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1 INTRODUCTION

Deliverable D4.6a “Analytical report for strengthening EECA NCPs/NIPs - Russia” presents the outcome of the review of the Russian NCP system carried out by FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency/Division European and International Programmes.

This review was carried out within Work Package 4 (WP4) ”Supporting the NCPs/NIPs in EECA countries” in Task 4.2 “Capacity Building of NCPs Russia” of the “IncoNet EECA-S&T International Cooperation Network for Eastern European and Central Asian Countries” project, funded by the European Commission under FP7 (Specific Programme Capacities/International Cooperation).

The report and its results were presented to the respective representatives of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science as well as to the Russian NCPs on 23rd September 2009 in Moscow.

FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency was invited to implement the review of the Russian NCP system due to its substantial experience as NCP organisation and its longstanding cooperation with Russia.

The report builds on previous EU-Russia project work/activities and is based on a systemic approach. Due to the current status, the focus of the report was put on the development of a real NCP system, and suitable governance structures to support, steer and monitor the Russian FP7 support system.

One important element for the analysis of the current situation was a series of semi-structured interviews with Russian NCPs carried out by FFG in February 2009 in Moscow.
2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Deliverable D4.6a “Analytical report for strengthening EECA NCPs/NIPs - Russia” presents the outcome of the review of the Russian NCP system carried out by FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency/Division European and International Programmes. This review was carried out within Work Package 4 (WP4) “Supporting the NCPs/NIPs in EECA countries” in Task 4.2 “Capacity Building of NCPs Russia” of the “IncoNet EECA - S&T International Cooperation Network for Eastern European and Central Asian Countries” project, funded by the European Commission under FP7/INCO.

The aims of the report are the following:

- Provide Russian authorities with an outsider’s expert view about the effectiveness and efficiency of the current Russian NCP system,
- Based on the findings, raise the awareness for the need to substantially revise and improve Russia’s FP7 support structures in order to fully exploit the potential of EU-Russia RTD cooperation,
- Provide - notably with the perspective of Russia’s association to FP7 - concrete recommendations on how Russian authorities can prepare for effective participation in FP7 during the transition phase.

The report and its results were presented to the respective representatives of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science as well as to the Russian NCPs on 23rd September 2009 in Moscow.

FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency was invited to implement the review of the Russian NCP system due to its substantial experience as NCP organisation and its longstanding cooperation with Russia.

**Methodology applied**

The present report builds on previous work including the following:

- “Improving the framework for international cooperation. Fostering European and international cooperation of Russian R&D institutions: A Strategic approach to innovation at the example of Life Sciences.”, published by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWi) and the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (MOES) within the TACIS Institution Building Partnership Programme (IBPP) Project: Innovations and Strategy in the Use of Intellectual Property in the Russian Federation, 2005.
The methodological, organisational and financial support provided by the INTAS “ININ” initiative (ININ – FP6 Information Network in the NIS countries), in the period 2001-2007, to Russia and the other New Independent States (NIS) countries to assist them with the establishment and development of National Contact Points (National Information Points) for the EU Framework Programmes for Research & Technological Development.

The present report is based on a systemic approach. Due to the current status of the Russian NCPs and building on the TACIS IBPP report, the focus of the present report was put on the development of a real NCP system, and suitable governance structures to support, steer and monitor the Russian FP7 support system.

One important element for the analysis of the current situation was a series of semi-structured interviews with Russian NCPs carried out by FFG in February 2009 in Moscow. The interview guideline developed by FFG in consultation with its project partners in Work Package 4 of the IncoNet EECA project as well as the list of Russian NCPs who participated in the interviews are attached as Annexes to this report.

Structure of the Content

The report comprises an overview of analytical findings and a comprehensive set of recommendations to Russian authorities on the further development of the Russian FP7 support structures, also specifying respective background and rationale.

The main part of the report comprises the analytical findings and corresponding recommendations in more detail. A summary and conclusions close the report.

Furthermore, the Annex includes important reference material such as the conclusions of the report “Spotlight on EU Russia RTD cooperation: A snapshot of experiences on researchers’ level”.

Context of the Report

The present review of the Russian NCP system takes place within WP4 ”Supporting the NCPs/NIPs in EECA countries” of the IncoNet EECA project.

The purpose of WP4 is to strengthen the EECA-NCP/NIP structures currently in place. WP4 aims to support EECA NCPs/NIPs by further developing the necessary competences and skills for the benefit of the Russian research teams interested in participating in FP7. Thus, the completion of the present report is an essential contribution to the success of WP4.

The present report is a complementary element to other WP4 activities, such as

- 3-days FP7 training workshop of Russian FP7 NCPs which took place in June 2009 in Moscow (Deliverable D4.7a),
- One–week training visit of Russian NCPs at FFG in Vienna scheduled for the first week in February 2010 (Deliverable D4.8a) and
- Consultancy and networking activities integrating Russian and EECA NCPs into the EU NCP community (Deliverable D4.4a).

Furthermore, there will be synergies with the BILAT-RUS project in which FFG is responsible for developing and implementing an advisory network for Russian NCPs in cooperation with CNRS/France and DLR/Germany.
Main findings and recommendations

The findings are structured along 3 major lines:

1. **Structure of the NCP System**
   - Contractual relationship with MES and FASI
   - Funding for NCP host organisations
   - NCP staff

2. **NCP work**
   - Activities
   - Individual consultancy
   - Assistance to researchers

3. **NCPs and their environment**
   - Networking and coordination of Russian NCPs
   - Regional networks of multipliers
   - Networking with EU NCPs
   - Support from the European Commission

Based on the analysis done, the recommendations defined have been structured according to the following logic (5 blocks):

1. Development of a comprehensive Russian FP7 support system
2. Governance of the FP7 support system
3. FP7 support system staff and its recognition
4. NCP work as a systematic process towards successful FP7 cooperation
5. Networking at European level

Each of the mentioned fields is split into a “recommendation for strategic development” and a set of “recommendations for action” giving indications towards the implementation.

In the chapters “Summary of main interview findings and recommendations”, “Status of the current NCP system: Findings in Detail” and “Future Perspectives: Recommendations in Detail” the outcomes of the interviews and the rational for the recommendations are described more extensively.
3 SUMMARY OF MAIN INTERVIEW FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Findings of the review

The findings resulting from the review are structured along 3 major lines:

1. Structure of the NCP System
   - Contractual relationship with MES and FASI
   - Funding for NCP host organisations
   - NCP staff

2. NCP work
   - Activities
   - Individual consultancy
   - Assistance to researchers

3. NCPs and their environment
   - Networking and coordination of Russian NCPs
   - Regional networks of multipliers
   - Networking with EU NCPs
   - Support from the European Commission

3.1.1 Structure of the NCP System

Contractual relationships and funding for NCP host organisations

- In addition to the ministerial decree from 21st February 2007, there is no written binding contract for the parties involved: the MES, FASI and NCP host organisations.

- Current Russian law foresees the provision of funding for NCP activities within the Federal Targeted Programme.


- Based on the changed procedures in 2008, FASI published competitive calls for tender in which NCP host organisations could participate as well as any other research organisation. These calls covered the analysis and monitoring of Russia’s participation in the Framework Programme, the provision of information and advice services, the development of references and methodological materials for potential participants, the development of recommendations on how the participation of Russian researchers in FP7 can be increased, and the organisation of events like brokerage/partnering events, FP7 conferences and workshops.
• Federal funding provided via above-mentioned calls for tender is insufficient to cover all costs for NCPs activities. The percentage of costs of NCP work covered by FASI varies between 30-70%.

• NCP host organisations contribute from their own budget, participate in international projects funded by the EC and/or staff carries out RTD work while also working as NCP. A high share of NCP-related staff works only part-time as NCP.

• Monitoring takes place formally via reports and informally via personal contacts and the attendance of events by representatives of FASI and MES.

• Reporting for funding received from FASI is time consuming.

• Upon request, some NCPs also send annual reports to MES.

**NCP Staff**

• The nomination of Russian NCPs was done by decree of the Russian Federal Ministry of Education and Science by 21st February 2007. Guidelines for Russian NCPs and a list of nominated Russian NCP host organisations as well as NCPs are attached as annexes to this decree. Although not legally binding, the “Guiding Principles for setting up systems of National Contact Points (NCP systems) for the Sevenths Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (FP7)”, published by the European Commission, serve as Terms of Reference for Russian NCPs and NCP host organisations.

• NCP host organisations and NCPs were nominated based on personal invitation and/or after an expression of interest. There was no official public call for tender enabling Russian institutions to submit a proposal in order to act as NCP host organisation for FP7.

• NCP host organisations were carefully selected based on their thematic expertise, insight and networking, although without a transparent application and selection process along a given set of fixed criteria stipulated in an official document.

• NCP staff – Heads as well as other NCP-related staff - was carefully selected and is highly qualified.

• Staff fluctuation, notably experienced junior staff, is high, ranging from several months to 1.5 years.

• While NCP hosts often manage to maintain at least one experienced senior NCP, experienced junior NCP staff is likely to return to research or to move on to other, more profitable jobs after rather short periods of time. Although the situation seems to become more stable for some NCPs, important experience is rather likely to get lost for the NCP host and Russian researchers looking for advise.

• NCPs are highly aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the Russian NCP system, as well as of possible improvements and solutions. In general, NCPs are keen to deliver good results, but feel that the current NCP system fails to offer appropriate working conditions.
• NCP host organisations and NCP related staff have to cope on a daily basis with structural weaknesses of the Russian NCP system, insufficient and instable federal funding, little backing, coordination and strategic guidance, limited resources and support, little long-term stability and official recognition.

• Due to the current framework conditions, NCP host organisations tend to have an increased interest in actively taking advantage of their institutional investment by getting first hand information and developing own FP-projects while the task of NCPs is targeted towards the entire Russian RTD community including potential competitors of the respective NCP host organisation. Thus, situations of conflicting interests for NCPs can develop.

3.1.2 **NCP Work: Activities, Individual consultancy, Assistance to researchers**

• Russian NCPs currently focus on information dissemination, the organisation of events like info days and workshops with international speakers and participants and advise via email and phone. All NCPs maintain individual websites. There is no common FP7 Web-Portal providing access to all Russian thematic and horizontal NCPs.

• Taken the size of Russia’s RTD community, the clients databases maintained by each Russian NCP organisation seem very limited (50 – 1500 entries).

• Services like proposal checks, support in completing A-forms or with the negotiation phase, assistance and advice on legal and financial issues (IPR, consortium agreement) and reporting (project internal and towards the EC) are not fully developed. Due to the status of Russia as Third Country Russian researchers so far rarely have coordinated FP-projects. Assistance and advice on before-mentioned issues is rather considered by NCPs as a task of the coordinator.

• Russian NCPs receive many requests from Russian researchers to support EU-Russia partnering and consortium building. Finding a competent EU coordinator is a major challenge since Russian NCPs lack information about promising EU-consortia under preparation.

• Russian NCPs underlined the growing demand for individual consultancy. All Russian NCPs believe that individual consultancy is a major factor to ensure the success of Russian researchers in FP7.

• In many cases consortium building with EU partners is limited by the lack of visibility of Russian expertise (NCPs and researchers) in Europe.

3.1.3 **NCPs and their environment**

*Networking and coordination of Russian NCPs*

• As there is little strategic guidance from MES, NCPs are guided by the different institutions hosting them.

• Some Russian NCPs started to cooperate with other Russian NCPs. Based on their needs, they became active themselves.
• There are no national coordination and networking meetings among Russian NCPs.

• Nearly all Russian NCPs expressed a need for networking, coordination and strategic guidance of all Russian thematic and horizontal NCPs. As a number of NCP host organisations and NCPs were nominated for the first time as FP7 NCPs, this was considered as particularly important.

**Regional networks of multipliers**

• Many NCPs maintain a more or less informal network of regional and institutional FP7 multipliers.

• Due to a lack of financial support, cooperation with regional and institutional multipliers is usually limited to the dissemination of information. There are no regular face-to-face meetings, no trainings of multipliers and there is no exchange of data. Sharing of experiences is limited to rather informal contacts.

**Networking with EU NCPs**

• The intensity of networking with EU NCPs is very diverse, ranging from good contacts of some Russian NCPs with some EU NCP colleagues to little to no contacts with others.

• FP7 NCP projects offer good opportunities for networking among Russian and EU NCPs.

• Cooperation with EU colleagues is focused on partner searching.

**Support from the European Commission**

• Contacts with the EC are highly diverse, ranging from very close cooperation and regular contacts to, in some few cases, practically no contacts.

• Some NCPs regularly receive official invitations to NCP meetings and attend; others never receive invitations and by consequence don’t attend. NCPs who already carried out a joint Coordinated Call usually have good relationships and close contacts with the EC.

• EC representatives attend events organised in Russia up-on request.
3.2 Recommendations resulting from the review

Based on the analysis done, the recommendations defined have been structured according to the following 5 blocks:

1. Development of a comprehensive FP7 support system
2. Governance of the FP7 support system
3. FP7 support system staff and its recognition
4. NCP work as a systematic process towards successful FP7 cooperation
5. Networking at European level

Each of the mentioned fields is split into a recommendation for strategic development and a set of recommendations for actions giving indications towards the implementation.

Fig. 3.1: Blocks of recommendations for a comprehensive FP7 support system
3.2.1 Development of a comprehensive FP7 support system

Recommendation for strategic development

Development of a comprehensive FP7 support system with a clear common vision, defined objectives, activities and structures comprising the national, regional and institutional dimension in a complementary approach.

Recommendation for action

- Setting-up a strategy development process together with all relevant stakeholders at national and regional level identifying objectives, goals, strategies, activities and performance goals and indicators.
- Development of scenarios of Russia’s potential for participation in FP7.
- Provision of an appropriate contractual framework for NCP host organisations enabling sustainability of the system and services offered (e.g. timing of contracts coordinated with the duration of the EU Framework Programme, management by objectives, official nomination of NCPs, common reporting and monitoring standards, etc).
- Network development of capable officially appointed and recognized FP7 contact points at regional and institutional level to be coordinated by NCPs.
- Provision of sufficient funding for the system clearly related to above defined objectives and activities foreseen. Funding should include all levels of the system.
- Foresee structured mechanisms for coordination and learning of the system.

3.2.2 Governance of the FP7 support system

Recommendation for strategic development

Development of a consistent, highly effective and efficient governance structure for the Russian FP7 support system.

Recommendation for action

- Establishment of a supervisory body acting as steering committee providing supervision and strategic orientation for the FP7 Support System and the implementation of its contract(s). This steering committee should consist of a limited number of high level representatives of all relevant parties (MES, FASI, NCP Coordinator, adequate regional or institutional representatives). Ideally, a limited number of international experts are also included as members.
- Organisation of regular meetings of the supervisory body (app. 4 times per year) to monitor the implementation of the contract(s) and to facilitate strategic discussions.
- Setting up an effective, proactive national coordination (represented by an individual person or a specific unit) of the FP7 Support System at operational level in the implementation of the contract(s):
  - Acting on behalf of MES/FASI,
  - Empowered to provide strategic guidance and coordination,
o Mediating between all Russian thematic and horizontal NCPs and the MES/FASI,

o Facilitating an ongoing dialogue,

o Without being given the competence to interfere into the daily business of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points.

o Setting-up of a common NCP and FP7 Contact Point Web-Portal.

o Organisation of regular trainings and meetings of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.

o Enhance, with the help of the national coordinator, the establishment of a networking platform for sharing of experiences and best practise among all NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.

o Encourage NCPs cooperation towards joint events on horizontal issues like legal and financial questions or project administration and reporting, joint publications, joint visibility activities, etc.

3.2.3 **FP7 support system staff and its recognition**

**Recommendation for strategic development**

Recognize NCP and FP7 Contact Point work as specific high-level job profiles that need professional experts in research management in order to achieve sustainable quality of the FP7 support system and create common understanding within the system and at stakeholder level.

**Recommendation for action**

- Development of the NCP job profile as full time professional (avoiding add-on NCP jobs with parallel research work commitments).

- Development of FP7 contact point job profile suitable for regional and institutional level.

- Development of a formal recognition process for NCPs and FP7 Contact points at regional and institutional level.

- Include attractive incentives into the NCP and FP7 Contact Point job profiles in order to keep experienced NCP and FP7 Contact Point staff.

- Develop clear guidelines laying down organisational rules excluding any potential conflict of interest thus facilitating NCP services for the entire Russian S&T community.

- Provide NCP units and NCP related staff with organisational and financial autonomy to serve the entire Russian RTD community if they are hosted by a RTD organisation interested itself in participation in FP7.
3.2.4 **NCP work as a systematic process towards successful FP7 cooperation**

**Recommendation for strategic development**

In order to ensure its effectiveness NCP work has to be understood as a systematic process with clearly defined standards and linked performance goals.

**Recommendation for action**

- Estimation/categorisation of Russia’s potential target group for successful participation in FP7 and definition of NCPs performance goals and indicators to reach these target groups in terms of quality and quantity.

- Develop tailor-made NCP service “packages” and standards towards the Russian RTD community: e.g.
  - For high potential Russian coordinators: from information, consultancy to proposal checks. Such packages could also include financial incentives for Russian coordinators (e.g. preparatory funding instruments)
  - For high potential Russian partners: from information, consultancy to effective partner searching, etc.

