



MIRRIS recommendations for better participation to the ERA

03 March 2016, Prague

Synergies with Research and Innovation Funds: The Stairway to Excellence, DG JRC

Mobilising Institutional Reforms in Research and Innovation Systems







Mirris

Mobilising Institutional Reforms in Research and Innovation Systems





1 MIRRIS 2 Main findings and barriers 3 Conclusions





Support action aiming at:

- 1) **Profiling** R&I performance in ERA and Framework Programmes of New Member States;
- 2) Proposing **actionable** solutions to improve performances and participation to H2020.

More at <u>www.mirris.eu</u> updated Reports on EU13 participation to ERA

MIRRIS is funded under FP7 SSH and is implemented by a consortium of 11 leading organizations under the coordination of META Group.





MIRRIS closure:

52 dialogue meetings held in EU 13 during period of three years during which:
800 national stakehoders mobilised
85 national ministries engaged
75 universities engaged
50 innovation engaged

A number of reports, unique analysis, policy briefs and academic papers produced

More at <u>www.mirris.eu</u>







MIRRIS High Level Conference

Better exploiting European funds for Research and Innovation: "The Quest for Excellence of EU13"

26 May 2016, Brussels


Representation of the "Lazio Region in Brussels" Rond Point Schuman, 14, Brussels, Belgium



www.mirris.eu








ACTION ORIENTED

issues.



MIRRIS Good Practices

✓ 29 good practices selected
✓ 15 countries (9 "Old" MS – 5 NMS – 1 Extra EU)

Topics matching the identified GAPs: Pre-preparation and pre-call intelligence; Pre-preparation and application readiness; Project preparation and administrative

More at <u>www.mirris.eu</u>





ACTION ORIENTED



The devil is in the detail

- Coaching to a specific actor on one intervention selected from the identified priority list.
- The format is based on a 1,5 days peer to peer mutual learning activity.
- To close the circle, MIRRIS will provide the selected organisation with one of the key people involved in the implementation of the intervention.
- The series of MIRRIS Coaching Seminars starts with Czech Republic on March 04 in cooperation with *Technology Centre of the Academy of Sciences (Technology Center ACSR*) on topic of synergies.









Main findings from MIRRIS Policy Dialogues

Mobilising Institutional Reforms in Research and Innovation Systems





FP7: EU 13 & EU 15

Whatever criteria taken into consideration, EU12 (and Croatia) Member States are **less performing** than EU15


\mathcal{E}

huge **disparities** between EU12 (and Croatia) Member States









Benchmark of EU 13 and EU 28









Research,

Barriers Personal level Organisational level Structural level

Mobilising Institutional Reforms in Research and Innovation Systems





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); 0
- Limited national R&D **budget**, and in many countries in particular the private investment in R&D;
- **Uncertainty** of national funding mechanism of Uuniversity and 0 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 0 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?







WHAT IS BEHIND THESE ARGUMENTS (1/2)?

- FP7 Projects are seen just as an opportunity to increase salaries (tactical, shorterm);
 - 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.









Challenges & Roadmap

Mobilising Institutional Reforms in Research and Innovation Systems





COMMON CHALLENGES

- **1. Understanding** benefits for participation to FP7/H2020
- 2. ESIF/H2020 Synergy
- 3. Research Excellence Promotion
- 4. Brain drain
- 5. Mobility of reserchers, talent **circulation**
- 6. Skilled human capacity
- 7. Evaluation system
- 8. Involvement of **private** sector in ERA
- 9. Innovation drive and market oriented research





NATIONAL CHALLENGES CZECH REPUBLIC

- 1. Understanding of added value for participation to FP7/H2020
- 2. Promotion of Czech Research Excellence
- 3. Leverage on ESIF funds to participation in H2020
- 4. Innovation driven research system
- 5. Skilled human capacity inside Research Organisations (ROs)
- 6. 'Brain drain.









PROVIDING SOFT AND HARD INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON SYNERGIES BETWEEN ESIF AND H2020



PARTICIPATION TO EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION AND NETWORKS

