

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## Table of Contents

Organization	Score	Verdict
Anonymous_3	9	Likely Ally
EUPHA European Public Health Association	8	Likely Ally
Matthew Spaniol	8	Likely Ally
AMALIA MARIA KOUTSOGIANNI	8	Likely Ally
Gaël QUEINNEC	8	Likely Ally
Sanja Terlevic	8	Likely Ally
Kieran DALTON	8	Likely Ally
Melanoma Patient Network Europe	8	Likely Ally
EuroStack Project	7	Likely Ally
GROUPE VYV	7	Likely Ally
Ioannis Lamprou	7	Likely Ally
Joni Suikeli	7	Likely Ally
Juan Bartolomé García Martínez	7	Likely Ally
Kansaneläkelaitos Kela	7	Likely Ally
Kevin Bradley	7	Likely Ally
Adrien Cadiot EI	7	Likely Ally
EU-LIFE - Alliance of Independent Research In...	7	Likely Ally
Office of the Government and Government of th...	7	Likely Ally
Simon Önnered	7	Likely Ally
SUEZ	7	Likely Ally
TNO Vector	7	Likely Ally
TNO	7	Likely Ally
UNESPA	7	Likely Ally
University of Bergen	7	Likely Ally
Xylem	7	Likely Ally
Ministry of the Economy Luxembourg	7	Likely Ally
ZOE Institute for Future-fit Economies	7	Likely Ally
Egmont - Royal Institute for International Re...	7	Likely Ally
ECOLAB	7	Likely Ally
Andre REBENTISCH	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_1	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_10	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_11	7	Likely Ally
ASOCIACION INDUSTRIAL DE CANARIAS ASINCA	7	Likely Ally
Association internationale Futuribles	7	Likely Ally
CHEM Trust	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_4	7	Likely Ally
bert hubert	7	Likely Ally

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

Philea	6	Likely Ally
NA	6	Neutral
Nicolas Overloop_1	6	Neutral
Anonymous_9	6	Neutral
Anonymous_5	6	Neutral
Maria Lindqvist	6	Neutral
SPES project - Sustainability Performances Evi...	6	Neutral
Anonymous_2	6	Likely Ally
TES	6	Neutral
Special Secretariat of Foresight	6	Neutral
Instituto Nacional de Administração IP Portug...	6	Neutral
Maastricht School of Management	6	Neutral
Bankenverband	6	Neutral
F Hanna Campbell	6	Neutral
Fraunhofer IAO	6	Likely Ally
FutuRes Towards a Resilient Future of Europe ...	6	Likely Ally
Gabriele De Giorgi	6	Neutral
David Van Geert	6	Likely Ally
Agroecology Europe	6	Neutral
Kai Wellmann	5	Likely Ally
Anonymous_8	5	Neutral
Nicolas Overloop	5	Neutral
Francisco José Viturro Barreiro	5	Neutral
UAP Coalition Netherlands	5	Neutral
Transfer Pricing Services SRL	4	Neutral
Anonymous	4	Neutral
Negar RIAHI	4	Neutral
Anonymous_7	4	Neutral
VLAD HERES	3	Opponent
Anonymous_6	3	Opponent
José Luis Rajab_1	3	Opponent
Antonio Mincarini	3	Neutral
Ivana Nem?icov?	3	Opponent
José Luis Rajab	3	Opponent
Esteban Carlos Borzino	2	Opponent
Davy Anthonissen	1	Opponent

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## Total Stakeholders Analyzed: 74

Likely Allies: 44 | Neutral: 23 | Opponents: 7

### Top Allies (High Alignment)

#### **Anonymous\_3 - Score: 9/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions identify threats to democracy and liberal values in Europe and call for urgent, well-resourced EU action to defend them. They converge on the need for strategic efforts that include strengthening societal resilience through education and civic capacity-building (including digital literacy).

**Disagreements:** The other submission is narrowly focused on an education-centred response as the primary remedy, while the other takes a much broader approach that prioritises regulatory enforcement, institutional reform, strategic investment in technology and research, procurement and defence/industrial measures, and climate/biosecurity preparedness. In short, they agree on the problem and the need for resourcing, but differ on scope and the mix of policy instruments to prioritise.

#### **EUPHA European Public Health Association - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** They both prioritise embedding strategic foresight into EU policymaking, calling for longer-term scenario planning, capacity building, and institutional mechanisms to ensure foresight informs decisions. Both endorse cross-sector collaboration (linking health, climate and digital policy), use of AI-driven early-warning/weak-signal detection, and translating foresight outputs into concrete policy actions to strengthen resilience.

**Disagreements:** They differ in sectoral emphasis and policy focus: one submission foregrounds technology/strategic-autonomy measures (defence and tech sovereignty, procurement reform, biofoundries) and explicit research and governance for climate interventions, while the other concentrates on health-sector priorities (ageing, pandemic preparedness, AMR, health infrastructure) and normative questions in health prioritisation. As a result, they place different weight on security and industrial policy actions versus a health-centred, equity-oriented foresight agenda.

#### **Matthew Spaniol - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening strategic foresight and learning-by-doing: they support using foresight to monitor outcomes, generate early warnings, and adapt policy based on evidence. Each endorses iterative policy-making, emphasising experimentation, feedback loops and methods to detect when policies fail so they can be corrected promptly.

**Disagreements:** One submission foregrounds a provisional, epistemic approach to policy--treating measures explicitly as experiments, centring falsification and lightweight, easily-reversible designs--while the other emphasises building durable institutional capacity (centralised enforcement, mission-driven research, procurement reform) and advancing specific sectoral strategies (AI, biotech, SRM, mental health). The difference is therefore mainly one of priority and emphasis: broad methodological humility and minimal permanence versus targeted, structural reforms and comprehensive governance frameworks.

#### **AMALIA MARIA KOUTSOGIANNI - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening youth resilience through education, mental-health measures, and improved digital literacy and critical thinking to manage disinformation and technological change. Both call for meaningful youth participation and institutional mechanisms to ensure young generations' voices and long-term interests are represented in policymaking.

**Disagreements:** They differ mainly in scope and emphasis: one adopts a wide-ranging, technology- and security-oriented resilience agenda (including AI, climate interventions, biotech, procurement and defence/competitiveness measures), while the other focuses narrowly on social and economic stability for young people (decent work, affordable housing, healthcare, and targeted education reforms). Consequently they prioritise different policy instruments -- systemic industrial/regulatory reforms versus social protection, labour-market and participatory measures -- though these priorities are complementary rather than directly opposed.

#### **Gaël QUEINNEC - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions identify environmental (climate), geopolitical, and technological (AI/digital) challenges as central to EU

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

resilience and call for a more proactive, forward-looking conception of resilience. They converge on the need to broaden participation in foresight processes to include non-governmental stakeholders, specifically enterprise and private-sector foresight practitioners or clusters. Both also signal support for reframing resilience thinking beyond narrow short-term responses toward stronger, future-oriented approaches.

Disagreements: They differ in emphasis and level of detail: one submission advances specific policy instruments (regulatory enforcement, procurement reform, public-funded research priorities, SRM governance, biosecurity measures, and mental-health-in-all-policies) while the other focuses narrowly on process improvements (bringing industry foresight into collective intelligence sessions) and on clarifying conceptual framing (advocating the term 'anti-fragility'). There is a potential tension over stakeholder balance: one leans strongly toward public-interest safeguards, precaution, and inclusive citizen deliberation, whereas the other prioritises greater direct involvement of corporate/enterprise foresight networks and a language of performance and sovereignty.

## **Sanja Terlevic - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening democratic legitimacy of policymaking through meaningful citizen inclusion and participatory processes, including mechanisms for public engagement and deliberation. They also converge on the need for adaptive, experimental policy tools (e.g., safe/controlled experimentation or sandboxes) and agile policy frameworks that can respond quickly to emerging challenges while maintaining democratic standards.

Disagreements: Submission A places strong emphasis on specific technical and security priorities -- enforcement capacity, strategic R&D investment, procurement reform, tech and defence sovereignty, biosecurity, and governance/research of climate interventions (SRM) -- and prescribes concrete institutional and funding measures. Submission B is high-level and primarily concentrates on accessibility, co-creation, and low-risk policy experimentation without advancing sector-specific security, industrial or scientific governance prescriptions.

## **Kieran DALTON - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise forward-looking strategic foresight as essential to shaping Europe's trajectory to 2040 and stress the need to strengthen resilience through intra-EU consolidation and an active, results-oriented neighbourhood policy. They share emphasis on investing in R&D, education and key emerging technologies (including AI) and on mobilising citizens and societal participation to build durable social and technological capacity.

Disagreements: They diverge in emphasis and granularity: one submission focuses on institutional and regulatory reforms (enforcement bodies, procurement reform, mission-driven research, biosecurity, and detailed governance for climate interventions like SRM) and on specific technical domains (biotech, neurotech, climate science) and quantitative foresight tools, while the other stresses urgent geopolitical consolidation, creating prosperity in neighbouring regions, renewable energy and space technologies, and bottom-up social innovation without prescribing complex governance architectures. There is also a difference in tone on the role of large corporations versus grassroots societal engagement and on the balance between rapid, short-term geopolitical responses and long-term systemic capacity-building.

## **Melanoma Patient Network Europe - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both stress the central role of robust science, evidence-based decision-making, and ethics in strengthening European resilience. They agree on the need to invest in education and scientific literacy to counter misinformation and improve public health and democratic outcomes. Both call for sustained public engagement and leadership that embody moral values and critical thinking.

Disagreements: One submission takes a broad, systems-level approach that prioritises strategic foresight, technological sovereignty, defence and industrial policy, climate-intervention research/governance, and specific R&D and procurement reforms, while the other focuses narrowly on education, ethics and scientific literacy as the primary lever for resilience. There is a difference in emphasis on resource allocation and policy instruments: one advocates proactive research into potentially controversial technologies and institutional enforcement mechanisms, whereas the other prioritises societal-level literacy, ethics and countering pseudoscience without detailing techno-industrial or security measures.

## **EuroStack Project - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise European technological sovereignty, stronger investment in R&D and skills, and using public procurement and standards to build domestic capabilities. They agree on the need for stronger cybersecurity, interoperable open

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

standards, and improving the Commission's strategic foresight and scenario planning to inform long-term resilience.

