



Response to the Open Public Consultation on the European Institute for Innovation and Technology (EIT)

June 2011

Contents:

- A. EIT mission, objectives and added value**
 - EIT mission
 - Core objectives of the EIT
 - EIT added value
- B. Synergies with other EU activities**
- C. Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs)**
 - KIC model
 - Co-location
 - Themes
- D. Impact, dissemination and outreach**
 - Impact on people – nurturing talent through education
 - Dissemination
 - Outreach beyond Europe
- E. Organisation**
- F. Funding model**

CESAER - the Conference of European Schools for Advanced Engineering Education and Research - is a not-for-profit-making international association of leading European universities of technology and engineering schools/faculties at comprehensive universities and university colleges.

CESAER stands for scientific excellence in engineering education and research, and the promotion of innovation through close cooperation with the private and the public sector in order to ensure the application of cutting-edge knowledge in industry and society. It maintains and promotes the highest quality standards in knowledge and competence with added value to collaborators of competitiveness and growth environments

CESAER has a current membership of 57 institutions, representing 25 different countries.

CESAER Office: Kasteelpark Arenberg 1, B-3001 Leuven

Tel: +32 16 32 16 87

E-Mail: info@cesaer.org

<http://www.cesaer.org>

A. EIT mission, objectives and added value

EIT mission

„The EIT’s mission is to contribute to sustainable European economic growth and competitiveness by reinforcing the innovation capacity of the member States and the EU. It shall do this by promoting and integration higher education, research and innovation of the highest standards“. What is called EIT mission in the consultation document is actually the formulation for the EIT objective as defined in the EIT regulation, Article 3. In general, CESAER would welcome a consistent argumentation in different publications regarding all aspects of the EIT.

CESAER sees the “reinforcing innovation capacity” as the core of EIT’s mission and objectives.

1. How do you perceive the mission of the EIT in the EU context?

In general, CESAER perceives the EIT mission and objective positively. However, it has to be ensured that the EIT conveys its clear focus on becoming a model for transforming research results into technical and societal innovations by providing open innovation environments. These environments formed by the KICs should attract excellent and innovation-oriented education and research and should foster growth and competitiveness. In addition, CESAER emphasises that the EIT has to support all three objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy: smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

CESAER strongly supports the EIT’s mission of reinforcing Europe’s innovation capacity by promoting the knowledge triangle of integrating education, research and innovation.

CESAER sees the EIT as an interesting, potentially relevant and most needed exercise for developing, testing and applying efficient approaches stimulating and strengthening innovation in Europe building on the realisation of the knowledge triangle and involving the main partners of the Triple Helix universities and research organisations, industry and governments.

Core objectives of the EIT

CESAER supports the EIT objectives as defined by the Regulation (see above).

In the text of the consultation document the core objectives of the EIT are described differently as *“in pursuing its mission, the EIT is to create tangible impact, notably in terms of new business creation, people with profiles and skills fit for an ideas economy, as well as generation and dissemination of knowledge.”*

In its response to the consultation, CESAER starts by using the definition of innovation as presented in the Frascati Manual¹: *“An innovation is the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), or process, a new marketing method, or a new organisational method in business practices, workplace organisation or external relation. The minimum requirement for an innovation is that the product, process, marketing method*

¹ *The Measurement of Scientific and Technological Activities Frascati Manual 2002. Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development. OECD 2002*

or organisational method must be new (or significantly improved) to the firm.” In addition, CESAER stresses also the importance of societal innovations as new arrangements, structures and processes fostering innovation without necessarily addressing only existing and defined markets but also bearing the potential of creating new markets.

In principle, CESAER supports the objective and clear focus of the EIT to create tangible impact. The EIT should become a model for transforming knowledge created at universities and research organisations and research results into innovation - both technical and also non-technical innovation.

Due to the lengthy processes of establishing the KICs there are little or no achievements to assess so far and therefore it is too early to say if the original aspiration and the envisaged impacts are realistic. The intention to have an open learning process has however failed to this date and the promised open learning platform need urgent implementation.

In the view of CESAER members, tangible impact related to innovation goes beyond new business creation, people with profiles and skills fit for an ideas economy, as well as generation and dissemination of knowledge.

