

FUEL CELLS and HYDROGEN 2 JOINT UNDERTAKING (FCH 2 JU)

PROCEDURE FOR SELECTION AND DRAFTING OF TOPICS



Drafted by

Carlos Navas, FCH 2 JU Project Manager

26/05/2016

Reviewed by:

<i>Person(s)</i>	<i>On behalf of</i>	<i>Date</i>
Philippe Mulard	IG/RG	06/06/2016
Johan Blondelle/Katarzyna Drabicka	EC	31/05/2016
Alberto Garcia/Jean-Luc Delplancke/Mirela Atanasiu/Elisabeth Robino/Nikos Lymperopoulos	PO	10/06/2016

Endorsed by the Governing Board on 29/06/2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. OBJECTIVE	3
3. ACTORS	4
3.1. Programme Office	4
3.2. Industry Grouping and Research Grouping - Technical Committees and Coordination Group	4
3.3. European Commission.....	5
3.4. Scientific Committee	5
3.5. States Representatives Group	5
3.6. Governing Board	5
3.7. Conflict of Interest	6
4. PROCEDURE.....	6
4.1. General workflow.....	6
4.2. Process setup	7
4.3. Preliminary list of topics	7
4.4. First draft	8
4.5. Second draft.....	9
4.6. Meeting to finalise selection of topics	10
4.7. Final draft	10
5. ANNEXES	12
Annex I. Summary of main roles of all actors at each stage of the process for selecting and drafting topics	12
Annex II. Glossary & acronyms.....	16
Annex IV. FCH 2 JU Strategic and specific objectives	18
Annex V. Illustrative timeline	19

1. INTRODUCTION

The Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 Joint Undertaking (FCH 2 JU) is a public-private partnership focusing on the objective of accelerating the commercialization of fuel cell and hydrogen technologies. The FCH 2 JU was set up, within the Horizon 2020 (H2020) Framework programme, as a Joint Undertaking by Council Regulation N° 559/2014. Its aim is to contribute to the Union's wider competitiveness goals, leverage private investment, and help tackle societal challenges. It brings public and private interests together in a new, industry-led implementation structure, ensuring that the jointly defined research program better matches industry's needs and expectations, while focusing on its objective.

According to the Council Regulation, the FCH 2 JU implements these objectives mainly through funding given through grants awarded following calls for proposals. These grants and calls for proposals follow H2020 rules and guidelines for their implementation and should follow the strategic goals included in the Multi-Annual Work Plan (MAWP), adopted by the FCH 2 JU Governing Board. The FCH 2 JU replaces and succeeds the FCH JU, established under Council Regulation 521/2008, which had a similar role under the Seventh Framework Programme.

It should be noted that neither the Council Regulations nor the MAWP lay down the process by which the various annual calls for proposals are meant to be agreed upon by the stakeholders. These stakeholders are the Members of the JU (Industry Grouping, Research Grouping and the European Union represented by the European Commission) and its bodies (Governing Board, Executive Director – supported by the Programme Office, Scientific Committee, States Representative Group and Stakeholder Forum). Even if the process was not specifically addressed, the FCH JU (2007-2013 under FP7) was conceived as an industry-led partnership and this was reflected by the approach applied for proposing and drafting the call topics in which working groups comprising representatives of the 3 members (IG, RG and EC) were established with the industry and research members taking the lead in proposing topics, providing their supporting rationale for how they would contribute to the goals of the JU and drafting the topics according to discussions held on their merit, content and alignment with strategy and policy, in close collaboration with the EC.

Once the Programme Office was established and the JU was granted autonomy in November 2010, this basic framework was kept and has been used in subsequent calls for proposals through call 2016.

2. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this document is to formalise the procedure by which call topics are proposed, drafted, selected and ultimately form part of the annual work plan of the FCH 2 JU. The procedure clarifies the roles of all stakeholders in the process and the specific steps involved.

It must be noted that this procedure refers to the selection of topics, rather than the larger Annual Work Plan (AWP), which contains not only these topics, but also other sections related to other activities of the FCH 2 JU.

3. ACTORS

This section outlines the main actors involved in the process of selecting and drafting topics and their respective roles.

