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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The aim of D4.3/ Expert Meeting was to discuss about and to agree upon final versions of

- the methodological standard for the review of NCP/ NIP structures, notably the interview guide
- a rough training concept for each EECA region
- a concept for the networking among EECA and EU NCPs/ NIPs
- the quality assurance for the assessment and the training

Furthermore, the aim of the meeting was to

- to discuss about the consultation of EECA-NCPs/ NIPs by EU-NCPs
- to get an overview about new FP7-NCP-projects and their activities
- to share timetables until June 2009 (Tasks 4.2 - 4.5)

The meeting was carried out successfully on 11/12 September 2008. All main objectives were reached:

- Partners agreed on the methodology for the review of NCP-structures and the final version of the interview guide. A coordinated approach towards the interviews, the reports with recommendations for decision makers and the workshops has been agreed.
- Basic concepts for the four training workshops were presented and finalised.
- An agreement was found how to implement the networking among EECA and EU NCPs/NIPs.
- Quality assurance measures were agreed for the review and the training workshops.
- The preparation of the visits of EECA NCPs to EU-NCPs was postponed until the beginning of 2009. DLR will host FP-Contact Points from Third Countries in the late autumn 2008. The next steps will be taken after this experience and will build on it.
- EECA and EU Task Leaders were provided with a list of FP7-NCP projects and CSA targeting the EECA countries.
- A brainstorming on the consultation of EECA-NCPs/ NIPs by EU-NCPs took place.
- Timetables for Tasks 4.2-4.5 were shared. Task Leaders agreed to develop final timetables for Tasks 4.2 - 4.5/Implementation of activities in the EECA regions until the end of November, in time for the annual report.

The cooperation among partners works very well. The next steps will be made 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 the EU (resp. AC) in FP7 can only be achieved if appropriate, professional, reliable and well-functioning NCP/ NIP structures are in place in EECA countries. By delivering a successful Expert Meeting/ D4.3 of WP4, all partners/ Task Leaders of WP4 made sure that there is a sound basis for the further work to be accomplished in WP4. They contributed considerably to achieving notably the aims of WP4, but in the end also of the IncoNet Project.
1 INTRODUCTION

WP4 – “Supporting the NCPs/ NIPs in EECA countries” comprises two main parts:

- 4.1 – Methodological standards, quality assurance and horizontal activities
- 4.2 - 4.5 Implementation in the target regions:
  - Russia
  - Eastern Europe (Ukraine/ Belarus/ Moldova)
  - Caucasus Region (Armenia/ Azerbaijan/ Georgia)
  - Central Asia (Kazakhstan/ Uzbekistan/ Kyrgyzstan/ Tajikistan/ Turkmenistan)

Task 4.1 comprises:

- the development of a tool for the assessment and review of NCP/NIP-structures in the EECA-countries (due by October 2008)
- the development of a rough training concept for EECA NCPs/ NIPs (due by November 2008)
- the development and implementation of a concept for the networking among EECA and EU NCPs/NIPs (due by October 2008)
- the organisation of an Expert Meeting (due by September 2008)
- the quality assurance for the training visits of EECA NCPs in EU-NCPs
- the exploration of synergies with FP7-NCP-projects

Tasks 4.2 – 4.5 comprise, for each individual EECA-region mentioned above:

- an assessment of NCP/ NIP-structures
- the organisation of training workshops for EECA-NCPs/NIPs (eg 3 in Central Asia)
- the organisation of visits of EECA NCPs/NIPs at EU-NCPs
- the provision of support to the networking with EU-NCPs
- the consultation of EECA NCPs/NIPs by EU-NCPs
- dissemination of information towards and from EECA-regions

This list demonstrates that Task 4.1 lays the basis for a successful completion of Tasks 4.2 - 4.5, although Tasks 4.2 – 4.5 are under the complete responsibility of the respective Task Leaders.

The main purpose of the Expert Meeting, D4.3, was to discuss and agree the instruments and tools developed within Task 4.1, which are to be used in Tasks 4.2-4.5.

2 AIMS OF THE EXPERT MEETING

The aim of the meeting was to discuss about and to agree upon final versions of

- the methodological standard for the review of NCP/ NIP structures, notably the interview guide
- the rough training concepts for each EECA region
- the concept for the networking
- the quality assurance for the assessment and the training

Furthermore, the aim of the meeting was to

- to discuss about the consultation of EECA-NCPs/ NIPs by EU-NCPs
- to get an overview about new FP7-NCP-projects and their activities
- to share timetables until June 2009 (Tasks 4.2 - 4.5)
3 **INTENDED RESULTS**

The intended results of the Expert Meeting can be summarised as follows:

**Review of NCP-structures (D4.1)**
- an agreed version of the interview guide
- an agreed structure for the 4 analytical reports with recommendations for decision makers
- a coordinated approach towards the workshops for decision makers/ national authorities

**4 Training Workshops (D4.2)**
- agreed rough training concepts for each EECA-region

**Quality assurance**
- an agreed approach to the quality assurance for the review of EECA NCP-structures and the training workshops

**Networking (D4.4)**
- An agreed approach to the networking among EECA and EU NCPs (incl. AS)

**Consultation EU-EECA NCPs**
- A rough concept for the consultation of EECA NCPs by EU-NCPs

**Implementation of 4.2-4.5**
- A timetable until June 2009

4 **METHODOLOGY**

4.1 **Identification of the State of the Art**

As a first step, FFG carried out in close cooperation with the partners (different task leaders) a survey among EECA NCPs/NIPs in order to get an overview about
- the NCP-systems in place at the moment in the EECA countries
- the training needs of NCPs/NIPs and related staff
- the framework for the networking (eg regular attendance of NCP-meetings in Brussels by EECA-NCPs/NIPs, financial means available among EECA NCPs/NIPs to cover travel costs to NCP-meetings)

Due to the good support of the partners in the Workpackage, notably the Task Leaders, 29 NCPs/NIPs participated in the survey. To date (10 October 2008), the questionnaires of four NCPs/NIPs are missing:
- NCPs for ICT, Azerbaijan and Georgia
- NCPs for Space&Environment, Belarus

The survey provided a good overall insight into the target groups of WP4. European Task Leaders of WP4 were provided by FFG with detailed reports specifying the outcomes of the survey. The outcomes of the survey should support the Task Leaders when carrying out the work necessary in WP4, notably the interviews.
The online template of the questionnaire is available at:
http://www.ffg.at/buk/IncoNet/

The list of participants is attached as Annex 1, page 15 and a brief summary of the outcomes is attached as Annex 2, page 16. Furthermore, the main conclusions of the survey have been integrated into the presentations made during the Expert Meeting (see the different annexes). FFG also received a detailed report from Anna Pikalova, HSE, with a description of the current Russian NCP-system.

4.2 Methodology of Cooperation

In general, FFG as task leader first developed a concept or approach for each area of activity of Task 4.1, collected then feedback from the co-Task Leader and the other partners in Task 4.1 (Task Leaders of Tasks 4.2-4.5), integrated their suggestions for modification and proposed agreed draft versions at the Expert Meeting. This approach enabled the partners in the task to achieve together consolidated results for each requested area of activity.

For the training, FFG proposed to organise a joint additional workshop with Help-Forward and VINNOVA in Vienna to develop the basic training concept for the EECA-region together from scratch. FFG wanted to build the rough concept on the rich experiences of all three EU-partners in the task.

5 TARGET GROUPS FOR THE ACTIVITIES OF WP4

It was one of the objectives of the survey to identify the exact target groups in all EECA-countries.

The response to the survey was good: 29 out of the 33 EECA-NCPs/NIPs registered currently on CORDIS replied:

Russia: 12 NCPs out of 12 participated
Ukraine, Moldova: both (2) NCPs/NIPs participated
Belarus: 6 out of 8 NCPs participated, the NCPs for Space and Environment will not be contacted anymore
Armenia: all 3 NCPs participated
Azerbaijan: 1 NCP (the coordinator) participated so far, 1 new NCP for ICT has been communicated to CORDIS recently. The NCP for ICT takes part in the “Ideal-ist” project, and visited FFG recently (on 23 September 2008) in this context. The NCP for ICT has been informed about the activities of the IncoNet EECA Project, notably WP4, and plans to participate in the project activities.
Georgia: 1 out of 2 Georgian NCPs participated. The NCP for ICT will be encouraged by the Task Leaders to participate also. Further nominations are expected for other thematic areas, all will be invited to participate in WP4.
Kasakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan: all 4 NCPs/NIPs participated.
Turkmenistan: In Turkmenistan, an NCP/NIP has been nominated recently. The NCP for Kazakhstan will make sure that this NCP participates. Contacts have been established already to this end.
5.1 Definition of the Target Groups:

The basis for the work in WP4 is the NCP-Guidelines “Guiding Principles for setting up systems of National Contact Points (NCP systems) for FP7” published by the European Commission in December 2007.

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.

However, based on the insight into specific countries, it remains the responsibility of the respective NCP-coordinator to decide which NCP-organisation from the respective country should be considered for WP4. This should be clarified before the interviews are starting.

Task leaders were provided with the list of 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.

6 ACTIVITIES

6.1 Preparation of the Expert Meeting

6.1.1 Interview Guide

FFG provided the partners with a draft version of the guide before the meeting and invited them to send their feedback before the meeting. FFG received very detailed and helpful feedback. A revised version was prepared for the final discussion at the meeting.

6.1.2 Training Concept:

The partners in the task, Help-Forward and VINNOVA, are as experienced as FFG with the development and implementation of trainings in EECA countries. FFG decided for this reason to involve these two partners very actively into the development of a rough concept for the training workshops, instead of proposing them a ready-made concept for comments.

To this end, FFG organised a workshop of two days on 26/27 August with VINNOVA and Help-Forward to conceive the basic training concept (see the agenda for your information as Annex 3, page 24. The workshop enabled partners to share their experiences and views and to get a better insight into the whole EECA-region, beyond one specific region. The outcomes of the survey were also discussed.

The workshop proved that one common basic training concept for the entire EECA – region would not meet the specific needs of each of these regions. By consequence, Help-Forward, VINNOVA and FFG decided to develop individual rough concepts for each EECA-region. However, the workshop enabled the partners to agree on a basic outline of the training which will be submitted with D4.2/ Core curriculum for the 3-days basic training for EECA NCPs/NIPs. The individual concepts were prepared by the EU-Task Leaders for being presented and discussed at the Expert Meeting.
6.1.3 Networking of EECA and EU NCPs.

FFG, disposing of more than 67,000,-€ for promoting networking between EECA and EU NCPs, discussed internally many times how to best fulfil this deliverable.

In the end, a concept was prepared which foresees the organisation of “Special sessions” dedicated to EECA-NCPs, to be organised during regular NCP-meetings in Brussels. This concept was prepared for being discussed at the Expert Meeting.

6.1.4 Quality Assurance

FFG prepared a handout on the quality assurance for the assessment of NCP-systems and the training workshops. Furthermore, FFG prepared a structure for the four analytical reports resulting from the assessment, in order to discuss this point with the partners. Partners were provided with the concepts before the meeting in order to be able to provide well-reflected feedback.

6.1.5 Consultation of EECA-NCPs by EU-NCPs

FFG prepared a presentation to encourage a brainstorming about the consultation.

6.1.6 Synergies with FP7-NCP-Projects

FFG prepared a list of all FP7-NCP-projects where FFG is involved. This list aimed at providing partners, especially in the EECA countries, with an overview in order to enable all of them to identify possible synergies.

6.2 Implementation of the Expert Meeting (11/12 September 2008)

The meeting took place on 11-12 September 2008, starting with a reception on 10 September 2008. Please see the Agenda and list of participants attached as Annex 4/Agenda, page 25, Annex 5/List of participants, page 27.

10 September 2008

The meeting started with a reception at the Restaurant ROTH, Währingerstrasse, 1090 Vienna, on 10 September. The director of FFG/European and International Programmes, Sabine Herlitschka, invited all partners for an informal Get Together.

11 September 2008

The official work started on 11 September, with the following main items (see agenda).

