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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the present deliverable D4.1/"Concept for the analysis of NCP/NIP systems in EECA” is to set a methodological standard for an analysis of the NCP/NIP systems in the EECA countries.

The review of NCP/NIP systems in EECA, to be carried out in Tasks 4.2-4.5 of WP4, foresees the following steps:

- Interviews
- Drafting of four analytical reports for each EECA region (or, if more appropriate, individual countries) with recommendations to EECA national authorities on how to strengthen their respective NCP/NIP systems
- Organisation of workshops for communicating the recommendations to EECA national authorities

The methodological standard has to make sure that Task Leaders of Tasks 4.2-4.5 implement this review in each of the EECA-regions defined by the IncoNet-EECA project in a coherent way along defined quality standards.

The methodological standard for the review, which was developed within Task 4.1, comprises:

- an interview guide
- a common structure for the analytical report
- a common approach to the Quality Assurance

These instruments, attached to this deliverable, were basically developed by FFG and agreed with all partners/Task leaders of WP4 who contributed substantially to their finalisation.

Based on the outcomes of the D4.3/ “Expert Meeting”, D4.1/ "Concept for the analysis of NCP/NIP systems in EECA” was completed in line with the Technical Annex.

The purpose of WP4/"Support to NCPs/ NIPs in the EECA” is to strengthen the EECA-NCP/NIP structures currently in place and to support EECA NCPs/ NIPs with further developing the necessary capacities and structures to respond to the requirements of FP7.

NCPs/ NIPs take a key role between policy makers, proposers and other stakeholders. They complete the different levels of action addressed by the IncoNet EECA project. An enhanced cooperation between EECA and EU/AS countries in FP7 can only be achieved if appropriate, professional, reliable and well-functioning NCP/NIP structures are in place in EECA countries.

By delivering D4.1/"Concept for the analysis of NCP/NIP systems in EECA countries”, the Task Leaders and partners of Task 4.1 completed a substantial step towards a successful completion of WP4. A successful WP4 will strengthen EECA- NCP/ NIP structures and by this contribute to the overall success of the IncoNet EECA project.
1 INTRODUCTION

The NCP/NIP systems in place on the spot in EECA play a major role in further strengthening the successful participation of EECA researchers in FP7.

In recent years, repeated efforts were made by the EU to contribute to the establishment of well-trained and efficient NCP/NIP –systems in EECA, like for ex. in the framework of INTAS or via a series of SSA funded under FP6 in the different Thematic Priorities.

At the same time, NCPs/ NIPs in EECA gained considerable experience over the last years.

WP4/”Support to NCP/NIP in EECA” of the IncoNet EECA-project, funded by the European Commission, foresees the review of NCP/NIP structures in EECA.

The present deliverable D4.1/”Concept for the analysis of NCP/NIP systems in EECA” comprises the setting of a methodological standard for an analysis of the NCP/NIP systems in the EECA. The review itself takes place within Tasks 4.2-4.5 under the responsibility of the respective Task Leaders.

2 AIMS

The aim of D4.1/”Concept for the analysis of NCP/NIP-structures in the EECA countries” is to provide Task Leaders of Tasks 4.2 - 4.5 with a methodological standard for carrying out the review of NCP/NIP-structures in the EECA countries.

The methodological standard has to make sure that Task Leaders implement this review in a coherent way, following defined common quality standards.

The Technical Annex defines on Page 16 that the framework and aim of the review is:

„to support the further development of the existing NCP-structures and their efficiency building on the ownership of the respective EECA country and the expertise of the well-functioning trans-European NCP-network.“

This means that it is important that the target groups in EECA identify with the activity and support it.

It should be underlined that the aim of the review is

- to identify potential for development
- to describe and present the potential for development
- to contribute in a positive way to the development itself

The purpose of the review is not

- to criticise
- to judge individuals
3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 The NCP-Guidelines “Guiding Principles for Setting Up Systems of National Contact Points (NCP systems) for FP7”

The basis for the implementation of this task is the NCP-Guidelines “Guiding Principles for setting up systems of National Contact Points (NCP systems) for FP7”, published by the European Commission Services in December 2007.

NCP/NIP-systems thus need capability to ensure

- competence in the different thematic and horizontal priorities
- coherence of approach
- high level of services

However, as a matter of fact, the specific situation of Third countries as such, and of each particular Third country, needs to be considered. Third countries will in general not maintain NCP/NIP structures at the same level or to the same extend as Member States do.

