

President Sartori,

Dear colleagues,

Ladies and gentlemen,

Let me begin by thanking all the colleagues with whom I have worked in close collaboration on Horizon 2020. I should like to thank, in particular, Cristian Ehler and Teresa Riera Madurell for their openness in discussing the three different reports: framework, rules and specific programme. Because of the numerous point of similarity in these three reports, we have made an effort to discuss them conjointly as much as possible. I should

also like to thank the different shadow rapporteurs for their hard work and constructive comments and the EPP working group and advisers for their invaluable assistance.

Today, to begin with, I should like to give you an overview of the progress that has been made on the draft report for the Specific Programme Implementing Horizon 2020 since the 1<sup>st</sup> consideration of amendments.

So, with regard to the progress that has been made up until this point: we are working on the Compromise Amendments

and making every effort to include as many as possible of the changes suggested by colleagues.

Two reports – my own on the Specific Programme and Ms Riera Madurell's report on Regulation – are being discussed in parallel.

Furthermore, a number of broader issues— such as PPP and SME participation – are currently discussed together with Mr Ehler's report. Our intention is to ensure the necessary coherence between the three H2020 reports: Regulation, Specific Programme and Rules of Participation.

In so far as the main areas that require further work, five stand out. These are

~The question of open access to research publications and open access to research data.

~Secondly, the question of whether the “widening of participation” should belong to pillar 1 or whether it is better understood in terms of a horizontal toolbox.

~Thirdly, there has also been some debate about whether “Science with and

for society” should be placed in pillar 1, pillar 3 or in a horizontal toolbox.

~Fourthly, among the pillars, within the societal challenges, there is the question of earmarking (e.g. x% for renewable energy). This involves notions of type of participants, type of research and so on.

~Finally, there is the matter of Stem Cells research.

Hence, if considerable headway has been made, there remain a number of questions that remain to be resolved.

## *Downward Pressure on the Budget*

Before finishing, let me say a few words about the pressure to revise the budget. As you know, the MFF negotiations are still under way. In this context, the Cypriot Presidency has recently announced that “*all elements inside and outside the MFF, will have to be adjusted downwards*”. A decision on the final figures is expected for the third week of November (between the 22<sup>nd</sup> and the 23<sup>rd</sup>).

These “adjustments” will inevitably have a considerable impact on the whole structure – and for that matter on the

viability – of H2020. It is to be hoped that the different governments – and not least those with a reputation for academic excellence – will make an effort to attribute an at least adequate budget for H2020.

By way of conclusion, let me thank those colleagues that have already or still intend to contribute their comments to the Compromise amendments. It is with pleasure that I anticipate continuing along the path that we have already travelled along so productively together.

Thank you very much.