Disagreements: They differ on approach and scope: one submission advocates mission-driven, centrally coordinated institutions and broader coverage of climate interventions, biotech, defence and enforcement bodies, while the other prioritises a bottom-up, Open Source First stack, SME-led procurement and explicitly rejects hyperscaler-led models like the current Gaia-X approach. There are also different emphases on governance trade-offs -- centralised enforcement and large pan-EU facilities versus decentralized community-driven development and market-based financing for open-source components.

## GROUPE VYV - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions emphasise the centrality of climate risk and its health consequences, including worsening mental health and the rise of infectious diseases, and call for stronger strategic foresight, research and preparedness. They also agree on the need to protect vulnerable populations, integrate health into broader policy-making, and strengthen resilient supply chains and local capacity for essential goods and services.

Disagreements: The Centre for Future Generations prioritises technology and strategic autonomy at EU level (e.g., pan-European AI research infrastructure, enforcement bodies, biofoundries, SRM research and export controls) and frames resilience through geopolitics, defence and regulated tech development. Groupe VYV instead focuses on community and mutualist responses, social protection, access to care, food systems, local adaptation measures and frugality, expressing greater caution about large-scale technological roll-outs and stressing decentralised, solidaristic instruments.

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## Top Opponents/Divergent (Low Alignment)

### Davy Anthonissen - Score: 1/10 (Opponent)

Agreements: Both submissions stress the need for a stronger, more capable Europe able to respond to geopolitical threats and to reduce strategic dependence on external actors. Each calls for enhancing European security and capacity at an EU-relevant level.

Disagreements: They diverge fundamentally on means, norms and policy priorities: one emphasizes democratic governance, rule-of-law, multilateralism, careful regulation of emerging technologies, climate and societal resilience, and investment in R&D and institutions; the other advocates unilateral, extra-legal measures such as territorial annexation, civilian arming/militia structures, and transactional fixes that contravene international norms. Their policy focus and values are therefore largely incompatible, with one prioritising long-term, systemic resilience and institutional safeguards and the other prioritising immediate militarised expansion and ad hoc security measures.

### Esteban Carlos Borzino - Score: 2/10 (Opponent)

Agreements: Both emphasise the importance of economic dynamism, competitiveness and functioning markets, and express concern that policy choices can produce long-term harms if poorly designed. Both invoke democratic legitimacy and the rule of law as foundational to prosperous societies.

Disagreements: One submission calls for active public action: stronger regulation and enforcement, mission-driven public R&D, strategic procurement, and targeted state-led measures to manage systemic risks and build resilience. The other rejects interventionism, arguing for minimal state involvement, rapid rollback of crisis-era controls, and primacy of private property and market freedom, resulting in a fundamental disagreement over the role of the state in innovation, risk management and economic policy.

### VLAD HERES - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening Europe's strategic autonomy: reducing critical dependencies (in technology, energy and supply chains), investing in domestic R&D and manufacturing, and beefing up defence and procurement capacity. They also share concern about foreign influence and disinformation campaigns undermining European security and democratic processes, and call for stronger institutional capacity to respond to these threats.

Disagreements: They sharply diverge on means and values: one submission advocates rights-respecting, multilateral, transparent and precautionary approaches (including democratic oversight, public participation, research governance and social fairness), whereas the other prioritises hardline, unilateral and often coercive measures (cyberattacks, sabotage, deportations, immediate military action and purges of foreign influence). They also disagree on social policy and civil liberties -- one emphasises inclusion, mental-health and intergenerational equity, the other promotes exclusionary immigration policies and alignment with far-right rhetoric.

### Anonymous\_6 - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise protecting and strengthening social goods--notably healthcare, social protection and environmental sustainability--and express concern about the erosion of public services and social safety nets. Both call for greater democratic accountability and for policymaking to better reflect citizens' needs and well-being.

Disagreements: They sharply diverge on security and investment priorities: one advocates bolstering defence/strategic autonomy (including onshoring defence production and mobilising investment vehicles) and active tech and procurement policies, while the other rejects investment in armaments and opposes diverting public/pension funds to military purposes. They also differ on fiscal and institutional approaches: one proposes using public and private capital (including pension capital) to finance strategic R&D and resilience infrastructure, whereas the other insists pension and savings must be preserved for retirees and redirected instead toward social services.

### José Luis Rajab\_1 - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)

Agreements: Both submissions call for stronger EU-level legal and enforcement capacity and greater strategic autonomy, including more robust common rules and enhanced defence capabilities at the EU level. They share an interest in the EU having more global influence and the ability to act cohesively on security and strategic industrial policy.

Disagreements: They diverge sharply on values and methods: Submission B advances exclusionary, xenophobic and unilateral

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

policies (e.g., banning entry of Muslims, punitive trade isolation, hostility toward certain governments), while Submission A emphasizes democratic safeguards, human rights, multilateralism, inclusive deliberation, and rights-respecting governance of technology and climate policy. Submission A prefers evidence-based, precautionary and cooperative approaches (e.g., transparent research, international norms, participatory forums), whereas Submission B advocates nationalist, protectionist and punitive measures that would conflict with those approaches.

## **Antonio Mincarini - Score: 3/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise citizen welfare, social solidarity, and protection of people from harm, emphasising wellbeing and reducing poverty as key goals. They also share a common opposition to unnecessary wars and a stated desire to enhance the protection of citizens.

**Disagreements:** They diverge sharply on environmental and public-health priorities: Submission B calls for 'less green' policies and fewer vaccines, whereas Submission A emphasises robust climate action, preparedness (including research on interventions) and strengthening biosecurity and vaccine/biomanufacturing capacity. Submission A also emphasises stronger regulatory frameworks, enforcement, and proactive technology governance and strategic foresight, which contrasts with Submission B's emphasis on individual freedom and reduced regulatory emphasis on 'green' agendas.

## **Ivana Nem?icov? - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening Europe's industrial and technological capacity, including support for domestic tech development and maintaining competitiveness. They share concerns about governance and rule of law, and express interest in stronger enforcement or more effective institutions to protect European interests and values. Both also show wariness about foreign influence in technology and an interest in data/privacy protections for citizens.

**Disagreements:** They sharply diverge on climate and energy policy: one advocates decarbonisation, proactive climate resilience and regulated research on climate interventions, while the other calls for halting the Green Deal, preserving combustion-based infrastructure, and resuming cheap energy imports. They differ on strategic dependencies and geopolitics: one stresses strategic autonomy, multilateral governance and caution about reliance on rivals, the other prioritises pragmatic trade (including with Russia) and rejects current EU policy directions. They also prioritise social policy differently -- one emphasises inclusive, intergenerational governance and mental-health-in-all-policies, while the other emphasises stricter border control and a return to traditional economic/diplomatic priorities.

## **José Luis Rajab - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions call for stronger EU-level capacities: more coherent common laws or legislation across member states and greater European strategic autonomy in defence and international influence. Each expresses a desire for the EU to act with greater unity and assertiveness on the world stage to protect European interests.

**Disagreements:** They diverge sharply on values and means: one submission emphasises democratic safeguards, human rights, inclusive and multilateral governance, evidence-based research, and precautionary regulation of emerging technologies; the other advances exclusionary, xenophobic immigration policies, targeted hostility toward specific external governments and groups, and unilateral protectionist retaliation. The priorities and policy instruments therefore differ profoundly--cooperative, rights-respecting governance versus nationalist, coercive and discriminatory approaches.

## **Negar RIAHI - Score: 4/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions support the development and uptake of biotechnology-based innovations for health and stress the importance of regulatory evaluation and market access (CE/FDA approval and health-economic assessment). They also converge on the idea that new bio-based materials and medical technologies should be considered within healthcare procurement and national evaluation processes.

**Disagreements:** Submission B is a narrow, product-level advocacy for fast adoption of a specific dental hydroxyapatite resin and emphasizes immediate clinical use and procurement, often making strong efficacy claims; Submission A takes a systemic, risk-aware stance, prioritising mission-driven public research, biosecurity, enforcement, independent evidence generation and precaution. CFG stresses strategic priorities (strategic autonomy, biofoundry networks, export controls, governance of dual-use biotech and broader foresight tools) that are largely absent from the product-focused submission, which does not engage with biosecurity, governance or

# **Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations**

large-scale resilience planning.

## **Anonymous\_7 - Score: 4/10 (Neutral)**

Agreements: Both submissions value more inclusive and accessible public participation: they support lowering barriers so a wider range of people (including shy or marginalised voices) can engage. Each endorses remote or low-friction participation mechanisms and capacity-building to broaden stakeholder input into discussions and decision-making.

Disagreements: One submission is narrowly focused on practical, grassroots measures (more webinars and anonymity-friendly formats) to increase participation, while the other prioritises systemic policy, institutional reforms, technical governance, and large-scale research investments across multiple sectors. They therefore differ sharply in scope, scale, and policy priorities: one emphasizes immediate, low-cost engagement tools; the other emphasizes structural regulatory, research and enforcement actions that the short submission does not address.

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## Detailed Analysis - All Organizations

### **Anonymous\_3 - Score: 9/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions identify threats to democracy and liberal values in Europe and call for urgent, well-resourced EU action to defend them. They converge on the need for strategic efforts that include strengthening societal resilience through education and civic capacity-building (including digital literacy).

Disagreements: The other submission is narrowly focused on an education-centred response as the primary remedy, while the other takes a much broader approach that prioritises regulatory enforcement, institutional reform, strategic investment in technology and research, procurement and defence/industrial measures, and climate/biosecurity preparedness. In short, they agree on the problem and the need for resourcing, but differ on scope and the mix of policy instruments to prioritise.

### **EUPHA European Public Health Association - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: They both prioritise embedding strategic foresight into EU policymaking, calling for longer-term scenario planning, capacity building, and institutional mechanisms to ensure foresight informs decisions. Both endorse cross-sector collaboration (linking health, climate and digital policy), use of AI-driven early-warning/weak-signal detection, and translating foresight outputs into concrete policy actions to strengthen resilience.

Disagreements: They differ in sectoral emphasis and policy focus: one submission foregrounds technology/strategic-autonomy measures (defence and tech sovereignty, procurement reform, biofoundries) and explicit research and governance for climate interventions, while the other concentrates on health-sector priorities (ageing, pandemic preparedness, AMR, health infrastructure) and normative questions in health prioritisation. As a result, they place different weight on security and industrial policy actions versus a health-centred, equity-oriented foresight agenda.

### **Matthew Spaniol - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening strategic foresight and learning-by-doing: they support using foresight to monitor outcomes, generate early warnings, and adapt policy based on evidence. Each endorses iterative policy-making, emphasising experimentation, feedback loops and methods to detect when policies fail so they can be corrected promptly.