3.2 The Survey Among EECA NCPs/NIPs

Although not foreseen in the Technical Annex, the first step in this field was to carry out a survey. The purpose of the survey was to gain insight into the state of the art of current NCP/NIP systems in place in EECA. This comprises the network architecture in each country, the governance structure, the target groups in terms of approximate numbers of researchers with potential to succeed in FP7, the activities covered currently by NCP/NIP-systems, the training needs and state of the art of networking with EU-colleagues, including the attendance of NCP-meetings.

Another purpose of the survey was to raise the awareness of the target group in EECA for the upcoming work. An active participation in the survey was considered by the Task Leaders as an indicator that NCP/NIP representatives will also participate in the other activities of WP4.

Some extracts from the survey:

NCP-network architectures in the EECA countries

The NCPs/ NIPs in the EECA show, like the EU-NCP-structures, a wide variety of architectures, from highly centralised to highly decentralised structures, with different actors. Some countries like Ukraine, Moldova and the Central Asian countries have a highly centralised architecture with all NCPs under one roof, while eg Russia and Belarus represent a decentralised architecture with a number of different, independent NCP-organisations.

The following table shows that there are a few state agencies (Uzbekistan, Ukraine), but the majority of NCPs/ NIPs in the EECA is located at non-governmental research institutes (eg under the umbrella of the respective national academy of science).
The majority of NCPs/ NIPs has been nominated by ministerial decree:

Many of the EECA NCPs/ NIPs represent experienced NCP-organisations, but nearly 45% indicated that they were established only for FP7:
Nearly 50% of NCPs/ NIPs receive no national funding for their NCP-work:

![Graph showing national funding for NCP work]

Many NCPs/ NIPs in EECA countries maintain a network of regional/sectoral multipliers, but the majority of FP7 multipliers receives no funding for their FP7-work:

![Graph showing multipliers' funding for FP7 work]

**Attendance of NCP-meetings in Brussels by more than 50% of EECA NCPs/NIPs**

The European Commission states in the “Guiding Principles for setting up NCP-systems”:

“FP7 contacts nominated by the national authorities in Third Countries will be invited to participate in transnational NCP activities and meetings, but will in general not receive any financial contribution from the European Commission services.”

Only 53.6% of NCP/NIP-organisations actually send a representative to EU-NCP-meetings. The Russian NCPs, the NIP Ukraine and three Belarusian NCPs attend NCP-meetings in Brussels. Nobody from Moldova and the Caucasus region attends, and apart from Kazakhstan nobody from Central Asia.

---

1 Page 3, Guiding principles for setting up systems of NCP
Supervising and monitoring

Nearly 60% of all NCP-organisations in the EECA countries define the annual implementation programme themselves:

However, nearly all NCPs/NIPs report to their contracting body (multiple answers were possible to this question):
A special committee was established for appr. 50% of all EECA NCP/NIP-organisations in the EECA countries and monitors the work of the NCPs/NIPs:

50% of the 24 EECA NCPs/ NIPs who answered to this question indicated that their performance was evaluated already:

The overwhelming majority monitors and assesses the own work:
For the majority of NCPs/NIPs in the EECA countries, the contracting body expects an increase of successful researchers in FP7:

![Graph showing percentage of respondents with and without declared goal.](image)

The interviews will be made by taking the outcomes of the survey into consideration. EU-Task leaders were provided with a detailed report of the outcomes of the survey for each EECA-region.

### 3.3 The Methodological Standard for the Review of EECA NCP/NIP Systems

The review foresees the following steps (Technical Annex, page 45/46):
- Interviews
- Drafting of four analytical reports for each EECA region (or individual countries) with recommendations to EECA national authorities how to strengthen their respective NCP/NIP systems
- Organisation of workshops for communicating the recommendations to EECA national authorities

By consequence, the methodological standard for the review comprises:
- an Interview guide
- a common structure for the four analytical reports with recommendations to national authorities in EECA
- agreed quality assurance measures

#### 3.3.1 The Interview Guide

An Interview Guide was developed by FFG and agreed with the partners and Task Leaders of Tasks 4.2-4.5/Implementation in EECA regions.

The final version of the Guide comprises five chapters:
- Chapter 1: The organisational framework
- Chapter 2: Target groups
- Chapter 3: NCP activities
- Chapter 4: Networking and cross-linking
- Chapter 5: Monitoring of success/ Self-monitoring
Chapter 1: The organisational framework
This chapter addresses two main issues:

- The basis to implement NCP-activities
- Human Resources

The purpose of this Chapter is to understand the context of work of the NCP organisation and NCPs.

