Contribution ID: 1aa49311-42b1-48ae-9fa4-9d74a665602e

Date: 04/11/2019 18:48:34

Public Consultation on 12 proposed Institutionalised European Partnerships under the future Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme

	Fields	marked	with *	are	mandator	٧.
--	--------	--------	--------	-----	----------	----

Introduction

With a proposed budget of nearly 100 billion euro from 2021 to 2027, the Horizon Europe framework programme represents the largest collaborative multinational research and innovation investment in Europe and is open to participants worldwide.

The European Parliament and the Council have provisionally agreed on the Horizon Europe legislative package (COM(2018)435)[1]. Based on the agreement, Horizon Europe promotes a more strategic, ambitious and impact-oriented approach to public-public and public-private partnerships (European Partnerships), ensuring that they can effectively contribute to the Union's policies and priorities.

European Partnerships allow to bring together a broad range of actors to work towards a common goal, develop synergies with EU, national and regional programmes and strategies, and accelerate societal and market uptake. Different forms of European Partnerships can be implemented depending on specific needs, type of activities and criteria: Co-funded, Co-programmed or Institutionalised European Partnerships.

Institutionalised Partnerships are implemented only when other parts of the Horizon Europe programme, including other forms of European Partnerships (Co-funded or Co-programmed), cannot achieve the objectives or generate the necessary expected impacts. The preparation of such Institutionalised Partnerships requires new EU legislation and the setting up of specific legal structures (funding bodies) based on Article 185 and 187 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU)[2]. As such all Institutionalised Partnerships must be justified with an impact assessment prior to the preparation of the legislative proposals.

The European Commission is currently running the impact assessment of 12 candidate Institutionalised European Partnerships in the following priorities:

- 1. EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious diseases (Global Health)
- 2. Innovative Health Initiative
- 3. Key Digital Technologies
- 4. Smart Networks and Services
- 5. European Metrology
- 6. Transforming Europe's rail system

- 7. Integrated Air Traffic Management
- 8. Clean Aviation
- 9. Clean Hydrogen
- 10. Safe and Automated Road Transport
- 11. Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from waste and biomass
- 12. Innovative SMEs

This public consultation aims to collect the views of stakeholders and citizens on the need for such Institutionalised European Partnerships and will feed into the impact assessment process. This consultation is structured in two parts: Part 1 covering all candidate Institutionalised European Partnerships and Part 2 specific to each candidate. We invite you to provide feedback on any of the candidate Institutionalised European Partnership.

The questionnaire is available in English, French and German and you can reply in any EU language. You can pause any time and continue later. Your contribution is downloadable once you have submitted your answers.

Responses received after the closing date will not be considered. Questionnaires sent by e-mail or on paper will not be analysed except those due to accessibility needs of people with visual disabilities and their representative organisations.

A summary on the outcome of the public consultation will be published by the Commission services on the 'Have your say' portal.

We thank you for your participation.

Protection of personal data

Privacy statement on the protection of personal data in EU Survey

- [1] Legal texts for Horizon Europe to be found here: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/research-and-innovation-including-horizon-europe-iter-and-euratom-legal-texts-and-factsheets_en
- [2] Following Article 8(1)(c) of the proposed Regulation for Horizon Europe

About you

- *Language of my contribution
 - Bulgarian
 - Croatian
 - Czech
 - Danish
 - Dutch
 - English
 - Estonian
 - Finnish
 - French
 - Gaelic
 - German

	□ Greek
	Hungarian
	Italian
	Latvian
	Lithuanian
	Maltese
	Polish
	Portuguese
	Romanian Clavel
	SlovakSlovenian
	Spanish
	Swedish
	m giving my contribution as Academic/research institution Business association Company/business organisation Consumer organisation EU citizen Environmental organisation Non-EU citizen Non-governmental organisation (NGO) Public authority Trade union Other
* FIR	st name Chris
*Su	rname
	Gent
*En	nail (this won't be published)
	chris.gent@zeroemissionsplatform.eu
	ganisation name 55 character(s) maximum
	ETIP Zero Emission Platform (ZEP)
	ganisation size Micro (1 to 9 employees)

- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Belgium

Check if your organisation is on the <u>transparency register</u>. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

