The University of Oslo strongly supports the European Framework Programme for Research and Innovation. We believe in the general knowledge, cooperation and openness that the Framework Programme inspires and builds upon, encompassing the principle of excellence through curiosity driven and mission driven research in synergy with the needs of a rapidly changing European society.

The design of the next Framework Programme must take into account the need for trust, truth and transparency. Trust in research - and the legitimacy of the framework programme - depends on transparency and open access to research and innovation. Social sciences and humanities must be secured sufficient funding to fully stimulate needed research into the major inequalities and confidence crises in today's world.

Since Horizon 2020 was designed, UN has agreed on a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG’s) that require interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral efforts and a new thinking about both research and education. This should be clearly present in the planning for the next Framework Programme. The universities have a special responsibility for developing research and study programs that reflect the complexity of the SDG’s. Our students are leaders of the future in a world that must take sustainability goals seriously in science and politics.

The University of Oslo would like to convey the following areas of opportunities and concern:

- **Excellence should be the key principle** of all parts of the new Framework Programme. The H2020 pillars related to excellent frontier and curiosity-driven research, and in particular those linked to excellent basic research, mobility and research infrastructures, have proved to be extremely important tools for the research communities, and should be continuously safeguarded and encouraged in the new Framework Programme.

- **Development and implementation of the European Research Area** should be the ambitious and sought after objective, and the future Framework Programme will be the most important instrument to realise this. **Collaborative research** is the main instrument for supporting continued and strengthened integration and for ensuring the **EU-added value of research**. The development of ERA should be a continuous process, and FP9 should enable all stakeholders to take part in the efforts to create integration and synergies and thereby implement the strategic priorities of ERA.
• It is vital to strike the right balance between research and innovation in FP9 to prevent the potential gap between low and high technology readiness level research from growing wider, as the focus on innovation has been intensified during previous framework programmes. This demands a better complementarity and coordination between curiosity driven and mission driven research. We are concerned about a further drift towards close-to-market innovation and commercialization at the expense of basic and applied research. More funding should be allocated to collaborative research projects at nominally low Technology Readiness Levels to ensure research opportunities early in the innovation pipeline. Major technological breakthroughs and the majority of disruptive innovations, including solutions to the great societal challenges, cannot always be planned, and will in many cases be closely connected to frontier research.

• The integration of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in research and innovation is a basic requirement to ensure sustainable solutions to societal challenges. There is still a need to enable, and even formalise, greater inclusion of SSH in all activities for FP9. When defining societal challenges in the future, the perspectives and analytical strengths in the disciplines of social sciences and humanities should be taken into greater account. Investment in new technology, robotisation and new business models require research on how this affects communities and individuals, and how new technologies risk increasing differences rather than reducing them. Topics suitable both for SSH inclusion and SSH lead should be clearly identified, the concepts of impact and innovation broadened in order to include the SSH perspectives in a sustainable way. FP9 needs sufficient and sustainable funding to be able to implement its strategic priorities and ambitions, as well as to support the research communities’ participation. It is therefore essential to safeguard and strengthen the grant-based budget dedicated to science for the upcoming Framework Programme.

• EU actions should play a role that cannot be played at a national level, and EU funding should create additional incentives for national governments to increase the general investment in research and innovation. The Framework Programme should foster international competition and collaborative research. However, given the limitations of EU-funding, the potential for better synergies with national and regional funding should be explored and further developed. Through Horizon 2020, Europe has steadily dismantled barriers and increased mobility in academia. We now risk that Brexit may turn back the clock, and we therefore call for dedicated support to ensure and strengthen collaboration within and beyond Europe.

• Closing the divide within Europe due to differences in research and innovation capacity is of great concern for the continued development of the research communities as well as ERA, and appropriate measures should be developed to address this situation. The use of Twinning and Teaming initiatives, as well as dedicated use of structural funds, towards capacity building within research and education, should be developed further together with other initiatives.
• We appreciate the simplification measures introduced in H2020. However, further streamlining and simplification of the Framework Programme must be a continuous process, and should be based on trust between the Commission and the research community, with appropriate levels of verification when required.

• H2020 has been characterised by an increasing number of applications and decreasing success rates. In combination with the complexity of the instruments, this may soon turn out to be a threat to the research community's interest in EU funded actions. The oversubscription needs to be addressed properly in FP9, looking at both call topics and application procedures. More use of two stage procedures, improving the quality of evaluation procedures, clarifying the concept of impact and interdisciplinarity in relation to the specific call, could be possible measures.

• We welcome the three O's: Open Innovation, Open Science and Open to the World and urge a focus on the ‘quick wins’, removing barriers and enhancing initiatives to collaboration. The three O's must be further developed in FP9 in a way that confirms the legitimacy of research and which promotes cooperation and democratisation of science.