Since innovation is the ultimate goal of the EIT, CESAER emphasises that generation and dissemination of technology is not sufficient. Innovation is characterised by highly interactive processes and feedback loops between different actors, disciplines and sectors with the aim to produce new products and new services – for existing companies and also through newly created enterprises and new structures that promote societal growth. In the course of such interactive processes knowledge is exploited and transformed into improved or new products, processes and services, methods, management approaches etc. as defined by the Frascati manual (see above).

THE EIT should develop – via the KICs – showcases and models how these objectives can be achieved by orchestrating the elements of the knowledge triangle and the partners in the Triple Helix.

The knowledge and technologies used by the EIT and the KICs, respectively, can stem from results of EU RTD and national activities or from any other – including corporate - sources – of the members of KICs and from other actors. The EIT’s objectives most certainly encompass also the attraction of new knowledge from around Europe and the world in order to maintain European competitiveness.

Human resource development is absolutely necessary. However, the formulation “people with profiles and skills fit for an ideas economy” is too general and should be much more specific addressing characteristics such as creativity, endurance, ability to work in interdisciplinary, intersectoral and intercultural teams, entrepreneurial spirit, being able to cope with the challenges of different phases in the innovation cycle. Traditional education and training are not sufficient for developing such capabilities and skills. New approaches of facilitating learning in stimulating environments close to research and development on the one side as well as innovation on the other side will be necessary. Mainly education and training integrating research, technological development and transformation towards innovation will be needed.

In general, CESAER emphasises that there is a need for the EIT and the KICs to pursue the balanced integration of education, research and innovation when making the knowledge triangle a reality. The EIT and the KICs have to play the role of a “catalysts” of innovation

bringing the actors of the knowledge triangle – and the Triple Helix – together and stimulating the appropriate reactions by appropriate orchestration.

For the achievement of its mission, how relevant is it for the EIT to deliver on the following issues?

2. New business creation through innovation

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
	☒			

3. The transfer and valorisation of higher education, research and innovation activities in a business context

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

4. Cutting edge and innovation-driven research in areas of key economic and societal interest

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
	☒			

5. Development of talented, skilled and entrepreneurial people through education and training activities

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

6. Dissemination of best practices and systemic knowledge sharing

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

7. Are there any OTHER key areas in which the EIT should aim to achieve impact

In principle, all the issues and areas of activity are highly relevant. However, the formulations remain at a highly abstract and general level and in the form of “buzzwords” which are difficult to be against.

Regarding Question 4., CESAER is indicating that it is not highly relevant that partners in KICs perform cutting edge research funded through the EIT. Cutting edge and innovation-oriented research funded by other sources will certainly be important as the knowledge (and IP) base for the activities of the KICs. However, it has to be considered that also economic and societal relevance of the research will be equally important at the same time.

CESAER sees the EIT as a test bed and also experimentation platform for new approaches towards fostering innovation in Europe.

CESAER recommends putting an emphasis of developing feasible “business models” for the KICs based on the concept of open innovation with preferred model agreements including fast and safe handling for all stakeholders in order to make optimal use of the Intellectual Property (IP) available in the KICs and its members but also beyond. This has to be based on elaborate IP rules and IP management procedures in order to ensure benefits for all partners in the knowledge triangle and create win-win situation. The optimal organisation of the management of the IP portfolio of the KICs will be a crucial issue for the success of the KICs and the EIT.

EIT added value

In terms of added value, how relevant are the following characteristics of the EIT in pursuing its objectives?

- 8. The balanced approach to the knowledge triangle, addressing education, research and innovation simultaneously and integrally, i.e. connecting stakeholders who would otherwise not meet.**

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

- 9. The focus on excellence.**

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
	☒			

- 10. The collocation model, bringing people together in an innovative environment and connecting regional strengths to a global scale.**

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

11. The focus on people as the main driving force for innovation.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
	☒			

12. The business-like approach to funding.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

13. The creation of new funding and organisational models for innovation.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

14. Are there any OTHER characteristics the EIT should embrace in order to achieve its objectives?

CESAER distinguishes between the added value created at regional (co-location) and European level.

The above aspects are not necessarily linked to the European level but are in the same way also relevant for individual (regional) KIC co-location centres or other forms of research and innovation oriented open innovation models and Public Private Partnerships. In the presentation of the EIT mainly the added value of the co-location approach is addressed and too little emphasis is put on the European added value.

CESAER supports the approach to build the EIT activities upon the creation of – in the long-run self-sustainable - regional co-location centres and their networking around joint commitments and well defined challenges.