- Development of complementary service packages for FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.

- Setting up one data (customer relation) management system for the entire NCP system with possibilities for links to FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.

- Meet the urgent need of legal and financial information towards FP7:
  - Establish a Legal and Financial NCP and employ in addition at each thematic and horizontal NCP host organisation one expert on legal and financial issues.
  - Continuously develop a set of typical FAQ on legal and financial issues for Russian researchers.

- Substantially increase the capacity of Russian FP7 support structures to provide individual face-to-face consultancy and to monitor the impact of face-to-face-consultancy.
3.2.5 Networking at European level

Recommendation for strategic development

Setting up structures that facilitate systematic networking at European level.

Recommendation for action:

- Ensure the integration of Russian NCPs into FP7 NCP projects of their thematic/horizontal area by providing the financial resources or at least travel budget.
- Ensure that the EC sends official invitations to take part in NCP meetings to all Russian NCPs\(^1\).
- Ensure that all Russian NCPs are able to attend European NCP meetings by providing the respective travel budgets.
- Provide Russian NCPs with more opportunities for networking with EU NCP colleagues particularly with respect to partner searching and exchange of good practises.

\(^1\) NCPs for RI, ICT and SME don’t receive invitations
4 BACKGROUND AND OVERALL OBJECTIVES OF THE REPORT

4.1 Background of the report

The IncoNet EECA project is funded by the European Communities within FP7/INCO for a duration from January 2008 to December 2011. The project is coordinated by Dr. George Bonas, International Centre for Black Sea Studies, Athens, Greece. 21 partners from 13 countries (EU, Associated States, Eastern Europe and Central Asia) work together in eight Work Packages. More information about the project can be found at: www.inco-eeca.net

The project aims to strengthen the scientific and technological cooperation between the EU Member States (MS) and Associated Countries (AC) and the Eastern European and Central Asian countries. To achieve these goals, the IncoNet EECA project implements activities at both the policy and operational level.

- At the policy level the project will support the establishment and operation of a Regional S&T Policy Dialogue Platform bringing together national representatives/policy makers from the EU MS, AC and the EECA countries, as well as representatives of the European Commission.
- At the operational level the project includes a variety of activities aiming at: an enhanced participation of researchers from EECA countries in FP7; the support of NCP/NIP structures in the EECA with particular emphasis on previous work and projects.

Facilitating and ensuring an optimized participation of the EECA in the FP7 needs well-trained effective and efficient National, Regional and Institutional Contact/Information Points (NCPs/NIPs/RIPs) and a comprehensive FP7 support system in the respective countries of the EECA. A number of efforts have already been undertaken in this respect. In particular the INTAS ININ network has to be mentioned. Also other relevant support structures, measures, action, projects and initiatives targeting the EECA took place or are still on the way.

The IncoNet EECA project supports the further development of existing structures and provides input and expertise on of well-functioning trans-European network of National Contact Points. Building on a standard methodology developed in Task 4.1 and respective quality assurance activities, the following activities are foreseen on regional level in each of the participating EECA countries under Tasks 4.2 – 4.5:

- Recommendations to national authorities on how to increase the efficiency of existing structures based on national ownership;
- Training of existing NCPs/NIPs
- Visits to EU NCP host organisations
- Continuous consultancy for EECA NCPs/NIPs by experienced EU NCPs.

In addition in Task 4.1 the integration of the NCPs/NIPs in existing networks of EU National Contact Points will be fostered in order to ensure active cooperation.

The Deliverable D4.6a “Analytical report for strengthening the EECA NCPs/NIPs - Russia” presents the outcome of the review of the Russian NCP system carried out by FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency/Division European and International Programmes. This review
was carried out within Work Package 4 (WP4) "Supporting the NCPs/NIPs in EECA countries" in Task 4.2 “Capacity Building of NCPs Russia” of the “IncoNet EECA project.

An important element to analyse the current situation was a series of semi-structured interviews with Russian NCPs carried out by FFG in February 2009 in Moscow. The list of NCPs interviewed as well as the interview guideline developed by FFG in consultation with its project task partners in Work Package 4, are attached in the Chapter “Annexes”.

The aims of the report are the following:

- Provide Russian authorities with an outsider’s expert view about the effectiveness and efficiency of the current Russian NCP system,
- Based on the findings, raise the awareness for the need to substantially revise and improve Russia’s FP7 support structures in order to fully exploit the potential of EU-Russia RTD cooperation,
- Provide - notably with the perspective of Russia’s association to FP7 - concrete recommendations on how Russian authorities can prepare for effective participation in FP7 during the transition phase.

The analytical report and its results were presented to the respective representatives of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science as well as to the Russian NCPs on 23rd September 2009 in Moscow.

FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency was invited to implement the review of the Russian NCP system due to its substantial experience as NCP organisation and its longstanding cooperation with Russia.

The present report builds on previous work including, amongst others, the following:

1. “Improving the framework for international cooperation. Fostering European and international cooperation of Russian R&D institutions: A Strategic approach to innovation at the example of Life Sciences.”, published by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWi) and the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (MOES) within the TACIS Institution Building Partnership Programme (IBPP) Project: Innovations and Strategy in the Use of Intellectual Property in the Russian Federation, 2005.


3. The methodological, organisational and financial support provided by the INTAS “ININ” initiative (ININ – FP6 Information Network in the NIS countries), in the period 2001-2007, to Russia and the other New Independent States (NIS) countries to assist them with the establishment and development of National Contact Points (National Information Points) for the EU Framework Programmes for Research & Technological Development.
ad 1) The TACIS IBPP report states that “there is no systematic public advisory and consultancy service developed for the Russian science community including information and advice for proposal writing”. The report also mentions that NCPs for FP6 seem to be the only systematic support structure, while underlining that the impact of Russian NCPs was rather low due to limited training, lack of practical experience, critical personal resources and a lack of infrastructure in terms of information and communication tools, meetings rooms and organisational support for events. The TACIS IBPP report concludes that individual Russian researchers need to make a major effort in order to be successful in the Framework Programme. The rejection of proposals is thus considered as individual failure of proposers only rather than being related to insufficient support structures.

The establishment of FP support structures comprising national as well as regional and institutional contact points is highly recommended. A number of recommendations specify how the current system, based on the analysis in the year 2005, should be restructured and the tasks of all actors in this system be revised.

The present IncoNet EECA report integrates new developments in Russia and takes – four years after the publication of the TACIS IBPP report - the current Russian situation in the area of FP7 support structures into account.

ad 2) The recent report called “Spotlight on EU-Russia RTD cooperation. A snapshot of experiences on researchers’ level”, published by FFG within the RUSERA EXE project, shows that EU-Russia RTD cooperation is established and has started to work at the level of researchers. The Russian S&T contribution to joint projects is undisputed among leading European researchers. Russian partners are in high esteem among European FP6 project coordinators because of their high scientific competence and personal reliability. Scientific and human relationships among researchers are in general excellent. However, the report also identifies hurdles and barriers preventing Russian teams from participating more successfully in FP7. The report concludes that despite the successful cooperation so far, a lot still needs to be done to exploit the full potential of EU-Russia RTD cooperation. One major recommendation of the report in order to increase the success of Russian teams in FP7 is the further development of suitable FP7 support structures in Russia.

ad 3) As the Sixth Framework Programme (FP6) for Research and Technology Development was open for participation to scientists from Third Countries (including the NIS), the European Commission (EC) turned to INTAS in December 2002 to establish a method whereby the NIS scientific communities would be encouraged to play a greater role in the European Research Area (ERA) and the FP6 calls. The ININ initiative ran until the end of the FP6. Relevant NIS authorities responsible for science and technology were asked to appoint FP6 NCPs/NIPs in their respective countries, modelled on the example of the European National Contact Points (NCPs) in the Framework Programme. The next step was to draw up detailed Terms of Reference (ToR) for the project. These were drafted by a consortium of EU and Central European organisations with experience in this field. They laid out a clear definition of the many tasks the network needed to cover in order to reach all the NIS scientific communities and to ensure that the NCPs/NIPs had all the relevant information and training. With this ToR in hand, INTAS again invited the NCPs/NIPs to explain the structure INTAS would expect to see built up, and give them the tools to do so with their authorities. One of those tools was an NIP grant agreement, including a yearly work programme, to be negotiated and signed with each of the NCPs/NIPs. At the end of 2003, five calls for tenders were published, leading to the selection of four consortia of experienced European NCP
organisations to run a series of training sessions. The last call concerned the Continuing Advisors. With a view to helping the NCPs/NIPs implement their tasks, INTAS contracted a consortium of European NCP organisations to provide advice on a continuous basis to the NCPs/NIPs. By the end of 2004, INTAS had signed NIP grant agreements with most of the NIS partners. The European Commission proposed to discontinue INTAS at the end of FP6 and as of 1 January 2007 INTAS has been in liquidation. From the beginning of 2007 therefore, INTAS started to wind-up its activities, with no new activities to be started from that time.

The precursor organisation of FFG Division of European and International Programmes (EIP) “Bureau for International Research and Technology Cooperation” was one of the contracted European NCP organisations in charge of the continuous advice targeting the cooperation with Russian NCPs (INTAS ININ project “NIP Continuing Advice - Russia”). The long-lasting cooperation of FFG with Russian NCPs continued in FP7 in general and in particular in the IncoNet EECA project.

4.2 EU-Russia RTD cooperation

4.2.1 Russian participation in the Framework Programmes

International cooperation was rather weak in FP6. The European Commission allocated 280 Mio. EUR for financing the participation of Third Countries in the core activities of FP6 (Thematic Priorities), however just 80 Mio. EUR were spent.

Russia was the most successful Third Country participant in FP6: 454 Russian participations were involved in 309 FP6 projects (signed contracts). The financial contribution of the European Commission to projects with participations from Russia was 1.36 billion EUR with a direct financial contribution of the European Commission to partners from Russia of 49.84 Mio. EUR.

In FP7, the United States and the Russian Federation are currently the most successful Third Country participants so far. In 136 FP7 proposals retained for funding 235 Russian participations are involved. Retained proposals including Russian participants come up with a total financial contribution by the European Commission of 1.14 billion EUR, out of which Russian participants receive 28.86 Mio. EUR.

With these figures the Russian participation is on the same track in FP7 as it was in FP6.

Furthermore, it can be observed, that the total European financial contribution to projects including Russian partners has significantly increased from 1.36 bn EUR in FP6 with its duration of 4 years, to 1.14 bn EUR after already 2 years under FP7. However, Russian partners do not profit from this development since their share is in the same dimension in FP6 and FP7. A graphical presentation of the quantitative development of Russia’s participation is presented in Figure 4.1

2 Source: European Commission, July 2009 (please also refer to Chapter “10.9.1 Russian participation in signed FP6 contracts”)
3 Source: European Commission, July 2009 (please also refer to Chapter “10.9.3 Russian participation in FP7 proposals retained for funding”)
Figure 4.1 summarises the development of Russia’s participation in FP6 and compares it to the current status in FP7. Considering the 4 year duration of FP6, the figures for 2 years under FP7 represent 50% and are compared to the status of participations, projects and financial contribution specifically for Russian partners and in total for projects involving Russian participation.

**Is the financial dimension important?**

It is difficult and actually impossible to calculate clear figures on the impact of participation in a funding programme such as the Framework Programme. There is a broad range of positive effects and impact that go far beyond the financial share of the individual partner in a FP project. However, keeping this limited and one-dimensional character of financial share in mind, it can be used as an indicator for multi-dimensional and broader impacts of substantial value. As such, the financial share is an important indicator, particularly for any Ministry of Finance that compares it to current or possible future contributions to the Framework Programme.

With the perspective of the Russian association to FP7 this view is of interest as well. The ratio of the current Russian share of app. 30 Mio. Euro in FP7 projects and Russia’s likely, at least 35-fold higher contribution (between 1.0 and 2.5 billion Euro) demonstrates the huge Russian potential for further strengthened participation in FP7.

### 4.2.2 Initiatives building and nurturing EU-Russia cooperation

A broad range of initiatives have been set up and implemented in the course of the past years intended to build and nurture the cooperation between Russia and the EU.

At the St. Petersburg Summit in May 2003, the EU and Russia agreed to reinforce their cooperation by creating four so called ‘Common Spaces’ in the framework of the Partnership
and Cooperation Agreement and on the basis of common values and shared interests. These Common Spaces cover the following issues:

1. The Common Economic Space, covering economic issues and the environment,
2. The Common Space of Freedom, Security and Justice,
3. The Common Space of External Security, including crisis management and non-proliferation,
4. The Common Space of Research and Education, Including cultural aspects.

The Moscow Summit in May 2005 agreed on the development of the required instruments. Consequently, specific objectives and actions required were set out as summarised in the respective documents:

- EU-Russia Common Spaces Progress Report 2008
- Common Spaces Roadmap 2005
- EU-Russia Common Spaces Progress Report 2007

The Fourth Common Space of Research is the most advanced and least controversial of the four Common spaces in which EU-Russia cooperation is covered.

In May 2008, the EU-Russia Permanent Partnership Council on Research met during the Slovenian Council Presidency. At this occasion, the extension of the S&T agreement was agreed upon and Russia submitted a request for association to FP7. Although the association process has been somewhat slowed down in the meantime for political reasons, the way forward for EU-Russia cooperation in FP7 is clear and got a major strategic goal.

The EU and Russia concluded a Partnership and Co-operation Agreement (PCA) in 1997. The aim of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) is to encourage political, commercial, economic and cultural cooperation between Russia and the EU. It is the embodiment of the joint commitment of the EU and Russia to promote partnership and understanding for mutual benefit. Signed in June 1994, the PCA entered into force in December 1997 and opened a new chapter in EU-Russia relations. The PCA set the parameters for mutually beneficial cooperation in economic, social, financial matters, as well as in science and technology between the EU and Russia. This comes at the completion of a ratification process, which involved the Russian Parliament, the European Parliament and the Parliaments of the 15 EU Member States. Mutually binding commitments were set out in the 112 articles, ten annexes, two protocols and several joint declarations of the original Agreement.

On 6 November 2003, the EU and Russia renewed an Agreement on Scientific and Technological Cooperation. The Agreement provides a framework for allowing Russian organisations to take part in EU research programmes (except in the nuclear sector) and in turn grants EU organisations access to equivalent Russian programmes. The Agreement also promotes the free access to and shared used of research facilities and the visits and exchanges of scientists.

The June 2008 Summit between EU and the Russian Federation saw the launch of negotiations on a new EU-Russia agreement.

---

EU-Russia Joint Thematic Working Groups have been set up in order to foster the S&T cooperation in the following areas: Food, Agriculture and Biotechnologies, Health, Energy, NMP, Mobility, ICT, Aeronautics, Environment, Nuclear Fission Research.

As recent interviews among EC-representatives involved in these Working Groups have shown, the European Commission is rather satisfied with the quality of work, reliability, open mindedness and the good relationships prevailing in the different Working Groups.

A number of coordinated EU-Russia calls (in the FP7-Themes Food, Agriculture and Biotechnologies, Health, Energy, NMP) were already carried out successfully, more are to follow.

Some EU-Russia Joint Thematic Working Groups are already exploring further, new mechanisms and instruments suitable to promote EU-Russia cooperation in FP7, such as the twinning of projects funded separately by EC- and Russian sources.

Within the Specific Programme CAPACITIES of FP7 Programme INCO, the European Communities currently fund several Coordination and Support Actions (CSA) enhancing the strategic cooperation with Russia:

- IncoNet EECA
- BILAT RUS
- ERANET RUS

Central information Web-Portals on EU-Russia RTD cooperation have been created:

- [www.increast.eu](http://www.increast.eu)
- [www.stgate-rus.eu](http://www.stgate-rus.eu)

Additionally, specific Coordination and Support Actions targeting Russia are funded in different thematic areas under the Specific Programme COOPERATION.

The overarching aim of all these projects and initiatives is to further improve the framework for EU-Russia RTD cooperation in FP7, and to increase the integration and successful participation of Russian partners. This includes the level of policy makers as well as RTD managers and researchers.

### 4.2.3 The role of the Russian FP7 Support System

Taking into consideration what has been mentioned above the accompanying national conditions are important influencing factors if it comes to successful participation in the EU Framework Programme. These conditions include – to list only some of the very important ones - national research capacities and funding, training and networking of researchers, visibility of Russian research performances beyond national borders.

Access to information and experience on how to successfully participate in the EU Framework Programme is a key factor, thus highly effective and efficient national support systems play a central role in the national S&T setting. Investments in a well structured national support system pay off, as can be seen in other countries.

Due to the country’s size in terms of population, Russia’s GDP and the scope of RTD (Number of researchers/RTD organisations, etc.) carried out in Russia, Russia’s contribution

---

5 Carried out by DLR and FFG within the FP7 BILAT RUS project (CSA)
to the EC’s research budget would be substantial in case of an association. Although the impact and benefits of the involvement into FP7 can by far not be limited to the direct financial return, all Member States and Associated Countries closely follow the success rates of their researchers in terms of financial return in order to justify the investment of national taxpayer’s money. Thus, also for this reason, all EU countries and Associated States develop and maintain FP7 support structures in order to facilitate their researchers’ performance in the highly competitive Framework Programmes.

