



Joint Research Centre

the European Commission's in-house science service



 ec.europa.eu/jrc

JOPRAD Regional Meeting 3-4 February 2016

Summary & Conclusions

Gunnar Buckau
Lumir Nachmilner

gunnar.buckau@ec.europa.eu
lumnach@gmail.com



Session 1: Introduction to Joint Programming

Objectives of the Meeting

Inform, motivate and engage Member States with Less Advanced Programmes

Get Feedback

Why Joint Programming

Responds to changes in Waste Management Challenges and Boundary Conditions

Workplan

Joint Strategic Research Agenda by the Actors (WMO, TSO, RE)

Knowledge Management System integrating KM, E&T, Guidance, Strategic Studies,



Session 1: Introduction to Joint Programming

- **EC statistics**
 - ✓ **low involvement of MLAP**
 - ✓ **unballanced capacities/capabilities between starting and advanced programmes**
- **Joint programming shall support:**
 - ✓ **integration and inclusiveness of research communities,**
 - ✓ **dissemination of knowledge,**
 - ✓ **vision/purpose beyond national interests,**
 - ✓ **excellent science,**
- **but not repetition of the research**



Session 1: Introduction to Joint Programming

JOPRAD outcomes

- A preliminary evaluation of a potential in-kind and financial commitment of Member States in activities of the Joint Programming through their identified “mandated actors”**
- A “Programme Document” focused on key priorities of WMOs, TSOs side and Research Entities.**
- Current SRA`s are different**
- A “Report - overall scheme of a JP” comprising a proposal for the implementation of this Joint Programming including the legal framework**



Session 2: Engaging Member States

France:

Well defined legal basis (Principles, Scope, Responsibilities, ..)

Update of well defined National Plans (every three years)

->Well defined political process all the way up to the Parliament

Cost estimate for CIGEO: 25,000 Mio €

Romania:

National Programme with Actors and Responsibilities defined, but strategy shall be revised

Mobilisation of national capacities

Continued participation in R&D on European level is essential

Access to Knowledge on a European Level and Participation in JP is important

Session 2: Engaging Member States

European
Commission

WG 1: Exploring the domain of **scientific-technical activities** potentially covered by the Joint Programming

1. Joint efforts within EU seen as principal for national pgms
2. Formulating a Joint SRA – different needs of actors – to be considered in future scrutiny
3. Predisposal activities seen as significant for national pgms (processing of waste, prolonged storage)
4. Methodological issues are of high priority (how to)
5. Search for joint efforts (sharing knowledge) regarding expensive RD&D, the same disposal concepts – even in smaller groups
6. Involving societal issues is recommended for each national programme

Session 2: Engaging Member States

WG 2: Exploring **strategic and horizontal activities** potentially covered by a Joint Programming

Key Outcome:

Very interesting discussion by very interested partners

Broad range of observations

Basis for taking into account the variety of interests (not all participants are interested in all topics)

Need for clear management structure and governance procedures in order to ensure that all interests are balanced

Serves the basis for work the coming 6 months (MTWS), and onward



Session 3: Way Ahead

Funding & Administrative Schemes

- **Based on existing experience, funding of Joint Programming is seen as viable**
- **Administrative scheme – potential solution outlined, will be more elaborated for discussions at the mid-term workshop**



Session 4: Conclusions

- **DGR development = interdisciplinary issue – not entirely reflected in SRA (GT topics underestimated)**
- **Entering a R&D programme in early stages even with minority involvement of an institution will enhance constructing its own systematic and extensive research**
- **National specifics need to be adequately considered while constructing JP**
- **Standardisation of R&D activities requested**
- **National commitment is needed to get in the programme**
- **Get organised in an early stage of the pgm**



Session 4: Conclusions (2)

- **Peer review might help small pgms in their implementation**
- **Small programmes have problems to be started - predisposal issues are common to them => shared effort may enhance this start**
- **JOPRAD = ambitious project, setting up priorities & governance are key aspects**
- **Sharing technical problems would be beneficial for everybody**
- **Differences regarding mandated actors in particular countries shall not compromise the overall goal**
- **Establishing national priorities is the first step towards defining JOPRAD priorities**



Session 4: Conclusions (EC)

- **KM is a central issue of the programme, it is well established**
- **Predisposal issues to be prioritised**
- **Flag the gaps identified, need to incorporate them adequately**
- **Not only national benefit is followed, EU added value shall be respected as well (commonality principle)**
- **Decision makers shall be involved in mid-term workshop**

- **Be positive....**



Final Remarks

Key Messages

- **Interest is there**
- **Get Informed**
- **Get organised**
- **Get on the Bus**