

# Results and recommendations of the virtual 2nd Biotech Hub Meeting

Convened by ERA-NET Cofund on Biotechnology ([ERA CoBioTech](#))

**10th - 11th November 2020**

Dresden and [online](#)

## Authors

On behalf of the Saxon State Ministry of Science, Culture and Tourism (SMWK), this report was written by Rosalind Attenborough, Robert D.J. Smith, Zara Thokozani Kamwendo, Gabriele Süptitz, Diana Schulz and Karen Deprie.

## Recommended Citation:

Attenborough, R., Smith, R.D.J., Kamwendo, T.K., Schulz, D., Süptitz, G. and Deprie, K. *Results and recommendations of the Second European Biotech Hub Meeting*. Dresden: Saxon State Ministry of Science, Culture and Tourism (SMWK)

## Table of contents

Acronym list.....	3
Background to the report.....	4
Executive Summary .....	5
<b>(1) Partnerships under Horizon Europe</b> .....	6
Lesson 1: Consolidate knowledge and trust developed in prior partnerships .....	6
Lesson 2: Hedge against a potential loss of funding diversity and disempowerment of smaller organisations.....	7
Lesson 3: Anticipate the organisational challenges of larger, broader partnerships.....	8
<b>(2) Bioeconomy as a European Mission</b> .....	8
Lesson 4: Funders hold multiple visions for and understandings of the bioeconomy .....	9
Lesson 5: Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) is well acknowledged, but there is capacity for learning .....	9
Lesson 6: Criteria for Horizon Europe and future bioeconomy funding programmes .....	10
Meeting organisers.....	12
Annex: Agenda of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Biotech Hub Meeting .....	13

## Acronym list

BBI-JU	Bio-based Industries Joint Undertaking
CBE	Circular Bio-based Europe Partnership
CoBioTech	ERA-Net Cofund on Biotechnologies
EC	European Commission
ERA	European Research Area
ERA-Net	Network in the European Research Area
ETP	European Technology Platform
FP	Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development
H2020	Framework Programme for Research and Innovation “Horizon 2020”
JTI	Joint Technology Initiative
KIC	Knowledge and Innovation Community
R&D (&I)	Research and Development (and Innovation)
RRI	Responsible Research and Innovation
TRL	Technology Readiness Level

## Background to the report

ERA CoBioTech is an ERA-Net Cofund Action, funded by the European Commission (EC) under H2020. The programme aims to strengthen biotechnological research and development within the European Research Areas (ERA) in three ways: (1) by enhancing cooperation and coordination of different national and regional research funding programmes; (2) by promoting systems biology and synthetic biology as technology drivers to speed up research and innovation in industrial biotechnology; and (3) by demonstrating the public benefits of biotechnology in Europe.

In addition to its funding calls, ERA CoBioTech established the **European Biotechnology Hub**, a platform to align policy instruments which address the ERA in biotechnology and related fields. The Hub creates fora for all relevant stakeholders to engage, debate and share knowledge about a range of technical, policy, environmental and societal issues relating to biotechnology funding and development.

A vital tool in this regard is the programme of Hub Meetings, which convene key actors from regional, Member State, and EC organisations to discuss strategic issues. **The goal of second Biotech Hub Meeting** was to mobilise participants' extensive knowledge about how partnerships in biotechnology and the bioeconomy had functioned to date and use this knowledge to contribute to the development of partnerships in Horizon Europe.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held in virtual format. In total, 79 participants from 14 European countries joined the presentations, workshops and panel discussions. Participants were primarily from national and regional ministries and funding agencies, with the addition of two European Commission staff. Most participants had substantial experience with current and past ERA initiatives (e.g. ERA-Nets, ETPs, KICs or JTIs under FP6, FP7 and H2020). Thematically, the meeting covered industrial (white), agricultural (green) and medical (red) biotechnology as well as adjoining health topics and more production-focussed parts of the bioeconomy.

