

TUESDAY, 30 SEPTEMBER 2014

BRUSSELS

THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, RESEARCH AND ENERGY

HEARING OF CARLOS MOEDAS

COMMISSIONER-DESIGNATE

(Research, Science and Innovation)



2-002

**IN THE CHAIR: JERZY BUZEK***Chair of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy**(The hearing opened at 9.05)*

2-003

**Chair.** > Welcome to all of you, first of all to the Commissioner-designate, Mr Moedas, who on the decision of Jean-Claude Juncker has been given the portfolio for research, science and innovation. The Committee on Industry, Research and Energy is the committee responsible for the EU's research and innovation policy, including science and technology as well as the dissemination and exploitation of research findings. Our priorities are exactly the same as those of Mr Commissioner-designate for the next five years.

Let me welcome all the representatives of European society present in this hall – journalists, NGOs, representatives of small and medium business, innovation, universities, and of course all of you watching our hearing via webstreaming.

In thinking about an exit strategy from the crisis, innovation is one of the most important leverages and we have been trying to push it forward for many years because we in this committee are the authors of a special programme, the biggest research and innovation programme in the world, Horizon 2020. But this is not enough; we always want to bring together all the most important issues in the triangle of knowledge: innovation, research and education.

The guidelines for approval of the Commission state in Annex XVI that we should answer two questions after the hearing. Is the candidate qualified to be a Member of the College? Is he or she qualified to carry out the particular duties assigned?

The Commissioner-designate has 15 minutes at the beginning and the opportunity to make closing remarks at the end. Forty-five questions from MEPs in accordance with the ping-pong principle: question, answer, question, answer. One minute for a question, two minutes for an answer.

I now give the floor to the Commissioner-designate.

2-004

**Carlos Moedas**, *Comissário designado*. > Senhor Presidente, Senhoras e Senhores Deputados, é para mim uma grande honra estar hoje aqui nesta que é a casa da democracia europeia. Muito obrigado pela oportunidade de exprimir aqui as minhas ideias e responder às vossas perguntas.

2-005

I will continue in English. My story is a European story. I was born in a beautiful city in the south of Portugal, where most families went through considerable hardship. It is a region that has since benefited immensely from the work of its citizens but also from the instruments of European solidarity. Growing up, I saw first-hand the vital role Europe played in consolidating our young democracy, as it did for Greece or for Spain. I saw how Portugal was able to seize the many opportunities for growth and social welfare brought by European integration.

My life has been marked by geographic but also upward mobility – that upward mobility that only democracy and the European Union made possible. And I am grateful for that. It has made me the man, the citizen and the politician that I am today.

From my native city I moved to my country's capital, thanks to an educational system that democracy made inclusive and open. My parents had just one life goal, which was to send their children to university, and they did. What they never imagined was that one day one of their children would go from Lisbon to Paris, thanks to one of the most amazing projects of European Integration: the Erasmus Programme. Erasmus was the defining moment of my life and the defining moment of so many in my generation. I was one of the first in my country to benefit from it.

Now let me just say a couple of words in French.

2-006

Je voudrais dire quelques mots en français car la France est aussi un peu mon pays: c'est en France que j'ai fini mes études; c'est aussi en France que j'ai commencé ma carrière professionnelle comme ingénieur; c'est aussi en France que j'ai connu ma femme et c'est aussi en France que je me suis marié, à la mairie du XV<sup>e</sup> arrondissement de Paris.

2-007

Then we moved to the U.S., where I studied and actually gained a totally new perspective of what it actually means to be a European. When you are far from Europe, you are able to see more clearly. You are able to see more clearly the unique European values and the culture that we must preserve for our children.

Then I came from Boston to London, where two out of my three children were born and where I lived for four years in one of the most vibrant and amazing cities in the world. I then returned to Portugal to manage companies, to develop my own business: businesses that created jobs and economic opportunities. In 2011 I was elected as a member of parliament, and soon after appointed as a member of government. There I was able to help Portugal at a time of national and European crisis.

So, honourable Members, my story is a European story. Today, before you, I am seeking your confirmation to open a new chapter, so that I can serve and give back to Europe what Europe has given me over the years. I am committed to working with you for the sound and steady progress of the European Project.

As you know, President-elect Jean-Claude Juncker assigned me to the area of research, science and innovation. I take this challenge with enthusiasm and confidence, since I am fully aware that to realise President-elect Juncker's political agenda and to restore sustainable growth, competitiveness and employment in Europe, we need solid foundations of innovation and excellence in science and research.

If confirmed, I will set three priorities. My first priority is to advance with the creation of the framework conditions that enable the full potential of European research, science and innovation. We could achieve so much more if we had fewer barriers to research and innovation, if we had a growing capacity to attract global talent, if we had a rising tide for all Member States to progress and advance, thus increasing opportunities for sharing the very essence of innovation.

To improve framework conditions, we must finalise the European Research Area and accelerate the actions of the Innovation Union. We need to improve policy coordination, namely through better monitoring and the European Semester. We need to explore synergies with the European Structural and Investment Funds at national and regional level, strategies across all Member States to strengthen research capacities and innovation. I will also be particularly vigilant on the gender dimension – not just because this is a question of fairness, but because we cannot afford to waste any talent.

My second priority would be delivering on Horizon 2020. We are today sitting here because we are privileged from the increased resources in this area, which are notably due to the wisdom of this Parliament. We now need to ensure that the 80 billion Horizon 2020 programme is implemented in the most effective and efficient way. At the same time, we must pursue the simplification agenda where we have been able to achieve so much already, thanks to the determination of Commissioner Geoghegan-Quinn and to the support of Parliament. This will allow us, in particular, to attract more newcomers to research and science.

To deliver on Horizon 2020's goals, we need to pay special attention to tackling the societal challenges faced by our citizens: implementing the Innovation Investment Package, developing innovative financial instruments (including for SMEs), and focusing on energy efficiency and competitive low-carbon energy, especially on renewables. In this context, I want to fully acknowledge the important contribution that Social Sciences and Humanities can make. I know that these are also priorities for the European Parliament and crucial for delivering on President-elect Juncker's main priority of boosting jobs, growth and investment.

My third priority will be to defend the value of excellence in science and research. The foundations for Europe's global standing and potential in research, science and innovation rests on the creative freedom of its scientists and researchers, specially those engaged in frontier research projects. Fundamental research for me is the stream that actually leads into the rivers of technology and innovation. And it is for this reason that I am such a strong supporter of the European Research Council. Furthermore, it will allow us to build a new generation of young, talented and dynamic scientists and researchers.

In delivering these three priorities, it is essential that we step up our engagement with the rest of the world by fostering science diplomacy and international cooperation.

Mr Chairman, honourable Members, I look forward to your questions today and, if confirmed as a Member of the Commission, to an excellent cooperation in the coming years.

In my time in national government, I worked every day, every hour, every second to eliminate barriers, to simplify procedures and to create new opportunities for people. If confirmed as Member of the Commission, I will keep the same focus and the same drive, as I deeply believe in the power of research, science and innovation.

My focus will be: delivery, delivery and delivery. In my European story and in my political experience, I worked across institutions and sectors. I helped breaking artificial silos and worked towards the reforms that Europe desperately needs.

If confirmed, I stand ready to place all my energy and all my skills at the service of research, science and innovation as the bedrock of sustainable growth in Europe and for all European citizens.

2-008

**Christian Ehler**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr Moedas, good morning and welcome to Parliament. My first question would be: according to the recent EP study 'The cost of non-Europe', completing the European research area would lead to an efficiency gain of between EUR 9 and 11

billion per year. The European research area is meant to be up and running by the end of the year. However, it is still from being complete. From your perspective, what are the main obstacles in achieving this goal, and what are your priorities in tackling them? What can be done at EU level, and what needs to be done at Member State level alone?

2-009

**Carlos Moedas**, *Commissioner-designate*. > I stated – and I deeply believe – that the European research area is crucial for Europe, not only because it is a research, science and innovation project but because it is important for the whole European project. The European research area, as you know, represents the way to lower the barriers to actually get better cooperation and a better flow of information.

But going straight to your question, most of the tools at European level are already there. What we are missing now is how can you actually do it with the Member States, and make them implement those tools. I would stress three things that, I think, are the bottlenecks, or part of the bottlenecks, that we have to go through.

The first one is that we need better alignment of the national research agendas. Why is that? Because we need to try to tackle duplication and fragmentation. So we have to do it.

Second, there is an important point about the lack of transparency that still exists, in some cases, in recruitment in universities and research centres across Europe. That has to be tackled.

Third, we need to continue the gender dimension and to fight the gender imbalance which is unfair in Europe. So, by mid-2015, the Member States have committed to producing a road map, and, if I am confirmed in post, I will be ferocious about making sure that this road map is implemented.

2-010

**Carlos Zorrinho**, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Queria começar por cumprimentar o Sr. Comissário indigitado. Na sua intervenção inicial, demonstrou um total alinhamento com o programa de Jean-Claude Juncker. Esse programa, como sabe, faz parte do compromisso de mobilizar 300 mil milhões de euros para a inovação limpa, para os novos modelos energéticos, para a reindustrialização da Europa.

Mas surpreendentemente, ao mesmo tempo, o Conselho Europeu quer reduzir o financiamento do programa Horizonte 2020, que é determinante para o crescimento e o emprego e até para dar credibilidade à aposta de Juncker.

Neste caso queria colocar-lhe três questões.

Como pensa, Sr. Comissário indigitado, convencer o Conselho, não apenas a não cortar, mas a reforçar o financiamento do Horizonte 2020?

Que percentagem do plano Juncker pensa que pode capturar para a investigação, para a ciência e para a inovação?

E, finalmente, qual a sua estratégia para ligar o Horizonte 2020 ao Programa de Crescimento Verde e Azul de que a Europa necessita?

2-011

**Carlos Moedas**, *Comissário designado*. > Senhor Deputado, muito obrigado pela sua pergunta e muito obrigado por aproveitar esta ocasião para falar em português e também saudá-lo pessoalmente.

Como sabe, o Sr. Presidente eleito Jean-Claude Juncker referiu-se aos 300 mil milhões como esse projeto que vai ser liderado pelo, se confirmado, Vice-Presidente Katainen. E eu penso que é um pacote extremamente importante para o futuro. E esse pacote, a minha função, se confirmado nesta função, é exatamente essa. É tentar ser aquele que vai mostrar que a inovação, a ciência e a investigação são uma peça fundamental para o futuro do crescimento. E porquê? Se nós repararmos, entre 1995 e 2007, 62 % do crescimento na Europa foi derivado exatamente de inovação. Ou seja, este *portfolio* tem um ponto fundamental nesse novo pacote dos 300 mil milhões de euros, e eu estarei lá para o defender.