Once associated to FP7, it will be a huge challenge to ensure an appropriate Russian participation as is demonstrated by the current status of involvement (see 4.2 and Figure 4.1). Since its creation, the current Russian NCP system has come a long way. However, it is highly recommendable for Russia, to use the preparatory phase for the potential association to FP7 in order to further develop the current structures into a real Russian FP7 support system.

### 4.2.4 Learning from Experience: The Austrian case

There are many interesting examples of FP7 support systems all over Europe with a broad range of varying experiences and successes. Based on its longstanding experience in the field, the Austrian case is briefly described.

Austria put forward its first efforts towards a national information structure in the preparation for its membership to the European Union in 1995. An information office for the Framework Programme and EUREKA was set up, which became BIT-Bureau for International Research and Technology Cooperation. In 2004 BIT was merged into FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency, the largest Austrian funding agency for applied research, which also hosts the respective services in its Division of European and International Programmes (EIP). A team of some 45 experts provide information, consultancy, personalised coaching and training on successful participation in primarily the EU Framework Programme, EUREKA and the Enterprise Europe Network. Parallel to the start of the 7th FP, the services of EIP were further focussed in order to strengthen the individual coaching and hands-on training via the FFG-Academy scheme. Additionally, a reinforced system of indicators and close output-oriented monitoring concentrated on effectiveness of the services was set up.

Austria’s role in the Framework Programme started with a real challenging situation of very few participations before 1995, and could be increased and strengthened step by step beginning with FP4. Nowadays Austria is represented with app. 2000 successful participations and 118% return rate in FP6. Reinforced services contributed to further expanding this trend in FP7. Currently Austria has a return rate of 130% (Data: November 2009).  

Major success factors are:

- Well experienced NCPs working together in a central organisation not involved itself in research and having the close link to national research funding,
- Comprehensive Austrian support system including all actors at national, regional and institutional level,
- Clear profiles of NCPs with educational background necessary for the specific NCP theme, who work according to defined standards and indicators,

---
• Comprehensive spectrum of services along the project development and implementation process from general to tailor-made customer support/coaching
  o Email Services
    Information on relevant R&D Programmes straight to you customer
  o Individual Coaching
    Should the customer invest time & money for getting involved in European R&D?
  o Preparatory Co-funding
    Co-funding for European R&D project development
  o Partner Search
    Assistance in finding the right partners for R&D projects
  o Legal Issues and IPR
    Assistance in legal matters for R&D projects
  o Proposal Check
    Checking proposals before they are submitted to the European Commission, thus increasing the chances for successful evaluation
  o Project Management
    Trainings for effective R&D project management
  o Exploitation
    Tech transfer and exploitation assistance for customer R&D projects

• Involvement in the Framework Programme at all levels (“training on the job”) incl. proposal evaluation, expert groups, own proposal development and implementation, etc,

• Broad “platform” of contracting authorities with a transparent governance structure comprising all levels,

• Pro-active cooperation in the European network

• Strategic involvement in FP projects to generate and foster international contacts
5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Introduction

The present report is based on a systemic approach. Due to the current status of the Russian NCPs and building on previous work, the focus of the present report was put on the development of a real NCP system, and suitable governance structures to support, steer and monitor the Russian FP7 support system.

As basis for the analysis of the current situation, FFG carried out semi-structured interviews (Deliverable D4.5a - Russia) with Russian NCPs in February 2009 in Moscow. The interview guideline developed by FFG in consultation with its project partners in Work Package 4 (WP4) “Supporting the NCPs/NIPs in EECA countries” in Task 4.1 “Methodological standards, quality assurance and horizontal activities” of the IncoNet EECA project as well as the list of Russian NCPs who participated in the interviews are attached as Annexes to this report.

The present report builds on previous work including the following:

- “Improving the framework for international cooperation. Fostering European and international cooperation of Russian R&D institutions: A Strategic approach to innovation at the example of Life Sciences.”, published by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWi) and the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (MOES) within the TACIS Institution Building Partnership Programme (IBPP) Project: Innovations and Strategy in the Use of Intellectual Property in the Russian Federation, 2005.


- The methodological, organisational and financial support provided by the INTAS “ININ” initiative (ININ – FP6 Information Network in the NIS countries), in the period 2001-2007, to Russia and the other New Independent States (NIS) countries to assist them with the establishment and development of National Contact Points (National Information Points) for the EU Framework Programmes for Research & Technological Development.

The goal of the “Deliverable D4.5a Visits to/interviews of EECA NCPs/NIPs - Russia” was to review the state of the art of the NCP system in Russia through visits and interviews of Russian NCPs. The results of the interviews together with other studies and analytical activities were the basis for the development of recommendations for the improvement and strengthening of the Russian NCP system to be addressed to national authorities in Russia.
5.2 Aim and Methodology of the Interviews

The aim of the interviews was to provide FFG with more insight information into the current situation and context of work of Russian NCPs, as experienced and seen by Russian NCPs themselves.

The purpose was to provide the interviewers from FFG with all required information enabling them to write an analytical report with recommendations to the Ministry for Education and Science of the Russian Federation.

Based on the interview guide developed by FFG in consultation with the partners (Task leaders) in WP4, the interviews were carried out between 2nd and 6th February 2009. FFG took notes of each interview. After the interviews, each Russian NCPs received the minutes of the interview and was invited to provide comments and modifications which were taken into consideration by FFG. The final version of each interview is available at FFG.

These final versions were used as a basis for the analytical report (Deliverable D4.6a - Russia) with recommendations.

5.3 Target Groups

The list of Russian NCPs taking part in the interview is attached as Annex 10.5. Due a business travel, the NCP for Environment was not able to take part in the interview.

5.4 Activities

5.4.1 Preparation

As an introduction for the interviews, FFG organised in cooperation with HSE a workshop of half a day for all Russian NCPs on 02 February 2009 in Moscow. The purpose of the workshop carried out with the participation of the Austrian NCP coordinator and Director of FFG/EIP, Dr. Sabine Herlitschka, was to underline the aims and purpose of the review and to encourage Russian NCPs to take part in the activity.

The invitation letter and programme of the workshop are attached as Annex in “Deliverable D4.5a Visits to/interviews of EECA NCPs/NIPs - Russia”.

HSE was responsible for the preparation of the organisational framework. This included:

- The dissemination of the invitation to take part in the interview among 12 Russian NCPs,
- Telephone contacts for obtaining the personal confirmation of participation of NCPs, agreement of the exact time schedule and location for each interview (premises of HSE or premises of NCP to be interviewed),
- Drafting of the final list of the interview participants and time schedule made available to FFG.
5.4.2 Implementation

HSE was responsible for the

- Organisation of the welcome and introductory workshop at HSE on the first day of “interview week”, 2nd February 2009, including flipcharts and technical facilities like laptop, internet access and a multimedia projector;
- Scheduling and organisation of the meetings among FFG and the respective Russian NCPs for 10 interviews from 2 to 6 February 2009;
- Provision of rooms and refreshments for the interviews with the NCPs for “Aeronautics”, “Energy”, “Infrastructures”, “Mobility” and “Inco” taking place at the premises of HSE.

For FFG, Ralf König and Petra Reiter together carried out the interviews. Normally, 2 interviews per day were carried out, always by these two representatives from FFG. Due to the limited time available, two interviews were once carried out in parallel: On 5th February 2009, Ralf König carried out the interview with the SSH NCP, and Petra Reiter carried out the interview with the NCP for “Food and Biotechnology”.

Each NCP confirmed by her/his signature that the interview took place. These confirmations are stored at FFG and will be made available upon request.

5.4.3 Follow up

FFG prepared minutes of each interview. These minutes were sent to each NCP for comments and modifications. Based on the feedback of each Russian NCP, a final version for each interview was developed.

The summary of the main analytical findings resulting from the interviews is attached as Annex 3 in “Deliverable D4.5a Visits to/interviews of EECA NCPs/NIPs - Russia”.

The results of the interviews were one of the elements for the comprehensive analysis and development of analytical recommendations for Russian authorities based on the experiences of FFG and its experts involved.
6 Status of the current NCP system: findings in detail

This chapter on “Findings in detail” is structured along 3 major lines with respective subheading. Each subheading summarizes the most important reflections on the issue. However, in the frame of this report it is impossible to go into all the details.

1. Structure of the NCP System
   • Contractual relationship with MES and FASI
   • Funding for NCP host organizations
   • NCP staff

2. NCP work
   • Activities
   • Individual consultancy
   • Assistance to researchers

3. NCPs and their environment
   • Networking and coordination of Russian NCPs
   • Regional networks of multipliers
   • Networking with EU NCPs
   • Support from the European Commission
6.1 Structure of the NCP System

Key words summarizing main findings

- Nomination process (criteria, selection)
- Guiding principles
- Contracts
- No mid-term planning
- Competitive calls for various NCP-like activities
- Insufficient funding / host organisations contributions
- No monitoring reporting standards
- NCP staff: carefully selected, highly qualified, try to be very active in various ways
- Fluctuation of staff
- Awareness of strength and weaknesses of current system
- Missing coordination and strategic guidance
- Lack of funding
- NCP job profile: as add-on work
- NCP host organisations contribute financially
- Situation of conflict of interest

6.1.1 Contractual relationships with MES and FASI

6.1.1.1 Nomination

The majority of NCP host organisations were nominated by the Decree of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation from 21\textsuperscript{st} February 2007. The decree was issued in line with the implementation of the Road Map for the Common Space of Research and Education, including Cultural Aspects.

Guidelines for Russian NCPs as well as a list of nominated NCP host institutions and NCPs were annexed to this decree. Some NCP host organisations, like the NCP for Environment, were nominated later.

Russian NCP host organisations are governed by the above-mentioned Ministry decree.

Although not legally binding, the “Guiding Principles for setting up systems of National Contact Points (NCP systems) for the Seventh Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (FP7)”, published by the European Commission, serve also as Terms of Reference for Russian NCP host organisations.
6.1.2 Application and selection procedure of host institutions

The application and selection process lacks full transparency to the interviewers. It seems that some NCPs wrote a letter to the MES expressing an interest in a specific NCP. Furthermore, it seems that the personal and institutional reputation as well as good informal contacts were essential factors leading to the selection of one specific institution.

Following the interviews, the selection of host organisations thus didn’t follow specific transparent criteria, fixed in writing and known to the interviewees.

In general, selected NCP host institutions are well known and rather acclaimed Russian RTD institutions, RTD funding organisations (like FASIE) and universities well embedded into the RTD community of the respective thematic area of the Framework Programme.

The type of institution varies from small institutes with 25 – 30 employees to large research institutes and higher education institutions with several thousands of employees.

6.1.1.3 Contractual relationship between the MES, FASI and the NCP host organisations

The decree from 21st February 2007 is the only legal document at the disposal of NCP host organisations. The decree does not bind the Russian Federal Ministry for Science and Education/MES and/or FASI towards the NCP host organisations.

It is foreseen that two departments of the MES receive and approve annual work programmes provided by NCPs.

The organisational context and conditions of work of NCPs are not specified. There is no written commitment of the MES to provide a stable financial framework enabling NCPs to carry out all the tasks mentioned in the decree of 21st February 2007 and the annexes.

Following the interviews, the Russian Federal Ministry for Education and Science shows little official, public support to NCP activities.

Relationships between FASI, the MES and the different NCP host organisations are heterogeneous and governed by personal, informal contacts.

NCP host organisations lack official public recognition, structures and duties, enabling them to act on behalf of the entire Russian Federation.

6.1.2 Funding of NCP host organisations

6.1.2.1 The funding system

Current Russian law foresees the provision of funding for R&D activities that can be implemented by research organisations and universities nominated as NCPs within the framework of the Federal Targeted Programme (FTP).

In 2006/2007, FASI granted Russian NCP host organisations in the framework of the FTP subsidies based on contracts.

Procedures changed in 2008. In line with the rules and regulations, work packages and time schedule of the Federal Targeted Programme, FASI now publishes calls for tender targeting R&D in which NCP host organisations can compete as any other research organisation. These
calls cover the analysis and Monitoring of Russia’s participation in the Framework Programme, the provision of information and advice services, the development of reference and methodological materials for potential participants, the development of recommendations how the participation of Russian researchers in FP7 can be increased, the organisation of events like brokerage/partnering events, FP7 conferences and workshops. Any Russian institution may respond to such a call for tender.

Via these calls, FASI provides funding to research organisations and universities hosting NCPs for R&D and accompanying activities, namely analyses, methodological work, recommendations, web-sites, events (incl. staff costs).

6.1.2.2 Procedure followed

In view of these calls for tender, research organisations and universities hosting NCPs submit proposals to FASI on a competitive basis. These proposals comprise legal and administrative data of the applicant institution, a confirmation of the institution’s qualifications, the rationale of the proposed work, the description of work and intended results, the time schedule, an overview of staff costs, the organisation of events like info days and workshops in Russia, and travel costs to attend international events and NCP meetings.

There are two departments of the Ministry for Education and Science of the Russian Federation which are responsible for international cooperation within the Framework Programme: the “Department of International Cooperation in Education and Science” lead by Director Mr. Vladislav Nichkov (http://eng.mon.gov.ru/ruk/dir/nichkov) and the “Department of Strategy and Perspective Projects in Education and Science” lead by Director Mr. Sergey Ivanets (http://eng.mon.gov.ru/ruk/dir/ivanets).

NCPs usually first discuss their plans with the responsible persons from FASI and/or the Ministry. FASI examines the proposed activities. If they are assessed as reasonable and complying with the rules, the purpose and actions of the Federal Targeted Programme which is aimed at the development of the Russian Federation, it includes the activities into a call for tender. In principle, any Russian organisation can respond to this type of call.

This application procedure takes some time. By consequence, NCP host organisations are likely to lack Russian federal funding for the first months of a year.

Not all NCP host organisations apply for funding. Those who can afford it avoid these extensive administrative procedures, as they consider the amount of funding as too small for this effort.

6.1.2.3 Amount of federal funding

Federal funding provided via the calls for tender issued by FASI within the framework of the Federal Targeted Programme is inappropriate and insufficient for covering the whole set of basic NCP activities which NCPs usually carry out and are necessary in situation of “new” countries like Russia.

Therefore many NCP host organisations cover parts of the costs of the NCP work, notably staff costs and overheads, by their own budget, restrict their activities and/or they try to acquire additional funding by participating in EC funded projects.

Following the interviews, the contribution of FASI covers approximately 30 % of the budget spent by NCP host organisations for NCP work and related activities.
6.1.2.4 Monitoring of NCP work by MES/FASI

Monitoring takes place on a formal level via the reports about activities funded by FASI. On an informal level, Monitoring takes place on request of the Ministry of Education and Science and by the attendance of events by the representatives of FASI and/or the MES. Personal, informal contacts are a decisive element of the relationship between MES/FASI and the NCPs.

The Heads of the NCP units are often distinguished researchers in high administrative positions of the RTD landscape. Due to their good personal contacts, they often first meet face-to-face the representatives of FASI to propose and discuss some ideas what could be done. This happens also during the year, if, for example, an NCP would like to carry out an extra (not previously planned) event. Then FASI may agree to the suggestion of the NCP and publish a suitable call for tender if the proposed activity is in line of the objectives and thematic of the FTP. Based on the application put forward in response to this targeted call for tender by the NCP host organisation, FASI provides funding, e.g. for a specific event like a FP7 conference, workshop, etc.

Writing the reports seems to be very time consuming, as reports are likely to comprise several dozens of pages with the annexes. These reports are approved by evaluators of the MES/FASI.

Formally, annual reports don’t comprise all NCP activities. The annual report covers the activities detailed in the Description of Work annexed to the contract with FASI. But NCP host institutions try to cover all their NCP activities with their reports.

If FASI is not fully satisfied with some elements of a report, additional information may be requested.

Reports are approved on a formal level and the final amount of money is transferred. Apart from this, there is no further formal feedback to the reports.

It should be mentioned that NCP staff is quite absorbed with the annual FASI application and reporting procedures: At the beginning of the year, staff is busy with making the plans and application for the upcoming year, at the end of a year, staff is busy with writing reports comprising activities and the finances.

6.1.3 NCP staff

6.1.3.1 High qualifications of staff employed

Many NCP host organisations involve a small number of experienced senior staff and employ/hire a considerable number of junior staff for NCP-related work.

In fact, the majority of Russia’s nowadays NCP related staff is rather young, well educated, open minded, fluent in English, interested in the job and rather used to living and working in an international environment.

Many have a background in research, but they are also employees with a partial managerial background. There is awareness among NCPs that both competences are needed within NCP host organisations.

The Heads of NCP units are likely to be distinguished, leading and well known Russian researchers with high responsibilities not only in RTD, but also in the administration (e.g. Dean of a faculty, Vice Rector of a university, Head of an institute or Head of unit of the
Russian Academy of Sciences - RAS. The position and competences of the Heads enable them
to take significant decisions within the organisations where they are located, including the
shifting of institutional and/or human resources. They usually dispose of an excellent personal
network into the RTD community and to the Ministry of Education and Science resp. FASI.

A lot depends on the personal interest these decision makers take in the NCP work. Nearly all
interviewed NCP related staff underlined that their Heads did their best to support them and
that they actually showed a real interest in the NCP work.