Disagreements: One submission foregrounds a provisional, epistemic approach to policy--treating measures explicitly as experiments, centring falsification and lightweight, easily-reversible designs--while the other emphasises building durable institutional capacity (centralised enforcement, mission-driven research, procurement reform) and advancing specific sectoral strategies (AI, biotech, SRM, mental health). The difference is therefore mainly one of priority and emphasis: broad methodological humility and minimal permanence versus targeted, structural reforms and comprehensive governance frameworks.

### **AMALIA MARIA KOUTSOGIANNI - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening youth resilience through education, mental-health measures, and improved digital literacy and critical thinking to manage disinformation and technological change. Both call for meaningful youth participation and institutional mechanisms to ensure young generations' voices and long-term interests are represented in policymaking.

Disagreements: They differ mainly in scope and emphasis: one adopts a wide-ranging, technology- and security-oriented resilience agenda (including AI, climate interventions, biotech, procurement and defence/competitiveness measures), while the other focuses narrowly on social and economic stability for young people (decent work, affordable housing, healthcare, and targeted education reforms). Consequently they prioritise different policy instruments -- systemic industrial/regulatory reforms versus social protection, labour-market and participatory measures -- though these priorities are complementary rather than directly opposed.

### **Gaël QUEINNEC - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions identify environmental (climate), geopolitical, and technological (AI/digital) challenges as central to EU resilience and call for a more proactive, forward-looking conception of resilience. They converge on the need to broaden participation

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

in foresight processes to include non-governmental stakeholders, specifically enterprise and private-sector foresight practitioners or clusters. Both also signal support for reframing resilience thinking beyond narrow short-term responses toward stronger, future-oriented approaches.

**Disagreements:** They differ in emphasis and level of detail: one submission advances specific policy instruments (regulatory enforcement, procurement reform, public-funded research priorities, SRM governance, biosecurity measures, and mental-health-in-all-policies) while the other focuses narrowly on process improvements (bringing industry foresight into collective intelligence sessions) and on clarifying conceptual framing (advocating the term 'anti-fragility'). There is a potential tension over stakeholder balance: one leans strongly toward public-interest safeguards, precaution, and inclusive citizen deliberation, whereas the other prioritises greater direct involvement of corporate/enterprise foresight networks and a language of performance and sovereignty.

## **Sanja Terlevic - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening democratic legitimacy of policymaking through meaningful citizen inclusion and participatory processes, including mechanisms for public engagement and deliberation. They also converge on the need for adaptive, experimental policy tools (e.g., safe/controlled experimentation or sandboxes) and agile policy frameworks that can respond quickly to emerging challenges while maintaining democratic standards.

**Disagreements:** Submission A places strong emphasis on specific technical and security priorities -- enforcement capacity, strategic R&D investment, procurement reform, tech and defence sovereignty, biosecurity, and governance/research of climate interventions (SRM) -- and prescribes concrete institutional and funding measures. Submission B is high-level and primarily concentrates on accessibility, co-creation, and low-risk policy experimentation without advancing sector-specific security, industrial or scientific governance prescriptions.

## **Kieran DALTON - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise forward-looking strategic foresight as essential to shaping Europe's trajectory to 2040 and stress the need to strengthen resilience through intra-EU consolidation and an active, results-oriented neighbourhood policy. They share emphasis on investing in R&D, education and key emerging technologies (including AI) and on mobilising citizens and societal participation to build durable social and technological capacity.

**Disagreements:** They diverge in emphasis and granularity: one submission focuses on institutional and regulatory reforms (enforcement bodies, procurement reform, mission-driven research, biosecurity, and detailed governance for climate interventions like SRM) and on specific technical domains (biotech, neurotech, climate science) and quantitative foresight tools, while the other stresses urgent geopolitical consolidation, creating prosperity in neighbouring regions, renewable energy and space technologies, and bottom-up social innovation without prescribing complex governance architectures. There is also a difference in tone on the role of large corporations versus grassroots societal engagement and on the balance between rapid, short-term geopolitical responses and long-term systemic capacity-building.

## **Melanoma Patient Network Europe - Score: 8/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both stress the central role of robust science, evidence-based decision-making, and ethics in strengthening European resilience. They agree on the need to invest in education and scientific literacy to counter misinformation and improve public health and democratic outcomes. Both call for sustained public engagement and leadership that embody moral values and critical thinking.

**Disagreements:** One submission takes a broad, systems-level approach that prioritises strategic foresight, technological sovereignty, defence and industrial policy, climate-intervention research/governance, and specific R&D and procurement reforms, while the other focuses narrowly on education, ethics and scientific literacy as the primary lever for resilience. There is a difference in emphasis on resource allocation and policy instruments: one advocates proactive research into potentially controversial technologies and institutional enforcement mechanisms, whereas the other prioritises societal-level literacy, ethics and countering pseudoscience without detailing techno-industrial or security measures.

## **EuroStack Project - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise European technological sovereignty, stronger investment in R&D and skills, and using public

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

procurement and standards to build domestic capabilities. They agree on the need for stronger cybersecurity, interoperable open standards, and improving the Commission's strategic foresight and scenario planning to inform long-term resilience.

Disagreements: They differ on approach and scope: one submission advocates mission-driven, centrally coordinated institutions and broader coverage of climate interventions, biotech, defence and enforcement bodies, while the other prioritises a bottom-up, Open Source First stack, SME-led procurement and explicitly rejects hyperscaler-led models like the current Gaia-X approach. There are also different emphases on governance trade-offs -- centralised enforcement and large pan-EU facilities versus decentralized community-driven development and market-based financing for open-source components.

## GROUPE VYV - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions emphasise the centrality of climate risk and its health consequences, including worsening mental health and the rise of infectious diseases, and call for stronger strategic foresight, research and preparedness. They also agree on the need to protect vulnerable populations, integrate health into broader policy-making, and strengthen resilient supply chains and local capacity for essential goods and services.

Disagreements: The Centre for Future Generations prioritises technology and strategic autonomy at EU level (e.g., pan-European AI research infrastructure, enforcement bodies, biofoundries, SRM research and export controls) and frames resilience through geopolitics, defence and regulated tech development. Groupe VYV instead focuses on community and mutualist responses, social protection, access to care, food systems, local adaptation measures and frugality, expressing greater caution about large-scale technological roll-outs and stressing decentralised, solidaristic instruments.

## Ioannis Lamprou - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions place resilience and strategic foresight at the centre of EU policy and call for systemic, whole-of-government approaches to prepare for prolonged, interconnected crises. They agree on the need for greater coordination across EU agencies and networks, stronger monitoring/stress-testing of capabilities, and on making foresight more inclusive and accessible to citizens and administrations.

Disagreements: They differ on priorities and institutional emphasis: Submission A focuses heavily on emerging-technology governance, mission-driven R&D (AI, biofoundries), procurement reform, centralized enforcement capacity, and explicit climate-intervention research, while Submission B prioritises accommodating diverse member-state threat perceptions, parliamentary ownership of resilience, and an inclusive, decentralised platform linking agencies and civil society. These differences imply potential tension between A's technocratic/centralised instruments and B's emphasis on member-state inclusiveness and parliamentary integration.

## Joni Suikeli - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise stronger EU responsibility for defence and preparedness, including reducing reliance on external actors and assessing the costs of collective security. They agree on the need to strengthen European cohesion and resilience -- including countering internal political forces that erode unity -- and on preparing for crises even when conditions appear calm.

Disagreements: The other submission is narrowly focused on hard and soft defence measures, national identity and immediate security costs, whereas the first submission emphasises a broader suite of long-term policies (technology governance, climate intervention governance, biosecurity, R&D and procurement reform) and institutional foresight mechanisms. They also differ in framing of external threats: one centers state-level geopolitical and military threats and national identity, while the other foregrounds technological, climate and democratic risks and multilevel regulatory responses.

## Juan Bartolomé García Martínez - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions identify high-impact systemic risks (including abrupt sunlight reduction / nuclear-winter type scenarios and infrastructure shocks) as legitimate priorities for EU action and call for stronger preparedness. They converge on the need for publicly funded, mission-driven R&D, rapid deployment pilots, and international cooperation / trade continuity as central elements of resilience planning. Both also emphasise strengthening scientific monitoring, modelling and early-warning capabilities to inform policy

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

responses.

Disagreements: The two submissions differ in emphasis and policy focus: one prioritises institutional and governance reforms (democratic safeguards, regulatory enforcement, tech sovereignty, AI/neurotech governance and intergenerational equity) while the other concentrates on operational, technical food-system solutions (resilient foods, bioindustrial repurposing, seaweed, microalgae, single-cell protein) and concrete ramp-up logistics. They also prefer different instrument mixes -- centralized enforcement and procurement reform versus national contingency plans, flexible biofuel mandates, stockpiles and rapid construction/pilot projects -- and one gives sustained attention to social/mental-health and democratic processes that the other treats only peripherally.

## Kansaneläkelaitos Kela - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience through improved strategic foresight, cross-level cooperation, and continuity of critical services. They share concern for societal wellbeing, trust, protection of vulnerable groups, and the need for robust digital resilience and data protection for health and social systems. Both call for better integration of foresight into policy processes and for mechanisms that ensure continuity of essential public functions in crises.

Disagreements: Submission A emphasises high-level technological and geopolitical priorities--AI and R&D leadership, procurement reform, defence and tech sovereignty, biosecurity, and active research/governance on climate interventions (SRM) and early-warning systems. Submission B focuses on operational public-service resilience: continuity of payments, national agency involvement in foresight, pragmatic interoperability, GDPR compliance, and cyber-security of health and social databases. In short, A is oriented toward strategic, tech-driven and security-focused instruments; B is focused on service delivery, legal safeguards, and institutional continuity at national level.

## Kevin Bradley - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions recognise a more fragmented, geopolitically volatile 2040 and the need to strengthen EU strategic autonomy through supply-chain diversification, trade and defence tools, and enhanced cyber/data security. They also agree climate change is a central resilience challenge requiring large-scale adaptation, energy system transformation and investments (including carbon removal/advanced energy options) as well as renewed focus on food, health and critical-industrial resilience.

Disagreements: They differ on priorities and approaches: one submission foregrounds democratic safeguards, regulatory enforcement, mission-driven public research (e.g., pan-European AI infrastructure), SRM research governance, mental-health impacts of digital tech, and biosecurity measures such as biofoundries; the other emphasises industrial-scale responses -- greater domestic resource extraction, circularity, trade defence, stronger military/defence posture, and pragmatic acceptance of conservative regulation slowing some bio-innovations. These differences reflect contrasting emphasis on precautionary governance and societal/ethical issues versus more realpolitik, resource- and industry-led resilience measures.