6.2.1 Methodological Standard for the Assessment of NCP-structures in the EECA Countries

The morning session was dedicated to the debate of all open points regarding the review of NCP-systems in EECA countries. The aim was to reach agreement on the final version of the guide, and on its exact use. The exact target groups for the interviews (eg NCPs only or also decision makers like the head of an NCP-hosting organisation) were topics of discussion. The structure was slightly revised, misleading questions were reformulated or deleted, some questions were also added, like eg a small section concerning the duties of NCPs/NIPs in relation to their respective Ministries.

It was agreed that Task Leaders were invited to use the guide in a flexible way. Eg, if Task Leaders believed that some questions were inappropriate for their region or a specific country,
they were entitled to drop these questions. However, it was agreed that approximately 90% of the questions of the interview guide should be considered by all interviewers.

Please find attached as Annex 6/ page 28, the presentation made by FFG at the meeting.

The interview guide will be submitted with D4.1/Concept for the analysis of NCP'/NIPs in EECA.

6.2.2 Training Concept for the EECA Region

The afternoon session was dedicated to the training workshops. FFG made a general introduction summarising the results of the survey in this field and the main parameters for the training concepts(see Annex 7, page 33). Afterwards, VINNOVA, Help-Forward and FFG presented their respective concept for each individual region (see Annex 8/ page 36, VINNOVA/ Central Asia, Annex 9/ page 38, Help Forward/ Caucasus and Eastern Europe, Annex 10/ page 41, FFG/Russia). EECA-Partners in the task provided feedback and suggestions for modifications. The four training concepts themselves will be submitted with D4.2/Core curriculum for a 3 days basic training.

12 September 2008

6.2.3 Networking

The morning session was first dedicated to the networking concept prepared by FFG, (see Annex 11/ page 44). The proposal of FFG to organise special sessions was basically supported. But the discussion showed that it will not be easy to make the choice of the Thematic NCP-meetings where a special session should be organised. Diverging interests became obvious. However, the organisation of the first session at the NCP coordinators’ meeting in Spring 2009 was supported by all partners.

The survey had shown that many EECA-NCPs/NIPs already attend European NCP-meetings. FFG proposed to use the funding available mainly for those EECA NCPs/NIPs who currently don’t attend NCP- meetings. However, some objections were raised, as many NCPs/NIPs in fact don’t use national funding for attending NCP-meetings, but rather EC-project funding or other types of sponsors. It was agreed that Task Leaders would find out during the interviews how attendance of NCP-meetings is currently funded and to communicate this to the WP-leader and co-leader. Then a decision will be taken how to best use the funds available to the maximum benefit for all.

6.2.4 Quality Assurance

FFG and NIP presented an outline how the quality assurance of the assessment and the training could be addressed and discussed open questions. The “Workshops for decision makers” (Recommendations how the NCP-systems can be strengthened) were also discussed, notably the size of these workshops, the exact target groups and who should communicate the recommendations. A coordinated approach was agreed upon with a sharing of plans when Task Leaders will prepare the workshops next year.

FFG proposed a common structure for the report with recommendations which is required for each region, if not each EECA-country.

The discussion showed that Task Leaders feel that in some cases it might be more appropriate to address individual countries rather than an entire EECA-region. This might be particularly necessary for Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova where individual workshops are considered by the Task-Leaders.
6.2.5 Consultation of EU-NCPs

Ralf König made an input on the consultation of NCPs/NIPs. Please see the presentation as Annex 12/ page 46.

Two main items were discussed regarding the consultation of EECA-NCPs by EU-NCPs:

⇒ Which questions should be transferred to EU-NCPs?
   It seemed important to avoid very basic questions. EECA NCPs will therefore be expected to filter themselves a little bit the questions to be addressed to their EU-counterparts.

⇒ FFG wished also to avoid that the main content of the consultation would be partnering. FFG believes that the new FP7-NCP-projects are very suitable for enhancing partnering. However, all participants underlined that partnering should not be excluded from the consultation, as partnering represents one of the key challenges for EECA-NCPs/NIPs.
   It was agreed that a multilevel approach will be the best solution, with partnering being directed as appropriate to an NCP-project, to CORDIS, to an IncoNet EECA-brokerage event or to a new, suitable consortium in the country of the EU-NCP doing the consultation.

The item was discussed that EECA NCPs might hesitate in general to ask any question at all. So it was stated that there was a need to rather encourage EECA-NCPs to really contact their European counterparts and to submit their open questions.

It was agreed that the consultation work needs to be documented with the help of a form, in order to make this work visible.

As this task belongs to 4.2-4.5, Task Leaders will in the end agree among themselves how to best approach consultation.

6.2.6 Synergies with FP7-NCP Projects

FFG presented an overview of FP7-NCP projects (under preparation/in implementation) as well as an overview of other CSA targeting the EECA region. The partners received a detailed list (print-out) with the activities of each project and the website, where already available. Please see the presentation made as Annex 13/ page 47 for more information.

6.2.7 Timetable 4.2-4.5

Partners shared their timetables. As some elements of the concrete timetables for the training, the interviews and the workshops for decision makers still need to be agreed with all EECA NCPs/NIPs involved, Task Leaders agreed to develop detailed timetables until the end of November. These timetables will be included into the annual report.

The meeting was closed on 12 September at lunch time.

6.3 Follow-Up of the Expert Meeting

FFG prepared a summary of the results of the Expert Meeting, with open questions to be clarified. This summary is attached as Annex 14/page 53.
7 CHALLENGES MET

7.1 Networking among EECA and EU NCPs

It proved challenging for FFG to develop a sound concept for the networking among EU and EECA NCPs/NIPs. Finally, a structured approach was selected. The issue how to use the funds available for covering travel and accommodation costs is also rather sensitive.

7.2 Consultation of EECA-NCPs by EU-NCPs

Some EECA-NCPs are very experienced already. It will be necessary to develop a tailormade approach which actually responds to the needs of experienced NCPs/NIPs. Some Task Leaders pointed out that EECA NCPs/NIPs might hesitate to take advantage of the offer of consultation. It was agreed that they need to be rather encouraged to take an active role and to request support.

8 OUTCOMES

8.1 Interview Guide

Some modifications of the draft interview guide proposed by FFG were decided jointly by the partners, and a final version of the interview guide was agreed upon. The final version of the guide, which is already available, will be submitted with D4.1/Concept for the analysis of NCPs/NIPs in EECA.

8.2 Training Concepts

The Training concept for Russia was finalised in bilateral talks by Anna Pikalova, HSE and FFG. VINNOVA and Help-Forward integrated the feedback collected during the Expert Meeting and sent revised, final concepts to FFG. These concepts will be submitted with D4.2/Core curriculum for a 3 days basic training of NCPs/NIPs.

8.3 Networking

Partners agreed to the idea of organising “Special Sessions” dedicated to EECA countries, in Brussels at NCP meetings. During the interviews, Task Leaders will clarify who receives funding from which source and who really needs financial support from the project budget. Based on these results, FFG will make a financial planning.

To date (21 October 2008), the proposal to organise Special Sessions at NCP-meetings was clarified by FFG with the European Commission. The European Commission Services agreed to offer EECA NCPs and NIPs a time-slot of 30 minutes at the next meeting of NCP-coordinators in Spring 2009. This time-slot will allow FFG to briefly present the initiative and to introduce the EECA-colleagues resp. they will introduce themselves. A small exhibition about EECA NCPs/NIPs’ activities, RTD potential, success stories and more, will be organised the whole day in a separate room near to the NCP-meeting room. EU-NCPs will invited and encouraged to visit the small exhibition during the breaks and to take advantage of the opportunity to make individual acquaintances of EECA-NCPs/NIPs.

The thematic area of the next “Special Session” in Autumn 2009 will be decided by the EECA-NCP coordinators during this meeting.
8.4 Quality Assurance

Based on the outcomes of the discussions during the meeting, a final version of the handouts for the Quality Assurance for the assessment and the training were developed. Furthermore, the comments regarding the structure for the four analytical reports were integrated and a final structure was developed. Please find these materials as Annex 15/ QA Assessment, page 62, Annex 16/ QA Training, page 65, Annex 17/Structure of the report for decision makers, page 66.

8.5 Consultation of EU-NCPs

The general discussion showed that this point needs some attention in order to be successfully carried out. Partnering will not be excluded, but will be directed also towards the FP7-NCP-projects. Task Leaders agreed that the work done needs to be documented in a structured way. FFG considered to make a concept. However, this task belongs to Tasks 4.2-4.5, and will be carried out mainly under the responsibility of the individual, experienced Task Leaders.

8.6 Synergies with FP7/NCP-Projects

FFG provided a list of NCP-projects, with an overview of the activities of each project, and the website if available. Task Leaders will explore how they can make use of FP7-NCP-projects in order to enhance synergies with their respective target regions/s.

9 CONCLUSIONS

The meeting was carried out successfully. All main objectives were reached:

Partners agreed on the methodology for the review of NCP-structures and the final version of the interview guide. A coordinated approach towards the reports with recommendations for decision makers and the workshops has been agreed.

The basic concepts for the training workshops were presented. EU-Task Leaders took note of the comments of their EECA-colleagues and were able to finalise after the meeting their concepts for each EECA-region.

FFG gained the support of all Task Leaders for the Networking Sessions and received a mandate to contact the European Commission to find out if a networking session at NCP Coordinators meeting in Spring 2009 will be supported (done in the meantime, support from the EC obtained). A procedure was agreed which will help the Task Leaders of Task 4.1 to decide about the funding of travel costs of EECA-NCPs and NIPs (clarification of EECA-funding sources for attending NCP-meetings during the interviews).

Quality assurance measures were agreed for the review and the training. The preparation of the visits of EECA NCPs to EU-NCPs was postponed until the beginning of next year. DLR will host NIPs from Third Countries in the late autumn. The next steps will be taken after this experience and will build on it.

EECA and EU Task Leaders were provided with a list of FP7-NCP projects and CSA targeting the EECA countries. This will help everyone with identifying synergies with other projects/activities targeting the EECA region.

Partners discussed about the timetable for 4.2-4.5. The final timetables will be available at the end of November, in time for the annual report.

Cooperation among partners works well, the next steps will be done in line with the TA.
## 10 ANNEXES

### 10.1 Annex 1: List of EECA-Participants in the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>NCP</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Asia, N. Africa, Middle East</td>
<td>NCP for Food, Agriculture, Mobility, NFP, R&amp;D</td>
<td>Anto Mihalov</td>
<td>Director of the Centre for International Projects</td>
<td></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 Climatology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Science Research and Statistics</td>
<td>NCP for SSH</td>
<td>Sopasnikova Natalia</td>
<td>Senior Scientific Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. V. Zhukovsky Institute of Crystallography NAS</td>
<td>NCP for NMP</td>
<td>Marian Morkovskaya</td>
<td>Senior researcher, head of Laboratory of Crystallography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Technical University Moscow Institute of Steel and Alloys</td>
<td>NCP for Research Infrastructure</td>
<td>Tarasenko Viktor</td>
<td>Coordinator of NCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University Higher School of Economics</td>
<td>NCP for INCO</td>
<td>Goldberg Kaplan</td>
<td>Vice-President, Director of the National Centre for Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RostORME</td>
<td>NCP for Energy</td>
<td>Zourovitskaya</td>
<td>Project administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Operating Systems</td>
<td>NCP for ICT</td>
<td>Marinov Marinov</td>
<td>Head of International Cooperation Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly technological institute</td>
<td>NCP for Transport/Aerospace</td>
<td>Gudkov Andrei</td>
<td>Chief Contracts Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Assistance of Small Innovative Enterprises</td>
<td>NCP for SME</td>
<td>Olga Popova</td>
<td>Director of International Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Basic Medicine, Moscow State University</td>
<td>NCP for Health</td>
<td>Sema Tatarkova</td>
<td>Expert for International Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe/Baltic, Moldova, Ukraine</td>
<td>NCP for Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Olga Maslovskaya</td>
<td>Academic Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Genetics and Orontology, Belarus, Nat Acad Sciences</td>
<td>NCP for INCO</td>
<td>Anna Selikhatchianska</td>
<td>Leading researcher, Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>NCP for Science and Technology Park, MET/IT</td>
<td>Svetlana Yashina</td>
<td>NCP contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. V. Lutsko Heat and Mass Transfer Institute</td>
<td>NCP for NMP/Energy</td>
<td>Vitaly Bikiniak</td>
<td>Head of International Relations Dept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Biophysics and Cell Engineering</td>
<td>NCP for Health</td>
<td>Igor Volkov</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Sciences of Moldova</td>
<td>NCP for Health</td>
<td>Dr Mena Inoue</td>
<td>Consultant, NCP FPT manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Information Centre for Ukraine-EU S&amp;T Cooperation</td>
<td>NCP for Health</td>
<td>Klara Kolon</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus Region</td>
<td>NCP for Legal/Financial issues, SME, S&amp;T</td>
<td>Tigran</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Sciences of Armenia</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, INCO</td>
<td>Vahak Shukurov</td>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Information &amp; Automation Problems NAS RA</td>
<td>NCP for ICT, INCO</td>
<td>Levin Astanagian</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>NCP for NMP/Energy, NMP, Energy, EPP, People, CAPACITIES</td>
<td>Akhmedov Zagol</td>
<td>Head of Office of national Information Point of FP2 in Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George National Science Foundation</td>
<td>NCP for Health, Food, Agriculture, ICT, NMP, Energy</td>
<td>Martin Dedeic</td>
<td>Head of Office for International Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>NCP for Health, NMP</td>
<td>Kamila Magazieva</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Library of the Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>NCP for Health, NMP, Energy, NMP, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Bylybil Bakiev</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Development of Scientific Cooperation</td>
<td>NCP for Health, NMP, Energy, NMP, Mobility, Mobility, INCO</td>
<td>Nigor Miraev</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info-Union Centre for Promotion of S&amp;T cooperation</td>
<td>NCP for Cooperation, Health</td>
<td>Enrik Zakhidov</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2 Annex 2: Overview of Outcomes to the Survey among EECA NCPs