6.1.3.2 NCPs only part-time available for NCP work

As was mentioned already, the federal funding NCP host organisations receive from FASI is
unstable and usually insufficient to cover all costs accumulated by the NCP activities. The
NCP host organisations are therefore even obliged to look for additional income from their
own institutional budget and/or from national/international projects. The share of federal
funding from FASI in the overall budget varies from 50 to 70% according to the estimations
made during the interviews. Without participating in international projects, many NCP host
organisations would not be in a position to maintain their NCP-related staff.

This leads to a situation, where staff employed for NCP work has considerable other duties
like project work or research. Many employees involved into NCP related activities are thus
only part-time available for the NCP work. Usually, NCP host organisations employ only one
person full time for NCP work. NCP work is in some cases regarded as add-on activity.

6.1.3.3 High frequency of staff changes

NCP work is basically an interesting, although demanding work in an international
environment which requires a skilled workforce. NCPs need a series of competences and
skills, among them good insight into the RTD area concerned, communication skills including
a good knowledge of English, organisational and management skills, presentation skills,
networking skills and more.

This type of staff is nowadays in general in high demand in Russia. As the Russian Federal
Ministry of Education and Science is not bound by the decree of 21st February 2007 to engage
in specific financial responsibilities ensuring that NCPs can fulfil and finance their duties,
NCP host organisations may loose the federal funding from FASI each year. NCP host
organisations have little stability and personal security to offer to their young, talented, skilled
and interested staff. Some interviews showed also that junior NCP staff may also feel
sometimes a bit lost with developing plans and writing reports, although their Heads do their
best to support them.

It is not easy to maintain skilled people in a workplace without offering attractive conditions
of work, such as an attractive and stable salary, a stable contract, or mid-/long-term career
perspectives support and recognition.

Notably if NCPs have a background as researcher, they are likely to leave once they are
familiar with the rules and procedures of FP7 and got some exploitable contacts. They prefer
to develop their (research) career inclusive own FP projects since the NCP work does not yet
provide for a sustainable career path.

However, some NCP host organisation managed to keep experienced senior staff, ensuring
continuity over FP6 and FP7, accumulating a very good level of experience and knowledge.
The interviews showed that NCPs are highly aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the Russian NCP support system, as well as of possible improvements and solutions. In general, NCPs are keen on delivering good results, but feel prevented from this by a NCP system failing to offer appropriate working conditions. Due to the current situation, the main motivation to work as NCP is to learn how to deal with FP7 in order to acquire funding. Once they learned enough – the frequency of staff changes varies between several months and 1.5 years – they return to their work as researchers or move on to other, more profitable jobs.

6.1.3.4 Potential conflict of interest

As mentioned before, organisations selected as NCP host organisations are usually well known, rather traditional and acclaimed RTD institutions, RTD funding organisations (like FASIE) and universities well embedded into the national RTD community of the respective thematic area of the Framework Programme. Many Russian NCP host institutions carry out research themselves, and/or they provide higher education. Some institutions do also conduct different analyses, evaluation activities and/or foresight studies on behalf of the Russian Federal Ministry of Science and Education.

On a national level, the visibility of these organisations - most of the times high already before the nomination – increased further after the nomination as NCP host organisation. Those which were rather unknown before gained in the meantime considerable visibility and status within the Russian RTD community, notably among those researchers which are active in the Framework Programme.

Furthermore, NCP host organisations are active on an international level. The fact, that they were selected as host for a NCP usually increased their international visibility, provided opportunities to create new contacts and to develop international activities (bilateral cooperation with EU Member States, participation in projects funded by the European Commission).

In fact, the only exception is FASIE who is as a federal funding institution not entitled to participate in any projects funded by the European Commission.

NCP host organisations appreciate that they get access to first hand information about FP7 for their own institution and in general more information about European RTD activities and leading projects.

As mentioned already, federal financial commitment, strategic guidance and other support is rather limited. NCP host organisations in many cases contribute from their own budget to the funding of NCP activities, or develop international projects funded from FP6/FP7 to ensure additional income to be able to pay their staff while providing also consultancy on FP7 to other Russian institutions.

Russian NCP host organisations have to cope on a daily basis with structural weaknesses of the Russian NCP system – insufficient and instable federal funding, little coordination and strategic guidance, limited resources and support, little long-term stability and official recognition. This explains that, on the other side, NCP host organisations may seek a return to their institutional investment and try to benefit also from the fact that they host an NCP for FP7.

The interviews showed that the self-concept of NCPs is guided by the idea that there is no official binding contractual relationship between two parties, MES resp. FASI and the NCP host organisations. There is little awareness and/or little willingness to become aware, let alone any feeling of guiltiness about a potential conflict of interest. The fact that institutions as well as individuals may directly benefit from their position as NCP host or NCP, as
compared to other Russian institutions or researchers participating in the FP7 on a competitive basis with the host, is not regarded as a potential problem.
6.2 NCP work

Key words summarizing main findings

- Focus on information dissemination, organisation of events
- Individual approaches (e.g. no common websites, databases, etc.)
- More elaborate services hardly developed (e.g. individual assistance) due to lack of resources and training
- Partner searching highly needed but very difficult: lack of info, visibility and access.

6.2.1 Activities

6.2.1.1 Focus on information dissemination and events

Currently, the dissemination of information and the organisation of events like FP7 info days or workshops as well as the provision of information and advice by email and phone are the most central tasks of Russian NCPs. All NCPs maintain a FP7 website in Russian and English language. Many NCPs disseminate regular newsletters; some NCPs developed already success stories.

6.2.1.2 Target groups

Databases of customers are more or less maintained by all NCPs, with the number of entries varying between 50 entries to 1500. These figures comprise institutional multipliers.

While still being rather small taken the size of Russia’s RTD community, target groups are extended with the help of info days, national associations, the Russian Technology Transfer Network (RTTN) and of networks (mostly informal) of multipliers. However, not all NCPs are convinced that under the current circumstances they are necessarily expected to extend their target groups.

There are little pre-defined strategies to check if target groups were actually reached.

The majority of clients of Russian NCPs are beginners in FP7, many of them located at research organisations. For some Research Themes like SSH academic institutions prevail. Partners in projects which receive EC funding are also an important group of clients at least for some NCPs.

The approximate majority of clients carry out basic research. For some research areas like ICT, applied RTD prevails.

6.2.1.3 New opportunities for Russian participation in FP7

With regard to new opportunities in FP7, the Technology Platforms established in the Theme Food, Agriculture and Biotechnology and the EU-Russia Coordinated Calls are worth mentioning.
6.2.1.4 Information on legal and financial issues

Some NCPs deal with questions on legal and financial issues, but not all. Sets of “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQ) are rarely used.

One NCP translated the Financial Guide of FP7 into Russian, and compared the financial rules of Russia to those of the European Community. The outcomes are available free of charge via the FP7-website of this NCP.

Several NCPs underlined that they try to answer all questions. If they can’t answer them immediately, they search for the answer and come back to the client.

At the same time some other NCPs simply feel overburdened with detailed questions in this area, due to a lack of experience and a lack of time/resources. Researchers are in this case directed to competent researchers with experience, to senior NCPs from other Themes, or simply to CORDIS resp. the Financial/IPR Helpdesk funded by the EC.

6.2.1.5 Trainings

NCPs are more likely to organise info days than real trainings. Trainings are still mainly carried out within projects funded by the European Commission, with trainers from EU Member States (MS) or Associated States (AS). However, some NCPs started to develop and carry out trainings themselves. NCPs also invite experienced Russian colleagues from other Themes (e.g. BIO NCP) to this type of event.

6.2.2 Individual consultancy

Individual consultancy is conducted by email, phone and face-to-face. Most of the times but not always individual consultancy is initiated and requested for by researchers. Individual consultancy also takes place at the occasion of events and workshops.

NCPs explained that they deal mostly with beginners in FP7 and underlined the difficulty to make Russian newcomers understand the Framework Programme and its benefits. To find out if a researcher resp. her/his project idea actually has potential to succeed in FP7, notably in an open call, is one main purpose of individual consultancy. Phone calls seem to be very popular in this context.

Face-to-face consultancy is less frequent, due to the limited staff resources. Some NCPs entirely refrain from face-to-face consultancy because this would exceed the capacities of their human resources.

Many NCPs monitor the number of their consultancies by one way or the other. All of them are at least able to make an approximate estimation. One NCP underlined that it would be much more important to monitor their output if they had a real official public mission, were really paid for their work and needed to justify the spending of federal funding. But in the current context, there is little motivation to spend a lot of time to monitor activities in more detail than what is required by the reports to FASI.

Asked how they monitor the success of their work, many NCPs consider a successful proposal as the most reliable indicator. Some NCPs regarded the fact that researchers come back a second time, showing a real interest, or in particular continue until the submission of a proposal already as a success.
All NCPs underlined that the number of requests for individual consultancy increases steadily. Some NCPs mentioned that the type of questions became more sophisticated in FP7, showing that a growing segment of the Russian research community active on an international level gained some experience and knowledge about the Framework Programme. NCPs were also convinced that the need for individual consultancy will increase further, notably in case of Russia’s association to FP7.

Asked how they prepare for this growing need, NCPs said that above all more staff would be needed.

All NCPs were convinced that individual consultancy was a key factor to ensure and increase the success of Russian researchers in FP7.

6.2.3 Assistance to researchers

6.2.3.1 Partnering and consortium building

NCPs indicated a strong need for support in this area, particularly with respect to identifying professional and experienced coordinators. Many NCPs use personal networks to provide partnering support services. Russian NCPs usually rely on good links to the Russian RTD community if there are requests from Europe. Features are maintained on their websites, enhancing partnering. However, the lack of information about project consortia under formation in Europe is regarded as an important barrier to the successful integration and participation of Russian newcomers in FP7.

6.2.3.2 Services

Services like proposal checks, support with completing A-forms or with the negotiation phase, on IPR and the consortium agreement are not fully developed by all NCPs. There are very few proposal checks. This can be explained partly by the fact that Russian researchers usually act as partners, not as coordinators. Requests for the assessment of a project idea are also not very frequent. Researchers rather request the judging of the general adequacy of a project idea to a given call.

Particularly with respect to reporting and financial issues support is frequently requested.

6.2.3.3 Dealing with specific target groups: SMEs

Most of the times, SMEs are included into the information and consultancy work as any other group of customers. Many NCPs don’t develop specific measures to attract SMEs. Compared to the participation of research organisations, the number of Russian SMEs participating in FP7 is low.

The Technology Platforms established by the NCP for Food, Agriculture and Biotechnology are considered as a success and a suitable tool to reach Russian SMEs.

However, the industrial implementation of RTD results still needs to develop in Russia. NCPs believe that SME would require much more support in order to be able to succeed in FP7, starting with easy access to credits.
Many NCPs either consider that SMEs are not ready for FP7 (lack of human resources, lack of capacity to communicate in English), that they have to face currently other, rather very basic challenges in Russia, or they believe that they are simply not interested because of the administrative burden. The necessity to provide additional funding might also prevent SMEs from participating in FP7. Thematic NCPs are likely to refer SME clients to the SME NCP.

Contrary to this, NCPs believe in a high potential of the academic sector in Russia to succeed in FP7, although the infrastructure might sometimes form a barrier to a successful participation.
6.3 NCP and their environment

Key words summarizing main findings

- No/little strategic guidance by MES, partly by host organisations
  - Some exchange between different NCPs but no nationally coordinated approaches, exchange, training
- NCPs maintain informal regional/institutional network
  - Lack of resources for exchange/sharing of experience/training/face to face meetings with regional/institutional multipliers
- Varying contacts with EU NCPs (intense to no contacts)
  - FP7 NCP projects are good opportunities for networking
  - Cooperation with EU NCPs focussed on partner searching
- Varying contacts with European Commission (intense to no contacts)
  - Invitations to EC NCP meetings received by some RU NCPs
  - Coordinated calls help in networking
  - EC officers availability upon request

6.3.1 Networking and Coordination of Russian NCPs

6.3.1.1 Networking of Russian NCPs

Currently, cooperation among Russian NCPs from different research themes and horizontal programmes is informal and takes place case-by-case.

NCPs expressed a strong need for sharing of experiences and good practise. Nearly all NCPs believe that this would create useful synergies. NCPs underlined also the need to cooperate on overlapping (cross-cutting) topics.

Due to the lack of an initiative from the MES or FASI, some NCPs started to cooperate with other Russian NCPs by themselves. This cooperation takes place among NCPs of neighbouring RTD areas, among NCPs covering horizontal programmes and those responsible for specific Research Themes of the FP7 Specific Programme “Cooperation”, among less experienced and more experienced NCPs. Networking and cooperation takes place at events, within the framework of working groups established by the NCPs themselves, by projects financed by the MES resp. FASI or within projects funded by the EC.

Some NCPs said to maintain only very sporadic contacts with other NCPs, which was not considered as a satisfying situation. As for FP7 a number of Russian NCPs were nominated for the first time, this process was considered as particularly important. A very small number of NCPs considered more networking with their colleagues as of low priority, without being against it.
6.3.1.2 **Role of the NCP coordinator**

Although there is an officially nominated NCP coordinator, there is currently little to no official coordination and guidance from the MES via this coordinator. NCPs were aware of the NCP coordinator located within the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation. Some NCPs mentioned that they address the NCP coordinator in case of difficulties, and that the coordinator would respond to these requests.

In many cases, neither the MES nor FASI provide strategic guidance to NCP host organisations. It is up to the NCPs to develop strategies on their own. In general, NCPs are currently guided by the Heads of NCP host organisation, like a Dean of a faculty or Vice Rector of a university, who are usually busy with a wide variety of activities. Although NCPs underlined in the interviews the interest demonstrated by the Heads towards NCPs activities, they can’t focus on the daily NCP business.

In some few cases, there is close cooperation with the MES, and NCPs provide advice on FP7 issues to the MES. These NCPs act as mediator between the EC and the MES, and there is regular discussion and mutual consultancy. Cooperation seems closer, once an EU-Russia Working Group was set up and working.

However, this can’t replace official recognition, overall coordination and guidance for all NCPs from the MES.

There are no national coordination meetings although most NCPs show a high interest in national coordination among Russian NCPs. One NCP described Russian NCPs as “ships put to the sea, observed by the Ministry, without being told where to go”.

In the interviews, NCPs stressed the need for a regular forum to share experiences, enabling them to discuss about their work (problems and possible solutions, success rates etc.) and their individual approaches. NCPs demonstrated a clear need, wish and interest to develop joint strategies and solutions.

The cooperation with MES was not described as bad, in some cases rather close to excellent, with contacts taking place approx. twice a week. NCPs tend to regret the lack of a systematic approach involving all NCPs. It was underlined that it was necessary to really involve all NCPs in a regular mutual communication and information flow.

NCPs underlined that someone – a mediator - was required to ensure an ongoing dialogue between the Ministry/MES and the NCPs. This type of dialogue would enable NCPs to be informed about new positions and views of the MES. Besides, NCPs believe that the MES would greatly benefit if they were informed about activities of NCPs, notably about views and experiences of NCPs concerning the Russian participation in FP7.

The role of the NCP coordinator was regarded as a potentially very important role.

One NCP underlined that the NCP coordinator should be someone from the Ministry as the MES has this supervisory role. This function/position should be defined without direct responsibility for the activities of NCPs, but rather for enhancing the dialogue between the MES/FASI and the NCPs. One NCP mentioned that good insight into the NCP business would be of an advantage for the concrete person acting as national NCP coordinator.
6.3.2 Regional networks of multipliers

There are no officially nominated regional FP7-multipliers or contact points (RCP). However, following the Russian Guidelines for NCPs, Russian NCPs are expected to develop a national network of regional multipliers. Financial provisions to develop this network are not mentioned.

Many, but not all NCPs indicated in the interviews that they actually maintain a network of multipliers in regions and/or institutions. Due to the limited financial possibilities, the main task of these networks is to disseminate information like newsletters (published by the respective thematic/horizontal NCP) to their own respective target groups. Regional and institutional multipliers play thus an active role in dissemination of information. They provide support with broadening the target groups of NCPs.

Apart from this, there is little interaction between the central thematic/horizontal NCP and multipliers. Some NCPs mentioned one face-to-face meeting which took place at the beginning of the cooperation. There are no regular meetings, there is no exchange of data, no systematic sharing of experiences and there are no trainings tailor made for multipliers or regional contact points.

The current level of funding does not allow NCP host organisations to maintain a more active network of regional multipliers or contact points.

Apart from the lack of an appropriate financial setting, an official nomination and recognition as regional multipliers/contact point would greatly support regional actors, following the views of some NCPs.

All NCPs underlined that they consider the development of a well-functioning network of regional FP7 multipliers/contact points as a priority for a country of Russia’s size.

6.3.3 Networking with EU NCPs

Networking with EU NCPs was considered as very important by Russian NCPs. The level of networking into the EU NCP community varies. Some NCPs are very well networked, others have practically no contacts.

FP7 NCP projects can play a very positive role to integrate Russian NCPs into the European NCP community. Some NCPs mentioned that they get helpful support and contacts while taking part in FP7 NCP projects.

6.3.4 Support from the European Commission

6.3.4.1 Contact with the European Commission

Some NCPs described the contact with the EC as very fruitful and constructive. This was particularly true for those NCPs who participated already in the development and implementation of joint EU-Russia Coordinated Calls.