This document summarises the **key outcomes** of the workshops and panel discussions, and the **recommendations** that are, in consequence, given for consideration by European Commission staff. Discussions were organised in two parts: (1) Partnerships under Horizon Europe; (2) The Bioeconomy as a European Mission.

## Executive Summary

On the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> of November, 2020, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Biotech Hub Meeting was organised by the Saxon State Ministry of Science, Culture & Tourism (SMWK). The Biotech Hub Meetings bring together representatives from the European Commission and from European initiatives supported by Member States and regions in order to foster strategic alignment and integration in biotechnology.

The specific goal of this meeting was to use the participants' experience of partnerships in biotechnologies and bioeconomy in Europe to contribute to their future shape under Horizon Europe.

The 79 participants from 14 European countries mostly had strong experience with initiatives contributing to the European Research Area, e.g. ERA-Nets, ETPs, KICs or JTI, and represented national or regional ministries and funding agencies, as well as two members of the European Commission/DG Research and Innovation. Thematically, the meeting covered white, green and red biotechnology, adjoining health topics and more production-focussed parts of the bioeconomy.

Participants discussed experiences of European partnerships to date, opportunities and challenges of Horizon Europe partnerships, and ideal future partnerships in the area of the bioeconomy/life sciences. Compared to Horizon 2020, there will be much fewer partnerships and only three different partnerships models.

Horizon Europe partnerships would benefit from building on valuable elements developed in Horizon 2020 ERA-Nets, such as knowledge, infrastructure, networks, trust, and best practice established over the years, so mechanisms should be developed to ensure this transfer. Larger, more top-down networks might also lead to funding gaps within their broad fields, and disempower smaller countries and regions. Higher barriers for entry into a partnership were also a concern voiced by regions. In the planned CBE, mechanisms to allow regional and Member State funders to play more active roles in its development and thus to ensure their contribution as per the Bioeconomy Strategy are required, e.g. via the Deployment Group.

With regard to the bioeconomy, discussions focussed on the understanding of this term, the impact of biotechnologies in the transition from a fossil-based to a bio-based economy, and the role of responsible research and innovation. In health, and thus in red biotechnology, bioeconomy and sustainability do not currently have the same relevance as in other areas.

Important aspects of future partnerships, in addition to organising joint calls and funding joint research, include strengthening or establishing a circularity approach in biotechnology, continued funding of a broad TRL spectrum and aiming for good data stewardship. Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) are well acknowledged in the respective networks, but there is capacity for learning. Digitalisation was noted as a useful tool, but not as a goal in its own right. As part of an initiative or call, it should always be a means to a very specific end. Participants also identified specific gaps in the focal points currently planned by the CBE. These bioeconomy-related topics would have to be addressed by other initiatives.

## (1) Partnerships under Horizon Europe

In Horizon Europe, the EC aims to make European partnerships more “strategic, coherent, and impact-driven”<sup>1</sup>. Compared to Horizon 2020, there will be fewer partnerships and the form they take has been rationalised to three types – co-programmed, co-funded, and institutionalised. Biotechnology transects several proposed partnerships, but industrial/agricultural biotechnology is only clearly targeted in one partnership, the *European Partnership for a Circular bio-based Europe: sustainable innovation for new local value from bio- waste and biomass* (CBE), which builds on the Bio-based Industries Joint Undertaking (BBI-JU) funded in H2020.

The first day’s workshop focussed on the implications of these changes for ERA CoBioTech Hub stakeholders. Participants discussed experiences of European partnerships to date, opportunities and challenges of Horizon Europe partnerships, and ideal future partnerships in the area of the bioeconomy/life sciences. These discussions have been distilled into three key messages for policy makers and the coordinators of future partnerships.

