



Horizon 2020
Programme

CICERONE

Coordination and Support Action (CSA)

This project has received funding from the European
Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme
under grant agreement No 820707

Start date : 2018-11-01 Duration : 24 Months
<http://cicerone-h2020.eu>



Benchmark of governance and financing models of European clusters and platforms

Authors : Mr. Vasileios RIZOS (CEPS), Jorge Nunez Ferrer (CEPS), Cristian Stroia (CEPS)

CICERONE - Contract Number: 820707

Project officer: Eleni Magklara

Document title	Benchmark of governance and financing models of European clusters and platforms
Author(s)	Mr. Vasileios RIZOS, Jorge Nunez Ferrer (CEPS), Cristian Stroia (CEPS)
Number of pages	41
Document type	Deliverable
Work Package	WP3
Document number	D3.2
Issued by	CEPS
Date of completion	2019-07-31 14:52:58
Dissemination level	Public

Summary

The objective of this report is to survey and benchmark governance and financing models of relevant European clusters, platform and initiatives. The activity is part of Work Package 3 Implementation Pathways, that addresses the high-level objective "to build and test a lasting organisation and pathways to reach the desired impact". This report was developed by the means of a mixed qualitative-quantitative research method to collect data and information via interviews and surveys, supplemented by desk research to fill information gaps. The results revealed that the analysed initiatives register a diversity of governance and financing models, but they all appear to have a generic three-layered governance structure, comprised of: an executive, operational and advisory level. Further, the majority of analysed initiatives have no independent legal status, while those that opted for a legal entity preferred not-for-profit organisations, European Economic Interest Grouping or governmental platforms. Additionally, the predominant financing model for the investigated initiatives is public funding. Private funding is rarely found as an option among the examined initiatives, few using private sources and chargeable services. At the same time, the benchmarking exercise revealed that if an initiative wants to be directly financed, it then requires a legal entity. This applies to any initiative that would like to participate in any call for funding on their own. Furthermore, some forms of legal entities can benefit from funding by a group of national public organisation supporting a specific initiative, since such organisations could improve collaboration and engagement. Being a directly-financed initiative by the private sector can undermine the independent nature of an initiative, and can place additional requirements on the supervision, control and management of the governance structure and operations. If the funding is private, then it is necessary for an initiative to have a board of directors (supervising the mandate and ensuring independence) and also an executive board (that oversees the activities and performs strategic planning and high-level decision-making). Post-project sustainability creates particular challenges to projects, especially in the area of innovation, since they are highly reliant on public support and very rarely can offer services of interest to the private sector.

Approval

Date	By
2019-08-05 10:18:39	Mrs. Rebeka KOVACIC (Univ Maribor)
2019-10-01 17:39:00	Mr. Thomas WAGNER (CKIC)

Benchmark of governance and financing models of European clusters and platforms

Deliverable 3.2

31.05.2019 Final

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
1 Introduction.....	6
2 Methodology	6
2.1 Criteria for the selection of initiatives.....	6
2.2 Taxonomy of initiatives	7
2.3 Indicator selection	8
2.4 Collection of information	9
3 Factsheets by initiative.....	10
3.1 BiodivERsA.....	10
3.2 Norface	11
3.3 BONUS	13
3.4 JPI Oceans.....	15
3.5 HERA	17
3.6 JPI FACCE	18
3.7 Catalunya Circular	20
3.8 Circulary.....	21
3.9 ECERA European Circular Economy Research Alliance	22
3.10 ETIP Bioenergy – European Technology and Innovation Platform	23
3.11 GGKP Green Growth Knowledge Platform.....	25
3.12 TAP Transformative Actions Program	27
3.13 PACE Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy	28
3.14 Renewable Heating and Cooling (RHC) Platform	29
3.15 AVAENSEN Cluster	30
3.16 Covenant of Mayors	32
4 Characteristics of the analysed initiatives	33
4.1 Governance structure.....	33
4.2 Legal status.....	34
4.3 Financing model	34
4.4 Stakeholder involvement	34
5 Lessons and conclusions.....	35
5.1.1 Governance structure.....	35
5.1.2 Choice of legal status.....	35
5.1.3 The financial model and right legal entity.....	35

5.1.4	Governance and stakeholder participation.....	36
5.1.5	Sustainability challenges after public grants end.....	36
5.2	Next steps.....	37
ANNEX 1 Open-ended questionnaire.....		38
ANNEX 2 Preliminary screening of relevant initiatives		39
ANNEX 3 Collection of information for the selected initiatives		41

Figures

Figure 1	Generic governance structure of selected initiatives – similarities and differences	33
----------	---	----

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The objective of this report is to survey and benchmark governance and financing models of relevant European clusters, platform and initiatives. It provides a starting point for preparing governance and financing model options, and procedures for post-project sustainability of the future joint platform for efficient Circular Economy programming in the EU. The report is part of the activity of *Work Package 3 Implementation Pathways*, that addresses the high-level objective “to build and test a lasting organisation and pathways to reach the desired impact”. Part of this activity is *Task 3.2 Platform Governance*, which carries the objective of preparing and validating the governance options and mechanisms to ensure the post-project sustainability of the future joint platform. Essentially placed within this task is activity A3.2.1, which undertakes the surveying and benchmarking of existing relevant governance and financing models for European clusters and platforms, the outcomes of which are presented in the present report.

This report was developed by the means of a mixed qualitative-quantitative research method to collect data and information via interviews and surveys, supplemented by desk research to fill information gaps. The first step in this process was a preliminary screening activity, which covered 94 initiatives considered for analysis and also aided in the selection of a number of 8 indicators to be assessed via a questionnaire. The second step was the selection of four essential elements (multi-level representation and diversity of geographical footprint; sustainability as the preeminent topical focus; diverse financing models; strategic focus) for the sampling process, which lead to a sample of 35 initiatives being singled out. This sample of initiatives was approached and invited for interviewing and surveying by the means of a short open-ended questionnaire. Eventually, 16 initiatives responded with information, results which are presented and analysed in this report.

The results of surveying the selected initiatives brought about several pertinent lessons. The initiatives register a diversity of governance and financing models, but they all appear to have a generic three-layered governance structure, comprised of: an executive, operational and advisory level. Further, the majority of analysed initiatives have no independent legal status, while those that opted for a legal entity preferred not-for-profit organisations, European Economic Interest Grouping or governmental platforms. Additionally, the predominant financing model for the investigated initiatives is public funding (which can be either EU funding, national/regional funding or mixed public funding). Private funding is rarely found as an option among the examined initiatives, few using private sources and chargeable services. Other sources of income consisted of in-kind contributions, ‘common pot’ schemes, philanthropic financing or foundations. Nevertheless, two initiatives had no sources of financing since they were either voluntary networks or partnerships.

At the same time, the benchmarking exercise revealed that if an initiative wants to be directly financed, it then requires a legal entity. This applies to any initiative that would like to participate in any call for funding on their own. Furthermore, some forms of legal entities can benefit from funding by a group of national public organisation supporting a specific initiative, since such organisations could improve collaboration and engagement. Being a directly-financed initiative by the private sector can undermine the independent nature of an initiative, and can place additional requirements on the supervision, control and management of the governance structure and operations. If the funding is private, then it is necessary for an initiative to have a board of directors (supervising the mandate and ensuring independence) and also an executive board (that oversees the activities and performs strategic planning and high-level decisionmaking). Post-project sustainability creates particular challenges to projects, especially in the area of innovation, since they are highly reliant on public support and very rarely can offer services of interest to the private sector.

KEYWORDS: Governance, platform, sustainability, financing, legal entity

Disclaimer

The content of this document is the sole responsibility of the authors and any opinions expressed therein do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Commission. For the purpose of the report, only the names of the platforms, clusters, initiatives and networks are mentioned, without being associated with the name of the interviewee.

Authors

Jorge Nunez Ferrer, CEPS

Cristian Stroia, CEPS

1 Introduction¹

The H2020 CICERONE project brings together programme owners, research organisations and other stakeholders to create a platform for efficient Circular Economy programming in the European Union. The priority setting and the organisation of the future platform is driven by Programme Owners (POs), involved either as project partners, or via a stakeholder network.

The objective of this report is to analyse the governance and financial structures of different networks and platforms of similar nature to the future platform for efficient Circular Economy programming in the EU in order to propose the potential structure of a continuation of the platform.

This report presents the results of surveys and interviews performed on a number of platforms and networks, to benchmark them and identify the most appropriate models based on the nature of CICERONE.

Key questions this exercise addresses are:

- What structure is the most appropriate for the platform?
- How can the platform be sustainable financially after the end of this first period, i.e. can it be financed by membership fees, national contributions, EU funding?
- What are the legal forms of existing platforms and initiatives?

This deliverable is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the methodology used to select the surveyed initiatives, Section 3 presents information collected from surveying and interviews in a factsheet-structured format, Section 4 looks at the main characteristics of the analysed initiatives, and finally, Section 5 derives lessons, conclusions and the next steps in the project towards building and testing a lasting organisation and pathways to reach the desired impact of the future joint Circular Economy programming platform in the EU.

2 Methodology

2.1 Criteria for the selection of initiatives

The benchmarking approach for this report mainly seeks to identify transferable practices in governance models and mechanisms to ensure post-project sustainability of the future platform for efficient Circular Economy programming in the EU. In addition to this, the benchmarking activity of selected initiatives also includes, among others, information on the business models, legal status and stakeholder/user information of each of the selected initiatives. The selection of indicators is described in section 2.2.

Four essential elements were singled out for the screening and sampling process of various initiatives:

- *Multi-level representation and diversity of geographical footprint of the initiative:* European, international, regional, subnational;
- *Sustainability as the preeminent topical focus of the selected initiatives.* Secondary preference was given to topical connection to the fields of circular economy, industrial development, urban development, and energy;
- *Diverse financing models:* public (EU-funded), private and from other sources;

¹ The authors of this report express out appreciation to CICERONE project partners Sihtasutus Eesti Teadusagentuur (ETAg) and LGI Consulting for their support in the preliminary information collection and interviewing for this report.