## Adrien Cadot EI - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise a forward-looking, EU-led resilience agenda that combines strong climate leadership, technological governance (notably ethical AI) and protection of democratic information ecosystems. They agree on the need for participatory foresight, stronger public-interest governance of emerging technologies, and attention to societal wellbeing (mental/cognitive resilience) and intergenerational fairness. Both emphasise strategic autonomy in critical domains (energy/critical supply chains) and the importance of rethinking prosperity beyond narrow short-term metrics.

Disagreements: They differ on means and emphasis: one submission is technical and security-oriented, prioritising centralized enforcement, defence and mission-driven R&D (e.g., biofoundries, a pan-European AI research institution, SRM research and detection systems), while the other foregrounds cultural, design-led and decentralised strategies (post-growth economic frames, biophilic cities, cultural sovereignty, localised energy and agronomic sovereignty). There is also a tonal difference--risk-anticipatory and precautionary policies vs. 'radical/lucid optimism' and narrative-led transition--leading to different policy toolkits and prioritisation of centralization versus localism/decentralisation.

## EU-LIFE - Alliance of Independent Research Institutes in the Life Sciences in Europe - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions emphasise that scientific research and R&D investment are central to Europe's long-term resilience,

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

competitiveness and strategic autonomy, and both call for stronger support for research talent and infrastructures. They agree on the need for a coherent European R&I framework that preserves excellence (ERC/EIC/MSCA-equivalents) and balances public and private financing to enable innovation and preparedness.

Disagreements: They differ on emphasis and instruments: one submission foregrounds broader regulatory, governance and security priorities (stronger enforcement bodies, procurement and defence/tech sovereignty, climate-intervention governance including SRM, biosecurity and neurotech/mental-health safeguards), while the other focuses narrowly on protecting and expanding bottom-up, discovery-driven research funding (a ring-fenced FP10, doubling R&I budgets, and prioritising ERC/MSCA/EIC) and warns against excessive top-down industrial/defence directionality. This creates potential tension over how much R&I policy should be mission-driven or defence-aligned versus left to investigator-led discovery and research infrastructure support.

## Office of the Government and Government of the Republic of Lithuania and Strategic Analysis Center S - Sc

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience through improved strategic foresight, early-warning/monitoring systems, and better use of technological tools (including AI) to make foresight outputs more actionable. They agree on the need to bolster productive capacities and supply-chain resilience, adopt whole-of-society approaches to preparedness, and translate foresight into policy-relevant indicators and response options.

Disagreements: The submissions differ in emphasis: one places stronger weight on intergenerational equity, mental-health impacts of digital technologies, governance and research on climate interventions (SRM), biofoundries/biosecurity, and building pan-European R&D institutions and procurement reform; the other focuses more on operational resilience across peacetime/crisis/conflict, harmonised resilience indicators, civil-protection baselines, empowering vulnerable groups (including gender dimensions), and region-specific security threats. They also diverge on time-horizon and use of foresight: one stresses long-term systemic governance and precautionary research agendas, while the other prioritises short-to-medium-term, actionable, iterative foresight exercises and real-time monitoring for policy response.

## Simon Önnnered - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions emphasize the importance of strategic foresight and anticipatory policymaking to manage interconnected megatrends (technology, climate, demographics) and strengthen long-term EU resilience. They also agree on the need to monitor system-level risks--including climate-driven migration, labour displacement, and societal harms from digital technologies--and to prioritise policies that address inequality and intergenerational fairness.

Disagreements: They differ in prescription and emphasis: one submission advances concrete, interventionist proposals (dedicated R&D missions and institutions, procurement and enforcement reforms, SRM research governance, biofoundry networks, and tech/defence sovereignty), while the other is more diagnostic and methodological, focusing on mapping megatrend interlinkages, proposing eco-awareness as a standalone megatrend, and recommending indicator-based monitoring and further research. The submissions also vary in focus on specific technologies and threats (e.g., explicit SRM and biosecurity governance versus attention to misinformation, urban systems pressure, and conceptual framing).

## SUEZ - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening governance and enforcement to improve resilience and call for cross-cutting, integrated policy approaches that connect climate risks with sectoral responses. They agree on the need for investment in infrastructure and innovation, including digitalisation and circular solutions (e.g., reuse, resource efficiency), to increase long-term resilience. Both stress the importance of transboundary cooperation and better implementation of existing policy tools to manage climate-driven resource challenges.

Disagreements: The other organisation focuses narrowly on operational water-sector measures (pricing reform, leak control, aquifer recharge, treated wastewater reuse and basin-level governance) and on market/investment levers to enable infrastructure deployment. The submission emphasises high-level strategic foresight, emerging technology governance (AI, SRM, biotech, neurotech), intergenerational fairness, and precautionary democratic oversight, which are broader systemic priorities and may conflict with purely market-based or rapid deployment approaches; there is also potential tension around water pricing and equity versus investment needs. Finally, the two differ in time horizon and emphasis: one prioritises immediate, sectoral operational fixes while the other prioritises long-term systemic governance, R&D, and precautionary research agendas.

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## TNO Vector - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience by identifying and securing critical dependencies in technology and supply chains, and both advocate using systematic, evidence-based approaches (metrics, mapping, and studies) to inform policy. Each supports actionable inputs to the Strategic Foresight Report and the use of analysis that translates into operational policy levers across company, network and geopolitical scales.

Disagreements: The two differ in emphasis and normative framing: one stresses democratic safeguards, public-funded and precautionary research, intergenerational fairness, ethics and enforcement of rights-facing regulation, while the other focuses on a business-centric concept of building and measuring 'control points' to secure negotiating positions and strategic advantage. This creates potential tension between promoting private or corporate control points as security levers and prioritising public oversight, transparency and limits on private capture.

## TNO - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritize strengthening EU resilience and strategic autonomy through sustained investment in R&D and deep-tech (AI, biotech, quantum) and recognise supply-chain vulnerabilities and the need to reduce overreliance on non-EU partners. They also agree on improving foresight capacity -- including early-warning systems and more rigorous, system-aware methods -- and on reforming governance/investment tools (procurement, funding pipelines) and moving beyond GDP as the sole success metric.

Disagreements: They differ in emphasis and policy focus: one submission foregrounds climate-intervention governance (SRM), intergenerational equity, mental-health impacts of digital/neurotech, biosecurity and precautionary public research and enforcement, while the other centres on industrial competitiveness, commercialisation, creating economic control points, adaptive governance (discontinuing underperforming policies) and applying System Dynamics modelling. Tone and policy instruments also diverge: one stresses stronger centralized enforcement, ethical/democratic safeguards and precaution; the other stresses localized participation, faster commercialization pathways and modeling tools to guide strategic choices.

## UNESPA - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience and preparedness--particularly for climate-related and cyber risks--and endorse closer public-private cooperation and stakeholder dialogue to close protection gaps. They also converge on the need for better risk awareness, targeted incentives for prevention, mobilisation of investment, and appropriate access to data (with consent) to enable risk pricing, mitigation and recovery.

Disagreements: The submissions differ in scope and emphasis: one focuses on long-term strategic foresight, governance and enforcement for emerging technologies (AI, biotech, SRM, neurotech), intergenerational justice and precautionary frameworks, while the other focuses on pragmatic insurance-sector priorities such as insurability, data access for underwriting, pension savings, retail investment, SME support and simplification of regulatory burdens. This creates potential tensions where stronger precautionary/regulatory approaches and centralized enforcement could constrain market flexibility and data-driven insurance innovation that the industry seeks to enable.

## University of Bergen - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise climate research, interdisciplinary work, and enhanced research infrastructure (including data sharing and prediction systems) to bolster long-term resilience. They also agree on the need to integrate social sciences, humanities and psychology into technology and health research, address youth and mental-health concerns, and strengthen EU research funding and strategic foresight-oriented approaches.

Disagreements: They differ on emphasis and policy instruments: one submission pushes mission-driven, security-oriented measures (defence/tech sovereignty, procurement reform, biofoundries, SRM research and centralized enforcement) and active governance of emerging tech, while the other centres on boosting basic and curiosity-driven research, prioritising university-led mechanisms (ERC/MSCA), civilian-only R&I and safeguarding open competition with caution on large top-down partnerships. There is also divergence on risk appetite for climate intervention research and the preferred locus for dual-use work (security/defence channels versus civilian R&I separation).

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## Xylem - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise resilience to climate change, emphasise the need for EU-level strategic planning and preparedness, and call for increased investment and targeted funding to shore up critical infrastructure. They also agree that digitalisation and better data/early-warning systems are key enablers of resilience and that strategic autonomy and competitiveness should be considered in planning.

Disagreements: They diverge in scope and emphasis: one submission is sector-specific, focused on operational measures for water efficiency, tariffs, national risk plans, and financing instruments, while the other prioritises governance of emerging technologies, precautionary research (e.g., SRM), democratic oversight, and pan-EU institutional reforms. There is also a difference in approach where one pushes mandatory technical and market measures to accelerate deployment (e.g., volumetric tariffs, mandated reuse, procurement/funding incentives) and the other stresses stronger regulation, enforcement, public R&D and participatory foresight to manage systemic and intergenerational risks.

## Ministry of the Economy Luxembourg - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions emphasise the same high-level threats: geopolitical competition, accelerating technological change, and escalating climate risks, and call for stronger EU resilience through investment in R&D, improved regulatory capacity, and strategic foresight. Both documents stress the need to protect democratic institutions and public trust, strengthen supply-chain and critical-infrastructure resilience, and integrate climate adaptation into security and economic planning.

Disagreements: They differ in emphasis and preferred instruments: Submission A prioritises governance of frontier technologies (including dedicated pan-European AI research capacity, SRM research governance, neurotech safeguards, and biofoundries) and prescriptive regulatory/enforcement reforms coupled with intergenerational equity measures. Submission B takes a more pragmatic, economy-focused approach--detailing operational preparedness (stockpiles, energy diversification and storage, pension concerns, industrial policy, green finance, and territorial/regional measures) and is more cautious about techno-solutionism and large-scale interventionism.

## ZOE Institute for Future-fit Economies - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions strongly endorse mainstreaming strategic foresight across the EU policy cycle, including capacity building so foresight becomes a regular part of decision-making. They also converge on intergenerational fairness, the importance of citizen participation (standing panels or youth engagement) and on integrating social and environmental considerations into policy design to strengthen long-term resilience.

