Basic information

2003/0223(CNS) CNS - Consultation procedure Decision	Procedure completed
EC/United States agreement for scientific and technical cooperation: renewal See also 1998/0095(CNS) **Subject** 3.50.20 Scientific and technological cooperation and agreements **Geographical area** United States	

Key players

European Parliament

Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
ITRE Industry, External Trade, Research, Energy	BERENGUER FUSTER Luis (PSE)	20/10/2003

Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
BUDG Budgets	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	

Council of the European Union

Council configuration	Meetings	Date
Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs	2606	2004-10-04

European Commission

Commission DG	Commissioner
Research and Innovation	

Key events

Date	Event	Reference	Summary
01/10/2003	Legislative proposal published	COM(2003)0569	Summary
05/11/2003	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
26/11/2003	Vote in committee		Summary

26/11/2003	Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading	A5-0436/2003	
16/12/2003	Decision by Parliament	T5-0560/2003	Summary
04/10/2004	Act adopted by Council after consultation of Parliament		
04/10/2004	End of procedure in Parliament		
11/11/2004	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information

Procedure reference	2003/0223(CNS)
Procedure type	CNS - Consultation procedure
Procedure subtype	International agreement
Legislative instrument	Decision
Amendments and repeals	See also 1998/0095(CNS)
Legal basis	EC Treaty (after Amsterdam) EC 170 EC Treaty (after Amsterdam) EC 300-p3-a1 Rules of Procedure EP 52-p1
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	ITRE/5/20151

Documentation gateway

European Parliament

Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading		A5-0436/2003	26/11/2003	
Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading		T5-0560/2003 OJ C 091 15.04.2004, p. 0026-0067 E	16/12/2003	Summary

European Commission

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Legislative proposal	COM(2003)0569	01/10/2003	Summary
Document attached to the procedure	SEC(2003)1048	01/10/2003	Summary

Additional information

Source	Document	Date
European Commission	EUR-Lex	

Final act

Decision 2004/0756
OJ L 335 11.11.2004, p. 0005-0006 Summary

EC/United States agreement for scientific and technical cooperation: renewal

2003/0223(CNS) - 16/12/2003 - Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading

The European Parliament adopted the resolution drafted by Luis BERENGUER FUSTER (PES, E) and approved the conclusion of the agreement.

EC/United States agreement for scientific and technical cooperation: renewal

2003/0223(CNS) - 01/10/2003 - Legislative proposal

PURPOSE : the renewal of the Agreement for scientific and technical cooperation between the EC and the USA. PROPOSED ACT : Council Decision. CONTENT : the conclusion of the Agreement for scientific and technological cooperation between the EC and the United States of America was concluded 1998, and entered into force on 14 October 1998. It was for an initial period of five years with provision for review and extension. An independent Panel of experts carried out a review. Certain recommendations are of special interest, and will be followed up during the preparation and the implementation phase of the agreement: - to raise awareness of the Agreement the EU in order to increase its relevance and the involvement of the Member States in relation to the European Research Area and the conclusions of the Lisbon Council, including to identify target areas for communication in relevant sectors (science, industry, government)"; - that the Joint Consultative Group of the Agreement be better exploited as a communication vehicle so that scientific and other relevant communities are aware of its agenda and the outcomes of its deliberations. - to establish a strategy that will build effectively on the foundation in the first five years and better exploit the potential of the Agreement. In addition, the Commission will pay particular attention to the recommendations concerning the balance of reciprocity, a general framework for the question of funding, and to ensure good direct communication with the relevant US government institutions. The USA wants a straightforward renewal, without changing the text of the current Agreement so as to maintain continuity in the scientific and technological relations between the USA and the Community. Rapid renewal is in the best interest of both parties. A one-step procedure is suggested (a single procedure and a single act concerning signature and conclusion). In the light of the above considerations, the Commission requests the Council: - to approve the conclusion of the Agreement, after consulting the European Parliament; - to authorise the President of the Council to designate the person empowered to sign the Agreement. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS : - budget line : costs will be charged to the specific budget headings of the programmes with the RTD Framework Programme (Chapter B6-6013.) - Overall figures for total annual cost: preparatory activities, review of the cooperation : EUR 50 000; scientific and technical workshops/meetings : EUR 60 000; - type of expenditure : 100% grant (missions to the USA by Commission officials and experts, organisation of workshops). Administrative and technical operating expenditure included in Part B: Commitments and appropriations for 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 respectively - EUR 0.11 million per year.

EC/United States agreement for scientific and technical cooperation: renewal

2003/0223(CNS) - 04/10/2004 - Final act

PURPOSE : the renewal of the Agreement for scientific and technical cooperation between the EC and the USA.

LEGISLATIVE ACT : Council Decision 2004/756/EC concerning the conclusion of an Agreement renewing the Agreement for scientific and technological cooperation between the European Community and the Government of the United States of America.