- *Strategic focus:* EU-driven, business/industry-driven, research-driven.

2.2 Taxonomy of initiatives

The objective of this report was to cover chosen categories (such as platforms, clusters, public-private partnerships, networks, joint programming initiatives, innovation partnerships) with at least one representative initiative from each category.

From the screening of initiatives for the benchmarking exercise, the main typologies emerged. The following list presents the taxonomy and short description of sampled initiatives:

- **Platforms:** while there is no universally-agreed-upon definition, from a business point of view, a platform can be considered a “business model that focuses on helping to facilitate interactions across a large number of participants. The role of the platform business is to provide a governance structure and a set of standards and protocols that facilitate interactions at scale so that network effects can be unleashed.”² While platform can cover a wide set of purposes and activities, the European Commission acknowledges that some of the specific characteristics include: “the ability to create and shape new markets, to challenge traditional ones, and to organise new forms of participation [...]; they operate in multisided markets but with varying degrees of control over direct interactions between groups of users; they benefit from ‘network effects’ [...]; they often rely on information and communications technologies to reach their users, instantly and effortlessly; they play a key role in digital value creation [...]”³
- **Clusters:** According to the EU Cluster Portal, clusters are considered “groups of specialised enterprises – often SMEs – and other related supporting actors that cooperate closely together in a particular location”⁴. The aim of clusters is to stimulate innovation, increase job creation and the registration of patents by operating on regional markets.
- **European Innovation Partnerships (EIP):** were created to “promote the implementation of a new innovation ecosystem, aiming to act across policies, sectors and borders to tackle societal challenges and enhance Europe’s competitiveness”⁵.
- **Joint Programming Initiative (JPIs)** are strategic processes that aspire “to pool national research efforts in key strategic areas in order to make better use of Europe’s Research and Development resources in a structured and coordinated way. Member States voluntarily agree on common visions and Strategic Research Agendas (SRA) to address major societal challenges in a partnership approach, and commit to working together to implement them through Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs)”⁶. JPIs leave the discretionary power of collaborative project selection to member states and funding agencies, thus allowing for bottom-up initiatives to spring up.
- **European Research Area (ERA)** was originally conceived on the idea that “a gain in efficiency can be obtained if isolated national research systems become more interoperable, allowing for better flows of knowledge, technology and people among them and creating a more

² Hogel, J. (2015), The Power of Platforms, Deloitte University Press, https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/za/Documents/strategy/za_The_power_of_platforms.pdf

³ COM/2016/0288 final <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1466514160026&uri=CELEX:52016DC0288#footnote2>

⁴ EU Cluster Portal (2017), https://ec.europa.eu/growth/industry/policy/cluster_en

⁵ EPRS (2017), At a glance – European Innovation Partnerships, [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2017/603938/EPRS_ATA\(2017\)603938_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2017/603938/EPRS_ATA(2017)603938_EN.pdf)

⁶ Norface Era-net (2012), Delivering the European Research Area in the Social Sciences and Preparing for Horizon 2020 – A report on Inter-agency Co-operation, <https://www.norface.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/NORFACE-a-report-on-inter-agency-cooperation-web.pdf-Adobe-Acrobat-Pro.pdf>

integrated European system for research”⁷. It allows for the free circulation of technology, scientific knowledge and researchers.

- **ERA-NET Cofund:** is considered funding instrument “designed to support public-public partnerships (P2Ps), including joint programming initiatives between the Member States, in their preparation, the establishment of networking structures, design, implementation and coordination of joint activities as well as Union topping-up of a trans-national call for proposals”. Consolidating the previous ‘ERA-NET’ and ‘ERA-NET Plus’ into one instrument that implements one “substantial call with top-up funding from the EU Commission, for transnational research and innovation in selected areas with high European added value and relevance for Horizon 2020”.⁸
- **Public-Private Partnerships:** are understood by the European Commission as “long-term contracts between two units, whereby one unit acquires or builds an asset or set of assets, operates it for a period and then hands the asset over to a second unit. Such arrangements are usually between a private enterprise and government but other combinations are possible, with a public corporation as either party or a private non-profit institution as the second party”⁹.
- **European Technology and Innovation Platforms (ETIP):** were created by the European Commission in the framework of the new Integrated Roadmap Strategic Energy Technology Plan (SET Plan) by putting together stakeholders and experts from the energy sector. ETIPs are mergers between “European Industrial Initiatives (public-private partnerships to implement research agendas for the development and deployment of low carbon energy technologies) and European Technology Platforms (ETPs)”¹⁰.
- **Article 185 programme:** refers to the EU treaty that defines the various forms of collaborations between EU member states. This particular article states that if the member states establish a joint research programme, the European Community can join it. This includes participating in the structures created to execute national programme. The decision about the EU participation has to be made by a co-decision of the EU Parliament and the Council.¹¹

2.3 Indicator selection

Each initiative is individually presented in a concise and methodical approach in the form of a factsheet that covers the selected indicators. The approach is not exhaustive in its analysis but presents a synoptic perspective of the selected initiatives, in light of the answers collected from interview/survey respondents. The common indicators to characterise the selected initiatives include:

- **Financing model:** subdivided into 3 types: *private funding* (membership fee, service fee, event-based revenue etc.), *public funding* (EU or national funding in the form of grants or subsidy) and *other sources* (in-kind, ROI, dividends etc.)
- **Governance structure:** reveals the system of rules, practices and processes by which each initiative is directed and controlled
- **Legal status:** the registered legal identity of the initiative, as recognised by the legal courts

⁷ EPRS (2016), The European Research Area – Evolving concept, implementation challenges, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2016/579097/EPRS_IDA%282016%29579097_EN.pdf

⁸ European Commission (2019), ERA-NETS, http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/cross-cutting-issues/era-net_en.htm

⁹ Article 15.41 of Regulation (EU) No 549/2013, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A32013R0549>

¹⁰ EPRS (2017), At a glance – European Technology and Innovation Platforms, [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2017/603939/EPRS_ATA\(2017\)603939_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2017/603939/EPRS_ATA(2017)603939_EN.pdf)

¹¹ European Parliament (2016), Article 185 initiatives – At a glance, [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2016/593476/EPRS_ATA\(2016\)593476_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2016/593476/EPRS_ATA(2016)593476_EN.pdf)

- **Sustainability attainment** (i.e. long term financial sustainability, continuous stakeholder engagement etc.)
- **Stakeholder involvement:** seen as the process used to engage relevant stakeholders to influence a range of outcomes through communication, information, consultation, participation or partnerships. For this report, the subcategories taken for consideration are: *direct engagement* (e.g. in dialogue, consultations, meetings etc.), *online engagement* (e.g. via social media, teleconferences etc.), *provision of information* (e.g. via newsletters, website, publications, social media etc.) and *other means* (such as action partnerships).
- **Member/user typology:** seeks to mention the categories of members or users of each selected initiative/platform/network/cluster
- **SWOT analysis:** following input collection (where applicable) from interviewed or surveyed respondents, the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis covers a few pertinent insights in a simple format
- **Objective achievement:** aims to highlight (where applicable) several achieved results, in line with the objectives of the initiative

2.4 Collection of information

For this report, the authors opted for a mixed qualitative-quantitative research method to collect data and information via interviews and surveys, supplemented by desk research to fill information gaps. A preliminary screening activity that covered all the categories mentioned in section 2.2 resulted in a total of 94 initiatives being considered for examining (see *ANNEX 2 Preliminary screening of relevant initiatives*). The preliminary screening aided in the selection of a number of 8 indicators (previously described in Section 2.3) to be assessed in via a questionnaire.

A sample of thirty-five initiatives that met the selection criteria (section 2.1) was approached and invited for interview and surveying by the use of an open-ended questionnaire (see *ANNEX 1 Open-ended questionnaire*). The number of respondents who took part in the interviews and surveying totalled 16, while the information for one initiative was collected from desk research (see *ANNEX 3 Collection of information for the selected initiatives*).

The information was collected via short questionnaires, containing eight open-ended questions, one for each category of indicator mentioned in section 2.3 – the sample is found in *ANNEX 1 Open-ended questionnaire*. The structure of the survey, along with a brief description of the project and the aim of the current report, was sent via email to thirty-five selected initiatives.

The process of collecting information encountered several challenges and limitations, the main one coming from the method of reaching out to stakeholders for interview and surveying through the “cold approach”, i.e. without having a previously established contact with them. This entailed mostly reaching out via general email addresses and website contact forms to send customized messages and survey guideline, which proved to have a very low response rate. Moreover, the low response rate persisted throughout the period of the activity, despite repeated rounds of follow-up emails, reminders, and, in some cases, phone follow-ups. Lastly, the quality of input and responses received from stakeholders.

In what follows, section 3 introduces the information collected from surveying and interviews in a factsheet format that allows for a simple and concise structuring of the content. Each selected initiative is presented independently, and the information is organised according to an indicator-based framework.