The added value of co-location centres is nothing specific to the EIT because there are long-standing experiences of Member States with different forms of competence centres, excellence centres, innovation hubs and others. Through the targeted trans-national combination of several co-location centres in one KIC European added value comes in – or may come in. CESAER criticizes that this European aspect of added value has so far not been sufficiently specified by the EIT. The European added value comes in through the cross-national communication, coordination, cooperation and learning, utilizing the diversity of approaches applied in different parts of Europe and leading to improved intra-European connectedness counteracting fragmentation.

Furthermore, also the added value of the EIT governing several KICs has not been sufficiently defined and explained so far. One may have the impression that the KICs could stay individual projects. The objectives and roles of the EIT organising, monitoring and following the KICs need to be further developed and specified including the communication strategy of the EIT to the “outside world”.

Beyond the mere task of the financial management of the KIC activities, the EIT – and more specifically the EIT Headquarters (EIT HQ) – should have the clear tasks to follow, monitor and benchmark the KICs, to facilitate communication, exchange of information and mutual learning, and – very important – to disseminate the experiences, to organise interaction and (again) mutual learning with other innovation actors and initiatives in Europe (and maybe beyond).

Thus, the EIT HQ in close cooperation with the GB could become an important actor as “European innovation hub” stimulating innovation in the EU.

B. Synergies with other EU initiatives

15. Within the Common Strategic Framework, the EIT has a distinctive role to play, as it links up all three sides of knowledge triangle.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

16. The “societal challenges” approach will facilitate the creation of synergies and interconnections with other EU and national initiatives

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

17. The EIT should seek to actively generate synergies with other initiatives in the area of education, research and innovation, thereby creating additional value.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

17b. Which ones? And how can strategic coherence be achieved between them and the EIT?

CESAER agrees with the statements 15. to 17. However, these are also exactly areas of specific weaknesses and deficits of the EIT. So far, the Governing Board (GB) didn't strive for synergies with other ERA or EHEA instruments, initiatives and activities, just the opposite. The GB tended to claim being unique and different from “usual Commission initiatives” such as e.g. FP7, but also from other national or regional approaches. CESAER sees certainly a need for change and improvement regarding utilizing synergies in the future.

On the one side, the EIT and the KICs have to build on and utilize European (FP7), national research projects and programmes as well as other public and private knowledge sources and initiatives promoting innovation as major bases and sources for their innovation activities. As regards e.g. FP7, results and outcomes of collaborative projects will be one source of results to be exploited in KICs and their co-location centres. In addition, the connection to relevant parts of the educational efforts at European but very much also on national and regional level have to be considered. This is one aspect of synergies.

In CESAER's view, there is a need to clearly locate the EIT on the landscape regarding the EIT as an instrument as such but also with regard to themes of the KICs (see Chapter C. below).

In FP7, on the other side, there are possible synergies and complementarities between the EIT and different types of instruments – e.g. networks of excellence, infrastructure initiatives and especially actions in the frame of the schemes Regions of Knowledge and Research Potential. Furthermore, European Technology Platform, Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs) are interesting structures where synergies can be sought. In the future, also opportunities of synergies and complementarities with the European Innovation Partnerships (EIPs) will have to be explored. Also the recent ERC initiative towards “proof of concept” has to be considered.

In general, research driven clusters supported by FP7, the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework programme (CIP) and also through Structural Funds have to be considered for the development of synergies.

The whole area of human resource development for innovation has to be high on the agenda. In that area, the EIT has to lead a dialogue with the Marie Curie scheme, the Life-long Learning Programme but also with the European Social Fund (ESF) to develop innovation-oriented initiatives with the help and in cooperation with these schemes.

Finally, the KIC co-location centres will have the tasks to explore the possibilities of synergies and complementarities with national and regional schemes.

In general, the EIT HQ as well as the Governing Board will have the important task to open up the EIT for communication and interaction with “the rest of the world” and to overcome the present seemingly rather inward looking attitude.

18. By bridging world-class excellence and regional outreach, KICs co-location centres will contribute to the formulation and implementation of smart specialisation strategies.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

C. Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs)

KIC model

19. How relevant is the bottom up approach of the KIC model, i.e. autonomy and flexibility in defining the governance model and structure in order to adapt to specificities of the priority theme and the market linked thereto?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

The bottom-up approach of the KIC model is highly relevant with regard to the structures and approaches developed and implemented by the KICs in order to achieve tangible impacts.