3.1. Programme Office

The Programme Office performs a supporting role to the Executive Director and the other bodies of the FCH 2 JU. The Programme Office provides the final version of the Annual Work Plan (AWP), including the call for proposals and its topics description, to the Executive Director, who submits it to the Governing Board for final adoption.

Its main roles are to:

- Coordinate the overall process by serving as the main point of contact for all actors. As such, it interfaces with all stakeholders for the transfer of relevant information
- Propose and enforce the calendar with the specific steps in the planning of the process
- Provide input into proposed topics during the drafting process, including feedback on the content and format of the topics
- The PO may also suggest topics, mainly based on outcomes and results of previous or ongoing projects or studies

3.2. Industry Grouping and Research Grouping - Technical Committees and Coordination Group

Both the Industry Grouping (IG) and Research Grouping (RG) participate actively in the process. When becoming a member of any of these groups, a participant is asked to identify the specific pillar (Transport, Energy or Cross-Cutting) in which she/he wishes to participate and provide input. Thus, Technical Committees (TCs) for the different areas of work under Transport, Energy and Cross-cutting activities are formed both for IG and RG. Leaders from IG and RG for each of the TCs are nominated and serve as main contact points for their respective fields and groups and form as a whole the Coordination Group (CG) for IG/RG. Their identities and roles should be communicated to the PO at the start of the process. Being an industry-led entity, the CG Chairman is nominated by the Chairman of the board of the Industry Grouping and acts as a central point of contact between the IG/RG TCs and the external stakeholders.

The respective TCs for IG and RG work together to propose a common, unified list of topics by each of the indicated deadlines.

The main roles of the TCs are to:

- Serve as the primary group in charge of proposing and developing topics, providing proper justification and rationales for them
- Represent IG/RG according to the structure of the FCH 2 JU programme: Transport and Energy pillars and Cross-Cutting Activity Area encompassing Technical Committees¹ covering all activities
- Identify topics for which additional conditions for participation may be necessary and provide justification

¹ At the time of this writing, there are 5 TCs: Transport, Transport Infrastructure, Energy to Hydrogen, Stationary Fuel Cells and Cross-Cutting

- Provide feedback to comments given by other actors involved in the process

3.3. European Commission

The EC is one of the main stakeholders in this process. Its main role is to provide input into proposed topics during the drafting process, including feedback on the content and justification of the topics keeping in mind EU policy objectives and positioning with respect to other initiatives and funding sources. It can also suggest topics for inclusion, based on EU policy drivers. In addition, it interfaces directly with the TCs to discuss the appropriateness of the justification for any additional conditions for participation on topics proposed by TCs.

While the EC as a whole is represented in this process, the main points of contact are representatives from DG RTD (G2), who are then in charge of relaying the relevant information to other units in the EC with direct interest in the process (particularly within DG RTD itself, DG MOVE, DG ENER and the JRC).

3.4. Scientific Committee

The Scientific Committee (SC) is composed of 9 members and acts, under the Council Regulation, in the role of an Advisory Body to the FCH 2 JU. Its role in this process is to:

- Assess whether the proposed topics are in line with scientific priorities
- Consider whether the formulations of the proposed topics are able to reach those scientific priorities and propose modifications where this is not the case
- Identify scientific/technological gaps and suggest topics accordingly

The SC is consulted on the basis of the first draft of topics (see Section 4.4), which it receives from the PO once it is made available.

3.5. States Representatives Group

The States Representative Group (SRG) is composed of representatives of each Member State and acts, under the Council Regulation, in the role of an Advisory Body to the FCH 2 JU. Its role in this process is to:

- Assess whether the proposed topics are in line with strategic priorities
- Consider whether the formulations of the proposed topics are able to reach those strategic priorities and propose modifications where this is not the case
- Indicate national priorities and, where applicable, inform on related national/regional initiatives.
- Provide an opinion on alignment with H2020 and SME participation

The SRG is consulted on the basis of the first draft of topics (see Section 4.4), which it receives from the PO once it is made available.

3.6. Governing Board

The Governing Board is made up of 10 representatives from IG, RG and the EC, representing the founding members. As part of its mandate, upon submission by Executive Director, it formally adopts the Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the following year, so that the AWP for year n is approved by the end of year $n-1$. The topics within the call for proposals are typically part of the AWP itself.

3.7. Conflict of Interest

The Programme Office and the bodies of the FCH 2 JU shall observe and comply with the corresponding rules regarding the prevention and management on conflict of interest.