3 Factsheets by initiative

3.1 BiodivERsA

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
BiodivERsA	Era-net	Biodiversa is a network of national and regional funding organisations promoting pan-European research on biodiversity and ecosystem services, that provides innovative opportunities for the conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity.	Biodiversa has an <i>advisory board</i> (that gives input to policy making, in addition to other tasks), a <i>scientific advisory board</i> and an <i>executive board</i> (dealing with running tasks and technicalities). They are supported by a <i>secretariat executive manager</i> , responsible for operational implementation of the project, and by an Officer dedicated to science-society/policy interfacing
Legal status	Financing model		
n/a	Private funding	Public funding	Other sources
	-	members state funding + EC support (under the Horizon 2020 ERA-NET COFUND scheme)	-
Typology of users/members			
The participants in this platform are only funding organisations, whose interest is to publish joint calls. Scientist, ministries and other relevant stakeholders are connected to the initiative via joint calls (participants) and via thematic workshops or conferences			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
Workshops, conferences	-Social media (Twitter) -Website -Newsletters	-policy briefs -Supports participants of the joint calls with best practice manuals on that topic - Stakeholder engagement handbook for scientists - https://www.biodiversa.org/702	-Joint calls -Matching events between researchers and stakeholders
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Biodiversa has been a sustainable initiative through EC funding, having been initially funded in FP6. -its research helped LIFE projects to build upon -knowledge transfer towards IPBES 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reached 23 countries to promote coordination of research on biodiversity, ecosystem services and Nature-based Solutions - supported the advancement of academic excellence and the build-up of European research - Impact of BiodivERsA support to research in terms of high leverage and networking effects <p>(More details)</p>	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Extended continuity of the initiative; -clear focus; -clear governance structure; - strong charismatic coordinator - supports a large, active research community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -dependent on EC and member states funding (not self-sustainable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greater visibility of activities, results and research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -discontinuation of EC funding

3.2 Norface

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
Norface	Era-net	<p><i>New Opportunities for Research Funding Agency Cooperation in Europe (NORFACE)</i> is a partnership of national research funding agencies from 19 European countries, dedicated to leading and developing opportunities for scientists in the area of social and behavioural sciences. It promotes research, shares best practices among research funders and makes international collaboration between social scientists in Europe possible.</p> <p>Launched in January 2004, the NORFACE network is the result of a successful bid for funding to the European Commission’s FP6</p>	<p>The management organisation of the Norface network has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- a <i>network board</i> (in which all network partners are represented; has strategic responsibilities; is the highest authority in decision making; it takes the final decisions on funding matters and decides on all internal operations and procedures)- a <i>management team</i> (advises the Network Board on the implementation of its strategy, is formed of one staff member from each partner and is the forum for joint consideration of the implementation, management and monitoring of the network’s research programmes)- a <i>Coordination Office</i> in the Netherlands <p>(More details)</p>
Legal status		Financing model	
		Private funding	Public funding
n/a	-	Member states funding (an annual membership fee calculated per country size ‘common pot’, which supports the secretariat in the Netherlands)	-
		Other sources	
n/a			
Typology of users/members			
A close partnership and network of national research agencies (major European and European-Associated research (funding) organisations as well as key organisations dedicated to leading and developing opportunities for scientists in the area of social and behavioural sciences)			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
Workshops, conferences, multilateral connections, series of seminars		-publications and data - roadmaps	-joint calls
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
Existing since 2003, this era-net was previously supported by funding organisations (member states) and also by EC (mainly via cofund). When the EC support stopped. The members of this network decided that the topic is still very interesting for the participating funding organisations and therefore this platform now continues only with the support of member states.		<p>The objectives (to develop and manage research programmes and act as a forum for discussion and knowledge exchange among funding agencies) were met by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- developing research programmes with high scientific and societal value- promoting effective transnational pan-European research networking and synergy of research programmes, - supporting innovation and excellent interdisciplinary research- fostering European added value and a comparative perspective- becoming a forum for discussion and knowledge exchange among funding agencies- bridging gaps between research domains and disciplines <p>(More details)</p>	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
-A good example of how an era-net can become self-sustainable.	- took several years of ‘light touch’ cooperation before scaling up	- increased use of the NORFACE network by	- the “common pot” funding model was difficult to

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The membership fee is calculated per country size – it has been found to be one of the key elements why also smaller member states are interested (and able) to participate. If the membership fee would be divided equally by the number of participants (not taking into account the size of the country) most probably small countries would not participate - bringing together a significant mass of high-quality international research capacity from relevant scientific disciplines and knowledge holders in innovative endeavours - establishment of a ‘common pot’ funding model, which implied that national control over national research funding was deliberately moved up to the transnational level - high involvement in the network’s activities of all partner organisations (including new-comers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - frequent changes of management team members across the different years of operation - learning opportunities through international cooperation to occur at the organisational level (not just at the individual level) - moving the international co-operation to other parts of the world can be a lot more challenging 	<p>management team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - transfer the accumulated NORFACE knowledge to new Management Team-members and new Network Board members would be to make some kind of a welcome package of selected documents/studies/best practices 	<p>embrace by national funding organisations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - difference between partner organisations related to the financing of thematic programmes through Norface
--	--	---	---

3.3 BONUS

Name	Type	Overview	Governance		
BONUS	Article 185 programme (TFEU)	BONUS, the Joint Baltic Sea Research and Development Programme for years 2010-2017, was started by the BONUS member states together with the EU and officially launched in September 2010 by a co-decision of the European Parliament and the European Council as a Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) Article 185 activity. BONUS is aligned with the objectives of the European Strategy for Marine and Maritime Research. It is an integral part of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea which seeks to provide both a coordinated, and inclusive framework in response to the key challenges facing the Baltic Sea Region, together with concrete solutions for these challenges. BONUS is built on BONUS+ (2009-2011) and BONUS ERA-NET (2003-2008)	a) Implementation bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>Steering Committee</i>: is the highest decision-making body of the initiative, and is formed of representatives from the national funding institutions (members of BONUS) under a rotating chairmanship.- <i>Executive Committee</i>- <i>Secretariat</i>: established as a European Economic Interest Grouping EEIG in 2007 to act as the legal management organisation of BONUS b) Funding bodies c) Advice, Consultation and Support bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>Advisory Board</i>: consists of scientists of high international standing and representatives of relevant key stakeholders, who assist the Secretariat by providing independent advice, guidance and recommendations regarding scientific and policy-related issues of relevance to BONUS- <i>Forum of Sector Research</i>- <i>Forum of Project Coordinators</i>: is composed of coordinators of ongoing projects funded through BONUS, and assists the Secretariat in matters dealing with the scientific coordination of BONUS		
Legal status		Financing model			
		Private funding	Public funding	Other sources	
The BONUS Secretariat (an European Economic Interest Grouping EEIG) acts as the legal management organisation of BONUS and it serves as the dedicated legal structure for the implementation of the BONUS programme		-	-Participation fee is dependent on the size of the budget committed to the joint calls. Financing model 50/50 (50% from member states, 50% from EC). And it applies for the whole programme (not for certain joint call, project) – it allows the programme to be flexible (it is possible to reallocate budget between partners if needed). The technical side can be in times complicated (Commitment vs spent budget in practice). -The BONUS Secretariat is funded by the member fees and the Finnish Ministry of Education.	- mandatory In-kind contribution from partners	
Typology of users/members					
BONUS members are the national research funding institutions in the eight EU member states around the Baltic Sea					
Stakeholder involvement					
Direct engagement		Online engagement		Provision of information	Other means
- At the programme level, the main mechanism for stakeholder involvement is the <i>BONUS Forum</i> (organised annually or biennially to carry out consultations and share results of the BONUS funded projects with policymakers) - Open participation events - Forum for project coordinators		- E-bulletin - newsletter - social media		- Publications	- Joint calls - Innovation calls - Young scientist activities

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conferences for clustering activities of projects - events are often combined with other major national events to get more international attention 			
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very sustainable platform. Preparatory activities started in 2003, when the Bonus programme was created after two previous thematic era-nets. Development of the platform over time is very important to guarantee sustainability. - The rotating chairmanship of the Steering Committee guarantees sustainable governance for the platform and also provides a learning possibility for the new chair to fulfil the tasks according to the requirements. - a key aspect to maintaining the interest of the participants is the fact that the platform is well targeted and concentrated on a very specific topic, with a regional focus. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BONUS strategic research agenda is now well covered, by integrating the research activities in the Baltic Sea system into a durable, cooperative, interdisciplinary well-integrated and focused multi-national programme. - By the end of 2018, all 28 projects funded from the Viable ecosystem (VE) and Innovation calls of 2012 and Sustainable ecosystem services (SES) call of 2014 have been completed. These projects enhanced not only the scientific knowledge on the Baltic Sea system, but with overall at least 230 corresponding suggestions, also had a widespread impact on policy development, management measures, and society at large in the Baltic Sea region - As of 2019, All 19 themes of the BONUS strategic research agenda are satisfactorily covered - Highlights from the projects show major contributions to policy action plans <p style="text-align: right;">(More details)</p>	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having the legal status of an EEIG - European economic interest group – is seen as a great benefit by the BONUS members, as it helps to feel the “ownership” of the initiative - sustainable governance for the platform - The compulsory “In-kind contribution” to the programme (e.g. shared infrastructure) helps to create synergies between partners and initiates new common projects - high ranking in the national agenda due to regional focus and cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacity building in small states - barriers to joint programming at the Member State level (in particular the reluctance to use a real common pot system for financing) - An unfortunate effect of the co-funding principle, however, is that BONUS has had the biggest effects on capacity in the countries best able to afford national contributions. - diffuse influence on policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sharing BONUS best practices and methodologies with other initiatives - new partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Widening the scope of the initiative beyond a regional focus, making it harder for local ministries (who are responsible for providing funding commitments) to feel ownership - regulatory impediments