For the thematic focuses of the KICs the EIT has to consider the activity areas and possible synergies and complementarities with other European initiatives (see also Chapter B.).

20. How relevant is the participation of the private sector to the success of the KICs?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

20b. What are the main preconditions for high private sector participation in a KIC?

The EIT has to develop a convincing “business model” showing to the private sector the advantages and possible benefits and profits – from “joining the club” and investing in KICs. Corporate partners should be partners on the same conditions as academic and other public partners, sharing governance responsibility as well as resources and assets.

Access to knowledge and technologies, but also to new partners for developing new knowledge and technologies and the development of new forms of innovation partnerships – including the access to research infrastructures - will be means to attract partners from the private sectors.

Partnerships (both ways) in KICs will offer the full potential of education, research and innovation actors involved. In addition, the involvement of all actors in the Triple Helix will also ensure government or regional authorities being involved which might offer also new opportunities for benefiting from public procurement.

The sector of human resource development and professional training for innovation are important aspects providing new environments for staff development and “learning by doing” in the areas of innovation and entrepreneurship.

21. How relevant is the focus on measurable deliverable for the success of the KICs?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

22. Are there OTHER features the EIT should embrace in order to further enhance the KIC model? If yes, which ones?

The EIT should provide a learning platform for advanced PPP approaches for innovation in Europe. Deliverables should be clearly defined in a way that they can also be assessed.

So far, it seems that the EIT has somehow got stuck in its self estimation of “uniqueness” with the consequence that the openness for learning from, building on and further developing what is already available in Europe is more or less blocked. In that context, also the lack of performance indicators and the deficits of an appropriate monitoring and evaluation procedures have to be mentioned.

There is an urgent need, as required by the EIT Regulation and Statutes, for developing appropriate performance indicators and establishing sound monitoring and evaluation procedures for the KICs and for the EIT as a whole for supporting the learning process and to be able to assess progress towards achieving objectives and targets.

The potential of the different financial instruments available in FP7 (RSFF), CIP and Structural Funds have to be explored.

The KICs are to be based on an even level partnership where all partners are expected to contribute, participate and challenge the KIC in order to ensure that it performs well in accordance with set targets.

Co-location

23. How relevant are the co-location centres to the success of the KICs?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

24. What can be the potential benefits of co-location centres for the country/region in which they are located?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
	☒			

25. Are there OTHER measures the EIT should promote in order to maximise the benefits of co-location across Europe?

CESAER sees a need to clarify and define much clearer the EIT's strategies and activities making full use of the different co-location centers. What is the division of labour as well as the coordination and cooperation and possibly the complementarity between the co-location centres in a KIC? What kind of experiences emerge from the KICs that are quite different in organisational and also legal structure and are active in very different thematic areas? CESAER supports the idea of the KICs defining their internal organisation and structures in accordance with their objectives and ambitions. However, information on these aspects are interesting also for other European actors and should therefore be made available.

CESAER members point out that the preferred roles and responsibilities of universities need to be defined in order to ensure optimal functioning of the KICs.

The transnational character of the KICs and the role and (European) added value of assembling several co-location centres from different regions under one KIC has to be better explained. This hold also for the measures applied by different KICs to exploiting the advantages of the grouping of several co-location centres under one KIC umbrella should be specified.

From the GB the importance of the CEO for KICs used to be stressed. The research and innovation community is very much interested how this works and is put into reality.

Finally, the role of the EIT HQ regarding KICs and their co-location centres should be defined and explained.

Themes

26. How relevant are the following criteria for selecting KIC themes with a true innovation potential?

26a. Address major societal challenges which Europe faces, to contribute to the Europe 2020 Agenda.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

26b. Economic and societal relevance, expressed for example in % of the GDP or the research intensity.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

26c. Bring about sustainable and systematic impact; measured i.a. in terms of new educated entrepreneurial people, new technologies, new business creation and/or social value creation.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

26d. Blend a critical mass of excellent research, education and innovation stakeholders; which would not otherwise unite in new, long-term configurations.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

26e. Address the European paradox – i.e. select themes where Europe has a strong research base but weak innovation performance to boost market translation.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

26f. Be able to mobilise investments and long-term commitment from the business sectors; have an existing market for its products or services or be able to create new ones.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

26g. Require transdisciplinary approaches and the development of new types of education across boundaries of disciplines.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

26h. Offer potential for impact on the global scale and engaging in international co-operation with excellent partners from third countries.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

27. Are there any OTHER criteria you would consider relevant for selecting the KIC themes?

First priority should be given to the question whether a theme is useful and suitable to create innovation and associated impact within the timeframe of the project period, i.e. 10

to 15 years. It has to be avoided that KICs end up in blue sky research and excellent but untargeted education for which other instruments exist.