Disagreements: One submission prioritises concrete, security- and technology-focused interventions (e.g., mission-driven R&D for AI and climate interventions, biofoundries, biosecurity, procurement reform, and stronger centralised enforcement) while the other stays at a higher level, promoting sustainable and inclusive wellbeing (SIW) metrics, horizontal data integration and lighter institutional coordination between existing networks. This creates different emphases on governance: a more technocratic, mission-oriented and defence-aware agenda versus a metrics-driven, participatory and system-integration approach.

## Egmont - Royal Institute for International Relations - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise climate and environmental risks as central to EU long-term resilience, calling for stronger adaptation, diversified supply chains and reduced external dependencies. They also agree on the need to strengthen strategic foresight, early-warning and preparedness mechanisms, improve financing for transition/adaptation, and bolster EU strategic autonomy (including in defence and critical technologies/value chains).

Disagreements: The two differ on the role and primacy of technological fixes and institutional design: one emphasises mission-driven research into emerging technologies (including governance for SRM, expanded AI and biofoundry capacity), centralized enforcement bodies and tech-centric procurement/R&D reforms, while the other stresses ecological limits, social and moral change, caution about techno-solutionism, stronger public provisioning (civic service, re-publicisation of services) and governance reforms based on orchestration, differentiated integration and experimental regulatory arenas. They also prioritise different mixes of tools -- top-down pan-European institutions and standards versus flexible, multi-speed cooperation and grassroots/territorial approaches.

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## **ECOLAB - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience and competitiveness through targeted policy and investment, stressing that sectoral resource needs (e.g. water, energy, critical technologies) must be integrated across climate and industrial policy. They each call for stronger legal and regulatory frameworks, better measurement and data systems, and public-private funding mechanisms to scale innovation and secure supply chains.

Disagreements: The submissions differ in scope and emphasis: one focuses on broad governance of emerging technologies, climate intervention research, biosecurity, and strategic foresight (including long-term democratic and intergenerational considerations), while the other concentrates tightly on operational water management--water-efficiency mandates, national water plans, water accounting, reuse regulatory harmonisation, and specific funding vehicles. They therefore prioritise different near-term instruments and policy entry points (high-level governance and foresight vs. targeted, immediate industrial water efficiency reforms).

## **Andre REBENTISCH - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening European technological sovereignty and reducing dependencies on non-EU providers, especially in critical digital infrastructure and cloud services. They agree on the need for strategic investment and coordinated public action to build indigenous capabilities and improve resilience of essential systems.

Disagreements: They diverge on scope and policy emphasis: one submission advances a broad, cross-sectoral agenda (climate interventions, biofoundries, mental health, regulatory enforcement, foresight) and favours institutional and regulatory solutions, while the other focuses narrowly on software stack autonomy and open-source ecosystems as the primary resilience pathway. There is potential tension over means -- centralized institutions and heavy regulatory frameworks versus decentralized, community-driven open source approaches and prioritisation of software over other technology domains.

## **Anonymous\_1 - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise preserving and promoting Europe's quality of life through strong healthcare, universal high-quality education, social inclusion and accessible green cities, and view these social goods as core assets for long-term resilience. They also agree the EU must strengthen economic competitiveness by attracting investment and corporate presence and must rebuild credible international leadership, including more effective diplomacy.

Disagreements: The other submission focuses primarily on social policy, urban quality of life, and pragmatic measures to attract company headquarters and internationalise European firms, whereas the first submission places much greater emphasis on technological sovereignty, emergent-technology governance (AI, biotech, neurotech), climate-intervention research and biosecurity, and institutional reforms for foresight, procurement and enforcement. There is therefore a difference in priorities and policy instruments: one is social- and diplomacy-centred and short-to-medium-term economic attraction, the other is techno-regulatory, strategic-foresight and defence/innovation-system oriented with stronger emphasis on research infrastructure and risk governance.

## **Anonymous\_10 - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions identify concentrated private tech power and data extraction as major systemic risks and call for stronger EU action to counterbalance that influence. They also converge on the centrality of advanced technologies (notably AI) to future resilience and the need for proactive, science-informed EU policy and investment -- including preparing for climate-driven migration and the insufficiency of mitigation alone.

Disagreements: One submission places stronger emphasis on democratic safeguards, public oversight, precautionary governance, intergenerational fairness, and sector-specific measures (biosecurity, mental health, SRM research governance), while the other prioritises rapid, technocratic, AI-driven decision-making, flexible policy trade-offs, and concentrated technological programs (e.g., pooling resources toward major tech goals). They also differ in tone on research/ deployment risk: one stresses inclusive deliberation and regulatory enforcement, the other stresses speed, scientific prioritisation and resource-focused responses to meet urgent technical and energy challenges.

## **Anonymous\_11 - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience through greater strategic autonomy -- notably in defence, AI capacity, and domestic production of critical goods such as medicines. They converge on the need to close capability gaps (AI delays, supply-chain vulnerabilities) and to reduce reliance on external suppliers by building European industrial and technological capacity.

Disagreements: Submission B frames the current approach as overly heavy, costly, and ineffective and emphasizes immediate, pragmatic remedies (onshoring production, fixing shortages, establishing a European defence) with a critical posture toward broad strategies. Submission A, by contrast, endorses ambitious, long-term investments, institutional reforms, strengthened regulatory and enforcement mechanisms, mission-driven research (including contentious areas like SRM), and systemic foresight-priorities that imply large-scale spending and more complex governance rather than the lean corrective focus implied by Submission B.

## **ASOCIACION INDUSTRIAL DE CANARIAS ASINCA - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience through industrial competitiveness, reducing dependence on non-EU supply chains, and boosting R&D, innovation and skills development to support reindustrialisation and the green/digital transition. They agree that targeted public policy and investment (including procurement and support for SMEs/regions) are essential to maintain competitiveness and prepare for future shocks.

Disagreements: They diverge on emphasis and policy approach: one submission prioritises governance, strategic foresight, regulatory enforcement, ethical oversight of emerging technologies (including biosecurity and research on climate interventions) and intergenerational concerns, while the other focuses on pragmatic industrial supports for regions (especially ultraperipheral islands), flexible SME treatment, immediate competitiveness measures and energy/mix concerns. This creates potential tensions between stricter regulatory/precautionary stances and calls for deregulatory flexibility, lower compliance costs and regionally tailored industrial assistance.

## **Association internationale Futuribles - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU long-term resilience through improved strategic foresight, better crisis management, and measures to enhance strategic autonomy (notably in supply chains, industry and critical technologies). They likewise recognise climate risks and geopolitical competition as central threats requiring coordinated EU-level responses and greater investment in preparedness and research.

Disagreements: One submission emphasises normative, technology-specific governance and societal concerns--detailed proposals on AI institutions, biosecurity and biofoundries, neurotechnology risks, mental health, SRM research governance, procurement reform and centralized enforcement--alongside explicit intergenerational equity and participatory mechanisms. The other is more focused on synthesising foresight literature and prioritises industrial policy, de-risking/reshoring of value chains, defence/competitiveness and scenario-based analysis, offering fewer prescriptive measures on emerging tech governance and social impacts.

## **CHEM Trust - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions place environmental sustainability, public health and intergenerational fairness at the centre of EU long-term resilience and call for stronger regulatory frameworks, enforcement and better policy coordination across domains. They also agree that resilience requires joined-up policymaking that links economic competitiveness with protection of people and ecosystems and that the public should be involved in deliberation around high-stakes choices.

Disagreements: CHEM Trust is narrowly focused on chemical pollution control and regulatory fixes (strengthening REACH, universal PFAS restriction, endocrine disruptor rules, and strict polluter-pays enforcement) as the primary pathway to resilience. The Centre for Future Generations emphasises technological sovereignty, strategic investment and anticipatory governance for emerging tech (AI, biotech, neurotech), climate-intervention research, defence and procurement reform, and mental-health-in-all-policies -- reflecting different priorities and potential tension between precautionary phase-outs and active, mission-driven tech deployment.

## **Anonymous\_4 - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening democratic legitimacy, transparency, and enforcement to restore public trust in EU institutions. They agree that representation and accountability deficits undermine the EU's resilience and call for institutional reforms to better align decision-making with citizens' interests.

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

Disagreements: Submission B focuses narrowly on parliamentary-level problems--attendance, corruption prevention, socio-economic representativeness, and reforming selection and remuneration of elected MEPs--seeking immediate procedural and personnel remedies. Submission A emphasises systemic, long-term resilience across technology, climate, defence and foresight policy (e.g., AI, biotech, SRM, procurement, R&D and new enforcement bodies) and proposes broad institutional capacity-building, participatory foresight and cross-sector governance measures rather than the specific parliamentary selection/pay reforms highlighted by Submission B.

## **bert hubert - Score: 7/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions identify dependency on non-European technology providers as a strategic risk and call for policy action to reduce that dependence. They agree the EU should strengthen its technological sovereignty, procurement practices, and enforcement to protect democratic governance and operational continuity.

Disagreements: One submission advances a broad, multi-sectoral strategy (AI research infrastructure, biotech biofoundries, SRM governance, mental-health policies, and enhanced foresight) and prefers measured, research-led and multilateral approaches; the other is narrowly focused and urgent, arguing for immediate operational decoupling from US cloud providers on legal and political grounds. The first emphasises capacity-building, institutional design and balanced governance, while the second emphasises immediate, pragmatic removal of dependence with a combative tone.

## **Philea - Score: 6/10 (Likely Ally)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise long-term strategic foresight and building EU resilience, emphasising intergenerational fairness, inclusive deliberation, and the need for cross-sector collaboration (government, civil society, research and private funders). They also agree on the value of long-term, risk-tolerant investment and innovation to address systemic challenges (climate, social cohesion, health) and on removing barriers to effective cross-border cooperation and funding.

Disagreements: The submissions differ in emphasis and preferred instruments: one stresses technological and defence sovereignty, centralized enforcement, procurement reform, mission-driven public R&D and detailed governance for high-risk domains (SRM, biosecurity, AI), while the other prioritises enabling philanthropy through legal/fiscal simplification, scaling social innovation and partnership roles for foundations. This creates potential tensions over the pace and stringency of regulation (and export/dual-use controls) versus policies that expand philanthropic flexibility to fund experimentation and civil-society driven solutions.