Annex 2: Summary of outcomes of the survey among EECA NCPs:

1. Russian Federation:
   - Governance structure: The governance structure in Russia is well established. The NCP-structure is rather decentralised. There is experience and continuity: Eight out of twelve NCPs worked already under FP6. All NCP but one (NCP for SME) receive national funding for their work. Many NCPs are located at non-governmental research institutes (6), while four NCPs are located at Higher Education Institutions. There are no state agencies.
   - The contracting body takes an active role, defines for (or in cooperation with) the majority of NCPs (seven out of twelve) annual work programmes, receives reports and monitors the work of the majority of NCPs through a committee (seven out of twelve). However, the governance structure is not fully coherent for all NCPs.
   - There is monitoring and evaluation experience: All NCPs but one monitor their own work and carry out self-assessments. Furthermore, five out of ten NCPs underwent an evaluation from outside (two NCPs didn’t reply to this question).
   - All NCPs but one plan to increase their outreach, to raise the number of individual consultancies as well as the number of researchers addressed by newsletters/events. Furthermore, the majority of Russian NCPs (eight out of twelve) indicated that the contracting body expects an increase regarding the number of successful researchers in FP7.
   - The importance of the Russian non-central regions is taken into account: Six out of twelve NCPs maintain a network of regional and/or sectoral multipliers. In four cases, these regional multipliers receive dedicated funding for their work.
   - NCP-Activities:
     - The majority of NCPs covers the full range of NCP-activities. The production of best practice examples/ success stories was the weakest point: Only five NCPs develop success stories. Eight NCPs out of twelve promote the programme to new actors, in particular SME.
     - All NCPs provide individual advice, the majority by all means (email, phone, face-to-face).
     - The majority of Russian NCPs deploys a wide portfolio of measures to assist researchers. The least frequent activities are Training sessions on proposal writing. Advice by a final proposal check and Assistance during the negotiation phase.
   - Training:
     - Training content: It is remarquable that there is a high interest in ETP, JTI’s and ERANET’s. Other priority topics of interest to Russian NCPs are all issues connected to the finances, IPR and issues related to the management of projects. Furthermore, the Assessment of project ideas, the Dissemination and exploitation of results and the Consortium Agreement are areas to be included into a training.
     - NCPs would like to send as a whole 40 persons to the training workshop of April 2009. This number exceeds the number of maximum participants for one training. It will be necessary to limit the number of participants.
     - Russian NCPs prefer a training targeting newcomers as well as advanced and experienced staff, although many of them are very experienced.
     - Sharing of experiences: Only six out of twelve NCPs are interested in a sharing of experiences. Proposed themes for a sharing of experiences are the planning of costs, in

1The NCP for ICT made no indication.
general experiences with FP7, as well as experiences with the production of best practise examples and the life cycle of a project.

**Networking**
- All NCPs attend meetings in Brussels. For one NCP the situation is unclear (illness?).
- The contact among Russian NCPs is well established, but for some NCPs there seems to be some room for improvement. Only two NCPs consider the contacts to EU-NCPs as well established, many NCPs see considerable room for improvement (seven out twelve).

**II. Eastern Europe**

**Ukraine:**
- **Governance structure:** The governance structure in Ukraine is well established. The NIP Ukraine, established as a state agency in 2003, offers experience and continuity since FP6. The state provides national funding for NIP since FP6. The contracting body takes an active role, defines the annual work programme, monitors the work of the NIP via a special committee and receives annual reports.
- There is a number of full-time employees, supported by part-time employees (which are employed on a free-lance basis?).
- NIP plans a considerable increase of outreach in FP7 (newsletters/events and increase of the number of individual consultancies). The contracting body also expects an increase of the number of successful Ukrainian researchers in FP7.
- NIP underwent an evaluation and carries out a self-assessment and monitoring of own activities.

**NCP-activities:**
- NIP deploys the full range of NCP-activities incl. the production of success stories/best practise examples and maintains a network of multipliers which receives dedicated funding for the work.
- NIP carries out individual advice and assistance of researchers with a wide range of measures. However, NIP doesn’t make final proposal checks and there is no assistance to researchers during the implementation of a project.

**Networking:**
- NIP is interested in a sharing of experiences. NIP attends NCP-meetings in Brussels on a regular basis.
- NIP maintains rather well established contacts to the other FP7-contacts points in Belarus and Moldova, but doesn’t have well established contacts with EU-NCPs.

**Belarus:**
- **Governance structure:** Most NCPs were established rather recently, at the beginning of FP7. There are eight NCP-organisations, and six of them replied to the questionnaire. There is no national funding for the NCP hosting organisations.
- The contracting body takes only with the NCP for NMP/Energy an active role and defines the annual implementation programme. All other NCPs define the annual work programme themselves. However, all but one NCP (SSH) report to the contracting body on an annual basis. Special committees monitor the work of four NCPs. The structure is not coherent for all NCPs.
- The network can benefit from an experienced NCP-coordinator, which is also NCP for INCO, ICT and Mobility and who has been working already under FP6.
- NCPs are for the majority located at non-governmental research institutes and higher education institutes.
- Staff resources are limited, there are very few full-time employees. Most of the employees work part-time and on a free-lance basis (apart from the coordinating NCP and the NCP for SME).
- The majority of Belarussian NCPs (four out of six) plans to increase the outreach of the NCP. The contracting body expects that the number of successful researchers increases under FP7 (apart from SSH).
- Three NCPs maintain a network of regional or sectoral multipliers, but there is no dedicated funding for their work.

**NCP-Activities:**
- While NCPs carry out a number of activities, they don’t cover the full range of NCP-activities. All Belarussian NCP disseminate up-to-date documentation, many organise infodays, while only three maintain a website, issue a newsletter, promote the programme to new actors or produce success stories.
- All NCPs provide individual advice by all means, apart from the NCP for SSH and Bio who don’t conduct face-to-face consultancy.
- Assistance to researchers: Some NCPs deploy the full range of NCP-measures to assist research (ICT/INCO/Mobility, SME), while others offer only a limited portfolio. It is remarkable that many offer trainings on PF7 and trainings on proposal writing (themselves or in cooperation with EU-partners?).

**Networking:**
- The majority of NCPs is interested in a sharing of experiences.
- Three Belarussian NCPs regularly attend NCP-meetings in Brussels. Four out of six can prefinance 60% of a journey to Brussels.
- Contacts among Belarussian NCPs can improve, the contacts with NCPs from the Ukraine and Moldova are considered by the majority as well or rather well established, while contacts with EU-NCPs are considered as rather not well established.

**Moldova:**
- **Governance structure:** The Moldovan FP7-Contact Point was established under FP6, but receives no national funding. The contracting body receives annual reports, but there is no special committee to monitor the work of the NCP.
- Staff resources are rather limited. The NCP plans to increase its outreach in FP7 (newsletter/events, individual consultancy) and has to this end defined specific objectives. The contracting body also expects the NCP to increase the number of successful researchers in FP7.
- Monitoring and evaluation: The NCP has been evaluated and carries out self-monitoring and assessment activities.

**NCP-activities:**
- The Moldovan NCP carries out the full range of NCP-activities, apart from issuing a newsletter.
- There is a network of multipliers, which receives no dedicated funding.
- The NCP for Moldova provides all types of individual consultancy and deploys the full range of NCP-measures to assist researchers.

**Networking:**
- The Moldovan NCP is interested in a sharing of experiences. Nobody attends NCP-meetings in Brussels. The NCP is able to prefinance a journey to Brussels.
- The Moldovan NCP maintains well established contacts with Ukraine and the Belarussian NCPs and rather well established contacts with EU-NCPs.
Training – Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova

Legal issues (Consortium Agreements and IPR) are the first priority for the training.
- Secondly, NCPs from this EECA-region are interested in ETP’s/ITI’s and ERANET’s, financial issues, how to assess a project idea, proposal writing and the dissemination of results.
- NCPs would like to send 31 persons to the training which can be considered as a large group. It may be necessary to limit the number of participants but this is up to the task leaders.

Caucasus region (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia):

Azerbaijan:

Governance structure: There are currently two NCP hosting organisations hosting the NCP for INCO (+ NCP-coordinator) and the NCP for ICT. The NCP for ICT was established in July 2008 (CORDIS Website)\(^3\).
- The NCP coordinator and NCP for INCO for Azerbaijan was established at the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan by decree during FP6. The reply of the NCP for ICT of Azerbaijan, located at the Baku Business Training Center, was not received.
- The NCP coordinator/NCP for INCO receives no national funding for the NCP-work. There is no full-time employed personnel. 2-3 persons work on a part-time basis.
- The NCP hosting organisation/NCP for INCO defines the annual implementation plan, but submits annual reports to the contracting body. There is no monitoring by any committee.
- The NCP coordinator estimates the target group of researchers with potential to succeed in FP7 to amount to appr. 20 000 researchers, of which the organisation reaches currently 11-20% with newsletters and events, and 6-10% with individual consultancy.
- The NCP defined objectives to increase the outreach and impact until the end of FP7. However, the contracting does not expect that the number of successful researchers from Azerbaijan increases until the end of FP7, as compared to FP6.
- Monitoring and evaluation: The NCP hosting organisation at the National Academy of Sciences was evaluated already by an external body. It carries out self-monitoring and assessment activities.

NCP-Activities:
- The NCP for INCO/NCP-coordinator carries out the full range of NCP-activities, including the production of best practise examples/success stories.
- A network of regional/sectoral multipliers is maintained, but receives no dedicated funding.
- The NCP for INCO/NCP-coordinator provides individual consultancy by all means and assists researchers with a wide portfolio of activities with the exception of Advice on how to deal with IRP and Assistance during the negotiation phase and during project implementation.
- The NCP for INCO/NCP coordinator carries out Training sessions on FP7 as well as Training sessions on proposal writing (with the support of EU-colleagues or by themselves?)

\(^3\) The NCP for ICT of Azerbaijan visited FP7 on 23 September 2008, as they were participating in the ICT-Ideal-ist project. They were invited, in agreement with the NCP-coordinator from Azerbaijan and Help-Forward, to participate in the activities of WP4. They were interested and agreed.
Networking:
The NCP for INCO/NCP coordinator made no indication regarding the interest in a sharing of experiences. The NCP doesn’t attend meetings in Brussels and is not able to prefinance a journey to Brussels by 60%. The NCP for INCO/NCP coordinator indicates to have well established contacts with colleagues in the EECA-region of the Caucasus Region, and to have rather well established contacts with EU-NCP-colleagues.