Gostava também de lhe referir que nós, quando olhamos para o futuro, temos que olhar para o futuro e tentar perceber, como europeus, realmente a importância deste ponto. E o Sr. Deputado que, desde há muitos anos, conheço, e sei que muitas vezes o escreveu, o Sr. Deputado, sobre a importância da inovação, já desde 2010, 2009 que vou lendo aquilo que escreveu em Portugal. E essa importância, essa mensagem que o Sr. Deputado começou a passar em Portugal, há muitos anos atrás, essa mensagem também será a minha para o futuro.

2-012

**Hans-Olaf Henkel**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr Moedas, you have outlined a couple of priorities, which I think are all correct, but I am missing one. Even if we did everything that we are planning to do in Europe, it would only cover about 6% of the total expenses in research and development. Ninety-four per cent are being done by the countries. I wonder what you are doing to ensure that the countries at last spend the amount of money for research and development which they have been promising for a long time. Only a few European countries do that – like Switzerland,



Sweden and Finland, and so on. So here is my precise question: do you not think that you need an additional priority – trying to convince the national governments to do what they promised?

2-013

**Carlos Moedas**, *Commissioner-designate*. > Mr Henkel, I think that you raised a very important point which is at the heart of this portfolio, namely: how can we work with the Member States? How can we actually pass on the message of the crucial importance of research, science and innovation?

I was just referring to this staggering statistic: from 1995 to 2007, 62% of Europe's growth was due to research, science and innovation. So when we look at the programme that we have in this portfolio Horizon 2020, we have to try to find ways of leveraging one between other programmes, such as the Structural Funds that have around EUR 100 billion in funding for innovation across the board.

We have to find ways of aligning the agendas at the level of the countries. We have projects on infrastructure that should be used across the Union as a resource. If there is a case for a policy that should be carried out at European level, then it is research, science and innovation policy. The Member States have their role to play, but our role is our ability to try and our ability to go to those countries and explain to them how important it is. That is why I contend that the role of this portfolio should be even higher and even stronger at the European Semester. That is something that is already there, but we have to be there to do more.

2-014

**Fredrick Federley**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Thank you for your presentation, Commissioner-designate Moedas. My question concerns one of the key challenges we face in Europe today – antimicrobial resistance. This is a growing problem with potentially disastrous consequences throughout Europe and throughout the world where the current system is not delivering. Not only is the excessive use of antibiotics for human health and in agriculture driving up the resistance level, but no new classes of antibiotics have been discovered since 1987.

My first question is: as the person responsible for one of the largest research programmes in the world, would you propose new innovation models to simulate research in areas where the current system is not delivering results, such as in antibiotics? Secondly, how would you ensure that you and your fellow Commissioners – for agriculture and for health – do not undermine each other so that antibiotics will be effective and also available for future generations?

2-015

**Carlos Moedas**, *Commissioner-designate*. > Horizon 2020 is actually, when you look at it, organised as challenges, as you know. When we look at the major priorities, we are looking at health. Basically, in Horizon 2020 the line that we have in terms of health, demographics and well-being, is about EUR 7.4 billion. The problem – and going directly to your question – I am aware of this growing problem, as a citizen and as a person, and we need urgent action.



We have to think in ways that for the future enable us to establish a real framework of correspondence between commitments and payments. We have to establish that for the future because, as it is, the situation is not sustainable. So I will be here but, as the humble person that I am, I am telling you that I need the help of this House, and I am counting on the help of everybody to tackle this.

You also mentioned something that is also very important, which is basically how to get more private investment but maintain the public one. I am here to defend public investment. I believe in public investment in research, science and innovation. So, of course, when you look at the numbers, what is missing to achieve the target of 3% is more on the private side, but the public side is essential and I will be there to fight for it.

2-018

**Ernest Maragall**, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor Moedas, le doy dos datos que tienen que ver con la relación entre investigación e innovación: uno, la baja tasa de conversión de la una en la otra, mucho menor en Europa que en los Estados Unidos o en los países emergentes; y, dos, la asimetría regional europea, estructural y seguramente relacionada con el esfuerzo histórico acumulado en I+D+i de cada país.

Limitarse a financiar la excelencia científica en esas condiciones no es suficiente. Esto supone muchas veces atraer a los actores que ya acceden a dichos fondos. ¿Cómo lograremos, pues, que las regiones menos favorecidas tengan también acceso a los fondos y puedan destinarlos a superar su desfase tecnológico? ¿Cómo aseguraremos la sinergia entre Horizonte 2020 y los programas de desarrollo regional? Y, en relación a las pymes, ¿cómo vamos a pasar de las buenas intenciones de siempre a la concreción de políticas cuantificables?

Aún más, ¿le parecería una propuesta interesante la que defiende la exclusión del esfuerzo en I+D+i del cómputo de la estabilidad fiscal? Esto sí sería —creo yo— un buen refuerzo para esa política.

Espero que su cultura económica, de origen financiero, no le lleve a confundir innovación con especulación, ni retorno productivo con beneficios empresariales.

2-020

**Carlos Moedas**, *Comisario propuesto*. > Buenos días. Yo diría que su pregunta toca una cuestión importante a la que he hecho referencia en mis palabras iniciales. Y lo he hecho porque conozco y tengo conciencia del problema que el señor diputado nos trae aquí: no podemos dejar que en Europa ningún Estado quede rezagado.

La ciencia, la innovación y la investigación deben tener en su centro la excelencia; pero hemos de traer al grupo de los países que cuentan con ella a aquellos que aún no pertenecen a dicho grupo. Y ello es obvio porque, efectivamente —lo sabemos en economía—, cuando no es así, unos son cada vez más ricos y otros cada vez más pobres.

Hay dos puntos: uno, el trabajo excelente llevado a cabo en este comité en el pasado para integrar en el programa Horizonte 2020 una línea específica que permita acceder a esta escalera de la ciencia. Y una parte de este programa, como el señor diputado sabe, se dedica a reunir centros o universidades de dos países, lo que llaman en inglés el *teaming* o el *twining* o incluso las cátedras de la *European Research Area* —perdón por los anglicismos—.

Pero yo pienso que tenemos que ir más lejos: pensar cómo podemos encontrar aquí alguien que tenga la fuerza, la energía de trabajar con el futuro colega de la parte de los fondos estructurales para que no quede todo, como decía el señor diputado, en meras palabras, sino que se materialice.

Para eso estoy aquí y pondré en ello toda mi energía.

2-021

**Dario Tamburrano**, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Commissario Moedas, la sua lettera di mandato la chiede di promuovere l'eccellenza internazionale della ricerca europea e di rafforzare la capacità di innovazione. I due termini sono molto affascinanti. Vediamo però come sono definiti dalla stessa Unione europea nel saggio *Indicators of Research Excellence*: "L'eccellenza è basata sulle passate pubblicazioni e sui laboratori di cui dispone il ricercatore per svolgere il suo lavoro. L'innovazione riguarda il coinvolgimento in un contesto di rilevanza economica e sociale e bada all'impatto che la ricerca avrà sulla società". In altre parole, l'eccellenza è quella che porta all'immissione sul mercato di nuovi prodotti, con lo scopo teorico di migliorare la qualità di vita dei cittadini. Tuttavia, una ricerca che metta in condizione di non ammalarci è più utile di quella che ci fornisce un nuovo farmaco. Per le imprese produrre una nuova medicina è redditizio, non lo è che i cittadini non si ammalino affatto.

Come si colloca di fronte a questo bivio tra etica e mercato?

2-022

**Carlos Moedas**, *Commissioner-designate*. > You touched upon a major point in European economics as a whole. For too long, politicians, governments and economists used to look at input indicators and not at output indicators. What is important in innovation is to be able to look at the output of innovation. It is not about how much I put in – although, of course, that is important and is an indicator – but rather about what I get from innovation.

So far, there is an output indicator that has been developed which is a composite of different elements. There is no way, in innovation, to tackle the output of innovation with a single element: you have to have a blend of different things, from patents to different points in relation to the added value in the economy.

For me, the important thing is to look more into the future to new indicators of output. Without that, we cannot make it into the future because the future is about the result and not the input. There is still work to do here, and I will be vigilant on that work. If I am confirmed in post, I will be here for you in the future to ask me where those output indicators are and what they mean, and we will dig into the detail because digging into the detail is always important.

2-024

**Antonio Tajani (PPE).** – Signor Commissario, non c'è competitività industriale se non c'è innovazione. Lei, nel corso del suo intervento iniziale, ha detto, in maniera molto chiara, che intende difendere la cultura europea, anche in questo settore. E, visto che parliamo di cultura europea, mi pare che faccia parte, proprio del nostro *savoir faire*, del nostro DNA, l'innovazione non tecnologica. Penso al *design*, alla commercializzazione, alle tante idee che fioriscono in tutto il mondo europeo. La Commissione europea in passato ha preparato documenti e studi per sostenere il *design*, grazie a gruppi di lavoro. La questione di come la ricerca potrebbe contribuire a progetti di innovazione non tecnologica diventa quindi centrale.

La domanda che le pongo è: che cosa intende fare per mettere l'innovazione non tecnologica al centro delle azioni della prossima Commissione?

2-025

**Carlos Moedas, commissaire désigné.** > Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Tajani, on se connaît bien en parlant français; donc, si vous le permettez, comme je ne parle pas italien, je vous parlerai en français.

Je pense que c'est exactement le point que nous devons améliorer en Europe. Parfois – d'autres l'ont déjà dit –, l'Europe est très habile à transformer des euros, de l'argent, en connaissances, mais par la suite, on réussit moins bien à transformer cette connaissance en argent, en euros, en profit. Ce circuit est très important parce que, pour avoir la capacité de continuer dans la recherche fondamentale, nous avons besoin de créer des richesses.

Je pense que la fonction d'un homme politique qui, s'il est confirmé, fera face à un portefeuille comme celui-ci, est effectivement d'avoir la capacité de donner une nouvelle vision de l'innovation. Et l'innovation n'est pas que technologique. L'innovation, comme vous le dites, Monsieur le Député, va

bien au-delà de tout cela. Cela peut être l'innovation des processus dans une entreprise, cela peut être l'innovation de mon business plan, que je fais comme chef d'entreprise, cela peut être le design... Tout cela est complémentaire de la technologie. Si nous avons, dans les prochaines années, cette capacité d'inculquer cette nouvelle vision, nous ferons vraiment le saut vers ce qui est important.