4. PROCEDURE

4.1. General workflow

To facilitate the process and streamline the flow of information, each actor should appoint ideally 1-2 persons as the main contacts for their respective group. These persons shall act as recipients of input, be in charge of transmitting relevant information to their respective groups and coordinate the exchange of information internally and externally.

Normally, the topic descriptions are compiled by the CG and sent to the PO. The CG has defined jointly between IG and RG a specific procedure to draft the preliminary list of topics to be proposed. These internal procedures are not part of this document. It should be noted that, if appropriate, topics may also be suggested by EC in line with policy orientations, or by the PO in line with outcomes and results of ongoing or finished projects or studies.

The overall concept is to go through several drafts of the topics, as follows:

- Preliminary list: basic outline of the topic, including its rationale, scope and justification
- First draft: first complete draft of the topic descriptions, using the H2020 template
- Second draft: second complete draft of the topic descriptions, addressing the points raised in the preceding version
- Meeting to agree on the final list of topics: attended by representatives from CG, EC and PO
- Final draft: final version of topic descriptions and call conditions (e.g. additional conditions for participation), to be submitted to the EC for the InterService Consultation process and final adoption by the GB

An overarching principle behind this process is to give all stakeholders a chance to study and understand the scope for a topic and provide input on it before proceeding with its full description. It is also to avoid challenging the scope/rationale of a specific topic at a late stage.

At each step, sufficient time shall be given to select the topics, draft the topics description and for review and comments from stakeholders. These comments then serve as the basis for subsequent versions. Each of these steps is explained in more detail below.

In particular, the SRG and SC are consulted after the first draft is compiled; their comments on this version are provided to the CG, EC and PO and must be addressed together with the second draft, in a separate document by the CG, EC and PO. The group that drafted the topic in the first place is responsible for responding to the comments from the SRG and SC. For both SC and SRG, the CG through its Chairman will propose a meeting with at least the Chair and Vice-Chair of both advisory groups in which the CG is to address the comments on the first draft of the topics originally provided by them. Such a meeting must take place between the time of submission of the comments by SC and SRG and the time of adoption of the AWP by the GB.

In accordance with the Statutes of the Council Regulation², the GB must, in addition, provide feedback to the SRG. To help in this purpose, the CG will provide to the GB both the comments provided by the SRG on the first draft of topics and the answers to those comments. The GB will then be in charge of providing its feedback to the SRG. Such feedback should be provided without “undue delay” as stated in the Council Regulation, but in any case no later than the time of adoption of the AWP for the corresponding year.

In view of ensuring the adoption of the European Commission’s Financing Decision (i.e. the approval of the annual contribution from the EU budget for calls for proposals/calls for tender) in due time, the PO and the EC will take all necessary measures at the time of the initiation of the process for the selection and drafting of topics.

4.2. Process setup

Prior to the start of the process, the PO prepares and circulates a calendar with the planning for the process, including deadlines for submission of various drafts and key dates for meetings/teleconferences. The proposed calendar is sent to the CG and the EC for revision. Comments/suggestions for changes to the calendar should come within 2 weeks of its distribution and discussed, via email or teleconference, until a final calendar is agreed upon. The estimated budget envelope allocated to the corresponding AWP is also communicated to the CG by the PO; if any changes are made to this figure during the process, the PO will communicate them to the CG/EC as soon as these are known.

Once adopted, this calendar is to be shared with the SC and SRG.

4.3. Preliminary list of topics

According to the calendar, a preliminary list of topics should be submitted by the indicated deadline. The TCs through the CG, EC and PO may suggest topics for this purpose. The rationale behind this step is to consider the idea and understand the scope behind each topic so that a preliminary decision can be reached without forcing proposers to fully develop an idea that may be rejected.

For this purpose, a simplified ad hoc template, simply describing the scope and rationale of the proposed action, should be followed. This template is to be distributed by the PO prior to the start of the process (see Annex III). The following elements should be included in each topic proposal:

- Reference to MAWP and Council regulation objectives (see Annex IV)
- References, insofar as possible, to other documents or body of work of strategic value directly related to the FCH 2 JU, such as, but not limited to³:
 - o MAWP annexes
 - o Strategic Reference Document (SRD)⁴
 - o Conclusions from ongoing or previous FCH 2 JU-funded studies or projects
 - o Conclusions from Programme Review Reports
 - o Recommendations from the Regulations Codes and Standards Strategy Coordination Group
 - o EU Energy or Transport policies or initiatives

² Council Regulation N° 559/2014. Annex. Art. 11.5

³ Due to their dynamic nature, specific references are not included in this document.