Armenia:

-Governance Structure: There are two NCP hosting organisations in Armenia, three NCPs replied to the questionnaire. Both are located a non-governmental research institutes, such as the National Academy of Sciences (NCP for Legal and Financial Issues, SME and SiS, NCP coordinator) and the Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems (NCP for INCO, ICT).

Both NCP hosting organisations were nominated by order of the Ministry.

The NCPs of Armenia are quite experienced: One was nominated under FP5 (NCP for ICT/INCO), one was nominated under FP6 (Legal and Financial Issues, SME, SiS). None of them receives national funding.

There is no personnel employed on a full-time basis. Both NCPs are working only part-time to carry out the NCP-work and have possibly also other, additional duties. However, they are employed on a fix basis.

-The NCP for INCO/ICT defines an annual implementation programme. None of the two NCPs reports to the contracting body, and there is no monitoring committee.

-Monitoring and evaluation: Both NCP hosting organisations were evaluated already. None of them carries out a self-monitoring and assessment of the own work, and they didn’t define specific objectives to increase their outreach and impact until the end of FP7. However, the contracting body expects from both NCP hosting organisations that they increase the number of successful researchers until the end of FP7, as compared to FP6.

NCP-Activities:
The NCP for Legal and Financial Issues, SME and SiS carries out the full range of NCP-activities. The NCP for INCO/ICT issues a newsletter, organises infodays and disseminates up-to-date information.

The NCP for Legal and Financial Issues, SME and SiS maintains no network of FP7-multipliers. The NCP for INCO/ICT maintains a network of multipliers, but they do not receive any dedicated funding for carrying out FP7-work.

Both NCPs provide individual advice by all means.

Assistance to researchers:
- The NCP for Legal and Financial Issues assists researchers with a wide range of activities, with the exception of Advice on EC-administrative procedures, Advice by final proposal check, and Assistance during the negotiation phase. Both NCPs carry out training sessions on FP7, but no training sessions on proposal writing.

Networking:
- None of the two NCPs is interested in a sharing of experiences. They don’t attend meetings in Brussels and have no means to prefinance a journey to Brussels by 60%. Both indicate to have well established contacts in the own country and EECA-region of the Caucasus Region. The NCP for INCO/ICT lacks well established contacts to EU-NCPs while the NCP for Legal and Financial Issues, SME, SiS indicates to have well established contacts to EU-colleagues.
**Georgia:**

**Governance Structure:** There are currently two NCP hosting organisations: The National Science Foundation of Georgia and the Ilia Chavchavadze State University\(^4\).

The National Science Foundation hosts the NCP-coordinator and the NCP for INCO.

The Ilia Chavchavadze State University hosts the NCP for ICT.

The reply of Ilia Chavchavadze State University, NCP for ICT is missing. The NCP

for INCO/NCP coordinator was established by order of the Ministry. The NCP

coordinator and NCP for INCO was established during FP6 and receives national

funding since FP7 started. The NCP hosting organisation defines the annual work

programme and submits quarterly reports to the contracting body. Furthermore, a final

report is required at the end of FP7. There is no other monitoring of the work of the

NCP hosting organisation by the contacting body.

-Staff resources: The NCP coordinator disposes of no full-time employee. But there is

a considerable number of employees working part-time on NCP-tasks (7-19).

-Monitoring and evaluation: The NCP hosting organisation (INCO) was evaluated

already. No specific self-monitoring is carried out. The reply of the NCP didn’t

indicate if the contracting body expects an increase of successful researchers from

Georgia in FP7.

- Target groups: The target group is estimated to 10 000 researchers, of which 21-30%

is reached with newsletters and events, and 11-20% with individual consultancy. The

NCP coordinator made no indication if the NCP hosting organisation defined

objectives to increase the outreach and impact until the end of FP7.

**NCP-Activities:**

-The NCP (INCO) maintains an FP7- website, organises infodays and disseminates

up-to-date information.

-There is a network of multipliers which receives no dedication funding.

-Individual advice is carried out by all means (email, phone, face-to-face).

-Assistance to researchers: A wide range of activities is deployed to assist researchers

although there is no advice on IPR, the CA and also no advice during the project

implementation.

- Training session on FP7: Training sessions on FP7 or proposal writing are not

offered by the NCP.

**Networking:**

The NCP coordinator is interested in a sharing of experiences. NCP-meetings are not

attended, and the NCP hosting organisation is not able to prefinance 60% of a journey

to Brussels.

The NCP coordinator made no indication regarding the contacts in the Caucasus

Region region, but indicates to have “rather well established” contacts to EU-NCPs.

**Training Content for the Caucasus Region:**

The first priority of NCPs from this region (4 out of 4); are the topics: How to assess a

project idea, Proposal Writing, followed by the following topics, selected by 3 out of 4

NCPs: The structure of FP7, Issues related to the evaluation and selection of

proposals, Rules of participation, planning of costs, CA, How to make a proposal

check, Dissemination of results,

The third priority – selected by 2 out of 4 NCPs – consists of Financials

statements/budget transfers and audits,

1 NCP out of 4 selected: IPR, Exploitation of results, Issues related to the management

of a project: The majority (4 out 4) has been working with FP6 already and has

\(^4\) More NCPs will be nominated in the near future. They will be included into the WP4-activities.
considerable experience, 3 out of 4 prefer a training for advanced level, while one prefers a training for newcomers AND advanced level
Target groups for the training: 12 persons so far (two replies missing)

Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan):

Governance structure: The network architecture in all Central Asian countries is centralised. There is only one NCP-organisation for each country.
Some NCP hosting organisations are very experienced (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan).
Only the NCP hosting organisation for Uzbekistan receives national funding.
-Half of the Central Asian NCP hosting organisations define the annual implementation programme themselves, for the others it is defined by the contracting body.
-The reporting structure is quite incoherent: The NCP for Kazakhstan submits no reports, while the NCPs for Uzbekistan and Tajikistan submit annual reports. The NCPs for Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan submit in addition final reports at the end of FP7.
Only in Tajikistan a special committee monitors the work of the NCP hosting organisation.
-The contracting bodies of the NCP hosting organisations in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan expect an increase of the number of successful researchers in FP7, as compared to FP6.
-All four NCP hosting organisations indicate that they carry out self-assessment and monitoring activities, three of them were also evaluated already: Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan.

NCP activities:
- The NCPs for Kazakhstan and Tajikistan carry out all “usual” NCP-activities. The NCP for Uzbekistan carries out many NCP-activities, with the exception of the production of success stories and the promotion of the programme to new actors like SME. The NCP for Kyrgyzstan issues a newsletter.
All four NCP hosting organisations maintain a network of multipliers, but only the network in Uzbekistan receives national funding.
- Individual advice: Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan provide individual advice by all means: per eMail, per phone and face-to-face. The NCP for Kyrgyzstan provides individual consultancy by email and phone. The NCP for Tajikistan provides individual advice only per email.
-Assistance to researchers: The NCPs for Kazakhstan and Tajikistan deploy the entire portfolio to assist researchers, incl. training sessions on FP7 and proposal writing. The NCP for Uzbekistan deploys also a wide range of activities to assist researchers. Activities in the field of legal and financial issues, IPR, CA are, for example, not carried out. The NCP for Kyrgyzstan deploys rather a limited selection of activities, there are, for example, no trainings for FP7 and proposal writing.

Training content for Central Asia:
- The majority (4 out of 4) of NCPs is interested in the following topics: The structure of FP7, Issues related to the management of a project, exploitation of results, rules of participation, CA
Secondly, a majority (3 out of 4) of NCPs is interested in the following topics: How to assess a project idea, Proposal writing, The life cycle of a project, Issues related to the evaluation and selection of proposals, Dissemination of results, Planning of costs in FP7, Financial statements/Budget transfers and audits, IPR
The majority (3 out of 4) of NCPs has been working with FP6 already. 3 out of 4 NCPs prefer a training for both target groups, newcomers and advanced level. 2 out of 4 NCPs have little experience with FP7. 2 out of 4 have considerable experience with FP7.

Target groups in numbers: 19

**Networking**

- All NCPs are interested in a sharing of experiences. Only the NCP of Kazakhstan attends NCP-meetings in Brussels. Two out of four NCPs are able to prefinance 60% of a journey to Brussels. The NCP of Kazakhstan considers that both, EU and EECA-contacts are well-established, while the NCPs for Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan believe that they are rather well established. The NCP for Tajikistan provided no reply to these two questions.
10.3 Annex 3: Agenda of the WS on 26/27 August

**Agenda**

**WP4, Task 4.1:**

Development of a concept for a training of 3 days for NCP/FP contact points in the EECA

**Date:** 26/27 August 2008

**Place:** Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG), European and International Programmes
Sensengasse 1
A-1090 Vienna, AUSTRIA

**Schedule:**

**26 August 2008**

- 11:00 Welcome, aims and intended results of the workshop
- 11:15 Sharing of experiences
- 13:00 Lunch
- 14:00 Exploration of best practise (methodologies, content)
- 17:00 EECA: Cultural patterns to be considered
- 18:30 End of the working day
- 19:30 Dinner

**27 August 2008**

- 09:00 Design of the training modules
- 13:00 Lunch
- 14:00 Design of training modules
  - Content required (presentations)
  - Preparation of the meeting on 11/12 September (to do's until)
- 17:00 End of the workshop

---

The INCONET EECA project is funded by the European Commission from FP7/INCO.
10.4 Annex 4: Agenda of the Expert Meeting

**Agenda**
WP4, Task 4.1: Expert Meeting

**Date:** 11/12 September 2008

**Place:** Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG), European and International Programmes Sensengasse 1 A-1090 Vienna, AUSTRIA

10 September 2008

- 18:00 Welcome reception by Sabine Herlitschka, Director of FFG/EIP Restaurant ROTH, Währingerstrasse 1, 1090 Wien Dinner at Restaurant ROTH

11 September 2008

- 09:30 Opening, aims and intended results of the meeting Ralf König, Petra Reiter, FFG
- 10:00 Methodological standard for the assessment of NCP-structures in the EECA Petra Reiter, FFG
- 10:30 Coffee break
- 11:00 Methodological standard for the assessment of NCP-structures in the EECA Petra Reiter, FFG
- 13:00 Lunch
- 14:30 Concept for the training workshops of 3 days: Introduction and specific concepts for each EECA-region Petra Reiter, FFG Karin Hjorth-Rybbe/ Bengt Nilsson/Monica Hjertman, VINNOVA Vassilis Tzakalos, HELP FORWARD
- 17:00 End of the meeting

12 September 2008

- 9:30 Concept for the networking with EU-NCP’s Petra Reiter, FFG

Consultation of EECA NCP’s by EU-NCP’s Brainstorming, Ralf König

The INCONET EECA project is funded by the European Commission from FP7/INCO.
Synergies with NCP-projects
Ralf König, FFG

- 11:00 Coffee break

- 11:30 Quality assurance and coordination of WP4
  Vadym Yashenkov, NIP Ukraine, Petra Reiter, FFG
  Sharing of activities and the timetable of their implementation of 4.2 - 4.5 until October 2009
  Vadym Yashenkov, NIP Ukraine, Petra Reiter, FFG

- 13:00 Farewell Lunch

The INCONET EECA project is funded by the European Commission from FP7/INCO.
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**IncoNet EECA**  
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<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>12.09.08</td>
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<td>Rybbe</td>
<td>VINNOVA</td>
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<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>12.09.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosteliska</td>
<td>Oxena</td>
<td>Kyiv State Centre for Scientific, Technical and Economic Information</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ic@lpd-nip.kiev.ua">ic@lpd-nip.kiev.ua</a></td>
<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>12.09.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magzieva</td>
<td>Kamila</td>
<td>hExCB-Kz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kamila.magzieva@gmail.com">kamila.magzieva@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>14.09.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilsson</td>
<td>Bengt</td>
<td>VINNOVA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bengt.nilsson@vinnova.se">bengt.nilsson@vinnova.se</a></td>
<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>12.09.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikalova</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Higher School of Economics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:apikalova@hsie.ru">apikalova@hsie.ru</a></td>
<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>12.09.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Cornelia</td>
<td>PT-DLR, EU Bureau of the BMF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cornelia.schneider@dlr.de">cornelia.schneider@dlr.de</a></td>
<td>09.09.08</td>
<td>12.09.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsakalos</td>
<td>Yassilios</td>
<td>HELP-FORWARD Network/ FORTH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vsak@help-forward.gr">vsak@help-forward.gr</a></td>
<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>12.09.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yashenkov</td>
<td>Vadym</td>
<td>Kyiv State Centre for Scientific, Technical and Economic Information</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fp@lpd-nip.kiev.ua">fp@lpd-nip.kiev.ua</a></td>
<td>10.09.08</td>
<td>14.09.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background/rationale for WP 6

