

# HYLIGHTS

Hydrogen for Transport in Europe

[www.HyLights.eu](http://www.HyLights.eu)

## Comparative Analysis of JTI Programme Management Structures and US Benchmarking

### Executive Summary

**Report Status: Final Version**

**Report Date: April 2008**



A Coordination Action to Prepare European and Fuel Cell Demonstration Projects on Transport

Acknowledgement:

HyLights is financed by funds from the European Commission under FP6

Contract: TEN/05/FP6EN/S07.53917/019990.

## **Executive Summary**

Programme Management is fundamental to the coordination of the activities undertaken by project partners. Programme Management also ensures that the outcomes of projects can be achieved and that those outcomes are in line with the main targets of the programme. Therefore a good structure is needed whereby the aspirations of the leaders and the realities of the work ahead are communicated and a common approach be developed and monitored. A programme is a major undertaking for most organisations, meaning significant funding and substantial change for the organisations and individuals involved.

Currently the Fuel Cell and Hydrogen industry in Europe is working together with the European Commission (EC) in a process that will define the programme management of the Joint Technology Initiative (JTI) on Fuel Cells and Hydrogen (FCH). This Joint Undertaking FCH JTI that is being created will issue calls for tender for projects aimed at advancing European technology towards commercialisation.

This document considers what are the comparative programme management practices in both similar JTI projects as well as and other hydrogen-based programmes such as that of the US DoE's Hydrogen Program.

This document only deals with Programme Management and the bodies that will implement the Programme. No mention is made here of the Project Management level, except in the last chapter which identifies the Programme Management bodies and the data that they will monitor from project level.

Certain characteristics of each JTI are identified which helps in the understanding of the composition and purpose of each JTI. Their programme management structures are then benchmarked against that of the FCH JTI. The same approach is undertaken when comparing the US DoE Hydrogen Program with FCH JTI.

This document finds that while the JTI structures are fairly similar in their structures and operations there are different structures in place mainly with regard to research and regions' representation. The difference is largely due to the composition of the Industry Grouping as there does not seem to be a link between the complexity of the programme management structure and the amount of funding available.

Compared with the US the European JTI structure is composed of many similar bodies as the current ongoing U.S. approach. However the JTIs appear more open to the regions' representation than the US model and there is a more formalised approach in the US allowing for coherent work across the 300m people bloc despite the programme receiving less funding.

## Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2. Methodology</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>3. Main Analysis</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>What is a JTI? : A Brief Overview</b>                               | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>JTI Benchmarking Analysis</b>                                       | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>The Governing Board</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>The Executive Director</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>The Stakeholder and/or General Forum</b>                            |           |
| – IMI JTI, Clean Sky JTI, FCH JTI, ENIAC                               | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>The (National) States Representatives Group</b>                     |           |
| – FCH JTI, Clean Sky JTI, and IMI JTI                                  | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>The Public Authorities Board – ARTEMIS and ENIAC</b>                | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>The Scientific Committee – FCH JTI and IMI JTI</b>                  | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>The Industry and Research Committee – ARTEMIS and ENIAC</b>         | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Working Committees – Clean Sky</b>                                  | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Hydrogen Specific Programme Management Comparison – EU vs. U.S.</b> | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Implementing PGIs in a European Programme Management Structure</b>  | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Programme Management:</b>   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Applied Research and Technology Development</b>                     | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Safety, Codes and Standards</b>                                     | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Education</b>   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>4. Conclusions</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Annex I - Programme Management Structure of ENIAC and ARTEMIS</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Annex II – FCH JTI Programme Management Structure</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Annex III - Clean Sky JTI Programme Management Structure</b>        | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Annex IV – DOE Hydrogen Program Organization</b>                    | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Annex V – Activities of the US DOE Hydrogen Program</b>             | <b>13</b> |