Chapter 2: Target groups
This chapter addresses two main issues:

- Who are the target groups of EECA NCP/NIP organisations
- How do EECA NCP/NIP organisations reach their target groups

The purpose of this chapter is to

- raise awareness for the need to define distinct target groups
- gain insight into the balance between the different target groups
- find out if there is a systematic approach to widen target groups
- gain insight into cooperation structures to widen target groups
- gain insight into the monitoring of the impact of NCP/NIP- work

Chapter 3: NCP activities
This chapter addresses the NCP-activities, which includes the following main points:

- Information and awareness raising
- Individual support
- Assistance to researchers/ clients
- Training

The purpose of this chapter is to

- gain insight how NCP-activities are carried out
- find out of what improvements the interviewee/s is/are thinking of

Chapter 4: Networking/ Cross Linking
This chapter addresses three main issues:

- the networking with other NCPs in the own country (if appropriate)
- the networking with other European NCPs
- the contact with the European Commission

The purpose of this chapter is to

- gain insight into the level of networking
- gain insight into the informal networking versus formal/official cooperation
- learn about the improvements which the interviewee/s is/are thinking of
Chapter 5: Monitoring of success/Self Monitoring

This chapter addresses activities related to the monitoring of success and the self-monitoring.

The purpose of this chapter is to

- gain insight into self-monitoring
- find out what is the level of satisfaction of interviewee/s with the state of the art
- encourage the interviewee/s to make some individual reflections

Apart from the guide, the interviews are based on the experiences, knowledge and insight of the Task leaders and on the outcomes of the survey. EU-Task Leaders were provided with the Interview Guide, attached as Annex 2, page 16, to be used for the interviews.

3.3.2 A Common Structure for the Four Analytical Reports with Recommendations to National Authorities

Based on the outcomes of the interviews, Task Leaders of Tasks 4.2-4.5 will write analytical reports with recommendations to national decision makers. The methodological standard comprises a structure for these analytical reports which will be followed by the EU-Task Leaders and authors of these reports. The agreed structure is attached as Annex 3, page 27.

3.3.3 Agreed Quality Assurance Measures

The methodological standard comprises quality assurance measures. The aim of the Quality Assurance is to ensure a coherent implementation of Tasks 4.2.-4.5, although the four EECA regions differ substantially.

As was mentioned already, Task Leaders agreed to the measures proposed by FFG. The outline of these Quality Assurance-measures is attached as Annex 4, page 28.

For example, the quality assurance guidelines describe in detail how the interviews should be prepared, implemented and followed-up. The guidelines will furthermore ensure a coordinated approach to the workshop for decision makers. Task Leaders expect that the target group for these workshops is rather small, and that these workshops will not be public events.

4 TARGET GROUPS

All Task leaders of WP4 agreed that the publication of an organisation/person as NCP on CORDIS qualifies this organisation for inclusion in all activities of WP4.

Furthermore, those NCPs who participated in the survey should normally be considered for participation.

To date, the target group comprises 29 EECA NCPs/NIPs out of 33 “known” thanks to the publication of NCP/NIPs on CORDIS. The list of participants is attached as Annex 1, page 15.

Task leaders were provided with the list of EECA NCPs/NIPs who participated so far in the survey. It is up to the Task Leaders to clarify with the NCP-coordinators in each country if those included in the list of participants to the survey are the correct target groups.
5 ACTIVITIES

In cooperation with the partners, FFG carried out as a first step the survey among EECA NCPs and NIPs.

An online template was provided to the partners, which can be found at:

http://www.ffg.at/buk/inconet

The survey was mainly carried out in June 2008. However, completed questionnaires arrived until the end of September. 29 questionnaires were received. On CORDIS, 33 NCP/NIP organisations/persons located in EECA can be found.

During the Expert Meeting on 11/12 September, partners/Task Leaders agreed which EECA NCPs/NIPs would be contacted another time and invited to complete the questionnaire. Two more questionnaires were received after the Expert meeting.

It will in any case be possible at any moment before the interviews to participate in WP4 and to submit a questionnaire.

Secondly, FFG developed during the summer months the interview guide. The draft version of the interview guide was first handed over to the EU-Task Leaders who provided detailed feedback. The modified version was then sent to all partners in the task. Feedback was collected from all partners before the meeting in September. Comments were integrated in the draft version before the meeting. During the meeting, the final draft version was discussed and finalised.

Thirdly, the quality assurance was developed. Before the meeting, partners received from FFG an outline how the Quality Assurance for the assessment could look like. Partners provided feedback during the meeting in Vienna. After the meeting, FFG sent the final version to the partners.

The fourth step was to agree on a common structure of the analytical reports with recommendations for national EECA authorities. FFG developed a proposal which was finalised jointly by all partners during the Expert meeting.