In FP 6:
- INCO – 1864 Third Country Research teams / 166 projects
- 280 Mio EUR for integrating Third countries in core activities of FP 6 - only approx. 80 Mio EUR spent

In FP 7:
- Wide participation of Third Country/EECA teams possible and encouraged in the core activities of FP 7
- New orientation of the INCO programme, INTAS phased out
- Challenge: How to take advantage of the potential

Aims of the assessment

- 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.
- An assessment is an exercise
  - To identify potential for development
  - To describe and present the potential for development
  - To contribute in a positive way to the development itself

Purpose is NOT:
- To criticise
- To judge individuals

Methodological standard

- Survey
- Interviews
- Common structure for a report
- Quality Assurance

Outcomes of the survey

General information
More than 50% - had an evaluation by an external body

Nearly 90% of NCP organisations monitor their own performance/ work

The contracting body expects in 81.5% an increased performance for FP7

Nearly 80% of NCP organisations defined themselves objectives to increase their performance

Main features of the interview guide

- Chapter 1: The organisational framework
  - The basis to implement NCP activities
  - Human Resources

Purpose of this chapter:
- To understand the context of work of the NCP organisation and NCPs

Main features of the interview guide

- Chapter 2: Target groups
  - Who is your target group
  - How do you reach your target group

Purpose of this chapter:
- Awareness for definition of distinct target groups
- Insight into the balance between the different target groups
- Systematic approach to widen the target groups?
- Insight into cooperation structures to widen the target groups
- Monitoring of impact of own work
Main features of the interview guide

- Chapter 3: NCP activities
  - Information and awareness raising
  - Individual support
  - Assistance to researchers/ clients
  - Training

Purpose:
- Insight how NCP-activities are carried out
- What improvements is/are the interviewee/s thinking of

Main features of the interview guide

- Chapter 4: Networking/ Cross Linking
  - Networking with other NCP’s in your own country (if appropriate)
  - Networking with other European NCP’s
  - Contact with the European Commission

Purpose:
- Insight into the level of networking
- Informal networking versus formal/official cooperation
- Improvements which the interviewee/s is/are thinking of

Main features of the interview guide

- Chapter 5: Monitoring of success/ Self Monitoring

Purpose
- Insight into self-monitoring
- Level of satisfaction of interviewee/s with the state of the art
- Individual reflections

How to use the interview guide

- Build on the results of the survey
  - Interviewers have been provided with the detailed outcomes of the survey (reports for each EECA region)
- Build on the „Guiding Priorities for setting up NCP for IFP“
  - Taking the specific situation of Third countries into account
  - NCP-systems need capability to ensure
    - Competence in the different thematic areas
    - Coherence of approach
    - High level of services
- Quality Assurance - will follow tomorrow!

Contact:

Petra Reiter
FFG – Austrian Research Promotion Agency
European and International Programs (EIP)
Unit for International Cooperation and Mobility
Tel: +43 (0)5-7755-4605
E-Mail: petra.reiter@fg.at
http://nlp7.ffg.at
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Annex 7: Presentation: Training Concept for the EECA Region

**Introduction**

- Activities so far:
  - Survey among EECA NCP’s in June 2008
    - 27 out of 34 NCP organisations/NCP’s in the EECA participated
  - Workshop with Help-Forward, VINNOVA and FFG
    - 26/27 August 2008
    - Result forms the basis for the 3 training concepts
  - Three rough individual concepts for each EECA-region
    - Based on the results of the workshop
    - By Help-Forward, VINNOVA and FFG

Survey: A good participation among EECA NCP’s

- Russia: 16 NCP’s out of 12 participated - OK
- Ukraine, Moldova: both 2 NCP’s participated - OK
- Baltic states: 4 out of 8 NCP’s participated - OK
- Armenia: 3 NCP’s participated - OK
- Azerbaijan: 1 NCP participated, 1 new NCP for EU task force - OK
- Georgia: 1 NCP out of 2 participated - OK
- Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan: all 4 NCP’s participated - OK
- Turkmenistan: missing - OK

Overview of outcomes of the survey:

**TRAINING**

Details will be presented by the EU-Task Leaders of each EECA region

A mixed, but rather experienced target group

Trainings for newcomers AND advanced level
IncoNet EECA - 212226
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Size of some training groups maybe too large

Mixed attitudes towards a sharing of experiences

Overall conclusions
- Unequal, sometimes large target groups for the trainings
- Need to limit the number of participants
- Target groups not coherent
- Newcomers and many advanced persons
- Clear preferences regarding the content
- Planning of costs, financial statements, budget transfer and audits a priority for all
- ETP/JITs, ERANET’s a priority for Russian, Ukrainian, some Belorussian and the Moldovan BCP’s

Development of a rough training concept for all EECA regions
Due by 30 September 2008

Workshop with VINNOVA, HELP FORWARD and FFG
26/27 August
- All three partners
  - Considerable training experience (FFG-FPG)
  - Considerable experience with their respective target regions
- Joint development of a rough concept more appropriate

Workshop with VINNOVA, HELP FORWARD and FFG
26/27 August - Outcomes
- Outline of best practise - training
  - Tailored for the target group
  - Interactive, with practical exercises to deepen new knowledge
  - Practical knowledge which can be applied immediately after the training in daily life
  - Setting of priorities - „less is more”
  - Enough time for questions and enough breaks
  - To build redundancies enabling participants to grasp new knowledge
D4.3_Expert meeting on the methodology of analysis and training

Contact:

Petra Relar
FFG – Austrian Research Promotion Agency
European and International Programmes (EIP)
Unit for International Cooperation and Mobility
Tel: +43 (0) 699 7155-4505
E-Mail: petra.relar@fgg.at
http://www.ffg.at

Workshop with VINNOVA, HELP FORWARD and FFG
26/27 August - Outcomes

- Outline of best practice for presentations
  - Comprising only a small number of slides
  - Including practical examples from real life to illustrate content
  - Little information on one slide
  - Use of basic terms easy to remember
- Attention of audience often weakens after 20 minutes

Workshop with VINNOVA, HELP FORWARD and FFG
26/27 August - Outcomes

- What should participants take with them?
  - Knowledge to improve their everyday work
  - Practical materials like checklists, FAQs, practical examples, forms etc
  - Better networking with other NCP’s (ECCA+EU)
- How do we know if we achieved the results of the training?
  - Feedback
  - Atmosphere
  - Results of practical exercises
  - Number and type of questions

Workshop with VINNOVA, HELP FORWARD and FFG
26/27 August - Outcomes

Target groups
- Many of the participants experienced already several FFG trainings
- resp. will attend the InContact WS, Moscow, October 2006
- A more detailed definition of the target group (age, position, gender, background) will be possible after the interviews
- In most cases, participation supposed on a voluntary basis
- Maybe little familiarity with practical exercises
- Due to the size of groups, recommendation for NCP’s to send only staff which is directly related to NCP-work

Conclusion of the meeting on 26/27 August 2008

- No single common basic concept for all ECA regions
  - ECA-regions too diverse
- Individual rough concepts for each ECA-region instead
  - Each EU-Rank leader prepares a rough training concept for the present meeting
- As appropriate, these rough concepts will be adapted after the meeting and submitted to the Commission (30.09.2008)
- Later changes are possible
  - Results of the interviews
  - Other reasons (upon decision of resp. task leader)
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Training Concept for Central Asia

Bengt Nilsson
Bengt.Nilsson@VINNOVA.se

Training concept Central Asia

- Three training occasions are planned
  1. Kazakhstan
  2. Uzbekistan
  3. Kirgizstan / Tajikistan / Turkmenistan
- The trainings will occur in March and May 2009
- No NCP contact available yet in Turkmenistan

Training concept Central Asia

- The survey was answered by all CA countries except Turkmenistan
- The survey showed major different needs on Training Contents between the four different countries

Training concept Central Asia

- Kazakhstan
  - Has requested all the proposed training topics
- Uzbekistan
  - Has requested "most" of the proposed training topics
  - Excluded topics are:
    - "The political background for FP7 and the ERA"
    - "ETP's, JTIs, ERANETS"

Strategy for the training concept

- At a first glance: Since there will be three different training occasions we need to make three different training packages.

  BUT

  at a second glance:
Strategy for the training concept

Kazakhstan: Requested all topics
Uzbekistan: Requested almost all topics
Tajikistan: Requested topics of step 1, 2 and 3
Kyrgyzstan: Requested very few of the topics.

Since this is one training occasion we need to adapt the biggest need. Furthermore, we have assessed the need for Kazakhstan.

Conclusion and way forward
All the three training occasions require all or almost all of the topics prepared on the survey. For purpose to make one training package to be used in all three occasions. As a supplement we plan to send this proposal for a final review in the respective countries.

Training concept, things to take into account
- The number of attendees for the three training occasions according to the survey:
  1. Kazakhstan: 10
  2. Uzbekistan: 5
  3. Kyrgyzstan: 3, Tajikistan: 3, Turkmenistan: 1, Total: 6 (+1)
- From experience we know that the trainings will be attended by more persons than initially announced. E.g. head of universities and other persons high up in the administration.
- We need to be prepared for locations taking more persons than announced and also to be prepared for a wider range of presentation material.
- In many cases there is a need for an interpreter.

Training agenda day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:05</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training agenda day 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:05</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training agenda day 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:05</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Presentation of methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background material from survey
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**AIMS**
- As defined in INCO-Net workshop:
  - to deepen existing knowledge about and understanding of FP7
  - to provide participants with practical knowledge which they can apply immediately
  - to raise their capacity to consult clients
  - to raise the awareness how NCP’s can improve aspects of their work
  - to raise the interest in certain aspects of their work

**FACTS**
- Armenia:
  - The NCP’s of Armenia are quite experienced: one was nominated under FP5 (NCP for ICT/INCO), one was nominated under FP6 (Legal and Financial Issues, SME, SE), none of them received national funding
  - There is no personnel employed on a full-time basis
  - Both NCP’s provide individual advice by all means
- Georgia:
  - The NCP coordinator dispenses no full-time employee
  - Training assistance on FP7 or proposal writing are not offered by the NCP
  - The NCP coordinator is interested in a sharing of experiences
- Azerbaijan:
  - The NCP coordinator for INCO receives no national funding for the NCP-activities. There is no full-time employed personnel.
  - The NCP for INCO/NCP coordinator carries out the full range of NCP activities, including the production of best practice examples/success stories.
  - The NCP for INCO/NCP coordinator provides individual consultancy by all means with the exception of advice on how to deal with IPR and assistance during the negotiation phase and during project implementation.
- Ukraine:
  - NR shows the full range of NCP activities.
  - NCP does not make final proposal checks and there is no assistance to researchers during the implementation of a project.