There are a number of additional or other criteria that could be considered:

- + Inability of existing instruments to address the challenges or to achieve the objectives,
- + Need for tools to address the dual necessity and challenge of short and long-term goals in a thematic area,
- + Complementarity or innovation support function connected to existing initiatives,
- + Prospects to attract partners from the actors in the knowledge triangle and the Triple Helix (governments and regional authorities),
- + Support for strategic European plans (e.g. SET plan, Strategic Transport Technology Plan, etc.),
- + Alignment, coordination with priorities of the forthcoming Common Strategic Framework for Research and Innovation and also with other European policies.

In order to avoid unnecessary thematic duplication or overlaps, to utilize possible synergies and complementarities, and to clearly position the EIT on the landscape of European instruments it is important that the GB communicates with the other European programmes and initiatives and doesn't act as a stand alone initiative.

28. How suitable are the following themes to be treated in a KIC?

28a. Health

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28b. Aging population

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28c. Healthy childhood

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28d. Food

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

--	--	--	--	--

28e. Sustainable cities

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28f. Natural resources

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28g. Biotechnology

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28h. Safe societies

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28i. Added value manufacturing

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

28j. Human learning

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know

29. Are there any OTHER themes you would suggest to be treated in a KIC?

The above list of possible themes seems to be chosen by the GB (again) in splendid isolation and it is not clear if a systematic search process has been performed and which criteria have been applied.

CESAER members sense a lack of transparency of the EIT choosing the themes – both the themes listed above and the themes proposed in the recently published draft of the Strategic Innovation Agenda. By choosing the topics without specifying and publishing the selection criteria in advance, the GB may have identified and defined possible participants of

future KICs and this might not coincide with the development of preferred and most competitive clusters in certain regions.

For CESAER it doesn't seem reasonable to vote on a list of themes that are not well justified and that address both broad topics and some societal challenges.

In addition, there is a need for a well structured foresight exercise involving stakeholders and experts from the community of innovation actors to identify potential future themes for KICs.

In that context, it may also be considered to add an open pre-application phase including interest, readiness, and suggestions on how the proposed KIC would take part in a European learning process for the knowledge triangle in practice.

There is an urgent need for the GB to identify and consider current initiatives at European level such as ERA-NETs, European Technology Platforms (ETPs), Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs), Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs) and European Innovation Partnerships (EIP) and define precisely which role future KICs should play in the framework or "orchestra" of ERA and EHEA instruments.

The GB should identify complementary and/or synergetic roles of KICs and KIC themes first.

30. What is the ideal scope of a KIC theme? How much leeway should KICs have in defining the specific topic within a broader theme?

The EIT/KIC activities and their clear priority on innovation have to become an integrated and well coordinated part of the future Common Strategic Frameworks for Research and Innovation as well as Cohesion Policy. Questions of this kind have to be addressed in the overall context of the forthcoming programme developments. This should not compromise the special form of organisational set-up and the respective level of independence.

31. Would it make sense to establish several KICs in one and the same theme?

First, one has to gain experience from the working of the existing KICs and assess their achievements before such a question can be addressed.

At the moment, all ideas about the EIT and the KICs are based on intentions, objectives and plans and there is little or no base for substantial decisions on the future.

Currently, the EIT and the KICs are still in the early stage of the initial phase which has and should have clearly the character of a pilot and test phase.

D. Impact, dissemination and outreach

Impact on people – nurturing talent through education

32. How relevant is it for the EIT to promote entrepreneurial attitudes and creative thinking?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

33. How relevant is it for the EIT to generate new educational programmes that create new profiles of entrepreneurial and knowledgeable talent?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
			☒	

34. How relevant is it for the EIT to promote EIT labelled degrees and diplomas?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
			☒	

35. Are there any OTHER elements the EIT should foster in order to unleash the innovative and entrepreneurial potential of people?