FURTHER BUILDING OF PARTNERSHIPS AND INTERNATIONAL LINKAGES

> STRENGTHENING OF INTER-SECTORIAL COLLABORATION



MOBILISATION OF FOREIGN RESEARCHERS PROMOTION OF CZECH

RESEARCH EXCELLENCE AT WIDER SCALE

STRONGER PRESENCE IN BRUSSELS





X	N
(\mathcal{N})	1λ
H	

Description of the challenge	• Promotion of benefits to researchers with regards to participation in FP7/H2020 versus ESIF;
Understanding of added value for participation to FP7/H2020	Raising awareness of values related to participation to the EU programmes;
	• Strengthening of partnership and networks through associations and networks, in particular
	those based in Brussels;
	Reward scheme for reseachers.
Proposed actions	 Develop a communication strategy focused at promoting the added value of participation in EU programmes, showcase of successful stories and outcomes of the participation (success stories written by the scientists themselves about the participation in a form of publications); Successful scientists to be used asrole models to newcomers and undertake the roles of mentors and trainers;
	• Establish of a reward scheme for researchers that participate to EU programmes (different incentive scheme for those that were successfully awarded by EC and those that have passed the threshold but were not awarded in the final selection); introduce incentive measures for ERC grantees and expand the scheme so that successful applicants to the SME instrument and H2020 are included (the scheme shall be compliant by the upcoming Seal of Excellence measure to be introduced by the European Commission);
	 Endorse measures aimed at raising awareness of the value of participation to different European associations and networks based in Brussels for the purpose of strengthening the existent networks, building of new partnerships with an aim to increase participation to the EU programmes as well as to undertake more roles in the capacity of Project Coordinators; Endorse a set of measures aimed at establishing of the peer review schemes with countries that are identified as good peers in terms of knowledge transfer and capacity building (Scandinavian countries to be used as a benchmark); Organise workshops with successful participants from peer countries during annual events that are focusing at EU programmes such as CZEch Days for European Research (CZEDER) that would focus at sharing of success stories and value of participation to EU programmes
Proposed implementing	 Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
institutions	Technology Centre ASCR
	The Council of Research, Development and Innovation
KPI's to be used when	Increase number of Czech coordinators in H2020 and WP leaders;

CONCLUSIONS MADE BASED ON RESPONSE OF CZECH STAKEHOLDERS

- 1. Need for rapid implementation of the reforms already in train, and which are aimed at introducing an effective methodology for the evaluation of research institutions;
- 2. The new funds distribution system prioritising internationalisation will promote the needed cultural change;
- 3. The need for effective co-ordination of ESIF and H2020 funds. Here the onus is on respective ministries to explore synergies, both up and down stream involving all the funding bodies;
- 4. The good co-ordination activity amongst Czech Republic's various delegations in Brussels is already in place. All the representative offices in Brussels already have an high level of cooperation and joint organise events to promote partnerships and the excellence of Czech research institutions toward relevant European. The intelligence cleaned by these 'actors' was not always used effectively by targeting key institutions back in Czech Republic.
- 5. Coaching priorities are 'synergies' (between ESIF and H2020), and the implementation of the 'Proof of concept instrument.'





MIRRIS " Take Aways"

Mobilising Institutional Reforms in Research and Innovation Systems





- Aim high (at the international level) and market the excellence of the EU13 centres and research teams to EU15 consortia leaders;
- ✓ Establish a rewarding system for researchers or teams winning (not participating) H2020 Grants (down-stream synergies, grant for the use of R&D results);
- Involve successful teams and the diaspora as "role models" for first time applicants;
- ✓ Make a better use of the "Country" presence in Brussels;
- Incentivise the establishment of "project offices" in universities and research centres;
- Better coordination (between NCPs and EEN) for going beyond information and marketing excellence abroad.







- Leverage on previous ERDF investment in R&D infrastructure as flagships for marketing the capacity to be involved in H2020 projects as staircase to excellence;
- Use the opportunities opened up by RIS3 (ex-ante conditionality for Thematic Objective 1) to tackle the challenge of synergies to exploit excellence and international dimension;
- ✓ Use Article 70 of the common provision regulation in order to build long-term partnerships (Article 70(2) stipulates the possibility to allocate resources to operations located outside the programme area).















<u>2</u>

For more info: .tmlinaric@meta-group.com www.mirris.eu info@mirris.eu





WHAT FIGURES DON'T TELL US?

1. What is the influence of **structural** factors?

- quality of excellence in R&D
- effectiveness of support **ecosystem**
- availability of national **budget**
- preference for ERDF funding
- talent to transform an idea into a proposal
- 2. What influence have **subjective** factors?
 - visibility of the R&D eco-system
 - readiness of **stakeholders**
 - willingness for **networking** expectations of researchers/organizations
 - strategic attitude
- 3. What influence have **objective** factors?
 - date of full membership to the EU
 - size of **population**
 - number of qualified researchers and middle management staff
 - relevance of the services provided by intermediary organisations (NCP, ...)







- Support often intended as "Processing information"
- Differences in performances are often related to different strategic vision (Tactical v/s strategic attitude "egg" v/s " chicken")
- H2020 v/s ESIF 2014-2020 competition between instruments rather than co-operation
- Perceived effectiveness of support and lack of proactive attitude
- Attitude of working in silos v/s capitalizing on "collective intelligence" and understanding of the value chain
- local v/s global, focus on national dimension rather than openness to internationalization;