**TIME - PLACE**
- Ukraine – Belarus – Moldova:
  - Minsk, Belarus, May 2009
  - 11 participants: Ukraine 5, Belarus 10, Moldova 10
- Armenia – Georgia – Azerbaijan:
  - Tbilisi, Georgia, May 2008
  - 12 participants: Azerbaijan 3, Armenia 6, Georgia 3
IncoNet EECA - 212226
07/11/2008

**TRAINING NEEDS**

- Ukraine – Belarus – Moldova
  1. Legal issues (Consortium Agreements and IPR)
  2. ETPs/ITPs and ERANET’s, Financial issues, how to assess a project idea, proposal writing and dissemination of results
- Armenia – Georgia – Azerbaijan
  1. Proposal writing
  2. Evaluation of proposals, Structure of FP7, Rules of participation, Financial issues, Consortium agreement, Dissemination of results
  3. IPR, project management

**CONCEPT**

- 1 day basic training + 2 days advanced training
- 3 full days
- 1 training package structured according to the needs of the 6 countries
- Topics covering many aspects serving as “shop-list”
- Selection of training topics and finalisation of agendas after interviews and communication with local NTPs

**Features of training:**

- Basic knowledge of FP / NCP
- Advanced knowledge of FP / NCP
- Real case studies
- Practical exercises
- Interaction and active participation of the audience
- Feedback and evaluation by the participants

**TRAINING CONTENT – DAY 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>11:45</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12:14 | 12:45 | Introduction to the training and participants: project objectives, benefits, methodology, structure and activities
| 13:00 | 13:55 | Project management: definitions, objectives and processes
| 13:55 | 14:45 | Information management: tools and methods
| 14:45 | 15:30 | Lunch break

**TRAINING CONTENT – DAY 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>15:45</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15:45 | 16:30 | Information and Communication techniques (part 1)
| 15:40 | 16:30 | Organization of ICT events (part 1)
| 15:10 | 16:00 | Practising an RIA event
| 15:45 | 16:30 | Organization of ICT events (part 2)
| 15:45 | 16:30 | Opening
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**Topics: The Structure of FP7: A strong interest in ETP’s, JIF’s and ERANET’s**

**Proposal preparation: Assessment of a project idea, Evaluation/selection of proposals**

**Project management an important topic**

**Legal and financial issues an important topic**
Summary of preferences of RU NCP’s:

**Priority 1 (9 out of 10 NCP’s):**
- Planning of costs in FP7
- Financial statements/budget transfers and audits
- IPR
- FTP, JIP, TRAINEE

**Priority 2 (8 out of 10 NCP’s):**
- Issues related to the project management,
- How to assess a project idea,
- Dissemination/exploitation of results, CA
- Evaluation and selection of proposals

**Target group: Many experienced NCP organisations**

**Target group: Newcomer and advanced**

**Summary of the survey:**

- Target group not coherent
  - newcomers and advanced level
  - rather experienced and well established
- Clear preferences regarding the content
  - Need to set priorities
- Quite larger size of the target group for the training
  - 12 to 36/37 so far (2 replies missing)
  - limitation of the number of participants?

**Day 1: Introduction and Project Management**

- Introductions, Russia in view of the association to FP7
- Tasks and skills of NCP’s required for the life cycle of an FP7 project
  - Basic documents and electronic tools for NCP’s
  - How to keep up-to-date
- Understanding the political context of FP7
  - Exercise: Screening of project ideas, finding of appropriate programmes and calls, link to evaluation and selection criteria
- Project Management (Afternoon session)
  - Proposal writing (Pre, during, exercise on time management)
  - Project implementation (tasks of CO/P, reporting, controlling)
Day 1: Alternative afternoon session

- How to assess a project idea
  - Which questions to ask
- Consortium building
  - Most suitable partners and how to support researchers with finding them
- How to assess the impact of a project
  - Presentation, Exercise, Plenary

Day 2: Financial Issues

- Planning of costs in FP:
  - Presentation, discussion, exercise in small groups, plenary
- Managing costs in FP:
  - Presentation: Pre-financing, interest rates and the Guarantee fund
- Audits in FP:
  - Presentation, exercise in small groups, plenary

Day 3: Legal Issues, evaluation/selection of proposals

- Dissemination and exploitation of results
  - Difference, link to CA, IPR
- Practical examples and exercise
- Discussion of blocks of a CA
- Evaluation and selection of proposals (afternoon)
  - Presentation, Exercise, Plenary

Day 3: Alternative afternoon sessions

OR
- EIP’s and ERANET’s
  - Practical examples with relevance for Russia, Q&A session
OR
- Individual consultancy
  - Sharing of experiences, parameters for good practice

A rather interactive approach:

Methodology:
- 2 max. 3 key lectures per day
- Many small working groups (2, 3 persons)
- Practical exercises
- Q&A sessions, discussions and sharing of experiences an important element
- Size of the group needs to be limited (20)
- Choice of final agenda in agreement with Russian BCP’s
- Attendance of the InContact Workshop – a precondition for participation

Contact:

Petra Reiter
FFG – Austrian Research Promotion Agency
European and International Programmes (EIP)
Unit for International Cooperation and Mobility
Tel.: +43/(0)5-7755-4605
E-Mail: petra.reiter@fg.at
http://r2.ffg.at
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**INCONET EECA**
**WP4: Supporting NCP/FP-Contact Points in the EECA countries**
**Concept for the networking**
Vienna, 12 September 2008

Petra Reiter
FFG – Österreichische Forschungsfinanzierungs-Gesellschaft, Bereich Europäische und Internationale Programme (BIP)

**Networking:** 44% of EECA NCP’s lack well established contacts to EU-NCP’s

**Attendance of NCP-meetings:** 50% attend

**Aims of the networking:**
- To raise the awareness of EU-NCP’s for their EECA colleagues and the potential for cooperation
- To increase the visibility of EECA NCP’s
- To support individual contacts
- To enable EECA NCP’s so far not attending meetings in Brussels to attend

**Proposed Activities**
- To organise Special Sessions of approx. 1 hour during NCP-meetings
  - To offer EECA NCP’s the opportunity to present themselves and their countries
- To organise after these Special Sessions a reception linked to a small socialising and networking
  - Promotion of EECA countries
  - Sharing of experiences between EU and EECA countries
**Approximate Timetable**

- Spring 2009 – Meeting of NCP-coordinators
- Autumn 2009 – Meeting of NCP’s for Energy
- Spring 2010 – Meeting of NCPs for ICT
- Autumn 2010 – Meeting for NCPs for Mobility
- If possible (depends on remaining funds)
  - Spring 2011 – Meeting of NCP’s for Bio, Food and Agriculture

**Costs and funding available**

- FFG – approx. 50,000€ for this task (Task 4.1.2)
- FFG will cover travel and accommodation costs
  - Flight costs – prefinancing of 50% of costs
  - Reimbursement of remaining costs only on the basis of original receipts (or certified copies)
  - FFG books hotel rooms in Brussels and pays the rooms directly

**Open questions**

Do we agree that those NCP’s should receive this funding which do not currently have any national funding?

**Next Steps:**

- Clarifying if our proposal is supported by the Commission
  - Will be done by our NCP-coordinator
- If yes, detailed planning will start
- Planning for the 2nd meeting in Autumn 2009 will start in Spring 2009

**Contact:**

Petra Reiter
FFF – Austrian Research Promotion Agency
European and International Programmes (EIP)
Unit for International Cooperation and Mobility
Tel: +43-(0)5-7755-4405
E-Mail: petra.reiter@fgf.at
http://pp7.fgg.at
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Consultancy for EECA NCPs

Continuous advice/support service
- any FPP topic
  - thematic expertise already available in EU Project Partner NCP?
  - EU/NCEC NCP balance?
- any time (on demand)
  - permanent availability and time responsiveness?
- any EECA NCP vs. EU Project Partner NCP
  - how is coordinating structured?
- Communication on instruments
  - Email, phone, videoconference, chat room on project website, meetings
- Best practices examples
  - NTM information or other FPP support actions?
  - others?

Consultancy for EECA NCPs

Structured advice/support service
- Communication instruments
  - Email, phone, videoconference, chat room on project website?
- Publication of information on project website
  - EU Project NCP meetings, EU/NCEC NCP partner meetings?
- EU/NCEC NCP Project Partner NCP
  - development of general EC reporting template?
  - development of a national EC reporting template?
- Monthly or bi-monthly coordination
  - regular coordination on legal and financial FPP issues?
- Any EU Project NCP to EU Project Partner NCPs
  - main EU Project NCP as gateway to EU Project Partner NCPs?
  - EU/NCEC NCP as gateway to EECA NCPs?
  - EECA regions differ from Russian?
- Structured coordination
  - regular country specific?
  - regular country specific?

Ralf König

FFG – Austrian Research Promotion Agency
Division European and International Programmes (EIP)

Tel.: +43 (0) 7355 4601
Fax: +43 (0) 7355 94600
Email: ralf.koenig@ffg.at
http://rp7.ffg.at
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Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects

**Why?**
- Access to European-wide networks
- Access to information and know-how exchange
- Access to thematic experts
- Access to EU NCP colleagues
- Access to project ideas and potential project partners
- Access to training measures and information days
- Access to brokerage events
- Access to partner search databases

**Who?**
- ECA NCP project partner
- ECA NCPs
- EEC NCPs
- IFP NCPs
- EEC A researcher

**How?**
- Direct contact to EU NCPs involved in NCP projects
- Direct contact to EU NCPs involved in EC projects
- Contact EC thematic NCP correspondents
- Pro-active and/or need-driven
- Organizer of local or regional events

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects

**Why?**
- Opportunity (need) for partner search (activity)
- Opportunity for dissemination of country-specific information on the project.
- Opportunity for dissemination of visibility of project.
- Opportunity for dissemination of project.
- Opportunity for dissemination of project.
- Opportunity to learn from the best or most appropriate NCP organisations.
- Opportunity to share (infield, personnel) information and results.
- Opportunity for face-to-face contacts on projects.
- Opportunity to create own need-driven institutional and personal network.

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects

**How?**
- Search for future NCP projects
- Participant in brokerage or partnering events
- Participant in information days
- Participation in EU NCP meetings
- Search for appropriate workshops and events (if possible).
- Contact EU thematic NCP correspondents
- Pro-active and/or need-driven
- Organizer of local or regional events
Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects
When?
- current NCP projects
- as beneficiary of new project partners
- as beneficiary of funding project activities
- future NCP projects
- as potential project partner
- check thematic WorkProgrammes
- general or specific need-driven
- if essential for carrying NCP work
- if resources available
- if improvement of NCP work and activities

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects
Where?
- Health
  - Project acronym: HEALTH NCP NET
  - Project title: Coordination Action for Reinforcing the Health National Contact Points Network
  - Project coordinator: Institute of Health Carlos III, Spain
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information in Annex
  - Project start: 01.06.2005
  - Project end: 31.04.2012
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: http://healthnet.net/healthnet.es

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects
Where?
- Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Biotechnology
  - Project acronym: BIO-NET
  - Project title: A Network of National Contact Points providing cutting-edge NCP services to the Knowledge-Based Bio-Economy research community
  - Project coordinator: CenterNovem, Netherlands
  - Project type: CSACA (Supporting)
  - Project information in Annex
  - Project start: 01.09.2008
  - Project end: 31.08.2012
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: www.csc-bio-net

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects
Where?
- Information & communication technologies
  - Project acronym: Idealo2011
  - Project title: Reinforcing the network of National Contact Points (NCP) for ICT under FP7, by promoting further trans-national cooperation within this network
  - Project coordinator: DLR, Germany
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information in Annex
  - Project start: 01.10.2008
  - Project end: 30.09.2011
  - Project status: contract negotiations
  - Project website: http://www.idealo-ict.net

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects
Where?
- Nanoscience, nanotechnologies, materials & new production technologies
  - Project acronym: N2M Team
  - Project title: HELP-FORWARD, Greece
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information in Annex
  - Project start: 01.09.2009
  - Project end: 31.08.2010
  - Project status: in preparation
  - Project website:
Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects

> Energy
  - Project acronym: C-ENERGY
  - Project title: Connecting Energy NCPs under the Energy Theme
  - Project coordinator: APRE, Italy
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information/abstract: see ANNEX
  - Project start: end 2008
  - Project end: end 2008
  - Project status: contract negotiations
  - Project website:

> Environment (Including Climate Change)
  - Project acronym: ENH-TOGETHER
  - Project title: Environment NCPs cooperating to improve their effectiveness
  - Project coordinator: Autoritare Naionale per Corrente Sostenibile, Romania
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information/abstract: see ANNEX
  - Project start: end 2008
  - Project end: end 2013
  - Project status: contract negotiations
  - Project website:

> Transport (Including aeronautics)
  - Project acronym: ETNA
  - Project title: European Transport NCP Alliance
  - Project coordinator: TÜV Rheinland Consulting GmbH, Germany
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information/abstract: see ANNEX
  - Project start: 31.03.2011
  - Project end: 31.03.2011
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: in preparation

> Socio-economic Sciences and the Humanities
  - Project acronym: META-SOCITY
  - Project title: Trans-national co-operation among National Contact Points for Socio-economic sciences and the Humanities
  - Project coordinators: DLR - Deutsches Zentrum für Luft und Raumfahrt, Germany
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information/abstract: see ANNEX
  - Project start: 01.02.2008
  - Project end: 30.01.2011
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: www.meta-society.eu

> Space
  - Project acronym: COSMOS
  - Project title: Cooperation of Space NCPs on a means to Optimize Services
  - Project coordinator: Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DLR), Germany
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information/abstract: see ANNEX
  - Project start: 01.06.2008
  - Project end: 31.05.2011
  - Project status: running
  - Project website:

> Security
  - Project acronym: SEREN
  - Project title: Secure Research NCP network - phase I
  - Project coordinator: Commissariat à l’Energie Atomique, France
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information/abstract: see ANNEX
  - Project start: 01.02.2008
  - Project end: 31.07.2009
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: www.seren-project.eu
Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects

Where?