## **NA - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience, defending European democratic values, and adapting governance to rapid technological change. They agree on the need to harness digital and scientific capabilities to improve public services and societal wellbeing, including reforms to make institutions more effective and citizens more digitally literate.

Disagreements: Submission A emphasises precaution, stronger regulatory enforcement, targeted strategic investments (e.g., AI infrastructure, biofoundries), and explicit climate-intervention governance, while Submission B prioritises rapid technology adoption, procedural simplification, periodic re-evaluation of regulations, and efficiency gains with less emphasis on precaution. They also differ on specificity and scope: A advances detailed security, procurement and bio/ climate policy proposals; B remains high-level and focused on cultural/administrative adaptation and openness to trade-offs for innovation.

## **Nicolas Overloop\_1 - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

Agreements: Both submissions identify acute geopolitical risks to Europe and call for stronger EU strategic autonomy, including stepped-up defence and security capabilities. They agree on the need to invest in European technological and industrial capacity (including support for Ukrainian defence innovation) and to address internal fragmentation and democratic legitimacy to ensure coherent continental responses.

Disagreements: They diverge sharply on means and priorities: one advocates a primarily hard-power, forward-leaning military posture (naval/air drones, overseas bases, direct force-posture) to secure trade routes, while the other prioritises multilateral governance, regulatory enforcement, ethical oversight, and mission-driven R&D as pathways to resilience. They also differ on institutional reform--one proposes centralising political mandate via direct election to enable decisive action, whereas the other emphasises

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

democratic safeguards, enforcement capacity, and deliberative mechanisms to balance security with rights and long-term stewardship.

## **Anonymous\_9 - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening Europe's technological and industrial autonomy (chips/AI/software, reindustrialisation) and increasing R&D and scientific capacity to underpin resilience. They also agree on the need to reform procurement and labour/education systems to support skills, continuous retraining, and economic competitiveness, and identify climate change, demographic change and geopolitical rivalry as core long-term risks.

**Disagreements:** They diverge on governance and policy style: one emphasizes faster, more centralized executive powers and streamlined decision-making to deliver strategic autonomy, while the other stresses strong democratic safeguards, enforcement, inclusive deliberation and precaution (especially around emerging tech and SRM). They also differ on social priorities--one calls for mandatory fiscal/pension reform and merit-based migration to shore up workforce numbers, whereas the other foregrounds intergenerational equity, participatory mechanisms, mental-health policy and multilateral, transparent research governance.

## **Anonymous\_5 - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise stronger EU strategic autonomy--notably in defence capability and critical technologies--and call for the bloc to be more proactive internationally rather than passively observing crises. They also share concern about dependence on non-EU actors in areas like space and critical infrastructure and support building European capacity and procurement mechanisms to reduce that reliance.

**Disagreements:** The other submission advocates direct, interventionist military action to stabilise source countries and a more immediate assertive posture in space, whereas the first submission emphasises strengthening defence industrial capacity alongside robust democratic oversight, multilateral governance and long-term institution-building. The first submission places substantial weight on regulatory frameworks, social resilience (mental health, intergenerational equity), research-led approaches and precaution (e.g., SRM governance and biosecurity), priorities that are absent from the other submission's narrow focus on force projection and space presence.

## **Maria Lindqvist - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions stress the centrality of democratic engagement: they argue that public discussion, education and inclusive deliberation are necessary to achieve sustainable and legitimate EU policy outcomes. Each sees greater civic participation as a corrective to current policymaking practices and a prerequisite for durable decisions.

**Disagreements:** They diverge on means and trust: one submission emphasizes structured, evidence-based mechanisms (strategic foresight, regulatory enforcement, mission-driven research and designed participatory processes) while the other calls for broadly opening up debate on contentious topics and implies current institutional suppression. The detailed submission prioritises technical, institutional and expert-led remedies alongside participatory forums, whereas the short submission focuses narrowly on unrestricted public debate without proposing technical governance or evidentiary frameworks.

## **SPES project - Sustainability Performances Evidence and Scenarios - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise stronger climate action, long-term resilience and intergenerational fairness, calling for improved strategic foresight, public engagement, and evidence-based R&I that serves societal needs. They each stress the need to strengthen governance, social protection (health, education, inclusion) and to embed wellbeing considerations into policymaking. Both advocate more transparent, participatory processes to align policy with long-term societal and environmental objectives.

**Disagreements:** Submission A emphasises technological sovereignty, defence and competitiveness, large-scale mission-driven tech investments (AI, biofoundries) and anticipatory research on climate interventions (SRM), alongside procurement and enforcement reforms to mobilise capital and innovation. Submission B centres on replacing GDP with a Sustainable Human Development framework, redistribution, progressive taxation, community banking, social economy promotion and systemic limits to growth; it prioritises transformative social and economic reforms over technology- and defence-led industrial strategies. They also differ on the framing and tools for mobilisation (market-facing investment and procurement reforms vs. fiscal/redistributive instruments and mass

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

advocacy) and on the relative emphasis given to researching high-risk climate interventions.

## **Anonymous\_2 - Score: 6/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise social fairness and improving access to essential health and welfare services, and they share concern about the affordability pressures households face. Each supports policies that would reduce burdens on vulnerable groups and increase equitable access to basic needs and healthcare-related products.

**Disagreements:** They differ in scale and emphasis: one submission focuses on immediate, concrete social support (free period products, birth control access, affordable food), while the other emphasises long-term strategic measures, institutional reforms, and technological and security resilience. They also prefer different policy instruments -- direct provision and affordability measures versus systemic investment, regulatory restructuring, and strategic foresight.

## **TES - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise EU resilience, especially in the energy/climate domain, and call for ambitious decarbonisation targets and milestones toward mid-century. They agree on the need for adequate, predictable financing and clearer implementation of existing EU legislation and market measures to scale low-carbon solutions and strengthen supply security.

**Disagreements:** They differ on policy instruments and risk framing: one submission emphasizes strategic foresight, strong regulatory oversight, precautionary governance for emerging technologies, and mission-driven public research, while the other prioritises technology-neutral market deployment, simplified funding rules, industry-led scaling (including specific e-fuels and blending mandates) and an industrial decarbonisation bank. There is also a contrast over the role of public intervention versus market mechanisms and over attention to non-energy technological risks (e.g., SRM, AI, biosecurity) which the industry submission does not address.

## **Special Secretariat of Foresight - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise long-term strategic foresight and intergenerational fairness, stressing that policy should account for future demographic and societal impacts. They also converge on the need for stronger policy coordination and more inclusive citizen participation to inform priority-setting.

**Disagreements:** Submission A places heavy emphasis on emerging-technology governance, climate intervention research, biosecurity, enforcement capacity and procurement-driven innovation, while Submission B is narrowly focused on demographic ageing, fiscal sustainability and the creation of a fiscal-foresight network. Their preferred instruments differ: Submission A advocates regulatory reform, mission-driven research and defence/tech sovereignty measures, whereas Submission B emphasizes fiscal planning, service restructuring for the elderly and policymaker networks.

## **Instituto Nacional de Administração IP Portugal - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions support the 2025 Strategic Foresight Report process and its goal of strengthening EU resilience toward 2040, and both value grounding the report in evidence and scientific contributions. They concur on the importance of linking foresight work to EU strategic frameworks (e.g., Competitiveness Compass and preparedness planning) and on engaging research and academic actors in the report's development.

**Disagreements:** Submission A advances detailed policy priorities (e.g., proactive governance of emerging technologies, SRM research and governance, biofoundries and biosecurity, procurement reform, mental-health-in-all-policies, and strengthened enforcement institutions) while Submission B remains process-oriented and offers to contribute research without endorsing or addressing those substantive measures. Submission B does not take positions on the specific risks, instruments, or regulatory reforms emphasised in Submission A, indicating a difference in depth and policy ambition.

## **Maastricht School of Management - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU economic resilience by boosting competitiveness, investment, and secure supply chains, and they see procurement reform as an important policy lever. Both recognise geopolitical competition (US/China and

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

broader geostrategic shifts) and call for more coherent, better-resourced EU action to translate policy into outcomes (including targeted R&D/aid-for-trade and capacity building).

**Disagreements:** Submission A emphasises strong regulatory stewardship, democratic safeguards, precautionary and publicly funded research (notably on emerging technologies and climate interventions), strategic foresight and intergenerational equity, while Submission B focuses on trade-led development through deeper, reciprocal PTAs, bilateral market access, and investment incentives, favouring pragmatic or relaxed conditionality. These differences imply potential tensions over the balance between values-driven regulation and assertive, bilateral trade/investment tools as the primary route to resilience and development, and they prioritise different geographic and sectoral focuses (emerging tech/biotech/climate vs. EU-Africa trade and value-chain upgrading).

## **Bankenverband - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions identify geopolitical tension, rapid technological change (notably AI), and climate risks as central threats to EU resilience and call for stronger EU autonomy in digital and critical infrastructure. They also agree on the need for increased investment in R&D and innovation, harmonised regulatory/technical standards, public-private partnerships, improved cybersecurity, and stronger strategic foresight and citizen education to prepare for long-term risks.

**Disagreements:** The submissions diverge on regulatory philosophy and sectoral priorities: one emphasises precautionary governance, robust enforcement, public funding for independent research (including on climate interventions like SRM), biosecurity, mental-health impacts of tech, and intergenerational fairness; the other prioritises enabling digital finance markets, tokenisation, sandboxes and market-led innovation, greater private finance mobilisation, and lighter-touch/harmonising regulation to avoid stifling competitiveness. They therefore trade off stronger, centralized oversight and research-led governance against regulatory flexibility and market-driven instruments to scale digital finance.

## **F Hanna Campbell - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening long-term resilience through strategic foresight, expanded investment in innovation, and greater use of advanced technologies (AI, satellite/remote sensing) to inform policy and early-warning systems. They also converge on the need to bolster supply-chain and production resilience via more distributed capabilities and to integrate defence/security considerations into resilience planning. Both endorse regulatory reform and new funding instruments to accelerate transformative change while emphasising inclusive approaches to governance and public engagement.

**Disagreements:** They diverge on the preferred pathways: one stresses precautionary, governance-first approaches (centralised enforcement, biosecurity, tightly governed research on high-risk interventions) and sector-specific priorities like biotech and SRM governance, while the other advocates rapid, systemic spatial and infrastructural transformation (land liberation, elevated/airborne transport, mass highway abandonment, and sweeping financial and housing redesign). This produces potential tensions over scale and timing of interventions, distributional impacts (e.g., land-use and subsidy reallocation), and trade-offs between centralized oversight versus mobility-oriented, decentralised governance and deployment speed.