### Lesson 1: Consolidate knowledge and trust developed in prior partnerships

A great deal of tacit knowledge has been gained from over 15 years of ERA-Nets, Technology Initiatives and other programmes. This knowledge covers a wide range of activities such as transnational cooperation, co-programming, co-funding research, organising joint training, knowledge transfer activities and stakeholder engagement. Successful partnerships depend on this knowledge, as well as interpersonal networks and relationships. Some of these elements are intangible but nonetheless important, e.g. trust based on past international cooperation structures.

Participants commonly suggested there was a risk of things being “lost in transition” to the new structures. For instance, in Horizon Europe the practical management of some partnerships is expected to change hands, and there is therefore potential for these new organisations to “reinvent the wheel,” or be unable to reinvent specific elements. At the same time, some participants felt that they currently lack information about how the new partnerships will operate practically, and which stakeholders can be included in partnerships. Participants had been unable to obtain this information.

The transition to the new structure of European Partnerships should include a strategy to ensure the wealth of practical knowledge about what makes a good partnership is not lost. Participants considered it important that EC directives on partnerships are accompanied by tools and support for implementation; ERA-LEARN was considered an important tool, for example.

### Recommendations:

- 1.1. Create mechanisms, tools, and spaces for Horizon Europe partnerships to build upon successes of past partnerships in the same domain.
- 1.2. Ensure that these mechanisms allow transfer of informal or intangible knowledge by consulting or working directly with relevant stakeholder groups and individuals.
- 1.3. Assess, and possibly adapt, the membership structure of individual partnerships in a way that is accessible to Member States and regions.

---

<sup>1</sup>European Commission, 2020: “Summary Note European Partnerships.” [https://www.era-learn.eu/documents/summary\\_note\\_european\\_partnerships\\_spc](https://www.era-learn.eu/documents/summary_note_european_partnerships_spc) (accessed 20.11.2020).

- 1.4. Provide information that can guide Member States', regions' and stakeholders' decisions about which partnerships to join.

## Lesson 2: Hedge against a potential loss of funding diversity and disempowerment of smaller organisations

Participants expected benefits from the new Horizon Europe partnership structure: synergies might avoid sectoral silos and reduce thematic overlaps, result in greater industrial competitiveness, and increase capacity for clinical trials. Stakeholders can gain a better overview of European R&I funding opportunities in each area and build more ambitious, multinational proposals. For Member States, having fewer, broader partnerships means they can cover a wider thematic field with their limited total resources for engaging in partnerships. Prioritising, which before meant deciding for or against participation in a network, can happen within a partnership, even from call to call.

Participants also saw the new approach to partnerships as a shift to a more centralised, top-down structure that favours “big winners” with lobbying power over a diverse, distributed, flexible (if messy) ecology of smaller actors. This applied to the Horizon Europe structure in general, and to the BBI/CBE partnership in particular. Ironically, a broader thematic focus means there is the potential to create gaps, for instance if the topics that have the greatest “lobby” or that are supported by the most active partners gain priority over a more diverse set of interests. There was concern that the nuances in priority setting, such as between regional and national funders, may be lost. For instance, some regional, EU-13 and smaller funders specifically use partnerships to internationalise early- and mid-career researchers, but it was not clear how this would be possible in the new structures.

Some viewed BBI as a success because of its high level of industrial enrolment (visible in roadmaps for various industrial sectors) and positive participation experiences. But again, other funders emphasised the need for a scope beyond ‘high-TRL’ projects, or were concerned that their inability to fund industrial research would prevent their participation in CBE. Participants were unsure how divergences in priorities would be negotiated within individual partnerships. Horizon scanning, portfolio analysis and diverse agenda setting methodologies may ameliorate some of these concerns.

Regional funders voiced concerns about the high barriers to entry into the current proposals for the CBE. Some participants also mentioned an absence of structures for consulting regions: co-funded partnerships are the only clear option for regions to take an active role, but there are currently no biotechnology-driven co-funded partnerships. These concerns are particularly relevant in the context of the Bioeconomy Strategy<sup>2</sup>, which emphasises the importance of a regional approach to development and deployment of technologies. It was not clear to regional funders how this approach would be implemented in the new CBE Deployment Group. While the exact structure and mandate of this group has not been finalised, participants emphasised that the main challenge will be to construct the group in a way that enables real, regular two-way (rather than top-down) communication and thus a meaningful alignment with Member State and regional programmes related to the bioeconomy.