- IDEAS (for the time being no NCP project)
  - Project acronym: EeNoNoNCP
  - Project title: European Research Infrastructures Network of National Contact Points
  - Project coordinator: National Documentation Centre (EKT)/NRIF, Greece
  - Project type: CSAC (Coordinating)
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: http://www.eenoconc.org

- RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURES
  - Project acronym: EuroBioNet
  - Project title: European Research Infrastructures Network of National Contact Points
  - Project coordinator: National Documentation Centre (EKT)/NRIF, Greece
  - Project type: CSAC (Coordinating)
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: http://www.eurobionet.org

- REGIONS OF KNOWLEDGE
  - Project acronym: TRANS REG NCP
  - Project title: Trans-national co-operation of NCPs Regional
  - Project coordinator: Instytut Podstawowych Problematy
  - Project type: CSAC (Coordination)
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: www.transregncp.eu

- PEOPLE
  - Project acronym: PeopleNetwork
  - Project title: Trans-national co-operation among National Contact Points for Marie Curie Actions (RUP NCPs)
  - Project coordinator: MATIMOP-GERD (ISERD), Israel
  - Project type: CSAC (Coordinating)
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: http://www.pplenet.org

- RESEARCH FOR THE BENEFIT OF SMEs
  - Project acronym: Trans4SME
  - Project title: Transnational Co-operation of the network of NCPs
  - Project coordinator: Zielt, Germany
  - Project type: CSAC (Supporting)
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: http://www.trans4sme.org

- RESEARCH POTENTIAL OF CONVERGENCE REGIONS
  - Project acronym: Re-PotNet
  - Project title: Trans-national co-operation among Research Potential NCPs
  - Project coordinator: National Documentation Centre (EKT)/NRIF, Greece
  - Project type: CSAC (Coordinating)
  - Project status: running
  - Project website: www.repotnet.org
Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects
Where?

- Science in society
  - Project acronym: EUROSIS
  - Project title: Euroscience Small Branch, Greece
  - Project coordinator: EuroScience Small Branch, Greece
  - Project type: CSACA (Coordinating)
  - Project information on Annex
    - See ANNEX
  - Project start: 01.08.2008
  - Project end: 31.01.2010
  - Project status: running
  - Project website:
    http://www.eurosis.org

- International cooperation
  - Project acronym: INCONTACT
  - Project title: Trans-national co-operation among NCPs for International Cooperation
  - Project coordinator: Help-Forward-FORTH, Greece
  - Project type: CSACA (Supporting)
  - Project information on Annex
    - See ANNEX
  - Project start: 01.01.2008
  - Project status: running
  - Project website:
    http://www.incontact.org

- projects targeting Eastern European and Central Asian countries
  - http://www.inco-eeca.net/projects/eastern_europe.pdf

- ActionPlan-BS
  - http://www.actionplan-bs.org

- ADAGIO
  - http://www.adagio-net.org

- ASCABOS
  - http://www.ascabos-europe.org

- BONUS
  - http://www.bonus-project.org

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects
Where?

- BSI
  - http://www.bsi-eeca.org

- BS-RESPOT
  - http://www.bs-repot.org

- CREATION
  - http://www.creational-eeca.org

- ERANIS FP6 project
  - http://www.eranis.org

- EuropeAid
  - http://www.europeaid.org

- Global SSH
  - http://www.bsh-network.org

- Ideal-ist
  - http://www.ideal-ist.org

- INCOMAT
  - http://www.incomat.org
Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects

**Where to?**

- **INCONTACT**

- **INJOY AND TRAIN**
  [http://www.fp7-duk.net/en/](http://www.fp7-duk.net/en/)

- **NET4SOCIETY**
  [http://www.net4society.eu](http://www.net4society.eu)

- **NSI-NEST**
  [http://www.neat.es](http://www.neat.es)

---

Synergies with FP7 NCP Projects

**Where to?**

- **RECAST (IST)**
  [http://www.recast.org](http://www.recast.org)

- **RegionERA**
  [http://www.regionera.org](http://www.regionera.org)

- **RUSERA**
  [http://www.rusera.org](http://www.rusera.org)

---

**Ralf König**

FFG — Austrian Research Promotion Agency
Division European and International Programmes (EIP)

Tel.: +43 (0) 7755 4601
Fax: +43 (0) 7755 944200
Email: ralf.koenig@ffg.at
http://ip7.ffg.at
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Updated version, FFG, 29 September 2008

Results of the expert meeting:
Task 4.1.c, 11/12 September 2008

• Target group of WP4-activities

What to do with those who didn’t reply so far, in spite of several requests to complete the survey?
  ⇒ Russia: The NCP for SME will be contacted one final time, as there have been changes of responsibilities. The NCP for Health received a letter from the Russian NCP-coordinator, has been contacted several times and there was no reaction so far. It was therefore agreed with Anna Pikalova, HSE that she would only focus on the NCP for SME and contact them one final time.
  ⇒ The NCP for Health is welcome to participate at any later moment, but will not be contacted and invited anymore.
  ⇒ Belarus: The missing two NCPs will not be contacted anymore.
  ⇒ Azerbaijan: There is officially only one NCP. The NCP for ICT is not involved. However, if they want, they can participate (Update from 23 September 2008: They will participate).
  ⇒ Georgia: There is one general NCP and an NCP for ICT (the latter didn’t participate so far) Update from 29 September 2008: More NCPs will possibly be nominated in the upcoming months. All, incl. the NCP for ICT, will be contacted by the Task leaders of 4.4 and invited to participate.
  ⇒ Turkmenistan: A new NCP has been nominated, will complete the survey (Kamila is seeing to it) and participate in WP4.

Who should be considered as an "NCP"?
The basis for our work is the NCP-Guidelines published by the EC. Task leaders agreed also that the publication of an organisation/ person as NCP on CORDIS qualifies this organisation/person for an interview (and inclusion in all other activities of WP4).
Furthermore, the NCPs who participated in the survey should normally be considered for our work.
However, based on the insight into specific countries, it remains the responsibility of the NCP-coordinator to decide which NCP-organisation from the respective country should be considered for WP4. This should be clarified before the interviews are starting.
We attach for your information a list of those NCPs who participated in the survey so far.
We propose that task leaders clarify – if this is required to their opinion - with the NCP-coordinators in each country if those included in the list are the correct target groups for our work.
Updated version, FF6, 29 September 2008

- **Interview Guide**
  
  **D4.1 due by end of September**
  
  **Responsible partner: FF6**

  **Modification of the interview guide**
  
  Comments of partners were integrated, such as:
  
  - What are other programmes your NCP-hosting organisation is dealing with? (p.1)
  - Target Groups: FP7 multipliers were added as a target group (p.4)
  - Target Groups: *If appropriate* added to “Coordinators of proposals” (p.4)
  - NCP activities: “Other issues” was added (p.8)

  **Target group for the Interview**
  
  It was agreed that the crucial target group of the Guide is NCPs. If interviewers/task leaders feel that in addition someone else, e.g. the director/head of an NCP hosting organisation, should be involved into the interview, it is up to them to proceed in this way.

  It has been agreed that, based on their expertise, task leaders/interviewers may modify the guide and leave some questions out. However, it was stated that the nature of the guide should not be changed. A flexible approach has been agreed, about 90% of the questions should remain part of the interview.

  The aim of the interviews is to focus on the NCP-structure/system. During the interviews, task leaders expect a clarification of the definition of “NCP” for each EECA-country. In any case, the definition of the European Commission serves as reference.

- **Training**
  
  **D4.2 Core curriculum for the 3-days basic training for EECA NCPs/NIPs due by end of September**
  
  **Responsible partner: FF6**

  Many NCPs wanted to have a training for newcomers and advanced level. However, the task leaders decided together that absolute newcomers should be trained mainly by their own NCPs.

  The training will thus focus on an advanced level, by including also newcomers.

  It was reaffirmed that the training workshops will build in particular on the InContact Workshop, Moscow, 15-17 October 2009. So far, it seems that NCPs from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan as well as Azerbaijan and Armenia will attend. The Russian NCPs will also attend. Svetlana will be contacted for the list of participants so that we can know who of our target group NCPs will definitely attend. You will receive the list as soon as we have it.

  Many NCPs in Russia and Ukraine selected ETP’s and ERANET’s as topics for a training. There seems to be a lot of discussion about this, and at the same time people lack information about the concrete rules for these two activities.

  The funding for participants in the trainings seems rather small, about 8,500,-€ for each WS apart from Russia. This will limit the number of participants. George Bonas may be contacted by the WP leader and Co-leader and the situation clarified, if both believe this is necessary for the full understanding of the budgetary situation.
Updated version, FF6, 29 September 2008

**Training concept Central Asia – VINNOVA**

Many topics will be covered. There will be one package for all countries which will be adapted to the needs of the individual countries. Two trainings are foreseen in March 2009, one in Kazakhstan, one in Uzbekistan and another training is foreseen for May 2009 in Kyrgyzstan, with the attendance of NCPs from Tajikistan and Turkmenistan.

20 participants for all three workshops are expected by VINNOVA. However, participants which are not registered may always show up.

**Update from 29 September**: A revised version was sent by VINNOVA.

**Training Concept EE and Caucasus Region – Help-Forward**

The first day – dedicated to office running, day 2 to proposal drafting, submission and evaluation, Vadym Yashenkov prefers even more training on financial and legal issues instead of NCP operation issues of Day 1. NIP receives many questions in the area of legal/financial issues and would appreciate theory and exercises on this topic, e.g. how to calculate person months, how to report etc. However, Siyavush is quite happy with the current concept for the Caucasus Region.

**Update from 29 September**: A revised version for EE was sent by Help-Forward.

**Training Concept Russia – FF6**

The training concept for Russia was presented, with several options. Anna suggested to invite a Russian auditor to the training and to include the topic evaluation/selection of proposals instead of other topics like project management, consortium building or individual consultancy.

In the autumn, each thematic NCP of Russia has to organise one FP7-workshop after request of the Ministry. NCPs will therefore have another opportunity to gain and deepen their knowledge about FP7, apart from the InContact WS. This means that the training of FF6 can indeed focus on a rather advanced level.

After the meeting, a final version of the training concept has been developed together with Anna P./HSE (see attachment).

The training in Russia is envisaged for the beginning of May (6-8) 2008.

**Joint materials?**

The issue was raised by VINNOVA if EU-task leaders should create synergies regarding presentations on similar topics as the basic theoretical materials are the same for all. FF6 believes that the methodology of transmission of the knowledge about basic topics may differ, which makes it hard to use similar presentations.

EU-task leaders will look into this issue again when preparing the trainings in detail. If there is a meeting of all IncoNet EECA-partners in January 2009, partners could meet for ½ day before or after the meeting to address this issue.

EECA task leaders underlined the importance of the explanations given to theoretical presentations. These explanations are considered as decisive for the understanding of content. However, the explanations are based on the practical experience of presenters and may not be exactly the same for all trainers. It will be hard to share them in a structured way.

A template for presenting the IncoNet EECA will be prepared by FF6 (1, max. 2 slides).

- **Networking**

**D4.6 Annual report about networking, due by October 2008**

**Responsible partner: FF6**

All task leaders agree to the proposal to organise special sessions (as part of regular NCP-meetings) and an exhibition/networking reception afterwards.
Updated version, FFG, 29 September 2008

Thematic areas of special sessions:

Task leaders agreed that the first "Special Session" shall be organised at the meeting of NCP-coordinators in Spring 2009. At this meeting, NCP-coordinators from EECA countries will decide which meeting/s of thematic NCPs should be selected then for another "Special session". Countries have different priorities, eg Kazakhstan – Health, Russia NMP. But in any case, EECA NCPs need to make a compromise and select the next thematic area/s.