L'OCDE, il n'y a pas si longtemps, peut-être deux ou trois ans, avait fait une étude dont résultait une donnée très intéressante: même dans les entreprises technologiques, 51 % de l'innovation que ces entreprises faisaient n'était pas technologique.

*(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)*

2-026

**Krystyna Łybacka (S&D).** – Panie Przewodniczycy! Mam do naszego gościa trzy pytania i wszystkie wynikają z faktu, że zgodnie z decyzją pana przewodniczącego Junckera Państwa składowa nadzorcza i kierownictwo czworo wiceprzewodniczących Komisji. W związku z tym pytanie pierwsze: jak wyobraża Pan sobie tę współpracę? Pytanie drugie: czy jest taka potrzeba, aby Pan wystarczał co do determinacji w obronie swojego portfolio? Po trzecie, w tej sytuacji takiej koniecznej współpracy horyzontalnej: jak możemy Panu zagwarantować, że wypełni zło one dzisiaj zobowiązania?

2-027

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > I will start by saying that one of the unique things about this new College of Commissioners is that Mr Juncker was able to create an innovative model. So, innovation has happened here, as elsewhere, with a different model for working. For this model to work we have to work in a team. So I will be there as a team player, to work with four Vice-Presidents and specifically with the Vice-President for the budget and the first Vice-President on questions of better regulation. This is about teamwork.

However, in my mandate letter it specifically said that I will be the one in the College dealing with matters of innovation and actually cheerleading around innovation as something that is for all portfolios and is all over the College. So I will give you my personal guarantee that I will do that. I am coming from three years of working in a government where my job involved precisely that – the ability, without any formal power, to influence across the board in a horizontal way. So I will be working with everybody in the College, making sure that every time we talk we have examples of innovation, and that innovation will be at the top of the agenda. I will be the torchbearer for research, science and innovation. You can be sure that I will be there doing that.

2-028

**Marek Józef Gróbarczyk (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczycy! Podstawą do funkcjonowania badań, przemysłu i innowacji jest dobrze funkcjonująca gospodarka, przede wszystkim przemysł. Brak tego przemysłu powoduje, że rzecz staje się bezprzedmiotowa. Ostatni raport komisyjny jednoznacznie wskazuje, że pieniądze są wydawane lub w ogóle nie są wydawane ze względu na to, że cz. Europy, m.in. Państwa, jak i mój kraj, nie ma odpowiedniego potencjału na to, aby rozwijała się

innowacyjn gospodark z powodu deindustrializacji. Jaka jest Pana ocena biej sytuacji pod k tem wla nie deindustrializacji Europy i jak Pan jako komisarz widzi swoj rol z zmianie takiego stanu rzeczy?

2-029

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > The way I look at industry and the look I have for the future of industry, because research, science and innovation is about looking at what the future will be. And no one knows the future.

When I look at projects like Industry 4.0, I think that is the way to look at it. When you look today at examples like 3D printing, you can explain to people that 3D printing is not just about printing, it is about tailor-made printing and getting back production into our countries through a different level of distribution; it is about being able to actually have your own eyewear to your own size immediately; it is about tailor-making. That will change totally the way industry will work in the future. So projects like Industry 4.0 and others will be at the top of my agenda, because they are the ones that will make Europe a continent that will be able to compete in a world that we do not know yet exactly what it will be.

2-030

**Angelika Mlinar (ALDE).** – Thank you, Commissioner-designate, for your very personal introductory words and your very strong gender perspective. Firstly, how do you plan to strengthen knowledge transfer between science and research institutions on the one hand and SMEs on the other? Secondly, research cooperation between EU Member States has largely been voluntary, to date, and coordination has been promoted by a non-binding open method of coordination. Do you see the WTO as an effective forum for promoting mutual learning and better coordination, or do you see a need for more central coordination? And, thirdly, from a more political and very Austrian perspective, since the Austrian public is very critical of GMOs, how do you see the future of GMOs in Europe?

2-031

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > First of all, I think that the crucial role of the Commission in terms of how you move science to SMEs is actually a very strong part of Horizon 2020. Today, when you look at Horizon 2020 and you see that – with the help of this Parliament if I am well informed on that point – 20% of both the line for societal challenges and the line for leadership and industry technologies are for SMEs. You are basically talking about EUR 8.6 billion. There is a very strong focus on SMEs, so this is definitely one thing that will be on the agenda in the future.

I would like to respond briefly to the question that you posed on GMOs. I think that we have to be clear. We have to look at the challenges of the future. We have to look at research into those challenges – and here we are talking about biosafety of GMOs and other things, so research is definitely important. However all of the ethical, economic and other principles set out in Horizon 2020 should be followed to the letter. President-elect Juncker said something different: he plans to

actually react in the authorisation procedure, which is a different part. So on the GMOs, everything stays as it is and should be in the Horizon 2020.

2-032

**Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Presidente, Sr. Moedas, ainda ontem à noite aqui ouvimos nesta sala o candidato a Comissário alemão fazer a sua apresentação em alemão. Hoje não tivemos a oportunidade de ouvir o candidato a Comissário português a fazer a apresentação em português. Isto é mais do que simbólico. Eu acho que é bastante revelador da tão apregoada igualdade dos Estados-Membros e do estado em que está a nossa União Europeia.

Mas eu queria dirigir-lhe uma pergunta muito concreta. Nas respostas que dirigi às perguntas que lhe fizemos, a resposta por escrito que fez, relativamente às qualificações e experiência para exercer o cargo para o qual está indigitado, deu destaque principal ao facto de ter sido o responsável do governo português por monitorizar o programa de ajustamento da troica.

Sinceramente, não me parece que isso seja um bom cartão-de-visita, até porque o que se espera de si como Comissário está nos antípodas do que se fez em Portugal no programa de ajustamento da troica, onde se asfixiou o sistema de investigação, onde se forçou investigadores a abandonar a ciência ou a abandonar o país porque não tinham opções.

Portanto, em que é que isso o qualifica? Sinceramente, não percebo, porque a sua função não é fazer um ajustamento no Horizonte 2020.

2-033

**Carlos Moedas, Comissário designado.** > Senhora Deputada, muito obrigado por me dar a oportunidade de falar em português nesta resposta. E gostaria de lhe referir, Sra. Deputada, que eu estive durante três anos a ajudar num programa de ajustamento que foi muito difícil. Foram sacrifícios enormes para toda a população. E esses sacrifícios eu conheço-os bem, porque os conheço ao nível familiar, ao nível dos meus amigos. E a Sra. Deputada também. E eu sempre reconheci a dureza e o sacrifício que esse programa foi.

Mas Portugal estava num momento em que precisava de dar a volta à sua credibilidade e precisava de conseguir mostrar àqueles que nos emprestaram dinheiro que éramos um país credível. E eu, aquilo que eu refiro na minha carta é que eu tive a capacidade, como uma pessoa que geria em diferentes perspetivas, em diferentes ministérios, a capacidade de concretizar. Eu sou uma pessoa que apresenta resultados. E eu penso que, no Horizonte 2020, especificamente, é importante ter um Comissário que seja uma pessoa focalizada nos resultados.



Agora a verdade é que eu, hoje, quando olho para trás – e disse-o muitas vezes, eu muitas vezes estive em desacordo com a troica, muitas vezes estive em desacordo com a troica – e quando olho, por exemplo, para o relatório que foi escrito neste Parlamento, eu estou de acordo com muitos pontos que aí estão. Mas é muito mais fácil olhar para aquilo que fazemos na vida depois do que antes, e é fácil ver que, é verdade, e o Sr. Juncker também já o disse, que a Europa está preparada para, se um dia tiver que voltar a fazer estes programas, os fazer na Europa, só com a Europa, e que estes programas tenham maior escrutínio democrático.

2-034

**Peter Eriksson (Verts/ALE).** – Jag tänkte också försöka prata mitt modersmål, och det är svenska. Jag tänkte ställa en fråga om mindre och medelstora företag. Ofta är det de mindre företagen som är de mest innovativa i näringslivet. Ofta är det ju tyvärr också så att forskningsprogrammen är skräddarsydda mer för stora företag.

Nu har vi avsatt särskilda pengar för mindre och medelstora företag, men väldigt många av de entreprenörer och forskare som jag känner upplever fortfarande att det är svårt att få tillgång och att det tar för mycket tid och resurser och kostar för mycket att delta i europeiska projekt när det gäller forskning. Hur vill du arbeta för att förenkla och öka tillgången till forskningen för de små och medelstora företagen?

2-035

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > The point of simplification –and I said it here – was a huge advance in Horizon 2020. You can see that in the work of the Parliament and in the report written by Ms Carvalho. The importance of simplification in Horizon 2020 is crucial.

When you look at those innovations and simplifications today, you can see that now you have just two funding rates – one of 100% for research and another of 70% for innovation actions – and you have a 25% flat rate when you actually want to reimburse your indirect costs. You have the fast track to innovation here. Mr Ehler was one person who was very much in favour, who helped and who was the torchbearer here. So we already have a lot of simplification that was – and is – embedded in Horizon 2020.

The same thing is true with regard to the new SME instrument, where actually we again have a number of simplifications to make it possible for small and medium enterprises to use them in a better way. With the SME instrument, you can immediately present your project. We immediately have the ability to give EUR 50 000 to start with the idea, and then it goes on. A lot was done, and I agree with you, but we have to take stock in the future of how it is working and then see what other simplifications we need, because simplification is an ongoing process.

2-036

**Roger Helmer (EFDD).** – Commissioner-designate, in my party we are very concerned about excessively high energy prices in Europe, which we consider to be the result of an over-commitment to very expensive and unaffordable renewables. I wonder whether you would agree with us that it would be far better to spend millions on research and development in order to develop cost-effective renewables rather than to invest billions in the roll-out of renewables that are unaffordable and will very soon become obsolete. And if you agree with this proposition, can I ask you what steps you would take in the course of your work to make sure that that happened?

2-037

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > In terms of energy, I think that is one of the biggest challenges for the future, and one of the biggest challenges where research, science and innovation have a role. Because we have to look at what we want for the future, and I think that we all agree that the overriding objective of Europe is a resource-efficient, low-carbon economy, and we all agree that we have set three major targets in terms of Europe 2020: 20% of reduction in greenhouse emissions, 20% of renewables as a source for consumers, and 20% increase in efficiency. So those targets will be – and, as you know, are about to be – set for 2030. Of course, the numbers are not yet the ones, but we are talking about increasing those.

And so, the role that we will have in terms of looking and adding more research on renewables is extremely important – but we have to be clear. We have to look at renewables as something that is part of our future. We can get renewables cheaper, of course, if we have more research, and we will work on that. But when I look at the fact that, with the help of this Parliament, we were able to achieve that 85% of the challenge in energy will be about non-fossil, we are talking about renewables, we are talking about efficiency, we are talking about storage. So I agree with your point that we have to get better, but the solution for getting better in life is to do more research.