⁴ The SRD, currently in preparation, identifies priorities to provide an overall roadmap for the FCH JU funding programme

Enough information should be provided so as to accept for further development or rejection; lack of clarity in scope and/or rationale may lead to rejection. At this stage, the emphasis should be on clarity and quality rather than quantity of information.

The CG, EC and PO submit a list of suggested topics using the template provided by the PO, including the main rationales justifying the selection. For the TCs of IG/RG, the CG is in charge of consolidating all inputs from the different TCs. The topics are then distributed to the PO, which in turn distributes it to CG, EC and within the PO. A meeting/telco is held a few days later to discuss the proposed topics and come to a decision on each one, with the following possible outcomes:

- Reject
- Accept for further development

Note that acceptance for further development does not imply in any way that the topic will be included in the final list of topics.

The PO sends minutes of the meeting/telco with decisions made for every proposed topic and next steps. Suggestions to modify these minutes may be proposed for a period of 1 week following the time when they are sent, after which they will be considered adopted officially and used for the next step.

List of deliverables:

- Preliminary list of topics following template
- Consolidated feedback from each stakeholder (one document from each of CG, EC and PO)
- Telco/meeting to discuss feedback
- Minutes of the meeting, following the telco/meeting with decisions and specific next steps

4.4. First draft

For those topics that are accepted for further development, the group who proposed initially the topic(s) will be in charge of providing a full topic description by the agreed upon deadline – failure to do so may be considered grounds to reject topics. For this purpose, the H2020 template⁵ should be used, to be distributed at the start of the process by the PO. If any topics will require additional conditions, the CG should identify said topics.

Topics that were not part of the preliminary list of topics cannot be proposed at this stage, unless there are duly justified circumstances. An example of such a case may be when evaluation results of a previous/ongoing call for proposals indicate that certain topics might not be covered, thus compromising the ability of the programme to achieve its goals. In such a case, topics not covered may be proposed again for consideration by all stakeholders; as starting point, the topic description for discussion shall be the one published in the previous call.

Proposals for indicative budgets for each call list (e.g. RIAs in Transport, RIAs in Energy, IAs in Transport, IAs in Energy, IAs in Overarching, RIAs in Overarching and RIAs and CSAs in Cross-cutting) should also be included. Call lists are groups of topics by pillar and type of action sharing an overall indicative budget for the group.

⁵ From the document: Guidance for the preparation of H2020 Work Programmes, available on the Funding Procedures Guide (GoFund) website of the EC (internal)

The full description of all topics is sent to the PO, which then sends the document to EC, PO staff, CG, SC and SRG for feedback with clear deadlines, as well as to the GB for information. This feedback should be provided to the PO contact point by the given deadline and in consolidated form. In this respect, it must be emphasised that the scope of feedback to be provided by SC and SRG should conform to their roles as stated earlier in this document. This feedback should be consolidated from the respective groups, rather than a compilation of various inputs from their individual members. After receiving this feedback, the PO compiles it and sends it to the CG, EC and within the PO.

A few days after circulating the feedback provided, a meeting/telco is held to discuss the comments, involving the PO, EC and CG. At this telco/meeting, minutes of the meeting from the previous telco/meeting should be addressed. Topics at this point may be rejected or accepted for further development/clarification. Again, acceptance for further development/ clarification does not imply inclusion in the final list of topics.

Following this telco/meeting, the PO sends minutes of the meeting/telco with decisions made for every proposed topic and next steps. Suggestions to modify these minutes may be proposed for a period of 1 week following the time when they are sent, after which they will be considered adopted officially and used for the next step.

List of deliverables:

- First draft of topics with full descriptions, following H2020 template
- Proposals for indicative budgets for each topic and call list
- Identification of topics for which additional conditions for participation are needed
- Consolidated feedback from each stakeholder (one document each from of CG, EC, PO, SC and SRG)
- Telco/meeting to discuss feedback
- Minutes of the meeting, following the telco/meeting with decision and specific next steps

4.5. Second draft

For those topics that are accepted for further work, the group who proposed said topic(s) will be in charge of providing a new version that addresses the comments given by the other actors.