It seems also that the quality of the contact considerably depends on the awareness and interest EC representatives take in issues related to Russia. For example, Christian Paterman, former Director of KBBE (Knowledge Based Bio-Economy) Unit (DG RTD, European Commission), was particularly mentioned as a positive example as he seems to have
contributed substantially to a good EU-Russia cooperation (working environment) in the Biotechnology, Agriculture and Food research area.

6.3.4.2 Participation in regular EU NCP meetings

All NCPs consider the participation in NCP meetings organised by the European Commission as important.

It is interesting to note that some Russian NCPs always receive official invitations to the NCP meetings, while others never receive an invitation.

There is no single harmonised approach of the different Units of the EC towards cooperation with Russian NCPs.

The EC used to reimburse the costs of participation of Russian NCPs until recently. However, this payment has stopped. The EC views Russia now as a mature partner able to fund the participation of NCPs by own means. This will only change in case of Russia’s association to FP7.

Russian NCPs now either submit applications towards FASI for covering the costs, pay the participation from EC-funded projects, from their own institutional budget or they don’t participate at all.

6.3.4.3 Support needed from the European Commission

Some NCPs have very little contact with the European Commission, notably those who don’t attend NCP meetings. It seems hard for them to formulate what type of support they would need from the EC.

While some NCPs are happy with their communication flow, some other NCPs complained that sometimes it takes time to get answers from the EC.

After request by Russian NCPs, the EC is likely to send representatives to take part as keynote speakers in FP7 events (workshops, conferences) organised in Russia.

All NCPs underlined that they would urgently and above all need information about accepted proposals and their Russian participants. The request to get statistical data about successful Russian participants (e.g. access to CIRCA) was one of the most urgent ones expressed by Russian NCPs. NCPs are very frustrated that as a Third Country participant in FP they don’t get these vital data. The access to evaluation and statistical FP data is regarded as a crucial issue.
7 FUTURE PERSPECTIVES: RECOMMENDATIONS IN DETAIL

7.1 Introduction

FP7 is not just a funding programme, but a substantial strategic challenge for individual researchers as well as research institutions in any country. Projects under FP7 have become too complex and the potential positive impact on any organisation involved in a funded FP7 project can be highly significant in terms of competitiveness. Therefore, a systematic and strategic approach is needed at every level.

These are challenges particularly relevant for NCPs and FP7 contact points, since their job is to be close to researchers and inform, assist and actually nowadays coach them in order to contribute to the researchers’ successful participation in FP7.

Since its creation, the Russian FP support system has already come a long way with many active and enthusiastic individuals involved at various levels. However, with the Framework Programme as a learning system becoming more and more competitive – currently (approx.) 15% success rate at European average – and Russia’s envisaged association to FP7, further efforts are urgently needed in order to continue the development and strengthen the Russian FP7 support system.

Following experiences in other countries it is obvious, that investments in an effective National FP7 support system pay off and can have a direct impact on the success of a national research system in the European FP7 competition. However, it is also clear, that success in FP7 depends on other essential factors such as national investments in research, national research priorities and structures, etc. These can be significant limiting factors, which cannot be compensated by even the best NCPs and FP7 contact points.

Based on the analysis done, the recommendations defined have been structured along the following 5 blocks (see Fig. 7.1):

1. Development of a comprehensive FP7 support system
2. Governance of the FP7 support system
3. FP7 support system staff and its recognition
4. NCP work as a systematic process towards successful FP7 cooperation
5. Networking at European level

Each of the mentioned blocks is split into a recommendation for strategic development and a set of recommendations for action giving indications towards the implementation.

Furthermore, the rational for each block of recommendations is described and high-lightening the most important aspects and elements of consideration. In the frame of this report it is impossible to go into all the details.
Fig. 7.1: Based on the analysis done, the recommendations defined were structured along 5 blocks as presented.
7.2 Development of a comprehensive FP7 support system

Recommendation for strategic development
Development of a comprehensive FP7 support system with a clear common vision, defined objectives, activities and structures comprising the national, regional and institutional dimension in a complementary approach.

Recommendation for action

- Setting-up a strategy development process together with all relevant stakeholders identifying objectives, goals, strategies, activities and performance indicators.
- Development of scenarios of Russia’s potential for participation in FP7.
- Provision of an appropriate contractual framework for NCP host organisations enabling sustainability of the system and services offered (e.g. timing of contracts coordinated with the duration of the EU Framework Programme, Management by Objectives, common reporting and monitoring standards, etc.).
- Network development of capable officially appointed and recognized FP7 contact points at regional and institutional level to be coordinated by NCPs.
- Provision of sufficient funding for the system clearly related to above defined objectives and activities foreseen. Funding should include all levels of the system.
- Foresee structured mechanisms for coordination and learning of the system.

7.2.1 Rational

7.2.1.1 The Diversity of NCP systems in Europe

NCP and FP7 support systems in Europe are structured in a highly diverse manner. Some countries – like France, Germany, UK, Greece and Belarus - maintain NCPs in different host organisations similar to Russia. The NCP coordinator has to ensure an ongoing dialogue, flow of information and communication among all thematic and horizontal NCPs. France and Germany maintain a joint Web-Portal as online entrance point to their national FP7 support structures.

Other countries created central organisation/agencies hosting all NCPs, like Sweden, Austria, The Netherlands, Italy, Poland and Ukraine. The national coordinator is in several cases the Director of this type of organisation or the respective FP7 department within the organisation.

Some countries seek organisational synergies between national funding programmes and NCP activities (VINNOVA/Sweden, SENTER-NOVEM/The Netherlands, FFG/Austria); others seek synergies between national RTD organisations and NCP activities and place NCPs at leading national RTD organisations.

In countries like Sweden, Austria and The Netherlands national funding for their central NCP host organisation is comprehensive and covers 100% of efforts, others like Italy are partly funded via contributions by members.
Large countries like Italy but also small countries like Austria maintain FP7 support structures composed of an integrated network of national, regional and institutional FP7 contact points and multipliers. Many EU countries have developed approaches to cover the whole country with (regional, local and institutional) contact persons for the FP.

The decision of the structures of a national system of contact points depends on country specific factors like organisational cultures, traditions, specific approaches of doing things and political considerations or legal and historical boundary conditions.

7.2.1.2 Building a real Russian FP7 support system

Taken the potential of Russian researchers to participate successfully in FP7 and the high contribution the Russian Federation most likely will pay to the European Community’s research budget in case of the association to FP7, it is highly recommendable to the Russian authorities to carefully prepare for adequate national FP7 support structures and use the time during the transition phase.

Following the analysis carried out and taken Russia’s current FP7 support structures, there are three basic options:

1. To maintain the current FP7 support structures
2. To basically maintain the current FP7 support structures, but provide NCP host organisations and NCPs with a more appropriate organisational and financial framework including regional and institutional multipliers
3. To entirely reorganise the Russian FP7 support structures and to set up a central agency uniting all NCPs in one organisation in one house.

As bottom line for setting up a real Russian FP7 support system the development of scenarios for Russia’s participation in FP7 is recommended, including benchmarking and estimation of Russia’s potential. Based on the results, a strategy development process together with all relevant stakeholders and actors (NCPs, regional actors, etc) would be most necessary. In the course of this process, objectives, goals and expectations, as well as adequate strategies to achieve these goals and finally the necessary activities have to be defined. Appropriate performance goals and indicators should be identified and linked to above mentioned strategies and activities in order to identify clear criteria for success. It is important to set-up the entire NCP and support structure as a learning system facing challenges, looking for solutions and gaining valuable experience. Thus, it is necessary to foresee suitable structures for systematic exchange of experience and learning of the entire system. It is recommended to capitalise on the experience and knowledge gained already in Russia, at the level of NCPs as well as at the level of researchers and RTD management.

7.2.1.3 NCPs and their environment: access to information and FP7 support all over Russia

Due to the size of Russia and the RTD landscape, it is highly recommended to develop a system of NCPs embedded into a network of regional and institutional multipliers/contact points.

Based on the before-mentioned scenarios of Russia’s potential to succeed in FP7 and the strategy development process, regional multipliers/contact points should be officially
appointed and recognized, provided with a clear definition of tasks and an appropriate budget. If applicable, the costs should be financed by national as well as regional sources. This would greatly support the need to provide researchers all over Russia with access to information and support towards the participation in FP7 regardless of their location.

Within relevant and leading RTD and higher education organisations institutional multipliers/contact points, should be established. If applicable, they should be financed by the institutional budget via federal funding.

Regular exchange, e.g. face-to-face meetings with the respective thematic/horizontal NCP and tailor-made trainings are indispensable for the maintenance of a well functioning FP7 support system. Furthermore, due to Russia’s size in terms of population and researchers, FP7 multipliers/contact points need to develop their own networks and contacts in the EU RTD community, e.g. by attending international FP7 conferences and workshops in the EU and Russia.

Participation of multipliers in FP7 Coordination and Support Actions is recommended in order to enable them to develop their capacity of fully understanding and applying the rules of FP7.

A written contract between NCPs, MES/FASI, regional authorities and regional multipliers is highly recommendable.

Regional multipliers need a clear description of tasks, performance goals and indicators. The attainment of intended results should be monitored by the steering committee mentioned before.

7.2.1.4 **Contractual Framework: A mutually binding, clear and stable framework of action for all parties**

The basis for a well structured NCP system is an explicit political will and commitment to create and maintain a system of National Contact Points and support system capable to exploit the potential of Russia to succeed in FP7.

As a first step, it is essential to recognize NCP host organisations and NCPs as official partners acting on behalf of the Russian Federation within the context of Russia’s participation in FP7. Furthermore, it is of utmost importance that Russian authorities ensure a suitable and stable organisational and financial framework to institutions hosting NCPs.

The entire NCP system needs high visibility within the RTD community, backed by the Russian authorities, be they national, regional and/or institutional.

A country of Russia’s size, with excellent RTD organisations located all over the country, and a high potential for successful participation needs FP7 support structures involving many actors of the RTD community, covering the whole country and all relevant types of institutions.

It is up to the Russian authorities to locate NCPs at different institutions or to unite them in one organisational framework or even organisation. NCPs can be located at leading national RTD institutions or at a specially created National Agency.

The key point is to provide NCP host organisations and NCPs with a clear and stable framework of action and appropriate financial means to fulfil their tasks. NCP host organisations and their staff need to be able to plan ahead.
The system of National Contact Points should therefore be based on a stable, well defined framework of actors with clearly defined objectives, strategies, tasks, performance goals and indicators and responsibilities.

A written contract between the parties to the NCP and support system is indispensable, defining objectives and transparent performance goals and indicators, binding all actors in mutual commitment.

### 7.2.1.5 An appropriate NCP funding mechanism

It is advisable to provide NCP host organisations with multi-annual contracts or to cover the entire duration of the Framework Programme (FP7) with such a contract, providing NCP host organisations with transparency and long-term stability.

The level of federal funding has to be in line with the goals and tasks defined. NCPs should be able to cover all costs incurring related to basic NCP activities without being obliged to look for additional income.
7.3 Governance of the FP7 support system

Recommendation for strategic development

Development of a consistent, highly effective and efficient governance structure for the Russian FP7 support system.

Recommendation for action

- Establishment of a supervisory body acting as steering committee providing supervision and strategic orientation for the FP7 Support System and the implementation of its contract(s). This steering committee should consist of a limited number of high level representatives of all relevant parties (MES, FASI, NCP Coordinator, adequate regional or institutional representatives). Ideally, a limited number of international experts are also included as members.

- Organisation of regular meetings of the supervisory body (approx. 4 times per year) to monitor the implementation of the contract(s), and to facilitate strategic discussions.

- Setting up an effective, proactive national coordination (represented by an individual person or a specific unit) of the FP7 Support System at operational level in the implementation of the contract(s): acting on behalf of MES/ FASI, empowered to provide strategic guidance and coordination, mediating between all Russian thematic and horizontal NCPs and the MES/FASI, facilitating an ongoing dialogue, without being given the competence to interfere into the daily business of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points.

- Setting up an effective, proactive national coordination of the FP7 Support System at operational level in the implementation of the contract(s):
  - Acting on behalf of MES/FASI,
  - Empowered to provide strategic guidance and coordination,
  - Mediating between all Russian thematic and horizontal NCPs and the MES/FASI,
  - Facilitating an ongoing dialogue,
  - Without being given the competence to interfere into the daily business of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points.
  - Setting-up of a common NCP and FP7 Contact Point Web-Portal.
  - Organisation of regular trainings and meetings of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
  - Enhance, with the help of the national coordinator, the establishment of a networking platform for sharing of experiences and best practise among all NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
  - Encourage NCPs cooperation towards joint events on horizontal issues like legal and financial questions, joint publications, etc.

The governance of the FP7 support system, its objectives and interactions is summarised in Fig. 7.2.
7.3.1 **Rational**

### 7.3.1.1 Suitable steering, supervising and monitoring of the FP7 Support System

A transparent monitoring procedure should be set-up based on transparent performance goals and indicators, responsibilities, work programmes, reports and regular face-to-face contacts in the form of official meetings. It is advisable to establish an organisational supervisory structure where all relevant authorities are represented and facilitate strategic discussions.

This type of supervisory body acting as steering committee should be based on transparent rules of procedures. NCPs and the FP7 Support System need an opportunity to report and explain their results; Russian authorities need an opportunity to obtain information. Regular meetings will enhance an exchange of information, early identification of specific challenges and facilitate the monitoring if performance goals are reached.

Annual reports based on an agreed work plan, an appropriate financial framework and agreed performance goals and indicators providing an overview of activities, justification of corresponding spending and the results/impact obtained are foreseen to be submitted to the steering committee and will be discussed in this forum.

### 7.3.1.2 Strategic guidance, coordination and networking of Russian NCPs

Networking among Russian NCPs is rather informal. Formal networking takes place mainly within projects funded by the European Commission and within some national activities, partly initiated on a bottom-up basis by NCPs themselves.
It is highly advisable to respond to the needs expressed by Russian NCPs to establish a forum for sharing of experiences and information on daily work, problems and possible solutions, approaches to different tasks and networking among all thematic and horizontal Russian NCPs.

NCPs should be provided with a forum to discuss about any issue arising from the NCPs work and should be able to learn from each other.

It is also recommended to enhance national networking via joint activities like events, publications, joint development/planning of strategies.

Besides, the aim of national NCP meetings would be to enhance the exploration and joint development of common strategies within a consistent system of FP7 support structures.

### 7.3.1.3 Pro-active national coordinator

Particularly in a country like Russia effective and pro-active national coordination is an essential success factor. This national coordination of the FP7 Support System can be taken care of by a specific organisational unit or an individual person. The primary objective of the national coordination is the operational implementation of the contracts for the FP7 Support System.

This national coordination is foreseen to act on behalf of MES/ FASI, empowered to provide strategic guidance and coordination, mediating between all Russian thematic and horizontal NCPs and the MES/FASI, facilitating an ongoing dialogue, without being given the competence to interfere into the daily business of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points.

Setting up an effective, proactive national coordination of the FP7 Support System at operational level would mean in practical terms:

- Setting-up of a common NCP and FP7 Contact Point Web-Portal.
- Organisation of regular trainings and meetings of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
- Enhance the establishment of a networking platform for sharing of experiences and best practise among all NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
- Encourage NCPs cooperation towards joint events on horizontal issues like legal and financial questions, joint publications, etc.

While the steering committee mentioned above is intended to supervise the development of the Russian FP7 Support System and provide strategic advice in the implementation, the National Coordination works at the level of the operational implementation.
7.4 FP7 support system staff and its recognition

Recommendation for strategic development

Recognize NCP and FP7 Contact Point work as specific high-level job profiles that need professional experts in research management in order to achieve sustainable quality of the FP7 support system and create common understanding within the system and at stakeholder level.

Recommendation for action

- Development of the NCP job profile as full time professional (avoiding add-on NCP jobs with parallel research work commitments).
- Development of FP7 contact point job profile suitable for regional and institutional level.
- Include attractive incentives into the NCP and FP7 Contact Point job profiles in order to keep experienced NCP and FP7 Contact Point staff.
- Develop clear guidelines laying down organisational rules excluding any potential conflict of interest thus facilitating NCP services for the entire Russian S&T community.
- Provide NCP units and NCP related staff with organisational and financial autonomy to serve the entire Russian RTD community if they are hosted by a RTD organisation interested itself in participation in FP7.

7.4.1 Rational

Current Russian NCP staff has been carefully selected and is well educated and skilled. NCP work is highly demanding and researchers benefit substantially from well-informed, experienced and pro-active NCPs. Experience with the Framework Programme is in high demand in Russia. To some extend, staff changes are rather unavoidable and it can be regarded as a good sign if staff moves on to better paid or other jobs.

However, the frequency of staff changes in Russia’s NCP host organisations, notably of experienced (junior) staff, is rather high.

It is therefore very important to take measures reducing the high frequency of staff changes with precious experience getting lost for the NCP host organisation and the Russian RTD community addressing the NCP. NCP work should be recognized as a specific job profile, to be handled in another manner than just as an add-on activity to other tasks and jobs.