2-038

**Barbara Kudrycka (PPE).** – For numerous causes, including the historical ones, there are different areas of research and innovation between the countries that are clearly noticeable and this is thoroughly indicated by the statistics of participation in the framework programme. During the negotiations on Horizon 2020 lots of focus was put on this area. At the end mechanisms were introduced that were supposed to increase the participation of less-developed new needs with good scientific potential, of course with the application of scientific excellence as their main criterion.

What are your plans for the less scientifically developed countries with scientific potential, in order to provide for higher participation in research projects in Horizon 2020?

2-039

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > This divide that we have today is unsustainable. We have to create ways of actually being able to tackle that divide, between the ones that are already high performance and the ones that are low performers. I think that the role of the Parliament here has been very important in Horizon 2020, with the inserting of a new line specific to widening and spreading

excellence, and when I look today at projects of teaming and twinning or the Euro research area, I think that these are very important.

What is missing and what I think – if confirmed – will be my role, is to be able to find ways with the structural funds, but to find ways not just by means of coming here and talking, but by finding ways of working together. We have in the structural and investment funds around EUR 100 billion that are for the area of innovation, so to get onto the stairway to excellence, if we could work together, if the processes were easier, and if someone wants to actually get into a process that needs to have Horizon 2020 and the Structural Funds, we could break that cycle. And breaking those vertical connections in politics and in government is always very difficult because people normally do not want that.

So you cannot think that, because the Commissioners are talking between themselves, it will work. It has to be work around and behind the line in all the services, etc. So we have to be disciplined and we have to have a plan and I hope that I can come here to tell you about it.

2-040

**Barbara Kappel (NI).** – Designierter Kommissar Moedas, Sie haben in Beantwortung des Fragenkatalogs des Europäischen Parlaments sinngemäß gesagt, dass Forschung, Wissenschaft und Innovation die wesentlichen Treiber für eine nachhaltige und dynamische Wirtschaft in Europa sind. Eine Wirtschaft, die auf Wissen und Kreativität basiert und nicht auf Schulden und stagnierenden Geschäftsmodellen. Ich teile diese Überzeugung und möchte deshalb Ihr Augenmerk auf die industriellen Schlüsseltechnologien in Europa lenken.

Die Entwicklung und Markteinführung industrieller Schlüsseltechnologien ist wesentlich für die Erreichung der Europa-2020-Ziele, für Horizont 2020, für die Innovationsunion und für den Aktionsplan zur Reindustrialisierung Europas mit einer Industriequote von 20 % des BIP. 23 % der weltweiten Exporte Europas sind auf Basis von Schlüsseltechnologien hergestellte Produkte. 100 Milliarden Euro sind für das nächste Jahr an Marktvolumen geplant. Deshalb meine Fragen:

Erstens: Welche Schritte werden Sie setzen um sicherzustellen, dass Europa die weltweite Nummer 1 im Bereich der Schlüsseltechnologien wird?

Zweitens: Wie werden Sie sicherstellen, dass Schlüsseltechnologien dazu beitragen, die gesellschaftlichen Herausforderungen, welche im Rahmen von Horizont 2020 definiert wurden, zu bewältigen?

2-041

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > As you know, under the pillar of industrial leadership we have EUR 13.5 billion dedicated to leadership and enabling industrial technologies. Within these fields, six priorities were established in terms of these key enabling technologies. We are talking about the future. We are talking about priorities that will be definitely the future as we will know it, because we do not know it yet.

We are talking about everything from nanoelectronics and photonics to biotech and advanced materials which will be the materials of the future. You see that one of the grant recipients of the European Research Council has received the Noble Prize for graphene, which is something that will eventually change the way we think about the world in terms of material. My plan is to look at the high-level expert group that has given advice, to try to implement that advice and look in particular at ways related to creating pilot lines, and to look at ways of combining funds with the structural funds and reinforcing all these matters.

2-042

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D).** – Gerbiamas paskirtasis Komisare, Lisabonos strategija dar 2000 metais nustatė tikslą pasiekti 3 procent BVP investicijas mokslinius tyrimus iki 2010 metų. Kaip žinia, šis tikslas nebuvo pasiektas. Šiuo metu Europos Sąjungos investicijų vidurkis mokslinius tyrimus ir inovacijas sudaro apie 2 procentus. Tai reiškia, jog dar mažiausiai penkerius metus Europos Sąjungos konkurencingumas šioje srityje ir toliau mažės. Nesame garantuoti, kad iki 2020 metų bus pasiektas šis tikslas, todėl klausiu, kokius konkrečius pasiūlymus Jūs numatote pateikti, kad Europos Sąjungos ambicijos tapti konkurencingiausia ir patraukliausia mokslinių tyrimų erdve pasaulyje virstų konkrečiais rezultatais? Antras klausimas: labai dažnai cituojate išrinktą Pirmininką J.-C. Junkerį, ar Jūs neatrodo, kad Jūsų portfelis vis dėlto reikalauja žymiai didesnės...

(Pirmininkas nutraukė kalbą )

2-043

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > In terms of the target of 3% in research and development for the future, if you look at the target, which is an important target – and we have to maintain it and we will maintain it – that target is divided in between 1%, so as to get to the target of 1% in public investment and 2% in private investment. And what do we see in the world today? We see that Europe is spending around 2.1%, that the United States is around 2.7%, Japan is around 3% and South Korea is about 3.4%. So this is a dynamic world that these positions are changing all the time, and we have to catch up and make sure that we will get there before the others.

And for that, we will have really to focus on our capacity of going from the frontier research to the applied research and to the innovation and so I would. One of the major points is, as you know, not a problem of public investment, because what is lacking here is the private side. So in my 3% with 1% public, I would say that is OK, but the 2% private is not yet there. How do you get more private

investment? For that you have PPPs, like joint technology initiatives, where you have private money getting into the system, and that is extremely important. So we have to find ways of leverage and to incentivise the private sector investing more in research and development.

2-044

**Philippe De Backer (ALDE).** – One issue that comes up time and time again in recommendations of the specialised literature on innovation policy is the establishment of competence centres, sharing knowledge and making sure that this knowledge is being translated directly into the markets and into new products. I think it is especially important for SMEs.

My question to you is the following. Do you see much more room than maybe today or in the past for these competence centres to be established for collaboration between the private sector and the public sector, to make sure that this innovation is being translated into the market? Where do you see this room, in which sectors and under which funding lines?

Another question, of course, is also one that always comes up, namely the fact that within the European contracts that are being made between research centres and private entities, like, for example, in IMI or other initiatives there is a discussion about IP-sharing. How do you see the future of this? How do you make sure that the intellectual property which comes out of these projects is shared equally between the public and the private side and that benefits can be reaped for the European economy?

2-045

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > I will start with the last part of your question. There was a Portuguese man called Diogo Vasconcelos, who passed away, who used to say that we are what we share, and I think that the future of science is about sharing. We all know that, but we are probably not fully doing it yet. In terms of sharing, we must of course take a balanced view but we have to keep on the track of sharing information. That is extremely important, as of course is trying to protect intellectual property rights.

With regard to your point concerning SMEs, it is extremely important that we find every way – be it competence centres or otherwise – to be able to make the industry and the public work together. It looks easy, but sometimes we do not find the right incentives, so in Horizon 2020 I will make sure to be vigilant about that.

2-046

**Evžen Tošenovský (ECR).** – Možná naváží na tu předcházející otázku. Evropský parlament se ke konci svého mandátu vyjadřoval ke specializovaným společným podnikům v rámci partnerství veřejného a soukromého sektoru pod programem Horizont 2020.

Jak je podle vás tento model financování výzkumu a vývoje úspěšný nebo jak se osvědčuje a jak považujete za účelné zakládat specializované společné podniky i pro další oblasti výzkumu a vývoje? Víme, že jedním společným podnikem je velký projekt Galileo, začal jako PPP (public-private partnership) projekt a pak se musel změnit a já jsem přesvědčen, že zase se bude muset vrátit k tomuto spolufinancování i ze soukromého sektoru. Jaký je váš názor?

2-047

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > As I said, I believe in the model of private and public, because it gives the right incentives for the private. I think that when you look at the so-called innovation investment package that was approved not long ago, what you see is that you have a 22 billion package for investment in innovation where 10 billion come from the private sector. In those projects that I have been along these two weeks learning about, you see very important projects for the future, like Innovative Medicines 2, which is a programme that is targeted at new medicines but for SMEs. So it is not about big conglomerates or big companies, it is about SMEs.

Then you have programmes like Clean Sky that already achieved results by, for instance, creating a new (if I understand – and I am an engineer by training) rotor for planes that is more clean. You have programmes like the bio-based industries or programmes on electronic components in systems. I think that it is not about the future Commissioner; it is about following the very specific criteria. There are very specific criteria on this, and if we find projects that actually are within those specific criteria, I think that we should look at them.

2-048

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Comissário, o senhor vem de um país, Portugal, que é, há muitos anos, um contribuinte líquido do Programa-Quadro de Investigação. Ou seja, mete lá mais dinheiro do que aquele que lá vai buscar.

E isto não é apenas um problema nacional, evidentemente. É um problema da União Europeia, temos países que enfrentam maiores dificuldades a financiar programas de que não beneficiam ou de que beneficiam muito pouco, e dos quais beneficiam sobretudo os países que estão já acima da média, também no plano científico e tecnológico. Isto é acrescentar ao fosso económico e social um fosso científico e tecnológico que acentua o primeiro.

Pergunto-lhe: que propostas concretas tem para garantir uma distribuição mais equilibrada das verbas do Horizonte 2020? Não me fale dos fundos estruturais. Não estou a falar dos fundos estruturais – que, para além do mais, foram encolhidos, como sabe. Estou a falar do Horizonte 2020, que cresceu. Nem me fale da *escada para a ciência*, porque saberá nesta altura, tão bem quanto eu, que é muito insuficiente a dotação que lhe foi atribuída.

Nessa medida a sua resposta de há pouco foi pouco convincente. Queria que me dissesse novamente que propostas concretas tem para garantir esta distribuição equilibrada.

2-049

**Carlos Moedas, *Comissário designado*.** > Senhor Deputado João Ferreira, em relação ao primeiro ponto que fez sobre Portugal, como contribuinte líquido, os números que eu tenho é que isso realmente foi o caso no passado, em grande escala, e o Sr. Deputado tem razão, e que hoje em dia não seria assim. Mas não tenho aqui os números sobre isso. Mas isso não invalida de todo a sua pergunta. É uma pergunta importante.