Additionally, answers to comments given on topics from the first version must be provided. These answers should explain if/how the comments were taken into account, in a separate document to be provided to the PO. In the case of answers to comments from the SRG, these will then be forwarded to the GB by the CG Chairman; the GB may then use these answers to formulate its formal reply to the SRG, as stated earlier (see Section 4.1). With respect to the comments from the SC, the answers to these are provided by the CG and will be sent to the SC by the PO.

If any topics require additional conditions for participation, the TCs must provide full justification for their introduction. Failure to do so will imply *de facto* the withdrawal of the request to include such additional conditions.

Revised proposals for indicative budgets for each panel (e.g. RIAs in Transport, RIAs in Energy, IAs in Transport, IAs in Energy, IAs in Overarching, RIAs in Overarching and RIAs and CSAs in Cross-cutting) should also be included.

The full description of all topics is sent to the PO, who then sends the document to the CG, EC and PO staff for feedback with clear deadlines, as well as to the GB for information. Feedback should be

provided to the PO contact point by the given deadline. The PO sends said feedback to the CG, EC and within the PO.

In this last step, the EC should indicate the suitability of the proposed justifications for additional conditions for participation.

List of deliverables:

- Second draft of topics with full descriptions
- Proposals for indicative budgets for each call list
- Separate document addressing comments from previous version
- Justifications for additional conditions for participation in identified topics
- Consolidated feedback from each stakeholder (one document each from of CG, EC and PO)

4.6. Meeting to finalise selection of topics

After comments have been submitted on the second draft, a meeting is held to finalise the selection of topics. The objective of the meeting is to agree on a final list of topics for the specific call for proposals under discussion. The CG, EC and PO are invited to the meeting. For Industry Grouping and Research Grouping all committee leaders and deputy leaders as well as the CG chairman are invited. Meeting dates have to be agreed by all necessary participants.

Topic discussions are held based on the second draft and comments thereof. A decision on next steps for each topic (needed additions to the text or rejection) should be made after discussing each topic. At this stage, lack of clarity on the scope or rationale for a topic shall be considered sufficient grounds to reject it.

Topics that have not been introduced nor discussed previously may not be proposed neither at nor after this meeting. Exceptions are allowed if unanimously agreed.

Call lists indicating how the topics will be grouped per pillar and type of action, as well as their respective indicative budgets (e.g. RIAs in Transport, RIAs in Energy, IAs in Transport, IAs in Energy, IAs in Overarching, RIAs in Overarching and RIAs and CSAs in Cross-cutting) should also be agreed upon.

The PO will circulate minutes of the meeting after the meeting to CG, EC and within the PO, including summary of conclusions for each topic and next steps, including specific timeline until the final version. Suggestions to modify these minutes may be proposed for a period of 1 week following the time when they are sent, after which they will be considered adopted officially and used for the next step.

List of deliverables:

- In person meeting in Brussels to discuss latest versions of topics and feedback thereof
- Final decision on the list of topics, including indicative budgets for each panel
- Minutes of the meeting, following the telco/meeting with specific next steps

4.7. Final draft

Following the meeting, the topics should be modified according to the suggestions made and agreed at the meeting as recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The PO communicates to the CG and EC the timeline for the next submission as part of the minutes of the meeting. As part of the next

submission, the CG must additionally provide an introductory section for the AWP related to the content of the call, providing a strategic outlook and overall rationale for the choice of topics for that specific year.

Additional time should be secured for subsequent revisions and/or teleconferences, as needed. This time shall also be agreed at the same meeting.

Between the meeting and the final draft, several feedback and modification loops may be needed, although these should in principle not affect the topics in any major way, unless there are exceptional circumstances and it is so decided and agreed upon by the CG, EC and PO.

The PO shall communicate the need to abide by the given deadlines, while at the same time CG and EC will also work to ensure that these deadlines are kept.

Once the final draft is obtained, the topics and related call conditions are included in the AWP document and are submitted together with the draft budget to the EC for its internal Inter Service Consultation procedure. Following this procedure, any changes to the AWP text requested by the EC services shall be communicated to CG, EC and within the PO. The final version is then sent by the Executive Director to the GB for adoption.