## **Fraunhofer IAO - Score: 6/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening Europe's emerging-technology ecosystems through sustained, long-term investment, development of specialised workforce and industry expertise, and enhanced international cooperation. They also converge on the need to reform structural and administrative barriers (funding mechanisms, procurement and translational pathways) so research more readily converts into commercial and strategic capabilities.

**Disagreements:** They differ on regulatory posture and breadth of concerns: one submission emphasises stronger enforcement, precautionary governance, democratic oversight and attention to societal risks (e.g., biosecurity, mental health, climate interventions), while the other calls for a less bureaucratic regulatory framework to accelerate innovation. The first advances a broad, cross-sector resilience agenda (climate, biotech, SRM, AI, foresight) whereas the second focuses narrowly on structural enablers for the quantum computing ecosystem.

## **FutuRes Towards a Resilient Future of Europe Horizon Europe funded project - Score: 6/10 (Likely Ally)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritize strengthening EU long-term resilience through improved strategic foresight, evidence-driven

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

policymaking, and attention to intergenerational fairness. They converge on the need to bolster social cohesion and human capital--including making labour markets and talent retention more effective--and to empower local communities and participatory processes to increase societal resilience.

Disagreements: They diverge on primary policy focus and instruments: one submission concentrates on emerging-technology governance, climate intervention preparedness (including SRM), biosecurity, defence/tech sovereignty, and centralized enforcement and R&D institutions; the other centers on demographic resilience, labour market participation, caregiving, pensions, and locally driven care and community strategies. They also differ in preferred levers -- large-scale, mission-driven R&D/procurement and centralized agencies versus local demographic strategies, labour-market reforms, and community-level interventions.

## Gabriele De Giorgi - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)

Agreements: Both submissions endorse strengthening European cohesion through education, civic engagement and the promotion of shared democratic values; each stresses the importance of engaging young people in shaping Europe's future. They also align on preserving national identities while building stronger pan-European bonds and on using institutional action at EU level to foster solidarity and trust.

Disagreements: The proposals diverge on priorities and instruments: one focuses on technical resilience (AI, biotech, climate security, enforcement, procurement reform and large-scale R&D/infrastructure) and anticipatory governance, while the other focuses narrowly on cultural education, curricula and symbolic holidays to build identity. They therefore imply different resource allocations and policy pathways--structural, regulatory and scientific interventions versus pedagogical and symbolic nation-building measures.

## David Van Geert - Score: 6/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise stronger European strategic autonomy, including building domestic industrial capacity (defence and critical materials) and reducing dependence on non-European suppliers. They also converge on boosting intra-European trade/integration, protecting and developing nature, and investing in education and skills to increase European resilience and knowledge capacity.

Disagreements: The other submission emphasizes concrete geopolitical moves (Greenland integration, Arctic positioning), an explicit push for a modern nuclear energy programme, and a direct build-out of a European arms industry, whereas the first submission focuses on governance, regulatory safeguards, mission-driven R&D (AI, biotech, SRM), precautionary research, and democratic oversight. There is also a difference in emphasis on methods: one favours rapid industrial and territorial strategies, the other prioritises foresight, enforcement, public deliberation, and targeted research infrastructure and procurement reform.

## Agroecology Europe - Score: 6/10 (Neutral)

Agreements: Both submissions emphasise the urgency of climate-related tipping points and the need to prioritise long-term resilience through anticipatory governance, improved strategic foresight, and stronger cross-sector policy coherence. They also converge on the importance of democratic legitimacy, public and stakeholder engagement, and protecting food security and environmental integrity as central elements of EU resilience.

Disagreements: They differ sharply in priorities and preferred policy instruments: one submission focuses on technological solutions, mission-driven R&D (including biotechnology, AI and climate-intervention research), strategic tech and defence sovereignty, and procurement/research institution reform, while the other prioritises agroecology, nature-based solutions, CAP transformation, territorial/local food systems and stricter protection of Green Deal commitments. This creates potential tension over approaches such as support for controlled SRM research and private-sector scaling versus precautionary, agroecological pathways and stronger regulatory protections that limit market-driven or techno-centric responses.

## Kai Wellmann - Score: 5/10 (Likely Ally)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening democratic participation and giving citizens--especially children and young people--greater voice in shaping policy. They share an urgent concern for environmental sustainability and the need to act now to secure resilience for future generations.

Disagreements: They diverge on means and scale: one advocates detailed, research-driven, regulatory and institutional interventions

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

(strategic foresight, targeted R&D, procurement and enforcement reforms, and structured international governance), while the other advances grassroots, behavioural and straightforward measures (education from kindergarten, green roofs, tree-planting as punishment, and a ban on nuclear power). They also differ in scope and tone--one is technocratic and EU/international in focus, the other is local, moralistic and immediate with little emphasis on complex governance or scientific risk assessment.

## **Anonymous\_8 - Score: 5/10 (Neutral)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening European defence and improving fiscal resilience as part of broader stability efforts. Each treats increased resources for security as a legitimate lever to address budgetary and geopolitical vulnerabilities.

Disagreements: They differ sharply on who should pay and how funds should be mobilised: one calls for a municipal/city-level levy of 5-6%, while the other advocates EU-level instruments (procurement reform, public-private R&D investment, using pension funds) and stronger central governance with democratic safeguards. The municipal-contribution prescription raises concerns about local fiscal burden, accountability, and distributive fairness that are not addressed by the flat levy proposal.

## **Nicolas Overloop - Score: 5/10 (Neutral)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise European strategic autonomy in critical technologies and supply chains and call for stronger domestic capacity in areas such as advanced industry, energy and defence-related sectors. They also converge on the need to mobilise financing and policy levers (procurement, targeted investment, and capital-market reforms) to scale up strategic industries and make Europe more competitive globally.

Disagreements: They sharply diverge on means and safeguards: one submission advocates aggressive, protectionist and expedient measures (tariffs, rapid commercialisation of mineral deposits, fast-tracked permits including use of military domains, and removing net neutrality) to onshore capacity, while the other emphasises democratic oversight, environmental and intergenerational safeguards, multilateral governance, precaution, and transparent public-interest research and enforcement. They also differ in stance toward regulatory trade-offs--prioritising unilateral industrial expediency versus balanced, rights-based and deliberative policy-making.

## **Francisco José Viturro Barreiro - Score: 5/10 (Neutral)**

Agreements: Both submissions call for a stronger EU role in protecting citizens and correcting market failures, emphasising social fairness and the need for policies that reduce cost-of-living pressures and improve prospects for younger generations. Each urges more active public intervention and enforcement to limit harms caused by unregulated markets and to ensure basic wellbeing (housing, energy, health) is safeguarded.

Disagreements: Submission B prioritises a clearly anti-neoliberal stance: direct market constraints and stronger state intervention in basic goods (housing, food, energy) to curb capitalist excesses. Submission A focuses on technological and strategic resilience (AI, biotech, climate interventions, defence, procurement reform and public-private R&D), favouring targeted innovation policy and market-leveraging instruments alongside regulation -- creating tension between B's market-restriction approach and A's emphasis on using market/finance tools to drive innovation and strategic autonomy.

## **UAP Coalition Netherlands - Score: 5/10 (Neutral)**

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening EU resilience through improved monitoring, coordinated research, and evidence-based policy making. They agree on the value of investing in research & innovation, enhancing surveillance/early-warning capacities, fostering international cooperation, and promoting transparency and public trust through open data and participatory reporting mechanisms.

Disagreements: They diverge sharply on priorities and scope: Submission A focuses on mainstream long-term risks (AI, biotech, neurotech, climate tipping points and SRM governance, procurement and enforcement reforms, and intergenerational equity), while Submission B concentrates almost exclusively on institutionalising responses to Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena (UAP) -- including specific legal, aviation-reporting, space-surveillance and Horizon funding changes. They also differ in urgency and evidentiary stance: Submission B advocates immediate operational and legislative action on UAP and open repositories, whereas Submission A emphasises precautionary, prioritized research and governance across a broader set of emerging risks.

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## Transfer Pricing Services SRL - Score: 4/10 (Neutral)

Agreements: Both submissions recognise major medium- and long-term headwinds for the EU--notably demographic pressures and shifting geopolitical/security dynamics--and the need for public institutions to adapt. They each endorse using advanced technologies (including AI) to improve public-sector performance and call for greater transparency and accountability in governance. Both accept that institutional reform is necessary to finance and deliver resilience measures.

Disagreements: They differ sharply on priorities and policy orientation: one emphasises precautionary regulation, strong enforcement, strategic public R&D, climate intervention governance, and biosecurity, while the other focuses narrowly on tax administration reform, lowering compliance burdens, regulatory sandboxes, and empowering taxpayers (and corporates) through data and AI. The latter's deregulatory and taxpayer/corporate-empowerment emphasis can conflict with the former's push for tighter oversight, democratic safeguards, and mission-driven public investment in strategic technologies.

## Anonymous - Score: 4/10 (Neutral)

Agreements: Both submissions identify climate change and external geopolitical threats as important challenges to EU resilience and call for the Union to take action to strengthen its capacity to respond. They also share a general emphasis on the need to understand key problems before designing responses (i.e., a diagnostic step or strategic orientation).

Disagreements: Submission A prioritises detailed, governance-led responses: strengthening democratic safeguards, regulatory enforcement, strategic foresight, and governance of emerging technologies (AI, biotech, SRM), as well as intergenerational equity, mental health, procurement reform and biosecurity. Submission B focuses on traditional security issues (borders, ageing populations) and a 'firm' external stance, offering little detail on technology governance, foresight, or the nuanced climate intervention and research approaches emphasised in Submission A.

## Negar RIAHI - Score: 4/10 (Neutral)

Agreements: Both submissions support the development and uptake of biotechnology-based innovations for health and stress the importance of regulatory evaluation and market access (CE/FDA approval and health-economic assessment). They also converge on the idea that new bio-based materials and medical technologies should be considered within healthcare procurement and national evaluation processes.

Disagreements: Submission B is a narrow, product-level advocacy for fast adoption of a specific dental hydroxyapatite resin and emphasizes immediate clinical use and procurement, often making strong efficacy claims; Submission A takes a systemic, risk-aware stance, prioritising mission-driven public research, biosecurity, enforcement, independent evidence generation and precaution. CFG stresses strategic priorities (strategic autonomy, biofoundry networks, export controls, governance of dual-use biotech and broader foresight tools) that are largely absent from the product-focused submission, which does not engage with biosecurity, governance or large-scale resilience planning.