Agora nós temos que ver, e o Sr. Deputado que também é um homem da ciência, que participar no Horizonte 2020 tem obviamente uma parte monetária, do que é que se põe e o que é que se tira. Mas essa parte não é o todo. Quem acredita na Europa, quem acredita no projeto europeu sabe da importância do que é para um jovem investigador português poder estar a trabalhar com investigadores de toda a Europa. Isso é muito importante, essa passagem de informação, o que é que vai ser o futuro dessa pessoa, o que vai aprender com os outros, e isso é o mais importante da Europa.

Portanto, eu não estou de acordo, nem nunca estive, com fazer esse tipo de cálculo. Eu só respondi diretamente à sua pergunta, porque me perguntou uma pergunta matemática e eu respondo-lhe matematicamente. Mas a Europa não é matemática. É a capacidade de nós vermos desta importância que tem participar em ciência, investigação e inovação a nível europeu. Porque o valor disso é muito mais, é muito mais.

Aquelas pessoas que eu conheço que participaram, e que, como diz, são investigadores de países como Portugal, todos ganharam na sua vida no sentido que aprenderam muito mais. E, aliás, há estudos que mostram que investigadores que são... no sentido que têm mais mobilidade, que vão de uns países para outros, têm uma produção de impacto científico 20 % acima.

2-050

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE).** – I would like to follow up on the question that my colleague, Mr Bal ytis, asked. In your written answer to the committee, you did not announce any new initiatives with regard to Innovation Union. However, the reality is that maybe five to seven Member States are really very successful with regard to innovation, whereas others are clearly losing ground in international competition over innovation. Where, specifically, would you see your levers, as the Commissioner responsible for this field?

I will not be content with the answer that you gave just a few minutes ago when you said that the 3% target should be maintained, and we have to maintain it and we will maintain it. These are just political lyrics. I want to hear about real priorities.

2-051

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > I agree with your point and, if I am confirmed in post, one of the major parts of my job will be exactly to be active on the implementation side, making sure that in terms of the Innovation Union – such an important flagship for Europe and so important for innovation – this is not merely a question of Europe putting it together, but that the Member States are implementing it.

I will be happy to come here, and I hope that I can come here very often to this Parliament, not just in this format but I hope in more informal settings, to discuss with you and see what are the ways that we can think together, so that the Member States will follow. I will be very keen on that.

In terms of the problem, I do not deny problems, I do not deny that it exists, but I will myself be there to make sure that I work as much as I can for that to change.

2-052

**David Borrelli (EFDD).** – Al Consiglio "Competitività" del 25-26 settembre i ministri dell'Unione hanno deliberato l'attuazione di un programma di ricerca congiunto con i paesi del Mediterraneo, che hanno chiamato PRIMA (*Partnership in Research and Innovation in the Mediterranean Area*).

Le chiedo, signor Commissario, di illustrarci quali saranno gli obiettivi strategici di questa importante iniziativa anche in relazione all'azione esterna dell'Unione in quell'area e, in una prospettiva di mercato globale della ricerca, quali ritiene che siano per l'Unione le aree geopolitiche prioritarie di cooperazione nel campo della ricerca e quali investimenti saranno realizzati nel prossimo futuro per dare attuazione a questi orientamenti strategici.

2-053

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > One of the next levels that is part of my initial statement is about science diplomacy and about international cooperation, because – you know, Europe today is the forefront of science. No one has doubts about it. When you look at the European Research Council, you see the best of the best in the world. We have to be able to leverage as Europe – and here I am going beyond my portfolio, but I will work with my colleagues on that: our ability to actually do much more.

That is not just a question of us showing off that we are, as Europe, the forerunners and in the forefront of all this research; it is about how we can actually work with others to get better research. If you are looking at research, you are looking at problems that happen in other parts of the world where we need information to get more research. That is one example. You need to actually get your technology there to help other people in terms of development and humanitarian aid.



Now, quickly to your second point on PRIMA, which is a very interesting initiative. I think that it is an initiative that we are looking at very carefully. As you know, in terms of the way it can be made, we can actually talk about just one option – that is just one option in the table, which is Article 185 on joint programming. But that is just one option; there are other options, and I know that we are looking at it as we speak. So it is something that we will look at for the future and we will look at all the options.

2-054

**Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI).** – I am disturbed reading your words. My overriding concern will be a steadfast pursuit of the interests of the European Union. Mr Moedas, we are elected to control this monster – European Union bureaucracy – whose interest is usually contrary to the interests of Europe. Please tell me: do you really believe that, if you create an institution called the European Council of Research or something like that, and you give it plenty of money, then you help the research? You are wrong, because young scientists will create projects which will not be against the present state of knowledge. They will create the programmes which will be accepted by this Council. So you will stop the progress. My great compatriot, Marie-Curie Skłodowska, invented polonium and radium in the 19th century. There was no democracy, no fight for the equal rights of women, no European Union, but the progress of science and research was much, much greater than now.

2-055

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > It is a very complicated question to me to answer, because I am such a European. I feel so much that this project of Europe is so much more than the sum of the parts. We definitely have to do more work to explain more to the citizens what Europe is about.

So for me, your question is one of those to which I actually have no real answer, because I believe in Europe, and I strongly believe that this is the way for the future. I want my children to live in Europe, as a whole, as a project that is better for all of us.

2-056

**Adina-Ioana Vlean (PPE).** – Horizon 2020 is focused on strengthening research and innovation with the objective of increasing the industrial base to 20 % of GDP by 2020. How do you plan to allocate resources, either directly or by integrating the industrial dimension of key enabling technologies – such as materials, manufacturing and process technologies – in order to ensure added value for Europe? With the same objective of revitalising the European industrial base, how do you plan to build on EU strengths in areas such as CO<sub>2</sub> conversion, which, on the one hand, has enormous potential to give us independence from feedstock imports from other regions and, on the other hand, would help us make significant improvements in our storage of renewal energy in chemicals?

2-057

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > In terms of CO<sub>2</sub> and greenhouse gas emissions, first of all I would say that we know, in Europe today, that climate change is a fact. So our objective has to be to have research and science that can help us in dealing with these facts and making things better for the future.

Research here has to cover measuring, preventing, mitigating and adapting and, of course, as you just said, storage. As you know, storage is part of the 85% of that budget line we were talking about for energy in terms of renewables and efficiency. As to the way forward in terms of key enabling technologies, it is up to us to look at priorities for the future that will help in those fields – including in terms of nanoelectronics, in terms of photonics, in terms of advanced materials, manufacturing and biotech – and to see if we can get further and get into a process which, in future, will enable us to get results out of those priorities.

I will be watching those priorities, I will be very attentive to the high-level expert group, which has drafted interesting recommendations, and I will try to follow and to focus on such important matters for Europe.

2-058

**Martina Werner (S&D).** – Sehr geehrter Herr Moedas! Das Budget für Horizont 2020 wurde auf 77 Milliarden Euro festgelegt. Das sind gerade einmal 6 % der Gesamtfördermittel für Forschung in Europa. Meine Kollegin Constanze Krehl und ich würden in diesem Zusammenhang gern von Ihnen wissen: Wie können die für Horizont 2020 vorgesehenen Mittel von diesen 6 % trotzdem eine maximale Wirkung entfalten und auch am effektivsten genutzt werden?

Wie werden Sie eine möglichst große inhaltliche und strategische Kohärenz zwischen den Strukturförderprogrammen und Horizont 2020 sicherstellen? Dazu haben Sie schon einiges gesagt, könnten Sie aber bitte noch einmal näher darauf eingehen? Wie werden Sie weiterhin sicherstellen, dass diese Ausgaben für Forschung und Innovation auch für nachhaltige Technologien genutzt werden?

2-059

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > One of the very interesting things about Horizon 2020 is that it was, in a way, created according to a very simple architecture with these three pillars. One of the pillars that we are talking about – actually the bulk of Horizon 2020 – is about societal challenges. So I think that it was a great advance, in terms of organising research and science, to look at the challenges and not the sectors, because that puts the citizen at the centre.

The problems that we will face in the future are about challenges; they are not about sectors. And that will allow us to have more multidisciplinary in terms of research, which is what the future will be about. You can no longer solve a specific problem by looking at one specific scientific sector. You can solve a problem if you have the sectors working together. And so I will make sure that this Horizon 2020 strategy will be efficiently and properly implemented. We will of course have a mid-term review. I would really like that mid-term review not just to be on that date, I want to come here to talk with you and to see what feedback you are getting from the citizens, because you represent the

citizens of Europe. Then we can work on an ongoing process to look at that. But now it is about implementing what we have.

2-060

**Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR).** – In your opening statement you told a very emotional and, I think, very convincing story about your own education and about how important it had been for you – Erasmus, Paris and Harvard and so on. You also talked a little about social sciences and the humanities. I am very concerned about the large decrease, now, in the new budget. Actually, social sciences and humanities funding is being reduced from EUR 623 million to EUR 350 million. How does that fit in with your own declarations and with your own experience, and what are you going to do about it?

2-061

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > Mr Henkel, I think that when you look at the future, and when you look at the importance of social sciences and humanities, they are crucial in terms of research because they tell us about things that are of extreme importance: about the behaviour of people, about history, about culture and heritage.

The way the Horizon 2020 programme was built was more about challenges, and those challenges and the calls for proposals will be organised in such a way that social sciences will also have a role. There is definitely a line in the budget but there is also the whole implication that social sciences should have, and of course the programme is what we have. The programme is what we will have to implement, and for me it is extremely important in terms of research and science and innovation.

2-062

**Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE).** – Mr Moedas, 60% of the Horizon 2020 budget is earmarked for sustainability, for sustainable development, and President-elect Juncker in his political guidelines also stressed the importance of green growth. For me, sustainability is a prerequisite for the growth-and-jobs agenda. That is the reason, I believe, why it is so firmly embedded in Horizon 2020. Nevertheless, sustainability is not mentioned at all in your mission letter or in your written answers. Please explain why.

Secondly, what do you intend to do make Europe a leader in clean tech development, using Horizon 2020 and other instruments?

2-063

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > First of all, even if the word ‘sustainable’ is not mentioned in the letter or in my statement, sustainability is always there for me, because it is basically part of whatever you do for the future, which has to be sustainable. So I probably did not use the word because it is so firmly in my mind. I think that sometimes, when things are so obvious for us, we do not always verbalise them.

But I would say that, in terms of sustainability and green growth, this should be one of the examples where Europe actually is – and will be – the leader. What we have to look at is that green growth is also about economic growth. We should look at green growth as a tool for economic growth, because it is, and because without that we cannot grow in a sustainable way, and if you do not grow in a sustainable way, then do not even bother. No one should think that, even in terms of their private life or private businesses.