Update from 29 September:
- Further topics will be discussed with EECA NCP-coordinators at the InContact WS in Moskau.

Content of Special Sessions:
EECA NCPs will present the RTD potential of their countries and their resp. NCP-system. We propose that NCPs prepare each one slide and have a maximum of 3 minutes to present themselves, their NCP-system and plans for FP7 and an URL where to find more information. We suggest that afterwards, we invite all EU-NCPs to visit the hall in front of the meeting room where EECA NCPs will have flyers, posters, infomaterials on their resp. country, inventories of RTD organisations etc and perhaps some typical, appealing products (eg sweets) from their countries. To this end, 11 tables will be made available. EECA NCPs will receive info on this at the InContact WS in Moscow.

FFG will contact the European Commission services and clarify if they accept the participation of all EECA NCPs in the upcoming NCP-coordinators meeting. It needs also to be clarified who officially invites the EECA-NCP (the Commission?). As soon as there are news, we update you.

Update from 29 September:
- We contacted the Commission services regarding the first Special Session to be organised during the meeting of NCP-coordinators in Spring 2009. The response so far is, that the Commission proposes to organise such a special session at the occasion of a NCP-coordinators meeting, but not as part of the official agenda of the Commission. It may take place after the official meeting. However, it depends on the duration of the official agenda if this is feasible.

Ralf König will go to the next meeting of NCP-coordinators which will take place in Paris this week and clarify the situation with Alan Cross, the responsible liaison person in the Commission. We will update you, as soon as we know more.

Update from 22 October 2008:

FFG agreed with the European Commission that a slot of 30 minutes will be foreseen for presenting the EECA NCPs at the NCP-coordinators meeting in Spring 2009. At the same time, a small exhibition will be organised near to the meeting room of NCPs, where EU and EECA NCPs/NIPs can meet during breaks.

Financing of costs:

During the interviews, task leaders will clarify how NCPs who already participate in NCP-meetings finance their participation. Normally, the funds available from the IncoNet EECA project shall be used primarily for those EECA NCPs who currently have no funds at all to attend meetings in Brussels. It is not foreseen to replace by EU-funds any national funding source already made available for ensuring the attendance of an EECA-NCP in meetings in Brussels. The overall aim of the project is to encourage in the mid-term a financing of the attendance of EECA NCPs in meetings in Brussels by national EECA-authorities.

FFG will only cover flight costs and directly book rooms and pay hotel costs in Brussels.

The more NCPs have to be funded, the less meetings can be financed, obviously.
Updated version, FFG, 29 September 2008

- **Consultation of EECA-NCPs by EU-NCPs**

  FFG distributed as an example of the support offered by FFG to Russian NCPs an overview of calls in 2008/2009 which are interesting for Russia.
  It was agreed that EECA NCPs need to be encouraged to request consultancy and that a way to document consultancy is necessary.
  It was agreed that partnering would not be excluded from this consultation as this was considered by many task leaders as an important activity. However, nearly all NCP-projects comprise targeted partnering activities and therefore partnering will in general be directed to these projects not least because NCP-projects also have a European-wide audience.

  Nota Bene: Partnering is also foreseen under WP3, Task 3.2.

- **Synergies with NCP-projects**
  
  **Part of D4.4, due by the end of October 2008**
  **Responsible partner: FFG**

  An overview of NCP-projects was distributed. The overview comprises websites (if already available) and mentions the main activities of each project.
  We plan to publish this list on the IncoNet Webportal. The list can also be disseminated to EECA-NCPs (see attachment). The list was updated (for the NCP-project for NMP).
Updated version, FF6, 29 September 2008

- **Quality assurance**
  Part of D4.1/D4.2, due by the end of September 2008
  Responsible partner: FF6
  Later, part of D4.4/Annual reports due by October each year

  **Assessment:**
  Interviews will be carried out between November and April 2009. Please note that the deliverable is due by the **end of February 2009**.
  Interviewees will receive the written version of their interviews and approve that the content has been noted/understood correctly.

  **Quality assurance – Training**
  All task leaders, in particular EU-task leaders, will exchange their forms for evaluation of trainings in order to have a joint (draft) form by the end of September.

  **Workshops for decision makers, Implementation and target groups**
  Recommendations will be presented by those expert organisations who write the Analytical Reports.

  ⇒ **Russia:**
  In Russia, a restructuring is going on in order to prepare the country and the NCP-system for the association to FP7. A new department has been created which is in charge of the strategy planning regarding the association to FP7. This comprises areas like the adaptation of the legal and financial system and practical issues.
  A new procedure has been established for the provision of funding to NCPs. Rosnauka, the funding agency of Russian NCPs, can’t transfer the money directly to the NCPs. The funding has to come from the budget line which funds international activities, therefore the funding can only be provided on the basis of a competitive call for proposals and grant awarding. NCPs now submit annual programmes under special annual calls and normally receive funding to carry out their services. This procedure has no impact on the nomination of NCPs: Who is nominated for FP7, remains nominated. As a worst case, another organisation may win the award for carrying out the FP7-services, but will not become NCP, while the nominated NCP may have to work without federal funding.
  The workshop for decision makers is envisaged for 11 May 2009.

  ⇒ **Eastern Europe (Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova)**
  Help-Forward considers one workshop for decision makers from several countries as rather inappropriate. There are also some doubts among task leaders that decision makers might move to other countries for the attendance of these workshops. Therefore Help-Forward plans to carry out rather small workshops for each individual country, Moldova, Belarus and Ukraine. The Technical Annex does only foresee one workshop for Eastern Europe (apart from Russia). Help-Forward will try to find a financial solution by combining different events, eg attendance of/participation in a brokerage event with carrying out the workshops.

  ⇒ **Caucasus Region (Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan)**
  Same approach as above, but tailor made according to the local needs: Eg in Azerbaijan, the decision making authority is composed of 2 persons. Help-Forward will therefore see with the task leader and country representatives what is the best approach.
Updated version, FFG, 29 September 2008

Central Asia:
Interviews will be carried out only in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. Two corresponding workshops are planned: in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan.

Structure for the Analytical Reports:
The structure proposed by FFG was discussed and some modifications made (see attachment).

The size (nr of pages) of the Analytical Reports may diverge considerably. Some task leaders believe that the report will not exceed 10 to 15 pages, others expect more voluminous reports, up to 25 pages or more.
In the end, the size was left to the decision of task leaders.

Timetable for 4.2-4.5
Part of D4.3, due by the end of September 2008
Responsible partner: FFG

EU-task leaders will communicate timetables for all activities to be completed until June 2009 in their respective target region by the end of November 2008 to the WP-leader and co-leader.

FFG and HSE developed after the expert meeting already a rough plan for all activities, eg interviews envisaged for the first week of February 2009. All dates will be agreed and fixed with the RU NCPs in October 2008.
VINNOVA will carry out two trainings: one for Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan (March 2009) and one in Kyrgyzstan (May 2009). The training workshop in Kyrgyzstan will also be attended by the NCPs from Tajikistan and Turkmenistan. Interviews will be made before the end of March 2009.

Update 29 September: H-F will send a timetable by 10 October.

Launch workshops during the InContact Event (15.-17.10.2008)

FFG will carry out a small workshop of 1,5 hours targeting the Russian NCPs on 16 October at 17 o'clock.
VINNOVA will prepare a similar workshop for all other countries.

Update from 29 September:
There will be one joint WS for all EECA NCPs as part I, lasting about 1 hour. Afterwards, task leaders will hold, as they consider as appropriate, informal sessions with their target groups, eg FFG with Russian NCPs, and VINNOVA with Central Asian NCPs, H-F with EE/Caucasus NCPs, to explain, if necessary, in more detail what is planned, to collect feedback and to agree dates for the interviews.

Next meeting of partners in the task/WP:
It was not clear if the meeting in January 2009 will include all partners or only the PMB.

Update from 29 September:
There is an Assembly meeting planned for all partners of the IncoNet EECA.
**WP6: Overview of deliverables and their content:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of deliverable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responsible lead partner</th>
<th>Other partners involved</th>
<th>Due by</th>
<th>Extended internal QA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept for tasks 4.2-4.5 for analyzing the state of the art of NCPs/NIPs in the</td>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>FFG</td>
<td>NIP, ANAS, H-F, HSE, In ExCB-KZ, VINOVA;</td>
<td>Oct.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECA incl. interview guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Curriculum for the 3-days basic training for EECA NCPs/NIPs</td>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>FFG</td>
<td>NIP, H-F, VINOVA, ANAS, HSE, In ExCB-KZ</td>
<td>Nov.08</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Meeting on methodology of NCPs/NIPs analysis and basic training</td>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>FFG</td>
<td>NIP, ANAS, H-F, HSE, In ExCB-KZ, PT-DLR, VINOVA;</td>
<td>Sept.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report about networking activities towards EU-NCPs</td>
<td>D4.4</td>
<td>FFG</td>
<td>NIP, ANAS, H-F, HSE, In ExCB-KZ, PT-DLR, VINOVA;</td>
<td>Oct. 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance and assessment of the training visits of EECA NCP-NIPs staff in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU NCPs to be implemented Annual report on activities towards networking with EU-NCPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Oct. 08 DELAYED Will be prepared between November 2008 and February 2009 - see project manual*
Updated version, FFG, 29 September 2008

### Tasks 4.2-4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of deliverable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responsible lead partner</th>
<th>Other partners involved</th>
<th>Due by</th>
<th>Extended internal QA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits/Interviews of EECA NCPs/NIPs</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>FFG, H-F, VINNOVA</td>
<td>NIP, HSE, InExCBKZ, IUCP-T, CIT, ANAS, ASM, BELLSA, GNSF</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four analytical reports for strengthening EECA NCPs/NIPs and presentation to national authorities</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>FFG, H-F, VINNOVA</td>
<td>NIP, HSE, InExCBKZ, IUCP-T, CIT, ANAS, ASM, BELLSA, GNSF</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four regional 3-days basic trainings for EECA NCPs/NIPs (with reports)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>FFG, H-F, VINNOVA</td>
<td>NIP, HSE, InExCBKZ, IUCP-T, CIT, ANAS, ASM, BELLSA, GNSF</td>
<td>May (June?) 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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.

Final Version, 15.09.2008, Expert Meeting, Vienna
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.
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Quality assurance – 4 Training Workshops in the EECA regions
Task 4.1. - WP4/Inconet EECA

Basic principles:
- **Target-group orientated**
  - Based on the survey,
  - Refining during the interviews
- **Close cooperation among task leaders**
  - Sharing of experiences and methodologies
- **Definition of clear responsibilities and contact persons on both sides**
  - EU-Third Country
- **Building on the past**
  - Past trainings in the EECA countries
  - InContact WS in Moscow, October 2008
- **Coherency with 2009-visits of EECA NCP’s at EU-NCP hosting organisations**
  - Visits will build on the trainings
- **In general, establishment/ maintenance of a climate of trust and partnership**
  - Awareness and respect of traditions, hierarchies and any other cultural pattern
- **Early warning**
  - Task leaders commit themselves to address difficulties at an early moment.
  - Task leaders are encouraged to share any challenges with the WP-leader and co-leader at any time.

Practical tools (some suggestions, task leaders choose the most appropriate tool/s):
- **Monitoring by the organisers**
  - two internal evaluators for each region – the EECA partner in the task and one representative of the EU-side (written notes during the training)
  - close cooperation between the last two during the preparation, implementation and follow-up phase: follow-up each day after the training, exchange of notes, action to be taken if appropriate
- **Monitoring by participants**
  - to invite two or three (voluntary basis) participants to give a daily feedback at the end of the day – they note down on cards what they liked/disliked, provide concrete recommendations what, to their opinion, should be modified (follow up-small talk each day after the end of the training)
  - to integrate feedback sessions into the agenda and/or to provide participants with daily evaluation sheets
  - to collect feedback forms on a daily basis
- **Evaluation by training participants after completion of the training**
  - Use of the same evaluation forms for all participants in the trainings in the EECA region

Final version, 29.09.2008
10.17 Annex 17: Agreed Structure for the Analytical Reports (Recommendations to Decision Makers)

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