793300922868-60

ountry of origin	that of your arganization				
		0	Libya	0	Saint Martin
Aland Islands	Dominica	0	Liechtenstein	0	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
Albania	Dominican Republic	0	Lithuania	0	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Algeria	Ecuador	0	Luxembourg	0	_
AmericanSamoa	Egypt	0	Macau	0	San Marino
Andorra	■ El Salvador	0	Madagascar	0	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola	Equatorial Guinea	0	Malawi	0	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea		Malaysia		Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia		Maldives		Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	Eswatini	0	Mali	0	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia		Malta		Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	0	Marshall Islands		Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands		Martinique		Sint Maarten
Australia	D Fiji		Mauritania		Slovakia
Austria	Finland		Mauritius	\odot	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	0	Mayotte	0	Solomon Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana		Mexico		Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	0	Micronesia	0	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern and Antarctic Lands	0	Moldova	0	South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
Barbados	Gabon		Monaco		South Korea
Belarus	Georgia		Mongolia		South Sudan
	Afghanistan Aland Islands Algeria American Samoa Andorra Anguilla Antarctica Antigua and Barbuda Armenia Aruba Australia Austria Azerbaijan Bahamas Bahrain Bangladesh Barbados Barbados	Afghanistan Aland Islands Dijibouti Dominica Albania Dominican Republic Algeria American Samoa Andorra El Salvador Anguilla Antigua and Barbuda Armenia Armenia Aruba Arerbaijan Bahamas Bahrain Bangladesh Bangladesh Barbados Gabon Barbados Gabon	Afghanistan Aland Islands Dijibouti Dominica Aland Islands Dominican Republic Algeria American Samoa Andorra El Salvador Anguilla Antigua and Barbuda Armenia Faroe Islands Aruba Australia Austria Azerbaijan Bahamas Bahrain Barbados Barbados Barbados Gabon Dijibouti Dominica Dijibouti Dominica Dominican Republic Ecuador Egypt Sawatin Bauda Ecuador Egypt Salvador Equatorial Guinea Eritrea Estonia Eswatini Eswatini Eswatini Enland Faroe Islands French Polynesia Erench Southern and Antarctic Lands	Afghanistan Albania Dominican Republic Algeria American Samoa Andorra El Salvador Anguilla Antarctica Antigua and Barbuda Armenia Aruba Ar	Afghanistan Aland Islands Dominica Algeria Algeria Anderican Samoa Andorra El Salvador Anguilla Antarctica Antigua and Barbuda Argentina Armenia Aruba Faroe Islands Arustria Austria Austria Austria Austria Austria Austria Bangladesh Bangladesh Bangladesh Barbados Barbados Barbados Barbados Barbados Galbon Dominica Lithuania Macau Macau Macau Macau Macau Malawi Guinea Equatorial Guinea Bequatorial Guinea Bequatorial Malawi Guinea Bequatorial Malawi Malawi Malawi Malawi Malawi Malawi Mali Berbados Malta Marshall Islands Marshall Islands Martinique Mauritius Maur

Montenegro

Spain

Germany

 Belize Benin Bermuda Bhutan Bolivia Bonaire Saint Eustatius and 	GhanaGibraltarGreeceGreenlandGrenadaGuadeloupe	 Montserrat Morocco Mozambique Myanmar /Burma Namibia Nauru 	Sri LankaSudanSurinameSvalbard and Jan MayenSwedenSwitzerland
Saba Bosnia and	Guam	Nepal	Syria
Herzegovina Botswana Bouvet Island Brazil British Indian Ocean Territory	GuatemalaGuernseyGuineaGuinea-Bissau	NetherlandsNew CaledoniaNew ZealandNicaragua	TaiwanTajikistanTanzaniaThailand
British VirginIslands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
BruneiBulgaria	HaitiHeard Island and McDonald Islands	NigeriaNiue	Timor-LesteTogo
Burkina FasoBurundi	HondurasHong Kong	Norfolk IslandNorthernMariana Islands	TokelauTonga
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	NorthMacedonia	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and Caicos Islands
Central African Republic	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
		Guinea	Emirates
ChristmasIsland	Italy	Paraguay	UnitedKingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United StatesMinor OutlyingIslands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
© Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin Islands

CongoCook Islands	KazakhstanKenya	PortugalPuerto Rico	UzbekistanVanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	VaridateVatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and Futuna
Curação	Laos	Rwanda	WesternSahara
Cyprus	Latvia	SaintBarthélemy	Yemen
Czechia	Lebanon	 Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha 	Zambia
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Zimbabwe
Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	

Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Part 1: General questions on European Partnerships

As per the political agreement on Horizon Europe, an Institutionalised European Partnership shall be implemented only where other parts of the Horizon Europe programme, including other forms of European Partnerships (co-programmed, co-funded), would not achieve the objectives or would not generate the necessary expected impacts; they should be justified by a long-term perspective and high degree of integration.