Finally, the workshops for decision makers were discussed at the Expert meeting and a coordinated approach was agreed. Task Leaders will exchange their approaches when the concrete plans for the workshops are starting to be developed. The project assembly foreseen for January 2009 may offer a good opportunity to further discuss the preparation of the activities related to the review.

6 OUTCOMES

The methodological standard which was developed comprises:

- the interview guide (Annex 2, page 16)
- the basic structure for the analytical reports (Annex 3, page 27)
- the quality assurance (Annex 4, page 28)

7 CONCLUSIONS

In line with the Technical Annex, instruments resp. a methodological standard were developed to enable Task Leaders of Tasks 4.2-4.5 to carry out the review in the different EECA-regions. D4.1 was completed in line with the Technical Annex.
### 8 Annexes

#### 8.1 Annex 1: Target Group in EECA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant in the survey per region</th>
<th>NCP for</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State University - Higher School of Economics</td>
<td>NCP for Mobility</td>
<td>Ania Pikalova</td>
<td>Director of the Centre for International Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.N. Bakh Institute of Biochemistry, RAS</td>
<td>NCP for Bio, Food, Agriculture</td>
<td>Valeri Eryomin</td>
<td>Scientific Counsellor of Bio-NCP of Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>NCP for Environment</td>
<td>Andrei Shmakov</td>
<td>Head of Laboratory of Geoinformatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Science Research and Statistics</td>
<td>NCP for ISMI</td>
<td>Sopokhovkin V.</td>
<td>Senior Scientific Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.V. Zhukovsky Institute of Cybernetics IMEF</td>
<td>NCP for NIM</td>
<td>Viktorov V.</td>
<td>Senior Researcher, Director of NCP in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Technological University “Moscow Institute of Steel and Alloys”</td>
<td>NCP for Research Infrastructure</td>
<td>Tantscherko V.</td>
<td>Coordinator of NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University - Higher School of Economics</td>
<td>NCP for INCO</td>
<td>Goldberg K.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUST/EMEE</td>
<td>NCP for Energy</td>
<td>Zadeff Y.</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Operating Systems</td>
<td>NCP for ICT</td>
<td>Andreyev A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-UL Main Airports Institute</td>
<td>NCP for Transport/Aeronautics</td>
<td>Logunov A.</td>
<td>Chief of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Chemistry of Petroleum and Gas</td>
<td>NCP for SME</td>
<td>Peshkov L.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for SME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, Moscow State University</td>
<td>NCP for Health</td>
<td>Taftanov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusian Institute of System Analysis and Information Support</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Academic Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Genetics and Cytology, Belarusian National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>NCP for Bio, Agriculture, Mobility, IP, RSP</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Leading Researcher, Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology Park “MIRIUT”</td>
<td>NCP for SME</td>
<td>Shtokhov N.</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus State University</td>
<td>NCP for ISMI</td>
<td>Skvortsov V.</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. V. Zhukovsky Institute of Cybernetics</td>
<td>NCP for NIM</td>
<td>Belyaeva A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Biophysics and Cell Engineering</td>
<td>NCP for Health</td>
<td>Balakin V.</td>
<td>Head of the National Centre for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Sciences of Moldova</td>
<td>NCP for ICT</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Information Centre for Ukraine-RU ICT Cooperation</td>
<td>NCP for Mobility</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Region</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Sciences of Armenia International S&amp;T Programmes Unit</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Information &amp; Automation Problems NAS RA</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaycan National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia National Science Foundation</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Expert Counselling Board in Kazakhstan</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Library of the Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Development of Scientific Cooperation</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Uzbek Center for Promotion of ICT cooperation</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Shapovalov A.</td>
<td>Director of the National Centre for ICT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2 Annex 2: Interview Guide

IncoNet EECA
Guideline for face-to-face interview NCP xxx
Date xxx

The IncoNet EECA-project is funded by the European Commission within FP7/INCO.
http://www.inco-eeca.net/
1 The organisational framework

1.1 The basis to implement NCP activities

Text under brackets and in cursive letters – background information for the interviewer;

[referring to the report and the questionnaire: provide a safe starting point for both the interviewer and the interviewee, set up the frame for the interview and understand the framework in which the NCP hosting organisation is working]

- When did your organisation become NCP hosting organisation? How was your organisation selected and nominated?
- What has been changing since this moment for the organisation?
- Does your organisation also perform other activities, apart from the NCP activities?
  ⇒ If appropriate: What are other programmes (national and international) your NCP hosting organisation is dealing with? Proportion of NCP related activities compared to other activities of the organisation.
  ⇒ Status and visibility of NCP work within the organisation, benefits for the organisation;
  ⇒ If appropriate: Do you see any positive or critical impact of your organisation performing NCP AND other activities? Find out about the personal impression

[referring to report/questionnaire; find out about intensity of involvement of contracting body and how this is experienced: support? interference? conflicting incentives?]