3.4 JPI Oceans

Name	Type	Overview	Governance	
JPI Oceans	Joint Programming Initiative	<p>The Joint Programming Initiative Healthy and Productive Seas and Oceans (JPI Oceans) is established in 2011 as an intergovernmental platform, open to all EU Member States and Associated Countries who invest in marine and maritime research. The aim is to provide a strategic policy platform for a long-term European approach to marine and maritime research and technology developments.</p> <p>JPI Oceans focuses on a long-term collaboration between EU Member States, Associated Countries and international partners. JPI Oceans covers all European sea basins with 20 member countries and one observing country.</p>	<p>- <i>Management Board</i> is the decision-making body, responsible for agreeing on the SRIA, defining future priorities and implementing JPI Oceans actions. The Management Board comprises high-level representatives of government ministries and funding agencies, enabling co-design of actions with science policy relevance from the outset.</p> <p>- <i>Executive Committee</i> – an independent Strategic Advisory Board comprising experts from science, industry and civil society – assists the Management Board</p> <p>- The JPI Oceans Secretariat based in Brussels.</p>	
Legal status		Financing model		
		Private funding	Public funding	Other sources
The secretariat is a not for profit NGO under Belgian law (JPI Oceans AISBL). Participants in the initiative can become full members of the NGO, or be partner organisations (with observer status)		-	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Member governments pay a fee- The Common Support Action that the JPI operates is a project funded by Horizon 2020- Projects funded by various public surces, EU and national	-
Typology of users/members				
Only funding organisations				
Stakeholder involvement				
Direct engagement	Online engagement		Provision of information	Other means
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Stakeholder dissemination workshops- conferences	- Newsletter		- Policy briefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- joint calls- knowledge hubs
Securing sustainability of the initiative			Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- hard to evaluate, considering that the initiative is still at an incipient stage			<p>JPI Oceans has launched a number of actions, above and beyond joint calls for proposals, testing different approaches and new collaborative tools that are fit for purpose and working towards the alignment of national programmes. Among these actions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ecological aspects of microplastics- Blue Economy- Ecological aspects of Deep Sea Mining <p>(More details)</p>	
Strengths	Weaknesses		Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- very concrete targets and well-chosen goals, which are relevant and at national level, considering that concrete actions are expected at national level (main goals of this JPI	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- lower ranking in the national level agenda due to lack of regional focus and cooperation		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- topics of the JPI Oceans (priorities) to be linked with national priorities of the field	

are connected with marine strategy framework directive). This entails that member states have to deal with this topic at national level and concrete obligations will follow – therefore this topic is very highly ranked at the political agenda	- lack of a concrete responsible body/person for this JPI at national level.	- charismatic leader at the national level, who could defend the priorities and secure funding for the initiative	
---	--	---	--

3.5 HERA

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
HERA	Era-net	HERA – Humanities in the European Research Area – is a partnership between 26 Humanities Research Councils (funding agencies) across Europe and the European Commission, with the objective of firmly establishing the humanities in the European Research Area and in the European Commission Framework Programmes. The partnership is committed to leading and developing funding opportunities for humanities researchers in Europe. HERA exists since 2003 and is very well known in scientific communities and also recognised by funding organisations. The partnerships put a lot of effort into promoting their services and impact (especially for EC).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>Network Board</i>: the highest authority in the governance structure- <i>Joint Research Programme Board</i>: responsible for the governance of the funding call and for final funding decisions, monitoring progress and knowledge transfer activities. The JRP Board is the ultimate decision-making board of the consortium for joint research activities- <i>Management Board</i>: responsible for carrying out all the HERA activities of core substance in practice. The board consists of one senior staff member from each Partner organisation, who will normally be the person responsible for the implementation of the HERA Network at the Partner organisation- <i>National Contact Points (NCPs)</i> are members of the Management Team and also additional staff who act as the designated contact person when a call for research proposals is announced.
Legal status		Financing model	
		Private funding	Public funding
n/a	-	- From 2004 to 2009 the HERA network was supported with funding by the EU Framework Programme 6’s ERA-Net co-funding scheme - Currently funded by 26 Humanities Research Councils, with contributions based on national GDP.	-
Typology of users/members			
26 research funding organisations in 25 countries			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- workshops- conferences	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Social media (Twitter, Facebook)- Videos (Youtube)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- policy briefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- joint calls
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
Sustainable initially through EC funding, the initiative has been active since 2003		HERA’s funding has been used to support large-scale joint research programmes and associated activities such as matchmaking exercises for research applicants and knowledge exchange activities for projects. Over the course of its first three funding calls, the HERA initiative, together with the European Commission, pooled €56 million to fund 49 transnational projects	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Very enthusiastic and productive leader of the platform. Always neutral, with good communication skills, and finding relevant tasks even to smaller member states (so that everyone can feel engaged and relevant for the platform). The leader of the platform is being able to motivate the participants to commit to the initiative.			

3.6 JPI FACCE

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
FACCE-JPI	Joint Programming Initiative	FACCE – JPI VISION: An integrated European Research Area addressing the challenges of Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change to achieve sustainable growth in agricultural production to meet increasing world food demand and contributing to economic growth while maintaining and restoring ecosystem services under current and future climate change. FACCE-JPI MISSION: to achieve, support and promote integration, alignment and joint implementation of national resources under a common research and innovation strategy to address the diverse challenges in agriculture, food security and climate change.	The governing structure of FACCE JPI consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governing board - elected - Stakeholder advisory board - Scientific advisory board - Secretariat JPI FACCE has engaged different thematic initiatives to their activities. The European Commission has been involved to reflect on JPI FACCE activities and SRIA
Legal status		Financing model	
Presently no. FACCE-JPI has been considering becoming an NGO (just as JPI Oceans) or not. The NGO status of JPI would allow them to participate in H2020 calls.		Private funding	Public funding
		-	JPI FACCE part of ERA-LEARN which is funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 programme.
			Other sources
			Financing model is currently under discussion, since EC support in the next Framework Programme is not guaranteed. JPI FACCE has developed different scenarios to continue without relying on this funding.
Typology of users/members			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 24 participating public organisations from Member States - Target group of the initiative: Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), Public Research Organisations (PROs), Private and Semi-private Research and Technology Organisations (RTOs) 			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
Events	- broad topic newsletter (which includes news from other initiatives)	- communication and dissemination activities	The stakeholder advisory board engages key stakeholder organisations and their networks. It works well also for feedback analysis.
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - one of the oldest JPis - Encouraging member states to include the SRIA priorities to the national priorities has guaranteed the sustainability of the platform and the implementation of its priorities - longer term funding sustainability is uncertain 		This JPI has initiated many thematic era-nets, an aspect considered a strong side of the platform since these new era-nets also create new synergies	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - well-functioning governing structure - initiation of many thematic era-net programmes - the platform has been able to motivate the member states to include the SRIA priorities to the national priorities 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of sustainable funding

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high focus on communication and dissemination activities - global perspective (one governing board members is representing New Zealand) - broad topical coverage in the newsletter, to include news from connected initiatives | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

3.7 Catalunya Circular

Name	Type	Overview		Governance
Catalunya Circular	Subnational platform	Catalunya Circular was launched on the 9th of May 2018 in Barcelona and it already has around 20 member organizations. Its aim is to become a central point of reference for circular economy (CE) in Catalonia. Besides providing useful knowledge and information on CE, Catalunya Circular offers an opportunity to raise awareness about the work done by Catalan businesses and society by publishing details of their CE initiatives. These initiatives are geolocated on an interactive map and can be selected using a search engine that allows users to look for projects by keyword and/or type of economy.		- <i>Steering committee</i> : Composed by the Catalan Ministry of Business and Knowledge, the Catalan Ministry of Territory and Sustainability and the Catalan Ministry of Agriculture; main business organisations, trade unions and the Network of Cities and Towns for Sustainability). - <i>Advisory Board</i> : Composed of all aforementioned institutions + all partner organisations. - <i>Technical Secretariat</i> : Governmental policy officers from the Ministry of Territory and Sustainability.
Legal status		Financing model		
		Private funding	Public funding	Other sources
Public entity			Regional Government (Government of Catalonia)	
Typology of users/members				
Public administration (regional and local), business organisations, clusters, private companies.				
Stakeholder involvement				
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information		Other means
Meetings to talk about specific programmed activities and to foster new ones	- online platform	Provision of information about programmed activities, participation and support to their programmed activities		- Action partnerships: Interrelate similar initiatives undertaken by partners (e.g. platform created by the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona and Circular Catalonia). - invitations to participate in Catalan delegations regarding circular economy activities - possibility to disseminate information through the platform
Securing sustainability of the initiative			Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
Sustainability secured through: - Continuous political support - Continuous engagement and active support of partner organisations (especially business organisations and local authorities).			The initiative started in May 2018, and it has met its objectives. It is expected to reach a wider range of companies and to offer more and better tools in the near future	
Strengths	Weaknesses		Opportunities	Threats
- High engagement of stakeholders - Perceived as a good initiative - Involvement of different government departments	- Lack of resources - Technological limitations of being integrated into an online public platform		- Circular economy is seen as the economy of the future - Active international context - Increasing consciousness of stakeholders	- Most SMEs are in fact microenterprises with a low level of resources. Their support is unstable

3.8 Circular

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
Circularity	Industry platform	The Circularity platform is a web tool that continuously brings new examples of innovative ways in which industry, SMEs and other business add to the circular economy in Europe. At the same time, it highlights the regulatory and non-regulatory challenges these businesses still face to upscale their current initiatives or to start new ones. The platform is a unique bottom-up business-led hub of knowledge and expertise	The platform is managed BusinessEurope’s Industrial Affairs department (Director and employees).
Legal status		Financing model	
		Private funding	Public funding
n/a	-	-	Other sources
Circularity is a platform offered as part of its membership services by Business Europe.			
Typology of users/members			
The platform is collecting mostly Europe-based company-specific examples of new technologies and business practices that advance the circular economy. If a new technology is tested across a sector, the platform may consider such an example as well. Examples are only considered if there is at least one company involved and the example is actually tested in practice (it cannot live on paper only).			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
Dialogue and meetings	Social media direct messages	BusinessEurope newsletter and Twitter	Informal cooperation with interested sectors
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
The platform was a one-time investment with a flexible maintenance contract if needed. The platform collects new examples when needed through its membership or by contacting companies whenever it finds relevant examples		Circularity has so far been an important advocacy tool for BusinessEurope to showcase what companies big and small are doing in Europe to add to the circular economy, and what challenges they face to become even more circular. From the feedback we received from policymakers and businesses, this is useful for them to get a rough overview of what is happening and how certain policies are impacting companies. It has also been a useful tool for BusinessEurope’s position papers and during our presentations at events. It will remain a useful tool for all the aforementioned elements in the years to come as we move to the next EU political cycle.	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Wide coverage of examples across many countries, sectors and parts of the value chain. The information provided is concise and to-the-point: Description, added value and challenges. Partners and contact info are optional extras.	Underrepresentation of certain sectors. This does not mean that these sectors generally do less on circular economy, it’s just that they haven’t found our platform yet. Furthermore, there’s a heavy focus on recycling and recovery (e.g. industrial symbiosis).	There could be more focus on critical raw materials (CRMs) in the examples. Apart from examples dealing on remanufacturing, there could be more focus on the other examples on the life cycle of CRMs.	There to be a mismatch between the policy-making, which takes place at the macro level (regional, national or societal focus) and the implementation by companies (micro level) or between companies and other organisation (meso level).