### Recommendations:

- 2.1. Acknowledge the potential for partnerships under Horizon Europe to reduce diversity and increase power asymmetries.

---

<sup>2</sup>European Commission, 2018: A sustainable Bioeconomy for Europe: Strengthening the connection between economy, society and the environment. COM/2018/673 final.  
<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52018DC0673&from=EN> (accessed 07.12.2020).



- 2.2. Where necessary, create mechanisms to counteract the centralising effect of the new partnership structure, e.g. representing EU-13/smaller/regional funders in governance bodies of all HE partnerships; inviting smaller funders/patients/citizens (as relevant) to engage and evaluate their partnership experiences.
- 2.3. Assess long-term impacts of current partnership proposals on regional economies and citizen inclusion.
- 2.4. Develop CBE mechanisms, e.g. via the Deployment Group, to allow regional and Member State funders to play more active roles in the development of CBE and its programme than in BBI-JU, ensuring Member State and regional contribution as per the Bioeconomy Strategy.
- 2.5. Foster methodologies to monitor how the focus of each partnership changes over time in order to identify funding gaps or structural weaknesses, and develop mechanisms to adapt structures/initiatives as necessary.

### Lesson 3: Anticipate the organisational challenges of larger, broader partnerships

Participants linked success of past networks to strong communication and organisation, which give partnerships momentum and help to maintain participation beyond the initial funding period. Given the larger size of partnerships in Horizon Europe, the need for good communication and organisation is likely to be accentuated.

Some participants portrayed the administration and definition of funding calls in ERA-Nets as flexible in comparison to anticipated functioning of the new partnerships. For smaller actors, the cost of engagement is sometimes managed by having one person engaging with multiple ERA-Nets, which is also one way that capacity for best practice has been built (see Lesson 1). Additionally, ERA-Nets were seen as flexible in cost and commitment terms for smaller actors. If partnerships are very thematically broad, their management and implementation may become unwieldy and less inclusive/bottom-up (see Lesson 2).

The current ranking practice for allocating funding was seen as riskier in large partnerships, because if any one partner runs out of budget, this can block further funding allocation. More flexible allocation rules may be required to manage this risk. Participants identified flexibility in the definition of topics for and the administration of joint calls for R&D proposals as particularly important.

#### Recommendations:

- 3.1. Identify new administrative burdens and risks that may arise within Horizon Europe partnerships (even though the intention is to rationalise and simplify).
- 3.2. Promote flexibility within processes like funding call rankings so that the priorities of different funders can be negotiated.

## (2) Bioeconomy as a European Mission

Day 2's workshop offered participants space to examine what the key lessons were from biotechnology funding programmes, and how these might be taken forwards under new future policy frameworks. Groups discussed their understanding of the bio-based economy, the role of responsible innovation, as well as possible locations of biotechnology research and development in future funding programmes.



#### Lesson 4: Funders hold multiple visions for and understandings of the bioeconomy

Participants first discussed the notion of the ‘bioeconomy’, which has emerged as a key policy concept in the past decade. Although formally defined in many national and European documents, such as the European Bioeconomy Strategy<sup>3</sup>, the Bioeconomy Action Plan<sup>4</sup> and national bioeconomy strategies, our participants still had broad, varied and interchangeable understandings of terms such as (‘knowledge-based’) ‘bioeconomy’, or ‘bio-based economy’. The clearest distinction was between the bioeconomy as something that is already here versus the bioeconomy as a future state, requiring societal, technological and policy transformation. In the former definition, the term serves as shorthand for all economic activities associated with biology. The latter understanding, which aligns with the abovementioned strategy papers, emphasises the need to address climate change and de-carbonise our economy by replacing fossil-fuel resources with biological resources.