CONTENT : the Agreement for scientific and technological cooperation between the European Community and the Government of the United States of America was concluded in 1998 for a period of five years, extendable by a further five years.

This Decision approves the Agreement renewing the Agreement for scientific and technological cooperation between the EC and the United States. The material content of the renewed Agreement is identical to the material content of the Agreement, which expired on 13 October 2003.

EC/United States agreement for scientific and technical cooperation: renewal

2003/0223(CNS) - 01/10/2003 - Document attached to the procedure

This report comprises an impact assessment of the Science and Technology Agreement concluded between the EC and the United States of America. The Agreement was signed on 5 December 1997 and approved by the Council on 13 October 1998. The text of the EU-USA S&T Agreement requires that its performance and impact be reviewed prior to its renewal later this year. A Panel of three external experts has therefore undertaken this task and its findings are set out in this report. In essence the Panel's task as defined in its terms of reference was to assess what the Agreement was adding to S&T cooperation between the EU and the USA in relation to what was intended at the outset. Its principal **findings** may be summarised as follows:

-The number of projects in FP5 with USA collaborators is disappointingly low at around 140.

- Particular attention was paid to the awarenessof the Agreement both in the EU and the USA. The outcome was generally disappointing especially in Europe. At departmental and agency level in the USA, particularly where implementing arrangements had been put in place, it was of a higher order albeit limited in the main to such audiences. Particular initiatives need to be put in place to improve this situation both ex anteto portray the opportunity that is available and *ex post* to communicate the outputs achieved to appropriate audiences. Certain suggestions are made in the report.

- Undoubtedly awareness of the Agreement would be increased if its attractivenessto the scientific community and other stakeholders could be enhanced and be seen as more tangible. One way of doing this would be to attribute some form of funding to the operation of the Agreement perhaps as a 'Seedcorn fund' that would catalyse involvement. Another approach would be for the Parties to the Agreement to work together to identify research agendas that represent a shared scientific position for the EU and the USA in coming years. Some progress is being made here and specific suggestions are also set out in the report. Such approaches would increase the European added value of the Agreement which at present is not maximised in part because awareness of the opportunities available is of such a low order.

- The JCG meetingsare seen as instrumental for discussing and deciding areas for cooperation, the need for specific implementing arrangements and other initiatives designed to make the Agreement operational. However the meetings do not achieve a high profile and there is scant awareness of them outside those involved. The Panel was disappointed with the performance of the JCG.

- The differentiationbetween the EU–USA S&T Agreement and other analogous agreements with individual Member States needs to be clarified as there is some confusion about this in the USA.

- The Panel were able to identify positive benefitsfrom the Agreement though it would have liked to have seen more identifiable gains that could be directly linked to its existence. The benefits were mainly science-led and derive in many instances from the negotiation of specific implementing arrangements. They involve factors such as increased critical mass, experience of different ways of doing things, and accessibility of different datasets.

- The Agreement has the potential to achieve downstream impactson relationships, for example in industry and in terms of government policy in addition to those directly at a scientific level. From an industrial standpoint it takes time to convert S&T outcomes to marketable products or services and in the main such outcomes were not yet clear or capable of assessment.

- A further question for the performance and operation of the Agreement concerns the reciprocityof the respective involvements and whether these are in balance. Although this does not appear to be a significant issue there are some ambiguities in relation to certain USA departments and agencies that would benefit from clarification.

- In the first five years under review the potential impactof the Agreement has not been fully exploited and in the future more dynamic approaches are required.

Key **recommendations** are as follows:

-Every effort should be made to accelerate the cooperative process.

-The range of activities covered under the Agreement needs to be capitalised on.

-Target areas for communication should be identified in relevant sectors and initiatives put in place.

-The Commission should ensure that Member States are better briefed and are encouraged to 'buy-in' to the Agreement as stakeholders.

-Further elucidation is needed on particular aspects of the reciprocity achievable in the USA in specific circumstances.

-The JCG needs to be better exploited as a communication vehicle so that scientific and other communities are aware of its deliberations.

-Attributed funding should be established from both Parties as a 'Seedcorn fund' for use in specific initiatives.

-The Agreement should be renewed but as part of this process of renewal a strategy should be established that builds effectively on the foundations laid in the first five years in order to better exploit the potential of the Agreement.

-The EU Delegation in Washington DC, in conjunction with the Embassies of Member States, should make particular effort to communicate to USA government agencies the essential differentiation between the EU-USA S&T Agreement and those of Member States.

-The goals of the Agreement should be made more overt from a management standpoint and criteria for assessing delivery of these goals agreed.

-The Commission should ensure that it has put in place the appropriate level of direct communication with key USA government departments - and in doing so that the Agreement has a champion at a senior level on both sides.

-The relevance of high profile functions should be assessed continuously for opportunities that might be available to enhance relationships and involvements under the Agreement so that it is publicised and communicated to appropriate audiences.