- Who is your contracting body and what activities does your contracting body perform towards your NCP hosting organisation? How does the governance of cooperation with your contracting body work?
  ⇒ Is it defined in a contract? Or in guidelines?
  ⇒ Does it emanate from practical experience?
- If appropriate: Are there any changes since there is (federal, national) funding for the NCP hosting organisation?
  ⇒ Does your organisation contribute from it’s own budget in order to fulfil the NCP-requirements?
  ⇒ How do you perceive the budget available (for staff, budget for covering travel costs etc) for your NCP unit/hosting organisation?
- How do you perceive the role of your contracting body/bodies (governance structures; coaching, controlling, steering...)
[referring to the report] The annual implementation programme:

- If appropriate: Please give an outline of the report to the contracting body about the implementation: Size, content/chapters, performance indicators (qualitative/quantitative), consequences
  - What do you consider as most important activities?
  - If appropriate: Who defines the implementation programme?
- If appropriate, see report: How does the monitoring by your contracting body work?
- If appropriate Evaluation: How did the external evaluation take place? What was the impact?

Could you provide us with relevant documents (report of eg 2007, evaluation report eg)

1.2 Human Resources

[referring to report/questionnaire; find out about the balance between the amount of work and the staff resources, + the balance between the professional requirements linked to the NCP work and the qualifications of staff resources as well as the in-service training activities]

- Could you provide us with an organisation chart of your NCP unit/hosting organisation?
  - How do you distribute responsibilities among the staff (eg legal and financial issues)?
  - What is the level of experience with FP7 (FP6) of your staff? Do they have experience with carrying out EC-funded projects themselves? Do you consider this as important?
- How does the recruitment of staff in general work?
  - Do you use any profile for selecting future NCP-staff? Who decides about new staff to be recruited and selected?
  - What are the professional background and qualifications of the current staff (former researchers?, rather junior/senior, frequency of staff changes)?
  - If someone is not full time employed for the NCP work: What are other activities? Are they related to NCP-responsibilities? Where lies the priority and who decides about the setting of priorities?
- Please describe any in-service training aiming to increase competences and qualifications of NCP staff.
  - Did someone participate in a FP7- (or other) training of the EC? (traineeships in Brussels, staff exchange with other NCP's etc?)
Who will be participating in the training workshop of the Inconet EECA project Find out about the number, age, experience and position of these employees;

- How do you perceive the situation regarding human resources? Can your organisation basically cover all required NCP-activities as you want to?

2 Target Groups

2.1 Who is your target group?

[referring to the report/questionnaire. Find out about the balance between the different target groups, and about possible limits in terms of the definition of the target groups]

- Which type of institutions are your main clients? (balance)
  - academic institutions (higher education institutions)
  - research institutions (institutes of the academy of sciences etc)
  - SME
  - Industry
  - Other, e.g. individual researchers (please specify)

- What is the share for each type of institution? (percentage)

- Who are your clients?
  - Beginners in FP7
  - If appropriate: Coordinators of proposals
  - Partners in a proposal
  - People with a rejected proposal
  - Administrators
  - Researchers who evaluate FP-proposals
  - FP7-multipliers

- What is the share for each type of client (percentage)?

- What is their background?
  - Applied Research
  - Basic Research
  - Lead User
  - Other (please specify)

- Could you please provide some information how you deal with FP7-multipliers as a target group?

---

1 From „Training course for FP7 advisors. Hyperion Ltd, June 2007"
2.2 How do you reach your target group?

[referring to the report/questionnaire: Find out about the balance between objectives/requirements to increase the outreach, corresponding activities (systematic approach?) and the (systematic?) assessment of the impact of these activities]

- What are your instruments to actively approach your target groups (e.g., infodays, personal contact, targeted mailings, post etc.)?
  - Which part from your target group do you approach actively?
  - Vice versa, who of your target group approaches you actively as an NCP?
  - Are there segments of your target groups which you cannot address with the instruments at your disposal? Please provide examples if appropriate.

- Do you cooperate with partners in your country, e.g., business associations, innovation networks or the Ministry, to identify and address different target groups?
  - If yes, please name partners in your country and describe the cooperation.
  - If yes, do you cooperate on a regular basis or on a case by case basis?
  - Do regional FP7-multipliers play an active part with the broadening of your target groups?