One group discussed how such a transformation to a bio-based economy might be achieved in terms of public behaviour change and distribution of power. They foresaw tensions between short- and long-term goals (e.g. bio-based products may initially be more expensive than alternatives) and the potential need for regulatory change versus entrepreneurs’ desire for a stable regulatory environment. Potential drivers of a transformation were also discussed, including: frontrunner products that demonstrate clear benefit; early-adopting citizens; and broadening who has power to affect change.

It is also clear that the bioeconomy and related terms do not hold the same status for all sectors of the life sciences and biotechnology. Bioeconomy-related terms were central for participants in material- and resource-based sectors, where instigating a transformation to bio-based systems was fundamental to their work. But such terms were less central in the health sector: participants spoke of curing disease as the main priority. As one participant put it, “our goal is to save lives, not to be bio-based or circular”. It was also clear that related terms such as ‘circularity’ have varying connotations. For one participant in a health funding programme, circularity implied the recycling of prior innovations through off-patent drugs rather than circularity in terms of material resources.

#### Recommendation:

- 4.1. Anticipate the need for discussion and debate regarding the meanings of high-level terms like bioeconomy, bio-based economy, circularity etc. if Clusters 1 (Health) and 6 (Food, bioeconomy, natural resources, agriculture & environment) are to collaborate under Pillar 2 of Horizon Europe.

#### Lesson 5: Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) is well acknowledged, but there is capacity for learning

Most participants indicated that consideration of RRI or related ideas including sustainability and ethics were included within their respective networks. There was a sense amongst participants that these dimensions are – and should remain – fundamental to the practices of contemporary research programmes.

---

<sup>3</sup>European Commission, 2018: A sustainable bioeconomy for Europe: strengthening the connection between economy, society and the environment. Updated Bioeconomy Strategy, <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/edace3e3-e189-11e8-b690-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-149755478> (accessed 09.12.2020).

<sup>4</sup>European Commission, 2018: Bioeconomy: the European way to use our natural resources. Action Plan, <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/775a2dc7-2a8b-11e9-8d04-01aa75ed71a1> (accessed 10.12.2020).

There was reasonable capacity and knowledge as to how to embed this work appropriately. Participants identified that it was important not just to delegate responsibility to projects and researchers, but also integrate considerations of societal need, RRI and sustainability into the main strategic documents (e.g. roadmaps and vision statements) of a programme. Participants also identified joint calls and their respective procedures as sites for RRI, for instance by ensuring that applicants are aware of the RRI requirements in practical terms including examples; and ensuring that evaluators know what to expect and to include RRI in the scoring system.

Participants suggested that a valuable next step could be for ERA-Nets and future partnerships to exchange learning and materials on the topic of RRI. For instance, despite having similar organisational structures, several programmes had developed their approaches independently. ERA CoBioTech has developed a comprehensive Agenda for Responsible Research and Innovation<sup>5</sup>, and other ERA-NETs (e.g. EuroNanoMed III, ERA SusFood, M-ERA.Net) have developed or are developing their own approaches. One possibility for exchange could be around proposal evaluation processes as there were a range of procedures being developed, e.g. some programmes aimed to use evaluation panels as a site of capacity-building for RRI by ensuring new evaluators learn from established ones, while others had not.

### Recommendations:

- 5.1. Create mechanisms for partnerships to learn RRI best practice from one another.
- 5.2. Ensure that partnerships' prioritisation of RRI is signalled early on in roadmaps, and
- 5.3. Encourage exchange of RRI-relevant materials from call announcements, applicant and evaluator support, and scoring systems, e.g. via ERA-LEARN.