CESAER is concerned that EIT is putting the main focus on education currently. The development of new Master schemes and the “EIT label” may divert the EIT from its original focus on making the knowledge triangle a reality in a balanced way clearly targeting innovation directly and creating direct substantial impact addressing also to a certain extent the “European paradox”.

The EIT and the KICs should focus on developing innovative capabilities, entrepreneurial attitudes and skills, and creative thinking by involving people in well designed innovative activities and creating respective schemes and services for supporting people in such activities and not by “educational programmes”.

CESAER members see a possibility of tailor made short-term innovation and entrepreneurship related professional training for persons involved in KIC related innovation activities.

The EIT and the KIC should also tap into and learn from present initiatives at different universities in Europe, such as e.g. Aalto University in Finland where new approaches are developed for making the knowledge triangle a reality with a clear focus on innovation – technical and non-technical.

This being said, new educational programmes can be developed by universities in close cooperation with the EIT and the KICs in the framework of European and national education and training programmes. Thus, the EIT should play a bridging, advisory and stimulating role

between the future Common Strategic Frameworks for Research and Innovation and for Education and Culture.

When EIT's focus is on impact it should concentrate on academy-industry-public – Triple Helix - cooperation towards the exploitation of know-how, research results and technologies bringing them as innovations to the market with the help of existing companies that are partners of KICs or others that are important for the KICs or also by appropriate schemes supporting licensing and also spin-offs.

The EIT can also play a role stimulating the development of unified European licensing process, mechanisms for social innovations, knowledge triangle meetings around testbeds infrastructures and models for public procurement supporting innovation and growth.

Dissemination

36. The EIT should actively promote excellence and new models of knowledge sharing and open innovation, and ensure this knowledge remains accessible over time.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

37. The EIT should provide a number of concrete support measures for the dissemination of results from its activities to European innovation stakeholders.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

37b. What could these support measures be?

Many CESAER members have the impression of a certain isolationist orientation of the GB that is not recognising the EIT's role as a component within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the European Research Area (ERA) that has to play its appropriate complementary role in the "orchestra" of ERA and EHEA instruments and also national and regional programmes and initiatives. Complementarity and synergies with other actors, instruments and initiatives have to be high on the agenda and will strengthen the position of the EIT.

There is not enough communication or information provided via different channels on the development of the EIT as a whole and the KICs as such going beyond very general statements and claims to be a "role model for Innovation" and other repeated buzzwords. The GB and also the EIT HQ should put an emphasis on broad communication and interaction activities with the actors of innovation - also below the European policy level - trying also to utilize and tap into the widespread experiences of structures similar to KICs that are available in the Member States as well as at European level such as competence centres, cooperative research centres of excellence, different forms of open innovation models and Public Private Partnerships and also Joint Technology Initiatives. Organising and

facilitating mutual learning for the benefit of strengthening innovation across Europe is and will be a core task of the EIT that cannot be achieved in “splendid” isolation.

The EIT should use existing associations of universities and business as platforms for dissemination of results. However, this should not be restricted to one-way communication but should be of an interactive nature where the EIT can present its experiences and put them forward to discussion while at the same time other actors can also provide input. Of course, this should also be defined roles of the KICs.

In order to ensure a regular and structure communication and interaction with innovation stakeholders the EIT should consider appropriate channels or structures such as a stakeholder platform or forum and CESAER is offering its cooperation in such a framework. Clear signals and measures of the EIT’s preparedness to communicate with other innovation actors across Europe will be necessary for ensuring interest and engagement but also “ownership” of the EIT a new European instrument.

CESAER as the association of leading universities of technology in Europe has repeatedly offered to the EIT Governing Board its openness for cooperation to facilitate such learning processes. The EIT will need strategic partners for spreading its messages but also to learn from others. The EIT is not the first actor in this area.

38. The EIT should actively foster the creation of learning communities across the EU.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

38b. How could the EIT do so?

The EIT and the KICs together with the communities of other innovation actors in Europe should join forces striving together towards creating an environment of mutual learning about innovation in order to further improve the innovation climate and performance in Europe.

For innovation, conducive environments and frameworks play the crucial role. Therefore, it will be important that the KICs and the EIT identify the most important aspects and parameters of such environments and frameworks. The distributed nature of the KIC co-location centres provide a Europe wide network of intelligence capable of identifying optimal framework conditions and best practice.

The co-location centres can play an active role locally and the KICs can reach out to environments where the KICs are not directly active. Thus, the KICs can make a major contribution to strengthen the local-global connectedness of co-location centres and the KICs as a whole.