- Do you have a database of clients? How do you use this database? More details will be explored under Chapter 5.

- What are the most important difficulties you are facing when approaching new clients or new target groups?

Could you please provide us with any statistics showing how your contacts are distributed among different types of institutions (non-governmental research institutes, universities, SME, large industries, other)?
3 NCP activities

(This paragraph is not about a “list of activities”, but rather about “how” they are carried out.)

Interviewer uses the list of activities from the guidelines as a blueprint to compare with, and the activities listed in the questionnaire/report. Find out about how the NCP organisation works and what improvements the interviewee(s) is (are) thinking of.

Information and awareness raising

- Referring to the report/questionnaire: How does your organisation implement its NCP activities? What are your main instruments and activities?
  
  ⇒ Is there any change with regard to FP6?
  ⇒ How do you plan to take advantage of the new opportunities in FP7, how do you deal with the challenges (e.g., competition with other countries, particularly with the change of orientation of the INCO-programme, for Russia: upcoming association to FP7)
  
- How do you promote infodays, conferences and workshops? What are the usual target groups in approximate numbers?
- Do you use FAQ regarding legal and financial issues? Could you provide us with a set of ten most frequently asked questions in this area?
- Referring to the report/questionnaire, see, if appropriate! Could you please describe the network of or regional/sectoral/institutional multipliers (organisations, number, tasks)? How do you cooperate with this network?
  
  ⇒ Does the cooperation work on a regular or on a case by case basis?
  ⇒ Is there a mutual exchange of information?
  ⇒ Do you organise any training sessions for multipliers?
  ⇒ Do you have a chart of the network of multipliers (regional, institutional, sectoral, as appropriate)?
  ⇒ How do you perceive the value and benefits of the network of multipliers?

Individual support

We understand as “individual support” the targeted provision of oral or written feedback/consultancy regarding a project idea, a proposal, a consortium under construction etc.

- What is your approach to individual support?
- Who initiates individual support, e.g., a meeting to discuss a project idea or a proposal? (The client – the NCP?)
- What is the most frequent type of individual support among the three types of consultancy (email, phone, face-to-face)?
- If appropriate: How much time do you in average invest for a face-to-face consultancy?)
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⇒ For a general information
⇒ For an assessment of a project idea *(if appropriate)*
⇒ For a final proposal check *(if appropriate)*

• How does your NCP-organisation monitor the consultancy work? *More detailed exploration in Chapter 5*
  ⇒ How many individual consultancies does your NCP hosting organisation carry out per year *(e.g. in 2008 so far)*?
  ⇒ How do you assess the impact of the individual consultancies and of your own performance in this relation?
  ⇒ By which instruments/approach do you assess the level of satisfaction of your clients? Is there any analysis?
  ⇒ How do you yourself perceive the level of satisfaction of your clients with individual consultancy?

• Do you believe that the requests for individual consultancy will increase in FP7? If yes, how will your organisation/you yourself respond?

• Do you consider individual consultancy as an important factor to ensure the success of researchers from your country in FP7?

**Assistance to researchers/clients**

• How do you support partner search and consortium building?
  ⇒ CORDIS?
  ⇒ Specific tools like Ideal-ist?
  ⇒ NCP-projects? CSA?
  ⇒ Personal Networks

• *If appropriate* Which services does your organisation provide for each stage of the life cycle of a project?
  ⇒ Proposal Check
  ⇒ Proposal forms (A-forms) and submission procedures
  ⇒ Negotiation phase
  ⇒ IPR, CA (Legal and financial issues)
  ⇒ Reporting
  ⇒ Dissemination/Exploitation of results

• *If appropriate* How do you address specific target groups like SME and assist them with participating successfully in FP7? *(special events etc.)*

• How do you perceive the potential of SME in your country to succeed in FP7?
  ⇒ What are the main barriers for a successful participation?

• How do you perceive the potential of the academic sector *(research organisations, universities)*
  ⇒ What are the main barriers for a successful participation?
Training

*Referring to the report/questionnaire, only if appropriate*

- Do you conceive and carry out training sessions on FP7 and proposal writing yourself or do you cooperate usually with colleagues from the EU and/or Associated countries?
  - If appropriate: With which countries do you cooperate to organise trainings?
  - How long does it take to prepare for a training, and which issues do these trainings cover?
- How many days do these training last? How many participants usually attend? Are there also participants from more distant regions?
  - If appropriate: How are the costs of participants from the regions covered?
- How do you assess the impact of the trainings?
  - Do participants evaluate the trainings?

- Does your staff get any in-service training like “Train the trainer’’?