It is recommendable to offer attractive conditions of work, including official recognition, stability of the work place, an appropriate remuneration, support and guidance, enabling NCP host organisations to maintain skilled and experienced staff.
It is important to create and execute a specific job profile for NCPs. A NCP is not something like a “2nd class” researcher. Being a highly effective NCP is related – amongst others - to the following criteria:

- Specific knowledge of the respective RTD community
- Knowledge and experience with the rules of FP7
- Practical experience in implementing FP7 projects
- Experience with proposal evaluation in FP7
- Experience in project management and research management
- Regional, national and international networking

It is important to develop and shape this profile at the level of NCPs, as well as regarding contact points at regional and institutional level.

7.4.1.1 Potential conflict of interest

NCP host organisations were rather carefully selected, although without a transparent application and selection procedure.

If NCP units are hosted by a RTD organisation participating also in the FP, it is of major importance to ensure that a potential conflict of interest is avoided.

Clear guidelines and rules preventing a potential conflict of interest would help to raise the awareness for this requirement. In this context, NCP units should be provided with organisational autonomy if they are located at RTD organisations participating in FP7. Hierarchical links between NCPs and Directors of specific RTD units should be avoided. NCP staff should be responsible towards the MES/FASI (the organisation providing funding to their work on behalf of the entire Russian RTD community).

As long as NCP host organisations cover NCP activities from their own institutional budget at least partly, conflicts of interest are difficult to avoid. NCP host organisations therefore need to be provided with a suitable budget enabling them to be independent from additional sources of income for covering costs of NCP work/staff.
7.5 NCP work as a systematic process towards successful FP7 cooperation

Recommendation for strategic development
In order to ensure its effectiveness NCP work has to be understood as a systematic process with clearly defined standards and linked performance goals.

Recommendation for action

- Estimation/categorisation of Russia’s potential target group for successful participation in FP7 and definition of NCPs performance goals to reach these target groups in terms of quality and quantity (see also contractual relationships).

- Develop tailor-made NCP service “packages” and standards towards the Russian RTD community: e.g.
  - For high potential Russian coordinators: from information, consultancy to proposal checks. Such packages could also include financial incentives for Russian coordinators (e.g. preparatory funding instruments)
  - For high potential Russian partners: from information, consultancy to effective partner searching, etc.

- Explore the possibility of setting up one data management system for the entire NCP system.

- Meet the urgent need of legal and financial information towards FP7:
  - Establish a Legal and Financial NCP and to employ in addition at each thematic and horizontal NCP host organisation one expert on legal and financial issues.
  - To develop a set of typical FAQ on legal and financial issues for Russian researchers.

- Substantially increase the capacity of Russian FP7 support structures to provide individual face-to-face consultancy and to monitor the impact of face-to-face-consultancy.

7.5.1 Rational

7.5.1.1 Performance goals and indicators to reach target groups

Taken the number of potential customers in Russia, the current databases maintained by NCPs are rather small. These may have a variety of reasons.

It is important that Russian authorities define, together with their NCP-partners, performance goals and indicators regarding the extension of target groups to be addressed by the NCPs.

NCPs need clearly defined performance goals and indicators in terms of number and type of target groups to be proactively addressed. This includes activities to encourage specific target groups like SMEs to participate in FP7 or the cooperation with a network of multipliers (institutional/ regional).
7.5.1.2 A well functioning database, one system for all NCPs

Each NCP host organisation and other actors of FP7 support structures (multipliers/contact points) should be provided with appropriate resources in terms of funding and qualified staff to develop and maintain a well functioning database of customers. One harmonised data management system for the entire FP7 support structures would be most suitable.

7.5.1.3 Information and advice on legal and financial issues

The number of ex post audits carried out by the European Commission or/on behalf of the European Court of Auditors in the EU is growing.

The establishment of a Russian Legal and Financial NCP would be of major importance for the Russian RTD community interested in taking part in the Framework Programme, or already taking part due to many questions in legal and financial issues.

As long as there is no Russian NCP on legal and financial issues, Russian thematic and other horizontal NCPs should be provided with sufficient knowledge to respond to questions in this key area. It would be advisable to employ at each NCP host organisation one legal expert focusing on legal and financial issues, ensuring colleagues are well informed about the rules and their applications in different contexts. Training and close cooperation with EU legal and financial NCPs is particularly advisable as long as there is no Russian Legal and Financial NCP.

The development of a set of Russian FAQ’s is recommended which can be used by NCPs. Besides, NCPs would benefit possibly from an opportunity to share experiences about legal and financial issues via an electronic forum.

7.5.1.4 New opportunities for Russia in FP7

FP7 offers new opportunities and instruments, such as European Technology Platforms. One Russian NCP organisation managed to establish Russian Technology Platforms.

Russia is also entitled in FP7 to participate in ERANETs.

A targeted sharing of experiences of Russian NCPs, Russian authorities and other stakeholders and the development of joint strategies in the above mentioned areas would be most suitable.

7.5.1.5 Tailor-made NCP services and service “packages”

In view of Russia’s association in part or in full to FP7, it is highly recommendable to consider a clear definition of services (e.g. trainings for proposers, assistance on legal/financial issues) and service standards which all Russian NCPs should deliver, and to provide the appropriate resources, organisational conditions, training opportunities and structures enabling all of them to carry out these services. Depending on the needs of the specific target groups tailor-made service “packages” can be developed.

Performance goals and indicators based on the benchmarking of Russia’s potential to succeed in FP7 could form the starting point. Based on the performance goals and indicators, tailor-
made services should be developed by NCPs of different themes and horizontal programmes, in close cooperation. The NCP coordinator could lead this activity on behalf of the MES.

7.5.1.6 Development of individual consultancy

All NCPs underlined the growing demand for individual consultancy as well as the essential contribution of individual consultancy to ensuring the success of Russian researchers in the Framework Programme.

Individual consultancy, notably face-to-face consultancy is insufficient.

It will be essential to provide NCP host organisations with appropriate working conditions, notably in terms of number of staff, training and regional as well as institutional support structures located at Russian RTD institutions, to respond to this ever growing need.

A good monitoring of the consultancy work and an analysis of its impact is of major importance to prove its relevance. In case of Russia’s association to FP7, the effectiveness of the use of a common suitable customer relation management system could be explored.
7.6 Networking at European level

Recommendation for strategic development
Setting up structures that facilitate systematic networking at European level

Recommendation for action

- Ensure the integration of Russian NCPs into FP7 NCP projects of their thematic/horizontal area by providing the financial resources or at least travel budget.
- Ensure that the EC sends official invitations to take part in NCP meetings to all Russian NCPs.
- Ensure that all Russian NCPs are able to attend European NCP meetings by providing the respective travel budgets.
- Provide Russian NCPs with more opportunities for networking with EU NCP colleagues particularly with respect to partner searching and exchange of good practices.

7.6.1 Rational

7.6.1.1 Networking with EU NCPs

Russian NCPs should be provided with financial means to participate in FP7 NCPs projects, e.g. by attending meetings. The integration into activities of FP7 NCPs projects is well suited to support the networking of Russian NCPs into the community of EU NCPs and NCPs of Associated States.

Furthermore, all Russian NCPs should take part in Coordination and Support Actions funded by the EC, notably those including and/or targeting Russia.

Russian NCPs as well as regional multipliers need to be provided with enough national funding to enable NCP host units and regional FP7 support structures to send representatives to international conferences and workshops located in the EU and Russia.

7.6.1.2 A coordinated approach EC – Russia and vice versa

It would be useful if the EC manages to develop a coordinated approach towards Russian NCPs. Russian authorities should ensure that all Russian NCPs receive official invitations to regular EU NCP meetings. Furthermore, all Russian NCPs should be provided by Russian authorities with the financial means to actually attend these meetings.

7 NCPs for RI, ICT and SME don’t receive invitations
7.6.1.3 Access to statistics about Russian participation in FP7

As a Third country, Russia is not entitled to receive statistics. However, it would be highly recommendable if Russian authorities and the European Commission explore possible opportunity to provide Russian NCPs during the transition phase to the association to FP7 already with statistics (for example, by providing them with access to CIRCA). These statistics would enable Russian NCPs and authorities to monitor the impact of their work, to develop suitable performance goals and indicators, to increase the visibility of successful Russian research teams and to enable NCPs to get into contact with already successful project teams.
8 CONCLUSIONS

The EU 7th Framework Programme (FP7) is not just a funding programme, but a substantial strategic challenge for individual researchers as well as research institutions in any country. Projects under FP7 have become too complex and the potential positive impact on any organisation involved in a funded FP7 project can be highly significant in terms of competitiveness. Therefore, a systematic and strategic approach is needed at every level. These are challenges particularly relevant for NCPs and FP7 contact points, since their job is to be close to researchers and inform, assist and actually nowadays coach them in order to contribute to the researchers’ successful participation in FP7.

Since its creation, the Russian FP support system has come a long way. However, with the Framework Programme as a learning system becoming more and more competitive – currently approx. 15% success rate at European average – and Russia’s envisaged association to FP7, further efforts are urgently needed in order to continue the development and strengthen the Russian FP7 support system and thus the Russian research community.

This “Report for strengthening EECA NCPs/NIPs – Russia” summarizes the findings of the current status based on the review of the Russian NCP system. Furthermore, it presents a comprehensive set of recommendations on how FP7 support structures can be strengthened, embedded into background information on the rationale of the review and the methodology applied. Based on the analysis done, the recommendations developed are structured according to the following logic:

1. Development of a comprehensive Russian FP7 support system
2. Governance of the FP7 support system
3. FP7 support system staff and its recognition
4. NCP work as a systematic process towards successful FP7 cooperation
5. Networking at European level

Each of mentioned fields is split into a “recommendation for strategic development” and a set of “recommendations for action” giving indications towards the implementation.

Based on experiences in other countries it is obvious, that investments in an effective National FP7 support system pay off and can have a direct impact on the success of a national research system in the European FP7 competition. However, it is also clear, that success in FP7 also depends on other essential factors such as national investments in research, national research priorities and structures, etc. These can be significant limiting factors, which cannot be compensated by even the best NCPs and FP7 contact points.

Particularly with the perspective of the Russian association to FP7 action is needed regarding the national support system. This notion is supported by the current status of Russia’s participation in FP7. As much as the return rate is a very limited and one-dimensional factor, it can be seen as indicator for the many additional positive effects resulting from participation in FP7, and as such it is an interesting indicator. Compared to the current Russian share of app. 30 Mio. Euro in FP7 projects and Russia’s likely, at least 35-fold higher contribution (between 1 and 2.5 billion Euro) in case of association to FP7, the urgency of action at all levels becomes very obvious.

It is hoped, that this report provides impulses and guidance for Russian authorities and NCPs.
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10 ANNEXES

10.1 Abbreviations

AS  Associated State
    (to the Framework Programme)

BMBF  German Federal Ministry of Education and Research
       www.bmbf.de

BMWi  German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology
       www.bmwi.de

CNRS  Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France
       www.cnrs.fr/index.php

CSA  FP7 Coordination and Support Action

DLR  International Bureau of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research
     (BMBF) at the German Aerospace Centre (DLR), Germany
     www.internationales-buero.de

EC  European Commission
    http://ec.europa.eu/index_en.htm

EECA  Eastern Europe and Central Asian Countries

ETP  European Technology Platforms

EU  European Union
    http://europa.eu/index_en.htm

FAQ  Frequently Asked Questions

FASI  Federal Agency for Science and Innovation, Ministry of Science and
      Education of the Russian Federation (ROSNAUKA)
      www.fasi.gov.ru

FASIE  Foundation for Assistance to Small Innovative Enterprises
        www.fasie.ru

FFG  Austrian Research Promotion Agency
      www.ffg.at / www.ffg.at/rp7

FFG/EIP  Austrian Research Promotion Agency/Division European and International
         Programmes
         www.ffg.at / www.ffg.at/rp7

FP6  Sixth EU Framework Programme for Research and Technological
     Development
     http://cordis.europa.eu/fp6

FP7  Seventh EU Framework Programme for Research, Technological
     Development and Innovation
     http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7
FTP  Federal Targeted Programme of the Russian Federation
www.fcntp.ru
http://rp7.ffg.at/upload/medialibrary/08_Burger81299.pdf

HSE  State University - Higher School of Economics
www.hse.ru

ICP  FP7 Institutional Contact Point

ICT  Information and Communication Technologies

KBBE  Knowledge Based Bio-Economy

MES  Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation
http://eng.mon.gov.ru

MON/MOES  Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation
(former or other commonly used abbreviations)

MS  Member State
(of the European Union)

NCP  FP7 National Contact Point

NIP  FP6/FP7 National Information Point

NIS  New Independent States

RAS  Russian Academy of Sciences
www.ras.ru

RCP/RIP  FP6/7 Regional Contact/Information Point

RFBR  Russian Foundation for Basic Research
www.rff.ruf

RI  Research Infrastructure

RTTN  Russian Technology Transfer Network
www.rttn.ru/?&lang=eng

RTD  Research and Technology Development

SENTER-NOVEM  Agency of the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs
www.senternovem.nl

SME  Small and Medium sized Enterprise

SSA  FP6 Support Action

SSH  Social Sciences and Humanities

VINNOVA  Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation Systems
www.vinnova.se

WP  Work Package
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IncoNet EECA - S&T International Cooperation Network for Eastern European and
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“FP7 INCO CSA Project”
www.inco-eeca.net

IncoNet EECA Deliverable
D4.3 Expert Meeting on Methodology of Analysis and Training
IncoNet EECA Deliverable
D4.6a Visits to / interviews of EECA NCPs/NIPs - Russia

ERA.Net RUS - Linking Russia to the ERA: Coordination of MS/AC S&T programmes towards and with Russia
“FP7 INCO CSA Project”
www.eranet-rus.eu

IncrEAST - Information Exchange in Science and Technology between the European Research Area and Eastern European/Central Asian Countries
“Information Web-Portal”
www.increast.eu

Scope East - Scenarios for a co-ordinated approach to sustainable S/T co-operation with the Eastern Neighbours of the EU
“FP6 INCO SSA Project”
www.scope-east.net

RegionERA (REGIONAL NETWORK FOR SUPPORT OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL CO-OPERATION BETWEEN EUROPEAN UNION AND RUSSIAN REGIONS)
“FP6 INCO SSA Project”

TACIS - Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States
http://www/welcomeurope.com/default.asp?id=1110&idpgm=11088

TACIS - Institution Building Partnership Programme (IBPP)
http://www.kooperation-international.de/russland/themes/info/detail/data/26201/?PHPSESSID=c33269fafb89c&cHash=a2deff3391

European Commission - Guiding principles for setting up systems of National Contact Points (NCP systems) for the Seventh EU Framework Programme on Research and Technological Development (FP7)

FTP - Federal Targeted Programme of the Russian Federation
Directorate of Federal Research Programme
www.fcntp.ru
http://fp7.ffg.at/upload/medialibrary/08_Burger81299.pdf
EU-Russia Four Common Spaces

EU-Russia Common Spaces Roadmap

EU-Russia Common Space of Research and Education

EU-Russia Common Spaces Progress Report 2008

EU-Russia Common Spaces Progress Report 2007

OECD Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2008
www.oecd.org/sti/outlook

European Commission -Towards a European Research Area: Science, Technology and Innovation - Key Figures 2007
Strenghtening the Foundations of the European Research Area
Support for the coherent development of policies

OECD Watch - Model National Contact Point
http://ocecdwatch.org/publications-en/Publication_2223

European Commission - Key figures of science, technology and innovation
http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/monitoring/statistical01_en.htm

CORDIS - Science and Technology Indicators for the European Research Area (STI-ERA)
http://cordis.europa.eu/indicators/publications.htm

Guiding principles for setting up systems of National Contact Points (NCP systems) for the Seventh EU Framework Programme on Research and Technological Development (FP7)

PROVISO
Austrian monitoring project of the EU Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development
http://www.bmwf.gv.at/english/europeaninternational_affairs/the_provisor_project

PROVISO-Publication
10.3 Information Links

European Commission - DG External Relations – Russia
http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/russia/index_en.htm

European Commission – EuropeAid - External Relations Programmes – Russia
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/country-cooperation/russia/russia_en.htm

Delegation of the European Commission to Russia
www.delrus.ec.europa.eu

Compendium on Science and Research Cooperation between the European Union and the Russian Federation

European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/overview/index_en.htm

EU-Russia Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA, 1997)

EU-Russia Permanent Partnership Council on Research


Agreement renewing the agreement on cooperation in science and technology between the Government of the Russian federation and the European Community (2003)

COST - Intergovernmental framework for European Cooperation in Science and Technology
www.cost.esf.org

EEN - Enterprise Europe Network
www.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/info/countries/correspondence_centres_en.htm#russia
ESF - European Science Foundation
www.esf.org

EUREKA - Pan-European network for market-oriented R&D
www.eureka.be

INTAS - The International Association for the Promotion of Co-operation with Scientists from the New Independent States (NIS) of the Former Soviet Union
www.intas.be

ISTC - International Science and Technology Centre
www.istc.ru
10.4 Interview guideline for semi-structures interviews of Russian NCPs

IncoNet EECA
Guideline for face-to-face interview NCP xxx
©FFG 2008

This material is subject to copyright protection. The use, also in extracts, is only permitted with explicit written consent of the Austrian Research Promotion Agency.

Date xxx

The Inconet EECA project is funded by the European Commission within FP7/INCO.

http://www.inco-eeca.net/
1 The organisational framework

1.1 The basis to implement NCP activities

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

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

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

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

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

- If appropriate: Please give an outline of the report to the contracting body about the implementation: Size, content/chapters, performance indicators (qualitative/quantitative), consequences
  → What do you consider as most important activities?
  → If appropriate: Who defines the implementation programme?