It will be important that also the EIT Governing Board accepts the fact that it is still very much in the learning phase and should stop claiming to have the one and unique solution for innovation in Europe.

Outreach beyond Europe

39. The EIT should support European stakeholders in enhancing their international competitiveness.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

40. The EIT should support European stakeholders in their quest for attracting international talent.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
☒				

41. Which OTHER measures should the EIT take in order to enhance international competitiveness and attractiveness?

When the KICs will succeed in developing convincing approaches to stimulate innovation and creating measurable impact, they will become internationally visible and attractive anyway.

When KICs manage to stimulate innovation bringing research results and technologies to the market they will contribute to enhancing the competitiveness of their corporate partners. The success of the new approaches will radiate to the regions of the co-location centres and through the dissemination and learning initiatives they will spread across Europe and beyond.

The KICs should support their partner organisations to attract talents by providing attractive and competitive working environments and conditions and spreading the message about the attractiveness of KICs.

E. Organisation

42. How relevant are autonomy and flexibility for the EIT to fulfil its mission and have impact on the EU innovation landscape?

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
☒				

43. Flexibility is essential for the KICs to attract participation from the private sector.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Of little relevance	Irrelevant	Don't know
	☒			

The overall organisation of the EIT as a kind of “holding company” with the EIT Headquarters as the central management and the legally independent KICs as parts of the organisation seems to be a valid overall structure. However, the members of CESAER see quite some room for improvement.

As far as can be judged from the available information and impressions there seems to be lack of clear division of labour between the Governing Board (GB) and the EIT Headquarters (EIT HQ). In the view of CESAER, the GB should have a supervisory and advisory role and the EIT HQ should have the full responsibility for the operations in line with the accountability of the EIT Director to the GB (see regulation, Article 4.1.(c). There seems to be an urgent need for clarification and alignment of the roles of the EIT bodies.

As for the Governing Board, CESAER recommends a smaller number of members and sees 22 members as excessive. The role and position of the European Commission in the GB needs to be clarified. The representation of the KICs in the GB and communication between the KICs and the GB has to be ensured.

CESAER members see the need for a well designed EIT communication strategy that goes beyond occasional events or news mailings. There is a clear need for better communication and improved transparency of the GB towards the “outside world”. First and foremost, there have to be transparent and convincing ways of avoiding conflict of interest. There is some serious concern in the European education, research and innovation community that this is an area which deserves more attention and sensibility.

The development of the Strategic Innovation Agenda (SIA) would have been an excellent opportunity to show the competence and capability of the GB and EIT HQ to organise a Europe wide dialogue on the role of the EIT in the future of innovation activities in Europe and thus ensure a broad ownership of the final outcome. Unfortunately, the draft SIA available via the EIT website is in no way convincing and satisfactory and does not go much beyond the existing descriptions of the EIT. It seems that the draft of the SIA does not even satisfy the principles and requirements as defined by the Regulation. This outcome supports the views that there is no evidence that the GB alone has the ultimate wisdom and insight to

develop this strategy without input from the vast expertise and experience that is available in the community of innovation actors at European, national and regional level in Europe.

It is high time that the GB and prominent members of the GB open up to good practice and identified hurdles experienced at this critical phase of the EIT in order to be able to identify the real uniqueness of the EIT – which has to be proven yet. If not, there is a danger that the EIT will get into a certain isolation which would endanger the chances to achieve the EIT's ambitious objectives.

F. Funding model

44. The concept of EIT funding to KICs that acts as leverage should be maintained.

Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
	✗			

45. Are there any OTHER incentives the EIT shall put forward to KICs in order to achieve growth, impact and sustainability?

For CESAER members, the model to provide 25% funding as EC financial contribution for the value added activities seems interesting and appropriate and will support the “catalytic” function of the EIT.

For the financing of innovation also new financial instruments should be applied that may be developed further from the present available instruments (RSFF, CIP, Structural Funds, EIB) as well as from the private sector. The EIT Foundation is an interesting idea and one will have to see if and how it will take off.

As in all activities of the EIT and the KICs there is a need to closely monitor and assess the activities and learn from experience and ensure the readiness to continuous refinement and improvements. As frequently emphasised already, the EIT is an interesting European experiment and has to be organised as a learning organisation that is closely imbedded in the other European research and innovation as well as educational and training programmes and initiatives.