basis of public interest (e.g. to a representative of the research community and/or a representative of the technology platform's advisory council). Such seats would be non-voting, as the EC vote is indivisible.

Q1. Do the MSs support these general principles? Do any aspects require further clarification?

We support these general principles, although it would be necessary to clarify the next issues:

1.- Which are the conditions of being a founding member of the JTI (participating in the industry grouping or in the Board).

Reunión para la preparación de la
Reunión del Mirror Group de la HFP el 12-05-06 en Bruselas
Código: REU_PTE HPC_060512

2.- Further details about the public and private funding.

3.- It is necessary to elaborate a general and similar regulation for all the JTIs. These general rules should include: how new organizations could participate in the JTI and how the members could finish their participation, their organization and structure, their public and private funding, etc.

b) Involvement of the Member States

The EC represents the interests of the Community in the JTI Governing Board. There are 3 main options regarding the role of the MSs in the governance of the JTI:

- i) Establish a MS Supervisory Board (as in the Galileo Joint Undertaking). This body would receive all relevant JTI management information, analyse periodic reports and meet as appropriate, particularly prior to JTI Board meetings to inform the Commission of the MSs views on agenda items, which the Commission would then take into account when casting its vote.
- ii) Use the FP7 Programme Committee to perform a similar role as above, but without creating a separate body. A specific "hydrogen" configuration of the committee may be necessary – which could be the Mirror Group if it were given this formal role by the Member States.
- iii) Continue to use the current Mirror Group in an informal capacity to advise the Commission.

Note that the MSs will also have a second key role in the JTI operation (described in point 2 below), which is to consider how to align national programmes with the JTI programme. The ideal solution would be that both roles (governance and coordination) could be carried out by the same body.

Q.2 Which of the above options do MSs prefer (or suggest others)?

We prefer the second option (ii) mainly because the regulating character of the Energy Committee of the FP. That is the reason why we think this is the best option to participate in the governance of the JTI.

Q.3 Are there any other sensitivities of the MSs in relation to how the JTI will be set up?

It is necessary to clarify the next issues:

- According to the budget for the FP7 related to H2 and Fuel Cell Technologies, what will be the EC resources for the JTI. Due to JTIs are supposed to be supported by a new funding scheme, our position is that not more than 1/3 of all the budget allocated for H2 goes to JTIs. Obviously two thirds (2/3) of the budget should be used under well known FP6 schemes.

- Details about the public-private funding.

2) Operation of the H2&FP JTI – incl. relation with national programmes

Reunión para la preparación de la
Reunión del Mirror Group de la HFP el 12-05-06 en Bruselas
Código: REU_PTE HPC_060512

The content and schedule of the JTI work programme will be based on the work of the Implementation Panel of the HFP, although the JTI Governing Board will have the final say (decision making powers).

Q.4 Are the MSs content with the consultation procedures adopted by the IP?

We would like to know the consultation procedures adopted by the IP.

The JTI programme and calls for proposals will be open to competition. Members of the industry grouping will not have any priority or preferential treatment as regards the allocation of funds. Avoidance of conflicts of interest and upholding the general principles applicable to FP7, such as competition, excellence, transparency, SME participation etc will be the responsibility of the Director of the Programme Office. The EC's presence on the Board will be a further guarantor of "fair play".

Q.5 Do the MSs have any specific sensitivities as to how the JTI will operate?

1.- The HFP might be the organization who would take strategic decisions and the JTI might be a working tool for implementing the programme according to the HFP instructions.

2.- What role will play the research organizations and SMEs in the JTI?.

3.- Related to HFP Working Document dated on March 22, 2006, titled "*Aspects of a Possible JTI. An Industry View*", the information included in paragraph 4.2 of the document explains the Role of the Programme Office. The information described in Figure 4 and included in the major tasks of the Programme Office for project selection functions, does not clarify if the JTI will play the role as a project evaluator of proposals received and recommended by the Programme Office.

If the JTI is to become the central pillar of a truly integrated European effort for the development and deployment of hydrogen and fuel cells, then national and regional programmes and funding need to be mobilised in addition to the EC contribution. Several options/mechanisms could be foreseen:

- i) Contribute directly to the JTI resources for RTD+D. This option does not appear to be currently favoured, although MSs may consider joining the JTI as public funding partners in the future, once it is up and running and proving its worth.
- ii) Contribute directly to specific JTI projects. One mechanism could be to foresee a "topping-up" funding of national partners, in order to reduce the EC part of the contribution to JTI projects (e.g. EC could contribute up to 35% to demonstration projects, MSs and/or regions "top-up" to 50% and industry match with the remaining 50%; a similar mechanism could be used to "top-up" the funding of universities and SMEs from 50% to 75%). However, the overall principle of 50:50 public-private funding should be maintained. A concern might be that such an approach could not be generalised across all MSs.
- iii) Networking (or clustering) of nationally funded activities to provide an added EU dimension. The JTI could fund the deepening of the EU dimension, providing the "glue"

Reunión para la preparación de la
Reunión del Mirror Group de la HFP el 12-05-06 en Bruselas
Código: REU_PTE HPC_060512

to bring such initiatives together, on condition that they contribute to the overall objectives of the JTI.