- If appropriate, see report: How does the monitoring by your contracting body work?

- If appropriate Evaluation: How did the external evaluation take place? What was the impact?

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

1.2 Human Resources

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

- Could you provide us with an organisation chart of your NCP unit/hosting organisation?
  → How do you distribute responsibilities among the staff (eg legal and financial issues)?
  → What is the level of experience with FP7 (FP6) of your staff? Do they have experience with carrying out EC-funded projects themselves? Do you consider this as important?

- How does the recruitment of staff in general work?
  → Do you use any profile for selecting future NCP-staff? Who decides about new staff to be recruited and selected?
  → What are the professional background and qualifications of the current staff (former researchers?, rather junior/senior, frequency of staff changes)?
  → If someone is not full-time employed for the NCP work: What are other activities? Are they related to NCP-responsibilities? Where lies the priority and who decides about the setting of priorities?

- Please describe any in-service training aiming to increase competences and qualifications of NCP-staff.
  → Did someone participate in a FP7- (or other) training of the EC? (traineeships in Brussels, staff exchange with other NCP’s etc.)
2 Target Groups

2.1 Who is your target group?

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

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

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

- Who are your clients1?
  - Beginners in FP7
  - If appropriate: Coordinators of proposals
  - Partners in a proposal
  - People with a rejected proposal
  - Administrators
  - Researchers who evaluate FP proposals
  - FP7 multipliers

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

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

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

---

1 From "Training course for FP7 advisors. Hyperion Ltd, June 2007"
3 NCP activities

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

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

Information and awareness raising

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

Individual support

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

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

⇒ For a general information
⇒ For an assessment of a project idea (if appropriate)
⇒ For a final proposal check (if appropriate)

• How does your NCP organisation monitor the consultancy work? More detailed exploration in Chapter 3
  ⇒ How many individual consultancies does your NCP hosting organisation carry out per year (eg, in 2008 so far)?
  ⇒ How do you assess the impact of the individual consultancies and of your own performance in this relation?
  ⇒ By which instruments/approach do you assess the level of satisfaction of your clients? Is there any analysis?
  ⇒ How do you yourself perceive the level of satisfaction of your clients with individual consultancy?

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

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

Assistance to researchers/clients

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

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

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

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

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

[Referring to the report/questionnaire, only if appropriate]

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

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

Other issues

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

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

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

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

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

4.2 Networking with other European NCPs

- Do you participate in FP7-NCP-projects? How do you perceive the impact and benefits?
  
- Do you participate in any other CSA? If yes, how do you value the impact and benefits?
  
- How do you, apart from FP6/FP7-projects network / exchange information with other European NCPs?
Referring to the report/questionnaire, if appropriate: Since when do you (resp. your NCP-organisation) take part in the international NCP meetings/other European conferences/FP7-information days/trainings?

⇒ If yes, how do you value the outcomes of the participation?

⇒ Is there anything which could be improved?

⇒ Referring to the report/questionnaire: if your NCP hosting organisation does not send NCPs to NCP-meetings organised by the European Commission services: How important would you actually consider the attendance of NCP-meetings for your work? Please describe and specify, to your opinion, the impact of your non-attendance;

4.3 Contact with the European Commission

• How do you perceive your interaction with the EC?

⇒ How do you perceive the information and communication flow with the EC?

⇒ Do EC representatives attend events you’re organising?

⇒ Do you receive invitations to all NCP-meetings in Brussels?

⇒ Do you consider that there is good support from the Commission services for your work?

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

5 Monitoring of success/ Self monitoring

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

• Does your organisation use monitoring instruments (eg performance indicators, CRM-tools (Client-Relation-Management), online or offline databases) to monitor NCP-activities and keep record of it (based on your contract and beyond)?

⇒ If yes, how have these instruments been developed in the course of your NCP-activities?

⇒ Did your organisation get any specific guidelines from your national authorities as to how these instruments should be developed and implemented?
By which instruments do you assess the level of satisfaction of your clients (e.g., feedback forms, surveys, interviewees could bring examples as appropriate)? Is there any analysis?

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

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

1. Name of the interviewee:

Position:

2. Name of the interviewee:

Position:

3. Name of the interviewee:

Position:

Name of the NCP organisation:

Date of interview:
### 10.5 List of Russian NCPs interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>NCP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date / Time of Interview</th>
<th>Address of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>Mr. Evgeniy Andreiev</td>
<td>02.02.09 14:00</td>
<td>HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>Ms. Alexandra Savelieva</td>
<td>02.02.09 14:00</td>
<td>HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>Ms. Natalia Miroshnichenko</td>
<td>02.02.09 14:00</td>
<td>HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Ms. Elena Chistyakova</td>
<td>02.02.09 14:00 (postponed to 6.2.09, 10:00)</td>
<td>HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nano</td>
<td>Mrs. Marina Melkonyan</td>
<td>03.02.09 10:00</td>
<td>Shubnikov Institute of Crystallography RAS, Leninskiy prospect, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nano</td>
<td>Mr. Evgeniy Ugrinovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Mr. Dmitiy Vatulya</td>
<td>03.02.09 14:00</td>
<td>Institute of Operational Systems, Kosmodamianskaya naberezhnaya, 46-50, stroenie 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Mr. Alexander Beriev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Murashov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Mr. Denis Krjukov</td>
<td>04.02.09 10:00</td>
<td>HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>Ms. Anastasia Gurova</td>
<td>04.02.09 13:30</td>
<td>Centre for Science Research and Statistics, Tverskaya, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>Ms. Irina Krutj</td>
<td>04.02.09 13:30</td>
<td>Centre for Science Research and Statistics, Tverskaya, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>Ms. Natalia Chusova</td>
<td>04.02.09 13:30</td>
<td>Centre for Science Research and Statistics, Tverskaya, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Mrs. Irina Sharova</td>
<td>04.02.09 16:30</td>
<td>A.N.Bach Institute of Biochemistry RAS, Leninskiy prospekt, 33, build 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Mr. Vladimir Eryomin</td>
<td>04.02.09 16:30</td>
<td>A.N.Bach Institute of Biochemistry RAS, Leninskiy prospekt, 33, build 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Ms. Olga Reusche</td>
<td>05.02.09 10:00</td>
<td>Foundation for Assistance Small Innovative Enterprises, Mosfilmovskaya, 17B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Mr. Pavel Makarevich</td>
<td>05.02.09 13:00</td>
<td>M.V.Lomonosov Moscow State University, Lomonosovskiy prospect, 31, korpus 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Mr. Alexander Vorotnikov</td>
<td>05.02.09 13:00</td>
<td>M.V.Lomonosov Moscow State University, Lomonosovskiy prospect, 31, korpus 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Mrs. Anna Pikalova</td>
<td>06.02.09 10:00</td>
<td>HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>INCO</td>
<td>Mrs. Anna Pikalova</td>
<td>06.02.09 10:00</td>
<td>HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Russian NCP for Environment was not available due to a business trip.
10.6 Conclusions of the RUSERA EXE Report “Spotlight on EU Russia RTD cooperation. A snapshot of experiences on researchers’ level”

**Spotlight on EU Russia RTD cooperation. A snapshot of experiences on researchers’ level**
Published by FFG/ Austrian Research Promotion Agency in July 2009

**Conclusions**

RTD cooperation between Europe and Russia is established and works well. The Russian S&T contribution to joint projects is undisputed among leading European researchers. Russian partners are in high esteem among European FP6 project coordinators because of their scientific competence and personal reliability. Scientific and human relationships among researchers are in general excellent.

However, researchers involved into EU-Russia RTD cooperation face a number of hurdles. Experience and growing participation in FP7 and other EC-programmes will considerably increase the capability of researchers to cope with some of the challenges which were identified by the present report.

As a conclusion we would like to present a set of measures which would essentially help Russian and European researchers, notably newcomers, in EU-Russia RTD cooperation:

**On a federal level**

- the further development of suitable FP7 support structures in Russia—National Contact Points, Regional Contact Points in Russia’s regions – ensuring easy access of researchers to information about FP7, regardless of their location
- facilitation of visa provision to researchers notably in Russia’s regions
- the further establishment of suitable support and advisory structures for researchers on legal issues, notably in the field of IPR, to ensure a proactive approach to the dissemination and exploitation of results by Russian partners

- a deeper analyses of the impact of the participation of Russian researchers in EC-funded programmes on individual RTD results, careers and on the S&T output of institutions involved
- the development of career models rewarding a proactive approach to EC-funded international RTD cooperation
- the implementation of proactive measures to raise the awareness of decision makers and heads of institutions for the need to develop institutional strategies for international cooperation incorporating the participation in EC-funding programmes (and bilateral activities of individual EU Member States/ Associated States).

**On an institutional level**

- the establishment of strategic and lasting support to researchers participating in FP7, such as the provision of information about suitable EC- (and other bilateral) funding programmes and basic rules of participation, open calls, the preparation, management and monitoring of spending of the EC-grants, reporting to the EC, advise and support with legal and financial issues;
- the provision of flexible funding for physical mobility, enabling researchers to participate in preparatory and kick-off meetings, empowering them to formulate proactively their share of the work, proposing themselves their share of the budget
- a transparent and reliable management of EC-funding, in line with the rules of the EC and the contracts which have been signed

**On an individual level**

- researchers need to acquire complementary skills notably in the areas of project management, proposal writing and languages (English)
• researchers from the EU/AS and Russia need to put right from the start attention to their style of communication as EU-Russia communication seems to be a prominent source for misunderstandings

• visits of European partners to Russia, establishing personal relationships right from the start

• increased awareness of European coordinators for the need to consider Russian researchers as mediators to an administration with little experience in international cooperation

**Partnering and consortium building**

• increased transparency of the Russian RTD landscape, facilitating partnering for European newcomers in EU-Russia cooperation

• an enhanced information flow from Europe to Russia about consortia under formation to potential Russian partners, EU NCPs could contribute here

Within FP7, the European Community and Russia cooperate even more closely than in FP6, defining jointly RTD topics of mutual interest and benefit, offering specific instruments to encourage an intensified RTD cooperation.

It will be of major importance to develop a straightforward implementation strategy of measures necessary in order to enable Russia and Europe to fully exploit the high potential of EU-Russia RTD cooperation in the upcoming years, notably in case of Russia’s association to FP7.
10.7 Presentation of Analytical Report and Recommendations for Strengthening of Russian NCPs System to the respective representatives of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science

The report and its results were presented to the respective representatives of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science as well as to the Russian NCPs on 23rd September 2009 in Moscow at the State University – Higher School of Economics.
10.7.1 Agenda

Presentation of Analytical Report and Recommendations for Strengthening of Russian NCPs System. NCPs Meeting.

PROGRAMME
(draft)
Wednesday, 23 September 2009
State University – Higher School of Economics
Moscow, Myasnitskaya, 20
Room № 309

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10:00</th>
<th>Welcome and Opening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonid GOKHBERG, First Vice-Rector, State University – Higher School of Economics, and Director, Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10:30  | Presentation of Analytical Report and Recommendations for Strengthening of Russian NCPs System in FP7 |
|        | Sabine HERLITSCHKA, Director, European and International Programmes, Austrian Research Promotion Agency |

| 11:15-11:45 | COFFEE |
| 11:45      | LUNCH |

| 13:00-14:00 | Meeting of Russian FP7 National Contact Points |
|            | Welcome and Opening |
|            | Leonid GOKHBERG, First Vice-Rector, State University – Higher School of Economics, and Director, Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge |

| 14:15 | Presentation of Analytical Report and Recommendations for Strengthening of Russian NCPs System in FP7 |
|       | Sabine HERLITSCHKA, Director, European and International Programmes, Austrian Research Promotion Agency |

| 15:00  | Discussion of the Results and Recommendations of the Report |
| 17:00  | END OF MEETING |

Working language – English without translation
10.7.2 Presentation Slides

Developing a Russian FP7 Support System

Findings and Recommendations based on NCP Review within IncoNet EECA

Sept. 2009

Sabine Herlitschka
Director
European and International Programmes (EIP)
FFG - Austrian Research Promotion Agency

Today it is about...

- Background of the review
- The Review: Findings and Recommendations
- Conclusions
Today it is about...

- Background of the review
- The Review: Findings and Recommendations
- Conclusions

The Logic of FP7 Instruments and Activities

- Offering strategic information: monitoring, review, recommendations, etc.
- Supporting Framework Conditions
- Joint R&D Projects
Why is the EU Framework Programme Interesting?

FP is not interesting because of the money!

FP is about working on major S&T questions, critical mass that individual researchers, teams, nationals do not have themselves, changing cultures of cooperation, mechanisms of research systems, etc.

FP is a strategic challenge with impact at all levels: individual, institutional, national and the potential to change systems.

Technical Details of the Report

» Context of the report:
  Part of IncoNet EECA project:
  Work Package 4: “Supporting the NCPs/NIPs in EECA countries”,
  Task 4.2 “Capacity Building of NCPs Russia”
  Deliverable 4.6a: Analytical Report for strengthening EECA NCPs/NIPs – Russia

» Methodology applied:
  previous reports and analysis (part. TACIS) and RusenaExe interviews with RU NCPs in Febbr. 2009
  Analysis and development of recommendations

» Structure of the Report: Summaries, Methodology, Background, Findings & Recommendations, Conclusions, Annexes & References
Aims of the Report

- provide Russian authorities with an outsider's expert view about the effectiveness and efficiency of the current Russian NCP system,
- based on the findings, raise the awareness for the need to substantially revise and improve Russia's FP7 support structures in order to fully exploit the potential of EU-Russia RTD cooperation,
- provide (with the perspective of Russia's association to FP7) concrete recommendations of how Russian authorities can prepare - during the transition phase - for effective participation in FP7.

Today it is about...

- Background of the review
- The Review: Findings and Recommendations
- Conclusions
Trends of RU participation in FP7

Findings relate to...

Structure of the RU NCP System
- Contractual relationship with MES and FASFI
- Funding for NCP host organisations
- NCP staff
- RU NCP work
- Activities
- Individual consultancy
- Assistance to researchers
- RU NCPs and their environment
  - Networking and coordination of Russian NCPs
  - Regional networks of multipliers
  - Networking with EU NCPs
  - Support from the European Commission
Recommendations structured as follows...

5 blocks of recommendation, each of which set up as
Recommendation for Strategic Development
plus a set of
Recommendations for Action towards Implementation

1. Development of a comprehensive Russian FP7 support system
2. Governance of the Russian FP7 support system
3. FP7 Russian support system staff and its recognition
4. NCP work as a systematic process towards successful FP7 cooperation
5. Russian networking at European level

A challenging position embedded into national RTD system
NCP work is not an add-up activity!
Findings in Detail 1

Structure of the Russian NCP System

Contractual relationships between MES, RAS & NCP host organisations and funding

Keywords: Nomination process, Guiding principles, Contracts, no mid-term planning, competitive calls for various NCP-like activities, insufficient funding, host organisations contributions, monitoring, reporting, standards

Russian NCP Staff

Keywords: NCP staff carefully selected, highly qualified, try to be very active in various ways, fluctuation of staff, awareness of strength and weaknesses of current system, missing coordination and strategic guidance, lack of funding, NCP job profile, as add-on work, host organisations contribute financially, situation of conflict of interest

Findings in Detail 2

Russian NCP Work: activities, individual consultancy, assistance to researchers

Keywords:
Focus on information dissemination, organisation of events, individual approaches (eg. web sites, no common web site, databases, etc.) - more elaborate services hardly developed (eg. indiv. assistance) due to lack of resources and training, partner searching highly needed but very difficult; lack of info, visibility and access.
Findings in Detail 3

Russian NCPs and their environment: networking, coordination, EU, EC

Key words:
No/little strategic guidance by MES, partly by host organisations – some exchange between different NCPs but no nationally coordinated approaches, exchange, training – NCPs maintain informal regional/institutional network – lack of resources for exchange/sharing of experience/training face to face meetings with regional/institutional multipliers – Varying contacts with EU NCPs (intense to no contacts) – FP7 NCP projects are good opportunities for networking – cooperation with EU NCPs focussed on partnering – Varying contacts with European Commission (intense to no contacts) – invitations to EC NCP meetings received by some RU NCPs – coordinated calls help in networking – EC officers availability upon request

The NCP – one of the keys for Success

- Are able to deal with FP7 as strategic challenge
- Raise visibility of FP
- Explain FP in national context and act pro-actively in the national network
- Be active in the international network with EC and other NCPs
- Act quickly and in time
- Motivate, encourage, coach researchers
- Coach researchers in times of intensive efforts
Recommendations: Background

- Current status of RU NCP development: rather normal, further development/substantial changes necessary but no "revolutions"
- NCP Systems in Europe: various models depending on many factors
- FFG background and experience: structured system with strong central organisation
- Guiding principle for recommendations: systemic approach
- National environment (funding, priorities, structures): important!

5 blocks of recommendation: each of which set up as
Recommendation for Strategic Development plus
Recommendations for Action towards Implementation

5 Blocks of Recommendations

Governance of the System

Networking at European Level

FP7 Support System

FP7 Staff and Recognition

NCP Work as Systematic Process towards successful FP7 cooperation
Recommendation 1:
Development of a Comprehensive FP7 Support System

Recommendation for strategic development:
Development of a comprehensive FP7 support system with a clear common vision, defined objectives, activities and structures comprising the national, regional and institutional dimension in a complementary approach.