  *Could we have some materials linked to trainings (agenda) and a list of FAQ on legal and financial issues?*

Other issues

- To which extend do you carry out other activities, besides those mentioned before? Please specify your tasks related to
  - Relations with the Ministry/Funding agency
  - Cooperation with other countries
  - Publications
  - Other, please specify
4 Networking / Cross linking

[Find out about networking / cooperation on the different levels – what are the incentives? Find out about informal networking + information gathering versus formal / official cooperation]

4.1 Networking with other NCPs (NCP Network) / NCP-coordinator in your country (if appropriate)

- Could you please speak about the network of national NCPs?
  - If appropriate: To what extent does your NCP unit (resp. yourself) cooperate with other NCP’s from your country? Do you cooperate more with one or several specific NCP hosting organisations in your country? If yes, why?
  - If appropriate: Does your NCP unit cooperate on a regular basis (or on a case to case basis)? If yes, how do you cooperate on a regular basis? Eg Do you develop coordinated strategies for participation in FP7 on a regional level (joint thematic focus, target groups SME)?
  - If appropriate: Are there any national NCP-coordination meetings among thematic NCP’s? What is the outcome?
  - What is the role of the NCP-coordinator in your country? [find out, if it is helpful]
  - If appropriate: Is this kind of cooperation (with other NCP’s from your country + with the NCP-coordinator) important in your opinion? Is there any synergy potential in such cooperation?

- To what extent do you cooperate with other national players (apart from the network of FP7-multipliers, eg large industries, large governmental entities that act as endusers, public entities, organisations hosting important infrastructures and facilities etc)?
  - Who are these “other players”?
  - What are the goals and the content of this cooperation (potential synergies)?

4.2 Networking with other European NCPs

- Do you participate in FP7-NCP-projects? How do you perceive the impact and benefits?
- Do you participate in any other CSA? If yes, how do you value the impact and benefits?
- How do you, apart from FP6/FP7 projects network / exchange information with other European NCPs?
4.3 Contact with the European Commission

- How do you perceive your interaction with the EC?
  - How do you perceive the information and communication flow with the EC?
  - Do EC representatives attend events you're organising?
  - Do you receive invitations to all NCP meetings in Brussels?
  - Do you consider that there is good support from the Commission services for your work?

- Please define the most important challenges and weak points in your interaction with the European Commission services and propose suitable solutions.

5 Monitoring of success/ Self monitoring

[referring to the outcomes of the report/questionnaire; Find out about systematic self monitoring / databases about target groups, services etc., to which degree the interviewee/s is/are satisfied with the state of the art]

- Does your organisation use monitoring instruments (eg performance indicators, CRM-tools (Client-Relation-Management), online or offline databases) to monitor NCP-activities and keep record of it (based on your contract and beyond)?
  - If yes, how have these instruments been developed in the course of your NCP activities?
  - Did your organisation get any specific guidelines from your national authorities as to how these instruments should be developed and implemented?
FFG

⇒ By which instruments does your organisation assess the level of satisfaction of your clients (e.g. feedback forms, surveys, interviewers could bring examples as appropriate)? Is there any analysis?

Referring to the report/questionnaire: Find out about the quality of cooperation with the institutional environment and interaction with other actors:

- How satisfied are you yourself with the output of your NCP hosting organisation’s work?
- What are the difficulties that you experience with NCP activities?
  ⇒ When being confronted with these problems – who are your contact persons?
- What would you personally like to achieve by the end of FP7?
  ⇒ What are, from your point of view, the crucial points and key challenges in the near future (until the end of FP7)?
- Resuming: To which extend, to your opinion, is the national NCP-system adequate to ensure a successful participation of researchers in FP7?
  ⇒ Where do you see room for improvement? [individual /organisational level]?
- Any other comments?

1. Name of the interviewee:

Position:

2. Name of the interviewee:

Position:

3. Name of the interviewee:

Position:

Name of the NCP organisation:

Date of interview:
8.3 Annex 3: Structure for the Analytical Reports

WP4: Task 4.2-4.5:
Four analytical reports with recommendations for decision makers
Due by April 2009

Proposed structure:

I. Executive summary
   - Analytical findings
   - Recommendations

II. Background and rationale
   - Incl. if appropriate special features of the target region
   - Mention the target group of the report itself
   - Starting point of our work: Brief overview of state of the art of the context of work of NCP's (however, decision makers will know the state of the art...) - but as the reports are public, this might be useful

III. Overall aim and objectives

IV. Methodology and context of work
   Under this heading, the context of work of the IncoNet EECA project should be described