- iv) Complementary/joint/coordinated national calls in parallel with JTI calls, to avoid duplication of effort and overlapping activities. Ideally, the resulting projects should be brought within the JTI “umbrella” and could even be managed by the JTI Programme Office (by delegation of the MSs concerned). The opening-up of national programmes to participation from other MSs could also be possible (transnational cooperation).
- v) Run complementary (but entirely separate) national activities in parallel with the JTI, aligning with its objectives and the HFP “action plan”. This would be the weakest option, especially if there were no formal links established with the JTI. In such a scenario, how can it be ensured that a true European effort is achieved to implement the HFP vision?

The EC would like to maintain sufficient flexibility to implement effectively any of the above options, but clearly sees option (ii) as the most simple and effective one, provided that MSs programmes could be adapted to recognise the JTI and its projects as eligible for “toppingup” funding. Option (iv) is also interesting, again requiring a recognition of the JTI in national programmes.

Q.6 What are the MSs views on the above possibilities? Are there other options that could be considered?

The option (ii) “*Contribute directly to specific JTI projects*” would be the best option. Although option (v) would appear weaker from an EU point of view, it might not be realistic to completely exclude it at this stage.

Q.7 What part (%) of national and regional programmes could be channelled through the JTI? What part could be co-ordinated with the JTI in a formal way? What part would remain purely national?.

Nowadays these percentages can not be estimated. We would appreciate that CE would inform us about the FP7 funding percentages for JTIs.

Anyway most of the Spanish public funding participation in JTI would be conditioned to the interest of national entities in participating in H2 research.

3) National positions on the H2&FC JTI

Q.8 Are hydrogen and fuel cells a priority within the national policies on sustainable energy? Is there an existing (specific) national strategy or programme in place or under preparation?

Spain is working on a national programme on H2&FC.

Q.9 Do MSs agree that there is a need for a consolidated EU initiative as the central pillar of a truly integrated European effort for the development and deployment of hydrogen and fuel cells? Or, can the challenge be met with a “business as usual” approach (i.e. similar to FP6).

H2 JTI is necessary, provided that this would be useful to promote a diverse technological European industry, which would be accessible to all the MSs.

Q.10 Have MSs administrations established coordination mechanisms or structures to facilitate communication between relevant stakeholders, including industry, the research community and regional authorities?

Reunión para la preparación de la
Reunión del Mirror Group de la HFP el 12-05-06 en Bruselas
Código: REU_PTE HPC_060512

Since May 2005, the Spanish Technological Platform for Hydrogen and Fuel Cells is working on the National Strategic Policy in technological fields for hydrogen and fuel cells. The Platform has more than 100 members participate in 10 Working Groups.

4) Facilitating the inter-institutional process

Q.11 What can be done to enhance the prospects for a rapid and successful outcome for the H2&FC JTI in the decisional process in Council? What steps can MG members take to ensure that there is adequate communication with the national decision-makers/shapers in Council?

The JTI might ensure the criteria of transparency, opportunity and impartiality in order to allow MSs could take an active part in JTI operation. Even more, the JTI might coordinate the CE efforts with the national and regional programmes.

Q.12 How can the EC help (e.g. EC participation in national meetings, informal consultation on drafts proposals)?

Some suggestions:

- 1.- To elaborate a general and similar regulation for all the JTIs. These general rules should include: how new organizations could participate in the JTI and how the members could finish their participation, their organization and structure, their public and private funding, etc.
- 2.- To ensure the similar regulation for all the JTI (although each JTI might adopt it according to its particular technological and market development).
- 3.- The CE might elaborate a "JTI Guide" for the MSs .
- 4.- To ensure the same principles for the organizations in order to participate in projects as the FP6 does.
- 5.- It is necessary to elaborate a procedure about how the MSs suggestions and comments would be applied to the JTI.
- 6.- What is the relationship between the European Technological Institute and the JTIs?
- 7.- The CE might participate in national meetings in order to inform and disseminate the JTI in the MSs.

Autor del Informe y fecha:

Informe realizado por María Jaén (Secretaría Técnica de la PTE-HPC)

Fecha: 12/05/06