## Anonymous\_7 - Score: 4/10 (Neutral)

Agreements: Both submissions value more inclusive and accessible public participation: they support lowering barriers so a wider range of people (including shy or marginalised voices) can engage. Each endorses remote or low-friction participation mechanisms and capacity-building to broaden stakeholder input into discussions and decision-making.

Disagreements: One submission is narrowly focused on practical, grassroots measures (more webinars and anonymity-friendly formats) to increase participation, while the other prioritises systemic policy, institutional reforms, technical governance, and large-scale research investments across multiple sectors. They therefore differ sharply in scope, scale, and policy priorities: one emphasizes immediate, low-cost engagement tools; the other emphasizes structural regulatory, research and enforcement actions that the short submission does not address.

## VLAD HERES - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)

Agreements: Both submissions prioritise strengthening Europe's strategic autonomy: reducing critical dependencies (in technology, energy and supply chains), investing in domestic R&D and manufacturing, and beefing up defence and procurement capacity. They

# **Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations**

also share concern about foreign influence and disinformation campaigns undermining European security and democratic processes, and call for stronger institutional capacity to respond to these threats.

**Disagreements:** They sharply diverge on means and values: one submission advocates rights-respecting, multilateral, transparent and precautionary approaches (including democratic oversight, public participation, research governance and social fairness), whereas the other prioritises hardline, unilateral and often coercive measures (cyberattacks, sabotage, deportations, immediate military action and purges of foreign influence). They also disagree on social policy and civil liberties -- one emphasises inclusion, mental-health and intergenerational equity, the other promotes exclusionary immigration policies and alignment with far-right rhetoric.

## **Anonymous\_6 - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise protecting and strengthening social goods--notably healthcare, social protection and environmental sustainability--and express concern about the erosion of public services and social safety nets. Both call for greater democratic accountability and for policymaking to better reflect citizens' needs and well-being.

**Disagreements:** They sharply diverge on security and investment priorities: one advocates bolstering defence/strategic autonomy (including onshoring defence production and mobilising investment vehicles) and active tech and procurement policies, while the other rejects investment in armaments and opposes diverting public/pension funds to military purposes. They also differ on fiscal and institutional approaches: one proposes using public and private capital (including pension capital) to finance strategic R&D and resilience infrastructure, whereas the other insists pension and savings must be preserved for retirees and redirected instead toward social services.

## **José Luis Rajab\_1 - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions call for stronger EU-level legal and enforcement capacity and greater strategic autonomy, including more robust common rules and enhanced defence capabilities at the EU level. They share an interest in the EU having more global influence and the ability to act cohesively on security and strategic industrial policy.

**Disagreements:** They diverge sharply on values and methods: Submission B advances exclusionary, xenophobic and unilateral policies (e.g., banning entry of Muslims, punitive trade isolation, hostility toward certain governments), while Submission A emphasizes democratic safeguards, human rights, multilateralism, inclusive deliberation, and rights-respecting governance of technology and climate policy. Submission A prefers evidence-based, precautionary and cooperative approaches (e.g., transparent research, international norms, participatory forums), whereas Submission B advocates nationalist, protectionist and punitive measures that would conflict with those approaches.

## **Antonio Mincarini - Score: 3/10 (Neutral)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise citizen welfare, social solidarity, and protection of people from harm, emphasising wellbeing and reducing poverty as key goals. They also share a common opposition to unnecessary wars and a stated desire to enhance the protection of citizens.

**Disagreements:** They diverge sharply on environmental and public-health priorities: Submission B calls for 'less green' policies and fewer vaccines, whereas Submission A emphasises robust climate action, preparedness (including research on interventions) and strengthening biosecurity and vaccine/biomanufacturing capacity. Submission A also emphasises stronger regulatory frameworks, enforcement, and proactive technology governance and strategic foresight, which contrasts with Submission B's emphasis on individual freedom and reduced regulatory emphasis on 'green' agendas.

## **Ivana Nem?icov? - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)**

**Agreements:** Both submissions prioritise strengthening Europe's industrial and technological capacity, including support for domestic tech development and maintaining competitiveness. They share concerns about governance and rule of law, and express interest in stronger enforcement or more effective institutions to protect European interests and values. Both also show wariness about foreign influence in technology and an interest in data/privacy protections for citizens.

**Disagreements:** They sharply diverge on climate and energy policy: one advocates decarbonisation, proactive climate resilience and regulated research on climate interventions, while the other calls for halting the Green Deal, preserving combustion-based

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

infrastructure, and resuming cheap energy imports. They differ on strategic dependencies and geopolitics: one stresses strategic autonomy, multilateral governance and caution about reliance on rivals, the other prioritises pragmatic trade (including with Russia) and rejects current EU policy directions. They also prioritise social policy differently -- one emphasises inclusive, intergenerational governance and mental-health-in-all-policies, while the other emphasises stricter border control and a return to traditional economic/diplomatic priorities.

## **José Luis Rajab - Score: 3/10 (Opponent)**

Agreements: Both submissions call for stronger EU-level capacities: more coherent common laws or legislation across member states and greater European strategic autonomy in defence and international influence. Each expresses a desire for the EU to act with greater unity and assertiveness on the world stage to protect European interests.

Disagreements: They diverge sharply on values and means: one submission emphasises democratic safeguards, human rights, inclusive and multilateral governance, evidence-based research, and precautionary regulation of emerging technologies; the other advances exclusionary, xenophobic immigration policies, targeted hostility toward specific external governments and groups, and unilateral protectionist retaliation. The priorities and policy instruments therefore differ profoundly--cooperative, rights-respecting governance versus nationalist, coercive and discriminatory approaches.

## **Esteban Carlos Borzino - Score: 2/10 (Opponent)**

Agreements: Both emphasise the importance of economic dynamism, competitiveness and functioning markets, and express concern that policy choices can produce long-term harms if poorly designed. Both invoke democratic legitimacy and the rule of law as foundational to prosperous societies.

Disagreements: One submission calls for active public action: stronger regulation and enforcement, mission-driven public R&D, strategic procurement, and targeted state-led measures to manage systemic risks and build resilience. The other rejects interventionism, arguing for minimal state involvement, rapid rollback of crisis-era controls, and primacy of private property and market freedom, resulting in a fundamental disagreement over the role of the state in innovation, risk management and economic policy.

## **Davy Anthonissen - Score: 1/10 (Opponent)**

Agreements: Both submissions stress the need for a stronger, more capable Europe able to respond to geopolitical threats and to reduce strategic dependence on external actors. Each calls for enhancing European security and capacity at an EU-relevant level.

Disagreements: They diverge fundamentally on means, norms and policy priorities: one emphasizes democratic governance, rule-of-law, multilateralism, careful regulation of emerging technologies, climate and societal resilience, and investment in R&D and institutions; the other advocates unilateral, extra-legal measures such as territorial annexation, civilian arming/militia structures, and transactional fixes that contravene international norms. Their policy focus and values are therefore largely incompatible, with one prioritising long-term, systemic resilience and institutional safeguards and the other prioritising immediate militarised expansion and ad hoc security measures.

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

## Full Results Summary

Organization	Score	Verdict
Anonymous_3	9	Likely Ally
EUPHA European Public Health Association	8	Likely Ally
Matthew Spaniol	8	Likely Ally
AMALIA MARIA KOUTSOGIANNI	8	Likely Ally
Gaël QUEINNEC	8	Likely Ally
Sanja Terlevic	8	Likely Ally
Kieran DALTON	8	Likely Ally
Melanoma Patient Network Europe	8	Likely Ally
EuroStack Project	7	Likely Ally
GROUPE VYV	7	Likely Ally
Ioannis Lamprou	7	Likely Ally
Joni Suikeli	7	Likely Ally
Juan Bartolomé García Martínez	7	Likely Ally
Kansaneläkelaitos Kela	7	Likely Ally
Kevin Bradley	7	Likely Ally
Adrien Cadot El	7	Likely Ally
EU-LIFE - Alliance of Independent Resear	7	Likely Ally
Office of the Government and Government	7	Likely Ally
Simon Önnered	7	Likely Ally
SUEZ	7	Likely Ally
TNO Vector	7	Likely Ally
TNO	7	Likely Ally
UNESPA	7	Likely Ally
University of Bergen	7	Likely Ally
Xylem	7	Likely Ally
Ministry of the Economy Luxembourg	7	Likely Ally
ZOE Institute for Future-fit Economies	7	Likely Ally
Egmont - Royal Institute for Internation	7	Likely Ally
ECOLAB	7	Likely Ally
Andre REBENTISCH	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_1	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_10	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_11	7	Likely Ally

# Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations

ASOCIACION INDUSTRIAL DE CANARIAS ASINCA	7	Likely Ally
Association internationale Futuribles	7	Likely Ally
CHEM Trust	7	Likely Ally
Anonymous_4	7	Likely Ally
bert hubert	7	Likely Ally
Philea	6	Likely Ally
NA	6	Neutral
Nicolas Overloop_1	6	Neutral
Anonymous_9	6	Neutral
Anonymous_5	6	Neutral
Maria Lindqvist	6	Neutral
SPES project - Sustainability Performance	6	Neutral
Anonymous_2	6	Likely Ally
TES	6	Neutral
Special Secretariat of Foresight	6	Neutral
Instituto Nacional de Administração IP P	6	Neutral
Maastricht School of Management	6	Neutral
Bankenverband	6	Neutral
F Hanna Campbell	6	Neutral
Fraunhofer IAO	6	Likely Ally
FutuRes Towards a Resilient Future of Eu	6	Likely Ally
Gabriele De Giorgi	6	Neutral
David Van Geert	6	Likely Ally
Agroecology Europe	6	Neutral
Kai Wellmann	5	Likely Ally
Anonymous_8	5	Neutral
Nicolas Overloop	5	Neutral
Francisco José Viturro Barreiro	5	Neutral
UAP Coalition Netherlands	5	Neutral
Transfer Pricing Services SRL	4	Neutral
Anonymous	4	Neutral
Negar RIAHI	4	Neutral
Anonymous_7	4	Neutral
VLAD HERES	3	Opponent
Anonymous_6	3	Opponent
José Luis Rajab_1	3	Opponent

# **Stakeholder Alignment Report: Centre for Future Generations**

Antonio Mincarini	3	Neutral
Ivana Nem?icov?	3	Opponent
José Luis Rajab	3	Opponent
Esteban Carlos Borzino	2	Opponent
Davy Anthonissen	1	Opponent