### Lesson 6: Criteria for Horizon Europe and future bioeconomy funding programmes

Finally, participants identified several important criteria for future partnerships incorporating biotechnology and bioeconomy research. Reflections on organisational structures were offered as well as specific research needs. Many of these suggestions were synergistic with those offered in the Day 1 workshop. Regarding organisational structure, participants emphasised that there was a need for future partnerships to:

- **Develop 'multi-actor approaches'**<sup>6</sup> to priority setting and research;
- **Foster a circularity approach** both in the direction of biotechnology and bioeconomy funding programmes and the actual research process (e.g. addressing eco-design and value-driven design);
- **Maintain funding across a broad TRL spectrum** to support projects that develop new knowledge and insight, those which bring products and services to market, and those that span across several TRLs;
- **Capitalise on the learning around Responsible Research and Innovation** to date;

<sup>5</sup>Smith, R.D.J. et al, 2019: An Agenda for Responsible Research and Innovation in ERA CoBioTech. BBSRC, Swindon. [https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw\\_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/85886BE9C7161C71E0539A695E865A64/liv\\_e/document/ERA\\_CoBioTech\\_RRI\\_Framework.pdf](https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/85886BE9C7161C71E0539A695E865A64/liv_e/document/ERA_CoBioTech_RRI_Framework.pdf) (accessed 7 December 2020).

<sup>6</sup>EIP-AGRI (Horizon 2020 Multi-Actor Projects) [https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/sites/agri-eip/files/eip-agri\\_brochure\\_multi-actor\\_projects\\_2017\\_en\\_web.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/sites/agri-eip/files/eip-agri_brochure_multi-actor_projects_2017_en_web.pdf) (Accessed 7 December 2020).

- **Cultivate good data stewardship** through funding requirements and developing infrastructure, and;
- **Create hubs** to share resources and bring people together.

Discussion of research needs focused on three dimensions. First, using the example of personalised medicine, participants emphasised that much research in the area is oriented towards lower TRLs. There was some concern that future partnerships were not ideally placed to accommodate basic research. There was also concern about the relationship between ‘societal need’ and ‘scientific supply’. For instance, there are a range of neglected and rare diseases that are not adequately researched because industry does not view them as profitable. Developing new approaches to address these market failures would be valuable.

Second, participants discussed the place of digitalisation in biotechnology research agendas. Digitalisation was acknowledged as an important and wide-ranging tool, but one that was extremely hyped in its transformative potential. Participants argued that care must be taken to see digitalisation not as a goal of its own but as a means to a very specific end in each case, i.e. not to lose sight of the real goals of the programmes.

Third, CBE is the only Horizon Europe partnership currently focussed towards industrial/agricultural biotechnology. Because of this, there is a need to ensure that it accommodates a wide range of stakeholder and societal needs for a sustainable, responsible future. However, participants identified limits in the current scope of CBE. Perceived gaps of CBE that were mentioned included biotechnology topics spanning several TRLs, eco-design, green energy for industrial processes, and forestry. Additionally, participants once again emphasised that national and regional priorities cover goals of sustainability, responsibility, and circularity, which an industry-focussed initiative like CBE is at risk of not integrating deeply through proposed structures (see Lesson 2). They argued that forums were needed (e.g. via the CBE Deployment Group) to allow Member State and regional participation in agenda setting processes and to ensure alignment of agendas.

### Recommendations:

- 6.1. Ensure that Horizon Europe partnerships take a circularity approach to biotechnology funding, cultivate good data stewardship, support multi-actor approaches, and enable cross-TRL research.
- 6.2. Acknowledge the challenges specific to the health-focused partnerships in their design, e.g. with regard to encouraging industry participation.
- 6.3. See digitalisation as a useful tool, but not as a goal in its own right. As part of an initiative or call, it should always be a means to a very specific end.
- 6.4. Make space for bioeconomy R&I in clusters/partnerships others than CBE, if CBE cannot equally include non-industrial actors and the breadth of the bioeconomy.