3.9 ECERA European Circular Economy Research Alliance

Name	Type	Overview		Governance
ECERA European Circular Economy Research Alliance	Collaboration network	ECERA is a voluntary collaboration network between European RTO’s, with the aim to strengthen and integrate scientific knowledge and expertise in the field of Circular Economy from an interdisciplinary perspective.		ECERA has a steering committee with 1 representative per member organisation, and 2 back-up persons. The steering committee elects a chairman and a secretary for a 1-year term. For the organisation of a workshop, a working group has been set up.
Legal status		Financing model		
		Private funding	Public funding	Other sources
No legal status, only a voluntary network	-	-	-	None, ECERA is a voluntary alliance between RTO’s
Typology of users/members				
All members are European Research and Technology Organisations				
Stakeholder involvement				
Direct engagement	Online engagement		Provision of information	Other means
Direct engagement in the steering committee and working group	SC meetings are either physical or via telco		ECERA has a linked-in group and a website	
Securing sustainability of the initiative			Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
There is no long term financial sustainability yet. The network is just a voluntary network, which exists since mid-2018. ECERA is now looking into connecting to other organisations in order to get a stronger administrative and financial basis.			ECERA has been successful in bringing RTO’s together and setting up a dialogue between them. This provides clarity on ECERA’s complementarity and strengthens its collaboration in view of project opportunities. ECERA are also beginning to be recognised by other EU stakeholders as a point of contact for circular economy research and knowledge.	
Strengths		Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Bringing together RTO’s around knowledge building and sharing for circular economy. Exchanging research strategy of the members.		Trust between the partners is crucial to bring the network into a fully collaborative mode. There is no funding, so all work is voluntary and limited to contributions at the meetings	There is a need in Europe to bring knowledge and expertise together, to make sure that research projects lead to a common knowledge building. Complementarity between RTO’s will allow better and quicker knowledge development than the competition	Limited funding and lack of connection to Circular Economy initiatives in EU may lead to a loss of interest of the partners

3.10 ETIP Bioenergy – European Technology and Innovation Platform

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
ETIP Bioenergy - European Technology and Innovation Platform	Technology and innovation platform	The European Technology and Innovation Platform Bioenergy (ETIP Bioenergy) was launched in 2016 and combines the efforts of the European Biofuels Technology Platform (EBTP), which started in 2006, and the European Industrial Initiative Bioenergy (EIBI), which started in 2010. It is managed by a Steering Committee and supported by a Secretariat, with the European Commission being an active observer. The platform secretariat is with FNR	The governance structure of ETIP Bioenergy is composed of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steering Committee - Working groups - Advisory board - Coordination Group - Stakeholder Plenary - Secretariat
Legal status		Financing model	
		Private funding	Other sources
No legal status. ETIP Bioenergy is officially recognized by the European Commission and also a member of the EU Transparency Register .		-	EU financing to supporting project ETIP Bioenergy SABS2 under H2020 Grant Agreement Number: 825179
Typology of users/members			
Mixed membership- see website and Terms of Reference. Member State technical experts are represented in the Advisory Board of ETIP Bioenergy			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
3 Steering Committee meetings per year, Stakeholder Plenary Meetings every 12-18 months, contributions to consultations and preparation of position papers, own workshops and presentations in workshops/symposia by 3rd parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social media (Twitter, LinkedIn) - Videos (Youtube) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Newsletter 	Cooperation with other ETIPs and networks formally (e.g. EERA, ETIP RHC) or on the spot
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
ETIP Bioenergy exists since 2016, as a direct follow up of the European Biofuels Technology Platform EBTP created in 2006. This is based on continuous stakeholder engagement. The EC has 1st supported the EBTP secretariat. It funds now the ETIP Bioenergy SABS2 project providing general support to the platform. (More details)		ETIP supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the integrated SET-Plan implementation and subsequent actions to facilitate the development of demonstration and flagship activities, as well as longer-term R&D in line with the Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda. - Collaboration and interaction with relevant initiatives addressing renewable fuels, decarbonisation of transport, bioenergy and biomass valorisation as well as bio-based value chains - Stakeholder engagement to better understand the actor perspective and the socio-technical aspects of technology development and implementation; with special focus on outreach and engagement of civil society actors and constant provision of scientifically sound, unbiased, up to date information on renewable fuels and the bioenergy sector 	

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<p>Good coverage of the bioenergy sector and close link to the EC DG RTD. The presentation of knowledge on the ETIP B website, cooperation with other action partners and initiatives. The activity of the Platform (organising WS, writing articles about the most recent topics, being present at various conferences), the Stakeholder Plenary Meetings (gaining and exchanging knowledge, meeting of industry, research and the EC)</p> <p>Teamwork with the SC Members at the Steering Committee (SC) Meetings, the work between the SC Leadership and secretariat, the internal work within the H2020 project consortium, SC Leadership is presenting the ETIP B very well</p>	<p>The constant challenge to keep Steering Committee and Working Group Members active. Many issues go beyond bioenergy R&I as such, especially as the sector is largely driven by the policy frame. Closer links to the legislators is desirable.</p>	<p>Major decisions about the political framework until 2030 have been taken recently (e.g. the recast of the Renewable Energy Directive) and also a SET-Plan Implementation Plan for Renewable Fuels and Bioenergy was approved. ETIP Bioenergy could make important contributions.</p>	<p>Other initiatives relating to the same topic that are not working on a voluntary basis and remunerate the experts who contribute; public perception of biofuels and bioenergy</p>

3.11 GGKP Green Growth Knowledge Platform

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
GGKP Green Growth Knowledge Platform	International platform	<p>The GGKP aims to identify major knowledge gaps in green growth theory and practice and to facilitate the creation of a dynamic green growth community of practice by facilitating interaction between its partners, scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and the private sector. The platform intends also to share knowledge, tools, data, and good practices through a dedicated web-based platform. The overall goal of the GGKP is to support policymakers and other relevant actors in developing, adopting, and implementing green growth policies and practices.</p> <p>The Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP) was established in January 2012 by the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment) and the World Bank.</p>	<p>The GGKP’s five managing organizations – the Global Green Growth Institute, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and the World Bank – together form the GGKP Steering Committee. As the principal governing and decision-making body of the GGKP, the <i>Steering Committee</i> is responsible for approving GGKP’s strategy and overall work program and its decisions are taken by consensus. The platform’s day-to-day operations are jointly managed by GGGI and UN Environment. Both organizations provide dedicated staff and consultants to the initiative and a GGKP office (<i>Secretariat</i>) has been established in Geneva, Switzerland, to manage the work. This Management Team is accountable to the GGKP Steering Committee and provides regular progress updates and status reports on GGKP implementation.</p> <p>Additionally, the Steering Committee has appointed an independent <i>Advisory Committee</i> made up of experts from around the world with deep technical or policy experience related to green growth research and practice. The Advisory Committee offers strategic advice and guidance on GGKP research programs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Recommending key research topics and pointing to new and emerging fronts for priority research;- Identifying and nominating institutions and experts to serve on GGKP <i>Research Committees</i> (established as the main mechanism through which the project aims to promote and execute the GGKP research activities);- Suggesting potential sources of research funding.
Legal status		Financing model	
		Private funding	Public funding
GGKP has no independent legal status. Instead, it is operated as a joint project of its Steering Members (GGGI, OECD, World Bank, UN Environment, UNIDO). Secretariat staff are jointly hosted by the UN Environment and GGGI	-	The Green Growth Knowledge Platform is funded with a combination of contributions from National Government (Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland), The GGKP has also received project funding from H2020 via GGGI to participate in the Green-Win Project – a project which is now closed.	GGKP receives some small, project-specific philanthropic funding from the MAVA Foundation and core and project budgets of the Steering Members of GGKP (GGGI, UN Environment, UN PAGE).
Typology of users/members			
Users tend to be interested in policy and come mostly from the public sector, academia, and policy support organizations. GGKP Knowledge Partners are organizations that are active in producing green growth knowledge products, such as reports, case studies, webinars and courses			

Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
The GGKP holds an annual conference, hosted by a Managing Organization on a rotating basis	The GGKP shares relevant Green Growth publications and events through social media including on Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn. The GGKP also holds bi-monthly webinars on green growth topics along with our partners.	The GGKP sends a monthly newsletter “Knowledge Update” featuring important green growth reports	The GGKP hosts a number of Research Committees, along with our partner organizations
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial sustainability is not guaranteed, but GGKP has benefited from a diverse group of funders underwriting both its core operations and special projects, like the Natural Capital Working Group. - the sustainability is insufficient due to the moderate level of institutionalization of the GGKP among the founding members and limited institutional mainstreaming of the GGKP in most of the Knowledge Partners 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall, the GGKP has done a good job at creating a neutral platform to host the latest research and news around green growth. There is always room to improve and iterate the web platforms for better user experience and higher impact. - the platform has high strategic relevance, the project being well anchored in the Rio+20 Conference outcome document. - the platform has been effective at delivering expected outputs in a short timeframe despite limited financial resources - project outcomes were satisfactorily used by policymakers and other relevant actors to develop, adopt and implement green growth policies and practices <p style="text-align: right;">(More details)</p>	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The open platform makes it easy for organizations to join and engage - The collative approach ensures that the GGKP is not in direct competition with its partners - Steering partners are some of the leading organizations in the effort to spur green growth 	Sustainable funding is difficult with shifting government priorities	The GGKP is in the process of launching two parallel platforms: The Green Industry Platform and the Green Finance Platform, to serve the respective communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustained funding and operational challenges as a co-hosted initiative is a frequent source of operational roadblocks. - GGKP’s future success rests largely on the ability to successfully launch its new platforms and partner with leading organizations in those communities

3.12 TAP Transformative Actions Program

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
Transformative Actions Program TAP	International platform	An innovative initiative that acts as an incubator that supports local and regional governments by catalysing and improving capital flows to cities, towns and regions and strengthen their capacity to access climate finance and attract investment. Through the TAP and its partners, local and regional governments can receive support to develop their infrastructure project concepts into a highly transformative, mature, robust and bankable project ready for financing and implementation. The TAP connects local and regional governments, technical experts and financial institutions. One of the pillars of TAP is the online TAP Platform, which displays select applications in the pipeline in a centralized, uniform format that optimizes visibility to potential investors and funders.	The TAP program is managed by ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability. There is a secretariat for the management of the program and an advisory board consisting of program partners.
Legal status	Financing model		
	Private funding	Public funding	Other sources
n/a	-	-	Initiative set up by ICLEI and covered its own resources at this stage. ICLEI it plans to pitch to the EU, national governments and international financial institutions
Typology of users/members			
City networks, regional governments, UN, international financial institutions, technical experts			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
Regular phone calls, e-mails, meeting at conferences and international events	-	Website Publications Knowledge center	Annual partnership meeting
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
TAP developed a scoring sheet to screen its projects based on their transformative impact, ambition, cross-cutting approach and inclusiveness. In the application form, TAP asks detailed questions on technical, financial and political sustainability.		Through TAP, 21 projects were successfully implemented in the past 5 years, which is a good result, but there is still more to achieve	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
- Wide expertise of partners; global and regional presence	Lack of partners' commitment	Build up a value chain around partners' expertise and network	Activities not funded

3.13 PACE Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy

Name	Type	Overview	Governance				
PACE Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy	Global public-private collaboration platform and project accelerator	The Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy - PACE- was launched in 2017 as a public-private collaboration, co-chaired by the CEO of Philips, the heads of the Global Environment Facility and UN Environment, with the Ellen MacArthur Foundation, the International Resource Panel, Circle Economy and Accenture Strategy as knowledge partners. PACE was launched during the 2018 World Economic Forum Annual meeting to drive public-private action and collaboration on the circular economy. From 2019, the World Resources Institute will support the scale-up of PACE and establish an Action Hub in The Hague.	<p>PACE is governed through a co-chair structure and is run by a central hub and a working group of co-chair and knowledge partner delegates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The Board has two Co-chairs (responsible for programme governance and strategic decision-making), an advisory group (formed of knowledge partners who provide advice on programme strategic direction), and members leadership (who provide input on programme strategic direction).- The Central Hub (shapes program strategy recommendations and is accountable and responsible for programme delivery). The secretariat is comprised of staff from a mix of organizations. <p>The World Economic Forum hosted and facilitated the platform initially, and subsequently, the World Resources Institute took over. (More details)</p>				
Legal status		Financing model					
		Private funding	Public funding	Other sources			
N/A		- Contributions by members	- Contributions by public entities participation, such as participating governments	- World Resources Forum Support (which is funded by a number of public and private organisations) - Foundations			
Typology of users/members							
More than 52 members from the public and private sector have joined PACE (companies, governments, organizations and regional development/investment banks) since its launch in 2017							
Stakeholder involvement							
Direct engagement		Online engagement		Provision of information	Other means		
Physical and virtual meetings Events		Video and teleconferences Social media website		- Digital communications and information exchange platform for members - publications	A core focus of PACE is on brokering and connecting targeted partnerships between members		
Securing sustainability of the initiative			Meeting the objectives of the initiative				
Active stakeholder engagement strategies have been developed to ensure the active leadership of members and partners			Positive achievements at the leadership level (more than 50 global leaders as members, and 11 new platform funding partners), and at the project level (10 affiliate projects were supported, and 3 core public-private partnerships were launched) as well as sharing insights and thoughts leadership from a range of platform partners. Additionally, more than \$25m project investment was catalysed and a learning strategy was developed (11 thought leadership products and 150 network experts). (More details)				
Strengths		Weaknesses		Opportunities		Threats	
- Leadership engagement; - brokering projects		Ensure all members are very active		- Many new areas to broker projects can be built out -scale-ups through replication frameworks		The goal of a Platform is to bring all key partners and projects together. This can include geographic specific/ topic specific platforms – but if there are too many “platforms” at a general level that seek to be established, it defeats the purpose.	

3.14 Renewable Heating and Cooling (RHC) Platform

Name	Type	Overview	Governance	
Renewable Heating and Cooling (RHC) Platform	European Technology and Innovation Platform (ETIP)	The European Technology and Innovation Platform on Renewable Heating & Cooling (RHC-ETIP) brings together stakeholders from the biomass, geothermal, solar thermal and heat pump sectors (including the related industries such as district heating and cooling, thermal energy storage, and hybrid systems) to define a common strategy for increasing the use of renewable energy technologies for heating and cooling.	RHC has a Board (the President + 15 Members), composed of Chairs of the five Technology Panels, and four Horizontal Working Groups. The Platform has a secretariat financed by the European Commission. RHC is in the process of setting up a stakeholders' group to better involve in its work other stakeholders (e.g. traditional heating sector, construction and buildings, national and local representatives))	
Legal status		Financing model		
		Private funding	Public funding	Other sources
No legal status		-	Financed by the European Commission via an H2020 project	-
Typology of users/members				
The platform is composed of industrial stakeholders, research organisations and academic stakeholders covering the whole innovation chain, with arrangements for interactions with the Member States and the European Commission but also representatives of businesses, regulators, civil society and NGOs as relevant.				
Stakeholder involvement				
Direct engagement	Online engagement		Provision of information	Other means
Consultation Horizontal Working Groups Technology Panels Annual Conference	Social media Teleconferences for the official groups		Newsletter Social media	
Securing sustainability of the initiative			Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
RHC had a stall in the period 2015-2018, due to the fact that the activities of the secretariat supporting the Platform were financed via a tender which focused on the drafting of studies, rather than on networking and dissemination activities (which is rather the focus of the ETIP). RHC has started with a new contract at the end of 2018, and is ramping activities up, hoping to get back to previous levels of support and commitment from members. Important to note that members are not financed.			The Platform has been able to increase the visibility of RHC-related issues at EU level, but still needs to work on increasing funding for RHC, and to better raise the profile of the sector (e.g. via à-vis electrification).	
Strengths	Weaknesses		Opportunities	Threats
Committed experts in the Board	Lack of involvement of important stakeholders from national governments, and traditional industry		- Raising the profile of the renewable heating and cooling sector	Focus on the electrification of heating - Future of EU funding

3.15 AVAESEN Cluster

Name	Type	Overview	Governance	
AVAESSEN Cluster	Cluster of change	<p>The Valencian Cluster of Energy Industries AVAESEN is a non-profit association of energy-related companies (renewable energies, circular economy, water cycle, waste treatment and smart cities) established in the Valencian region.</p> <p>Created in 2006, the AVAESEN cluster offers information on programs and open calls related to the energy sector, looks for adequate partners to consolidate the cluster and also manages the submitting of the proposal.</p> <p>The Cluster represents and advocates for the clean energy sector, offering tailor-made services to its members based on a joint plan, aiming at boosting their competitiveness, innovation and growth</p>	<p>In charge of the governance and management of the association is the <i>General Assembly</i>, formed of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- the <i>Board of Directors</i> (composed by all Tenured Members as well as by one representative for every Collective Member, all with the right to speak and vote, with one vote per member regardless of their different nature).- the <i>Vice President</i>- the <i>Secretary</i>- the <i>Standing Committee</i> <p>The Governing Board is formed of a President, three Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer and three Members.</p> <p>Staff: three-person permanent team (Director, administration and project manager)</p>	
Legal status		Financing model		
		Private funding	Public funding	Other sources
Non-profit		-fully privately funded service-provider - income generated for delivery of services	-	-
Typology of users/members				
More than 129 members, out of which over 110 SMEs, and the rest academia, research, government, investors, entrepreneurs and the civil society				
Stakeholder involvement				
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means	
- Events (more than 30/year) - meetings	- website - social media (Twitter)	- newsletter		
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative		
<p>With the financial crisis negatively impacting Spain, and the national government slashing subsidies for renewable energy projects, many clusters were drastically affected by the stoppage of national funding. As a consequence, AVAESEN chose to reinvent itself by cluster transformation and market adaption by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- turning AVAESEN into a real business generator for its members (shifting from a public-private subsidy-oriented cluster to a financially self-sustaining service provider)- placing entrepreneurship at the DNA of the cluster (launching its own cleantech accelerator)- branching out into other sectors- unlocking the clean energy domestic market by working closely with the Regional Government, local and national clusters- AVAESEN transformed itself from a network of cleantech SMEs into an authentic innovation ecosystem, that includes businesses, academia, research, government, investors, entrepreneurs and the civil society. <p>(More details)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Since its creation in 2006, the Cluster encompasses more than 100 business partners, a total employment of more than 6.000 professionals and a total turnover of 3 billion euros.- Expanding the EIT Climate-KIC Accelerator in 12 EU countries (strategy, curriculum development, partnerships and network creation)- Growing more than 70 start-ups directly (in Spain) and 275 indirectly (mainly in the South and East of Europe). The start-ups grown are in the market, having raised more than EUR 10mil and created 160 jobs so far.- Supporting the internationalisation of more than 100 small and medium-sized corporates- Implementing successfully >5 M EUR public funding across EU countries- raising the internationalization rate of the sector from 20% to 80% in 4 years. <p>(More details)</p>		