V. Analytical findings
   - Presentation basically in line with the structure of the interview guide
   - Additional items as appropriate
   - Particular challenges met, if appropriate
      i. Solutions found, if appropriate

VI. Recommendations in detail
   - No more than 10 if possible

VII. Summary and conclusions

VIII. Annexes
   - Summary of activities
      i. Eg Timetable, organisations visited, persons interviewed etc
      ii. Interview guide
8.4 Annex 4: Quality Assurance

Quality assurance – Assessment:
Task 4.1 - WP4/IncoNet EECA

1. Basic principles:

- **An agreed understanding of the purpose**
  - The purpose of an assessment is to identify and highlight potentials for development and to contribute in a positive way to the development of these potentials.
  - The purpose is not to criticise.
  - The purpose is not to judge individuals.

- **Basic documents**
  - The basic reference document is the “Guiding Principles for setting up National Contact Points (NCP-systems for the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7), 12/12/2007/European Commission DG TRD A1”;
  - The interviews are carried out on the basis of the outcomes of the survey carried out in June 2008.
  - The specific situation of each EECA country will be considered. It is obvious that Third Countries do not maintain similar NCP-structures like MS or AS (which are also very diverse).

- **Close cooperation among task leaders EECA-EU**
  - A coordinated approach has been secured for all EECA regions. The EU-partners in the task, which have considerable working experience with their respective target region, shared their experiences and agreed on a joint approach.
  - Interviewers and their partners in the EECA countries commit themselves to a close cooperation and an effective communication.

- **An agreed timetable with notification of delays**
  - The interviews will normally be carried out between October and April 2009. Analytical Reports have to be finalised by the end of April 2009 at the latest.
  - A final schedule for the interviews, the delivery of final Analytical Reports and the workshops for decision makers will be developed and agreed by the individual task leaders and communicated to the WP-leader and co-leader by the end of November 2008.
  - Considerable delays regarding these schedules should be agreed with the WP4 leader and co-leader.

- **Early warning**
  - Task leaders commit themselves to address difficulties at an early moment.
  - Task leaders are encouraged to share particular challenges with the WP-leader and co-leader at any time.
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2. Guidance notes for the Interviews

• **Preparation**
  ⇒ It is recommended to inform decision makers in each EECA region about the project and the purpose of the interviews before the interviews are carried out and to seek their agreement and support.
  ⇒ If some task leaders of 4.2-4.5 consider that a letter from the project coordinator would be the most suitable way to introduce the project resp. WP4, these task leaders are free to ask the project coordinator to send a letter (which they preconceive and hand over to George Bonas).
  ⇒ It is not absolutely required to go through all the questions. The interviewers may focus on those questions of the guide which they consider appropriate for their respective target groups. However, the nature of the guide should not be substantially modified.
  ⇒ It is up to the task leaders to decide if they provide interviewees beforehand with the set of questions or not (Without the remarks for the interviewers!), or only with an overview of thematic areas to be addressed during the interviews.

• **Implementation**
  ⇒ It is recommended that at least four persons participate in each interview: two interviewers and two interviewees.
  ⇒ At least two hours should be foreseen for one interview.
  ⇒ If a recorder is used, the agreement of the interviewee/s is necessary prior to the recording.

• **Follow-up**
  ⇒ Interviewees will be invited after the interviews to communicate by written (and/or oral way) to the task leaders for the respective EECA country/ies how they experienced the interviews. A form will be provided for this feedback. However, there is no obligation to provide feedback.
  ⇒ The feedback will be treated in a strictly confidential way.
  ⇒ Interviewees will receive a written version of the interview to check if the content was understood/noted down by the interviewers in a correct way.

3. Guidance note for the 4 Analytical Reports

• **The 4 Analytical Reports with recommendations**
  ⇒ All four reports will be written along a similar, agreed structure.
  ⇒ Interviewees will receive an outline of the results and will be asked to check, if necessary, if numerical and other, eg statistical or administrative facts presented in the report are correct.
  ⇒ On a strictly confidential basis, EU-task leaders (who have written the reports) may exchange their reports and collect mutual feedback to ensure a coherent approach before the next steps.
Reports may be sent to the task leaders in the EECA countries on a strictly confidential basis. This has no impact on the conclusions of the review.

4. Workshop for decision makers

- Once the consolidated reports are completed, the workshops will be carried out on their basis.
- To ensure a coordinated approach, there will be an exchange of information among task leaders when these workshops are planned and carried out.
- Recommendations will be presented by those organisations who write the Analytical report. As appropriate and depending on the task leaders, the project coordinator may be asked to participate in one of the workshops.