There will be three types of European Partnerships under Horizon Europe [1].

Co-programmed European Partnerships are based on memoranda of understanding and/or contractual arrangements between the Commission and private and/or public partners. They are expected to be best suited to partnerships involving industry, but also Member States, foundations, international partners etc. They are jointly implemented by the Commission (Union contribution via Horizon Europe work programmes) and partners (contributions under their responsibility), with full application of Horizon Europe rules for the Union contribution, whereas partners rules apply to their contributions. They allow for more flexibility over time as regards the composition of partners, objectives and activities and require the relatively lowest effort for set-up and implementation compared to the other forms of European Partnerships.

Co-funded European Partnerships are implemented under the responsibility of the partners, that receive a substantial budget contribution from Horizon Europe (Grant Agreement) to cofound their joint programme of activities. They are expected to be best suited to partnerships involving Member States, with research funders and other public authorities at the core of the consortium, and possibility to include foundations and international partners etc. By default national rules apply to calls launched by the consortium. They require a relatively moderate effort for their set-up and implementation compared to other forms of European Partnerships.

Institutionalised European Partnerships are based on the Union participation in and financial contribution to research and innovation programmes undertaken by several Member States (under Article 185 TFEU) or by bodies established under Article 187 TFEU, for partnerships involving typically industry, research organisations but also Member States, foundations and international partners. They are expected to be best suited for long-term collaborations with stable partners and provide only limited flexibility for adaptation during their implementation. Compared to other forms of European Partnerships, they require a relatively high and long-term effort for their preparation and set-up, including the establishment of dedicated entities (funding bodies) for their implementation. By default the rules for participation of Horizon Europe apply for the calls launched under Institutionalised European Partnerships.

[1] Article 8 of COM(2018)435

*	* 1. Have you been involved in the on-going research and	d innovation framework
	programme Horizon 2020 or the preceeding Framework	k Programme 7?

Yes

No

2. To what extent do you think that the future European Partnerships under Horizon Europe need to:

	1 (Not needed at all)	2	3	4	5 (Fully needed)	Don't Know
* Be more responsive towards EU policy objectives	0	0	0	0	•	0
* Be more responsive towards societal needs	0	0	0	•	0	0

* Be more responsive towards priorities in national and regional research and innovation strategies, including smart specialisation strategies	0	0	0	0	•	0
* Make a significant contribution to achieving the UN's Sustainable Development Goals	0	0	0	0	0	•
* Make significant contribution to the EU efforts to achieve climate-related goals	0	0	0	0	•	0
* Focus more on the development and effective deployment of technology	0	0	0	0	•	0
* Focus more on bringing about transformative change towards sustainability in their respective area	©	0	0	0	•	0
* Make a significant contribution to EU global competitiveness in specific sectors/domains	0	0	0	•	0	0
* Other	0	0	0	0	•	0

*(Other) Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Throughout the questionnaire hydrogen and fuel cells should be Clean Hydrogen, which correctly reflects the increased scope of the partnership to include the development of hydrogen production technologies for gigawatt scale handling, processing and application across multiple sectors.

*3. What would you see as main advantages and disadvantages of participation in an Institutionalised European Partnership (as a partner) under Horizon Europe?

500 character(s) maximum

Advantage: A partnership can include multiple industrial, academic, public and other stakeholders. Often with a mixed background, partnerships can draw together a variety of specialists to drive the development of hydrogen technologies across multiple sectors to help reach the EU climate and energy goals.

Disadvantage: The technological scope & partnership synergies for hydrogen (and other) partnerships in the past have been too narrow. Limiting the spread of the technological research.

4. For which of the candidate Institutionalised European Partnership(s) would you like to specifically provide your views through this consultation (you may provide your views for more than one)?

ws for more than one)?
EU-Africa research partnership on health security to tackle infectious
diseases - Global Health
Innovative Health Initiative
Key Digital Technologies
Smart Networks and Services
European Metrology
Transforming Europe's rail system
Integrated Air Traffic Management
Clean Aviation

	Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from waste and biomass
V	Clean Hydrogen
	Safe and Automated Road Transport
	Innovative SMFs

Part 2 - Questions on problems, objectives, policy options and impact tailored to each candidate European Partnership

The following questions allow to assess the necessity of a partnership approach, as well as the need for an Institutionalised Partnership for each candidate partnership.