List of deliverables:

- Final versions of all topics, including indicative budgets for each call list and justifications for additional conditions for participation, if applicable to any topics
- Introduction to the content of the call for Transport, Energy and Cross-Cutting

5. ANNEXES

Annex I. Summary of main roles of all actors at each stage of the process for selecting and drafting topics

	Role	Preliminary list	1 st draft	2 nd draft	Final draft
IG/RG (TCs/CG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve as the primary group in charge of proposing and developing topics, providing proper justification and rationales for them • Represent IG/RG according to the structure of the FCH 2 JU: Transport and Energy pillars and Cross-Cutting Activity Area. • Identify topics for which additional conditions for participation may be necessary and provide justification • Provide feedback to comments given by other actors involved in the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft preliminary list of topics, containing reference to MAWP and Council regulation objectives by agreed upon deadline • Include references, wherever possible, to other suitable documents (SRD, MAWP annexes, results from projects/studies, EU policy initiatives) • Participate in telco/meeting to decide on next steps for each topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide full topic descriptions by the agreed upon deadline • Identify topics for which additional conditions for participation apply • Propose indicative budgets for each call list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide revised full topic descriptions by the agreed upon deadline, addressing recommended changes from the previous version, by the agreed upon deadline • Provide separate document addressing comments from previous version • Provides separate answers to SC and SRG comments • Provide justifications for additional conditions for participation for all topics identified • Propose updated indicative budgets for each call list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise topic descriptions addressing recommended changes from previous version by the agreed upon deadline • Provide separate document addressing comments from previous version • Provide updated justifications for additional conditions for participation for all topics identified • Provide updated indicative budgets for each call list • Provide introductory section for the AWP related to the content of the call, providing a strategic outlook and

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in in-person meeting to finalise selection of topics and decide on next steps for each topic 	<p>overall rationale for the choice of topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in any telcos needed to finalise wording on topics
PO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate the overall process by serving as the main point of contact for all actors. As such, it interfaces with all stakeholders for the transfer of relevant information Propose and enforce the calendar with the specific steps in the planning of the process Provide input into proposed topics during the drafting process, including feedback on the content and format of the topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May suggest topics based on outcome and results of ongoing or past funded projects or studies. In this case, it is also responsible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute the entire preliminary list of topics to CG and EC Provide feedback on draft by the agreed upon deadline Participate in telco/meeting to decide on next steps for each topic Provide minutes of the meeting after telco 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute the consolidated list of topics to CG, EC, SC and SRG Provide feedback on draft by the agreed upon deadline Participate in telco/meeting to decide on next steps for each topic Provide minutes of the meeting after telco 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute the consolidated list of topics to CG and EC Provide feedback on draft by the agreed upon deadline Participate in in-person meeting to finalise selection of topics and decide on next steps for each topic Provide minutes of the meeting, with specific next steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute the consolidated list of topics to CG and EC Provide feedback on topics by the agreed upon deadlines Organise work and schedule telcos, as needed Incorporate final versions of topics into AWP and submit to EC for ISC Make final changes, if needed, to text before sending to GB for approval

	for providing feedback to comments given by other actors.				
EC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide input into proposed topics during the drafting process, including feedback on the content and justification of the topics. In addition, it interfaces directly with the TCs to discuss the appropriateness of the justification for any additional conditions for participation on topics proposed by TCs. • May suggest topics based on EU policy drivers. In this case, it is also responsible for providing feedback to comments given by other actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback on draft by the agreed upon deadline • Participate in telco/meeting to decide on next steps for each topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback on draft by the agreed upon deadline • Participate in telco/meeting to decide on next steps for each topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback on draft by the agreed upon deadline, including on the suitability of additional conditions, if any • Participate in in-person meeting to finalise selection of topics and decide on next steps for each topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback on topics by agreed upon deadlines • Participate in any telcos needed to finalise wording on topics
SC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address whether the proposed topics are in line with scientific priorities, whether the formulations of the proposed topics are able to reach those 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide consolidated feedback on first draft by the agreed upon deadline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive

	scientific priorities and propose modifications or topics where this is not the case				
SRG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address whether the proposed topics are in line with strategic priorities, whether the formulations of the proposed topics are able to reach those strategic priorities and propose modifications where this is not the case • Indicate national priorities, and inform on local initiatives. • Provide an opinion on alignment with H2020 and SME participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide consolidated feedback on first draft by the agreed upon deadline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive
GB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt the AWP, which includes the topics listed under the call for proposals and the budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to formally adopt the AWP • Needs to provide feedback to the SRG on how their comments to the first draft were taken into account