Recommendations for action:
- Strategy development: process together with all relevant stakeholders at national, regional level identifying objectives, goals, strategies, activities, performance goals and indicators.
- Development of scenarios of Russia's potential for participation in FP7.
- Provision of an appropriate contractual framework for NCP host organisations enabling sustainability of the system and services offered.
- Network development: development of capable officially appointed and recognised FP7 contact points at regional and institutional level coordinated by NCPs.
- Provision of sufficient funding for the system at all levels clearly related to above defined objectives and activities foreseen.
- Foresee structured mechanisms for coordination & learning of the system.
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Recommendation 2:
Governance of the FP7 Support System

Recommendation for strategic development:
Development of a consistent, highly effective and efficient governance structure for the Russian FP7 support system.

Recommendations for action:
- Establishment of a supervisory body acting as steering committee providing supervision and strategic orientation for the FP7 Support System and the implementation of its contract(s). This steering committee should consist of a limited number of high-level representatives of all relevant parties (MES, FASU, NCP Coordinator, adequate regional or institutional representatives). Ideally, a limited number of international experts are also included as members.
- Regular meetings of the supervisory body
- Setting up an effective, proactive national co-ordination (individual person or specific unit) of the FP7 Support System at operational level in the implementation of the contract(s).

Recommendation 2, cont.

- Setting up an effective, proactive national co-ordination (individual person or specific unit) of the FP7 Support System at operational level in the implementation of the contract(s):
  - Acting on behalf of MES/FASU,
  - Empowered to provide strategic guidance and coordination,
  - Mediating between all Russian thematic and horizontal NCPs & MES/FASU,
  - Facilitating ongoing dialogue,
  - Without interfering into daily business of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points.
  - Setting-up of common NCP and FP7 Contact Point Web-Portal.
  - Organisation of regular trainings and meetings of NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
  - Enhance establishment of a networking platform for sharing of experiences and best practice among all NCPs and FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
  - Encourage NCPs cooperation towards joint events on horizontal issues like legal and financial questions or project administration and reporting, joint publications, joint visibility activities, etc.
Recommendation 3:
**FP7 Support System Staff & Its Recognition**

**Recommendation for strategic development:**
Recognize NCP and FP7 Contact Point work as specific high-level job profiles that need professional expertise in research management in order to achieve sustainable quality of the FP7 support system and ensure proper understanding within the system and at stakeholder level.

**Recommendations for actions:**
- Development of the NCP job profile as full-time professional
- Development of FP7 contact point job profile for regional & institutional level.
- Development of a formal recognition process for NCPs and FP7 Contact points at regional and institutional level.
- Attractive incentives for NCP and FP7 Contact Point jobs in order to keep experienced NCP and FP7 Contact Point staff.
- Develop clear guidelines laying down organizational roles excluding any potential conflict of interest.
- Provide NCP units and NCP related staff with organisational and financial autonomy to serve the entire Russian RTD community if they are hosted by a RTD organization interested itself in participation in FP7.

---

Recommendation 4:
**NCP work as Systematic Process towards successful FP7 Cooperation**

**Recommendation for strategic development:**
In order to ensure its effectiveness, NCP work has to be understood as a systematic process with clearly defined standards and timelines performance goals.

**Recommendations for actions:**
- Estimation/categorisation of Russia’s potential target group for successful participation in FP7 and definition of NCPs performance goals and indicators to reach those target groups in terms of quantity and quality.
- Develop tailor-made NCP service “packages” and standards towards the Russian RTD community, e.g.
  - for high potential Russian coordinators: from information, consultancy to proposal checks, could also include incentives (preparation funding)
  - for high potential Russian partners: from information, consultancy to effective partner searching, etc.
Recommendation 4, cont.

- Development of complementary service packages for FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
- Setting up a one-stop service (customer orientation) management system for the active NCP system with possibilities for links to FP7 Contact Points at regional and institutional level.
- Meet the urgent need for legal and financial information towards FP7:
  - Establish a Legal and Financial NCP and to employ in addition at each thematic and horizontal NCP host organisation one expert on legal and financial issues.
  - To develop continuously a set of typical FAQ on legal and financial issues for Russian researchers.
- Substantially increase the capacity of Russian FP7 support structures to provide individual face to face consultancy and to monitor the impact of face to face consultancy.

Recommendation 5:
Networking at European Level

Recommendation for strategic development:
Setting up structures that facilitate systematic networking at European level.

Recommendations for action:
- Ensure the integration of Russian NCPs into FP7 NCP projects of their thematic/horizontal area by providing the financial resources or at least travel budget.
- Ensure that the EC sends official invitations to take part in NCP meetings to all Russian NCPs.
- Ensure that all Russian NCPs are able to attend European NCP meetings by providing the respective travel budgets.
- Provide Russian NCPs with more opportunities for networking with EU NCP colleagues particularly with respect to partner searching and exchange of good practices.
Today it is about...

- Background of the review
- The Review: Findings and Recommendations
- Conclusions

In Conclusion...

RU is on the way and has achieved a lot

however
FPs are not waiting

IncoNet EECA/NCP Review gives timely recommendations on future development
together with other initiatives like Bilat-RUS, ERA-Net RUS, etc.
RU has received a lot of input for action
Action on RU side is needed if new dimensions of cooperation and improvements of the system are intended
10.8 Expert Meeting on Success Factors for Russian Participation in the EU RTD Framework Programme

Within the frame of the FP7 CSA project “BILAT-RUS” an “Expert Meeting on Success Factors for Russian Participation in the EU RTD Framework Programme” was held at the State University – Higher School of Economics on 14 May 2009 in Moscow. On this meeting Dr. Sabine Herlitschka (Director FFG Division European and International Programmes (EIP)) gave a presentation titled “Providing an Optimum Frame for Networking of Science and Innovation Communities in Russia and the EU: The Role of NCPs”.

10.8.1 Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael SCHLICHIT, Director, Division for Cooperation with Russia and the CIS Countries, Federal Ministry of Education and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>EU-Russia Relationship: Evaluation of State-of-the-art and Prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sergey KARAGANOVA, Dean, World Economics and International Politics Faculty, State University – Higher School of Economics, and Chair of Freundum, Council on Foreign and Defense Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Russian Participation in the EU RTD Framework Programme as “Third Country”: Lessons Learnt and Main Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonid GOKHBERG, First Vice-Recto, State University – Higher School of Economics, and Director, HSE Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>Lessons Learnt from the Participation of non-EU Member States in the EU RTD Framework Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Case of Central and Eastern European Countries:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klaus SCHUCH, Managing Director, Centre for Social Innovation, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:20</td>
<td>COFFEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>Lessons Learnt from the Participation of non-EU Member States in the EU RTD Framework Programme (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Case of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcel SHATON, General Manager, National coordinator, Israel-Europe Directorate for the EU Framework Programme, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Case of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erik YSSEN, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Education and Research, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Providing an Optimum Frame for Networking of Science and Innovation Communities in Russia and the EU: The Role of NCPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sabine HERLITSCHKA, Director, European and International Programmes, Forschungs Förderungs Gesellschaft, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:40</td>
<td>How to Enhance the Framework for EU-Russia S&amp;T Co-operation: Recent Analytical Results and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | Joern SONNENBURG, Director, International Bureau of the Federal
Ministry of Education and Research c/o German Aerospace Center

15:00 DISCUSSION

15:20 COFFEE

15:40 – 16:45 Structured Discussion on Success Factors for Russian Participation in the EU RTD Framework Programme
Chair: Sergey IVANETS, Director, Department for Strategy and Perspective Projects in Education and Science, Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation
Co-chair: Joern SONNENBURG, Director, International Bureau of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research c/o German Aerospace Center

Role of Policy Coordination and Joint Instruments
- Lessons learnt from coordinated EU-Russia calls for proposals:
  - Common evaluation of proposals and methodology of calls for proposals
- Identification of common research priorities for FP
- Enhancing joint participation through bilateral instruments
- Monitoring and assessment of the participation in the FP
- Role of EU funded coordination projects (BILAT RUS, ERA-net RUS, Inco Net EECA, etc.). How to build joint ownership?

Shaping the legal/regulatory framework
- Intellectual property rights and their role for the utilization and commercialization of research results: how to share and protect IP between EU Member States and Russia
- Openness of S&T infrastructures; transfer of equipment and scientific material (biological, geological, etc.)
- Framework for cross-border funding and reciprocity of opening S&T programmes
- Scientific visas

Fostering networking among the S&T communities
- Increasing attractiveness and open-up Russian S&T institutions
- Raising awareness of the EU research community about the Russian scientific potential
- Introducing dedicated instruments for networking and using bilateral cooperation schemes

Optimizing the advisory network
- Development of the information and consultancy network building on the present NCPs, staff qualification, range of offered services and funding
- Building research capacity (scientific and administrative project management skills)

16:45 Concluding Remarks: How to Respond to Present Challenges?
Leonid GOKHBERG, First Vice-Rector, State University – Higher School of Economics, and Director, HSE Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge

17:00 End of the meeting
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Providing an Optimum Frame for Networking of Science and Innovation Communities in Russia and the EU:

The Role of NCPs

Sabine Herlitschka
Director
European and International Programmes (EIP)
FFG - Austrian Research Promotion Agency

Role of NCPs according to Guiding Principles...

- Informing, awareness raising
  - General and specific documentation on the Community RTD programmes, incl. rules for participation, submission of proposals, etc.
  - Organise promotional activities in liaison with the Commission services.
  - Raise awareness for the Community objectives (eg participation of women, SMEs in FP, link between science and ethics/civil society).
  - Raise awareness for other European research/innovation programmes

- Advising, assisting and training
  - Advise on administrative procedures and legal issues
  - Assist in partner search activities (using tools such as CORDIS, co-operation networks, business support network services etc.).
  - Organise training sessions for researchers, specific groups, intermediaries.
  - Assist the Commission services in assuring transparency and equal access to calls for new partners in on-going FP7 Projects.

- Signposting and Feedback
However...

FP7 is more than some kind of funding programme but a strategic challenge!

- At individual level: commitment to excellence at all levels is essential.
- At institutional level: balanced approach of bottom-up initiatives AND top-down institutional strategies is an important success factor for FP7.
- At NCP level: can contribute substantially if fully committed to tailor-made service, detailed knowledge of research community, pro-active networking, quality assurance of services.

In talking about FP7:

- FP7 is about reaching the top: excellence.
- FP7 is a strategic programme: cooperation with the best teams on key topics of European relevance.
- It is tough, time consuming and a learning experience to prepare for participation.
- NCPs are essential facilitators.
Nowadays NCPs work means...

- NCPs have to be at the forefront of the FP7 “learning system”
- With highly professional, innovative, incentive-driven approaches towards the research community

What is not enough anymore:
general information and partner-searching

Learning from Experience:
The Austrian Case
Learning from Experience:
The Austrian Case

It was NOT an easy start in the FP in 1995 when Austria joined the EU: hard work at all levels!!

Austria can be good example of what is possible

Nowadays: Austrian R&I well connected and active player in EU FP:

- FP6: 2000 AT participations with 20,000 EU/international partners, app. 4.5 billion Euro total volume of projects with AT involvement, 117% return rate
- FP7: further increase after first 1,5 years
- Structure of NCP System in AT

A long way...
the organisational set up

- Central organisation, nowadays part of FFG-Austrian Research Promotion Agency
- Broad spectrum of services: awareness, information, coaching
- Staff: Experts in the field plus additional expertise/experiences
- Training „on the job“: involvement in projects
- Strong networking, even in Austria and beyond

⇒ Staff is essential!
The National Environment: the wider Impact of FP Participation

- Favourable S&T environment to competition and cooperation
- National "versus" international programmes
- Culture of research management
- International networking of researchers

Thinking about FP7 competition: the National or European "package"?

- Tough competition
- Excellent partners
- Clear objectives
- Strategic planning
- Mutual needs
- National funding

FP7

Thinking of mid-term benefits!
Sustainable contacts with the best partners
Tangibles and intangibles
at the forefront of RTD
Investment into future competitiveness
and many more...

Relatively high success rates?
Rel. low success rates!

Beyond achievements of national programmes
Getting ready for the FP7 Challenges:
Austrian Examples

- Tailor-made, personalized coaching
- Measurement of effectiveness of information and coaching services
- FFG Academy: specific training programmes for applicants and consultants
- Coordinators in the focus: Austrian Champions in European Research and establishment of coordinators platform
- Strategic orientation: strategy meetings with leading organisations
- Development of complementary national information/assistance network: NCPs, RCPs, CPs at organisations
- Development of strategy for activities fostering international cooperation

Effectiveness of NCP Coaching

Year 2008: approx. 2000 proposals incl. AT partners submitted under "Cooperation" out of which...

- General Assistance: 22% not funded, 31% funded
- Detailed Assistance/Proposal Checks: 31% not funded, 44% funded
- No-contact: 40% not funded, 15% funded

Services provided by FFG/EIP in 2008:
7000 assistance/consultancy sessions, 28% long, 72% short
Not just Information but Training:
FFG Academy

Not just information but REAL training
Set up with start of FP7: approx. 650 participants in 20 trainings, restricted nr. of participants per training

4 standardized Modules/Courses
- FP7 for newcomers
- Proposal preparation and application
- Management and coordination
- Consultants training

Award for Successful Austrian Coordinators in FP7
Honoring Ceremony:
The first „Austrian Champions in European Research“
The NCP is a guide and coach and a key for success

The NCP – a key for Success

- Raise visibility of FP
- Explain FP in national context and act pro-actively in the national network
- Have strategic perspective
- Be active in the international network with EC and other NCPs
- Act quickly and in time
- Motivate, encourage, coach researchers
- Coach researchers in times of intensive efforts

A challenging position embedded into national RTD system
NCP work is not an add-up activity!
EU-Russia cooperation: main issues...

- Strong scientific culture in Russia
- Considerable RTD potential for FP7 and wide variety of RTD topics of mutual interests

However
- Insufficient information/awareness about leading Russian research among European researchers (and NCPs)
- Lack of contacts among Russian and EU researchers: partnering of successful EU-coordinators mainly via previous contacts or based on recommendations
- Restricted mobility of Russian researchers
- Insufficient knowledge on proposal writing & project management
- Insufficient language skills
- Insufficient FP7-support structures

Important for Russian NCPs

Contractual situation and funding for NCPs/hosting organisations
- Staff working as NCP
  - Frequency of staff changes
  - Conflict of interest
  - Activities
  - Individual consultancy

National and European networking
- Coordination and networking of Russian NCPs
- Regional networks
- Support from the European Commission
- Networking with EU NCP colleagues
Any questions?

Sabine Herlitschka
Coordinating NCP Austria
Director Division of European & International Programmes (EIP)

FFG
Austrian Research Promotion Agency
http://rp7.ffg.at
10.9 Quantitative Development of Russian Participation in FP6 and FP7

10.9.1 Russian participation in signed FP6 contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Russian Federation</th>
<th>FP6 Signed Contracts: Participation &amp; Contribution by Priority Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contracts with at least one participation from country</td>
<td>Participations from country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Life sciences, genomics and biotechnology for health</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information society technologies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nanotechnologies and nanosciences, knowledge-based multifunctional materials and new production processes and devices</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aeronautics and space</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Food quality and safety</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sustainable development, global change and ecosystems</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy support and anticipating scientific and technological needs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal research activities involving SMEs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific measures in support of international cooperation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the coordination of activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the coherent development of research &amp; innovation policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources and mobility</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research infrastructures</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euratom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: European Commission, July 2009
### 10.9.2 Russian participation in eligible proposals submitted to FP7

**RU - Russia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>RU - Russia</th>
<th>FP7 Eligible Proposals: Participation by Priority Area and Funding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Funding Schemes</td>
<td>Applicants from country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBBE</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMP</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Infrastructures</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research for the benefit of SMEs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science in Society</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Cooperation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURATOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion Energy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Fission &amp; Radiation Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>728</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.9.3 Russian participation in FP7 proposals retained for funding

### RU - Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>FP7 Retained Proposals : Participation by Priority Area and Funding Scheme</th>
<th>All Funding Schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retained proposals with at least one applicant from country</td>
<td>Applicants from country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>10 7,4%</td>
<td>13 5,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBBE</td>
<td>11 8,1%</td>
<td>23 9,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>9 6,6%</td>
<td>11 4,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMP</td>
<td>13 9,6%</td>
<td>20 8,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>10 7,4%</td>
<td>22 9,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>11 8,1%</td>
<td>27 11,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>20 14,7%</td>
<td>35 14,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>3 2,2%</td>
<td>3 1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>4 2,9%</td>
<td>5 2,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Research Council</td>
<td>23 16,9%</td>
<td>24 10,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie-Curie Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Infrastructures</td>
<td>13 9,6%</td>
<td>35 14,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research for the benefit of SMEs</td>
<td>1 0,7%</td>
<td>2 0,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science in Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euratom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Cooperation</td>
<td>4 2,9%</td>
<td>11 4,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Fission &amp; Radiation Protection</td>
<td>4 2,9%</td>
<td>4 1,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136 100,0%</td>
<td>235 100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>