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Committed and agile - Great impact multiplier - Action-oriented - member SMEs are more innovative, register more patents and create more jobs than they do alone - Strongly EU-connected 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - innovation scale-up - interconnection of innovation ecosystems and action at speed and scale across Europe - transforming traditional clusters into “clusters of change” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - national legislation in the energy sector

3.16 Covenant of Mayors

Name	Type	Overview	Governance
Covenant of Mayors	Initiative	The EU Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy is an EU initiative that voluntarily brings together local governments to committed to implementing EU climate and energy objectives. It was launched in 2008 and now gathers 7,000+ local and regional authorities across 57 countries drawing. It is a bottom-up multi-level cooperation model.	CoM has a <i>steering Committee</i> with the European Committee and an <i>informal political board</i> of mayors. It also has an <i>advisory board</i> . The CoM offices provide the secretariat.
Legal status		Financing model	
		Private funding	Public funding
N/A	No	The CoM for Europe is fully funded by the European Commission.	The CoM expanded beyond European Borders with the Global Covenant of mayors and Compact of Mayors (also initiatives but financed by the EC, Bloomberg, ICLEU, UN Habitat, Fedarene, CCRE, COR, C40, Eurocities, Energy Cities, Climate Alliance)
Typology of users/members			
This is an initiative for local authorities and engages policy makers, NGOs, local authorities.			
Stakeholder involvement			
Direct engagement	Online engagement	Provision of information	Other means
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Events - Signature ceremonies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - website - Twitter, Facebook, youtube - webinars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Press releases - A platform for dissemination of information with no commercial interest - Supports cities with the tools to prepare their decarbonisation paths 	-
Securing sustainability of the initiative		Meeting the objectives of the initiative	
-The CoM is financed by the European Commission. However, the non-EU Global CoM and Compact benefits from a number of sponsors.		Reached over 7000 cities in 57 countries that signed up to the Climate and energy objectives exceeding the targets on expansion and signatories. The challenge will be for the cities to achieve the 2020 and then the 2030 targets.	
Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong link to policies - Bottom-up - technical support by JRC - Awareness raising - Highly recognised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dependent on EC and funding (not self-sustainable) - Alignment to national Action Plans weak - The extension to beyond the EU required external funding - The cities prepare Strategic Energy Action Plans, but these are not always practical implementation plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should be used as implementation instrument - Knowledge Transfer between the participants - Peer to peer support, but too costly, but already a reality at national level - Stronger global visibility and participation of important organisations (also funding organisations) to enhance its reach. - include adaptation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discontinuation of EC funding; - discontinuation of other funders for global initiative; - a significant number of signatories may fail to fulfil the pledges

4 Characteristics of the analysed initiatives

This section lists the specific characteristics of the platforms in terms of governance structure, financial sources, legal status, etc and tries to identify the reason for the differences.

4.1 Governance structure

Each of the examined initiatives encompasses a distinct governance structure tailored to the aims and objectives of the initiative. However, most of them have a three-layered structure:

- *Executive*: mainly an Executive Board/Steering Committee
- *Operational*: generally, a Secretariat with a Management Team
- *Advisory*: predominantly an advisory board, or scientific/research advisory board

Based on the governance structure, the selected initiatives account for some similarities and differences in the generic governance functions, bodies and existence (or not) of a legal entity, which are highlighted below in Figure 1.

Figure 1 Generic governance structure of selected initiatives – similarities and differences

Governance function	Governance Body	Description	Relevance	Recommended governance bodies	
				If initiative has legal status	If initiative has no legal status
Strategic management	Board of Directors	Representatives of the organisation's stakeholders and/or shareholders	- Supervision of mandate and responsibility for all major decision-making - Ensures independence in case of external financing	+	-
	Executive Board	Senior management professionals who oversee the management of the organisation and its business	- Oversight of activities and strategic planning - Decision-making and management of high-level workplace issues	+	-
	Steering Committee	Consists of people in charge of the initiative at the customer's organisation, or of representatives of all partner organisations	- Provision of advice, securing project output delivery and achievement of project outcomes - Setting of objectives and allocation of resources	+ -	+
Operational	Management Team	Management professionals and supervisors who lead a team/staff	- responsibility of day-to-day operations - support for organisational development and growth of staff performance	+	+
	Secretariat	The department that fulfills the central administrative and secretary duties of an organisation/initiative	- Execution of daily administrative tasks - Handling human resources, personnel issues and finances	+	+
Advisory	Advisory Board	External advisers that informally provide non-binding advice to the management of an initiative/organisation	Providing external unbiased counsel on issues raised by the management; acting as a resource and encouraging the exploration of new ideas	+ -	+ -
	Scientific Advisory Board	External advisors composed of science and technology experts from academia and industry	Assesses the scientific direction and progress of the initiative	+ -	+

Legend

- Highly recommended governance body
- Not needed governance body
- Need of governance body is dependant on case-by-case requirements

Source: Authors' elaboration

Apart from the generic structure presented in Figure 1, each initiative differs in its governance model by the addition of other governance levels to the functioning structure, which can include: national contact points, working groups, stakeholder plenaries, co-chair structures.

4.2 Legal status

The majority of the investigated initiatives (12 out of 16) have no independent legal status. Having a separate legal entity was only considered by 4 of the analysed initiatives. Legal status options included: Not for Profit Organisation, European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG) and governmental platforms.

The particular choice of status depends on the kind of operations and funding source. Horizon 2020 funded programmes tend not to have a legal entity, but are projects undertaken by consortia of legal entities. The programmes turn into legal entities to officially join as an organisation in projects (only legal entities can apply for funding). For example, the Covenant of Mayors initiative cannot receive financing from any other source, nor apply for funding or join projects as an entity; instead, only the entities part of the Covenant are eligible for funding application. Some entities that have been created and funded by EU Horizon 2020 funding changed their status to be able to apply for funding for a follow-up period. The operations then become project-funded by a new Horizon 2020 and managed by the new entity as part of a consortium.

4.3 Financing model

For the majority of the initiatives investigated in the factsheets (12 out of 16), the prevailing financing model is public funding. This takes the form of solely EU funding (mostly Horizon 2020) for 6 initiatives, national/regional funding for 2 initiatives, and mixed public funding (EU and member states) for 4 initiatives.

Private funding is rarely found as a choice of financing model among the examined initiatives, with only 2 using private sources and chargeable services. Other sources of income consisted of in-kind contribution, 'common pot' schemes, philanthropic financing or foundations. On the far side, 2 initiatives had no sources of financing since they were either voluntary networks or partnerships.

Of the two initiatives that use private funding, the Valencian Cluster of Energy Industries (AVAESN) is fully self-financed through paid services, such as information and direct support to build consortia to submit proposals for EU support. In the second case, the Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy (PACE) is a public-private collaboration platform which benefits from public funding, support from a foundation, as well as contributions by the member companies.

4.4 Stakeholder involvement

Most initiatives are, by their nature, promoting a multistakeholder approach and place considerable attention to involving and engaging with stakeholders directly (through meetings, conferences, workshops), online (primarily through social media, website interaction, newsletters and teleconferences) and by providing information (through social media, publications and data sharing).

Besides the prevailing options to involve stakeholders, some initiatives additionally used action partnerships, created research committees and informal cooperation, established knowledge hubs. The choice depends on the objectives of the initiative.

5 Lessons and conclusions

Performing the analysis of the selected initiatives has revealed several meaningful lessons.

5.1.1 Governance structure

When considering the governance structure, it became clear that its design and the coordinator are one of the key issues that can guarantee performance and efficacy. An efficient and well-structured governance model has to fit the objectives and also the nature of the involvement of stakeholders.

The interviews and surveys of selected initiatives revealed that a strong, open and inclusive leadership of an initiative leads to successful output, impact and coordination. The characteristics of a coordinator are crucial, considering that such a person has to be able to well organise the work between partners, be dedicated to the development of the initiative and also has to be able to motivate partners to commit to the initiative (a huge problem in many platforms and working groups). The coordinator of a platform/initiative that is able to motivate the participants to commit to the initiative, even in small tasks, enables every member to feel engaged and relevant for the platform/initiative.

From the analysis, it also emerged that at the incipient stages, the aim of the initiative/platform has to be accurate, and the governance structure could be adjusted according to the objective of the platform. Having reputable organizations as steering partners of an initiative facilitates rapid development, visibility and scale-up.

5.1.2 Choice of legal status

The choice of legal status depends mainly on how the initiative is financed. If the initiative is a project run by legal entities without an own income stream, then there is no need to create a legal entity. Initiatives that do not want to apply for funding directly, do not need a legal status. Instead, the initiatives that want to apply for funding or raise fees require having a legal entity. The vast majority of such initiatives have a public objective, so in most cases the type of legal entity chosen is 'not-for-profit'.

5.1.3 The financial model and right legal entity

The choice of the financing model depends on the nature of the work undertaken and the reason for its existence. The initiatives created under a tender procedure to provide research on a specific area are not legal entities. Not having a legal status implies that the financial management and secretariat are provided by the legal entity that applied for the funding. It is also possible that the initiative is merely run by a legal entity that uses a part of its own revenues to cover the costs, or simply charges external contributors for running the initiative.