I think Horizon 2020 has several examples of projects that are extremely important in terms of that sustainability. Let us just refer to the Clean Sky Joint Technology Initiative, or others in terms of biofuels, or others that will try to go in the exact direction that you were referring to.

So I am sorry that I did not refer to that word, but it is something that is in my mind.

2-064

**Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire désigné, vous avez raison de mentionner que la question de la durabilité et de la soutenabilité est évidente. Mais à force de dire que c'est évident, souvent on ne le fait pas. Et l'Europe est, elle aussi, en train de rater le train. On le voit notamment avec les propositions sur le paquet climat/énergie 2030.

Vous avez confirmé – et c'est bien – que vous alliez continuer le travail de la Commission sur les 85 %, sur les budgets consacrés à l'énergie, à l'efficacité, au renouvelable, au stockage et aux réseaux intelligents. Vous n'avez pas mentionné, je crois, l'enjeu des 15 % du budget sur l'énergie qui devraient favoriser à la fois la mise en œuvre de tous ces programmes, notamment en matière d'énergies renouvelables et de mise en place, et l'accès à l'investissement. Ma question est la suivante: vous engagez-vous aussi sur ces 15 % du programme "Énergie intelligente pour l'Europe"?

2-065

**Carlos Moedas, commissaire désigné.** > Bien sûr. Je ne les ai pas mentionnés au moment de la réponse, mais je pense effectivement qu'ils sont essentiels.

Je vois mon rôle comme celui de quelqu'un qui croit d'abord dans un avenir énergétique soutenable et dans un avenir différent de ce qu'on a eu dans le passé. Dans ce cadre, je serai là pour contrôler et pour venir vous informer.

Je pense qu'il est important pour nos relations de venir ici vous parler avec exactitude et de vous dire à chaque étape où on en est. Outre le fait qu'il s'agit de quelque chose auquel je crois, c'est aussi, pour l'avenir de l'Europe, une façon de nous différencier et de montrer que nous sommes à la pointe des problèmes. Donc, bien sûr, je m'engage, Monsieur le Député.

2-066

**Pablo Echenique (GUE/NGL).** – Señor Moedas, como científico soy perfectamente consciente de que la ciencia y la innovación no son un negocio. No obstante, también es cierto que la ciencia y la innovación estimulan la productividad y la economía de los países como pocas actividades lo hacen. Se calcula, por ejemplo, que el Séptimo Programa Marco ha convertido cada euro invertido en entre siete y catorce euros de valor añadido a la industria. Su impacto a largo plazo se estima en un aumento del 1 % del PIB de la Unión, la creación de casi un millón de puestos de trabajo y un aumento de un punto porcentual y medio en las exportaciones.

Supongo que usted, como hombre de negocios, conoce estos datos, este impresionante efecto multiplicador; por eso es mi deber hacerle una pregunta directa: ¿apostará usted por un decidido aumento, repito, un decidido aumento, tanto en épocas de crecimiento como en épocas de recesión, de las partidas para investigación, innovación y ciencia de la Unión que tanto bien han demostrado hacerle a la economía? ¿O defenderá una política austericida responsable de recortes, que, como ya se ha demostrado en su país y en el mío, solo sirve para llenar los bolsillos de unos pocos y empobrecer a la mayoría?

2-067

**Carlos Moedas, Comisario propuesto.** > Mi respuesta es simple y breve: yo estoy aquí, en caso de ser nombrado, para defender la ciencia, la innovación y la investigación, y para admitir con mucha humildad que, cuando, por ejemplo, este Parlamento dijo y apostó por que se dotara a Horizonte 2020 con 100 000 millones y no con 80 000, este Parlamento tenía razón. Estoy profundamente convencido, cuando veo que el 62 % del crecimiento de Europa entre 1995 y 2007 se ha derivado de la innovación, de que esta habrá de ser mi labor. Esta es mi respuesta.

2-068

**David Coburn (EFDD).** – I would like to ask this: what can the Commission do to avoid this situation in future so as not to give the impression that taxpayers' money is being grossly wasted, especially when countries like Spain and Greece are in such terrible trouble because of the euro? I think that it is disgraceful that we should be squandering money on spacecraft, which quite frankly are only there to double-up the efforts of what the Americans have already done. It is just to spy on the European population and find out where their cars are to raise revenue for the European Commission itself.

2-069

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > I would say that when you look at the strengths of Europe and when you look exactly at this portfolio of research, science and innovation, you see how important Europe is. One: because if you create a European research area, you actually will decrease duplication, and that is good because you do not have 10 people doing the same thing. If you have infrastructures – and we have, as you know, a project with 48 infrastructures – the objective is that people can use it in different parts, so that you do not have to invest in one infrastructure in your country and then have another one investing in another country exactly the same. So that is good.

That is a good use of the taxpayer's money, because we are together and we are saving as Europeans. I would kindly say that in this kind of portfolio it is exactly the contrary of what you said, because this is where Europe really adds value. In the future, if you try to create some of the machines of the future, there will be no Member States that could do that alone, so Europe is needed. You cannot do it alone in your country. It is really important. That is my position.

2-070

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Commissioner-designate, you seem to me to have acquitted yourself very well thus far.

Now the figure of 3% of GDP by 2020 on R&D has been mentioned. Given the fact that we have only marginally increased our expenditure from 1.77% in 2009 to 1.94% in 2013, do you think this is a realistic target? Should it be revised downwards, or are you prepared to stake your reputation on achieving it?

Also, we are way behind Japan and the USA, with 3.39% and 2.77% respectively. In the USA the universities and industry lead the way. Companies like Google and Intel, which have strong R&D in my country, are very important. Are there any specific initiatives that you would prioritise to bridge the gap, and how do you propose to finance them?

2-071

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > In terms of the target, I think it is of the utmost importance and it has to be clear for us that the target should be maintained. However, as you rightly say, if we keep to the line we are on today we will not be able to get there. So, as a politician, I think my duty, if I am confirmed in post, is to create ways of getting there, knowing that the problem with this particular target is more on the private side, that is not investing as it should, than on the public side.

We have to create imaginative, innovative creative ways, in the positive sense of these words, to fill that gap and to give more incentives to the private sector. How do you give more incentives to the private sector? You give more incentives to the private sector if you have a framework that is more appropriate and within which they feel more comfortable about investing. Companies will invest more if they have the right framework, so there is a point about the framework.

Then there is the question of how, in Horizon 2020, we can try, through public-private partnerships and through the SMEs instrument and others, to actually leverage these amounts to more. If we do that, then the cycle to innovation can be completed.

2-072

**Jeppe Kofod (S&D).** – Mr Moedas, you are charged with a very important portfolio, as you also mentioned, to create long-term sustainable growth and hundreds of thousands of jobs in Europe. However, in doing so, Europe must facilitate and create favourable conditions for innovative companies, especially in the fields of greentech and climate-friendly solutions. In your mission letter, you are charged with – and I quote – mobilising innovative financial instruments under Horizon 2020 and promoting low-carbon technologies.

But, to my disappointment and also that of others, I heard today that crucial areas such as sustainable growth, renewable energy sources and the circular economy have not been mentioned by as much as a word. So I therefore ask you: will you guarantee that renewables, energy efficiency, sustainable growth and the circular economy will become top priorities for you? Will you ensure that these areas are prioritised over projects aimed at traditional fossil fuels? How in fact will you mobilise, and I quote, ‘innovative financial instruments’ to ensure that?

2-073

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > It is through the wisdom of the Parliament and everyone who works in this House that we were able to have – as regards the energy challenge – 85% for non-fossil fuels, specifically for renewables, storage and efficiency. That is actually very clear and I will make sure that will happen.

The same is true in respect to climate-friendly areas, where I will make sure to respect the 35% – and I repeat, 35% – of Horizon 2020 that will have to be invested in climate-friendly areas. The circular economy and the fact that we live on a planet where we have to obtain raw materials in a different way so that we can maintain our earth and our planet for the future is not just because of Horizon 2020. I will be very vigilant in those areas while working with you.

2-074

**Marek Józef Gróbarczyk (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczo! Moje pytanie również będzie dotyczyło energii, chciałbym zadać Panu jako inżynierowi. Jednym z zasadniczych elementów wzrostu gospodarczego Europy jest niezależność energetyczna. Rzeczywiście pokazuje jak słabą mamy konstrukcję pod kątem dostaw energii, przede wszystkim gazu. To ogromna przestrzeń badawcza, która może być wykorzystana właśnie do wdrożenia nowych rozwiązań czy przeprowadzenia badań słuchanych niezależności energetycznej Europy. Moje pytanie: jak rolę w Pana portfolio będzie stanowił gaz łupkowy i czy zamierza Pan wspierać badania słuchane wydobywaniu gazu łupkowego?

2-075

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > Just to be clear from the beginning, the energy mix is a choice for each country, and so it is not my role to define the energy mix. I just wanted to be clear about that because I think it is important for all the honourable Members.

In terms of shale gas, the way I see it is that research is exactly about giving you an answer – to you and to the citizens – of what the real potential is. But what are the real risks? We know there are risks in shale gas that we have to study, and that we have to do more research. So there I see a pure role for science as an important role, for the citizens, of actually getting the information about the potential of shale gas. What is the potential? But what are the risks? Because we have to be very careful about those risks, so I will actually be someone who will always look at science in these two ways: potential and risks.

And then it is up to each country of the Union, but I would say that if you want to get more independence in terms of energy – as you know it is not here yet and I am talking about research in that area – we should really focus on diversifying and on efficiency. Why are we not talking more about efficiency in terms of energy, because that is extremely important? So the way I see it is not just the point on shale gas, but it is also the point of looking at new ways and looking at inter-connections, etc., but I will leave that also to my colleagues in their roles.

2-076

**Dominique Riquet (ALDE).** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire désigné, le programme Horizon 2020 est touché, comme le reste des paiements du budget européen, par des retards considérables et peut-être bientôt des impayés.

Or, le phénomène particulier de la recherche, c'est que ces retards peuvent entraîner, bien entendu, des suspensions et des retards de programmes, mais aussi une explosion ou une dislocation des équipes de chercheurs qui vont, du fait de l'interruption temporaire des programmes, rejoindre d'autres équipes, et souvent d'ailleurs en dehors de l'Europe. Ceci entraîne non pas le retard, mais la disparition des programmes de recherche, entraînant évidemment un échec des recherches, mais aussi une perte de ressources financières.