## Meeting organisers

The meeting was organised by the Saxon State Ministry for Science, Culture and Tourism (SMWK): in particular, by Gabriele Süptitz and Diana Schulz in collaboration with Karen Deprie, who also chaired the meeting. Robert Smith, Zara Thokozani Kamwendo, and Rosalind Attenborough (Universities of Edinburgh and Durham) assisted in organisation and facilitated discussion groups. Tomasz Calikowski (European Commission) and Christine Bunthof (Wageningen University & Research) also facilitated discussions.

### Contact:

Saxon State Ministry for Science, Culture and Tourism (SMWK)  
Division 42 / EU and International Affairs  
Wigardstraße 17  
01097 Dresden, Germany

E-Mail: [cobiotech@smwk.sachsen.de](mailto:cobiotech@smwk.sachsen.de)

Annex: Agenda of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Biotech Hub Meeting**2nd Biotech HUB-Meeting of ERA-Nets and European Instruments  
related to Biotechnology and Innovative Technologies**

10-11 November 2020

organised by Saxon State Ministry for Science, Culture and Tourism (SMWK)

**Tuesday, 10th November, 2020 – Part I**

9:30 am - approx. 1:00 pm

Welcome address by the Free State of Saxony/Saxon State Ministry for Science, Culture and Tourism (SMWK)  
**Sebastian Gemkow**, State Minister and **Gabriele Süptitz**, Policy OfficerIntroduction by CO of ERA CoBioTech: **Hanna Steffens**, JUELICH, Germany

Biotechnology in Horizon Europe - R&amp;I needs and challenges

**Ruska Kelevska**, European Commission, Circular Economy & Biobased Systems (RTD.C.1)

Horizon Europe - Cluster 6 and its partnerships: emerging scenarios'

**Tomasz Calikowski**, European Commission, Circular Economy & Biobased Systems (RTD.C.1)

JTI BBI – Joint Technology Initiative Biobased Industries (BBI)

**Dirk Carrez**, BIC, Belgium

time for questions

coffee break

Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (SCAR) - New opportunities through collaboration in bioeconomy  
**Rolf Stratmann**, JUELICH, Germany

KetBio - A novel cluster model to bring KEY ENABLING BIOTECHNOLOGY research closer to markets and society

**Kathrin Ruebberdt**, DECHEMA, Germany

ERA-NET ERA-GAS – Monitoring and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases from Agri- and Silviculture

**Christine Bunthof**, WUR, The Netherlands

ERA-Net PerMed – ERA-Net on Personalised Medicine

**Cristina Nieto**, ISCIII, Spain

time for questions

coffee break

**Workshop "Partnerships under Horizon Europe"**

closing words

End of 1st day

**Wednesday, 11 November, 2020 – Part II**

**9:30 am - 1:00 pm**

**SUM UP & discussion**  
**Panel "Partnerships under Horizon Europe"**

cPPP SPIRE – Sustainable Process Industry through Resource and Energy Efficiency  
**Àngels Orduña Cao**, A.SPIRE, Belgium

JPI AMR - Joint Programming Initiative on Antimicrobial Resistance  
**Laura Plant**, VR, Sweden

KIC EIT Health - Promoting innovation in health  
**Katharina Ladewig**, EIT Health Germany GmbH

time for questions

**Workshop "Bioeconomy as a European mission"**

coffee break

ERA-Net E-Rare-3 – ERA-Net for Research Programmes on Rare Diseases  
**Florence Guillot**, ANR, France

M-ERA.Net - ERA-NET for materials research and innovation  
**Roland Brandenburg**, FFG, Austria

ERA-MIN 2 - Programme on Raw Materials to foster circular economy  
**Dina Carrilho**, FCT, Portugal

ForestValue - Innovating forest-based bioeconomy  
**Mika Kallio**, MMM, Finland

time for questions

**SUM UP & discussion**  
**Panel "Bioeconomy as a European mission"**

Closing words  
End of 2nd day