Annex II. Glossary & acronyms

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CG	Coordination Group
CSA	Coordination and Support Action
DG ENER	Directorate-General (of the European Commission) for Energy
DG MOVE	Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport
DG RTD	Directorate-General for Research and Innovation
DG RTD (G2)	Unit G2 at the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
FCH JU	FUEL CELLS and HYDROGEN JOINT UNDERTAKING – predecessor of FCH 2 JU, established under Council Regulation 521/2008
FCH 2 JU	FUEL CELLS and HYDROGEN 2 JOINT UNDERTAKING, established by Council Regulation N° 559/2014
FP7	7 th Framework Programme
GB	Governing Board of the FCH 2 JU
H2020	Horizon 2020
IA	Innovation Action
IG	Industry Grouping
ISC	Inter-Service Consultation
JRC	Joint Research Centre
MAWP	Multi-Annual Work Plan
PO	Programme Office
RIA	Research and Innovation Action
RG	Research Grouping
SC	Scientific Committee
SRD	Strategic Reference Document
SRG	States Representative Group

Annex III. Template for preliminary proposal of topics

PRELIMINARY DESCRIPTION OF TOPICS (max. 1 page)		
Topic Code/Number:	<i>Please provide a reference code or number</i>	
Title: <i>Please provide a title suitable for the proposed topic</i>		
Type of action:	<i>RIA – IA - CSA</i>	Number of projects:
Indicative budget (MEuro):		Expected duration (years):
Specific challenge:		
<i>Please provide a brief but clear explanation of the needs to be tackled. The text should outline the problem in a clear, unambiguous manner, allowing to readily understanding what is at stake. In addition, the text shall provide a clear justification of the reasons of choosing the proposed challenge for the current year, framing the challenge addressed within the FCH 2 JU programme and activities.</i>		
Scope:		
<i>Please provide a brief description of the objective(s) and purpose(s) of the proposed action. The text shall be used to focus, or delineate a perimeter to, the problem stated in the specific challenge.</i>		
Expected impacts:		
<i>Please provide a brief description of the expected impacts as a result of the proposed scope of projects addressing the specific challenge. The text shall provide a clear link between the scope and the expected impacts, and please bear in mind that the statement on expected impact is potentially the most important part of the topic description.</i>		
References:		
Please provide reference to the following documents, when appropriate:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAWP and Council regulation objectives • Strategic Reference Document (SRD) • Conclusions from on-going or previous FCH2 JU-funded studies or projects • Recommendations from the Regulations Codes and Standards Strategy Coordination Group • EU Energy for Transport policies or initiatives 		

Annex IV. FCH 2 JU Strategic and specific objectives

According to Council Regulation N° 559/2014 and the FCH 2 JU MAWP, the strategic objectives of the FCH 2 JU are to:

- i) boost the share of FCH technologies in a sustainable, low-carbon energy and transport system;
- ii) ensure a world leading competitive European FCH industry; and
- iii) secure inclusive growth for Europe's FCH industry, increasing/safeguarding jobs.

Specific objectives are to:

- i) reduce the production costs of fuel cells used in transport applications whilst increasing their lifetime to levels competitive with conventional technologies;
- ii) increase electrical efficiency and durability of the different fuel cells used for power production, whilst reducing costs for power and CHP applications to levels competitive with conventional technologies;
- iii) increase energy efficiency of the production of hydrogen from water electrolysis and renewable sources whilst reducing operational and capital costs so that the combination of the hydrogen and the fuel cell system is competitive with the alternatives available in the marketplace;
- iv) demonstrate on a large scale the feasibility of using hydrogen to support the integration of renewable energy sources into energy systems including through its use as a competitive energy storage medium for electricity produced from renewable energy sources; and
- v) reduce the use of EU defined 'critical raw materials'

Annex V. Illustrative timeline

AWP 2017 Calendar