Some initiatives may be fully funded by public authorities while having a legal entity. Instead, those initiatives that focus exclusively on supporting public authorities for research tend not to have a legal status – e.g. for areas of national programme coordination, or for producing public information with limited commercial value, but high public good value.

Having the status of a legal entity is required when the initiative wants to operate as an autonomous organisation, with its own accounts, its ability to raise funding and the ability to hire its own staff. Initiatives financed by EU grants cannot in principle be themselves legal entities, as grants finance is linked to a specific project, not to the general operational costs of an organisation.

When initiatives have been created by public funding, these may have to transform into legal entities to be able to continue operating if there is a risk the funding will stop. A number of projects supported by EU research funds have transformed into legal entities to be able to apply for a number of funding sources or bid to one or several Horizon 2020 projects as a partner.

All networks or initiatives tend to transform into non-profit organisations, since the objectives are public and their operations focus on creating public benefits.

Once the legal entity has been created, the business model varies in terms of funding sources. This ranges from income from public contributions and foundations to fees from members, maybe including some provision of services to clients, such as coordination assistance, running events, etc.

The legal status of an EEIG - European Economic Interest Group can be beneficial in certain cases, and allows the development of members's activities by promoting an equal involvement of all partners in the initiative. All partners share the liability for the company, not just the project coordinator in the country the entity is located. The disadvantage of an EEIG is its funding obligation being placed on members, who need to raise it entirely, and not on other sources of financing.

One such EEIG is the BONUS initiative, which has a distinctive approach through the "common pot" funding model, where members from different member states pool resources together. However, this is a "mixed model" because the involved member states finance 50% of the budget and the European Commission the remaining 50%. Still, the model had unwanted impacts, the assistance prioritising larger richer countries due to their greater contribution, while the needs are highest in poorer and smaller countries.

5.1.4 Governance and stakeholder participation

Important for all initiatives is a reputation of independence from private interests, which has to be guaranteed by a governance structure that allows the scrutiny of activities by different stakeholders. Some voluntary or compulsory "in-kind contributions" to an initiative by stakeholders could help to the sustainability of the initiative, especially at the initial stages. In a number of cases, stakeholders have a vested interest in prosperity of the initiative, supporting it in a number of non-financial ways, in addition to financial contributions.

When looking at *stakeholder engagement*, it emerged that a high involvement of all partner organisations (including new-comers) in the activities of a specific initiative proved to be a successful approach. Managing to establish a "We" was instrumental, an aspect that refers to an identity as a group and a common position. This is an important factor when a network/initiative has the ambition of moving from a group of partner organisations with different national positions to a new ground in international co-operation. What is more, physical and frequent meetings between stakeholders and members of an initiative stimulate ownership and constancy of engagement.

5.1.5 Sustainability challenges after public grants end

The *post-project sustainability* of an initiative can be challenging. Most initiatives are dependent on public sources of funding (e.g. EU financing), which have made long term initiatives vulnerable to cessation once the project/initiative concluded. In addition, for publicly funded initiatives, shifting government priorities and legislative changes affected the viability of an initiative. A shift from a public subsidy business model to a financially self-sustaining model can be possible through the introduction of a membership fee. The participation of private sector funding is not possible for all initiatives, a step which could additionally create complications and increase requirements on the supervision, management and control of the governance structure and operations.

If the project is focusing on outputs that are largely public goods without a private benefit, it is difficult to attract private funding. Making the initiative interesting for the private sector may mean that the project may lose its public good objectives and behave as representing the interest of the private funders. Here clear independence statutes and regular monitoring can help to reduce risks.

Nevertheless, an initiative with a clear topical focus can stimulate market and industrial buy-in. Bottom-up ownership of the initiative and close partnership with industrial players can secure a solid foundation for active and sustained engagement with stakeholders in the long-run. Adding to this, a straightforward long-term strategic planning of an initiative at the development phase plays a crucial role in its sustainability and viability.

5.2 Next steps

As previously stated, the current report is aimed to survey and benchmark relevant governance and financing models for European clusters, platform and initiatives. While it provides a starting point for preparing governance and financing model options, and procedures for post-project sustainability of the joint platform for efficient circular economy programming, the report will be followed by several activities integrated into the larger process of building and testing the governance of the future platform, and its sustainability and longevity. Such activities, as next steps, include business modelling and financial planning (CICERONE activity A.3.2.2.), assessment of legal options (A.3.2.3), preparation of the governance of the future platform (A.3.2.4), and design and testing of institutional capacity-building strategy (CICERONE Task 3.3).

ANNEX 1 Open-ended questionnaire

1. How is your platform financed?

• Membership fee	(provide details)
• Private sector financing	(provide details)
• Public financing (e.g. EU, national governments etc.)	(provide details)
• Other:	(provide details)

2. How was the sustainability of your platform guaranteed? (i.e. long term financial sustainability, continuous stakeholder engagement etc.)

3. What legal status does the platform have?

4. What is the governance structure of the platform? (e.g. executive/steering board, advisory board, elected representation, secretariat etc.)

5. How do you involve your stakeholders/members in the activities of the platform?

• Direct engagement (e.g. in dialogue, consultations, meetings, in writing etc.)	(provide details)
• Online engagement (e.g. social media, teleconferences etc.)	(provide details)
• Provision of information (e.g. email newsletters, social media etc.)	(provide details)
• Action partnerships	(provide details)
• Other:	(provide details)

6. What is the typology of your platform users/members? (e.g. businesses, policy makers, civil society, industries, financial institutions, academia, research institutes etc.)

7. Could you create a simple SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis of your platform?

• <i>Strengths (what works well)</i>	<i>(provide details)</i>
• <i>Weaknesses (what needs to improve)</i>	<i>(provide details)</i>
• <i>Opportunities (that can contribute to your strengths)</i>	<i>(provide details)</i>
• <i>Threats (obstacles)</i>	<i>(provide details)</i>

8. To what extent has the platform met its objectives so far?

ANNEX 2 Preliminary screening of relevant initiatives

EREK European Resource Efficiency Knowledge Centre
 PRIMA Partnership for Research and Innovation in the Mediterranean Area
 A.SPIRE Sustainable Process Industry through Resource and Energy Efficiency
 WssTP (European Technology Platform for Water)
 EURISA
 Smart Cities Marketplace
 ERA-MIN 2
 Covenant of Mayors
 Fuel cells and hydrogen Joint Undertaking (FCJ JU)
 ETIP Bioenergy - European Technology and Innovation Platform
 Renewable Heating and Cooling Platform (RHC Platform)
 The European Sustainable Cities Platforms
 TAP (Transformative Action Program) platform
 C40
 Green Growth Knowledge platform
 European Circular Economy Research Alliance ECERA
 ICLEI- Local Governments for Sustainability
 European Cluster Collaboration Platform (ECCP)
 Polyolefin Circular Economy Platform PCEP
 Circular Economy Platform of the Americas (CEP-Americas)
 Circularly
 Circular Economy Club (CEC)
 C2C-Centre
 PACE - Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy
 SEMILLA Circular Economy Hub
 EverMinds
 Global Platform for Sustainable Cities (GPSC)
 Catalunya Circular
 Circle Lab
 Circular Economy Platform of Ports (LOOP-Ports)

Circular Futures-Plattform Kreislaufwirtschaft Österreich

Mov'eo

EERA-JPNM

SAFE

ALICE

GreenWin

Cluster Logistique

SusChem

EMIRI

WaterBorne

SESAR JU

ACQUEA – EUREKA cluster for water

Basque Energy Cluster

Ocean Energy Europe

Pole Mer Méditerranée

"France Energies Marines

(Institute/ association)"

ETP Smartgrids

OEC Cluster

NEWIN

Pole Mer Bretagne

ID4CAR

Pôle Vehicule du Futur

LUTB Transport & Mobility System

Vitagora

Systematic

Automotive BW

E-mobility Cluster Regensburg

Cluster Transport, Mobility and Logistics Berlin-Brandenburg

ITS automotive nord e. V. (Niedersachsen)

ACS – Automotive Cluster of Slovenia

TAYSAD - Association of Automotive Parts & Components Manufacturers

Electric Mobility Norway

Lombardy Mobility Cluster

North East Automotive Alliance

Cluster de Automoción de Aragón

CEAGA - Cluster de Empresas de Automoción de Galicia

AVAESEN

Climate-KIC

KIC InnoEnergy

Green Energy Cluster

TERN

Venetian Cluster

Water Alliance

The Water Cluster

Clean Cluster

EcoBuildBrussels

GreenTech South

Bionian cluster
 Nanoprogress
 "NEPIC
 The North East of England Process Industry Cluster"
 GCE SUBSEA
 Textile-Platform – Fibres Textiles Clothing
 Manufuture
 Construction Products Europe
 European technology Sub-platform in Additive manufacturing
 PROMETIA
 Biodiversa
 Norface
 Bonus
 JPI Oceans
 Hera
 JPI FACCE
 The Bio-Based Industries Joint Undertaking (BBI JU)

ANNEX 3 Collection of information for the selected initiatives

Interviews	Surveys	Desk research ¹²
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BiodivERsA - Norface - BONUS - JPI Oceans - JPI FACCE - HERA - Covenant of Mayors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Catalunya Circular - Circularly - ECERA European Circular Economy Research Alliance - ETIP Bioenergy - GGKP Green Growth Knowledge Platform - TAP Transformative Action Program - PACE Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy - RHC Renewable Heating and Cooling Platform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AVAENSEN Cluster

¹² The desk research for this initiative is based on the international benchmark of clusters and platform business models carried out by CICERONE partner LGI Consulting in 2017 for the SPRINT H2020 project, and afterwards the authors of the present report complemented the research in line with to the list of indicators described in Section 2.3