Clean Hydrogen

The European Commission is assessing whether to propose an Institutionalised; European Partnership on Clean Hydrogen under Horizon Europe. Its overall objective would be to create a strong, innovative and competitive European Clean Hydrogen sector, fully capable of underpinning the European energy transition by accelerating the market entry of nearly-zero carbon hydrogen-based technologies and delivering a wide range of socio-economic benefits to the European society.

The proposed partnership would build on the experience gained in the existing Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 Joint Undertaking (FCH 2 JU), but could significantly revise its scope, expand partners and take account of the strengthened scientific, societal, economic and technological impact criteria of Horizon Europe. FCH 2 JU is a public-private partnership between the EU and the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells industry, established under Horizon 2020 (on the basis of Article 187 TFEU) and which functioning is currently planned until 31 December 2024.

The <u>inception impact assessment</u> outlines an early description of the problems, objectives, options and likely impact of a candidate European Partnership in this field.

1. To what extent do you think this is relevant for research and innovation efforts at EU level to address the following problems in relation to hydrogen and fuel cells?

Research and innovation problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Lack of understanding of or knowledge about hydrogen and fuel cells	0		0	•	0	0

Innovation gap in the EU in translating the results of hydrogen and fuel cells research into new products	•	0	0	•	•	0
Lack of interest of major market players to engage in hydrogen and fuel cells research	0	©	•	©	0	0

Structural and resource problems:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Limited collaboration and pooling of resources between public actors and private actors	0	©	0	©	•	0
Limited role of the current industrial policy in framing the market perspectives related to hydrogen and fuel cells innovation	0	0	0	0	•	0

Problems in uptake of hydrogen and fuel cells innovations due to:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Small current market size	0	0	0	0	•	0
Market failures due to inadequate industry investment	0	0	0	0	•	0
Lack of refuelling infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	•
Lack of funding or de-risking financial instruments for large-scale hydrogen/fuel cell projects	©	0	0	0	•	0
Overly restrictive regulation in the field of hydrogen and fuel cells	©	0	0	0	•	0
Overly restrictive regulation in energy markets and in particular for energy carriers that enable sector coupling across different areas (power, gas, fuels for transport networks)	0	•	0	0	•	0
High financial risk for early movers	0	0	0	0	•	0
Fragmentation among players and lack of critical mass	0	0	0	0	•	0
Fragmentation among Member States and lack of EU binding targets and bonding networks	0	0	0	0	•	0

High costs of clean hydrogen and fuel cells solutions that hinder mass commercialisation			•	
until serial production is achieved, factoring-in economies of scale				

2. In your view, how should the specific challenges described above be addressed through Horizon Europe intervention?

European Partnerships may take any of the following forms:

- a) Co-programmed European Partnerships: based on memoranda of understanding and/or contractual arrangements between the Commission and private and/or public partners;
- b) Co-funded European Partnerships: based on participation in and financial contribution to a programme of R&I activities, using a Programme co-fund action; or
- c) Institutionalised European Partnerships: based on participation in and financial contribution to R&I programmes undertaken by several Member States (under Article 185 TFEU) or by bodies established under Article 187 TFEU (Institutionalised European Partnerships)
 - Traditional calls under Horizon Europe work programmes
 - Co-Funded partnership
 - Co-Programmed partnership
 - Institutionalised Partnership

* Please explain briefly your choice:

500 character(s) maximum

Institutionalised Partnerships are well understood and can offer opportunities to leverage EU and private funding.

3. In your view, how relevant are the following elements and activities to ensure that the proposed European Partnership would meet its objectives?

Setting joint long-term agenda with strong involvement of:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Member States and Associated Countries	0	0	0	0	•	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	•	0
Academia	0	0	0	•	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	•	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders (e.g. end users, regulators, etc.)	0	0	0	0	•	0

Pooling and leveraging resources (financial, infrastructure, in-kind expertise etc.) through coordination, alignment or integration with:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
--	------------------	---	---	---	-------------------	---------------

Member States and Associated Countries	©	0	0	0	•	0
Industry	0	0	0	0	•	0
Academia	0	0	0	•	0	0
Foundations and Non-Governmental Organisations	0	0	•	0	0	0
Other societal stakeholders	0	0	0	•	0	0

