

## **Minutes 10<sup>th</sup> ManuFuture HLG meeting**

2008-03-03

09:00 to 15:30

Divani Caravel Hotel, 2 Vassileos Alexandrou Av

Meeting Room Vergina

Athens, Greece 16121

Participants: H. Flegel, Daimler, E. Bessey, Daimler; D. Ceglarek; Warwick; G. Chryssolouris, LMS Uni Patras; M. Schäfer, Siemens, R. Groothedde, TNO; A. Arun Junai, TNO; F. Knecht, VDMA; P. Johansson, Teknikföretagen; J. Lawler, Enterprise Ireland; D. Mavrikios; LMS-Uni Patras; S. Dunkerton, TWI; R. Tuokko, Technology Centre Hernia; L. Jalba, Microelectronica S.A.; E. Chlebus, CAMT WUT Wroclaw; R. Bueno, Fatronik-Tecnia; D. Palethorpe, CECIMO; P. Pickel, J. Deere – AET; K. Georgoulas; LMS-Uni Patras; G. Dimitrapoulos, LMS-Uni Patras; J. Pandremenos, LMS-Uni Patras; C. Decubber, Agoria; A. Sciolari, Assoknowledge Confindustria; A. M. Paci, ITIA-CNR; D. Mouritzis, LMS-Uni Patras; A. Gentili, EC-DG-RTD; C. Rieg, EC-DG-RTD; F. Jovane, ITIA-CNR; E. Westkämper, FhG-IPA; J. Mendonça, INESC Porto, J.C. Caldeira, INESC Porto; C. Hanisch, Festo; M. Kopač, UCS; C. Eberst, Convergent IT;

### **AP 1 Welcome and approval of the agenda**

*Annex 1: Agenda 10 HLG\_2008-03-03 Athens\_V3.pdf*

The Agenda topics were approved. However, the sequence of topics was changed according to the attached agenda version (Annex 1).

### **AP 2 Approval of the minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> HLG in Porto**

*Annex 2: Status of Manufuture 2008-03-03\_V1.pdf*

The minutes of the Porto HLG meeting were approved without changes. As introduction to the following presentations E. Bessey showed a slide about present status of Manufuture (Annex 2)

### **AP 3 UK view of ManuFuture – Overview of necessary tasks for 2008**

*Annex 3: Millar\_Athens\_2008-03-03.pdf*

W. Millar presented the UK view of ManuFuture. Based on the four priorities showed in Porto he gave a more detailed presentation on each of the then proposed action items. What can ManuFuture do for industry? What can we do better than anybody else? Develop a common view (mission/elevator pitch) plus the necessary evidence for it. Simplify the message. Restructure the organization to make it leaner and more focused. The role of the UK members within ManuFuture is to act as eyes and ears for UK industry.

He ended with a recommendation of six operational tasks for 2008 ff. He agreed to set up an action plan (= list of activities) objectives, timetable, deliverables in form of a project description.

#### **AP 4 ManuFuture terms of reference – updated status from Porto**

*Annex 4: Eberst\_080205\_HLG+TOR-w-alternatives.pdf*

C. Eberst showed in his presentation the pros and cons of the different options of possible compositions of the ManuFuture HLG. Guiding principles: HLG is the general assembly of ManuFuture. The HLG has to take decisions which are prepared in the support and working groups. HLG should be composed – as in the beginning – of more industrialists. Every entity should have its role and should play its role (responsibilities and values).

The working group argued for about 30 very active members. Their role is to show leadership and to give clear advice and direction. Their job is to strongly promote ManuFuture in their respective business and political environments.

It was decided to finalize the TOR for the next HLG meeting.

#### **AP 5 ManuFuture JTI – overview and next steps**

*Annex 5\_1: Knecht 080302 MANUFUTURE – JTIs.pdf*

*Annex 5\_2: Bueno\_JTI\_RB\_3MAR2008.pdf*

F. Knecht presented the financing models of already existing JTIs. JTIs are co-financed by the European Commission and industry. They are so called public private partnerships. For example: The Innovative Medicine Initiative (IMI) has 40 million running costs for 10 years paid by EC and another 40 million paid by pharmaceutical industry. It is about 1/6 of the DGR-F of 960 M€ + 960 M€ in kind.

ARTEMIS (Computing industries) Budget from DG INFSO-G, 1/5 of ICT challenge 2 budget + national governments 740 M€ domestic budgets, administered by respective nations.

To qualify for a JTI we have to have the proper message and a clear mid to long term focus. Both are important to play the game right. According to C. Chryssolouris the mission has to be simple, practical and fair, and oriented on the needs and concerns of the European public, which is jobs and growth. For R. Bueno the message has to be different for industrialists and governmental bodies.

R. Bueno based his presentation on slides from the EC in which he integrated his comments and suggestions. He showed which documents are needed to go for a JTI.

A. Gentili pointed out, that the EC has budget constraints in the FYs 2009 and 2010, therefore the next two calls within FP7 are limited calls. JTIs are not possible before 2010. Furthermore, a JTI is strongly correlated with the commitment from industry. Consequently, many European industrial sectors should promote a ManuFuture JTI.

It was decided to install a **ManuFuture JTI task force**, chaired by G. Chryssolouris to do a JTI feasibility study on a possible ManuFuture JTI. This study should be finished by October 2008 in order to be able to use the ManuFuture conference 2008 in St. Etienne, France, to disseminate the message.

#### **AP 6 Rethinking ManuFuture Implementation – Future of ManuFuture**

*Annex 6: Jovane\_Westkaemper\_rethinking\_manufuture\_hlg\_mar\_08\_athens.pdf*

F. Jovane and E. Westkaemper presented their thoughts about ManuFuture. The major task of implementation is pushing for relevant research projects. Their main concerns are: The missing industrial leadership within the projects, and the un-sustainability of the process because of insufficient resources. Furthermore, we could do more in the fields of materials and nano. Additionally, for F. Jovane there are also great challenges concerning global cooperation which are presently not covered.

Based on the presentation we had an intensive discussion on industrial leadership and participation: E. Westkämper argued to bring companies at the (HLG) table and in the lead of projects. We need industry leadership to get near to their problems. R. Groothedde pointed out that industry was necessary for consortium building, direction and pilot projects. The representatives of the organizations emphasized that it cannot work to bring SMEs into the HLG, since they cannot afford to come to such meetings regularly. Their spokespersons in the HLG are their organizations like VDMA, Orgalime, Agoria.

As discussed in previous meetings, neither the industrial associations nor the EC are prepared to spend money for the professional management of ManuFuture. Some of the ETPs charge a subscription fee.

#### **AP 7 Lessons from ManuFuture 2007, Porto**

*Annex 7: Mendonça\_MF\_2007\_Conf\_lessons\_HLG\_March08.pdf*

J. Mendonça gave an overview of ManuFuture Porto Conference and the main outcomes: MF 2007 was highly regarded at the political level and MF position has been strongly reinforced near industry and academia. The different evaluation aspects can be used for the preparation of the ManuFuture 2008 in France.

#### **AP 8 NRTP – Cascading of ManuFuture ideas**

*Annex 8: Caldeira\_MF\_NRTP\_2007\_HLG\_March08.pdf*

J. C. Caldeira proposed the next steps for the NRTP group in 2008. We need concrete objectives to lead our work. We have to activate private funds /regions and companies. Mobilizing this private money has to be done locally by the NRTPs and their members. We should take successful case studies to spread the ManuFuture message. Here we can do better. How many actively working platforms do we have? We will define some rules, and conditions to qualify as a NRT platform. The present approaches are very different. We should develop ManuFuture services: newsletter, website, data base. Based on these ideas, some actions have already been identified: Update the list of active NRTPs and names of active members. Summarize which national and regional funds are available. Show, what is going on within the initiatives ERA-Net and ERA-Net +.

#### **AP 9 ManuFuture Conference 2008, Paris**

*Annex 9: Richet\_Manufuture Paris 2008 V3.pdf*

D. Richet focused his presentation on three main objectives for the conference:

- Convince industrialists to participate. Industry involvement is crucial for the French presidency
- Gather existing European manufacturing communities
- Repoliticize the ManuFuture challenges

## **AP 10 European Concept Working Group**

*Annex 10: Sciolari Athens WG EC Presentation.pdf*

A. Sciolari addressed the specific needs of specific companies which were formulated in two previous preparatory meetings. The main addressee is the HVA product and service pillar of the MF SRA. The philosophy of the European Concept WG approach is shown on slide 4. It is about boosting product and service innovation in product industries. A. Sciolari argued for an integrated value proposition to reach this goal. A project proposal might be finished in 2010. If the outcome is clearer a next presentation in the HLG should be envisaged. Until then, the logo shouldn't be used on the slides as it has been done.

## **AP 11 Miscellaneous / any other business**

No additional topic has been brought up.

## **AP 12 Date of the 11<sup>th</sup> HLG meeting**

17<sup>th</sup> October 2008, Stuttgart, Daimler AG, Epplestr. 225

## **AP 13 Closing remarks**

The Chairman thanked G. Chryssolouris and his team for the perfect organization of the meeting, the HLG members for their participation and valuable statements, and closed the meeting.