

From: [REDACTED] (RTD)
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:53 PM
To: RATSO Signe (RTD)
Subject: FW: Summary - ERF roundtable: Innovation Principle: Progress and Future Challenges - 21 Nov 2017

Dear Signe,
As background info.
Best,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (RTD)
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2017 8:45 PM
To: METTHEY Jack (RTD); [REDACTED] (RTD); [REDACTED] (RTD)
Subject: Summary - ERF roundtable: Innovation Principle: Progress and Future Challenges - 21 Nov 2017

Dear Jack, dear [REDACTED] & [REDACTED],
Please find below my summary of the roundtable in subject (agenda appended).

Attendees notably included EC RSB ([REDACTED]), DE Perm Rep ([REDACTED]), OECD ([REDACTED]), as well as representatives from various industries/industry associations – see appended list distributed during the event (not sure whether this is the final attendance list, though).

The first panel (to which I took part) presented policies and progress, the second addressed challenges. Discussions were held under Chatham House rule.

Panel 1:

- OECD underlined the role of competition to drive innovation, and key regulatory aspects related to innovation: lot of scope to lower red tape and compliance costs, development and alignment of standards at national & international levels, if and when regulators should react in non-regulated areas (precautionary vs risk-based approaches), how to deal with new entrants, how to reform regulation when disruptive regulation occurs, better use of open, real-time data to help stakeholders realise when they are out of frame/compliance.
- ERF: welcomed the developments at EU level and a more balanced approach between precautionary & innovation principles, which are both needed; support of Csr Moedas particularly appreciated; underlined that innovation should be considered at every step in the process; reluctance of industry to provide evidence that legislation encourages or stifles innovation as perceived risk regarding their investments in innovation; central role of innovation in achieving sustainability.
- DE Perm Rep explained how they deal with innovation in the German Federal Government, which is focusing on costs/benefits, quality of data, and involvement of stakeholders.
- I put the IP in the context of Better Regulation and presented the activities carried out via the Task Force IP & first lessons learnt, including the importance of focusing on outcomes of policies rather than means to achieve these.

Discussion addressed:

- Concern that IP would only be implemented via the application of R&I tool in IA for legislative proposals; reassurance provided that not only legislative proposals are being considered by the TF, but also other types of policies.

- Impact assessment at EU level encompasses all aspects that would impact society as a whole (MS, citizens, not only industry), which is considered a better approach than only looking at costs.
- Regulation seen a means to foster fair competition.
- Importance for industry to have regulatory certainty: if there will be regulation, how it will look like and be appropriately implemented (the latter not being part of Better Regulation).
- In those cases where there would be a need to regulate a new technology, consideration of sunset clauses was suggested.

Panel 2 addressed concrete challenges in various areas: crop protection (pesticides, herbicides), CO2 emissions for cars, nickel industry.

- Challenges of industry mostly addressed the difficulties encountered when various policies/regulations are (perceived as) incompatible (eg promoting the IP on one hand, and black-listing substances considered innovative (as per the nr of existing patents) or indispensable/useful on the other [REDACTED])
- Wish that Commission avoids as much as possible working in silos, and promotes the IP across initiatives and fields, so as to avoid discrepancies and incompatibilities in this regard between pieces of legislation/policies.
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]) and plea to find balance between environment and industry; call for risk management option analysis (RMOA) in those areas where substitution is impossible.
- EC recent proposal [REDACTED] Warning that current regulatory approach risks blocking investments eg in alternative fuels due to created regulatory uncertainty.
- Authorisation cycles of 12 years pose problems when investment cycles are longer.
- Without commenting on specific cases, I encouraged stakeholders to voice their views when public consultations are issued during the legislative cycle process, and for those existing legislations considered problematic to reach out to the REFIT platform.
- Recognition by industry that they need to better engage with society.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]