Partnership composition:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t Know
Flexibility in the composition of partners over time	0	0	•	0	0	0
Ensuring a broad range of partners, including across disciplines and sectors (e.g. academia, research performing organisations, Member States representatives other EU Agencies like EDA, EMSA and other partnerships, etc.)	•	0	•	0	•	0

Implementing the following activities:

	1 (Not relevant)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don't Know
Joint R&I programme	0	0	0	0	•	0
Collaborative R&I projects	0	0	0	0	•	0
Deployment and piloting activities	0	0	0	0	•	0
Input to regulatory aspects	0	0	0	0	•	0
Co-creation of solutions with end- users	0	0	0	0	•	0

4. In your view, how relevant is to set up a specific legal structure (funding body) for the candidate European Partnership to achieve the following?

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Implement its activities more effectively	0	0	0	0	•	0
Implement activities faster to respond to sudden market or policy needs	0	©	©	0	•	0
Implements activities more transparently	0	0	0	0	•	0

Increase financial leverage	0	0	0	0	•	0
Ensure better links to regulators	©	0	0	0	•	0
Ensure better links to practitioners on the ground	0	0	0	0	•	0
Obtain more buy-in and long-term commitment from other partners	0	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure harmonisation of standards and approaches	0	0	0	•	0	0
Facilitate synergies with other EU and national programmes	0	0	0	0	•	0
Facilitate collaboration with other relevant European Partnerships	0	0	0	0	•	0

5. What is your view on the scope and coverage proposed for this candidate institutionalised European Partnership, based on its inception impact assessment?

	Too narrow	Right scope & coverage	Too broad	Don't know
Technologies covered	•	0	0	0
Research areas covered	•	0	0	0
Geographical coverage	0	•	0	0
Types of partners covered	0	0	0	•
Range of activities covered	•	0	0	0
Sectoral coverage	•	0	0	0

Please provide any comment you may have on the proposed scope and coverage for this candidate Institutionalised Partnership:

500 character(s) maximum

Hydrogen is one of the key solutions for the decarbonisation of several sectors including heavy industry. The clean hydrogen partnership should focus of all sectors not only fuel cells. Furthermore, there is a bias towards electrolysis produced hydrogen, the production of hydrogen should be technologically neutral provided is sourced from a low-carbon hydrogen production threshold.

- 6. In your view, would it be possible to rationalise the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership and its activities, and/or to better link it with other comparable initiatives?
 - Yes
 - No

(Yes) Please explain why? Which other comparable initiatives could it be linked with?

Clean hydrogen is a solution for the decarbonisation of multiple sectors. Allowing linked initiatives will ensure that research is accelerated and hydrogen plays a key role in the future of the Circular Economy, Clean Aviation, Europe's Rail, Shipping and industrial processes.

7. In your view, how relevant is it for the candidate European Institutionalised Partnership to deliver on the following impacts?

Societal impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Improved public health: reduction of pollutants, particulates and noise emissions compared to direct fossil fuel combustion	0	0	0	0	0	•
Improved working conditions (e.g. for transport professionals, or on construction sites) by eliminating toxic and harmful local emissions	0	0	0	0	0	•
Novel competitive cross-sectoral solutions for decarbonisation	0	0	0	0	•	0

Economic/technological impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Increased industrial leadership in hydrogen technologies and uptake of new technologies	0	0	0	©	•	0
Preparation of re-skilling of human resources towards high value-added markets with increasing weight in the economy (adaptation to phase-out /replacement of old technologies)	0	0	0	0	•	0
Providision of a solution for storing renewable energy for later use	0	0	0	©	•	0
Creation of jobs in the low-carbon economy by strengthening the European hydrogen sector	0	0	0	©	•	0
New demand-side solutions to decarbonise the energy and transport systems (also in remote /isolated areas)	0	0	0	0	•	0
Better cross-fertilisation of innovative ideas from SMEs to large companies that can bring them to mass market	0	0	0	0	•	0
Highly skilled jobs in industry	0	0	0	0	•	0

Low-carbon and competitive solutions for heavy duty and long-distance transport	0	0	0	•	0	0	
Low-carbon and competitive solutions for all modes of transport	0	0	0	•	0	0	

Scientific impact:

	1 (Not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very relevant)	Don' t know
Contribution to the advancement of science by stimulating innovation along the entire hydrogen value chain	0	0	0	•	0	0
New scientific knowledge and reinforcement of EU scientific capability	0	0	0	•	0	0

Contact

RTD-A2-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu