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Learning from 2 funding cycles in SEE-ERA NET PJC and SEE-ERA.NET PLUS

- Joint vision and common understanding
- Excellence (vs. cohesion)
- Thematic Priority setting
- Scale of funding
- Administration experiences
- Monitoring and Evaluation
Joint vision and common understanding

- **SEE-ERA.NET (FP6)**
  - Analysis, Dialogue, PJC: Mobilised national funding < 1 Mio €
- **SEE-ERA.NET PLUS (FP7)**
  - JC, 2.2 Mio € national funding + EC top up of 0.8 Mio €
- Joint vision with many dimensions
- Trust is the essential component of any joint funding
- Funders, beneficiaries see a “useful framework and instrument“
- Juste retour principle
IDEAS: Impact dimensions of horizontal+thematic ERA NET calls

• Impact on funding parties
  – Institutional learning
  – Enhanced visibility (nat., internat.)
  – Justification of public spending
  – Networking...

• Impact on final beneficiaries
  – Organisational/individual Researchers outputs, learning dimension
  – Adding own funds
  – Additional outputs
  – Networking
# Priority setting and objectives of call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INCO ERA NETs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Policy driven objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Motivation of Funding partners</strong></th>
<th><strong>Set up of call objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Definition of Call topic</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Linkage with policy actions</td>
<td>1 year in advance</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Sustainability of preERA NET</td>
<td>FP7 application (ERA NET Plus)</td>
<td>Thematic workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intraregional cooperation</td>
<td>EC top-up in ERA NET Plus</td>
<td>Task leaders, (funding) partners</td>
<td>Against background of priorities on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pooling bilat. funding</td>
<td>Synergies of cooperation</td>
<td>Thematic consultation</td>
<td>policy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical mass funding</td>
<td>Openness of instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piloting/Feasibility</td>
<td>Thematic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>EU MS Funding partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustained cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Funding partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic ERA NETs</strong></td>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>Visibility of thematic across EU</td>
<td>3 -6 months in advance to calls</td>
<td>Open call in thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Application to ERA NET</td>
<td>Community asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to SMEs/collaborative</td>
<td>Coordination to avoid duplication</td>
<td>Consultation with stakeholders</td>
<td>Workshop of funders and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research Transnational</td>
<td>Input from other sources of</td>
<td>Internal meetings, Management</td>
<td>potential beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>co-operation of SMEs</td>
<td>complementary funding</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Scientific Advisory board +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning among researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Level Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own data from survey to ERA NETs*
Indicators (Outputs, Results, Call success)

Did you define jointly indicators for the call (to define the final output expected from funded projects) in advance to a call?

Have you defined a set of indicators so that the success of a call can be assessed when the joint funding ends?

Source: Own data from survey to ERA NETs
Funding Partners

3.3 Mio €

JERP 1
JERP 2
JERP 3
JERP 23
Management

Framework
✓ Set rules and procedures (commitment letters, joint account)
✓ National Funding rules + common programme rules
✓ “Common label“, visibility
✓ EC control + National control with reportings
✓ Legitimization for spending national money
Thematic priorities

- SEE-ERA.NET (FP6): assessment and prioritisation
- SEE-ERA.NET PLUS (FP7): WBC-INCO.NET priority setting

- Clear response to needs and capacities, take up by community
- Funders “INCO“ departments (all…) not thematic
Excellence & ERA objectives

- Integration approach from EU MS, WBC, mutual learning process for the beneficiaries
- Sustainability is not automatic where cohesion and learning is emphasised
- Access to network for all partners equally important, EU MS tend to emphasis on access to resources like unique plant species and e.g. collections, databases.
- Excellence of projects remains undisputed (selection procedure, SC, Monitoring)
Involvement of funded partners per country in SEE-ERA.NET PLUS

- Montenegro
- France
- Romania
- Germany
- Bulgaria
- Austria
- Slovenia
- Albania
- FYR of Macedonia
- Croatia
- Serbia
- Greece
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Austria
Comparing… SEE-ERA.NET

SEE-ERA.NET PLUS
## PLANNING 2010
Use of 26.23% EC top-up to call in k€ (ranking by total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>projects involved</th>
<th>National share</th>
<th>EC share</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>EC share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>291,0</td>
<td>235,2</td>
<td>526,2</td>
<td>44,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>195,5</td>
<td>278,9</td>
<td>474,4</td>
<td>58,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>280,6</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>298,5</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>275,7</td>
<td>17,6</td>
<td>293,3</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250,1</td>
<td>16,0</td>
<td>266,1</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYROM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95,5</td>
<td>122,3</td>
<td>217,8</td>
<td>56,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>198,6</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>211,3</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>196,2</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>208,7</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>184,7</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>196,5</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71,6</td>
<td>26,7</td>
<td>98,3</td>
<td>27,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72,6</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>77,2</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47,8</td>
<td>20,7</td>
<td>68,5</td>
<td>30,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64,4</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>68,5</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2224,2  781,0  3005,2
Scale of funding

- High response, oversubscription from some countries
- All countries committed funding differing funding rules
- TK not involved in funded projects (SME fund)
- 10% for management
- … the most you can activate in the WBC under current circumstances with international cooperation departments

- Future: ~3% for programme impact evaluation
- Common eligibility rules
- Top-up Matching fund with limits per country
Administrative procedures

- Preparation of funding commitments
- Call documents and procedure
- NCPs
- Evaluation steps, International peer review
- Quality assurance by Scientific expert committee
- Communication of funding shares
- Contracting with coordinators
- Administrative support to funded projects
- Funding, Reporting, Monitoring
- Support to commercialisation (May 2013 in Novi Sad)
- Keeping evidence of results in view of possible evaluation
INCO ERA-NETs: Is funding simple?

Thematic Priority Setting

Commitment to fund

Call published

1 or 2 stage Application

Ex-ante Project selection

Balancing funding

Funded projects

Reporting results

Neither documentation!
Documentation?

- Non covered thematics
- Not included funders
- Excluded during balancing
- Differing funding rules
  - Coordinator vs. Partners
  - Organisational benefits EU MS, non EU MS partners
- Non applicants
- Ineligible
- Not invited to stage 2 (if)
- Available reviewers
  - Matching thematics (if)
- Timing (interim, at end, after)
  - Spends
  - Outputs and Results
  - Impact in some years

And much more!
...Researchers

Partners

Preparation of Call

Call and Proposal development

Review 1 Stage 1

Review 2 Stage 2

Selection

Running

Results

“€”

“€”

"Post Phase"...

new calls

Topics...

Subtopics

Programming,

Work Programmes

Partners

Funding Agencies

Observe,

Evaluate

performances

Use

Step in partnership for future projects
# Ex-ante selection criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCO ERA NET</th>
<th>Main categories</th>
<th>Additional categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific Excellence</td>
<td>Regional focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected impact</td>
<td>Transnational added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of consortium</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of project management</td>
<td>Exploitation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of the demonstration of proposal</td>
<td>Originality, novelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi/interdisciplinarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement (Gender, young scientists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic ERA NET</td>
<td>Technological and scientific excellence</td>
<td>European added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social and economic perspective</td>
<td>Transnational added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consortium and Project Management Resources</td>
<td>Exploitation and IPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Networking set of criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own data from survey to ERA NETs, call documents
Evaluation

National Eligibility Check

Eligibility Issues

Clear National Correction Phase

Review Management System

Scientific Evaluation

Who Evaluates What?

Database of Evaluators

Quality of Reviews

Solving controversial Review Cases

Matching Sublists Process

Qualified/independent rapporteur to meetings

Ranking List

Feedback to Applicants

Funding selection

Funding Decision

List of Funded Projects
Contracting

Call Secretariat
+ Coordinator

Consortium Agreement

National Contracting Process

Umbrella Contract
Monitoring

- National
  - Financial
  - Scientific
- General Monitoring
- To Call Secretariat for Funding
- Evaluation of Procedure
  - in house
  - external
- Information to Funders
- Central Monitoring
- Scientific/Financial Terminal Collection of O/R
- Publish Disseminate O/R + Reports
- Identify Evidence Sources
Supervision and monitoring of the SEE-ERA.NET Plus call

1. Evaluation stage:
   - Peer review
   - Scientific Council Meeting
   - Steering Board Meeting

2. Evaluation stage:
   - Peer review
   - Scientific Council Meeting
   - Steering Board Meeting

2. Monitoring survey
   Partners of all submitted full proposals (end 2010)
   Feedback on Evaluation process:
   - Transparency
   - Timing
   - Call materials
   - Information sufficiency etc.

3. Monitoring survey
   To all funded JERPs (March 2012)
   + Monitoring Meeting (23-24 April 2012)
   + Interim Report (31st August 2011)
   + Documentation of JERP results (May 2013)
   + Final Report (March 2013)

Expression of Interest (163 eligible)
Submission of full proposals (70 eligible)

23 funded JERPs

2 m
3 m
3-6 m
12 m
8-10 m
Monitoring processes during implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Interim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own data from survey to ERA NETs
...Researchers

Topics... Subtopics

Partners

Reviewers

Observe, Evaluate performances

Step in partnership for future projects

Use

“Post Phase”...

new calls

“€”

Preparation of Call

Call and Proposal development

Review 1 Stage 1

Review 2 Stage 2

Selection

Running

Results

Programming, Work Programmes

Monitoring, Observing Process, learning, exchange...

Funding Agencies

€
Documentation of JERP results for the last reporting...

PUBLICATIONS

- Publications in international peer reviewed journals
- Publications in scientific journals (review by editors)
- Other publications directed to the interested public (e.g. newsletters, articles in newspapers, brochures and leaflets etc.)
- Own publications of the project with primary scientific audience (e.g. edited proceedings, anthologies, published deliverables if addressed to the audience)
- Conference papers, posters, meeting abstracts
- Databases created (briefly describe access, target audience, other relevant details e.g. link for further reference)

EVENTS

- Speeches, workshops and/or sessions held at conferences
- Own event organization (e.g. workshop, conference, own panel or session attached to other conference, outreach events to policy makers or direct beneficiaries of research like farmers, future clients)

EXCHANGE AND TRAVEL

- Research staff exchange (including e.g. training in laboratory, summer schools)
- Student exchange (mainly educational purpose e.g. training in laboratory or summer schools)
- Other research related travel (e.g. field trips for collection of samples)

DEVELOPMENTS

- Developed new/improved products/technologies
- (planned) joint patent application(s)
- Contribution to standardization (ISO) or implementation of strategic frameworks
- Joint applications to other funding schemes during project duration
Next Round of funding?

Post Phase

- Effects
- Impacts
- Geographic Distribution
- Later outputs / results
- Impact Evaluation
- Awarding «Promotion Action»
- For successful projects

Kill
Repeat

Improve
Change... topics, beneficiaries, measures supported
Current vs feasible evaluation tasks

Have you used any type of evaluation results for the design of a next joint call or do you plan to use such results?

Do you think you could make use of the information received for the next call? (learning from monitoring)

Source: Own data from survey to ERA NETs
Documentation of JERP results

PUBLICATIONS

• Publications in international peer reviewed journals
• Publications in scientific journals (review by editors)
• Other publications directed to the interested public (e.g. newsletters, articles in newspapers, brochures and leaflets etc.)
• Own publications of the project with primary scientific audience (e.g. edited proceedings, anthologies, published deliverables if addressed to the audience)
• Conference papers, posters, meeting abstracts
• Databases created (briefly describe access, target audience, other relevant details e.g. link for further reference)

EVENTS

• Speeches, workshops and/or sessions held at conferences
• Own event organization (e.g. workshop, conference, own panel or session attached to other conference, outreach events to policy makers or direct beneficiaries of research like farmers, future clients)

EXCHANGE AND TRAVEL

• Research staff exchange (including e.g. training in laboratory, summer schools)
• Student exchange (mainly educational purpose e.g. training in laboratory or summer schools)
• Other research related travel (e.g. field trips for collection of samples)

DEVELOPMENTS

• Developed new/improved products/technologies
• (planned) joint patent application(s)
• Contribution to standardization (ISO) or implementation of strategic frameworks
• Joint applications to other funding schemes during project duration
Did you explore/ask for behavioral changes towards cooperation that were triggered or influenced by the funding (or the application)

Additionality

Did you ask the beneficiaries/funded partners in calls whether the funding had an effect on triggering additional own resources of a beneficiary (beyond planned in kind contributions)

Did you explore the net – effects resulting from the funding provided

Source: Own data from survey to ERA NETs
## Documentation of Outputs/Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centralized by CS</th>
<th>from funding partners</th>
<th>external review</th>
<th>publication of results</th>
<th>effort to collect all project outputs or results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCO ERA-NETs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic ERA-NETs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own data from survey to ERA NETs
# Planning of Impact assessments - Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Impact assessment planned</th>
<th>Effort to collect all projects output or result data</th>
<th>Access to relevant data and beneficiaries in some years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCO ERA-NETs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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FP7: EU 13 & EU 15

Whatever criteria taken into consideration, EU12 (and Croatia) Member States are less performing than EU15 & huge disparities between EU12 (and Croatia) Member States
Benchmark of EU 13 and EU 28
PERSONAL/MOTIVATIONAL

- Low Economic reward/wages/incentives of researchers;

- Lack of attractiveness of FP7/H2020 funding in comparison to ERDF funding and/or, when available, to other national or bilateral schemes (less bureaucracy, less selection criteria, no or less international dimension);

- No willingness in taking responsibility of administrative management (lack of time, little or no access to a project office support), project leadership.
ORGANIZATIONAL

- Weak **involvement** in European networks, which very often play a role in generating ideas for projects and facilitating partnerships;
- Difficulty to join (and **remain**) existing EU15 excellence consortia;
- Difficulty to maximize information and experience to **influence** and address the participation to the working committees;
- No sectorial **focus/strategy** to support FP7 stakeholders;
- Lack of **cooperation** between ministries;
- No leverage on **diaspora** and on successful **applicants** to coach the other potential participant.
STRUCTURAL

- **Geographical** disadvantages (far away from Brussels);
- Limited national R&D **budget**, and in many countries in particular the private investment in R&D;
- **Uncertainty** of national funding mechanism of University and National Research Centres;
- Lack of “**systemic**” support to applicants; Limited resources to NCP (often voluntary ); Weak capacity of drafting proposals; (cost of paying a consultant is often prohibitive);
- **Brain drain** (less excellent researchers in EU13 than in EU15 due to diaspora) and weak presence of foreign researchers (key to mobilise partnerships).
COMMON HEADLINES

1. «we cannot do anything because we have no money!»

2. «you tell us solutions»

3. “we need updated figures”
WHAT IS BEHIND THESE ARGUMENTS (1/2)?

- FP7 Projects are seen just as an opportunity to increase salaries (tactical, shortterm);
  - The strategic elements (international visibility, access to knowledge, better positioning in the scientific community, income from R&D results exploitation etc...) are not considered at all both by researchers and organizations;
  - The quest for excellence is not taken into consideration. ERA is not seen as an opportunity for the best actors in the country to remain competitive or improve their profile at international level (and attract more funding, including private ones);

- “Information driven” and “unidirectional” type of support lack of marketing of excellence abroad.
WHAT IS BEHIND THESE ARGUMENTS (2/2)?

- No **proactive**, systemic approach to **exploit opportunity** before the call is out (most activities can be done at zero cost);

- No strategic approach to tackle the challenge of the **global dimension** of R&D;

- **Attractiveness** (talent **circulation**) is a complex matter that goes beyond participation to EU Research programmes or level of salary.
“Original” measures to support researchers and participation into Horizon 2020 in OPs

Sample of measure out 50 OPs analysed

- Support to the participation in H 2020 (8)
- Support to ERA chairs (1)
- Second chance for ERC projects not funded (2)
- Exploitation of H2020 project results (1)
- Co-creation to exploit research results (1)
- Regional nodes of KICs (1)
- ICT vouchers in line with EU Digital Agenda (3)
- EU project office in a regional university (1)
- Access to European networks (5)
- Synergies with ESIF Article 96.3 (2)
- Hosting of foreign researchers (9)
- Internationalizations of researchers (1)
Current activities in Danube-INCO.NET
Scaling up Danube Funding Mechanisms

Contact: Elke Dall
dall@zsi.at
Support to Funding Parties meetings

- Objective: support to coordination of actions of Danube Region „funding parties“ for implementing joint multilateral funding activities

- Organisation of 2 Workshops on joint funding activities:
Support to establishment of Funding Coordination Network (FCN)

1. **Workshop on Funding Coordination Network** planned on May 30 and 31, 2016 in Berlin/Germany
   - preparation and organisation well underway
   - close cooperation with PA7 coordinators
   - list of nominated persons as members for the Danube Funding Coordination Network
   - invitations with draft agenda and preparatory documents to be sent out soon
Support to establishment of Funding Coordination Network (FCN)

2. **Promotion** of joint funding activities: printing and disseminating
   - outcome of Funding Coordination Network Workshop
   - possible joint funding activity agreed on, further coordinated actions