Que comptez-vous proposer – telle est ma question – pour assurer dans la mesure du possible la continuité financière et éviter des suspensions de paiement, qui sont souvent mortelles pour les programmes de recherche?

2-077

**Carlos Moedas, commissaire désigné.** > Monsieur le Député, le problème auquel vous faites référence est une des grandes préoccupations que, si je suis confirmé, j'aurai dès le premier jour.

Ce problème arrive de plus en plus et j'ai pu constater, au cours de ces trois semaines de travail, qu'en raison de ce problème, nous avons déjà, d'un côté, réduit le préfinancement de 65 à 35 % et qu'il y a un pipeline qui s'accumule. Nous avons donc un problème mais, comme je le disais – et je voudrais que cela soit clair –, je pense que c'est un problème que nous devons résoudre ensemble et je suis là,



avec vous, pour avoir votre soutien et ainsi confirmer ma force de travail pour essayer de le résoudre. Je veux être le défenseur et être là pour m'assurer qu'on peut trouver des solutions.

Il faut trouver des solutions pour le futur, il faut établir un cadre capable de supprimer la différence entre ce qu'on paie et ce qu'on promet de payer. De ce point de vue, comptez sur moi, je serai très vigilant.

Ensuite, il y a des gens qui, comme vous le dites, pourraient se fatiguer et partir ailleurs. C'est un aspect négatif, mais je serai là et je ferai de mon mieux, de toutes mes forces.

2-078

**Werner Langen (PPE).** – Ich möchte Ihnen ein Kompliment machen. Sie haben sich sehr gut in die Thematik eingearbeitet. Ich habe drei kurze Fragen.

Erstens: Wie sehen Sie die Zukunft von ITER, dem Projekt, bei dem die Europäische Kommission über Euratom mit der Schweiz in der Bauphase 34 % finanzieren soll?

Zweitens: Wie sehen Sie PPP-Projekte, weil die Umsetzung der Forschungsergebnisse in die Praxis und den Produktemarkt für die Produkte das Hauptproblem ist?

Drittens: Glauben Sie, dass Sie gemeinsam mit dem Parlament verhindern können, dass die vorgesehenen Kürzungen des Rates um 1,2 Milliarden Euro im Forschungsetat noch verhindert werden können, während die Kürzungen bei den Ausgleichzahlungen für Agrarleistungen minimal sind? Was ich für eine politische Fehlentscheidung des Rates halte.

Wie sehen Sie diese Probleme?

2-079

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > If I understand correctly, the question was about the ITER (International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor) project, and I would like to make two points.

Firstly, as you know, ITER is a very important project, and I would make it clear here that when we talk of nuclear power, there are two very different things. On the one hand, there is everything related to fission, and here the watchword is safety, safety, safety – safety for the citizens. Everything we do should be about safety. On the other hand, the ITER project – a project that is not just European – is a first of a kind in the different technology of fusion, and that technology can actually enable us in the future to solve a lot of our energy problems because, as you know, in the case of fusion you will have less waste.

In simple language – and I am talking as an engineer myself – you know how to stop: you can stop the reactions. You have something here that is potentially unique. So it is a project that I will make sure to come to this Parliament to inform you about it, because I am aware of the problems and the points about cost overruns etcetera, and I will be very keen to look at it. That is what I really want to tell you about ITER.

2-080

**Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D).** – Señor Moedas, suena bien lo que dice y podemos compartir los objetivos. Pero, señor Moedas, el Consejo de Competitividad declara que las políticas de consolidación fiscal sobre el gasto público en I+D+i ponen en peligro el crecimiento y la creación de empleo en Europa. Sin embargo, la realidad es que los recortes drásticos en ciencia e innovación en países como el suyo o el mío por los gobiernos conservadores han puesto en peligro la supervivencia del propio sistema.

En este contexto, a mi grupo le parece crucial asegurar la coordinación sistemática entre las políticas de la Unión Europea y los Estados miembros, desarrollando el Espacio Europeo de Investigación (EEI), como usted muy bien ha priorizado en su discurso.

Pero, señor Moedas, toda vez que parece que la cooperación no ha sido suficiente, ¿cree oportuno presentar una propuesta legislativa basada en el artículo 182, apartado 5, del TFUE para desarrollar el EEI y superar la descoordinación existente entre esas políticas de los Estados miembros y la Unión Europea? ¿Le parece el Reglamento ERIC un buen ejemplo a seguir?

2-081

**Carlos Moedas, Comisario propuesto.** > Señora diputada, cuando me habla de la crisis que hemos sufrido en nuestros países, que ambos conocemos muy bien, yo pienso que es una crisis profunda y que ha sido muy difícil para todos.

Yo diría que si algo está demostrado es que los países que invertían más en investigación han sobrellevado mejor la crisis. Si mira a países como Finlandia, que invierten mucho más que otros,

tiene hoy la prueba económica de que quien invierte más sale menos perjudicado. Y eso es un punto muy importante.

Por cuanto se refiere a legislar más en relación con el EEI, yo pienso que no es el momento. Pienso que tenemos primero que mirar el *roadmap*, la hoja de ruta que van a elaborar los países en 2015, e intentar trabajar con lo que tenemos. Considero que tenemos que estudiar siempre con mucha atención si de verdad es necesaria más legislación. Yo en este momento no estoy aún en posición de decirle, pero creo que tenemos que centrarnos en lo que tenemos. Después ya veremos, y espero estar aquí para poder compartir e intercambiar puntos de vista con usted.

2-082

**Maria Spyraiki (PPE).** – It is apparent from your presentation today that you are a team player and that you believe strongly in cooperation. However, at European level it is difficult to realise that we have strong innovation ecosystem cooperation among all the stakeholders: universities, SMEs and public administration. There is indeed a huge lag between research and research projects actually reaching the market and delivering to the real economy. One way to address this is through SMEs but there is an obvious need to simplify legislation to reinforce their capacity to access fresh capital. I come from Greece and we face this issue every day. I would like to ask you, Commissioner-designate, what your priorities would be in that respect, both at EU and at Member State level.

2-083

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > The importance of what you just said is actually a point about Europe in general. In Europe, we have been very good in terms of crossing borders, and unfortunately so because you will see my point about having cross-border debt: it goes from one country to another very easily. Unfortunately, equity does not. Unfortunately there is much less equity going from one country to another. I would say that, among the Innovation Union measures, the venture capital passport, as well as the patents and the euro patents, represents a way of breaking those barriers.

If we can have one European research area and if we can work on the framework conditions in each country, then we will make it possible for these SMEs to have more access to capital.

We have to look at different instruments. As you know, there is the risk-sharing finance facility: EUR 1 billion from the budget of the EU and EUR 1 billion from the European Investment Bank leveraging up to EUR 13 billion. So there are instruments that we need to look at. Here again, if I am confirmed in post, those are subjects that I want to begin working on and I will be happy to work together with you.

2-084

**José Blanco López (S&D).** – La austeridad extrema está imposibilitando a mi juicio alcanzar el objetivo de dedicar un 3 % del PIB a inversión en I+D, como fija la Estrategia Europa 2020.

Como no han sido suficientes sus explicaciones, le reitero la pregunta: ¿qué garantías puede ofrecer de que la Comisión va a impulsar el cumplimiento de los compromisos de la Estrategia 2020 en esta materia?

Por otra parte, el Instituto Europeo de Tecnología e Innovación es clave en la promoción de la interacción entre universidades, empresas y centros de investigación: ¿qué iniciativas va a impulsar para reforzarlo?

Y, finalmente, la iniciativa PRIMA ha reforzado la colaboración en I+D con nuestros socios del Mediterráneo en temas como la eficiencia y sostenibilidad de los sistemas alimentarios y los recursos hídricos, ¿cree que el trabajo desarrollado por PRIMA está suficientemente maduro como para considerar la propuesta inmediata de una asociación público-pública basada en el artículo 185 del Tratado? ¿Cómo lo va a abordar, dado que su respuesta escrita lo ha obviado?

2-085

**Carlos Moedas, Comisario propuesto.** > Las garantías que yo puedo dar hoy aquí a su Señoría es que trabajaré por que esto suceda. Como comisario estaré, en caso de ser nombrado, en una posición privilegiada para luchar, para hablar con los Estados miembros e inculcarles la necesidad de llegar a este 3 %. Y esto es lo que yo puedo hacer y para lo que me gustaría contar con la ayuda de sus Señorías aquí presentes.

En relación con el Instituto Europeo de Investigación, yo pienso que es un proyecto interesantísimo, porque viene a poner el elemento de la educación en la innovación, en la investigación, y eso es de gran importancia para Europa.

Para este proyecto estaré en coordinación con mi colega de la cartera de Educación y mi compromiso será grande.

Finalmente, por cuanto se refiere a PRIMA, considero que es un proyecto muy interesante, pero yo no tengo ahora ni la capacidad ni una respuesta para lo que el señor diputado me ha pedido. Lo que he dicho es que el artículo 185 es una opción, pero no es la única, es una de ellas. Tenemos que madurar, tenemos que entender y trabajarlo más.

2-086

**Paul Rübiger (PPE).** – Herr Kommissar! Mich würde interessieren, wie Sie in Zukunft mit STOA zusammenzuarbeiten gedenken. STOA ist der Wissenschaftsausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments. Welche Wissenschaftsschwerpunkte sollen wir nach Ihrem Wunsch gemeinsam mit der Kommission und STOA bearbeiten?

Zweitens: Welche Schwerpunkte wollen Sie in der globalen Beteiligung an Horizont 2020 setzen? Sehen Sie hier Unterschiede in den Regionen, oder glauben Sie, dass man hier in Zukunft neue Maßstäbe setzen könnte?

Drittens: Wie sehen Sie den KMU-Test im Bereich von Horizont 2020? Werden Sie in Zukunft die Ergebnisse veröffentlichen, insbesondere auch die Folgenabschätzung mit dem Prinzip *think small first*?

2-087

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > First of all, I think that I am a team player, so I will be here to work as much as we can and as often as we can. Working in team means working often and meeting people a lot. So I will be there.

The priorities in Horizon 2020 are the ones that were defined. I think that part of the job will be implementation, and that is crucial. Then we will basically have to measure what more efficient ways there are. We will have to look at the mid-term review, and we will be here to discuss all that.

So in terms of those points of Horizon 2020, I think that the three pillars define the priorities that I have in mind very well and in a detailed way. I actually appreciate the fact that we have allocated 20% of two lines, namely societal challenges and leadership enabling industrial technologies, amounting to EUR 8.6 billion to SMEs. I think that is something that we should focus on. SMEs are essential for our future as Europe because they are Europe. Europe is about small and medium enterprises.

So it is high time to implement. We will see how implementation goes and we can then talk about it together in a different way.

2-088

**Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D).** – I would like to come back to Mr Tajani's question. According to the American innovations scholar, Amar V. Bhidé, 90% of innovations are the result of workers identifying how to make improvements to their work environments, to their end products or to manufacturing methods. Work organisation is crucial for capturing this innovation, and successful workplace innovation is dependent on worker participation and involvement. But worker involvement in innovation has long been neglected in EU research policies, and social dialogue and worker participation have been undermined through austerity policies. So I would like to ask you very clearly what do you intend to do, in this crucial area for industrial policy in the future, as regards workers' involvement in innovation policies?

2-089

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > One of the fields of study in innovation that has interested me over the years is the democratisation of innovation. This is the field of study of an MIT professor called Professor von Hippel, who has been studying for a long time the fact that innovation is actually moving from the manufacturers to the user, and the user is us.

When you look at major steps in innovation, you have to look at innovation from the perspective that users are a very important part of the puzzle. Users are social partners; they are us and our families.

If you talk about governance and the innovation of governance, then the role of social partners is extremely important. If you talk about public administration innovation, there you have another example. I would say that today has proven that these links and these journeys between the past, where it was thought that only the manufacturer was able to innovate, are not exactly that. The user is giving a lot of innovation back to the manufacturer to make the new product. I think that it is a very interesting subject and I will be there.

2-090

**András Gyürk (PPE).** – Commissioner-designate, slowly but surely we are approaching the end of this hearing, and by now, no doubt, it is obvious to you how paramount the subject of research is for this committee. But do you think that it is also important for European citizens to be acquainted with the significance of research, especially when it comes to the question of promoting growth and creating jobs? Supposing that you believe it is important, in your opinion, what should be done to bring the topic of research closer to European citizens? Do you see that best practices in this area are worth mentioning? We are well aware of the fact that the EU controls only a few per cent of the financial sources of European research, but could our impact on public thinking be much more significant than that share? If your answer is yes, what should be done to reach that objective?

2-091

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > The point that you made is of huge importance: we have to create public awareness. Politicians have failed on that somehow, and I also blame myself for that. The point is that if you really want to come across with a message, you have to start at a very early age. Therefore, we are talking about education, we are talking about promoting at elite-level schools, and we are talking about supporting teachers by giving them the tools to start at a very early stage. You can see this in a lot of fields.

For instance, from the generation of my parents to my generation, the role of education has changed everything about how we view climate change. So the base is education. Then there is the role of all of us here to pass on the message. I hope that with my drive and my passion, I will be able to do it.

2-092

**Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D).** – Finland had a very bad recession in the 1990s, with unemployment of almost 20 % – it was 19 % in some years – and then we made a decision to put 4 % on R&D. Now, I think, the European added value is in R&D but, if the national budgets are cut, and we only increase the European money, there is no added value.

You come from the finance sector. Do you have concrete ideas as to how to really get the public and private sectors working together to find a way forward for a better future for society? I think the path to take is to find better solutions – technological, social and others – as you have mentioned here. In small countries, and also in Europe, we can say that finding finance for the commercialisation phase is sometimes difficult. We have good European innovations, but how can we make them work for Europeans as well?

2-093

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > Your country is a very good example of what you just said about the ability to go up the ladder of innovation and to create new ways of leveraging what we have.

I think that a lot can be done further with the private sector, and key enabling technologies that we have as priorities are a very good example of that. Other joint technological initiatives are part of what we have to look into the future, and I will be looking at it.

Then, on more the financial world, the example of the risk-sharing finance facility is a very good one, where basically the EIB has put 1 billion via the European Union budget and you could leverage 13 billion for those projects. There are examples like the SME instrument that is also in place and, by the way, accounts for 7% of the lines and societal challenges and leadership in enabling industrial technologies.

And so all those are good examples of what I always say: we should not try to re-invent the wheel. We should look at what we have and try to develop that. So that would be my plan.

2-094

**Michał Boni (PPE).** – Horizon 2020 sets three priorities and two specific objectives, one of them being science with and for society, 6% of the budget. We need initiatives to foster dialogue and debate on scientific, technological and innovation-related issues with the public through involvement of the research and innovation community and civil society organisations, and to take advantage of social media especially in order to help raise public awareness of the benefits of research in meeting societal challenges. Involvement of our societies is the background for real innovation. This is for democratisation of innovation, as you said. European citizens, through their representatives, have clearly expressed their demand for a much stronger two-way involvement of citizens in the research and innovation process. What are the main challenges to reach those aims, and what mechanisms and programmes would you establish or reinforce to reach the aims set by Horizon 2020? What would be your road map for these issues?

2-095

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > I would say that, when you look at the changes that are already there and you see that on Horizon 2020 there was public consultation, and you see that Science 2.0 today is under public consultation, there are steps being taken to actually get citizens and civil society more on board. So it will always be part of what we have in front of us as a democracy to be able to get more participation of civil society. There are different ways. I think there are ways of involving people through different forums and different points, but you have to be able to better explain to them why it is important. The role of politicians is to explain in simple words why things are important. So if we can do that, I think that people will come to us and will understand better.

2-096

**Patrizia Toia (S&D).** – Dopo tante importanti questioni generali, le porrò dei temi molto particolari e specifici. Il primo: ci sono 6 000 malattie rare, già conosciute, che affliggono 20 milioni di cittadini in Europa. Quali programmi concreti adotterà per la ricerca in questo settore che, ricordiamoci, non è remunerativo per le industrie farmaceutiche? Sosterrà – e in che modo – le *joint programming initiatives*, in particolare quella per le malattie neurodegenerative, come l'Alzheimer, per accelerare i progressi?

Torno alla proposta, che un collega ha già avanzato, su un partenariato di ricerca e innovazione nell'area mediterranea: quello denominato PRIMA. Lo ritengo importante, vista la instabilità politica dell'area e la sfida per il cibo e l'acqua. Se non sarà sulla base dell'articolo 185, quali altre vie potrà percorrere?

Infine, sul versante industriale per ridurre la crisi del settore marittimo, Lei si impegna a lanciare entro il 2015 la nuova PPP chiamata *European Vessels for the future*?

2-097

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner designate.** > First of all, I shall address the point on rare diseases, which is such an important and painful point for the families of so many. As regards rare diseases, when you look at Horizon 2020 and the way in which it was designed, you can see that for the first time it goes from frontier health research to clinical trials, with a special focus on chronic diseases. Horizon 2020 shows that cancer, cardiovascular disorders, diabetes, brain disorders, rare diseases and other neglected diseases often affect too small a group and there is sometimes not enough research. Here it is really important that we come together.

Europe is essential, because Europe offers the only way in which we can tackle those diseases, by providing information all around the world to actually tackle rare diseases. This is another example of how and why Europe is so important. You referred to PRIMA, which, – as I have already said – is an extremely important project. There are others, such as Bonus or other projects, which are extremely interesting, so we will look at them. I know it is something that is really there. I did not actually have time myself to go into the detail but I will. I will make sure that there will be something that we can



discuss here. I do not have time for the maritime point, but again, this is another very important subject.

2-098

**Kari Š, Krišj nis (PPE).** – There have been many questions and many answers today. I would like to just step back for a moment. If we consider what is the most important challenge in the next five years in research, I think you named it correctly at the beginning as your priority number two, namely implementation.

Decisions have been made. We know the kinds of budget that need to be provided for these programmes to be enacted, and it would be up to you as Commissioner to push these through. So my question to you is what, in your own view, best qualifies you to be the champion of research that this committee and this Parliament need so much?

2-099

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > I have set out these important three priorities – they are numbered 1, 2 and 3 but they could equally be 3, 2 and 1. First and foremost, we need to address the framework conditions. That is crucial for Europe. Secondly comes implementation. I will take ‘Implementation, implementation, implementation’ as a motto and if I am confirmed in my post you will listen to me as someone who considers himself qualified because I am an implementation person. I have been so for three years, in a job that was just about that – actually much less about public speaking and much more about doing things.

Thirdly, it is my belief that there are links we should never forget between curiosity research, frontier research and the final product. Professor Andre Geim, who is one of the Nobel Prize winners who invented graphene, once said that long ago this chain of links between the fundamental research and the product was actually quite short, but the chains have been growing and growing. Today when you look at the iPhone you do not know exactly what lay behind it in terms of curiosity and frontier research – these are the words used, although I am not quoting precisely, at a talk by Andre Geim.

The politicians have focused their attention on the last mile – on the finished product – and I want to focus on that because it is important, but we should not forget research as the basis of everything we do, and research in the future will be very different from research in the past. It is all about sharing information.

2-100

**Chair.** > Thank you, Mr Commissioner-designate, for your answers. You shortened some of them at the end and now we are perfectly within time. We still have a few minutes, as we proposed at the beginning, for your end remarks.

2-101

**Carlos Moedas, Commissioner-designate.** > First of all I would say, just before getting into the final statement, that when I think about innovation, I really think that innovation is something that is a culture. When you want to create a culture, you really have to be disciplined about it. Innovation is about iteration, about keep doing it, about failing, and it is actually about trying to change the world without fear of failure, which is something that actually crosses the minds of all of us each time we do something in life. So I would really think that, if you keep this image of me as someone that actually believes, I think that would be a great thing from this great exchange that we had today.

First of all, I am really honoured to be here. I was an elected Member of Parliament, I believe in democracy, I believe in the future. I really want to thank first the Chairman for this couple of hours; all the Members, of course, and I would also like to thank all the staff and the people that are here today and that have been here for the past hours listening. Last but not least, the interpreters that are behind there and doing great work, and finally tell you that you can count on my cooperation.

I will be present here really because I strongly believe that together we can achieve much more. If we work together, we achieve more. There is a saying from a writer that says that really nobody is as smart as everybody, and I believe that. We will be smarter together in achieving those goals. First, in really helping Europe on creating the right framework conditions. Second, on really believing in Horizon 2020 as a tool for jobs and growth that Europe desperately needs, and that we must champion excellence as the foundation for science. The energy that I have, the drive that I have, the dedication that has been my life in private terms and public terms, but specially the passion that I have for the portfolio that will be the portfolio of the future. If you confirm me, I will be at the service of Europe and all European citizens.

*(Applause)*

2-102

**Chair.** > Thank you very much, Mr Commissioner-designate. Research, science and innovation are the entire responsibility of our committee and we have been creating European framework programmes since the 1970s. We feel responsible in this committee for research and innovation, and also education, which is so important. It is good to see a former Erasmus student as a Commissioner-designate.

*(Applause)*

So it means our work has achieved something very concrete.

2-103

*(The hearing ended at 11.50)*

